AN EXAMINATION OF THE NEW COVENANT

IN THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS

by

R. Bruce Compton

The nature of the new covenant in the Old and New Testaments continues to be a focus of controversy. While pertinent texts have received individual exegetical consideration, little has been done to consolidate these into a unified study. Such is undertaken here in order to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the new covenant and to provide an exegetical basis for pursuing a select number of related issues. Specifically, it seeks to identify the degree of continuity-discontinuity between the new covenant and the Mosaic and, secondly, to discern the relationship between the new covenant and the church. As a foundation for the exegetical inquiry, two excurses are appended which treat the respective terms for "covenant" in the Old and New Testaments.

In the Old Testament, thirteen passages directly address the new covenant, supplying the following information: (1) The new covenant sustains a greater degree of discontinuity than of continuity with the old. (2) The new covenant provides for the transformation of the human personality, insuring the desire and capacity for obedience to the divine torah. (3) The new covenant establishes an inviolable relationship between Yahweh and the nation. (4) The new covenant provides for the complete forgiveness of sins. (5) The new covenant is promised in conjunction with Israel's regathering and restoration to its geographic homeland after a period of national judgment and dispersion. (6) The new covenant includes the cessation of warfare and a harmonious relationship between the nation and the animal kingdom. (7) The new covenant is mediated through the Servant of Yahweh, depicted as a future Davidide who delivers and rules the nation and who fulfills a salvific role toward the Gentiles.

In the New Testament, thirteen references bear directly upon the new covenant, yielding the following information: (1) The death of Jesus is presented as a covenant-ratification sacrifice, serving to establish the new covenant, and as an expiatory sacrifice, securing the forgiveness which it promises. (2) Jesus, as a high priest, is identified as the mediator and guarantor of the new covenant, insuring the fulfillment of its provision. (3) The new covenant is associated with believers in the present age, in that they enjoy the forgiveness it provides and benefit from the ministry of its high priest. (4) The new covenant assures the future deliverance of national Israel, accomplished through a Savior, encompassing the entire nation and including the forgiveness of sins.

The controlling motif in the relationship between the new covenant and the old, as indicated particularly in the discussion of their respective ministries, is one of contrast. The ministry of the new covenant is inseparably linked with the Spirit of God; it is a ministry which brings life and righteousness rather than condemnation and death.

On the relationship between the new covenant and the church, the position which views the church as presently participating in the new covenant and national Israel as ultimately fulfilling the new covenant is defended as the approach most consistent with the biblical evidence.

Accepted by the Faculty of Grace Theological Seminary

in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree

Doctor of Theology

Homer A. Kent, Jr.
Adviser

D. Wayne Knife
Adviser

Gary T. Meadors
Adviser

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART III: THEOLOGICAL CONSIDERATION AND SUMMARY

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
AD	I. J. Gelb et al., eds. The Assyrian Dictionary
AH	Author of Hebrews
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANE	Ancient Near East
BAGD	W. Bauer, W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and F. W. Danker, Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
BDB	F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament
BDF	F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament
BHS	Biblia hebraica stuttgartensia
Bib	Biblica
BJRL	Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library at Manchester
BR	Biblical Research
BSac	Bibliotheca Sacra
BT	Bible Translator
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CJT	Canadian Journal of Theology
ConB	Coniectanea biblica
EBC	Expositor's Bible Commentary
EBib	Etudes bibliques
EncJud	Encyclopaedia judaica (1971)

EvQ	Evangelical Quarterly
FBBS	Facet Books, Biblical Series
GKC	Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, ed. E. Kautzsch, trans. A. E. Cowley
GTJ	Grace Theological Journal
HNTC	Harper's New Testament Commentaries
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
IB	Interpreter's Bible
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IDB	G. A. Buttrick, ed., Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible
Int	Interpretation
ISBE	International Standard Bible Encyclopedia
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JETS	Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JR	Journal of Religion
JRH	Journal of Religious History
JSNT	Journal for the Study of the New Testament
JSOT	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
LQ	Lutheran Quarterly
MM	J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, eds., The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament
NBD	New Bible Dictionary

NCB	New Century Bible
NCBC	New Century Bible Commentary
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIDNTT	C. Brown, ed., New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NovT	Novum Testamentum
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum, Supplements
NTS	New Testament Studies
RB	Revue biblique
ResQ	Restoration Quarterly
RevQ	Revue de Qumran
RG	A. T. Robertson, Grammar of the Greek New Testament
RTR	Reformed Theological Review
SAJT	Southeast Asia Journal of Theology
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SPB	Studia postbiblica
ST	Studia theologica
TDNT	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
TDOT	G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren, eds., Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament
THAT	Theologisches Handwörterbüch zum Alten Testament
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
TOTC	Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries

TRE	Theologische Realenzyklopädie
TrinJ	Trinity Journal
TWOT	R. L. Harris, ed., Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament
TynBul	Tyndale Bulletin
TZ	Theologische Zeitschrift
VT	Vetus Testamentum
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum, Supplements
WTJ	Westminster Theological Journal
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZPEB	Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible

INTRODUCTION

Reasons for This Study

The reasons for this study are as follows. First, the nature of the new covenant within the Old Testament canon continues to be the subject of considerable debate.[1] At the center of this debate is the relationship between the new covenant and its counterpart, the old or Mosaic covenant. The problem here involves more than identifying the element(s) which makes the new covenant "new." It ultimately focuses on the degree of continuity-discontinuity between the Mosaic and new covenants. The divergence of opinion in response to this problem and the theological implications involved suggest the need for further examination of this relationship.[2]

---

[1]Walter C. Kaiser, "The Old Promise and the New Covenant: Jeremiah 31:31-34," JETS 15 (Winter 1972):14.

[2]This divergence has been expressed in recent years in the debate between reformed theology and dispensationalism. The former, embracing covenant theology, sees very little discontinuity between the Mosaic and new covenants. In covenant theology, the Mosaic and new covenants, as well as those of Noah, Abraham, and David, are all administrations of a covenant of grace which provides salvation as a gift. This is in contrast to a covenant of works made between God and Adam in Eden which provides salvation on the basis of works. As such, the Mosaic and new are simply variations of the same divine covenant. See, for example, L. Berkhof, Systematic Theology, 4th ed., rev. and enlarged (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1941), pp. 262-301; James Oliver Buswell, A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion, 2 vols. in 1 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962-63), 1:307-20; and Evangelical Dictionary of Theology, s.v. "Covenant Theology," by M. E. Osterhaven, 279-80.

Dispensationalism, on the other hand, has argued for a limited degree of continuity and a considerable degree of discontinuity between the two covenants. According to dispensationalists, this discontinuity between the Mosaic and the new reflects the basic distinction between law and grace, that is, between the demand for righteousness and the

However, before a solution to this question can be pursued, the new covenant in the Old Testament must first be defined. The term "new covenant" is found in the Old Testament only in Jeremiah 31:31-34, yet there are other passages in the prophets which speak of a future covenant in terms similar to those in Jeremiah. Although these other passages have received individual exegetical treatment, little has been done to consolidate these treatments into a unified study. Such a consolidated approach is not only valuable but also necessary if the nature of the new covenant in the Old Testament is to be discerned.

A second reason for this study is that the nature of the new covenant within the New Testament canon is also the subject of an ongoing theological controversy.[1] This controversy consists of two related issues. On the one hand, there is the problem concerning the identification of this covenant. Is it to be identified in each case with that spoken of in Jeremiah, or are there instances where a second new covenant is to be identified that is similar to but not identical with the first? On the other hand, there is the question regarding the relationship of

---

provision of righteousness. Rather than being variants of the same covenant, the Mosaic and new are viewed as two distinct covenants which operate on different principles. The Mosaic, representing law and demanding a righteousness for which it does not provide is associated with condemnation; the new, representing grace and making provision for righteousness, is associated with justification. See, for example, L. S. Chafer, Systematic Theology, 8 vols. (Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1948), 4:154-251; idem, Major Bible Themes: 52 Vital Doctrines of the Scripture Simplified and Explained, rev. J. F. Walvoord (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1974), pp. 144-49; A. J. McClain, The Greatness of the Kingdom: An Inductive Study of the Kingdom of God (Winona Lake, IN: BMH Books, 1974), pp. 154-60; and C. C. Ryrie, Dispensationalism Today (Chicago: Moody Press, 1965), pp. 116-22. For a treatment of the issues involved, see pp. 21-42; 187-204

[1]Homer A. Kent, Jr., "The New Covenant and the Church," GTJ 6 (Fall 1985):296-98.

the new covenant to the church. Does the church fulfill the promises of the new covenant, simply participate in but not fulfill these promises, or have no direct relationship at all to the new covenant?

As with the Old Testament, the pertinent passages in the New Testament have received individual attention, but with little effort to organize the various parts into a single study. The lack of a consensus on any of these issues underscores the need for further work.[1] In addition, their theological import serves to heighten the value of such a work.

Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study is two-fold. The first and primary purpose is to undertake an exegesis of the pertinent texts in order to arrive at an understanding of the new covenant in both the Old and New Testaments.[2] A second and subsidiary purpose is to apply the results of

---

[1]Similar to the Old Testament, the controversy in the New Testament is often seen in the exchange between reformed theology and dispensationalism. It is widely held among proponents of the reformed position that there is a close affinity between Israel and the church. The church in the New Testament is viewed as supplanting national Israel of the Old Testament in the development of God's redemptive activity. As such, there is only one new covenant and its promises ultimately are fulfilled by the church.

Dispensationalists, however, have maintained a fundamental distinction between Israel and the church. Consequently, they see the church either as sharing in the one new covenant for Israel or as participating in a new covenant different from the one promised to the nation. For a discussion of the issues and documentation, see the chapter on the relationship between the new covenant and the church, pp. 255-65.

[2]While not denying that there was interest in a new covenant during the intertestamental period, there is a question of what influence the literature of this period had on the treatment of the new covenant in the New Testament. Virtually all agree that the formative influence on the New Testament concept was the Old Testament.

On the intertestamental literature, see F. Charles Fensham,

the exegesis so that solutions to a select number of theological problems raised in connection with the new covenant can be offered. Specifically, this study attempts to answer the questions concerning the relationship between the old and new covenants and the relationship between the new covenant and the church.[1]

Method of This Study

In regard to the Old Testament, the following are undertaken.[2] An exegesis of the locus classicus for the new covenant, Jeremiah 31:31-34, begins the Old Testament section, forming the basis for the examination of related verses.[3] Included is a consideration of the

---

"Covenant, Promise, and Expectation in the Bible," TZ 23 (September-October 1967); 318-19; IDB, s.v. "New Covenant," by W. L. Holladay, Supplementary Volume:624-25; IDB, s.v. "Covenant," by G. E. Mendenhall, 1:721-22; and ZPEB, s.v. "Covenant, (in the New Testament)," by J. B. Payne, 1:1013.

[1]The former question is discussed in connection with the treatment of Jer 31:31-34 and 2 Cor 3:6. The latter question is taken up in a separate chapter in section III.

[2]The methodological presuppositions upon which this study proceeds are these: (1) The Bible is the inerrant Word of God; (2) The history it recounts is both factual and accurately recorded; (3) The meaning of a given text is one; it is that which the author intended; and it is determined by the application of the rules for interpretation.
For recent discussion on these issues in support of the above presuppositions, see Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., "The Current Crisis in Exegesis and the Apostolic Use of Deuteronomy 25:4 in 1 Corinthians 9:8-10," JETS 21 (March 1978):3-18; idem, Toward an Old Testament Theology (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978), pp. 1-19; and Elmer B. Smick, "Old Testament Theology: The Historico-Genetic Method," JETS 26 (June 1983):145-55.

[3]Kaiser, "Old Promise and the New Covenant," p. 14.
The versification throughout this study follows the MT when referring to the Old Testament. Where English language editions differ from the MT, English versification is placed in brackets (i.e., []).

text, the immediate context, and an exegesis of the respective verses.[1]

After this is an examination of related Old Testament passages within Jeremiah and the overall prophetic Old Testament.[2] As a limiting factor and as a basis for comparison, only those passages which specifically mention a future covenant are discussed.[3] The treatment of these references includes a discussion of the text, an examination of their respective verses, and an inquiry into the relationship of each to the new covenant.

With reference to the New Testament, the following are treated. Taking the canonical order, references to a new covenant in the Gospels are considered first. The focus here is on the Synoptics and the covenant reference found in conjunction with the Last Supper. The method of treatment in each case is textual and then exegetical.

Next is an examination of the Pauline corpus. The reference to

---

[1]As a preliminary step to the exegesis, the questions of provenance and authenticity, as well as of context, are discussed. It is not intended in this study to give a detailed treatment of the introductory matters. That is neither desired nor necessary. The intent is to provide an indication of the presuppositions in these areas which have influenced the exegesis. The documentation identifies the sources where the issues are developed more fully and where support for the conclusions embraced here can be found.

[2]The exegesis in the Old Testament is confined to passages in the writing prophets. This does not imply that there are no statements prior to the writing prophets concerning what is involved in the new covenant. In fact, a good case is made in connection with the exegesis of Jer 31:31-34 that there are antecedent trajectories for the new covenant embedded within the old. This limitation has been adopted because the new covenant as an identifiable entity was something that only the writing prophets developed in the Old Testament canon.

[3]Excluded from exegetical consideration are Zech 9:11 and Mal 3:1. Although both mention the word "covenant," neither offers sufficient information to identify clearly which covenant is in view nor are they able to advance the concerns of this study. Zech 9:11 is mentioned in the discussion of the new covenant in the Synoptics.

a future covenant in Romans 11 and the two references to a new covenant in the Corinthian epistles receive attention in this section. As with the Synoptics, the procedure followed is to treat textual matters before proceeding to an exegesis of the appropriate verses.

Finally, the passages in Hebrews are brought under scrutiny. Each of the seven passages where a reference to a new or future covenant is found is given individual treatment in regard to both textual and exegetical matters.

The third section in this study makes a specific application of the results of the exegesis and then provides a summarization. The application explores the problem of the relationship between the church and the new covenant, including the related issues of the number of new covenants and the point of fulfillment. The summarization draws together the conclusions from the individual chapters in an effort to arrive at a comprehensive understanding of the new covenant in the Old and New Testaments.

To take advantage of recent scholarship on the concept of "covenant" in the ANE, and as a basis upon which the exegetical portion of the study has proceeded, two appendices are included. These incorporate a survey of opinion with suggested conclusions regarding the respective Hebrew and Greek terms for "covenant." What is examined are their individual etymological development and their semantic range. Included in the study of the Old Testament are the question of the kinds of covenants involved (parity, suzerainty, land grant) and the issue of conditional versus promissory. Included in the New Testament use is the semantic question of covenant versus testament or will.

As has been indicated throughout, this study is primarily exegetical. This is not to imply, however, that historical or systematic studies have been ignored. On the contrary, an effort has been made to be comprehensive by including studies of the widest possible scope relating to the subject matter in the research for this work. Furthermore, an attempt has been made to reflect this scope when appropriate and feasible in the treatment of the topic. It is hoped that this study will fill a need on an exegetical level and provide a basis upon which similar and related studies can progress.

PART I

OLD TESTAMENT REFERENCES

CHAPTER I

THE NEW COVENANT IN JEREMIAH

Introduction

This chapter is concerned with an exegesis of the references to
a new or future covenant in Jeremiah. These include 31:31-34, 32:4,
and 50:5.[1] The design is to provide an exegetical foundation for
further treatment of the new covenant in both the Old and New Testaments
through an examination of the central Old Testament passage, Jeremiah
31:31-34, along with the other references to a future covenant in
Jeremiah.

Provenance

The questions of provenance and authenticity are as complex for
Jeremiah as perhaps for any book in the Old Testament canon.[2] There
are quite a few scholars who make somewhat of a sharp distinction between
the poetic sections, which are generally attributed to Jeremiah and/or

---

[1]Although employing similar expressions to the above refer-
ences, 24:7 is not included in that the term ברית is not used. At the
points where similarities exist between this verse and the afore-
mentioned references, an attempt is made to incorporate the information
provided by this passage as well.

[2]Because the two issues are related, they are treated together
throughout this study, unless indicated otherwise. For two recent and
fairly extensive treatments, see John Bright, Jeremiah, AB, ed. D. N.
Freedman (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1965), pp. lv-lxxx;
and J. A. Thompson, The Book of Jeremiah, NICOT, ed. R. K. Harrison
(Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1980), pp. 27-60. For
bibliography, see Brevard S. Childs, Introduction to the Old Testament
as Scripture (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), pp. 339-41.

his followers, and the prose sections, ascribed to either Baruch or more frequently to some later editor or editorial activity.[1]

The lack of consensus among critical scholars as to what does or does not represent the hand of Jeremiah should caution against embracing with anything approaching certainty the conclusions they espouse or even the presuppositions upon which their conclusions rest.[2] Taking into consideration Jeremiah's use of an amanuensis and the length and varying circumstances of his ministry, there is still no incontrovertible evidence against the conclusion that the prophecies which bear

---

[1]For a representative of this approach, see Otto Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, trans. P. R. Ackroyd (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965), pp. 356-65. He states, "In reality, we must reckon with a . . . complex process for the formation of the book. We can no longer determine with certainty how many hands or stages of editing are to be assumed. We may possibly, however, distinguish with reasonable assurance the individual component parts which were once independent and then brought together in the process of redaction" (p. 355).

See also James Philip Hyatt, "The Book of Jeremiah: Introduction and Exegesis," in vol. 5 of IB, eds. G. A. Buttrick et al. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965), pp. 781-91.

[2]R. K. Harrison, Introduction to the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1969), pp. 809-17. His conclusion is this: "Despite the prolonged history of criticism of Jeremiah, it is evident that scholars are far from being in agreement as to the nature of the process by which the prophecy acquired its extant form. . . . It is almost certain that the process of transmission of the oracles from the lips of the prophet to the ultimate form of the prophecy itself was considerably less complex than has been assumed by the majority of liberal writers on the subject. One thing is sure, namely, that the history of its composition and growth is not to be explained entirely on a purely literary basis" (p. 815).

He states elsewhere: "If a system of arbitrary and subjective delineation of literary units is wedded to a theory of textual transmission which is patently out of harmony with the known scribal practices current in the ancient Near East, and is applied to a matter such as the transmission of Jeremiah, the difficulties in the way of arriving at even a reasonably coherent view of the processes will be multiplied enormously" (Jeremiah and Lamentations: An Introduction and Commentary, TOTC, ed. D. J. Wiseman [Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1973], p. 31).

his name ultimately came from him. "What seems clear is that a prophet who ministers over a lengthy period of time amid changing circumstances and who is so thoroughly steeped in the messages of his fellow prophets should be allowed considerable variety in what he says and how he says it, without any narrow limitations as to tone or message."[1]

Furthermore, the evidence certainly does not demand several layers of editorial activity. Whatever editing took place, and the arrangement of the material with the interposing of topical and temporal sequences suggests such, could easily have been accomplished by the prophet himself during his imposed exile in Egypt, or quite possibly, by his secretary, Baruch, after the prophet's demise.[2]

Text

Because of the considerable number of divergencies between the MT and the LXX of Jeremiah, the question naturally raised is which of the two traditions should be considered superior.[3] The discovery of

---

[1]William Sanford LaSor, David Allen Hubbard, and Frederic William Bush, Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Background of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1982), p. 410.

[2]The first position is held by Charles L. Feinberg, Jeremiah: A Commentary (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982), p. 6. The second is held by Hobart E. Freeman, An Introduction to the Old Testament Prophets (Chicago: Moody Press, 1968), pp. 241, 247-48; and apparently by LaSor, Hubbard, and Bush, Old Testament Survey, who state as follows: "While such editing may well have taken place, it is just as likely that Baruch himself gave these speeches their final form" (p. 410).
Chapter 52 presents something of a different problem. It is quite possible that the material in this chapter, paralleling as it does 2 Kgs 24:18-25:30, was added as a historical postscript, perhaps by Baruch. See Feinberg, Jeremiah, pp. 15-16.

[3]It has been estimated that the LXX is one-eighth shorter in length than the MT. However, the differences involve not only the

both text traditions among the Qumran scrolls supports the initial conclusion that the MT and the LXX represent two recensions of the Hebrew text.[1] The information on the Jeremiah text from Qumran is too incomplete at this point to permit further conclusions. Although some hold to the shorter text as superior,[2] the majority appear to regard the MT as closer overall to the original and therefore the superior text.[3]

For the purposes of this study, it is concluded that the MT is to be preferred and that it provides an adequate basis upon which the exegesis can proceed. At the same time, because of the complexities involved and the inconclusive nature of the available evidence, it is best to proceed with caution and weigh each text where a variant is involved on its individual merits.[4]

---

length but also the arrangement of the material as well. Perhaps the best discussion to date can be found in J. Gerald Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973).

[1]For example, Gleason L. Archer, Jr. (A Survey of Old Testament Introduction, rev. [Chicago: Moody Press, 1974]) suggests that the LXX is representative of the initial work completed by Jeremiah in Egypt and the MT is representative of a longer edition produced by Baruch (pp. 361-62).

[2]Thompson prefers the LXX over the MT, at least in the prose sections: "It seems, particularly in the MT prose tradition, that conflation took place and the shorter LXX is more original" (Book of Jeremiah, p. 120). See also his discussion on the Qumran material, pp. 118-19.

[3]Feinberg (Jeremiah, p. 16) considers the MT to be "much superior to the Greek." Bright (Jeremiah, p. cxxii) concurs, adding that the MT is both well preserved and preferable.

[4]Hyatt, "Jeremiah," p. 791. He concludes thusly: "Generalizations regarding the superiority of the Septuagint over the Hebrew text, or of the latter over the Septuagint, are dangerous. Every instance of variation between the two must be carefully considered on its own merits."

The question concerning the nature of the text underlying the New Testament references to the new covenant is not treated here, but

Interpretation

Jeremiah 31:31-34

Greater context

The question of context must be approached from a two-fold perspective. The first considers the greater context of the new covenant reference, chapters 30-33, and its relationship to the rest of Jeremiah. The second perspective concerns the relationship between the new covenant pericope and its more immediate context of the verses preceding and following.

There is little disagreement regarding the theme uniting chapters 30-33, nor the appropriateness of the title, "Book of Comfort," which is drawn from 30:2-3 where Yahweh promises to remove (ושבתי) Israel's captivity (שבות).[1] The comfort associated with these chapters is derived from the prospect of future blessing which their oracles

---

is taken up at the appropriate place in the section of this study dealing with the New Testament.

[1]Cf. also 33:7-9. Some, while recognizing a common theme, make a division between chapters 30-31 and 32-33, due, in part, to the prominence of poetry in the former and of prose in the latter and, more particularly, to the apparent differences in their respective provenances. Chapters 30-31 include oracles addressed to the Northern Kingdom and are consequently assigned to an earlier period in Jeremiah's ministry. Chapters 32-33, on the other hand, speak of the imminent destruction of Jerusalem and are reckoned to have been written at a later time. See Thompson, Book of Jeremiah, pp. 551-53; and R. P. Carroll, From Chaos to Covenant (New York: Crossroad, 1981), pp. 198-205.

Thomas M. Raitt, "Jeremiah's Deliverance Message to Judah," in Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg, eds. J. J. Jackson and M. Kessler, Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series, ed. D. Y. Hadidian (Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1974), p. 168, raises a voice in dissent, at least in regard to the title of these chapters. He considers the rubric book of consolation gratuitous in that these chapters do contain words of admonition and the oracles recorded in them are highly fragmented and of dubious origin and unity.

offer to Israel and is in marked contrast to the rest of Jeremiah which is dominated by the expressions of God's condemnation and judgment.[1]

These four chapters may be divided into two sections of two chapters each. This division is suggested by the use of the phrase הדבר אשר היה אל ירמיהו מאת יהוה found at the beginning of chapters 30-31 and chapters 32-33. This formula both identifies the origin of the pronouncements which follow and marks off the two major sections.[2]

---

[1]Because of this marked contrast to the pervading theme of Jeremiah and because of the variation in the historical contexts of these oracles (see n. 1, p.13), some have questioned the authenticity of these chapters or at least of a number of the oracles found in them.

In apparent support, Thompson, Book of Jeremiah, pp. 552-53, states the following: "A safe conclusion amid the multitude of varying opinions is that chs. 30-31 contain genuine sayings of Jeremiah (perhaps to a greater extent than is generally realized), addressed to Northern Israel and uttered relatively early in his career (31:2-6, 15-22) together with other words of his spoken later in his career. Finally, the whole passed through the hands of an editor or editors who may have been responsible for some expansion or adaptation of Jeremiah's thought to a later situation."

However, as others note, the oracles offering the hope of God's future blessing are not entirely unique to these chapters, but are in fact anticipated in several earlier prophecies in the book (e.g., 2:1-3; 3:14-18; 16:14-15; 23:1-8; 24:4-7). See Feinberg, Jeremiah, p. 202; Thompson, Book of Jeremiah, p. 551; and Carroll, From Chaos to Covenant, pp. 201-204. Carroll estimates that about ten percent of the prophecies are taken up with a message of hope (p. 201).

Furthermore, the oracles involving the Northern Kingdom are not to be isolated from those addressing the Southern Kingdom as if the authenticity of the one precludes any possibility as to the authenticity of the other. Until evidence is brought forward which demonstrates clearly that Jeremiah could not have been the author of both, it is best to assume they are what they purport to be: oracles which come from the prophet Jeremiah.

As Harrison, Jeremiah and Lamentations, comments, such denials of Jeremianic authorship rest on theories which "lean heavily upon critical reconstruction . . . with their entirely unwarranted assumptions and unproven conclusions." He concludes that chapters 30-31 are "unquestionably genuine sayings of Jeremiah" (p. 134).

[2]Taking the min preposition (מאת) in its common sense of indicating source, Ronald J. Williams, Hebrew Syntax: An Outline, 2d ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), p. 56. It is true that

Nearer context

The immediate context of the principal new covenant prophecy
is located in chapters 30 and 31. (Analysis of the second section is
postponed until the examination of the covenant expression in 32:40).
The key to dividing these two chapters is the use of the prophetic
formula כה אמר יהוה. It is employed eleven times[1] and results in nine
strophic divisions: (1) Introduction, The comfort for Israel, 30:1-3;
(2) The time of Jacob's trouble, 30:4-11; (3) The healing of the incur-
able wound, 30:12-17; (4) The removal of Jacob's captivity, 30:18-31:1;
(5) The granting of rest to Israel, 31:2-6; (6) The regathering of
Israel, 31:7-14; (7) The comforting of Rachel, 31:15-22; (8) The
restoring of the nation, 31:23-34; and (9) Conclusion, The inviolability
of God's promise, 31:35-40.[2]

---

chapter 33 also begins with this phrase, but there it is initiated by
the waw consecutive (ויהי) which indicates that it is more intimately
linked with the preceding chapter.

Further support for linking chapters 32 and 33 may be found in
their respective introductory remarks. In 32:2 the word of Yahweh is
said to have come to Jeremiah while he was under arrest in the court of
the guard (בחצר המטרה). In 33:1 the prophecies which follow are specif-
ically stated to be the second (שנית) word communicated to Jeremiah
while still a prisoner in the same court of the guard (והוא עודנו עצור
בחצר המטרה).

Lastly, although not necessarily a reliable guide, it has
already been noted that these two sections are also distinguished by
the prominence of poetry in the first section and of prose in the second.

[1]Jer 30:2, 5, 12, 28; 31:2, 7, 15, 16, 23, 35, 37. Three of
these uses (30:5; 30:12; and 31:7) begin with the particle כי. It is
uncertain whether the particle is used in a causal sense or simply as
a conjunctive. See Williams, Hebrew Syntax, pp. 72-73. In either case,
the resulting divisions would be unaffected.

[2]A similar analysis of chapters 30-31 is that offered by
Briggs. Utilizing the same introductory formula, he divides these
chapters into six strophes: (1) The time of Jacob's trouble, 30:1-11;
(2) The healing of the incurable wound, 30:12-31:6; (3) The blessing
of Ephraim, God's firstborn, 31:7-14; (4) The description of Rachel

The context of the entire section must be understood in light of the calamity which has already overtaken the northern ten tribes and which is the imminent prospect for Judah and Jerusalem. Even to the casual observer, the strophes unmistakably point to a future time in which the united nation is restored to its habitat and is enjoying a period of prosperity and blessing.[1]

The strophe in which the new covenant appears, 31:23-34, is set off from the surrounding verses by its prosaic structure[2] and is

weeping for her children, 31:15-22; (5) The restoration of Israel and Judah and the New Covenant, 31:23-34; and (6) God's inviolable covenant with the nation Israel, 31:35-40 (Charles Augustus Briggs, Messianic Prophecy: The Prediction of the Fulfillment of Redemption Through the Messiah, 2d ed. [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893], pp. 246-57). See also George H. Cramer, "The Messianic Hope of Jeremiah," BSac 115 (July 1958):237-46; and Kaiser, "Old Promise and the New Covenant," pp. 14-15.

Technically, the seventh strophe could be divided at verse 16 in that the prophetic formula is repeated there. However, the context links verse 15 with verses 16 through 22, the latter verses offering the promise of comfort to the one who is weeping in verse 15.

Furthermore, verses 35-40 could also be divided at verse 37 because of the repetition of the formula at verse 37. Again, the context does not suggest a sharp break, but indicates a close relationship between the perpetuity of the created order (verse 36) and the vastness of creation (verse 37) as they are both used to underscore the reliability of God's promise to Israel.

[1]Kaiser concurs, "The whole context meticulously connects the new covenant strophe with a literal restoration of the Jewish nation. This includes not only the larger context of these . . . strophes and the second half of the 'Book of Comfort' (Jer 32-33), but also the immediate context of Jeremiah 31:27-28 and 31:35-46. On this point almost all commentators are agreed, at least initially so" ("Old Promise and New Covenant," p. 15).

[2]An attempt is made throughout this study to distinguish prose sections from poetry sections and to use the terminology appropriate for each. For prose sections the traditional terminology is employed. For poetic sections, the divisions are labeled following the pattern used by Lawrence Boadt, "Isaiah 41:8-13: Notes on Poetic Structure and Style," CBQ 35 (January 1973):23, n. 14.

divided into three paragraphs. The first paragraph, verses 23-26,
gives expression to the controlling thought which is the blessing of
Yahweh in conjunction with the restoration of the nation. This, in
turn, is followed by two additional paragraphs, each introduced by
the interjectory formula הנה ימים באים and each of which gives the
attendant circumstances concerning the nation's blessing.

These last two paragraphs appear to be arranged climactically.
The first, verses 27-30, indicates the two areas in which the promised
blessings are to be experienced. The two areas are the material or
physical and the moral or spiritual. The second paragraph, verses
31-34, identifies the basis upon which the blessings are to be enacted.
That basis is the new covenant.[1] The entire strophe, along with
verses 35-40, brings to a climax Yahweh's unmitigated message of hope
which is delivered within an overall context of condemnation and
judgment.

---

[1]The debate concerning the authenticity of the new covenant
pericope follows the same lines as those described in reference to
the entire section. There are those who see little of the original
author's thoughts in the passage. Rad, for example, rejects the
authenticity of these verses primarily because of its prose form:
"Jer. XXXI.31ff. can hardly be the form of the oracle as it was
originally spoken by Jeremiah, for he, like the other prophets, usu-
ally gave his oracles a verse form. Jer. XXXI.31 ff. is, however,
prose, though there are one or two places where the outlines of an
original verse form can still be recognized" (Gerhard von Rad, Old
Testament Theology, 2 vols., trans. D. G. M. Stalker [New York:
Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965], 2:214).
It must be noted that the majority do see at least Jeremiah's
thoughts in these verses, if not the ipsissima verba of the prophet.
See John Bright, Covenant and Promise: The Prophetic Understanding
of the Future in Pre-Exilic Israel (Philadelphia: Westminster Press,
(1976), p. 194. He gives three criteria in support of Jeremianic
authorship: (1) It is hope expressed as Jeremiah would have expressed
it; (2) It accords perfectly with the prophet's theology; and (3) It
deals with the problem that his theology has raised.

Exegesis

The new covenant pericope may be viewed as composed of three
elements. There is the initial promise of a new covenant in verse 31.
Secondly, there is in verse 32 a negative clause in which the new cove-
nant is contrasted with the old covenant. Finally, there is in verses
33-34 a series of declarative clauses describing in a more positive vein
the specific features of the new covenant. In the following exegesis,
the focus of attention is on the broader syntactical units of the
respective verses, except when more specific analysis is required.

Verse 31

הנה ימים באים. The new covenant promise is introduced by the
phrase, "Behold, days are coming," frequently used by Jeremiah to iden-
tify some future activity of God. A question is raised whether this
future, temporal reference can be more specifically limited.[1] The exact
phrase as employed here and in verse 38 is, to a certain extent, a
Jeremianic expression, occurring fifteen times in Jeremiah and only
five times in the rest of the Old Testament. Although its use outside
of Jeremiah may refer to an indefinite future reference, its use by
Jeremiah appears to involve a more specific point in time. When used
by Jeremiah, it invariably introduces either proclamations of God's
future judgment against the nation of Israel or her enemies or procla-
mations of God's future deliverance and restoration of the nation

---

[1]Norman L. Vaillancourt, for example, suggests that it is simply
used to indicate the indefinite future ("War and Covenant in the Prophet
Jeremiah" [Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1976], p. 172). Com-
menting on this and similar phrases, George E. Ladd avers that it is
used with both a near and a far reference, neither of which may be more
specifically identified (Jesus and the Kingdom: The Eschatology of
Biblical Realism [Waco, TX: Word Books, Publisher, 1964], p. 65).

following this time of judgment.[1]

In light of its five uses in the "book of consolation," the conclusion is drawn that in these chapters at least it refers to the time of the ultimate restoration of the nation and not simply to the indefinite future. In 31:3, it is used in connection with the restoring of Israel and Judah to the land which had been given to their forefathers; in 31:27, it is used in conjunction with the repopulating of the nation; in 31:38, it is used in conjunction with the rebuilding of Jerusalem;[2] and in 33:14, it is used in connection with the placing upon the throne of David a righteous branch to rule the nation.[3]

נאם יהוה. The formula for a divine proclamation, "a declaration of Yahweh," used throughout the writing prophets with the exception of Jonah and Habakkuk, is intended to indicate not only the source of the prophetic statement, but also the authority with which is it associated.[4]

וכרתי . . . בריח. This standard covenant expression is discussed

---

[1]Moshe Weinfeld, "Jeremiah and the Spiritual Metamorphosis of Israel," ZAW 88 (1976):18-19. See also Werner E. Lemke, "Jeremiah 31:31-34," Int 37 (April 1983):183.

The fifteen uses in Jeremiah are 7:32; 9:24; 16:14; 19:6; 23:5, 7; 31:3; 31:27, 31; 31:38; 33:14; 48:12; 49:2; 51:47; 51:52. Its use outside of Jeremiah is limited to these verses: 1 Sam 2:31; 2 Kgs 20:17; Isa 39:6; and Amos 8:11, 9:13.

[2]Jer 31:38 has only the first two words in the formula, the participle באים being supplied by the Qere.

[3]It could be argued that these verses found fulfillment in the post-exilic experiences of the nation. However, such an interpretation would greatly limit the sense of the respective promises and exclude altogether the covenant promise in verses 31-34.

[4]Bernard W. Anderson, "The New Covenant and the Old," in The Old Testament and Christian Faith: A Theological Discussion (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963), p. 230, n. 11, attempts to see in this phrase a structural marker, setting off the two major sections in the new covenant pericope.

at some length in appendix A. The issue arising with this construction
is with the identification of the addressees. There is little disagree-
ment concerning the initial recipients of the new covenant promise
depicted by Jeremiah. The two prepositional phrases, את בית ישראל
and ואת בית יהודה, identify the two divisions of the nation. As used
both generally in the Old Testament and specifically in Jeremiah, they
point unequivocally to the nation Israel.

The question comes in the New Testament application of this
covenant.[1] Whatever modifications the New Testament may suggest as to
the recipients of the new covenant are discussed in the section which
deals with the new covenant in the New Testament.

ברית חדשה. Easily the most difficult issue in these verses
deals with the significance of the attributive adjective חדשה, employed
only here in the Old Testament to identify this covenant. Unfortunately,
the term itself provides only a partial indication as to why this cove-
nant is designated a "new" covenant. It is frequently employed to
denote that which is new in character or quality, but its semantic range
is relatively broad. It may designate that which is renewed or restored,
such as a new wall; that which is recent or fresh, such as a new song;
that which is novel or distinct, such as a new highway; or that which
is new in the sense of different in character or quality, such as in a
new king.[2]

_____

[1]Kaiser states that "while there seems to be no argument over
who was originally addressed, there is everything but a consensus when
it comes to identifying who participates in the benefits . . ." ("Old
Promise and the New Covenant," p. 15).

[2]For a systematic treatment, see TDOT, s.v., "חדש," by R. North,
4:225-44. See the articles treating the concept from the New Testament

It has been suggested that, in light of its use in 31:22 where it refers to that which is novel or distinct,[1] its use with ברית in 31:31 should be so understood.[2] In other words, the new covenant would be something entirely distinct from that which the nation has previously experienced. However, its other uses in 26:10 and 36:10 (both referring to a new gate, שער . . . החדש) and the immediate context where the new covenant is compared to and contrasted with a previous covenant make this definition suspect.

Ultimately, the context must be the determinate in discerning why the covenant here is called "new." All that the adjective can be safely said to signify is that there is an element of contrast or discontinuity between this covenant and that with which it is compared. Specific dissimilarities existing between the two covenants must be determined on other grounds.

Verse 32

Having declared God's intention of establishing a new covenant with the nation in verse 31, Jeremiah presents some information about the nature of this covenant in verses 32-34. This is accomplished first

---

vocabulary: TDNT, s.v. "καινός," 3:448; and "νέος," 4:897, by Johannes Behm; NIDNTT, s.v. "New," by H. Haarbeck, H. G. Link, and C. Brown, 2:670-76. See also Lemke, "Jeremiah 31:31-34," pp. 184-86.

[1]כי ברא יהוה חדשה בארץ ("for Yahweh has created a new thing in the land").

[2]TDOT, s.v. "חדש," 4:236. If the new covenant pericope stopped with verse 32 and the declaration of the difference between the former and the new covenant, North's position would be considerably enhanced. However, verses 33-34 appear to provide some positive comparison (e.g., תורתי in verse 33), indicating perhaps that the relationship between the two covenants is not all discontinuity. Consequently, חדשה is not used in the sense North has suggested, at least in verse 31.

negatively in verse 32 by contrasting it with a previous covenant, and then positively in verses 33-34 by indicating some of its distinguishing characteristics. The first of these verses, 31:32, consists of a negative comparative phrase where the contrast between the new and previous covenants is introduced, followed by two relative clauses which modify and further describe the previous covenant.

לא כברית. The prepositional prefix כ, attached to the substantive ברית, signifies that a comparison is intended and, with the negative particle לא, that the comparison is one of contrast.[1] The degree of contrast must be determined from the surrounding context. The concern at this point is to determine the identity of the contrasted covenant.

אשר כרתי . . . . מארץ מצרים. The initial relative clause indicates conclusively that the previous covenant is the Mosaic. Although the expression אבותם ("their fathers") could be interpreted as a reference to the patriarch Abraham and his immediate offspring, the following temporal clause, beginning with ביום ("in the day") associates this

---

[1]On the preposition כ used comparatively, see Williams, Hebrew Syntax, p. 46. Too much should not be made over the use of לא rather than אל. It is true that לא is regarded as the stronger of the two particles and may be used emphatically, but the context still must indicate the degree of contrast. See GKC, pp. 478-79.

Weinfeld offers some interesting observations concerning the construction used here to highlight the contrast between the old and new covenants. He points to Jer 3:16-17, 23:7-8, and 31:29-30 where similar expressions as in verse 32 are used to bring out a contrast and point to the resulting change that is to occur in the fulfillment of God's future promises. All, he says, involve the spiritual rebirth of the nation Israel: "For Jeremiah this spiritual rebirth does not mean merely a revival of the old tradition but a complete revision of former values and their adjustment to a new reality which would ensure success and preclude failure such as had occurred in the past" ("Jeremiah and Spiritual Metamorphosis," p. 2).

covenant with the Exodus experience.[1]

אשר המה הפרו את בריתי. The second relative clause, beginning with

אשר המה, modifies ברית and provides additional information about the pre-

vious covenant and the intended contrast between it and the new. The

fact that this covenant is depicted as one which the recipients broke

(הפרו) indicates two things. First, it suggests that there was a defi-

ciency involved in the first covenant. Virtually all recognize that the

culpability for the broken covenant resides with the recipients and not

with the covenant. The nation had been given the responsibility of

keeping the covenant and the people had failed in their responsibility.

At the same time, few are willing to implicate the Mosaic covenant in

this failure. However, the fact that the old covenant could be broken

and that the new covenant could not, as will be indicated by the follow-

ing verses, suggests there was a deficiency with the old covenant.[2]

---

[1]Cf. 11:6-8. Several have followed Keil in expanding the time frame of this "day" to include the entire period of the wilderness experience and not simply the period at Sinai. Support for this treatment of "day" is taken from 7:21-26 (C. F. Keil, Jeremiah and Lamentations, vol. 8, trans. D. Patrick and J. Kennedy, Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, eds. C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch [reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1973], p. 37). See also Feinberg, Jeremiah, p. 20. In any case, the identification of this covenant remains clear.

Others have suggested that included implicitly in the contrast are the Abrahamic and the Davidic covenants as well. In other words, not only is the new covenant contrasted explicitly with the Mosaic covenant, but also with the Abrahamic and the Davidic in that the new replaces all of God's previous covenants with the nation. See Kaiser, "Old Promise and the New Covenant," p. 17; and O. Palmer Robertson, The Christ of the Covenants (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980), p. 281. It is difficult to argue in favor of or against such a suggestion in that it is in effect an argument from silence. All that Jeremiah says is that the new covenant is not like the one made in the Exodus.

[2]Feinberg implies this when he says: "If the old covenant had not been broken, then what need was there for the ministry of Jeremiah or any of the OT prophets. All were commissioned by God to call the

Second, the corollary to this is that the relative clause also indicates why a new covenant is promised: It is the replacement for a broken covenant. Had the old covenant not been deficient, there would have been no need for Jeremiah to promise a new one.

Before proceeding to the last clause in this verse, something should be said regarding the use of הפרו. Its most common form is, as it is here, in the hiphil where it can connote a range of meanings from "violate" to "invalidate."[1] Because of the wide scope of meanings possible for the term, the question is raised concerning its significance in this verse. The implications with this question are manifold. Since it is said that the nation has broken the old covenant, in what sense is the old covenant in force? What is the recourse for Jeremiah's generation--restoration or renewal? Several commentators have argued that when used in covenant contexts, the term should have its strongest significance where it would point to a complete annulment of the covenant relationship.[2]

Although the position described above is well supported, two

---

nation to repent of her transgressions of the Mosaic law" (Jeremiah, p. 220).
　　　Keil plainly states this: "It was a defect connected with the covenant made with Israel at Sinai, that it could be broken on their part" (Jeremiah, Lamentations, p. 38).

[1]Victor P. Hamilton gives a brief survey (TWOT, s.v. "פרר," 2:738). For a listing of synonyms, see also Moshe Weinfeld, "Covenant Terminology in the Ancient Near East and Its Influence on the West," JAOS 93 (April-June 1973):197; and Winfield Thiel, HEFER BERIT Zum Bundbrechen Im Alten Testament," VT 20 (April 1970): 214-29.

[2]Rad, Old Testament Theology, 2:212. He states that "the old covenant is broken, and in Jeremiah's view Israel is altogether without one" (2:212). For a development of this position, see also Robertson, Christ of the Covenants, pp. 284-85, especially n. 15.

cautions should be noted. The first is that breaking a covenant does not necessitate an annulment of the covenant. The individual who failed to obey the command for circumcision, for example, broke the covenant, yet the covenant was not annulled at that point. The individual in violation was simply placed outside of the covenant community.[1] Having said this, it must be added that Jeremiah is not speaking of an individual but of his generation as having broken the covenant. This is a case where an entire nation and not simply an individual is so described.

The second caution is that the punishments associated with the old covenant and involving the nation for their breach of covenant were disciplinary actions incorporated within the covenant structure. The indication from both Jeremiah and the other prophets is that the judgments levied against the nation were not an end in themselves, but were brought to bear against a wayward and disobedient generation to draw them back to a proper relationship with their covenant partner.[2] Yet at the same time, the fact that Jeremiah spoke of a new covenant is an indication that a time would come when the old covenant would no longer be operative.

ואנכי בעלתי בם. The last clause forms the protasis of a

---

[1]See Gen 17:14. Kaiser, "Old Promise and the New Covenant," p. 18, assumes on the basis of the use of פרר in Gen 17:14 and here that both the Abrahamic and the Mosaic were conditioned upon obedience. See appendix A for a discussion of this aspect of the covenant concept.

[2]TWOT, s.v. "פרר," 2:738; and Walther Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, 2 vols., trans. J. A. Baker, The Old Testament Library, eds. G. Ernest Wright et al. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), 1:457-59. Eichrodt comments thus: "Though the expectation of God's punitive intervention was very real, it looked on the whole for individual divine acts of punishment, the aim of which was not an annihilating judgment that would dissolve the covenant, but rather the maintenance of that relationship by the removal of disturbing elements" (p. 458).

concessive clause with the preceding clause functioning as the apodosis. Two issues are important here. The first involves a discussion of the only significant textual question that these four verses offer. In the LXX the construction ἠμέλησα is found where the MT has בְעַלְתִּי. This term is regularly employed with the meaning "to neglect" or "to show disregard for," suggesting a reading of גָּעַלְתִּי for the Hebrew, rather than בְעַלְתִּי as in the MT.[1] Although the New Testament appears to support גָּעַל through the use of ἀμελέω in Hebrews 8:9, other versional evidence and the use of בָּעַל in covenant contexts elsewhere in the Old Testament warrants treating it here as the preferred reading.[2]

The second issue with the clause has to do with the meaning of the preferred reading בָּעַל. In that the term in covenant contexts can mean either "master" or "husband," it is difficult to determine which Jeremiah intended in this verse. On the basis of the parallel construction in 3:14 where the meaning "master" is favored, several aver that such should be the meaning here.[3] In the same vein, it has been argued

---

[1] See the apparatus in BHS, p. 846. For the meaning of גָּעַל, see TDOT, s.v. "גָּעַל," by H. F. Fuhs, 3:45-48. On ἀμελέω, see BAGD, pp. 44-45.

[2] For a brief treatment of the issue, see Hyatt, "Jeremiah," p. 1039; and Feinberg, Jeremiah, pp. 221-22. There is some uncertainty as to the weight that should be given the versional evidence. The LXX, the Syriac, and the Old Latin appear to support the reading גָּעַל in 31:32. In 3:14 where a similar statement is found, these versions apparently support the reading בָּעַל. Among the versions in support of the MT at 31:32 are the Vulgate and Aquila. Fuhs notes that גָּעַל is also used in covenantal contexts, including Jeremiah 14:19 (cf. 14:21) (TWOT, s.v. "גָּעַל," 3:47-48).

[3] See, for example, Kamol Arayaprateep, "The Covenant: An Effective Tool in Bible Study," The Southeast Asia Journal of Theology 18 (1977):29. H. L. Ellison argues that when בָּעַל is used in marriage contexts, it is never followed by the ב preposition as it is here and in 3:14. His conclusion is that the ב preposition used in these two references indicates that בָּעַל must mean "master" and not "husband"

by others that in the covenant metaphor depicting the relationship between God and the nation, it is the idea of the intimacy and affection of the marriage bond that is foremost. Hence, "husband" and not "master" would be the preferred meaning in this verse.[1]

There is some question whether בעל in 3:14 should be understood in the sense of "master."[2] If it can be shown that such a meaning is not necessary there, then that would lessen the argument for a similar sense here. In any case, the concessive clause in this verse serves to heighten the guilt of the nation as the offending party. In breaking the covenant, Israel had done despite to a covenant partner who is described as her בעל.

Verse 33

Verse 33, introduced by the particle כי, along with verse 34, offers an explanation[3] for the previous contrast. This explanation is accomplished by a series of positive statements revealing certain characteristics of the new covenant. Ostensibly, these characteristics

---

(The Prophets of Israel: From Ahijah to Hosea [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1969], p. 196).

[1]Palmer, Christ of the Covenants, p. 282, n. 14. Feinberg adds that "this marriage relationship was the very basis on which God expected obedience to and fidelity in the covenant" (Jeremiah, p. 220).

[2]TWOT, s.v. "בעל," by Bruce K. Waltke, 1:119. Cf. 3:19-20.

[3]For this use of כי, see Williams, Hebrew Syntax, p. 72. It is quite possible, because of the intended contrast between the old covenant (verse 32) and the new covenant (verses 33-34), that the כי is to be understood in an adversative sense. See Anderson, "New Covenant and the Old," pp. 229-30; James Muilenberg, "The Linguistic and Rhetorical Usage of the Particle Ki in the Old Testament," HUCA 32 (1961):135-37; and Weinfeld, "Jeremiah and Spiritual Metamorphosis," p. 2. However, if this were the case, the pleonastic אם would be expected (cf. 23:8). See Williams, Hebrew Syntax, pp. 72-73.

mark the salient features of the new covenant that are not found in the old.[1] Verse 33 is composed of an initial declarative clause, restating the covenant promise of verse 31. It is followed by two appositional statements and concludes with a consecutive clause.

זאת הברית . . . נאם יהוה. Several issues of moderate concern are involved in the restatement of the covenant promise. The first deals with the designated recipients of the covenant. It has been suggested that the original addressees, the Northern Kingdom (בית ישראל), are identified here and that the reference to the Southern Kingdom (בית יהודה) found in verse 31 was a later addition.[2] It is true that the expression בית ישראל when used in conjunction with the expression בית יהודה is a reference to the Northern Kingdom. It is also true that when used alone, as here, it can refer either to the Northern Kingdom or to the entire nation, depending on the context.[3]

It may be assumed that בית ישראל in this verse refers to the entire nation and is functionally synonymous with the combined phrases found in verse 31.[4] There is no compelling evidence which requires the respective addressees in verses 31 and 33 to be different or which demands the reference to the Southern Kingdom in verse 31 to be a later addition.

---

[1] The intent with these two verses is not simply to affirm that there are differences between the old and new covenants. Specifically, the intent is to identify those items in the new that will overcome whatever deficiencies existed in the old and which will ensure the success of the new.

[2] See, for example, Ellison, Prophets of Israel, p. 163.

[3] TDNT, s.v. "'Ισραήλ," by Gerhard von Rad et al., 3:356-59.

[4] For example, 33:14, 17; Feinberg, Jeremiah, p. 220.

As in the preceding discussion, the temporal reference אחרי
הימים ההם ("after those days") may be either a stylistic variation of the
one used in verse 31 (ימים באים) or it may be a specific reference to a
time after the restoration of the nation, mentioned in the preceding
context (verses 23-30).[1]

נתתי את תורתי . . . אכתבנה. Various issues are taken up with
these two declarative clauses. The two clauses are synonymously parallel
and are in a chiastic arrangement.[2]

In addition, there is a planned contrast suggested by these
two clauses between the placement of the תורה in the old covenant
and its placement in the new. The contrast is this: In the old cove-
nant the law was written upon tablets of stone and was therefore
external; in the new covenant it is placed within, written upon the
heart, and is therefore internal. Virtually all agree that this inter-
nalization of the law as depicted in verse 33 is a distinguishing

---

[1]The former position is presented by John Bright, "An Exercise
in Hermeneutics: Jeremiah 31:31-34," Int 20 (April 1966):194; the
latter by Feinberg, Jeremiah, p. 220.

[2]The relationship between the two clauses may be illustrated
as follows:

C	B	A
בקרבם	את תורתי	נתתי

A[1]	B[1]	C[1]
אכתב-	-נה	ועל לבם

Theo. Laetsch notes that the perfect in the first line is
replaced by the imperfect in the second. He sees the perfect as
denoting an accomplished fact while the imperfect indicates progres-
sive duration. "Since this writing is the very essence of the cove-
nant, it never ceases, but throughout the duration of the covenant He
is continually writing it afresh into the heart so that it will not be
forgotten" (Bible Commentary: Jeremiah [St. Louis: Concordia Pub-
lishing House, 1952], p. 256).

characteristic of the new covenant.[1]

Before further conclusions can be drawn regarding the interpretation of these clauses, two additional questions must be raised and answered. The first concerns the meaning of תורה. The immediate context limits the use to some extent. The first person, singular pronominal suffix indicates that the תורה belongs to and is derived from God. It is the divine תורה.

Furthermore, in the context, it is associated with ברית. The two terms are closely related in that, as with the Mosaic covenant, a violation of the one would constitute a violation of the other. Because of this, there could be an attempt to see not only a new covenant but also a new law. However, the context seems to argue against that. The contrast, as noted above, is not between the old and new laws, but between the old and new covenants and the relationship the divine תורה sustains to the recipient in each. In each case, it is the same divine law that is in view.

The question, therefore, is to determine how Jeremiah viewed the divine law and specifically the divine law as associated with the old covenant. Although the term can be used in the more restrictive sense, referring to the Mosaic legislation and particularly to the Ten Commandments, Jeremiah regularly employed it in a broader sense,

---

[1]Keil documents the distinction between the two covenants by noting this: "בקרבם is the opposite of נתן לפניהם, which is constantly used of the Sinaitic law, cf. IX.12, Deut. IV.8, XI.32, I Kings IX.6; and the 'writing on the heart' is opposed to writing on the tables of stone, Ex. XXXI.18, cf. XXXII.15f, XXXIV.8, Deut. IV.13, IX.11, X.4, etc." (Jeremiah, Lamentations, p. 38).

parallel with the voice, word, statutes, and testimonies of the Lord.[1] In that there is no evidence to the contrary, it may be assumed that Jeremiah is using it similarly here. It is the תורה which constitutes divine instruction and which entails moral obligations.

> To Jeremiah the true Torah of Yahweh is not Deuteronomy nor any written code, nor priestly oracle, nor prophetic message, but something which has been partly expressed in all these ways and yet transcends them all--the revelation of the essential ethical will of God. Berith and Torah are related to each other as form and content. The Old Covenant was based on an important manifestation of the law of God in the form of external command. The New Covenant will be established by a better revelation of that will in the spirit of man.[2]

More than this cannot be gained from the immediate context but must await the consideration of related texts.

The second question involves the significance of the term לבב. Virtually all are in agreement that Jeremiah is using the term in its metaphorical sense, pointing to the seat of human personality and focusing on man's immaterial aspect, particularly in this case on his volition.[3]

---

[1] The noun appears eleven times in Jeremiah: 2:8; 6:19; 8:8; 9:12; 16:11; 18:18; 26:4; 31:33; 32:23 (Qere); 44:10, 23. For treatments of תורה, see TDNT, s.v. "νόμος," by H. Kleinknecht and W. Gutbrod, 4:1036-47; NIDNTT, s.v. "Law," by H.-H. Esser, 2:438-42; and TWOT, s.v. "ירה," by John E. Hartley, 1:403-405.

[2] John Skinner, Prophecy and Religion: Studies in the Life of Jeremiah (Cambridge, England: University Press, 1922), p. 332. See also Robertson, Christ of the Covenants, p. 282, n. 13. Further discussion on the relationship between the old and new covenants is taken up with the treatment of 2 Cor 3:6.

[3] TDNT, s.v. "καρδία," by F. Baumgärtel and J. Behm, 3:606-607; NIDNTT, s.v. "Heart," by T. Sorg, 2:181-82; TWOT, s.v. "לבב," by Andrew Bowling, 1:446-67. Thomas M. Raitt states that "in the Hebrew view the heart . . . is the center of willing and acting; . . . it is here that a man's real character finds its most ready expression" (A Theology of Exile: Judgment/Deliverance in Jeremiah and Ezekiel [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977], pp. 176-77).

Ultimately what must be in view with these two clauses in Jeremiah 31:33 is the divine provision for covenant keeping. The deficiency with the first covenant is not that it failed to communicate God's commandments, but that it failed to address man's heart, i.e., his nature, so as to insure compliance. In effect, what Jeremiah is indicating is that in the new covenant, through the placing of God's law upon the heart, there is promised the necessary transaction which will insure the recipient's success in fulfilling his covenant obligations. It is the transformation of the human personality, giving the human partner the ability to live in harmony with the moral standards expressed by the divine partner in the covenant relationship.[1]

Stating the conclusion this way does not suggest that such transformation was altogether absent under the old covenant. It does suggest, however, that under the new this change was to be an integral part of the covenant. The new covenant, unlike the old, guarantees this transformation for its recipients.[2]

The question as to how this transformation is accomplished is not indicated here by Jeremiah and must be answered by the greater

---

[1] Henry S. Gehman, "An Insight and a Realization: A Study of the New Covenant," Int 9 (July 1955):287. W. L. Holladay's interpretation is this: "The passage suggests that a law outwardly written on tablets of stone may elicit disobedience, or else grudging or insincere obedience; next time, therefore, God will write the law inwardly, making it a part of the total will of the people, so that they obey God, not because they are supposed to, but because they want to. Thus God's will permeates the people's will, so that each conforms perfectly to the other" (IDB, s.v. "New Covenant, The," Supplementary volume: 624).

Riatt notes that this transformation may not be viewed as a condition in the normal sense in that it is something God provides, not what is demanded of man (Theology of Exile, pp. 176-78).

[2] Robertson, Christ of the Covenants, p. 291.

context. Although the term ברית is not used, most see, in such passages
as Ezekiel 11:14-21 and 36:22-32 and particularly in the reference to
God placing His Spirit within man, the answer to the above question.[1]
In both passages there is a direct correlation between the placing of
the רוה within and the recipients' ability to comply with their moral
responsibilities.[2]

Whether or not such a transformation took place under the old
covenant is not addressed by Jeremiah. The question itself has been
answered both affirmatively and negatively.[3] Assuming that there is a
legitimate correspondence between the changing of the heart described
in Ezekiel 11:19 and 36:26 and the circumcision of the heart found in
Ezekiel 44:7, it cannot be said that such a concept was unknown in
connection with the old covenant.[4]

---

[1]Rad, Old Testament Theology, 2:234; Walther Eichrodt, Ezekiel:
A Commentary, trans. C. Quin, The Old Testament Library, eds. G. E.
Wright et al. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970), pp. 500-501;
Walther Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet
Ezekiel, Chapters 25-48, trans. J. D. Martin, eds. P. D. Hanson and
L. J. Greenspoon, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983),
pp. 248-49; and Kaiser, Old Testament Theology, p. 242.

[2]Cf. Ezek 11:19-20, noting the use of למען at verse 20, and
36:27. The construction in 36:27, ועשיתי את אשר בחקי תכלו, suggests
that the למען of 11:20 should be taken in the sense of "result" rather
than "purpose," assuming the two passages are parallel. See Williams,
Hebrew Syntax, pp. 61-62.

[3]For the affirmative, see John J. Davis, "Regeneration in the
Old Testament," (Th.M. thesis, Grace Theological Seminary, 1964),
pp. 68-130; and Leon J. Wood, The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament
(Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976), pp. 64-68. For the
negative, see Peter Peer, "The Church and the New Covenant of Jeremiah
31:31-34" (Th.M. thesis, Grace Theological Seminary, 1982), pp. 34-64.

[4]Cf. Deut 10:16; 30:6; Jer 4:4; and Ezek 18:31. See TDNT, s.v.
"περιτέμνω," by Rudolf Meyer, 6:77; NIDNTT, s.v. "Circumcision," by Hans-
Cristoph Hahn, 1:308-309; and TWOT, s.v. "מול," by Elmer B. Smick, 1:495.
Weinfeld sees no difference between God's circumcising the heart and the

A detailed treatment of the particular question concerning the transformation of the heart in the Old Testament is beyond the design of this study. Allowing that this transformation was a prerequisite for obedience to divine _torah_ (and that is the impression given by these passages) and allowing that certain individuals were described in the Old Testament as reflecting this obedience, it is surmised that this transformation took place under the old covenant. Jeremiah does not present anything in conflict with this conclusion. What he indicates is that with the new covenant this transformation is an intrinsic element and consequently is guaranteed for the recipients.[1]

---

command for the people of Israel to circumcise their own hearts ("Jeremiah and Spiritual Metamorphosis," pp. 31-32). In contrast, Peter C. Craigie sees in the former a divine act and in the latter a human responsibility (The Book of Deuteronomy, NICOT, ed. R. K. Harrison [London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1976], p. 364).

[1]Riatt states that the passages in Jeremiah and Ezekiel indicate that for "the first time God promises to transform the heart of his whole people as part of a new and unconditional scheme of salvation" (Theology of Exile, p. 177, n. 2).

Deut 30:6 presents something of a problem in that this terminology involving the circumcision of the heart is used in conjunction with the old covenant and appears to present the prospect of this transaction on a national level. Two solutions to this difficulty are proposed. The first sees the promise of Deut 30:6 as being conditioned by the requirement of obedience mentioned in Deut 30:2 (cf. 30:10). The difference between the old and new covenants is that there is not this condition in the new.

The objection to this proposal is that it requires as a condition (obedience) that which only the corresponding promised blessing (a new heart) can provide. See J. Ridderbos, Bible Student's Commentary--Deuteronomy, trans. E. M. van der Maas (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1984), pp. 268-71. In other words, the obedience which the circumcised heart enables is made a prerequisite for this circumcision. To avoid this problem, some view the condition as a condition of faith. See S. R. Driver, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy, 3d ed., ICC, eds. Samuel Rolles Driver, Alfred Plummer, and Charles Augustus Briggs (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1895), p. 328. This is supported by Deut 30:11-14 which is used in Rom 10:6-7 as describing an invitation to exercise faith. The difficulty with this approach is that שמע in Deut 30:2 involves not faith, but obedience

וְהָיִ֫יתִי . . . לְעָם. This covenant formula (bundesformel) is the traditional mode for expressing the covenant relationship. It depicts the very design and essence of God's covenant with the nation. This statement is meant to show that the relationship between the parties of the covenant is different or special. The expression itself combines the ideas of intimacy and possession and is used with both the old and new covenants (cf. Exod 6:7; 29:45; and Lev 26:12).[1]

Joining this expression with the waw conjunctive to the previous statements concerning the placing of the divine torah upon the heart could suggest that this formula is simply an adjunct. However, its use throughout Jeremiah in connection with both covenants indicates that it is functioning as a consequence of the preceding two clauses. Elsewhere in Jeremiah, the relationship depicted by this expression is realized on the basis of the nation's obedient response

---

and, according to 31:10, specifically obedience to the commandments. Cf. Deut 28:13.

A second and better solution is to view Deut 30:6 as a prophetic statement of the new covenant. The preceding context speaks of national dispersion and regathering. Deut 30:6 would be understood as a concommitant promise associated with the regathering and the resultant blessing of national restoration. See Craigie, Deuteronomy, p. 364; and J. A. Thompson, Deuteronomy: An Introduction and Commentary, TOTC ed. D. J. Wiseman (London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1974), pp. 284-86. This approach translates the waw beginning 30:6 as a simple, logical conjunctive, rather than as a temporal connective. See Williams, Hebrew Syntax, pp. 70-72.

For parallel passages which speak of a new heart in a covenant context, see especially Ezek 11:14-21 and 36:22-23.

[1] See the discussions by IDB, s.v. "New Covenant," Supplementary volume:624; Kaiser, "Old Promise and the New Covenant," p. 20; TDNT, s.v. "λαός," by H. Strathmann and R. Meyer, 4:32-37; and NIDNTT, s.v. "People," by H. Bietenhard, 2:796-98. Edward Malatesta treats the various ways this formula is constructed in the Old Testament (Interiority and Covenant: A Study of εἶναι ἐν and μένειν ἐν in the First Letter of Saint John [Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978], pp. 66-68).

to the divine torah.[1] The least that can be said is that this covenant establishes a relationship that was intended under the old covenant, but that had not been realized, at least in the same sense or to the same degree as under the new.[2]

Verse 34

Verse 34 continues the sequence of conjunctive clauses, providing a second consequence to the writing of the law upon the heart mentioned in verse 33. This, in turn, is followed by two causal clauses which both explain and confirm the second consequence.

ולא ילמדו עוד . . . דעו את יהוה. The second consequence to the placing of the divine torah upon the heart is that the need for disseminating the information contained in the torah is removed. As with the preceding statements, there is an intentional contrast between the old covenant in which instruction concerning torah was both required and necessary and the new where this instruction is obviated.[3]

However, before an explanation for this change can be discussed, two questions must be considered: For whom is this instruction made unnecessary? To what extent is it negated?

The identification of the terms רעה and אח provides the answer to the first question. The context suggests that these substantives depict the new covenant recipients, those who have had this knowledge written

---

[1]TDNT, s.v. "λαός," 4:36. On Jeremiah's use of this formula, see 7:23; 11:4; 24:7; 30:22; 31:1; and 32:38.

[2]Thompson, Book of Jeremiah, p. 581.

[3]ולא ילמדו עוד ("And they shall not teach again" [emphasis mine]). See Weinfeld, "Jeremiah and Spiritual Metamorphosis," pp. 28-29.

on their hearts.[1] Jeremiah is contrasting the individual receiving the
divine _torah_ through the mediation of another under the old covenant
with the one receiving it directly by God under the new. To the recipi-
ents of the new, it no longer is necessary for others to communicate
this knowledge.

In answer to the second question, a growing consensus under-
stands the curtailment of instruction in somewhat of a relative sense.
All instruction is not obviated, only that which is involved in the
strictest sense in covenant mediation. The contrast presumably lies
between the old covenant which required the dissemination of the _torah_
through the various covenant functionaries (e.g., priests and prophets)
and the new covenant where such functionaries are unnecessary.[2] This
seems to be the most logical explanation, although the evidence from
the immediate context is too limited to demand it. The verse does not
totally rule out instruction in conjunction with the new covenant, but

---

[1]Laetsch, _Jeremiah_, pp. 256-57. On the pronominal use of איש
in the construction איש את רעהו, see GKC, pp. 447-48. For the use of
רעה and אח as references to those within the covenant community, see
Jeremiah 34:14-17 and these articles: TDOT, s.v. "אח ," by Helmer
Ringgren, 1:118-93; and TWOT, s.v. "אחה," by Herbert Wolf, 1:31.

[2]Keil notes in _Jeremiah, Lamentations_: "The correct under-
standing of the words results from a right perception of the contrast
involved in them, viz. that under the old covenant the knowledge of
the Lord was connected with the mediation of priests and prophets"
(p. 40). See also Thompson, _Book of Jeremiah_, p. 581; and Feinberg,
Jeremiah, p. 221.
　　　　Robertson adds this: "The most natural interpretation in
context would point to the fact that the new covenant situation
would be one in which the need for people to mediate the covenant
would disappear." Noting that Moses, the priests, the prophets
et al. were presented in the Old Testament as teachers and mediators
of the old covenant, he comes to this conclusion: "But under
the new covenant, no mediator would be necessary for the communicating
of the will of God to his people" (_Christ of the Covenants_, p. 293).

it does suggest that the need for it will be considerably lessened.

כי כולם ידעו אותי . . . נאם יהוה. The first of the two causal

clauses explains why this instruction about the knowledge of God is

no longer essential. Jeremiah states that instruction is not required

with the new covenant because the knowledge communicated by it will

already be known.

The prepositional phrases, למקטנם ועד גדולם, indicate the

extent to which this knowledge is applied among the recipients of the

new covenant. As used elsewhere in Jeremiah, the phrases form a merism

and point to the fact that not just some, but all, are given this

knowledge as a consequence of the new covenant.[1]

The key issue in the discussion of this verse is the meaning of

the verb ידע. The meaning here must be defined in light of its use in

covenant contexts elsewhere by Jeremiah. It is clear from Jeremiah's

other uses that ידע should be understood here in a more profound sense

than that of mere theoretical or abstract knowledge. What is in view

is the intimate knowledge of God gained both deductively through obser-

vation and experientially through personal contact.[2]

In addition, this encounter from which the knowledge of God is

---

[1]Andrew W. Blackwood, Jr., Commentary on Jeremiah (Waco: Word
Books, 1977), p. 228. See also Jer 6:13; 8:10; 42:1, 8; and 44:12.

[2]NIDNTT, s.v. "Knowledge," by E. D. Schmitz, 2:395-97.
Thompson states this: "The verb 'know' here probably carries its
most profound connotation, the intimate personal knowledge which
arises between two persons who are committed wholly to one another in
a relationship that touches mind, emotion, and will" (Book of Jeremiah,
p. 581). See TDNT, s.v. "γινώσκω," by Rudolph Bultmann, 1:697-701;
TWOT, s.v. "ידע," by Jack P. Lewis, 1:366-67. Jeremiah's other uses
include 2:8; 4:22; 9:3, 5, 23, 24; and especially 22:15, 16. See
also Robert C. Dentan, The Knowledge of God in Ancient Israel (New York:
Seabury Press, 1968), p. 46.

obtained involves more than God showing favor to the covenant partner.
It cannot be disassociated from the human party's response in allegiance
and obedience. In accordance with 22:15 and 16, it is a knowledge which
is reflected in a life consistent with the character of God and which is
expressed in obedience to God's moral demands.[1] Therefore, to know God
is to be brought into a relationship of fellowship with God where his
favor is experienced and his will is obeyed. Again, this does not
preclude the availability of such knowledge prior to the new covenant;
it does indicate, however, that such knowledge is an integral and essen-
tial part of the new covenant.[2]

כי אסלח . . . לא אזכר עוד. The final causal clause consists of
two lines which are synonymous parallels and in a chiastic construction.[3]
It is uncertain whether this and the preceding clauses concluding

---

[1]Weinfeld, "Jeremiah and Spiritual Metamorphosis," p. 28, note
43, and p. 30, note 49. His conclusion is that both in Hebrew, as
well as in Akkadian, to "know God" (or "gods") is to fear God. See also
Kaiser, "Old Promise and the New Covenant," p. 20, note 46. Lewis con-
curs: "'Knowledge of God' appears in parallel with 'fear of the Lord'
. . . as a description of true religion. The man who has a right rela-
tion with God confesses him and obeys him. To do justice and righteous-
ness and to judge the cause of the poor and the needy is to know God
(Jer 22:15-16)" (TWOT, s.v. "ידע," 1:367). Herbert B. Huffmon, among
others, has attempted to show parallels with the use of the term in
the ANE. See Huffmon's "The Treaty Background of Hebrew Yada," BASOR
181 (February 1966):31-37; and his follow-up with Simon B. Parker, "A
Further Note on the Treaty Background of Hebrew Yada," BASOR 184
(December 1966):36-38.

[2]Cf. 24:7 where there is a similar collocation of Yahweh's
giving the nation a heart to know him and in turn its giving to him
its undivided allegiance.

[3]The arrangement can be viewed as follows:

B	A
לעונם	אסלח
A[1]	B[1]
לא אזכר עוד	ולחטאתם

verse 34 are in a parallel arrangement or a climactic arrangement with the latter marking the climax of the new covenant promise.[1] In either case, Jeremiah indicates by their juxtaposition that the two are related. In concert with the transformation of the heart and the establishment of a relationship described by the phrase "knowing God," the new covenant makes provision for the forgiveness of sins.

The relationship among these various facets is understood in this manner. It was the sin of the nation, expressed in violations of the old covenant and resulting in its being broken, that prevented the nation from knowing God and made necessary the changing of the heart. The new covenant, through the transformation of the heart and through the forgiveness of sins, was designed to remove the obstacles and allow the nation to know and to serve God.[2]

The real issue with this last clause is in determining its significance within the immediate context. The problem is to discern whether a contrast is intended between the forgiveness provided under the old covenant and the forgiveness mentioned here.[3]

---

[1]Kaiser ("Old Promise and the New Covenant," p. 19), following Anderson ("New Covenant and the Old," p. 15, n. 1), takes the last two clauses as climactic. Kaiser's argument is that the forgiveness of sins is the initial activity from which the other activities proceed (i.e., the knowledge of God and consequently the removal of the need for instruction). While it is true that such an argument is both logical and theologically consistent, it is still difficult to say that this is what Jeremiah intended by the two clauses. It may have been that Jeremiah wanted the two clauses to be viewed as corollaries and not climactically. The evidence from the immediate context is inconclusive.

[2]See Blackwood, Jeremiah, p. 228; and Feinberg, Jeremiah, p. 221.

[3]The issue is very problematic, and it is beyond the purview of this study to deal extensively with it. On the concept of forgiveness and its application in this verse, see NIDNTT, s.v. "Forgiveness," by H. Vörlander, 1:698-700; TWOT, s.v. "חלס," by Walter C. Kaiser, 1:626;

Although there is the possibility that in this instance no contrast is meant between the old and new covenants,[1] the general pattern in the pericope has been to mark those aspects of the new covenant which distinguish it from the old, even though the distinctions may be more relative than absolute. Furthermore, the New Testament indicates that a distinction exists between the efficacy of the old covenant sacrifice and that of the new. The assumption is that there must be a similar distinction regarding the related issue of forgiveness.[2]

Whatever the distinction may be, the statements themselves pose no interpretive problems. The balancing of the positive statement, "I will forgive their iniquities," with the negative, "I will remember

---

TDOT, s.v. "אטח," by K. Koch, 4:309-19; TWOT, s.v. "אטח," by G. Herbert Livingston, 1:277-79; and ISBE, s.v. "Forgiveness," by W. C. Morro and R. K. Harrison, 2:340-44.

Although not mentioned in the context, the place and significance of the Old Testament sacrifices is a necessary consideration in the discussion. For this aspect, see Hobart E. Freeman, "The Problem of the Efficacy of the Old Testament Sacrifices," Grace Journal 14 (Winter 1963):21-28; idem, Old Testament Prophets, pp. 315-22; Richard E. Averbeck, "An Exegetical Study of Leviticus 1:4 With a Discussion of the Nature of the Old Testament Atonement" (M.Div. thesis, Grace Theological Seminary, 1977), pp. 54-68; John S. Feinberg, "Salvation in the Old Testament," in Tradition and Testament: Essays in Honor of Charles Lee Feinberg, eds. John S. Feinberg and Paul D. Feinberg (Chicago: Moody Press, 1981) pp. 63-75; Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., "The Abolition of the Old Order and Establishment of the New: Psalm 40:6-8 and Hebrews 10:5-10," in Tradition and Testament: Essays in Honor of Charles Lee Feinberg, eds. John S. Feinberg and Paul D. Feinberg (Chicago: Moody Press, 1981), pp. 32-33; idem, Old Testament Theology, pp. 116-18; J. Barton Payne, The Theology of the Older Testament (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962), pp. 382-85; and Geerhardus Vos, Biblical Theology: Old and New Testaments (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954), pp. 174-78.

[1]Both of these statements are found in connection with the old covenant; e.g., Isa 43:25 and Jer 36:3.

[2]See pp. 234-38 of this paper for a treatment of the passages in Hebrews contrasting the sacrifice of Christ in conjunction with the new covenant with the sacrifices under the old covenant.

their sins no more," points to the connection between forgiveness and the removal of judgment.[1] Just as the nation's sin had brought divine punishment, so now its forgiveness would bring the removal of God's condemnation and wrath.

Jeremiah 31:35-40

As was indicated in the form analysis of chapters 30 and 31, verses 35-40 are set off from the actual new covenant pericope by the use of the prophetic formula in verse 35 (כה אמר יהוה) and by the poetic structure of verses 35-37. For this reason, these verses are not regarded as part of the new covenant but are reckoned as forming the concluding section to chapters 30 and 31. The design for the discussion of these verses is to identify their general content and their significance to the preceding verses.[2]

These verses are divided into two sections: verses 35-37 in poetic structure and verses 38-40 in prosaic.[3] The two sections function together as a pledge, assuring the permanence of the nation and its relationship to God.[4]

---

[1]See n. 3, p. 40. In Jer 14:10 the use of the phrase יזכר עונם ("he will remember their iniquity"), paralleling ויפקד חטאתם ("he will call into account their sins"), substantiates the connection between God's remembering sins and his punishing sins.

[2]For a recent and fairly extensive treatment of the textual and interpretive matters, see Thompson, Book of Jeremiah, pp. 582-84.

[3]Some divide these verses into three sections, with verse 37 separated from verses 35 and 36 because of the repetition of the prophetic formula כה אמר יהוה found at the beginning of verse 37 (for example, Thompson, Book of Jeremiah, pp. 582-83). The verses' similarities in content and poetic structure argue in favor of verse 37 being included in a single unit with verses 35 and 36.

[4]The first, verses 35-37, speaks of the nation in its entirety

Because these verses reflect terms frequently found in covenantal oaths in the ANE and because of their proximity to the new covenant, the inclination has been to view these verses as a divine pledge which ensures the new covenant promises.[1] While not denying that the verses are to be understood as giving a guarantee, the question raised is whether such an exclusive relationship is intended between these verses and the new covenant. Because of the use of the phrase כה אמר יהוה throughout chapters 30 and 31 to mark off the major subdivisions, it is better to see this last section as assuring not only the stipulations in the new covenant, but also all of the preceding promises.

Jeremiah 32:40

Nearer context

The second of the three references to a future covenant in Jeremiah is found in 32:40. Because of the similarity of circumstances depicted in 32:2 and 33:1 where the prophet is said to be under house arrest in Judah's court of the guard, commentators regard chapters 32 and 33 as a unit. In addition, because of the common theme of restoration and common phrases (e.g., הנה ימים באים), many include these two with chapters 30 and 31 in the "Book of Comfort."[2]

(literally, זרע ישראל), while the second, verses 38-40, limits the perspective to its capitol city.

[1]Keil, Jeremiah, Lamentations, pp. 41-47. Laetsch states this: "God's faithfulness in keeping His ordinances in the realm of nature is here made the visible pledge of like faithfulness in His keeping His covenant promises" (Jeremiah, p. 258). Cf. 33:19-26.
　　On the use of natural phenomena as covenant witnesses, see Herbert B. Huffmon, "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets," JBL 78 (December 1959):285-95.

[2]See p. 13, n. 1; Kaiser, "Old Promise and the New Covenant,"

Chapter 32 records the account of the Lord's directive to Jeremiah to purchase a field at Anathoth shortly before the destruction of Jeruaslem and the final deportation of the Southern Kingdom to Babylon.[1] The chapter is divided into three segments: (1) Verses 1-15 provide the details of the purchase; (2) Verses 16-25 record Jeremiah's questioning the Lord as to the reason for the purchase; and (3) Verses 26-44 give the Lord's response.[2]

The third segment in which the covenant reference is found is composed of two parts. In the first part, verses 26-35, the Lord reveals the cause for the deportation: the nation had failed to remain loyal to Yahweh and the captivity was his way of chastening her. In the second part, verses 36-44, the Lord extends to the nation the hope of a future restoration.[3]

The close correspondence between the context of Jeremiah 31:31-34 and the context of the covenant mentioned here suggests that the two covenants are identical. Both contexts involve God's judgment against the nation and its subsequent dispersion. Both also involve the promise of future restoration and blessing.[4]

---

p. 15; Feinberg, Jeremiah, p. 202. On the historical sequence in these chapters, see ibid., pp. 223-24.

[1]Presumably, this transaction was designed to show that such commercial activity is to be resumed at some point in Israel's future, notwithstanding the destruction of Jerusalem and the deportation of the nation (Thompson, Book of Jeremiah, p. 596).

[2]See C. von Orelli, The Prophecies of Jeremiah, trans. J. S. Banks (reprint ed., Minneapolis: Klock and Klock Christian Publishers, 1977), p. 248.

[3]Feinberg, Jeremiah, p. 231.

[4]Cf. verses 37 and 41. See Rad, Old Testament Theology, 2:214-15.

Exegesis

There is little included in the immediate context of the cove-
nant reference (32:40) which offers a significant addition to what has
already been presented by Jeremiah in 31:31-34.[1] The reference itself
continues a series of consecutive imperfects[2] begun in verse 37 and
extending through verse 41. According to verse 36, the recipients in
view are identified as the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Verse 38 repeats
the covenant formula found in 31:33, והיו לי לעם. The expressions
ונתתי להם לב אחד . . . ליראה אותי ("I will give them one heart . . . to
fear me") in verse 39 and ואת יראתי אתן לבבם ("I will set my fear in
their hearts") in verse 40 represent the same promise given in 31:33.
It is the divine activity upon the heart which brings about covenant
loyalty.[3]

---

[1]The text of this section has only a limited number of variants
and nothing that would present an obstacle in its interpretaion. See
Bright, Jeremiah, pp. 289-90, 295; Thompson, Book of Jeremiah, p. 595.

[2]Williams, Hebrew Syntax, pp. 33-34.

[3]The cause and effect relationship between putting the fear
of God in the heart and obeying God is seen in the construction in
verse 40: לבלתי סור מעתי ("that they not depart from me"). The ל is
one of purpose/result and depicts the consequence of the divine activity
upon the heart. See Williams, Hebrew Syntax, p. 50; and Rad, Old Testa-
ment Theology, 2:215. Whether ירא means "terror" or "awe" matters
little because in either case it points to the proper response to God
in light of the covenant relationship. The phrase "to fear God" means
to have the proper attitude toward God which would ensure compliance
with the covenant.
    For a discussion on the use of ירא, see TDNT, s.v. "φοβέω,"
by Günther Wanke, 9:197-205; NIDNTT, s.v. "Fear," by Wilhelm Mundle,
1:622; TWOT, s.v. "ירא," by Andrew Bowling, 1:399-401. Bowling
reflects the position of the others when he states this: "In several
passages, 'fearing' and proper living are so closely related as to
be virtually synonymous ideas . . . . It is plausible that this
usage of 'to fear' as a virtual synonym for righteous living or
piety grew out of viewing 'fear' as the motivation which produced
righteous living" (p. 40).

The covenant promise consists of a declarative clause, followed
by an extended relative clause functioning as an adjective and identi-
fying two distinguishing characteristics of this covenant. The two
characteristics are that God will not cease from doing good to the
nation and that the nation in turn will not cease from following God.[1]
Jeremiah includes these two characteristics to explain the reason this
covenant is described as an eternal covenant (ברית עולם): It is an
eternal covenant because both parties fulfill their respective respon-
sibilities in the covenant relationship.[2]

The only addition of significance is the descriptive adjective
עולם. Although the term עולם can signify the concept of permanence,
there are sufficient instances where the extent suggested by it is
not open ended. As a result, the overall context in each case must
ultimately determine the meaning intended by its use.[3] The immediate
context offers little information which can help in determining the

---

[1]The second subordinate construction within the relative clause
is disjunctive in that the object is placed before the subject/verb,
almost as if in chiasm with the first subordinate construction. Perhaps
the best explanation for the word order is to see it as a comparison
between the action God undertakes in this covenant and the action the
nation undertakes in response. On the disjunctive construction, see
Williams, Hebrew Syntax, pp. 70-72.

[2]Keil, Jeremiah, Lamentations, pp. 59-60.

[3]See TDNT, s.v. "αἰών," by Hermann Sasse, 1:197-209; NIDNTT,
s.v. "Time," by Joachim Guhrt, 3:827-29; and TWOT, s.v. "עלם," by Allan
MacRae, 2:672-73. For a somewhat different approach, see James
Muilenburg, "The Biblical View of Time," in Grace Upon Grace: Essays
in Honor of Lester J. Kuyper, ed. J. I. Cook (Grand Rapids: Wm. B.
Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975), p. 45. Muilenberg accepts the idea
of remoteness, but rejects the idea of permanency. Robertson, Christ
of the Covenants, p. 277, notes that this expression is used of the
Abrahamic covenant (Gen 17:7), the Davidic (Isa 55:3), and the Mosaic
(Isa 24:5).

extent the term is intended to have. The impression from the surrounding verses is that the longevity of this covenant is coextensive with the blessings associated with the restoration of the land (verses 41-44).

Jeremiah 50:5

Nearer context

The third and final reference to a future covenant in Jeremiah is found in the oracles against the nations in chapters 46-51, specifically in the oracles against Babylon, chapters 50-51.[1] In the opening verses of this prophecy, Jeremiah announces the threat of divine judgment against Babylon (verses 1-3), followed by the promise of Israel's deliverance (verses 4-5).[2] In this second section, a reference to a future covenant (ברית עולם) is recorded in verse 5.[3] The verses in the immediate vicinity of this reference do not speak so much of what is involved in this covenant as they do of the circumstances surrounding Israel's return (cf. verse 4 and verses 19-20).

The covenant context contains little that has not already been

---

[1]There are a considerable number of differences between the MT and the LXX with these chapters, including both the arrangement of these oracles and their placement in Jeremiah. For a discussion of these and the related issue of authenticity, see Thompson, Book of Jeremiah, pp. 686-87; 731-32. For a recent defense of Jeremianic authorship, see Feinberg, Jeremiah, pp. 291-92; 315-16.

[2]The oracles are primarily in poetic form. Verses 4-5 are set off from verses 1-3 by the change in subject (from Babylon to the nation), by the temporal modifier בימים ההמה ובעת ההיא ("In those days, at that time"), and by the prophetic formula נאם יהוה. Verses 6-16 are also set off from verses 4-5, principally by a change in theme from a summons to the nation to seek the Lord (verses 4-5) to an invitation for the nation to flee Babylon (verses 6-16).

[3]According to the text in BHS, verses 4-5 represent a quatrain of two couplets each.

48

presented in the previous references. The covenant is mentioned in
conjunction with the return of the nation to their land, ושבתי את
ישראל אל נוהו ("And I will restore Israel to its pasture," verse 19);
there is a uniting of the two divided kingdoms, בני ישראל . . . ובני
יהודה (verse 4); there is the promise of the forgiveness of sins, אסלח
("I will pardon," verse 20); and there is the inference that this cove-
nant is to be longlasting (verse 5).[1] The weight of these similarities
supports the conclusion that what is in view in these verses is the
same covenant first mentioned by Jeremiah in 31:31-34.

Exegesis

Verse 5 continues the description begun in verse 4 of the
nation's return to Palestine.[2] The verse begins with the declarative
clause either epexegetical to the preceding clause or concomitant
with it.[3] This, in turn, is followed by what appears to be direct
discourse with two coordinate imperatives describing the members of
the nation as exhorting themselves to return and join together with

---

[1]Thompson, Book of Jeremiah, pp. 732-34. This last point is
supported not only by the adjective עולם, but also by the concluding
relative clause לא תשכח ("that will not be forgotten"). It is uncer-
tain whether this last statement is meant to show a contrast between
this and a previous covenant which had been forgotten.

[2]The concluding statement from verse 4, ואת יהוה אלהיהם יבקשו
("And they shall seek Yahweh their God"), is brought forward in verse 5
with ציון ישאלו דרך ("They shall ask for the way to Zion") and then
defined by the expression באו ונלוו אל יהוה ברית עולם ("Come, let us
join ourselves unto Yahweh in an everlasting covenant").

[3]This requires taking בקש and שאל as parallel but not neces-
sarily identical activities. The structure of the verse makes syntac-
tical identification somewhat problematic and tentative. See Bright,
Jeremiah, pp. 359-60.

יהוה in this covenant.[1]

The critical issue with this reference is to determine whether or not the return of the nation from the Babylonian captivity satisfies the demands for the setting of the covenant promise. The overall context of chapters 50 and 51 unquestionably involves the neo-Babylonian empire and Israel's release from captivity. The references to the Medes (e.g., Jer 51:28) as the instrument God is going to use to punish Babylon and bring her downfall and the reference to Nebuchadnezzar as king of Babylon (Jer 51:34) certainly suggests that such is the case.

However, this does not demand that the covenant promised in this context must be located in the same historical setting. In fact, there are indications that mitigate against such a conclusion. For example, there is no such covenant activity recorded in the post-exilic writings. In addition, there is no indication that the many aspects associated here and in the previous references to the new covenant were experienced by the post-exilic community (e.g., the complete removal of sins, as in verse 20). Furthermore, the immediate context also provides evidence that the defeat of the neo-Babylonian kingdom and subsequent release and return of a remnant does not satisfy the context of this covenant. For instance, the destruction of the Babylonian nation presented in these two chapters shows little correspondence to the downfall of Babylon

---

[1] The MT points the two forms as imperatives while the LXX translates them as though they were imperfects. For a discussion, see Keil, Jeremiah, Lamentations, p. 270.

On the textual issues of the entire section, see Bright, Jeremiah, pp. 339-40; and Thompson, Jeremiah, pp. 729-31. Of the textual questions, none materially affect the interpretation of the covenant reference.

Syntactically, ברית is probably functioning as an accusative of specification. See Williams, Hebrew Syntax, pp. 12-13.

accomplished through Cyrus.[1]

Several possibilities can be put forth to harmonize what Jeremiah describes in these verses with what took place historically at the defeat of the neo-Babylonian empire by Cyrus and the subsequent return of a remnant of the nation to Palestine. Assuming that Jeremiah's statements regarding both the destruction of Babylon and the establishment of an eternal covenant are not simply figures or hyperbole, then the following two possibilities are suggested. Either the references to historical Babylon are used purely in an illustrative capacity of a more distant judgment or the prophet is mixing elements which involve both near and far references, with the description of Babylon's defeat falling within the former and the promise of the covenant falling within the latter.[2] In either case, the information supplied in this passage does not add any element to the covenant which was not also mentioned elsewhere in a context where the interpretation does not have these difficulties.

Summary

Having examined the references in Jeremiah to a new or future

---

[1] For a discussion of these and the related issues, see Bright, Jeremiah, pp. 359-60; Thompson, Book of Jeremiah, pp. 731-34; and Feinberg, Jeremiah, pp. 317-18. Thompson, among others, notes that the enemy from the north (verse 3) is problematic if viewed as the historical Persian empire in that Persia lay to the east of Babylon (p. 733). Because of this, Bright suggests that the reference in verse 3 was written before the defeat of the Medes by Cyrus in 550. Before that period the Medes, a nation to the north of Babylon, would have been viewed as the threat against the Babylonian kingdom (p. 360).

[2] Keil, Jeremiah, Lamentations, p. 270. Cf. also Jeremiah 29:10-14.

covenant, the following salient features are noted in summary:[1] (1) The covenant entails a degree of discontinuity with the old or Mosaic covenant (31:32), though both involve the same nation (31:31-32) and the divine torah (31:32); (2) The covenant includes Yahweh's transforming the heart of the individual so that there is both the desire as well as the capacity for obedience (31:33; 32:39-40; 50:4-5; cf. 24:7); (3) The covenant provides for the full forgiveness of sins (31:34; cf. 50:20); (4) The covenant establishes an inviolable relationship between Yahweh and the nation based, at least in part, upon the knowledge of God (31:33-34; 32:38-40; 50:5; cf. 24:7); and (5) The covenant is associated with the nation's regathering and restoration to the promised land, following a period of judgment and dispersion (31:27-29; 32:36-38; cf. 24:6-7).

---

[1] Riatt, "Jeremiah's Deliverance Message," pp. 172-77; idem, Theology of Exile, p. 201.

CHAPTER II

THE NEW COVENANT IN HOSEA

Introduction

The covenant reference in Hosea 2:20 [18] is examined in this chapter. The issues of provenance, text, and context are treated successively in order to provide a background for the more detailed examination of the pertinent verses. The overriding goal is to determine if a relationship exists between the covenant mentioned in Hosea and the new covenant found in Jeremiah, and, if so, what contribution this reference can make to an understanding of the new covenant.

Provenance

The underlying assumptions in this chapter are that Hosea was a prophet who lived during the eighth century in Israel and who addressed his prophecies primarily to the Northern Kingdom. He spoke both of God's condemnation and judgment and of His subsequent deliverance and restoration of Israel. Despite the conclusions of recent form-critical studies, it is also concluded that the prophecies recorded in the canonical Hosea are all genuine and represent the content of the prophet's message to the nation.[1]

---

[1]Whatever editing may have taken place, and there is no reason to doubt that some editing took place in its canonical form, neither the external nor the internal evidence requires that this was accomplished by someone other than the prophet himself. See Harrison, Old Testament, pp. 868-70. Against this position, see Eissfeldt, Old Testament, pp. 390-91; Hans Walter Wolff, Hosea: A Commentary on

Text

Although the MT of Hosea is recognized as being highly corrupt,
it is nevertheless regarded as being superior to the versions.[1] For
this reason, the MT is chosen as the principal text upon which the
exegesis is undertaken. Among the versions, the LXX has proven helpful
in recovering the correct text, but its assistance is limited in that
it gives evidence of being derived from a Vorlage similar to that of the
MT.[2] What textual questions there are in the section under consideration
are not significant and are treated when appropriate in the exegesis
below.[3]

Greater Context

Hosea is regarded as having two major divisions: chapters 1-3,

---

the Book of the Prophet Hosea, trans. G. Stansell, ed. P. D. Hanson,
Hermeneia, eds. F. M. Cross, Jr. et al. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press,
1974), pp. xxi-xxxii; and more recently, Francis I. Andersen and David
Noel Freedman, Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction and Commen-
tary, AB, eds. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (Garden City, NY:
Doubleday and Company, 1980), pp. 52-57; and Childs, Old Testament,
pp. 377-80.

[1]Andersen and Freedman, Hosea, pp. 66-68. Fortunately, the text
for the first three chapters (in which is located the covenant reference)
is relatively free from the problems which mark the last eleven chap-
ters and which give the text of Hosea such a bad reputation. See James
Luther Mays, Hosea: A Commentary, The Old Testament Library, eds. G. E.
Wright et al. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), p. 5.

[2]Apparently, the only difference in their respective Vorlages is
that the LXX used a Hebrew text that did not employ matres lectionis.
See John Mauchline, "The Book of Hosea: Introduction and Exegesis," in
vol. 6 of IB, eds. G. A. Buttrick et al. (New York: Abingdon Press,
1956), pp. 564-65. What little evidence has come from Qumran gives
the impression that the Qumran text follows a text similar to that of
the MT. Andersen and Freedman, Hosea, p. 66.

[3]On specific textual issues, the commentary by Wolff, Hosea,
pp. 31, 46-47, has proven helpful in identifying problems and providing
information.

which are composed of two biographical narratives separated by an
extended divine oracle and chapters 4-14 which are composed of a col-
lection of prophetic speeches or proclamations.[1] Hosea's reference to
a future covenant falls within the first division, and it is with this
division that the interest here is focused.[2]

The subdivision of the first three chapters poses something of
a problem. Assuming the verses in these chapters which reflect the theme
of future deliverance/prosperity are authentic, then three judgment/
deliverance cycles can be identified.[3] The first consists of 1:2-2:3
[1:2-2:1] in prose and is biographical narrative. The second cycle
includes 2:4-25 [2:2-23] in poetic narrative and represents a divine
speech. The third involves all of chapter 3 in prose and is autobio-
graphical narrative.[4]

The pattern in each of these cycles goes from comdemnation and
judgment to deliverance and restoration. The backdrop in each case is
the covenant relationship between Israel and Yahweh, depicted in terms

---

[1]Eissfeldt, Old Testament, pp. 385-87.

[2]The material in chapters 4-14 is treated only insofar as it
bears directly on the interpretation of 2:20 and assists in deciphering
Hosea's reference to the covenant mentioned here.

[3]The problems with these chapters arise not so much over the
three-fold division, but over the authenticity of those verses which
offer the hope of future deliverance and prosperity. See p. 52, note 1;
and David B. Wyrtzen, "The Theological Center of the Book of Hosea,"
BSac 141 (October-December 1984):315-29.

[4]The divisions and their identification presented here follow
roughly that developed by Andersen and Freedman, Hosea, pp. 61-63.
See also Wyrtzen, "Hosea," pp. 315-29. The distinction between prose and
poetry in these chapters is by no means clear. Andersen and Freedman
call chapter 2 "heightened prophetic prose" which they say approaches
poetry, distinguishing it from chapters 1 and 3 which they also regard as
approaching poetry (pp. 61-62).

of a marriage bond and represented through the relationship between the
prophet and his estranged consort, Gomer.[1]

> By divine command in the first (1:2-2:1) and third (3:1-5) judgment-
> salvation cycles the prophet's life becomes the symbol of the Lord's
> restorative confrontation. The divine accusation is against
> Israel's idolatry (. . . 3:1) and this idolatry is symbolized by
> harlotry (. . . 1:2). God's judgment response is represented by
> the names of Hosea's children (1:3-8). The divine restoration of
> relationship is represented by the reversal in the names (2:1-3;
> cf. 2:25). Thus God's confrontation of His people is embodied in
> the life of His prophet . . . .[2]

The analogy intended in these cycles is that Israel, like Gomer,
had committed fornication, in Israel's case by her alliance with other
gods.[3] As a consequence, God was going to punish her. However, this
punishment did not represent the irreversible termination of their
relationship. Instead, it was intended as a disciplinary action prepar-
atory to the reestablishment of the intimacies of the covenant bond.[4]

---

[1]There is a considerable debate on the various facets of Hosea's
relationship with Gomer; e.g., whether or not Gomer was a real person or
simply a symbolic figure; whether or not Gomer was a harlot or simply
depicted as such; and whether or not the woman in chapter 3 is the same
as in chapter 1 (i.e., Gomer or some other woman). See Harrison, Old
Testament, pp. 862-68; and Freeman, Old Testament Prophets, pp. 179-82.
Fortunately for the sake of the present study, none of these issues
materially affect the exegesis of the covenant reference.

[2]Wyrtzen, "Hosea," pp. 319-20.

[3]The analogy is primarily drawn upon in the first and third
cycles. The second cycle momentarily lays aside the illustration of
the prophet's experiences with Gomer and addresses the nation directly.
See C. F. Keil, Minor Prophets, vol. 10 in Commentary on the Old Testa-
ment, trans. James Martin, eds. C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch (reprint ed.,
Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1973), pp. 23-24.

[4]Freeman, Old Testament Prophets, p. 173, summarizes similarly:
"On the grounds of the bond and covenant relation existing between
God and Israel, represented often under the figure of marriage (cf.
Exodus 34:15; Isa. 62:5; Hosea 2:19; Jer. 3:14), the idolatry of
Israel is exhibited as whoredom and adultery. Thus the prophet's mar-
riage to adulterous Gomer was to illustrate this apostasy, and the names
of her children, the exile and judgment (chap. 1). Next the Lord

This collocation of impending judgment and future deliverance suggests that the covenant in view can be approached as a foreshadowing of Jeremiah's pronouncement concerning the new covenant. Both passages have as their antecedent context God's judgment against the nation because of her unfaithfulness. Both passages, in addition, involve God's subsequent removal of judgment and the establishment of a covenant relationship with its attendant blessings. All that can be said at this point is that similarities exist. The nature and extent of these similarities must be determined in the exegesis which follows.

Interpretation

Nearer Context

The actual covenant reference is found in the second cycle, 2:4-25, and particularly in the second half of the cycle, 2:16-25, where the deliverance/restoration theme is developed. Verses 16-25 are marked off from the preceding verses describing Israel's condemnation and judgment by the inferential particle לכן and are further distinguished by the use of the prophetic perfect in the first person.[1] The particle לכן, used at this juncture to associate the preceding judgment portion of the second cycle with the deliverance portion which follows, presents an interesting contrast. The inference suggested by its use is

---

announced that He was to put an end to Israel's whoredom, and after the discipline of exile and punishment would betroth Himself to her again forever (chap. 2). The prophet was commanded to restore his unfaithful wife, symbolically signifying God's unceasing love for Israel (chap. 3)."

[1]Walter Brueggemann, Tradition for Crisis: A Study in Hosea (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1968), p. 114.

that God, in spite of and in response to Israel's infidelity, is going

to put forth an even greater effort to establish the bonds of an inti-

mate relationship.[1]

This section, the deliverance phase of the second cycle, is

divided at verses 18 and 23 [16, 21], forming three strophes.[2] The

resulting structure consists of the initial expression of God's gracious

---

[1]Concurring is Ebenezer Henderson: "It thus marks the unex-
pected transition from threats to promises" (The Twelve Minor Prophets,
Translated from the Original Hebrew with a Critical and Exegetical
Commentary [reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980], p. 12.
See Andersen and Freedman, Hosea, p. 269.
    Wrytzen observes correctly the development in this section:
"The literary motif used in this second judgment-salvation cycle is
therefore an allegory of an unfaithful wife who is legally disciplined
for her immorality. Though the initial marriage is severed because of
the wife's sexual promiscuity, her loyal husband continues to love her.
This gracious loyal love finally prevails to bring about her restoration
to intimacy with Himself. The resulting bitter-sweet love story illus-
trates God's historical relationship with Israel and its future"
("Hosea," p. 320).
    Further support for the significance of לכן may be seen in 3:1.
There Hosea is directed by Yahweh to pursue his wife even though she is
loved by another, even as Yahweh has pursued Israel though the nation
has turned to worship others [emphasis mine], והם פנים אל אלהים אחרים,
"even though they turn to other gods."

[2]The divisions as indicated are supported by the temporal
modifier ביום ההוא ("in that day") and by the formula for divine oracle,
נאם יהוה, found at the beginning of verses 18 and 23. Wolff demurs on
the use of נאם יהוה as a division indicator (Hosea, pp. 40-41). Andersen
and Freedman follow similar divisions using the introductory והיה as
the strophic identifier (Hosea, pp. 266-68).
    The phrase ביום ההוא is used in the same way in these verses as
the temporal expressions discussed at Jer 31:31, 33; 50:4. Mays notes
that the construction is "used to designate the time when Yahweh acts
decisively in judgment or salvation; it probably refers to the 'day of
Yahweh' . . . " (Hosea, p. 47).
    For treatments on the use of יום in prophetic contexts, and
particularly its use in the construction יום יהוה, see TDNT, s.v.
"ἡμέρα," by Gerhard von Rad and Gerhard Delling, 2:943-53; NIDNTT,
s.v. "Present," by Georg Braumann and Colin Brown, 2:887-95; TWOT,
s.v. "יום," by Leonard J. Coppes, 1:370-71; and Richard Lee Mayhue,
"The Prophet's Watchword: The Day of the Lord" (Th.D. dissertation,
Grace Theological Seminary, 1981), pp. 1-219.

activity toward Israel, verses 16-17 [14-15]. This, in turn, is followed by two additional expressions, verses 18-22 and 23-25 [16-20 and 21-23], which identify further consequences that stem from the display of God's grace toward the nation. The entire section manifests its unity through the series of prophetic perfects in the first person singular which are employed throughout.

Exegesis

The covenant proclamation occurs in the second strophe,[1] specifically in verse 20, with verses 21-22 giving attendant circumstances which are related to but not necessarily included within the covenant proclamation.[2] Verse 20 can be divided into three periods. There is the initial declarative clause which includes the previously mentioned temporal modifier, בּיוֹם הַהוּא, as well as a series of prepositional phrases identifying the various parties associated with this covenant. This is followed by a second declarative clause, parallel to and in chiasm with the first.[3] Finally, there is a third declarative clause, functioning as a consequence of the first two and indicating the intended goal of the covenant activity.

---

[1]The two-fold theme developed in this strophe may be summarized as follows: verses 18-19 describe the removal of idolatry and the establishment of proper worship; and verses 20-22 depict the removal of God's judgment and the establishment of an intimate relationship.

[2]Verses 21-22 and the description of the intimate relationship to be established between Yahweh and the nation provide an obvious corollary to the covenant in verse 20. However, because the covenant mentioned involves the animal kingdom, it is not certain at this point whether the promises in verses 21-22 are to be viewed as an integral part of the covenant or simply as concomitant declarations.

[3]Andersen and Freedman, Hosea, p. 280. The chiasm is expressed by the reversing of the predicate-complement structure in the second clause.

There is little included in this verse that is not self-evident. The covenant expression וכרתי ברית is identical to that found in the three covenant texts discussed in Jeremiah. The temporal modifier, "in that day," has already been mentioned. It places the covenant activity in the future and, according to the surrounding context, in a time following a period of divine chastisement.[1] The repetition of the phrase at verses 18 and 23 shows that the various promises located in the immediate context are to be anticipated as occurring at the same time or in the same time period. They should not be interpreted as occurring in isolation.

The remaining prepositional phrases in the initial clause identify the parties associated with the covenant. Of question is whether the construction להם indicates that Israel is to be viewed as a covenant partner or merely as the one benefitting from the covenant.[2] It could be that the question is inappropriate. Hosea may not have intended the covenant metaphor to express such precise distinctions. In either case, the central thought is that, as a result of this covenant, Israel will enjoy a harmonious relationship with the animal kingdom. The various terms used by the prophet for the respective portions of the natural order are to be understood as representing a merism. The entire realm

---

[1]See Wolff, Hosea, pp. 50-52. Wolff correctly identifies this day as a day of salvation/deliverance.

[2]The majority see the covenant as being between the nation and the animal kingdom with God as the mediator. See Wolff, Hosea, pp. 50-51. Andersen and Freedman demur. According to them, the covenant is between Yahweh and the animal kingdom, with Israel receiving the advantage of this relationship (Hosea, pp. 280-81). In apparent agreement, see Mays, Hosea, p. 49. The preposition ל could be taken either way. See appendix A and BDB, pp. 503-504.

of nature is involved.

The second clause, in rough chiasm with the first as indicated by the reversing of the verb-complement order, is likewise fairly straightforward. The breaking of the bow (קשת), the sword (חרב), and, by zeugma, the battle (מלחמה) refers to the removal both of the implements of war and of warfare itself.[1] The third and final clause in this verse, speaking of Yahweh's securing the nation's safety (והשכבתים לבטח, "and I shall cause them to lie down in safety"), confirms the interpretation of the aforementioned initial two clauses.[2]

There are several elements within the context of this covenant which could argue that this is a separate and distinct covenant from that presented by Jeremiah. The first concerns the role God has in this covenant. It has been suggested by some that, unlike the covenant in Jeremiah 31, 32, and 50, God is shown in this instance as a covenant mediator and not as a covenant partner. In addition, the salient features mentioned by Hosea in verse 20 do not find a counterpart in the

---

[1]This is the interpretation followed by virtually all of the commentaries. See, for example, William Rainey Harper, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea, ICC, eds. C. A. Briggs et al. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915), pp. 241-43. On the use of ארץ meaning "land" rather than "earth," see Wolff, Hosea, p. 51. His argument is that of the nineteen times ארץ is used in Hosea, not once does it refer to the entire earth. Accepting his premise could limit the extent to which the freedom from warfare is experienced. On the other hand, Hosea purposely may not have intended his statement regarding the removal of warfare to exclude the territories beyond the confines of Palestine.

[2]The nominal form בטח is regularly employed in the Old Testament to depict the safety and security which is the result of divine intervention on behalf of the nation. See TDOT, s.v. "בטח," by Alfred Jepsen, 2:93; and TWOT, s.v. "בטח," by John N. Oswalt, 1:102. The ל is one of norm and the construction is equivalent to an adverbial accusative of manner (Williams, Hebrew Syntax, p. 49).

Jeremiah references. They are the previously mentioned relationship with the animal kingdom and the cessation of warfare.

Neither of these items, however, prevents the covenant in verse 20 from being identified as a preview of the new covenant, expanded and developed by Jeremiah. The most difficult problem in this verse is the issue of the covenant parties. If it can be shown that the covenant in this context is not between God and the nation, which Jeremiah's new covenant clearly is, then there are legitimate grounds for seeing here the possibility of a different covenant.

As has already been noted, however, the prepositions used make the exact relationship of the parties involved somewhat uncertain. Furthermore, it has been argued that the covenant metaphor used here may not have been intended for such exacting dissection. The metaphor is intended to communicate only that a covenant between God and the nation would involve, among other things, a harmonious relationship between the animal kingdom and Israel.

This conclusion is supported both from the immediate context, as well as by the following verses. In the immediate context, the second clause in the verse portrays a harmonious relationship that is to be established between Israel and her neighbors (suggested by the removal of the implements of war). Yet the verse does not suggest that this relationship involves a covenant between Israel and these nations. It merely states that this harmonious relationship is the consequence of divine activity undertaken on behalf of the nation in conjunction with the previously mentioned covenant.[1]

---

[1]The second clause involves something of a disjunction in that

In the verses which follow, Hosea mentions still another relationship that is established in connection with the covenant in verse 20. In this instance, the relationship described is between Yahweh and Israel and it is represented in the most intimate of terms through the marriage imagery, וארשתיך לי ("I will betroth you to me"). Although the term "covenant" is not repeated in these verses, the terms used and the relationship depicted closely approximate those expressed in covenant contexts elsewhere. Taken together, these arguments offer additional evidence that the covenant expression in verse 20 has a wider scope than would be possible if the covenant mentioned there were narrowly defined as between Israel and the animal kingdom.[1]

---

the sequence of perfects is momentarily broken and the imperfect אשבור is used. Because the consecutive perfects are employed both before and after the covenant expression, some of these perfects represent action which must be considered as distinct from the covenant itself. This cannot be said of the clause under consideration. The chiastic arrangement, along with the disjunctive construction, points to the conclusion that this clause is to be taken as an integral part of the covenant. In other words, the harmonious relationship between the nation and the animal kingdom and the removal of warfare from the land are intrinsically involved in this covenant.

[1]Wolff, Hosea, pp. 47-52. He notes the close parallel between the marriage metaphor and that of a covenant. Almost all agree that what Hosea intends in verses 21-22 is a description of Yahweh taking the nation as His bride through the paying of the bridal price (ב of price or exchange). See Harper, Hosea, p. 242. Against this view, see Andersen and Freedman, Hosea, p. 283.

Weinfeld correctly observes that the items included in the bridal price, e.g., חסד, רחמים, and אמונה, are "synonyms for the concept of loyalty which accompanies the covenant." He further notes that this bride price is that which God gives or "implants in His betrothed that she should not act treacherously toward Him anymore" ("Jeremiah and Spiritual Metamorphosis," p. 44, note 98).

Mays adds that the verb used here, ארש, represents the final step in concluding a marriage and includes the bride price which binds the arrangement and commits all concerned. "It is the public legal act upon which the validity of the marriage rests so far as society is concerned." See his treatment of the five substances in verses 21 and 22 as designating the basis for the eternal character of this new

The second problem, concerning the items found in Hosea that do not have counterparts in the references in Jeremiah, offers even less of a difficulty. A problem really exists only if the assumption is made that nothing can be viewed as involved in the new covenant unless it is mentioned by Jeremiah. This assumption is unwarranted. There is no indication that Jeremiah intended an exhaustive cataloging of new covenant elements in his treatment of the issue. Even in his own development, Jeremiah has items in one reference which are not found in his other references.

Moreover, the items Hosea includes appear from the context as essential aspects of the new covenant. The references to the animal kingdom and to warfare can and should be understood as vehicles of judgment God has used to discipline the nation (cf. 1:4-5 and 2:14 [2:12]) and which He is now removing (cf. 2:10-15 [8-13] with 2:20-25 [18-23]).[1]

Finally, the similarities far outweigh the alleged differences between the covenant mentioned here and the new covenant found in Jeremiah: (1) There is the previously mentioned juxtaposition of divine condemnation and judgment followed by divine deliverance and restoration (cf. Hos 2:4-25 [2-23] with Jer 30-31); (2) The relationship established is said to be forever (cf. Hos 2:21 [19] with Jer 32:40); (3) The

---

relationship. He concludes that "whereas the old marriage (i.e., covenant) was violated by Israel and revoked by Yahweh (1:2, 9; 2:2), this future one will endure" (Hosea, pp. 50-51).

[1]Mays, Hosea, p. 49; Andersen and Freedman, Hosea, pp. 281-83. Some have suggested that what is in view is the restoration of the original character of creation (Wolff, Hosea, pp. 50-51). This may be the case, but all that the context supports is that those items mentioned as instruments of God's judgment are to be removed.

covenantal activity results in the recipients knowing God (cf. Hos 2:22 [20] with Jer 31:34);[1] (4) There is the promise of future prosperity and material blessing associated with the nation's occupation of the land of Palestine (cf. Hos 2:23-25 [21-22] with Jer 32:41-43);[2] (5) There is the covenant formula "my people" and "my God" (cf. Hos 2:25 [23] with Jer 31:33); and (6) The new relationship is one arrived at by divine initiative and not in response to the nation's fulfilling covenant obligations.[3]

The remaining question is whether or not the promise of blessing indicated by these verses in Hosea relates to a historical fulfillment or to a future eschatological experience. The reference to Egypt and especially Assyria in the larger context of Hosea suggests that the deliverance is from the Assyrian captivity, pointing to a historical fulfillment. In addition, the immediate context speaks of the removal of the names of the Baals from Israel's mouth. Involvement with idolatry, at least the idolatry associated with Baal worship, ceased for

---

[1]Weinfeld, "Jeremiah and Spiritual Metamorphosis," p. 45. Mays defines the knowledge: "It means the whole response of Israel to the acts and words of Yahweh so that the people is defined in its total life by what Yahweh reveals of himself" (Hosea, p. 52; cf. pp. 63-64).

[2]Mays uses this to limit the extent of the peace spoken of in verse 20 to Palestine and its immediate confines (Hosea, pp. 59-60). However, such a limitation does not appear to be warranted nor necessary.

[3]Mays notes that the elements involved in the chapter parallel the blessings and curses found in Lev 26 (verses 6, 22, and 25). The difference, though, is that in Hosea the blessings described are not in response to Israel's obedience but are an unmerited gift from Yahweh. His conclusion is this: "This portrayal through the metaphor of marriage of Yahweh's new covenant with Israel in which God takes upon himself the responsibility for its integrity and permanence is the forerunner of Jeremiah's new covenant . . . " (Hosea, pp. 50, 52).

all practical purposes following the time of the Babylonian captivity.[1]

The problem with a historical interpretation is that no such covenant activity followed the period of Assyrian conquest. Although there were times of relative peace in the succeeding periods, none was sufficiently extensive to qualify for a fulfillment of the promise in verse 20. The same two possibilities exist here as in Jeremiah 50. Either there is a combination of both near and far elements in these pormises with the covenant taking place in the far reference; or the nearer context is simply used as an illustration of future events.[2]

Summary

Whichever the case, two prominent points are brought out by Hosea that are not developed in Jeremiah's new covenant prophecies: (1) There is the cessation of warfare, at least insofar as a means God has used for disciplining the nation; and (2) There is the establishment of a harmonious relationship between the nation and the animal kingdom.

---

[1]ZPEB, s.v. "Baal," by Arthur E. Cundall, 1:433.

[2]Freeman suggests that some delay in the realization of these promises is indicated by the immediate context. Commenting on chapter 3, he states the following: "The prophet was commanded to restore his unfaithful wife, symbolically signifying God's unceasing love for Israel (chap. 3). He was, however, to keep her is such a position that it would be impossible for her to commit whoredom any longer. By this the present state of Israel is described in which she is separated from her ancient rites of worship, yet free from her idolatries, until her restoration when her long period of discipline is completed" (Old Testament Prophets, p. 173; emphasis mine). From Hosea's perspective, the period described in 3:3-4 could have been understood as the time of the exile.

CHAPTER III

THE NEW COVENANT IN ISAIAH

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to identify the references to a future covenant in Isaiah, to determine the relationship of each to the new covenant, and to discover what contribution these can make toward an understanding of the new covenant in the Old Testament. As is the pattern throughout this study, issues of an introductory nature are treated insofar as they provide a basis for the exegesis which follows.

Provenance

In spite of the growing consensus which views the book of Isaiah as composed of two or three separate books, and without depreciating the complexities involved in the problem, the position embraced here is that the entire prophecy is a unified whole. Specifically, Isaiah was a prophet who spoke during the eighth century in Israel, addressing his oracles primarily to the Southern Kingdom. Although the prophecies in the canonical book were written at different times under differing circumstances, they were all written by Isaiah during his lifetime. The canonical Isaiah thus represents the content of the prophet's message to the nation.[1]

---

[1]See Oswald T. Allis, The Unity of Isaiah: A Study in Prophecy (reprint ed., Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1977), pp. 39-50; Edward J. Young, The Book of Isaiah, 3 vols, NICOT, ed. R. K. Harrison (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972), 2:538-52; Freeman, Old Testament Prophets, pp. 191-212; Archer,

Text

The text of Isaiah represented by the MT is well-preserved and serves as a satisfactory basis upon which the exegesis can be undertaken. The discoveries of 1QIsa[a] and 1QIsa[b] from Qumran have further corroborated the conclusions regarding the preservation of the MT and its reliability in reproducing the original. Among the versions, the LXX is considered superior. Although clearly inferior to the MT, it is nevertheless helpful on occasion in clarifying certain difficulties.[1]

Old Testament Introduction, pp. 326-51. Against this position, see R. N. Whybray, Isaiah 40-66, NCB, eds. R. E. Clements and M. Black (London: Oliphants, 1975), pp. 20-43; idem, The Second Isaiah, Old Testament Studies, ed. R. N. Whybray (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), pp. 1-42; Claus Westermann, Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary, trans. D. M. G. Stalker, Old Testament Library, eds. G. E. Wright et al. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), pp. 8-10; 27-29.

John L. McKenzie's remarks convey what may be viewed as the chief objection to identifying the eighth century prophet with chapters 40-55: "The distinction between First Isaiah and Second Isaiah has been made on the basis of vocabulary, style, and thought. The most striking feature of Second Isaiah is the two occurrences of the name of Cyrus (xliv 28, xlv 1). That Isaiah of Jerusalem (First Isaiah) could use the name of a king, in a language unknown to him, who ruled in a kingdom which did not exist in the eighth century B.C., taxes probability too far. It is not a question of placing limits to the vision of prophecy but of the limits of intelligibility; even if the name were by hypothesis meaningful to the prophet, it could not be meaningful to his readers or listeners" (Second Isaiah: Introduction, Translation, and Notes, AB, eds. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman [Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1968], p. xvi).

For a good survey of the history of the problem, see Harrison, Old Testament, pp. 764-800. For bibliographies, see Whybray, Isaiah 40-66, pp. 13-18; and Childs, Old Testament, pp. 311-16, 338.

[1]Charles Cutler Torrey, The Second Isaiah: A New Interpretation (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), pp. 205-15; Christopher R. North, The Second Isaiah: Introduction, Translation and Commentary to Chapters XL-LV (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), pp. 28-29; and Whybray, Isaiah 40-66, pp. 43-44. North and Whybray concur, adding the material from Qumran. George A. F. Knight cautions against assuming the versions are able to overcome a difficulty with the MT. He notes that the versions could just as easily have altered the original as preserved it (Deutero-Isaiah: A Theological Commentary on Isaiah 40-55 [New York: Abingdon Press, 1965], p. 16).

Specific textual issues are taken up when appropriate in the exegesis of the pertinent passages.

Greater Context

Isaiah makes six references to a future covenant in his prophecies: 42:6; 49:8; 54:10; 55:3; 59:21; and 61:8. These verses are categorized under one of two headings. The first is where one party is presented as a covenant to another (42:6 and 49:8). The second speaks in more traditional terms of a covenant being established between two parties (54:10; 55:3; 59:21; 61:8).

All of these occur in chapters 40-66 and, like Jeremiah 30-33, have been designated a "Book of Comfort" because of the message of hope they offer the nation (cf. 40:1-2).[1] Though recognized as an oversimplification, the two divisions of Isaiah are frequently contrasted, with chapters 1-39 characterized by the theme of condemnation and judgment and chapters 40-66 characterized by the theme of deliverance and restoration. As such, the six references fall into an overall context similar to that of Jeremiah's new covenant.

Interpretation

The "Book of Comfort" is divided into three sections. The first section, encompassing chapters 40-48, focuses on one who will come from

---

[1] P.-E. Bonnard, Le Second Isaïe: Son Disciple of Leurs Editeurs, Isaïe 40-66, Etudes Bibliques (Paris: J. Gabalda et cie, Editeurs [Librairie Lecoffre], 1972), p. 15. Various divisions have been suggested for chapters 40-66. The consensus separates 40-55 from 56-66, the former picturing an exilic context, the latter a post-exilic.

[2] Freeman, Old Testament Prophets, p. 191. He notes that such a distinction does not preclude a mixing of the elements in both sections (p. 192).

the East to rescue Israel. The second, chapters 49-55, centers around

the servant of the Lord in the role of a divine redeemer. The third

section involves chapters 55-66 and features Israel's Messiah as a

deliverer and a restorer.[1]

Isaiah 42:6

Nearer context

Chapter 42 is composed of six strophes, each of which is distin-

guished either by a change in the one speaking or by a change in the one

addressed. In the first strophe, verses 1-4, Yahweh is the speaker,

introducing His servant.[2] Set off from verses 1-4 by the introductory

formula, כה אמר האל יהוה, the second strophe consists of verses 5-9.

In this strophe as well, God is the principal speaker, talking about the

servant in the third person in verses 1-4 and directly to the servant in

verses 5-9.

The initial verse of the second strophe functions as an intro-

duction to the remaining verses. It is uncertain why God is spoken of in

---

[1] The divisions are those generally recognized with but slight
modifications by the majority of commentaries on the basis of subject
matter, historical perspective, or linguistic characteristics. The
development presented here follows closely that by Kaiser, Old Testament
Theology, pp. 212-19. In a similar vein, see C. von Orelli, The
Prophecies of Isaiah, trans. J. S. Banks, Clark's Theological Library
(Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1889), pp. 216-17; Freeman, Old Testament
Prophets, pp. 192, 213-14; and F. Duane Lindsey, "Isaiah's Songs of
the Servant, Part 1: The Call of the Servant in Isaiah 42:1-9," BSac
139 (January-March 1982):12-31.

[2] There is debate over who the servant is and whether or not
this section should be included in the "servant songs" (Westermann,
Isaiah 40-66, p. 98). For an extensive treatment on the issue of the
servant songs, see Christopher R. North, The Suffering Servant in
Deutero-Isaiah: An Historical and Critical Study, 2d ed. (Oxford:
Clarendon Press, 1956), especially pp. 190-219. For a recent bibliog-
raphy, see Whybray, Isaiah 40-66, pp. 16-17.

the third person in this verse in that in the verses before and after He is the one speaking. It may be that in verse 5 the prophet is attempting to identify more precisely the author of the statements which follow.[1]

In verses 6 and 7 Yahweh is presented as the one speaking, communicating what his servant is to accomplish. In verse 6 He addresses the servant directly in the second person. The verse consists of four declarative statements, each describing something about the servant. In the first three Yahweh tells what he has done on behalf of the servant. In the fourth, the statement concerning the covenant, Yahweh declares what the servant is going to accomplish. Verse 7 consists of two infinitive clauses which are in apposition to the fourth declaration of verse 6 and which further clarify what the covenant reference in verse 6 entails.

Verses 8 and 9 round out the strophe, giving a second description of Yahweh as the speaker, this time in the first person. In verse 8 he identifies himself by stating who he is and in verse 9 by what he is able to do. Both appear to be contrasting Yahweh with idols who have neither his reputation nor his ability. The verses serve to reinforce and to affirm what he has declared in verses 6 and 7. According to verse 9 what he has proclaimed previously has come to pass, insuring that what he now says will likewise transpire in the manner that he has declared it.[2]

---

[1]Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, p. 98. Lindsey calls verse 5 a "messenger formula," introducing the words of Yahweh in verses 6 and 7 ("Isaiah's Songs," p. 28, note 7).

[2]Joseph Addison Alexander, Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah (reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976), p. 138. Westermann feels the statements in verse 9 have no connection

Exegesis

Since the passages closely parallel one another, the issues involved with the covenant reference in this passage coincide with those in 49:8. Consequently, the solutions presented here are drawn from information provided there as well and must gain further support in the exegesis of that reference. The issues involve the meaning of the expression ואתנך לברית, the meaning of עם, and the identification of the servant.

ואתנך לברית

This phrase represents the most difficult of the interpretive problems. At issue is not the significance of ברית in that Isaiah invariably used it to mean "covenant." Nor does the question concern the significance of the expression נתן ברית. A rough synonym for the similar construction in Jeremiah 31:31 (כרת ברית), the combination means "to appoint" or "to establish" a covenant.[1] The question ultimately is how the expression, ואתנך לברית, is applied to the servant.

The first step toward a solution is to recognize that Isaiah has two prepositional phrases of identical construction governing the verb אתנך: לברית עם and לאור גוים. The parallel construction shows that Isaiah intended the two phrases to be understood as corollaries. In whatever sense the servant is appointed as a covenant, in a similar sense he must be appointed as a light. To be established or appointed for a light suggests the idea of appointed "to give" light. Thus, what

---

with verses 5-8 because they occur elsewhere in a different context (Isaiah 40-66, p. 98).

[1] See appendix A.

must be understood by the first phrase is that the servant is appointed
"to give" or "to mediate" a covenant.[1] In summary, the servant is
appointed by Yahweh to be a dispenser of a covenant. He is the one
through whom the covenant is realized and, at the same time, guaranteed.[2]
לברית עם

The second question raised in connection with verse 6 concerns
the identity of those represented by the term עם. The response to this
has been divided. There are a number of commentaries which see in this
word a reference to mankind in general. In this case, the singular is
used in a collective sense for all of humanity.[3] Two arguments support

---

[1]Lindsey correctly identifies the device used in these phrases
as a metonomy of effect for cause ("Isaiah's Songs," p. 25). Alexander
provides an explanation: "As light of the nations must mean a source
or dispenser of light to them, so covenant of people, in the very same
sentence, may naturally mean the dispenser or mediator of a covenant
with them. The only reason why the one appears less natural and simple
than the other, is that light is habitually used in various languages
both for the element of light and for its source . . . , whereas no
such twofold usage of the other word exists, although analogies might
easily be traced in the usage of such words as justice for judge,
counsel for counsellor, in both of which cases the functionary takes the
name of that which he dispenses or administers" (Isaiah, p. 136).

[2]Young, Isaiah, 3:119-21. His conclusion is thus: "That the
servant is identified with the covenant of course involves the idea of
his being the one through whom the covenant is mediated, but the
expression implies more. . . . To say that the servant is a covenant
is to say that all the blessings of the covenant are embodied in, have
their root and origin in, and are dispensed by him" (3:120). The ל
may be taken one of several ways, e.g., as a variant of the accusative
of the direct object (as frequently with the verb נתן). Perhaps the
understanding here is as a ל of norm, expressing the mode or manner in
which the servant functions, or possibly as a ל of purpose, expressing
the purpose of the servant's appointment (Williams, Hebrew Syntax,
pp. 48-51). Either would satisfy the demands of the context as inter-
preted here.

[3]James Muilenberg, "The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 40-66: Intro-
duction and Exegesis," in vol. 5 of IB, eds. G. A. Buttrick et al.
(Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956), pp. 468-69; and Westermann,
Isaiah 40-66, p. 100.

73

this conclusion. The first is that, as was noted, the expression לברית
עם is parallel to the phrase לאור גוים. In that in the latter phrase
גוים is clearly a reference to humanity, the conclusion is that עם in
the former expression must likewise be so understood. This identifi-
cation is further supported in that עם is used in the sense of humanity
in the immediately preceding verse, 42:5.[1]

On the other hand, a number understand the term עם in verse 6
to designate the nation Israel. The support for this position is
derived principally from the parallel passage, 49:6-8, where in an
almost identical context it clearly refers to the nation.[2] An objec-
tion could be raised that such an interpretation destroys the paral-
lelism in the two prepositional phrases. While it is true that the
two phrases are parallel, the parallelism appears to be more synthetic
than synonymous. Even assuming for the moment that the parallelism is
synonymous, the parallel elements need not correspond at every point.
In this instance, the correspondence would not extend to the two

---

[1]Whybray, Isaiah 40-66, pp. 74-75. It is recognized by almost
all that the genitive construction in ברית עם cannot be taken attrib-
utively for that would result in an almost impossible interpretation
for the corresponding אור גוים. The sense of the construction may be
either possessive or adverbial of reference (Williams, Hebrew Syntax,
pp. 10-11). See also North, Second Isaiah, p. 112.

[2]In 49:8 the expression עם is further identified as referring
to those who are Yahweh's, עמו (verse 13). On this occasion, the
people in view can be none other than the people of God, Israel. In
addition, these same individuals are associated in 49:8 with both land
(ארץ), defined later as the nation's land (ארץ הרסתיך, verse 19), and
inheritance (נחלות). This combination offers confirmation that the עם
in 49:8 should be understood as a reference to Israel. For a discussion
on both the nation of Israel as God's inheritance and the land as God's
gift to Israel, see TDNT, s.v. "κλῆρος," by Werner Foerster and Johannes
Herrmann, 3:769-79; and TWOT, s.v. "נחל," by Leonard J. Coppes,
2:569-70.

substantives in the absolute state, i.e., עַם and גּוֹיִם.[1] Based on the evidence from the parallel passage, the second position is preferred. לפקח עינים עורות

The third question, the identity of the servant, is approached by considering the nature of the deliverance accomplished by the servant. If the deliverance accomplished by the servant in chapter 52 is from the Babylonian captivity, then the servant is Cyrus. On the other hand, if the deliverance is from some other plight, then it may be anticipated that another servant is in view.

The two infinitive clauses in verse 7 are in apposition to the concluding clause in verse 6, clarifying more specifically the function of the servant in his role as covenant mediator.[2] The issue in verse 7 is not the meaning of the two clauses. At face value, their meaning is fairly obvious. They speak of giving sight to the blind and release to those who are held captive. The question is whether the clauses refer to a release from national captivity, i.e., from the Babylonian exile.

From the evidence provided in the chapter, the conclusion is that the release mentioned is not that initiated by Cyrus. It is true that Cyrus is described in chapters 44 and 45 in terms similar to the statements found in these verses. However, the verses in the immediate

---

[1]Orelli, Isaiah, pp. 236-37. In the parallel passage, 49:6, the servant's raising up the tribes of Jacob is juxtaposed with his being a light to the nations. There the two recipients of the servant's activity, the people of Israel and the Gentiles, are clearly distinguished, lending support to a similar distinction concerning the recipients of the servant's attention in 42:6.

[2]Although there is some question as to the subject of the two infinitives, most agree that it is the aforementioned servant. Against this conclusion apparently is Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, p. 100.

context suggest a metaphorical sense is to be understood for the blind-
ness in verse 6 and for the release as well.[1] Comparing verses 16-18
with 23-25, the impression is given that the blindness involves the
nation's not following the ways of Yahweh, just as their deafness
involves their not obeying His voice. In verse 16, Yahweh speaks of
leading the blind in the way they have not known, והולכתי עורים בדרך
לא ידעו ("and I will bring the blind by the way they know not"). It
is unlikely that the nation's return from the Babylonian exile is being
described here.

If the metaphorical use of the terms is intended and if the
terms are associated with the nation's disobedience and sin as the con-
text suggests,[2] the deliverance cannot be from the Babylonian captivity.
In this case, it points to a deliverance from spiritual blindness and
moral turpitude. As such, it could not be picturing what Cyrus
accomplished for the nation. Consequently, the servant must be identi-
fied with another, future deliverer.[3] Additional support for this

---

[1]Lindsey, "Isaiah's Songs," p. 25.   [2]Cf. verse 24.

[3]See Young, Isaiah, 3:120-21. He sees an intentional contrast
between the Messiah presented in these verses as the servant and Cyrus
presented in 45:1-13 as Yahweh's servant. What Cyrus accomplishes on
the national level concerning release from physical captivity, the
future servant accomplishes with reference to spiritual release (3:121,
note 30).
  Although there is a third possibility for the identification of
the servant, the nation itself, taking עם as a reference to the nation
appears to rule out this possibility. The nation could not be both the
servant mediating a covenant and the recipient of the covenant (F.
Delitzsch, Isaiah, trans. J. Martin, in Commentary on the Old Testament
in Ten Volumes, eds. C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch [reprint ed., Grand
Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975], pp. 179-80).
  Westermann, while agreeing as to the nature of the release, dis-
agrees concerning the identification of the servant. He sees the servant
as the nation, functioning as a covenant mediator and providing

position is provided in the treatment of the parallel passage which follows.[1]

Isaiah 49:8

Nearer context

Chapter 49 consists of two sections: verses 1-13 where the servant speaks, informing the nation of his calling, followed by Yahweh's response, speaking to his servant; and verses 14-26 where Yahweh alone is the speaker, addressing the nation directly. The covenant reference, found in Yahweh's response in the first section, is the focus of attention in the discussion of this passage.

The division of this first section presents a problem. Verse 5 begins with the phrase ועתה אמר יהוה, giving the impression that a transition takes place with Yahweh speaking in what follows. However, Yahweh continues to be spoken of in the third person until the end of verse 6. For this reason, most of the commentaries see the transition at verse 7 where the third person is no longer used of Yahweh, thus beginning the second strophe there.[2] Adopting this demarcation for verses 1-13, the first section consists of the following two strophes: verses 1-6 which represent the second of the "servant songs" and in

---

spiritual deliverance on a world-wide basis (Isaiah 40-66, pp. 100-101).

[1]References to verse 6 in the New Testament have purposely not been treated. The intent in the exegesis has been to identify the meaning of the covenant reference within its own historical context. At the same time, there does not appear to be any conflict with the conclusions drawn here and the use of these verses in the New Testament. On the use of 42:6 in Acts 26:23, see Young, Isaiah, 3:120-21; Freeman, Old Testament Prophets, p. 212.

[2]E.g., McKenzie, Second Isaiah, pp. 103-14.

which the servant addresses the nations and speaks of his calling; and, second, verses 7-13 in which Yahweh responds to the servant's statements.

The second strophe, containing the covenant reference, can be subdivided: First, verse 7 states what the servant can anticipate in light of what Yahweh has done for him. He is to be exalted, the abhorrence of the nation notwithstanding. Second, verses 8-12 reveal what Yahweh is to accomplish through his servant for the nation. The nation is to be restored to its land as an inheritance. Third, verse 13 calls for a response from creation to God's compassion toward his people.[1]

The covenant is expressed in the fourth of four declarations found in verse 8.[2] These declarations parallel those found in 42:6 and describe activities Yahweh undertakes on behalf of his servant.[3] The first three are either preparatory to the fourth or simply correlatives to the fourth.

The covenant declaration, verses 8-9a, includes not only the

---

[1]See also Lindsey, "Isaiah's Songs," p. 130.

[2]Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, pp. 212-13, along with others, considers the covenant promise to be a later addition. This conclusion is without adequate support and necessitates a restructuring of the remaining verses of this section.

[3]The four declarations in 42:6 are expressed by קרא, חזק, נצר (or יצר), and נתן. In 49:8 they are expressed by ענה, עזר, נצר (or יצר), and נתן. In 42:6 the first is a perfect while the remaining three are imperfects; in 49:8 the first two are perfects, the other two imperfects. The reason for the changes in the inflection is not clear. The waws is all cases are pointed as simple connectives and not as consecutives. North takes the perfects as prophetic and the imperfects as consecutives (Second Isaiah, pp. 100, 192). Regardless, as Young notes, all are referring to the future as suggested by the greater context (Isaiah, 3:278).

declarative clause in verse 8, but also the three infinitive clauses
which follow and which point to the provisions of the covenant.
Verses 9b-10 continue the provisions, but change the construction from
dependent infinitive clauses to independent declarative clauses. This
change suggests that the statements in these verses are viewed as
appositional to the infinitive clauses, further identifying what is
involved with this covenant.[1]

Exegesis

Having discussed the contextual considerations, it should be
noted that the issues involved with this reference are to a large
extent identical to those in the previous reference. The principal
concern here is to clarify the identification of the servant.[2]

Although associating the servant with the nation was ruled out
for 42:6, the question must be raised again here because the servant is
called "Israel" in verse 3.[3] Such a statement would seem to settle the
issue for the present context.[4] However, there are considerations which
mitigate against this conclusion. Perhaps the most telling evidence is
found in verse 5. There the servant is speaking, describing the function

---

[1]Young notes in these verses not only the change from the
infinitives in 9a to the finite forms in 9b-10, but also the change
in focus from the servant and what he accomplishes to the nation and
what it receives as provided by the covenant (Isaiah, 3:280).

[2]The expression ואתנך לברית עם is the same as the one already
discussed in 42:6.

[3]עבדי אתה ישראל ("you are my servant, Israel"). There is some
question about the authenticity of this reading. Cf. North, Second
Isaiah, pp. 187-88; and Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, pp. 208-210. The
evidence appears to be in support of its inclusion.

[4]North, Second Isaiah, p. 189.

first in terms of his being designated as Yahweh's servant, לעבד לו,
and then of his being the instrument in restoring the nation to God,
לשובב יעקב אלהו.[1] As the majority of commentators have indicated,
the servant cannot be the one bringing the nation to God as well as
the nation itself.[2]

Since the servant cannot be the nation, two possibilities
remain. Either he is Cyrus or he is a more distant, future deliverer.
Cyrus, although not mentioned after chapter 45, is a possibility in
that the statements about the servant's activity in chapter 49 are
similar to those used to describe Cyrus's role in delivering Israel from
Babylonian captivity (cf. 45:1-13). Furthermore, in chapter 48, the
nation's liberation from Babylon is specifically mentioned.[3]

Yet, as with the covenant in 42:6, the surrounding context in
chapter 49 portrays the deliverance in words which go beyond what Cyrus
was able to accomplish in ending the Babylonian exile. For example, in
49:6, the servant is said to be a light to the Gentiles. As a result,

---

[1] Verse 6 adds confirmation that the two expressions יעקב and
ישראל refer to the offspring and not to the progenitor per se. Cf.
שבטי יעקב ("the tribes of Jacob") and ונצירי ישראל ("the preserved of
Israel").

[2] McKenzie, Second Isaiah, pp. 104-105. Whybray states this:
"The task of the Servant as described in these verses makes his
identification with Israel impossible. Even if, as some commentators
have argued, the subject of the . . . infinitives . . . is Yahweh and
not the Servant--and this would be syntactically clumsy, if not
impossible--it would still be true that the Servant is involved in the
task, and therefore cannot himself be Israel" (Isaiah 40-66, p. 38).
Against this view, see G. W. Wade, The Book of the Prophet Isaiah, with
Introduction and Notes, 2d ed. rev., in Westminster Commentaries, eds.
W. Lock and D. C. Simpson (London: Methuen and Co., 1929), p. 315;
and Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, p. 211.

[3] 48:20, צאו מבבל ברחו מכשדים ("go from Babylon, flee from the
Chaldeans").

he is to bring Yahweh's salvation to the ends of the earth.[1] This could

not be said of Cyrus. In addition, the vocabulary used of the return

infers something broader than the nation's liberation from Babylon. In

verses 12 and 22 the returnees come from several points of the compass

and from more than a single nation or people. Although these expres-

sions may be hyperbolic, if taken at face value, they appear to rule out

linking the servant with Cyrus.

While none of these verses or the arguments based on them are

conclusive, the overall effect of their combined forces weighs heavily

in favor of the following conclusions. The servant is a future deliv-

erer, who functions in a role similar to but beyond that in which

Cyrus functioned. He is the mediator of a covenant which will bring

both a physical and a spiritual deliverance to the nation. He will also

function as a dispenser of light to the nations, delivering them from

spiritual darkness.

Little in these references is substantially different from that

---

[1] להיות ישועתי עד קצה הארץ ("in order that my salvation might
be to the ends of the earth"). Although the salvation in view with
ישועתי may be physical, the context in the parallel passage, 42:14-25,
points to a spiritual dimension. The intent with both covenant refer-
ences is probably not an either/or but a both/and. That is, the
deliverance involves both dimensions, the physical, as well as the
spiritual. Against this conclusion is Whybray, Isaiah 40-66,
p. 138.
    The use of 49:8a in 2 Cor 6:2 supports the sense of the
spiritual connotation and is therefore consistent with the interpre-
tation adopted. The interest at this point has been the meaning of
ישע in the immediate context. See TDNT, s.v. "σώζω," by Werner Foerster
and Georg Fohrer, 7:965-80; NIDNTT, s.v. "Redemption," by W. Mundle, C.
Brown, and J. Schneider, 3:206-209, 217-19; and TWOT, s.v. "ישע," by
John E. Hartley, 1:414-16.
    Paul's application in 2 Cor 6:2 does not demand that Isaiah in
49:8a had in view Paul's day. Just as Isaiah spoke of a day of deliv-
erance, so Paul spoke of a similar day for his readers. Against this
interpretation, see Alexander, Isaiah, p. 229.

already developed in the discussion of the new covenant in Jeremiah and Hosea. The parallels are sufficiently numerous and coincidental to point to a positive association between these references and the new covenant. The only salient addition concerning the covenant reference involves the role of the servant in providing salvation for the nations. The precise relationship between the servant's role as covenant mediator and his role as a redeemer for the nations is not clear, at least in the immediate contexts of these two references.

Isaiah 54:10

Nearer context

The four remaining passages speak of the covenant relationship in a more traditional way and constitute the second category of covenant texts. The first of these, 54:10, is found in one of the "Zion poems," a term designating those oracles in which Yahweh addresses his people with a message of comfort and consolation after a period of chastisement.[1]

Chapter 54 can be divided into two sections. In verses 1-10 Yahweh assures the nation that he is going to establish an intimate relationship with them; in verses 11-17 Yahweh conveys the prosperity and peace which will result from this new relationship.[2] The first section, in which the covenant reference occurs, is divided into three strophes. In the initial strophe, verses 1-3, the nation is promised

---

[1]McKenzie, Second Isaiah, pp. 139-40.

[2]J. Skinner, The Book of the Prophet Isaiah, Chapters XL-LXVI: In the Revised Version with Introduction and Notes, The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, ed. A. F. Kirkpatrick (reprint ed., Cambridge, England: University Press, 1954), p. 151.

that her offspring (citizens) will be numerous and will inhabit the
desolated territory. The second, verses 4-8, gives the reason why
this restoration is to be anticipated. Yahweh will reunite the nation
to himself in an everlasting relationship, ending their brief period of
estrangement. These verses portray the relationship between Yahweh and
the nation through the marriage metaphor, reminiscent of Hosea 2. The
last strophe, verses 9-10, consists of two causal clauses, confirming
what Yahweh has promised in the preceding verses.[1]

The covenant is found in the last strophe in verse 10. There
is little of controversy associated with these verses in that their
intent and meaning are readily apparent. In verse 9 God compares his
promise to the nation concerning the removal of his wrath to his promise
to Noah concerning the removal of water as an instrument of judgment.
The withholding of the one is as certain and as permanent as the with-
holding of the other.[2]

---

[1]Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, p. 274.

[2]Saying that the interpretation is fairly straightforward does
not deny that there are some questions concerning the particulars
involved. There is a question about the construction of the particles
used at the beginning of verse 9. Should the particle כי be written
separately as it is in the MT ("for as the waters of Noah") or should
it be joined to what follows, forming a prepositional phrase ("as in
the days of Noah")? See North, Second Isaiah, p. 247. The MT is
accepted in that it is not necessary to adopt the alternative reading.
In either case, the resultant meaning would not be materially affected.
Young qualifies the promise in verse 9. He does not rule out
God's being wrathful against those in view, but says only that God
promised not to show his wrath to the same extent or in the same way.
However, there is no need to qualify the promise of verse 9 in this
manner. The comparison is not between the means God has used in
showing wrath against Israel and the means by which he showed wrath
against the earth in Noah's day. Instead, the comparison is between His
showing wrath against Israel and his use of water as a judgment against
humanity. Just as he has promised not to use the one, so is he
promising not to exercise the other (Isaiah, 3:367). As North notes,

Verse 10 gives a second confirmation regarding the nature of God's promised mercy. In this case, the promise of God's mercy is likened unto the stability and dependability of God's created order. Although the hills and mountains can be shaken and even removed, God's promise of mercy and his covenant of peace cannot.[1]

Exegesis

The major question raised in connection with verse 10 is the meaning Isaiah intended for the expression וברית שלומי. The parallelism between the two negative clauses in verse 10 provides an initial solution to the significance of this covenant. Taking the first <u>waw</u> conjunctive as adversative and the second as a simple copulative, the two clauses show a synonymous arrangement.[2] Because of the correspondence between the two clauses, it is natural to see the construction וברית שלומי as having a meaning similar to וחסדי. In this instance, a covenant of peace refers to a relationship between Yahweh and Israel in which Yahweh's חסד is experienced through the withholding of his wrath and the showing of his mercy.[3]

"Yahweh lays himself under obligation as solemn as when he declared to Noah that never again would the earth be overwhelmed by flood, that never again will he be severe with his restored and compassionated Zion" (<u>Second Isaiah</u>, p. 247).

[1]The proper translation of the construct relationship here is "my covenant of peace" and not "covenant of my peace" (GKC, p. 440).

[2]

C	B	A
לא ימוש	מאתך	וחסדי

C[1]	B[1]	A[1]
לא תמוט	(מאתך)	וברית שלומי

[3]See Young, <u>Isaiah</u>, 3:368. Young includes in this expression of mercy God's offer of salvation. Wade defines it as the expression of God's favor and friendship (<u>Isaiah</u>, p. 350). For a discussion

Although the covenant of peace as presented here must include these ideas, the following context points to an additional dimension. According to verses 11-17 the covenant of peace also includes God's intervention on behalf of Israel against her enemies. These verses do not demand the total cessation of hostilities by the opposing nations, only that these hostilities be unsuccessful (cf. 54:14-15). Israel's peace in this sense stems from the knowledge that God will insure her continued victory over whatever foes may beset her.[1]

Isaiah 55:3

Nearer context

Isaiah's reference to a future covenant in 55:3 is one of the most difficult to interpret. The difficulties stem from three problems. The first is the association between the covenant promise and the statement about the mercies of David. Is this a reference to the new covenant or is it a restatement of the Davidic? The second concerns the historical context depicted in verses 1-3. Does the prophet through the imperatives in these verses address his own generation or is he

---

of חסד in the Old Testament, see Norman H. Snaith, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament (New York: Schocken Books, 1964), pp. 98-100; Nelson Glueck, "Hesed" in the Bible, trans. Alfred Gottschalk, ed. Elias L. Epstein (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1967), pp. 46-47, 71-102; Kathrine Doob Sakenfeld, The Meaning of "Hesed" in the Hebrew Bible: A New Inquiry, Harvard Semitic Museum, Harvard Semitic Monographs, ed. Frank Moore Cross (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978); TWOT, s.v. "חסד," by R. Laird Harris, 1:305-307. Harris sides with Sakenfeld against Snaith and Gleuck in seeing in the term the concept of kindness, rather than the more restricted sense of covenant faithfulness.

[1]For treatments of שלום, see TDNT, s.v. "εἰρήνη," by Werner Foerster and Gerhard von Rad, 2:402-406; NIDNTT, s.v. "Peace," by H. Beck and C. Brown, 2:777-79; and TWOT, s.v. "שלם," by G. Lloyd Carr, 2:930-32.

speaking specifically to a future, exilic community? The last arises
from the change in the addressees in these verses with the resulting
problem of discerning who is being addressed.

Chapter 55 can be divided into two sections: verses 1-5 in
which Israel is called upon to respond to God's mercy; and verses 6-13
in which the nature of this invitation and the intent of God's mercy
are elaborated.[1]

Verses 1-5, the section in which the covenant is found, can be
divided into two strophes. The first, verses 1-3, is distinguished
both by the use of the imperative and by the use of the second person
plural in identifying the addressees. The second, verses 4-5, is set
off by the repetition of the particle הן and by the change from the
plural to the singular to indicate who is being addressed.[2] The actual
covenant statement comes at the conclusion of the first strophe. Sev-
eral points concerning the precise relationship of the covenant within
the immediate context need to be treated before the issues involving
the larger context can be addressed.

Exegesis

ואכרתה לכם ברית

The first deals with the construction introducing the covenant

---

[1]Cf. Skinner, Isaiah, p. 157; Wade, Isaiah, p. 352; and North,
Second Isaiah, pp. 254, 259. For a somewhat more involved treatment
resulting in a four-fold division, see Walter Brueggemann, "Isaiah 55
and the Deuteronomic Theology," ZAW 80 (1968):191-203.

[2]The division followed here is derived primarily from structural
considerations. For a more formal treatment based on the content of
the verses, see Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, p. 281; and Brueggemann,
"Isaiah 55," p. 193. Both offer a threefold division, but do not agree
where the second division should occur. Westermann makes a break between
5a and 5b, while Bruegemann between 3a and 3b.

promise.[1] The combination of the waw conjunctive prefixed to a cohortative imperfect signifies an action which the speaker intends to accomplish. Following the imperatives as in this passage, the construction can indicate either a simple intention or, more specifically, an intended consequence.[2] In the former case, the relationship of the covenant to the imperatives would be causal. The covenant promise would represent the cause or basis for the invitations expressed by the imperatives.[3] In the latter case, the relationship of the covenant to the imperatives would be ecbatic. In response to their compliance with the imperatives, those addressed are promised a covenant by the speaker.

It is difficult to decide which of the two possibilities Isaiah intended. The evidence in the immediate context appears to be inconclusive. If the gracious nature of the invitations is kept in view, any

---

[1]This is the first time Isaiah has used the standard expression for making a covenant in the six passages under consideration. On the entire expression, see appendix A. Invariably, when a verb form is used in these passages in connection with ברית, it has the imperfect inflection. Here the form is an imperfect with cohortative ה.

[2]GKC, pp. 319-20. See also Young, Isaiah, 3:377. Several apparently treat the waw as pleonastic, but in doing so fail to take into consideration the cohortative use of the imperfect. See McKenzie, Second Isaiah, p. 141.

[3]The invitations in these verses involve more than the offer of material provisions. Included also is the offer of spiritual provision. The spiritual dimension to the provisions is supported by the apparent metaphorical use of מים ("waters") in verse 1, by the promise of satisfaction for those heeding God in verse 3, and by the offer of pardon for those coming to God in verse 7. On the metaphorical use of מים, see TWOT, s.v. "מי," by Walter C. Kaiser, 1:502. He lists, among others, such examples as Ps 42:2 [1]; 63:2 [1]; Isa 58:11; and Jer 2:13.
A further question is raised with verse 1 and the identification of the figure employed there. Some see in this verse an intended play on an invitation to come to wisdom's feast (Prov 9:5). Others prefer to view the figure used as that of the ANE water vendor. See Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, pp. 281-82. Still others associate the invitation here with Christ's statement in Matt 11:28-30; e.g., Young, Isaiah, 3:375.

qualification placed upon the covenant in the form of a condition would seem incongruous.[1] On the other hand, if the focus is on the commands, as suggested by the imperatives, it is not difficult to see a condition upon which the covenant is promulgated.[2] In either case, the identity of the covenant would not be affected.[3]

חסדי דוד הנאמנים

The second issue, somewhat more problematic for the purposes of this study, concerns the identity of the covenant in light of the following appositional phrase, חסדי דוד הנאמנים ("the sure mercies of David").[4] The phrase חסדי דוד occurs only twice in the Hebrew Old Testament, here and in 2 Chronicles 6:42. Although it has been argued for both uses that the nomen rectum is a subjective genitive, the context in both instances appears to favor an objective genitive.[5]

---

[1]Whybray, Isaiah 40-66, p. 190.

[2]Skinner, Isaiah, p. 159. In this instance, the condition would be that of obedience and particularly the obedience of faith. Both the "inclining of the ear," הטו אזנכם, and "hearing," שמעו, are often associated with obedience when predicated of man in his relationship with God. Furthermore, according to verses 1 and 2, the obedience involves receiving that which is graciously provided and freely offered. For a concise treatment of the significance of שמע to mean "obey," see TWOT, s.v. "שמע," by Hermann J. Austel, 2:938; TDNT, s.v. "ἀκούω," by Gerhard Kittel, 1:217-20; and NIDNTT, s.v. "Hear," by W. Mundle, 2:173-75.

[3]See appendix A and the discussion of the question of conditional versus unconditional covenants in the Old Testament.

[4]The relationship appears appositional in that there are no connecting particles between the two substantives ברית and חסדי. Both function as accusatives of object. See Williams, Hebrew Syntax, p. 15; and H. G. M. Williamson, "'The Sure Mercies of David': Subjective or Objective Genitive?" JSS 23 (Spring 1978):31-49.

[5]Williamson, "Sure Mercies," pp. 31-49. He notes that though there is debate over which use is indicated in 2 Chr 6:42, there has been almost unanimous agreement that in Isaiah it should be taken as objective. His arguments are as follows: The versions are mixed as to

Related to the kind of genitive used is the problem of identifying the historical antecedent to "mercies." Assuming the genitive is objective, the חסדי דוד points to the promises God had given to David in the Davidic covenant. There is a close parallel between the terminology employed here and the terminology found in the "Nathan oracles" in 2 Samuel 7:15-16 and Psalm 89:29-30 [28-29], especially 50 [49]. In 2 Samuel 7 and Psalm 89 the promises enumerated involve Yahweh's חסד and the assurances for these promises are based on Yahweh's אמונה.[1]

Having concluded that the construction is an objective genitive and that it refers to the promises God made to David in the Davidic covenant, the question remains regarding the covenant in verse 3. Several suggestions have been offered, two of which predominate. The first is that the covenant in this verse represents the promise of a renewed Davidic monarchy.[2] The second view is that the promises given originally to David and his offspring are now being expanded to include the nation as well.[3] In this latter case, the promises now applied to

---

their understanding of the construction and cannot be a factor in the solution. The noun חסד when governing a genitive, other than Yahweh, can be either, and likewise cannot be a deciding factor. The key is the use of the adjective הנאמנים. This is predicated of God, but never of David. Hence, the חסד must be God's with David as the recipient.

[1]Williamson, "Sure Mercies," pp. 41-43. The niphal of אמן can be used to describe the activity of God or of man. At the same time, its use in connection with the relationship between God and David overwhelmingly supports its predication of God's activity toward David and not vice versa.

[2]Cf. Skinner, Isaiah, p. 159.

[3]See Muilenberg, "Isaiah," p. 645; Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, pp. 283-84.

the nation deal specifically with the preservation of the nation.[1]

It is difficult to decide between the two possibilities since
the evidence in the immediate context is too limited to argue forcefully
for either. In one sense the decision is not critical in that the two
views are not diametrically opposed. The blessings associated with the
Davidic covenant involved not only David and his offspring, but the
nation as well since it was over Israel that a Davidide was to rule.
Thus, the promises to the one were in effect promises to the other.[2]
In either case, the verse does indicate that a relationship exists
between this covenant and the promises given to David in the Davidic
covenant without demanding that the two covenants be identical.

הן עד לאומים נתתיו

The identity of the parties involved in these verses is raised
as the last issue. There is general agreement that Yahweh is speaking
throughout this strophe. Although Yahweh is spoken of in the third
person in verse 5, as opposed to the first person in verses 1-4, there
is the same interchange of first and third persons in verses 6-13. The
speaker there is specifically identified as Yahweh (cf. verse 8, נאם

---

[1]While the particular promise given to David concerning his
throne could be applied here to the nation as a whole, such is not
necessary. The common elements appear to be the promise of preser-
vation and prosperity.

[2]Muilenberg, "Isaiah," p. 645; North, Second Isaiah, pp. 257-58;
and Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, p. 284. The use of the expression from
verse 3 by Paul in his address to the Jews at Antioch of Pisidia in
Acts 13:34 does not argue necessarily in favor of either interpretation.
See, for example, the treatment by Young, Isaiah, 3:378; and F. F.
Bruce, Commentary on the Book of the Acts, NICNT, ed. F. F. Bruce
(Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954), p. 276.

יהוה).[1] Furthermore, there is general agreement that those addressed in verses 1-3 are the people of Israel, depicted in these verses as exiles.[2]

As with verses 1-3, verses 6-7 include a series of exhortations, using among other forms the second person plural imperative. In connection with these imperatives, verse 7 identifies Yahweh with the expression אלהינו ("our God"). The first person, plural pronominal suffix indicates that the addressees are those who have Yahweh as their God and therefore could only be understood as a reference to Israel.[3]

The real crux in the identification of the addressees is in verses 4-5. Specifically, the problem is the identity of the individual addressed in the third person in verse 4 and in the second person in

---

[1]No distinction is made at this point between Yahweh as the speaker and the prophet as his spokesman. In either case, the content ultimately would be expressing the divine perspective. McKenzie (Second Isaiah, pp. 134-44) distinguishes between the words of Yahweh (verses 1-5, 8-13) and those of the prophet (verses 6-7). Ostensibly, the division is made in light of the fact that the invitations to respond to Yahweh address him in the third person. The distinction for the purposes of the present study is somewhat academic.

North notes that the invitations in verses 1-2 could also be viewed as coming from the prophet. He concludes as follows: "But it is impossible to disjoin vv. 1-2 from what follows, in which the speaker is Yahweh. This implies that 1-2 are also words of Yahweh. The whole is an example of the way in which a prophet could not only speak for God but also of God" (Second Isaiah, p. 255).

[2]Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, p. 283. The exilic context is recognized in this chapter principally from verses 12 and 13 where the prospect of release and restoration are specifically presented.

[3]Identifying those addressed in these verses with the nation in exile does not preclude any application of these prophecies to Isaiah's generation. It only places a limit on the direct application of the prophet's words to the specific recipients as indicated by the immediate context. Young recognizes the restriction the context places upon those addressed, but still expands the invitation recorded in these verses to all (Isaiah, 3:374-75).

verse 5. In verse 4 he is described as a witness (עֵד), a leader (נָגִיד), and a commander (וּמְצַוֵּה). In verse 5 the one addressed is said to issue a call (תִּקְרָא) and to receive glory from God (פֵּאֲרָךְ). Three possibilities have been suggested for the identification of this individual: the nation, David, and the future servant.[1]

In support of the first possibility, the nation has been the one addressed in the previous verses. Furthermore, the nation has been designated elsewhere in Isaiah (43:10, 12; 44:8) as a witness and as one in whom God is to be glorified. Lastly, a chiastic arrangement has been suggested by some between the last two lines of verse 3 and verses 4 and 5, further substantiating a connection between their respective addressees. According to this scheme, verse 4 explains what is meant by the "sure mercies" in 3c, while verse 5 expands what is involved in the covenant in 3b.[2]

---

[1] In support of the first possibility, see McKenzie, Second Isaiah, pp. 143-44.
The majority of those supporting the second make a two-fold identification. They identify the individual addressed in verse 4 as David, but see in verse 5 a reference to the future servant. Torrey, Second Isaiah, pp. 426-27. A variation of this approach is suggested by Whybray who prefers to see in verse 5 a reference to the nation (Isaiah 40-66, p. 192). See also Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, p. 285.
In favor of the last, see Young, Isaiah, 3:377-79. Skinner sees additional support in the change of tenses from perfects in verse 4 to imperfects in verse 5. His explanantion is this: "The distinction of tense is accounted for by the fact that v. 4 speaks of what is really past whereas v. 5 refers to a consequence still to be manifested" (Isaiah p. 160).

[2] The chiasm can be displayed accordingly:

A	B
Verse 3b	Verse 3c
B[1]	A[1]
Verse 4	Verse 5

See Williamson, "Sure Mercies," pp. 44-45.

There are difficulties with this interpretation which make its acceptance problematic. The most obvious is the change of pronouns from the plural forms in verses 1-3 when identifying those addressed to the singular forms in verses 4 and 5. Although the singular pronouns could be viewed as collectives, the change is still not explained, assuming the same addressees were intended throughout these verses. In addition, Isaiah elsewhere has not used the terms "leader" or "commander" to describe the nation. Lastly, the term "witness," when used elsewhere by Isaiah in reference to the nation, has been in the plural and not the singular as it in in verse 4.

The second suggestion is that the one addressed is David. In support of this interpretation is the reference to the mercies of David in verse 3, making David the closest antecedent for the singular pronouns in verses 4 and 5. Further, elsewhere in the Old Testament David is identified as a leader and as a commander (1 Sam 13:14, 25:30; 2 Sam 6:21; 1 Chr 11:2, 17:7). Third, the change in tenses from the perfects in verse 4 to the imperfects in verse 5 may be explained as an intentional shift from past to future. The perfects would refer to David, while the imperfects to the future Davidide.[1]

Against this view is the fact that David has never been called a witness either by Isaiah or elsewhere in the Old Testament. Furthermore, the particle הן ("behold"), it has been argued, regularly marks

---

[1]Skinner notes that some see a parallel between Psalm 18:44 [43] (cf. 18:44-51 [43-50]) and verse 4a in reference to David's imperfect dominion over Israel's enemies (cf. 2 Sam 8) and as a result his being a witness to them. What could be described imperfectly of David's rule in verse 4 and in Psalm 18 could be said of an idealized David, represented by the future servant/deliverer in verse 5 (Isaiah, pp. 159-60).

off that which is present or yet future, not what is already past.[1]
The perfects in this case would be taken as prefects of certainty and
the imperfects as true futures.

The third possibility is that the individual in these verses is
the previously mentioned servant. In support of this interpretation is
the identification of the servant as one in whom Yahweh would be glorified
(49:3). Moreover, the servant as a future Davidic deliverer is called a
leader both by Isaiah (9:6) and outside of Isaiah (e.g., Dan 9:25).[2]
Lastly, what could be said of David as a commander of peoples in a
limited sense may be stated of the future deliverer in a much broader
sense.

Arguing against this interpretation is Isaiah's silence
regarding the servant after chapter 53. Also, the servant has here-
tofore not been called a witness.

The solution to this issue suffers from the brevity of the
verses involved and the insufficiency of the evidence. Perhaps the
best suggestion is to view the individual as the servant previously
mentioned. In this case, he is shown as a future Davidide who will
satisfy the demands of both a deliverer and a commander. This conclu-
sion does not require that the covenant be a restatement of the
Davidic. The recipients of the covenant are identified by the pronominal
לכם. The antecedent, it has been shown refers not to David or to one of
his descendents, but to the nation. At the same time, the covenant must

---

[1]Young, Isaiah, 3:377.

[2]There is some question whether or not the cojoining of the
servant with the messianic Davidide is legitimate. See Skinner,
Isaiah, p. 160.

be related to the Davidic since the "mercies of David" (verse 3) are associated with it.[1]

Isaiah 59:21

Nearer context

The third reference to a future covenant in the second category of covenant texts is almost as problematic in its interpretation as the preceding reference. In that it falls within that portion of Isaiah (chapters 55-66) which many associate with a post-exilic context, there is the issue of the historical perspective represented by the prophet. In addition, as with the prior reference, there are some abrupt changes in the person and number of those referred to, making their identification difficult. Lastly, there is a reference to God's spirit (רוחי), the first time that the prophet has mentioned רוח in connection with covenant, which raises questions concerning the meaning of the expression and its relationship to the covenant.

The chapter can be divided into three sections: verses 1-8 in which the prophet is speaking on behalf of Yahweh, calling the nation to repent of its waywardness; verses 9-15a in which the prophet speaks on behalf of the nation and in which the nation acknowledges its guilt and confesses its sins; and verses 15b-21 in which the prophet once again speaks for Yahweh and where Yahweh promises to send a deliverer.[2]

---

[1]Additional support for these conclusions is provided in the discussion on Ezek 34:25 where a similar reference is found.

[2]The majority of commentaries support the divisions as indicated here. See Whybray, Isaiah, pp. 219-21. There is debate over the integrity of some of the verses. Several reject, for example, verse 21 and the covenant promise because of the change from poetry to prose and from indirect to direct discourse. See McKenzie, Second Isaiah, p. 171;

The section in which the covenant is mentioned, verses 15b-21, is composed of two strophes: verses 15b-17 which describe the provision of a deliverer; and verses 18-21 which describe the activity of the deliverer. This second strophe is further divided, with verses 18 and 19 showing the relationship of the deliverer to Yahweh's enemies, and verses 20 and 21 describing the activity of the deliverer in relationship to Zion.[1]

Exegesis

ואני זאת בריתי

The covenant is recorded in verse 21, following Yahweh's promise

---

Wade, Isaiah, p. 374; and Whybray, Isaiah, p. 220. In defense, see H. C. Leupold, Exposition of Isaiah, 2 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1971), 2:304; and Muilenberg, "Isaiah," pp. 686-87.
   The evidence for identifying the historical context in the chapter is limited. Many aver that the seeming political independence which the social sins enumerated in these chapters suggest and the emphasis upon spiritual oppression point to a post-exilic community. The evidence is inconclusive, and it is best to refrain from too exacting an identification of the Sitz im Leben. See Wade, Isaiah, pp. 377-79; Leupold, Isaiah, pp. 302-305; and Muilenberg, "Isaiah," pp. 58-59.

[1]The divisions follow basically those presented by Muilenberg, "Isaiah," pp. 687-89, among others. A question arises over who the enemies are that Yahweh punishes in verses 18 and 19. The impression gained from the immediate context is that this divine retribution is widespread. Verse 18 identifies those receiving punishment with the expression לאיים ("islands") which can refer to a number of lands and their inhabitants (BDB, p. 16; William L. Holladay suggests the extremities of the inhabited world [A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1971), p. 16]. The clause is not found in the LXX. See Alfred Rahlfs, ed., Septuaginta, 2 vols. [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1935], 2:646; and BHS, p. 768. As a consequence, Whybray rejects it as an explanatory gloss [Isaiah, p. 277]).
   In connection with this, verse 19 mentions two points of the compass, ממערב ("from the west") and וממזרח ("from the rising of the sun"), as the extent to which fear and glory of Yahweh's judgment will reach. The two expressions are probably used here as a merism, indicating the entire earth is involved in the scope of Yahweh's actions. See Young, Isaiah, 3:439; and Muilenberg, "Isaiah," p. 695.

as turning from transgression, ‏ולשבי פשע ביעקב‏. ‏ולשבי‏ is the closest

substantive in the plural and seems to be demanded by the context as

the antecedent. As such, the recipients of the covenant in verse 21

are the same as those to whom the promise of a ‏גואל‏ is given in

verse 20, i.e., the descendents of Jacob (‏ביעקב‏).[1]

‏ודברי . . . רוחי‏

A third issue, now that the covenant context and the recipients

have been determined, is to examine the covenant itself. The content

of the covenant, beginning with ‏רוחי‏ ("my Spirit") and continuing to

the end of the verse, stands in apposition to the initial predicate

statement, ‏זאת בריתי‏. It consists of a single promise, viz., that

Yahweh's ‏רוח‏ ("Spirit") and Yahweh's ‏דבר‏ ("words") shall not be removed

from those receiving them. The first person, singular pronominal suffix

on both substantives identifies them as the spirit and words which

belong to and come from God. The relative clause ‏אשר שמתי בפיך‏ ("which

I have put in your mouth"), modifying the second substantive ‏ודברי‏,

places emphasis on the verbalization of Yahweh's words.[2]

‏עליך‏

The real crux with this problem is identifying the individual

---

[1]Alexander, Isaiah, p. 378.

[2]Muilenberg, "Isaiah," p. 696; Whybray, Isaiah 40-66, p. 229.
Alexander notes this: "The particular mention of the mouth cannot be
explained as having reference merely to the reception of the word,
in which case the ear would have been more appropriate. The true
explanation seems to be that Israel is here, as in many other parts
of this great prophecy, regarded not merely as a receiver, but as a
dispenser of the truth" (Isaiah, p. 378).
    For a discussion on the concept of ‏רוח‏ in the Old Testament, see
TDNT, s.v. "πνεῦμα," by H. Kleinknecht et al., 4:359-67; and TWOT, s.v.,
"‏רוח‏," by J. Barton Payne, 2:836-37. For an excellent discussion on the
significance of ‏רוח יהוה‏, see Wood, Holy Spirit, especially pp. 16-29.

who is, along with his offspring (זרעך), the recipient of Yahweh's Spirit and words. Throughout this verse the recipient is represented through the second person, singular pronominal suffix. There are three possibilities. The first is that the individual is Isaiah. In this case, the Spirit and words would be taken together as pertaining to the prophetic office. In support of this interpretation is the fact that the prophet has been speaking throughout the chapter, both for the nation (9-15a) and for Yahweh (1-8; 15b-20). Consequently, he would be the one most likely to be addressed in the direct discourse in which Yahweh is communicating the promise of the covenant to an individual. Furthermore, elsewhere in Isaiah, the prophet is described as having God's Spirit and speaking His words.[1]

The chief difficulty with this view is explaining how Isaiah or the prophetic office could represent a covenant between God and the nation. In addition, if Isaiah were the one spoken of, the reference to his seed in effect promises an unbroken line of prophets. There is little historical evidence to support such a promise.[2]

The second possibility is that the pronoun has as its antecedent the nation Israel. In support of this interpretation is the fact that the nation's role as a spokesman for God and as a recipient of his

---

[1]Whybray, Isaiah 40-66, p. 229. He actually lists two possibilities--the prophet and the nation. The verses he gives associating Isaiah with Yahweh's Spirit and words are 50:4, 51:16, and 61:1-2. Cf. also 42:1 and 48:16.

[2]Skinner adds that the hereditary transmission of the prophetic gift is unheard of in the Old Testament (Isaiah, p. 195). In response, it could be said that the seed (זרעך) in view could be a reference to a spiritual progeny.

Spirit is something that Isaiah has mentioned before.[1] The major

problem with this view is the abrupt change from the plural pronouns

used of the nation to the singular pronouns used in reference to the

one spoken of in the covenant.[2] Furthermore, in the earlier chapters,

particularly 40-55, the prophet has linked God's Spirit and words with

His servant as often as he has with the nation. Consequently, the

reference to these two items here does not necessarily favor the nation

as the one addressed.

The third possibility is that the servant of Yahweh is the ante-

cedent to the pronoun. This identification would explain why the

prophet changed from the plural pronouns when addressing the nation to

the singular. It would also harmonize with those verses in which Isaiah

associates the Spirit and words of Yahweh with His servant. In fact,

the verses most frequently used in support of the second possibility

are those which are more likely to be Isaiah addressing the servant

and not the nation (cf. 42:1, 48:16, 50:4, and 61:1).

There are several problems which arise from this view. It is

not readily apparent what Isaiah meant in speaking of the offspring of

His servant (זרעך, "your offspring"). The expression could have been

---

[1]Whybray, Isaiah 40-66, p. 229; Muilenberg, "Isaiah," p. 696;
and Young, Isaiah, 3:441-42. Among the verses associating the nation
with Yahweh's Spirit and words, they list 32:15-17 and 44:3-5. In
addition to these, Alexander lists 42:1-7; 49:1-9; 51:6; 56:6-8;
and 58:12 (Isaiah, p. 378). Almost all who see a reference here to the
nation include as a cross-reference Joel 3:1-5 [2:28-32]. They see in
Joel's prophecy a similar outpouring of God's Spirit and words upon
Israel in a like eschatological context.

[2]Several note that such an abrupt transition is not altogether
unknown in prophecy (Whybray, Isaiah 40-66, p. 229). Skinner attempts
to explain the change of pronouns on the basis of the change from
indirect to direct discourse (Isaiah, p. 195).

intended metaphorically of those who are spiritually related to the servant, being redeemed by him. In addition, the servant has not been prominent in the immediately preceding chapters (56-58). Lastly, the references such as Joel 3:1-5 readily support the second position but are not as easily harmonized if the third is what Isaiah intended.[1]

The evidence is insufficient to argue conclusively for any of the above suggestions. Either of the last two could be defended in light of the cross-references both in Isaiah's prophecies and in the rest of the Old Testament. The first possibility, that of the prophet Isaiah, is unlikely due to the problem in understanding the reference to the recipients' descendents. There is little support that there has existed from the time of Isaiah an unbroken line of prophets in whom the words and Spirit of Yahweh have been placed. There is even less support that Isaiah has fostered such a lineage. Due to the similarities between the statement here and those occurring in the next covenant reference, further attempts at a solution are postponed until after its treatment.

Isaiah 61:8

Nearer context

The fourth and last reference in the second category of covenant references in Isaiah occurs in 61:8. The question of the historical Sitz im Leben is the same here as with each of the chapters in this section (56-66). The evidence has been interpreted as pointing to a

---

[1]Alexander suggests an alternative; namely, that the patriarch Israel, either as the progenitor or as an ideal representative of his descendents, is really the one spoken to in this verse (Isaiah, p. 378). The subtlety of such an explanation argues against its likelihood.

post-exilic setting, but, as previously mentioned, the evidence is limited and inconclusive.[1]

Chapter 61 follows logically the preceding chapter in that both share a common motif. They depict Yahweh exalting the nation through restoration and blessing. The chapter consists of two sections: verses 1-9 in which the speaker enumerates the blessings promised to the nation by Yahweh; and verses 10-11 in which the speaker responds in the nation's behalf to these promised blessings by praising Yahweh.[2] The first section, in turn, can be divided into two smaller units. In

---

[1]See p. 94, note 2. In the immediate context, the nation is depicted as needing release from captivity (verse 1). The exact nature of this captivity is not indicated. At the same time, there is also a reference to those in Zion (verse 3) which apparently refers to Jews living in Palestine. The nature of the captivity has already been discussed, and it was concluded that both a physical and a spiritual deliverance may be involved.

[2]The only debatable issue in the verses surrounding the covenant is the identity of the individual speaking in the opening section. The issue is only indirectly related here in that the identification does not greatly affect the interpretation of the covenant passage. The possibilities as to the identification of the individual speaking in verses 1-3 are two-fold: the prophet himself or the servant of Yahweh.

The arguments here are basically the same as with 59:21. The majority appear to favor the prophet himself, but to a certain extent the decision is based on whether or not the servant of the "servant songs" could be brought forward so far removed from the previous references.

For a treatment of the problem in favor of the prophet, see Muilenberg, "Isaiah," pp. 708-710; and Whybray, Isaiah 40-66, pp. 239-40. Both note the close similarities to the "servant poems." Whybray's objection ultimately is that the servant is never said to be anointed (ibid., p. 240). For rebuttal of this position, see Delitzsch, Isaiah, pp. 424-26; and Wade, Isaiah, pp. 386-87. Wade notes that kings (1 Sam 16:3), priests (Exod 28:41), and prophets (1 Kgs 19:16) were anointed.

In support of the claim that the servant of Yahweh is speaking, see Torrey, Second Isaiah, pp. 452-53; and Young, Isaiah, 3:458-60.

The use of verses 1-2a by Jesus in Luke 4:18-19 can be and has been explained in support of both positions. Therefore it is deemed inconclusive. See Alexander, Isaiah, pp. 397-98.

verses 1-3 the speaker explains his role in the initial communication of God's blessings. Then, in verses 4-9, the speaker tells what the nation can anticipate as a consequence of God's blessings.[1]

Verses 4-9, the section in which the covenant reference is found, is composed of three strophes. Verses 4-5 speak of the nation in the third person and tell of its restoration. Verses 6-7a describe the nation's resulting prosperity while speaking about the nation in the second person. Verses 7b-9 address the nation once again in the third person and provide both an inference and an explanation regarding the nation's anticipated blessing.[2]

Exegesis

כי אני יהוה אהב משפט

The causal clause in verse 8 contains the covenant reference. It consists of four declarative statements, giving the basis for the anticipated prosperity of the nation described in verses 4-7. The exact relationship among the declarative clauses is not certain.

The first clause, אני יהוה אהב משפט ("I, Yahweh, love justice"), is followed by a second clause, שנא גזל בעולה ("I hate robbery [along] with iniquity"), showing contrast.[3] The contrast provides the key to

_____

[1] These major divisions basically follow those recognized by Skinner, Isaiah, pp. 203-204.

[2] See Muilenberg ("Isaiah," p. 708) for a similar strophic analysis of this section. The כי at the beginning of verse 8 is taken causally, introducing Yahweh's explanation for the preceding promises, especially the nation's anticipated prosperity. See Williams, Hebrew Syntax, p. 72.

[3] Both clauses are participial, with the second balancing the first by providing the antithesis. What Yahweh loves is contrasted with what He hates.
There is a question over the vocalization of בעולה. The MT,

understanding what is meant by Yahweh's מִשְׁפָּט. The participial clause

defines the antithesis to מִשְׁפָּט as "robbery with iniquity." The preceding

verses have pictured Israel as afflicted (עֲנִיִּים, verse 1) and her land

as devastated (שְׁמֵמוֹת, verse 4). From this it is concluded that the

participial clause refers to the rapacious treatment Israel has received

at the hands of her enemies. This being true, Yahweh's מִשְׁפָּט must

incorporate what the chapter promises as a complete reversal of Israel's

previous fortunes. "Justice" here is the display of divine favor in

restoring the nation to the place of blessing.[1]

The remaining two clauses give further clarification as to what

is involved in this display of Yahweh's מִשְׁפָּט.[2] In the first Isaiah

describes Yahweh's justice toward the nation as פְּעֻלָּתָם ("their recom-

pense") and, in the second clause, as בְּרִית עוֹלָם. In the former case,

the justice is presented as a reward or recompense.[3] In the latter

---

followed by the Vulgate, gives a vocalization which makes it refer to
a burnt offering. A few MSS and a number of the versions vocalize it
as meaning "injustice" or "unrighteousness." See Alexander, Isaiah,
pp. 403-404. The majority prefer the latter in that what is disparaged
in the chapter is not Israel's offerings, but her unjust treatment
by her neighbors.

[1]TWOT, s.v. "שׁפט," by Robert D. Culver, 2:948-49.

[2]The two clauses concluding verse 8 are in a rough chiastic
arrangement as indicated by the reversing of the verb-complement order
in the second clause. In addition, the second clause replaces the per-
fect in the first clause with an imperfect. It is not clear what the
change in verb inflection is intended to communicate. Both verbs by
context refer to what is yet future and both involve a divine promise.
    The initial waw may be viewed as a simple conjunction, identify-
ing the two clauses as corollaries to the first part of verse 8 or as a
consecutive, showing that the two clauses are consequences of the
preceding statements. See Williams, Hebrew Syntax, pp. 33-34.

[2]TDNT, s.v. "μισθός," by H. Preisker and E. Würthwein, 4:706-12.
"Recompense" in this case should not be understood as what is earned
because Israel has not earned Yahweh's blessing. Rather, it is to be

case, it is described in terms of its form as an eternal covenant. The
covenant therefore represents the vehicle through which God's justice
is formalized and adjudicated.

Verse 9 rounds out the second strophe by offering support for
the preceding interpretation. In it the nations take notice of Israel's
privileged position and acknowledge that her offspring are the blessed
of Yahweh (כי הם זרע ברך יהוה).

Summary

Having examined Isaiah's six references to a future covenant,
the following conclusions regarding their relationship and contribution
to the new covenant are noted: (1) All six references are associated
with the new covenant. In each instance, there is a covenant promised
to the nation, following a period of national calamity and preceding
a period of unparalleled material and spiritual blessing. As such,
the similarities in context and content strongly suggest that Isaiah
is speaking of the same covenant mentioned by Hosea and developed
subsequently by Jeremiah. (2) The servant of Yahweh is commissioned to
function as the mediator of this covenant. (3) In connection with this,
the servant is presented as a future Davidide who both delivers and rules
the nation. This deliverance goes beyond the concept of physical release,
incorporating the dimensions of freedom from spiritual blindness and
bondage. (4) Lastly, the servant, in conjunction with the covenant,
fulfills a salvific role toward the Gentiles, granting spiritual
discernment and deliverance to the ends of the earth.

---

taken as what Yahweh has promised. It is Israel's reward in light of
its relationship to Yahweh. Cf. verse 7.

CHAPTER IV

THE NEW COVENANT IN EZEKIEL

Introduction

In harmony with the preceding chapters, the procedure here is to identify the references to a future covenant, to determine the relationship of each to the new covenant, and to note what contribution these can make toward an understanding of the new covenant. Before this is undertaken, however, a brief treatment of introductory matters is presented to establish parameters for the subsequent exegetical inquiry.

Provenance

Similar to Isaiah, Ezekiel has been the focus of an extensive number of form-critical studies. As a result of these, the conclusion of several recent writers has been that the book represents a long process of editorial activity, extending well beyond the lifetime of the sixth-century prophet. At the same time, others, having examined the issues, have found no compelling evidence to discredit Ezekiel as the one who wrote and arranged the prophecies, placing them in the form found in the canonical work. The latter is the position embraced in this study.[1]

---

[1]See Harrison, Old Testament, p. 849; Archer, Old Testament Introduction, pp. 369-71; Freeman, Old Testament Prophets, pp. 299-304; John B. Taylor, Ezekiel: An Introduction and Commentary, TOTC, ed. D. J. Wiseman (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1969), pp. 13-20. Moshe Greenberg's comments are pertinent. He concludes this: "The persuasion grows on one as piece after piece falls into the established patterns and ideas that a coherent world of vision is emerging, contemporary with the sixth-century prophet and decisively shaped by him, if not the very words of Ezekiel himself" (Ezekiel, 1-20: A New Translation

Text

In terms of text, only 1 and 2 Samuel have a more dubious repu-
tation than Ezekiel. Based on the number of discrepancies between the MT
and the LXX and the number of difficult readings within the Hebrew text,
it cannot be denied that the MT has suffered in the course of its trans-
mission. Nevertheless, the MT must still be considered the basis for
analysis. The versions reflect a high degree of dependence on the MT,
and the LXX, recognized generally as the best alternative to the MT in
reclaiming the original, is beset by its own problems. For this reason,
the MT is used in the following exegesis. The LXX is accepted as a ser-
viceable but, by no means, an infallible guide for correcting the Hebrew
text.[1] As in the preceding chapters, individual textual questions are

with Introduction and Commentary, AB, ed. W. F. Albright and D. N.
Freedman [Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1983], p. 27).
    Against this, see Herbert G. May, "The Book of Ezekiel: Intro-
duction and Exegesis," in vol. 6 of IB, ed. George Arthur Buttrick et al.
(New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), pp. 45-62; Walther Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1:
A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 1-24, trans.
R. E. Clements, ed. F. M. Cross et al., Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress
Press, 1979), pp. 68-74; idem, Ezekiel 2, pp. xi-xviii; and Childs, Old
Testament, pp. 360-61.
    For a survey of the issues, see Harrison, Old Testament,
pp. 832-54; and Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, pp. 3-74. Among the most recent
and extensive bibliographies are the following: Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1,
pp. xviii-xliv; Idem, Ezekiel 2, pp. xxii-xxxiii; Childs, Old Testament,
pp. 355-57; and Greenberg, Ezekiel 1-20, pp. 28-34.
    At the heart of the question of authorship is the issue of the
historical Sitz im Leben and, specifically, the problem of the geographic
setting described by the author. Most agree that the primary location
reflected in the prophecy is Babylon. However, certain chapters, partic-
ularly 8-11, have been interpreted as requiring a Palestinian provenance.
For a treatment of this aspect, see May, "Ezekiel," pp. 51-53; Harrison,
Old Testament, pp. 832-38; and Greenberg, Ezekiel, 1-20, pp. 12-17.

    [1]G. A. Cooke, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of
Ezekiel, ICC, eds. S. R. Driver et al. (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1936),
pp. xl-xlvii; Taylor, Ezekiel, pp. 47-48; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, pp. 75-77;
and Greenberg, Ezekiel 1-20, pp. 18-27. Cooke explains the poor condition
of the Hebrew text principally on the basis of the "extraordinary nature

treated when necessary in the exegesis of the specific references.

Greater Context

There is essential agreement concerning the major divisions of Ezekiel's prophecy. Chapters 1-24 focus attention on God's pronouncement of judgment against Judah and Jerusalem; chapters 25-32 center around oracles of judgment against the nations; chapters 33-48 record the promise of future deliverance and restoration for the nation. Some abstract chapters 40-48 from this last section, emphasizing the restored community and the rebuilt temple.[1]

The passages which mention a future covenant are 16:60, 34:25, and 37:26. Two other passages, 11:14-21 and 36:22-33, are often included with the preceding texts since they incorporate phrases reflecting covenant

---

of the events described" and the copyists' attempts to understand and explain them (Ezekiel, p. xxvii).

After considering the alternatives, Greenberg concludes that the MT is "the least shaky foundation for the study of the prophecy of Ezekiel" (Ezekiel 1-20, p. 20). Taylor reflects the sentiment of others concerning the use of the LXX when he says this: "It is unwise, however, to correct too readily what may be difficult Hebrew on the basis of a much more intelligible LXX rendering, because we can never be sure that the LXX translator was not improving on his original without adequate grounds for doing so" (Ezekiel, p. 47).

[1]Charles Lee Feinberg, The Prophecy of Ezekiel: The Glory of the Lord (Chicago: Moody Press, 1969), pp. 14-15. By "essential agreement," it is meant that, although the number of divisions can vary, the identification of the leitmotifs in the prophecy is all but universally acknowledged. The divisions and themes here are similar to those found in Freeman, Old Testament, p. 295; and Kaiser, Old Testament Theology, p. 236.

Both May ("Ezekiel," p. 64) and Childs (Old Testament, p. 365) isolate chapters 40-48 from chapters 33-39, treating the former as a separate section. For a discussion on chapters 40-48 from a literary perspective, see Moshe Greenberg, "The Design and Themes of Ezekiel's Program of Restoration," Int 38 (April 1984): 181-208. He concludes that these chapters reflect both the mind and the material of the preceding chapters and therefore must share a common authorship.

terminology.[1] However, because these last two passages do not mention
the term "covenant," they are excluded from receiving individual treat-
ment. At the same time, an attempt has been made to include whatever
pertinent information they offer when treating passages where similar
phrases occur.

<div align="center">Interpretation</div>
<div align="center">Ezekiel 16:60</div>

Nearer context

The first reference to a future covenant, Ezekiel 16:60, falls
within the first division of the book, where the oracles of judgment
against Judah and Jerusalem are given (chapters 1-24). In an effort
to facilitate the recognition of their respective emphases and
characteristics, these oracles have been divided into five sections.
The first section, chapters 1-3, focuses on Ezekiel's vision of God
and his call to prophetic service. The second section, chapters 4-7,
has the first of a series of judgment cycles and warns of the nation's
fall. Chapters 8-11, the third section, contain a series of visions
in which the prophet is transported to Jerusalem to view Yahweh's
forsaking of the city and the temple. The fourth and fifth sections,
chapters 12-19 and 20-24, are composed of two additional judgment cycles,
consisting of various oracles, symbolic acts, and parables, united by
their portrayal of national condemnation.[2]

---

[1] Raitt, Theology of Exile, pp. 204-206; Eichrodt, Ezekiel,
pp. 501-502; Rad, Old Testament Theology, 2:235. For a brief discussion
on the covenant reference in 20:37, see p. 111, n. 2.

[2] Feinberg (Ezekiel, p. 14) suggests the divisions given here.
The characteristics have been taken from Greenberg, Ezekiel 1-20, p. 4.

The nearer context for the first covenant reference, chapter 16, is located in the fourth section which composes the second judgment cycle. In the preceding chapter, the inhabitants of the nation (literally, "Jerusalem") are likened to a friutless vine which is consigned to be burned. The concluding verse of chapter 15 reaffirms this sentence of condemnation against the nation and its land, explaining that it is Yahweh's response to the unfaithfulness of the nation's inhabitants. In chapters 16 and 17, the prophet utilizes a set of historical allegories to illustrate the culpability of the nation.[1]

Two figures are specifically used by the prophet in chapter 16 to document the notorious history of Jerusalem and the nation.[2] The first involves an extended metaphor, verses 3-43, in which Jerusalem is portrayed as an unfaithful spouse.[3] In the development of the metaphor, Jerusalem is shown first as an abandoned newborn, pitied and adopted by God (verses 3-5). Subsequently, this adopted child grows to maturity and is betrothed to God who lavishes her with material wealth (verses 6-14). At this point, the betrothed becomes involved in gross immorality and infanticide (verses 15-34). In response, God labels her a harlot and

---

[1]Andrew W. Blackwood, Jr., Ezekiel: Prophecy of Hope (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1977), p. 103. Zimmerli, quoting from Goppelt (Die Religion, in Geschicte und Gegenwart, I, 239), defines an allegory: "An allegory in the proper sense is a portrayal which in its individual features has a pictorial meaning" (Ezekiel 1, p. 334). See Freeman, Old Testament, pp. 298-99.

[2]The city represents by metonomy the inhabitants not only of the city but also of the land. Feinberg, Ezekiel, p. 85.

[3]Marten H. Woudstra, "The Everlasting Covenant in Ezekiel 16:59-63," Calvin Theological Journal 6 (April 1971):23. Greenberg correctly recognizes the correlation between the marriage metaphor and the covenant in chapter 16 and what Hosea has previously developed (Ezekiel 1-20, pp. 297-99).

pronounces judgment against her (verses 35-43).

The second figure, found in verses 44-58, represents Jerusalem as a sibling whom Ezekiel compares to two other cities, Samaria and Sodom. In the comparison, the wickedness of Jerusalem is of such a heinous nature that the sins of her sisters pale in significance. This second figure concludes on a mixed note of hope and remorse--hope because of Yahweh's promise that all three cities are to be restored, and remorse because of the realization that such equal treatment brings disgrace to previously exalted Jerusalem (verses 53-58).[1]

Verses 59-63 form a conclusion to the chapter, uniting the two sections by drawing upon the figures used in each. In it, Yahweh promises to forgive the nation for her past transgressions and to reestablish a covenant relationship with her. The nation, in response, is overcome with a sense of shame and humiliation as she reflects upon her past sins and her undeserved, exalted position.[2]

Exegesis

These concluding verses, joined through a series of consecutive

---

[1]Greenberg, Ezekiel 1-20, pp. 292-95. The first section, in a highly idealized fashion, records the early history of the nation, using the figure of the unfaithful spouse. The second section documents her recent history, depicting the nation through personifcation as the rebellious sibling.

The identification of the two sisters is debated. Most see a reference to the two historical cities judged by God for their perverseness. Samaria would represent the capitol city of the Northern Kingdom and Sodom, one of the cities destroyed in Genesis 19. See Woudstra, "Everlasting Covenant," pp. 35-36; Greenberg, Ezekiel 1-20, pp. 288-89; and Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, pp. 350-51.

[2]Greenberg, Ezekiel 1-20, p. 294. He (pp. 295-97) enumerates the many elements which are shared by the two major divisions within the chapter, demonstrating its overall unity to those who argue to the contrary (e.g., Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, pp. 333-35).

perfects, can be analyzed according to the following pattern. Verse 59 is introduced by a causal כי and provides in summary the reason for Yahweh's judgment against the nation. Their previous covenant relationship called for specific sanctions against Israel in the event of its breach. In this verse, the oath (אלה), which the nation had despised (בזית), represented Israel's commitment to keep the covenant. This oath invoked a curse upon the nation were she to violate her covenant responsibilities.[1] To disregard this oath was an act of self-imprecation in that it inevitably brought upon the nation the covenant curses.[2]

Verses 60-61 form an antithesis to verse 59. They mark the contrast between the judgment which the nation had experienced and deserved and the promise of a covenant which the nation can anticipate but does not deserve.[3] Verse 60 gives the actual covenant promise, while verse 61 records the nation's response to this expression of Yahweh's

---

[1]Cf. Lev 26:14-39; Deut 29:9-28 [10-29]. See Greenberg, Ezekiel 1-20, p. 291.

[2]Woudstra, "Everlasting Covenant," pp. 26-27. This may be what is intended by the statement in 20:37, "and I shall bring you into the bond of the covenant" (והבאתי אתכם במסרת הברית). The verse consists of two clauses in synonymous parallelism. The first speaks of causing the nation to pass under the rod of Yahweh's chastisement (והעברתי אתכם תחת השבט). The second, because of the parallelism, defines the chastisement as that associated with Israel's former covenant. The "bond" in this case represents the discipline or punishment resulting from a breach of covenant. Such an interpretation fits well into the surrounding context which describes Yahweh's threatening to judge the nation in the same manner as He judged the wilderness generation (cf. verse 36). Both expressions of divine displeasure would be derived from violations of the Mosaic covenant. See TWOT, s.v. "יסר," by Paul R. Gilchrist, 1:386-87. Against this interpretation, Greenberg sees a reference to the eschatological convenant in 20:37 (Ezekiel 1-20, p. 304).

[3]Greenberg notes that this antithesis is the controlling rhetorical device in the chapter (Ezekiel 1-20, p. 295).

unmerited favor.[1]

Verses 62-63 are parallel to verses 60-61. Verse 62 restates
the covenant promise from verse 60. Verse 63, like verse 61, reiterates
what the nation's reaction will be to Yahweh's gracious provision.

והקמותי לך ברית עולם

Perhaps the overriding concern with these verses is the iden-
tification of the covenant promised in verses 60b and 62. There is
general agreement that the references in verses 59 and 60a have in
view the Mosaic covenant. The phrase בימי נעוריך ("in the days of your
youth"), modifying the covenant in 60a and the expression להפר ברית
("breaking the covenant") in 59 are both used elsewhere in connection
with the Mosaic covenant.[2]

The question that remains is whether the ברית עולם of 60b refers
to a reestablishing of the broken Mosaic covenant or to the making of an
altogether new covenant. On the basis of the verb used here (והקמותי),

---

[1]Verse 61 mentions that the two cities previously described as
the nation's sisters (verses 46-52) are to be given to the nation as
"daughters." It is not certain whether the reception of the "sisters"
as "daughters" stems directly from the promised covenant or is simply
a concommitant act. In either case, this reception is probably intended
in the sense of Israel's gaining authority or responsibility over the
cities, including the inhabitants and the territory.
    There is also uncertainty concerning the meaning of the
concluding statement in the verse, "and not because of your covenant"
(ולא מבריתך). It may indicate that this reception of the "sisters"
is not based on any covenant stipulation norbecause of the nation's
faithfulness to the covenant. See Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, p. 353;
Greenberg, Ezekiel 1-20, p. 292; and Woudstra, "Everlasting Covenant,"
pp. 41-42.

[2]The former phrase is found in verses 22 and 43 of this chapter·
and, according to verse 8, describes the stage of national development
during which the Mosaic covenant was enacted (cf. 23:3, 8, 19 and
Hosea 2:17 [15]). The latter is used in Jeremiah 31:32 of the nation's
failure to keep the Mosaic covenant.

some have argued in favor of a reestablishment of the former convenant.[1]
However, as has been shown, the evidence derived from the verb itself
is inconclusive. The verb may be used either of reestablishing a previ-
ous covenant or of establishing a new covenant.[2]

The evidence in the immediate context suggests that a distinction
is intended between the former covenant in verse 60a and the ברית עולם
of verse 60b.[3] Calling the latter an "eternal" covenant and describing
the former as a "broken" covenant (verse 59) posits a contrast between
the two. As pointed out in the discussion of the new covenant in Jere-
miah, an eternal covenant is such because it cannot be broken.[4] In
addition, there are certain telltale signs with this second covenant
which point in the direction of the new covenant. The first is that it
provides for national forgiveness, according to verse 63.[5] Secondly,
as in Jeremiah 31:34 this covenant results in the nation's "knowing"

---

[1]Woudstra ("Everlasting Covenant," pp. 30-31) lists several in
support of this position. See Kaiser, Old Testament Theology, p. 237.
The phrase in verse 60, וזכרתי אני את בריתי אותך ("as for me, I shall
remember my covenant with you"), should be understood in light of such
statements as in 20:5. To remember His covenant was for Yahweh to
remember His commitment to the nation in choosing them to be His people.
Woudstra disagrees, seeing in this expression the thought of reactivating
the covenant. "It [the expression] is tantamount to making the covenant
operative again" ("Everlasting Covenant," p. 29).

[2]Eichrodt, Ezekiel, pp. 216-17; and Greenberg, Ezekiel 1-20,
pp. 291-92. Though acknowledging the two possibilities, Greenberg
prefers the sense of "reestablish" in verse 60. See also appendix A.

[3]A. B. Davidson, The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, with Notes and
Introduction, Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, ed. J. J. S.
Perowne (reprint ed., Cambridge: University Press, 1906), pp. 116-17.

[4]See the discussion on Jeremiah 31:32 regarding the significance
of פרר ("break") and Jeremiah 32:40 on עולם ("eternal"), pp. 23-25; 46-47

[5]Greenberg, Ezekiel, pp. 292, 295.
There is a direct relationship between the covenant in 60b and

Yahweh. The phrase in verse 62, וידעת כי אני יהוה ("and you shall

know that I am Yahweh"), is joined to the preceding covenant statement

by a waw consecutive and points to a consequence of the covenant.[1]

Although not identical to the expression in Jeremiah 31:34, it is suf-

ficiently close to be identified with the Jeremianic reference.[2] While

the evidence is limited, there are enough parallels between the cove-

nant promise in verses 60b and 62 and those discussed from Hosea,

Isaiah, and Jeremiah to associate these verses with Jeremiah's new

covenant.

Because the overall context of chapters 1-24 focuses on God's

judgment against the nation, some have questioned whether a statement of

hope as expressed in 16:60-63 can be considered authentic. However, this

is not the first reference to a promise of deliverance in a context

otherwise dominated by judgment. The authenticity of this and similar

passages in these chapters can only be questioned if an arbitrary demar-

cation is made between a message of judgement and a message of deliverance.

---

the forgiveness mentioned in 63 which can be demonstrated by the
following. The covenant statements in verses 60b and 62 coincide. As
was noted, the two expressions are parallel and employ identical verbal
constructions (והקימותי). Furthermore, verse 63 functions as a telic
clause for verse 62, as indicated by the particle למען (Williams, Hebrew
Syntax, p. 61). Accordingly, the remembrance (תזכרי) and shame (ובשת)
the nation is to experience (verse 63) are the intended outcome of this
covenant activity (verse 62). Lastly, the forgiveness mentioned in
verse 63 is in a temporal construction (בכפרי לך, "when I forgive you")
and indicates when the nation's shame in response to the covenant takes
place. As such, both the forgiveness and the covenant are concommitant,
if not correlative events. They both precede the nation's shame, with
the covenant identified as the cause and the forgiveness identified as
the occasion.

[1]Williams, Hebrew Syntax, p. 33.

[2]Woudstra, "Everlasting Covenant," pp. 45-46.

This conclusion is neither warranted nor supported and can be reached only if it is assumed that such a mixing could not take place.[1]

Ezekiel 34:25

Nearer context

The remaining two covenant references fall within the third and last section of Ezekiel's prophecies and specifically in those chapters which describe the fall and subsequent restoration of Judah and Jerusalem (chapters 33-39).[2] The first of these is in chapter 34 where Yahweh is expressing his anger against two groups within the nation. On the one hand, He castigates the leadership of the nation which He likens to evil shepherds who have neglected their responsibilities of caring for the flock. On the other hand, he excoriates the wealthy in the nation who have acted irresponsibly toward the less fortunate, describing the former as evil sheep and the latter as good sheep.[3]

The chapter has traditionally been divided around these themes: verses 1-16 depict the condemnation of the evil shepherds and their replacement by Yahweh, the good shepherd; verses 17-22 present God as one who is going to judge between the good and evil sheep within the nation, purifying not only the leadership of the nation but the members as well; and verses 23-31 contain the promise of both a Davidic leader

---

[1]Included in these references are 5:13 and 11:14-21. For a treatment of the issue, see Greenberg, Ezekiel 1-20, pp. 303-306. Riatt ("Jeremiah's Deliverance Message," p. 181) notes that most of the leading commentaries are in support of the genuineness of all of these deliverance messages. See also, idem, Theology of Exile, pp. 174-76.

[2]See Davidson, Ezekiel, pp. 238-39; Cooke, Ezekiel, p. 372; May, "Ezekiel," p. 244; and Taylor, Ezekiel, p. 213.

[3]Cooke, Ezekiel, p. 373.

as well as a future covenant and a restored and prosperous land.[1]

The last division can be further divided into two sections.
Verses 23-24 record the promise of the Davidic ruler whom God will
set up over the nation, replacing the corrupt and previously condemned
shepherds. In verses 25-31, the covenant is described, along with the
corresponding restoration and prosperity of the land.[2]

The second section, verses 25-31, is connected by a series of
prophetic perfects in which Yahweh describes the program of restoration
for the nation.[3] The initial perfect in the sequence is the promise of
the covenant. The remaining perfects may represent either the constit-
uent elements of the covenant or actions related to but not necessarily

---

[1]Taylor, Ezekiel, pp. 219-24. Among the issues raised in these
verses which are not taken up in the discussion which follows are
the identification of the evil shepherds and the evil sheep. Concerning
the evil shepherds, some identify them with the corrupt political
leadership, and others, with false prophets and corrupt priests.
In light of parallel passages such as Jeremiah 23:1-8, it is best
to take the evil shepherds as political leaders in that they are
to be replaced with one likened to David. See, for example, C. F. Keil
who expands the identification of those evil shepherds to include all
in position of authority (Ezekiel, Daniel, trans. J. Martin, in Com-
mentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes, ed. C. F. Keil and F.
Delitzsch [reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.,
1973], pp. 80-83).
With regard to the evil sheep, the context suggests that a
distinction is to be drawn between those who are economically
prosperous and the economically deprived. The former have not only
failed to care for the less fortunate, but have also actually
taken advantage of them (verses 20-24). See Taylor, Ezekiel,
pp. 221-22.

[2]Technically speaking, verses 23-24 are included in a paragraph
begun with verse 20 and the inferential לכן. These verses are united
by a series of consecutive perfects, beginning in verse 20 and con-
tinuing through verse 23. Verse 24 breaks the series of consecutive
perfects and serves as a conclusion to the paragraph.

[3]Williams, Hebrew Syntax, p. 30. Williams call the prophetic
perfect a perfect of certitude.

incorporated within the covenant.[1] The various activities mentioned in
these verses are at least closely associated with the covenant, if not
material aspects of it.

Exegesis

וכרתי להם ברית שלום

The covenant expression in verse 25 is the standard construction
discussed in connection with Jeremiah 31:31 and elsewhere and needs no
further consideration. This is also true of its description as a ברית
שלום ("covenant of peace"). It is the same designation used in Hosea
2:20 [18] and Isaiah 54:10. The surrounding verses confirm the
conclusions drawn in the discussion of these previous references.

As with the references in Hosea and Isaiah, the peace spoken of
must be understood in its ultimate sense as peace with God. References
to other nations (verse 25) and to the animal kingdom (verses 25 and 28)
are involved in this peace simply because the beasts and the nations were
the vehicles through which Yahweh judged the nation in connection with
the old covenant.[2] The harmonious relationship with the animal kingdom,

---

[1]See ibid., p. 33. Williams identifies the two possibilities
for the consecutive construction either as temporal or consecutive
(ecbatic).

[2]Although some see in the reference to the animal kingdom a
figure for human antagonists (Davidson, Ezekiel, p. 252), the majority
recognize that both the animal and the human realms are involved, as
the respective verses indicate. See Feinberg, Ezekiel, p. 199. He
notes not only the correspondence with Hosea 2:20 [18], but also with
the references in Lev 26:6, Isa 11:6-9, and especially Ezek 14:15, 21.

On the textual question involving לבטח ("securely") in verse 25,
see Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, p. 210. Whether or not it is original here,
the context makes clear the intent of the passage.

Whatever differences may exist between the covenant of peace
here and that in Hosea 2:20 is a matter of appearance and not of
substance. Against this, see Eichrodt, Ezekiel, p. 480.

the security from enemies, and even the prosperity of the land are all
a result of the nation's covenant relationship with Yahweh.[1] Conse-
quently, the covenant of peace represents a covenant in which the nation
is able to fulfill its covenant obligations. As a result, it reaps the
blessings of the covenant rather than the curses.[2]

Therefore, the covenant in verse 25 cannot be a reference to the
Mosaic covenant. The phrase והשבתי חיה רעה ("and I shall remove the
beast of the field") in verse 25 is connected by a waw consecutive to
the covenant declaration and functions as its corollary. Taken with the
statements in verse 28, this phrase indicates that a contrast is intended
between the covenant of peace and the Mosaic covenant. The beasts of
the field and the nation's enemies were an integral part of the retrib-
utive provisions under the Mosaic covenant. To remove these items would
by metonomy point to a removal of the old covenant itself.

ועבדי דוד נשיא

The most problematic issue with this passage involves the identi-
fication of the one referred to in verse 24 as "my servant David" (ועבדי
דוד). Is the reference to a resurrected David or to a restoration of
the Davidic dynasty through a future Davidide?[3] The question is pertinent
because of the proximity of this phrase to the covenant in verse 25 and

---

[1]Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, p. 220.   [2]Taylor, Ezekiel, pp. 223-34.

[3]Cooke, Ezekiel, pp. 277-78. The expression in verse 23, רעה
אחד ("one shepherd"), is generally understood as a reference to a single
ruler, in contrast to the situation during the divided monarchy where
there were two. Keil, Ezekiel, p. 90; and Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, p. 218.
The question raised is how Yahweh is said to be the shepherd in
verse 15 while David is so described in verse 23. Cooke, Ezekiel,
p. 377. The solution, which appears to be the obvious one, is that it
is through His servant David that Yahweh exercises supervision over the
nation. Cf. 37:22-24.

also because of the close association between the reference to David and the promise of a covenant in Isaiah 55:3.

It is difficult to determine which of the two possibilities is intended here in that the information provided in the immediate context is so limited. Taken at face value, verses 23-24 appear to suggest that the servant is David. However, on the basis of the greater context and particularly 2 Samuel 7:12-17, most interpret these verses as a reference to a future Davidide who will fulfill the promise made to David that one would sit upon his throne.[1]

Assuming this is what Ezekiel intended in verses 23 and 24, the following parallels between the covenant here and the previously treated new covenant passages are noted: (1) Similar to Jeremiah 32:40, Hosea 2:20 [18], Isaiah 49:8 and 61:8, the covenant is connected with the restoration and subsequent prosperity of the nation in its land. (2) As with Hosea 2:20 [18] and Isaiah 54:10, it is called a "covenant of peace." It insures that the nation will dwell securely in the land, free from the threat of man and beast. (3) Like Jeremiah 31:34 and Ezekiel 16:62, the covenant activity results in the nation's "knowing" Yahweh. This is seen specifically by the phrase in verse 27, נידעו כי אני יהוה ("and you shall know that I am Yahweh"). (4) Following Isaiah 55:3, the covenant is associated with the promises given to David

---

[1]Feinberg, Ezekiel, pp. 198, 216. He argues that והקמתי in verse 23 should be translated "establish" rather than "raise up." It is the same verb used in 2 Sam 7:12 in speaking of David's offspring whom God will "set up" on David's throne. Using Jer 23:5 as the basis for interpreting these and the other references to a future David (e.g., Jer 30:5), Feinberg's point is well taken.
See also Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, pp. 218-19; and Eichrodt, Ezekiel, pp. 475-76.

concerning one who would sit upon his throne and rule the nation.
(5) Lastly, as in Jeremiah 31:33 and elsewhere, the covenant formula is used, describing the unique and intimate relationship the covenant establishes between Yahweh and the nation. This is reflected in verse 30 by the phrase אני יהוה אלהיהם אתם והמה עמי ("I, Yahweh, their God, am with them and they are my people"). The parallels as listed are too numerous not to associate the covenant here with the new covenant presented in Hosea, Isaiah, and Jeremiah.[1]

<center>Ezekiel 37:26</center>

Nearer context

The last reference to a future covenant in Ezekiel is located in chapter 37 which, along with chapter 36, describes the restoration and spiritual renewal of the nation in the land of Palestine.[2] The focus of chapter 37 is upon national restoration. The two figures used in the chapter, the vision of the dry bones coming to life and the symbolism of the two sticks being united, both point to the regathering and uniting of the nation in its geographical home.

Verses 11-14 provide the chapter with its own interpretation. According to verse 13 the resuscitation of the bones represents Yahweh's restoring the nation to its homeland. As such, the reference in verse 14 to Yahweh's placing his Spirit on or within the people (ונתתי רוחי בכם) can be understood in one of two ways. It could be a reference to the

---

[1]Weinfeld, "Jeremiah and Spiritual Metamorphosis," pp. 46-48; and Riatt, Theology of Exile, pp. 204-206.

[2]Davidson, Ezekiel, pp. 267-69; May, "Ezekiel," pp. 266-68; and Taylor, Ezekiel, pp. 234-26.

spiritual renewal of the nation as in 11:17-20 and 36:25-27. Or it could be pointing to Yahweh's Spirit as the instrument through which the regathering is accomplished. Either could be argued from the immediate context.[1]

The context of chapters 36 and 37 presupposes a dispersion. However, the details provided in these chapters argue in favor of a dispersion similar to, but not identical with, that which the nation was undergoing at the writing of Ezekiel's prophecy. As with the previous covenant references, the dispersion and regathering are depicted in terms which go beyond that which the nation historically has experienced. Thus, the nation's exilic experiences are to be taken as forming the backdrop for Ezekiel's prophecy of a future dispersion and subsequent regathering.[2]

The chapter is divided at verse 15 with the change in the figures from the vision of the dry bones (verses 1-14) to the symbolism of the two sticks (verses 15-28).[3] The section in which the covenant is found, verses 15-28, consists of two elements. The first is a description of

---

[1]See Eichrodt, _Ezekiel_, pp. 500-501, as well as the entries in note 2, p. 120.

[2]Taylor, _Ezekiel_, pp. 234-42 passim. Support for this interpretation is based principally on the description of the regathering presented in these chapters. The picture of national forgiveness and prosperity portrayed here does not correspond to what the nation experienced following the Babylonian exile. It is possible that the language is intended to be hyperbolic. But even if that were the case, there is little in these chapters which could legitimately be applied to the nation in the period following its release from Babylon.

[3]Feinberg, _Ezekiel_, p. 212; Cooke, _Ezekiel_, pp. 396-98; and Keil, _Ezekiel_, pp. 114, 129. Additional support for this division can be seen by the use of the formula to introduce a divine oracle found in verse 15, ויהי דבר יהוה אלי לאמר ("and the word of Yahweh came to me saying"), suggesting a break from the preceding verse.

the prophet's joining the two sticks, verses 15-17. The second is composed of an extended explanation, interpreting for the nation the significance of the prophet's action, verses 18-28.

The explanation itself is divided into three paragraphs. The first, verses 18-20, gives a second description of the action performed by the prophet. According to verse 19, the two sticks represent the divided kingdoms which are to be reunited.

The second paragraph, verses 21-24, provides the initial reason for what the prophet had done. Verse 22 indicates that the joining of the two sticks symbolized not only the nation united once again, but also the nation restored to its land and under one ruler. Verse 23 indicates that Yahweh's restoring the nation to the land is linked to his cleansing of the nation and constituting the people once again as His.

The last paragraph, verses 24-28, adds a second explanation, expanding on the first and identifying additional promises associated with the prophet's action. Verses 24 and 25 further clarify what is to be anticipated in uniting the nation in the land under one ruler. The land is the same as that of their forefathers and David is to be the ruler. Verses 26-28 give clarification concerning the cleansing of the nation and Yahweh's reclaiming of the people as His possession. Yahweh is to accomplish both in conjunction with his establishing an everlasting covenant with the nation.[1]

---

[1]The entire explanatory section in the second half of the chapter is connected by a series of consecutive perfects, begun in verse 19, following an initial participial construction הנה אני לקח ("Behold, I am about to take"). The participal appears to be a _futur_

Verses 26-28 form a single unit. The consecutive perfects begun in verse 19 and momentarily broken at verse 24 are resumed with the covenant promise in verse 26, carrying through to the end of the chapter. As has been the case with several of the preceding references, it is difficult to distinguish what is actually included in the covenant from what is pictured simply as associated with it. The consecutive constructions could picture either.[1]

---

instans. See GKC, p. 360.

Support for the paragraph divisions as developed above is seen from the following. Verse 21 repeats the introductory formula for a divine oracle found in verse 19, "Thus says the Lord God" (כה אמר אדני יהוה). In addition, the initial participial construction in verse 19 is reproduced in its entirety in verse 21. Furthermore, verse 24 is set off from verse 23 primarily because of the break in the sequence of consecituve perfects at verse 24. See Keil, Ezekiel, pp. 132-33.

The relationship between the last two paragraphs can be illustrated as follows.

The initial explanation

A   21   The nation regathered in the land
     22   The nation united under one ruler

B   23   The nation cleansed; designated as Yahweh's people

The subsequent explanation

A[1]   24   The nation established under one ruler, David
       25   The nation restored to the land

B[1]   26   The nation joined by a covenant to Yahweh
       27   The nation designated as Yahweh's people
       28   The nation sanctified, set apart for Yahweh's habitation

[1]Williams, Hebrew Syntax, p. 33. Because the covenant promise initiates the sequence of consecutives in these verses, it could be argued that the remaining perfects reflect further development of the covenant. However, as noted above, these subsequent perfects may point to activities associated with, but not neccessarily integral to, the initial covenant activity.

Exegesis

וכרתי להם ברית שלום

The covenant expression beginning verse 26 is relatively free
from interpretive difficulties. The covenant promise follows the
standard construction, previously discussed in Jeremiah 31:31. The
designations of this covenant first as a "covenant of peace" (ברית שלום)
and second, through an appositional clause, as an "everlasting covenant"
(ברית עולם) are identical to those previously used by Ezekiel in 34:25
and 16:60, respectively.[1] It is a covenant of peace since, according
to verse 23, Yahweh will cleanse the people from their iniquities and
establish them in their land. The "peace" here, as with 34:35, depicts
the harmonious relationship between the nation and Yahweh. It is an
everlasting covenant because, according to verse 23, the nation is able
to fulfill its obligations toward Yahweh.

ונתתי את מקדשי בתוכם

The only issue of import in verse 26 concerns the interpretation
of the expression מקדשי ("my sanctuary").[2] There is every indication
that מקדשי in this verse refers to the future temple, described

---

[1]The appositional clauses, "it shall be an everlasting covenant
with them," reverses the verb-complement order of the initial clause,
suggesting something of a chiasm.

[2]Following the appositional construction, verse 26 concludes
with three declarative clauses. The first two, ונתתים ("and I will
place them") and והרביתי אותם ("and I will multiply them") offer little
of controversy. There is some question regarding their originality.
Certain of the versions, including the LXX, omit them. See Zimmerli,
Ezekiel 2, pp. 270-71. Despite Zimmerli's conclusions, the evidence for
not treating them as genuine falls short of proof. Supplying the
ellipses for the first, the two declarations reiterate that Yahweh will
establish the nation in the land and will increase their numbers. See
Keil, Ezekiel, p. 136. The third declaration is the subject of the
above discussion.

in chapters 40-48 as the dwelling place of God. Support for this is
gained from the following. First, Ezekiel juxtaposes מקדשי in verse 26
with משכני ("my tabernacle") in verse 27. In that the latter predomi-
nantly refers to Yahweh's dwelling when in the singular, as it is here,
it suggests that the phrase in verse 26 should be similarly understood.[1]
Second, the most frequent use of מקדשי is in connection with the taber-
nacle or the temple of Yahweh.[2] This is particularly true of Ezekiel
where its preponderant use is in chapters 40-48 where it refers to the
future temple.[3] Third, the מקדשי is said to be established in the midst
(בתוכם) of the nation forever (לעולם). While it is possible that מקדשי
refers here to the second temple, that temple's destruction in 70 A.D.
makes its identification in this context suspect.[4] Taken together, these
argue in favor of interpreting מקדשי as a reference to the future temple
as Yahweh's habitation.[5]

---

[1]BDB, p. 1015. The "dwelling place" is associated with both
the tabernacle (Exod 25:9) and the first temple (Ps 26:8).

[2]TWOT, s.v. "קדש," by Thomas E. McComiskey, 2:789.

[3]See, for example, chapter 44:1-16 where it is used eight times:
44:1, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 15, and 16.

[4]Greenberg concurs, based on the several uses of "forever" in
these verses: "The five-fold repetition of 'forever' stresses the
irreversibility of the new dispensation. Unlike God's past experiment
with Israel, the future restoration will have a guarantee of success;
its capstone will be God's sanctifying presence dwelling forever in his
sanctuary amidst his people. The vision of the restored Temple (and
God's return to it) in chapters 40-48 follows as a proleptic corrobo-
ration of these promises" ("Design and Themes," p. 182).

[5]Whether or not the מקדשי is to be understood literally as
Yahweh's dwelling place is greatly debated. Because there appears to
be an intentional analogy between the first temple as Yahweh's habitation
(chapters 8-11) and this future temple as such (chapters 40-48),
Ezekiel's initial readers would have taken the reference in this verse

ודוד עבדי

The only other issue of note in the verses surrounding the cove-
nant promise involves the reference to David in verses 24-25. The issue
raises two questions. The first is over the identity of David; the
second is the relationship between the appointing of David over the nation
and the establishing of the covenant.

The first question faces the same possibilities as in Ezekiel
34:23-24. Although this could be a reference to a resurrected David,
the greater context argues forcibly for a future Davidide who will
occupy the throne of the historical David.[1]

The second question is more difficult to answer. Because of
their collocation in the immediate context, the promises of a future
Davidide ruling the nation and of an everlasting covenant are closely
associated. The conclusion reached in Ezekiel 34:23-24 was that the
covenant functions as a correlative to, and not epexegetically with,
the setting up of David's offspring. Nothing in the verses here miti-
gates against this conclusion. The consecutive perfects begun with the
covenant declaration in verse 26 suggest that the various promises
involved in verses 26-28 are to be viewed as contemporaneous with the
activities of verses 24 and 25. They are related to, but not included
within, the raising up of a Davidic ruler.

---

literally. See Eichrodt, Ezekiel, pp. 514-15.
    For a survey of the various approaches in interpreting chapters
40-48 and the reference to the temple, see Freeman, Old Testament
Prophets, pp. 308-24. Keil, while recognizing the significance of לעולם
and the relationship between the sanctuary here and the sanctuary of
chapters 40-48, nevertheless concludes that it has reference in this
verse to the ministry of the Holy Spirit (Ezekiel, pp. 136-37).

[1]See the discussion under the treatment of 34:25, pp. 118-19

As with the previous two references to a future covenant in Ezekiel, there are a number of similarities here to the new covenant passages in Hosea, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. In addition to the designations of this covenant as a "covenant of peace" and as an "everlasting covenant," the parallels also include the following: (1) The covenant formula is repeated in verses 23 and 27. (2) The nation's cleansing from trangression is mentioned in verses 23 and 28. (3) The nation's restoration to its homeland is referred to in verses 21, 22, 25, and 26. (4) The nation's physical prosperity is promised in verse 26. (5) Lastly, the knowledge of God is involved, according to verses 6, 13, and 14. The combined weight of these similarities argues effectively for including the reference here with the other new covenant passages.

Summary

The three covenant passages in Ezekiel have added little of significance to the features of the new covenant. The only significant characteristic not previously mentioned is that, in connection with the covenant, Yahweh is to establish His sanctuary in the midst of His people (37:26-28).

However, these verses have provided greater resolution on two issues. The first concerns the role that the Davidide is to have in connection with the nation's future restoration and anticipated covenant. Quite clearly, the references to a future David portray him as a prince and ruler over a reunited and restored nation (34:23-24; 37:24-25). The second involves the nation's reoccupation of its land. From the references in Ezekiel, the land can be specifically identified as that which had been given to Jacob and where the nation's fathers had lived (37:25).

This could only be understood as a reference to Palestine.[1]

---

[1]Keil (Ezekiel, p. 134) says this: "The further development of this promise in ver. 25 also shows that it is not in the glorified, eternal Canaan that Israel is to dwell, but in the earthly Canaan in which its fathers dwelt." See also Rad (Old Testament Theology, 2:234) who states the following: "Whenever Ezekiel speaks of the lot of the new Israel, he always assumes an historical, and also a political, existence for God's people within their own ancestral land."

PART II

NEW TESTAMENT REFERENCES

CHAPTER I

THE NEW COVENANT IN THE SYNOPTICS

Introduction

This chapter examines the references in the Synoptics to the new

covenant found in connection with the Last Supper. The introductory

issues are treated briefly before giving a detailed exegesis of the

pertinent verses. The fourth gospel is not included in this discussion

because it does not provide information about the Supper and, therefore,

does not include a reference to the covenant.[1]

Provenance

Despite a growing popularity of form-critical and redactional

---

[1]There is a debate over the contribution that the fourth gospel
makes to an understanding of the Last Supper, focusing on John 6 and
Christ's discourse on the bread of life. Several argue that Christ's
words in John 6 are to be associated with the Last Supper. See A. E. J.
Rawlinson, "Church, Baptism and Eucharist in the New Testament," in The
Ministry and the Sacraments, eds. A. C. Headlam and R. Dunkerley (London:
Student Christian Movement Press, 1937), pp. 304-305; IDB, s.v. "Last
Supper," by M. H. Shepherd, Jr., 3:73, 75; and Raymond E. Brown, The
Gospel According to John (I-XII): Introduction, Translation, and Notes,
AB, eds. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (Garden City, NY: Doubleday
and Company, 1966), pp. 231-304. Brown provides one of the most exten-
sive treatments of the eucharistic motif in John 6. He concludes that
verses 51-58 in particular have their origin in the Last Supper (p. 287).
   Others, however, have interpreted the Lord's remarks in this
chapter apart from any reference to the Supper. See ZPEB, s.v. "Lord's
Supper," by G. F. Hawthorne, 3:986; I. Howard Marshall, Last Supper and
Lord's Supper (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1980),
p. 66; and NIDNTT, s.v. "Lord's Supper," by B. Klappert, 2:535. In
Klappert's article, C. Brown adds an editorial comment to the effect
that the reverse is true: "There is, however, at least a prima facie
for saying the reverse. Jn. 6 is not about the Lord's Supper; rather,
the Lord's Supper is about what is described in Jn. 6" (p. 535).

studies in which the authenticity and/or integrity of the Synoptics
is questioned, there is no incontrovertible evidence to overthrow the
traditional position. Each of the Synoptics in its canonical form
represents the work of a single, first-century author, the name of
which is that historically given to each. Further, the accounts pre-
sented by each, while reflecting the theological perspective of its
respective author, are historically accurate. The external evidence is
overwhelmingly in favor of this position, and the internal evidence can
be shown to be in support of this position as well.[1]

---

[1]Concurring is D. Edmond Hiebert, An Introduction to the New
Testament, 3 vols. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1975-77), 1:43-159.
Against, see Werner Georg Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament,
rev. ed., trans. Howard Clark Kee (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975),
pp. 80-151.
    Donald Guthrie provides a good, well-documented survey of
the pertinent issues through 1970 (New Testament Introduction, 3d ed.,
rev. [Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1970], pp. 21-120).
For more recent treatments on Matthew, see Francis Wright Beare,
The Gospel According to Matthew: Translation, Introduction and Com-
mentary (San Francisco: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1981), pp. 3-49;
and Robert H. Gundry, Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and
Theological Art (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1982),
pp. 599-622.
    On Mark, see Hugh Anderson, The Gospel of Mark, NCBC, eds.
Ronald W. Clements and Matthew Black (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans
Publishing Co., 1976), pp. 2-60.
    On Luke, see E. Earle Ellis, The Gospel of Luke, 2d ed., NCBC,
eds. Ronald W. Clements and Matthew Black (Grand Rapids: Wm. B.
Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974), pp. 40-54; and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, The
Gospel According to Luke (I-IX): Introduction, Translation and Notes,
AB, eds. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (Garden City, NY: Doubleday
and Company, 1981), pp. 3-28.
    An evaluation of form criticism (Formgeschichte) is provided
by Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, pp. 188-219; of redaction
criticism (Redaktionsgeschichte) by D. A. Carson, "Redaction Criticism:
On the Legitimacy and Illegitimacy of a Literary Tool," in Scripture
and Truth, eds. C. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids:
Zondervan Publishing House, 1983), pp. 119-142; Ralph P. Martin, New
Testament Foundation: A Guide for Christian Students, 2 vols.
(Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975), 1:132-38;
and Robert L. Thomas and Stanley N. Gundry, eds., A Harmony of the
Gospels; with Explanations and Essays (Chicago: Moody Press, 1978),

The problem of priority among the Synoptics, along with its corollary literary dependence, is one that need not be treated. Ultimately, the concern is with the statements found in the canonical record and not with the sources utilized in their formulation. To a certain extent the issue of the relationship among the Synoptics is raised in connection with the textual question and is treated at that juncture.[1]

Text

The question of text is limited in this study to an identification of the original text of the Last Supper. Specifically, two problems are discussed. The first is with the reference to the covenant in Matthew and Mark and whether or not the adjective "new" is used.

---

pp. 274-94.

For bibliographies, see the commentaries listed above and David E. Aune, Jesus and the Synoptic Gospels: A Bibliographic Study Guide, TXF-IBR Bibliographic Study Guides, eds. Mark Lav Branson and David E. Aune (Madison, WI: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980), pp. 1-82.

[1]It is frequently stated that there are two parallel reports concerning the Last Supper. One is that given by Mark who is followed by Matthew. The other is that recorded by Paul in I Corinthians 11 who is followed by Luke. A variation of this is to have three accounts: Mark who is followed by Matthew; Paul in I Corinthians; and Luke. See TDNT, s.v. "κλάω," by Johannes Behm, 1:173.

The concern in this study is not with the identification of the sources behind the accounts, but with an examination of the accounts themselves. For a discussion on the relationship among the various accounts, see A. T. Robertson, A Harmony of the Gospels for Students of the Life of Christ; Based on the Broadus Harmony in the Revised Version (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1922), p. 196; William Barclay, The Lord's Supper (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976), p. 19; Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, 3d ed., trans. N. Perrin (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966), pp. 96-105; Leonhard Goppelt, Theology of the New Testament, 2 vols., trans. John E. Alsup, ed. Jürgen Roloff (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1981-1982), 1:213-222; and Marshall, Last Supper, pp. 30-40. Marshall's caution is this: "It must be emphasized that there is no good reason for supposing that any of the three versions must necessarily be closer to the original form of the acocunt than any of the others" (p. 38).

The second is with the two accounts of the Supper found in conjunction with Luke's gospel and determining which is original. Rather than taking up these issues at this point, each is undertaken in connection with the examination of the respective accounts.

Greater Context

The context of the Last Supper is roughly the same in all three of the Synoptics. Jesus referred to a covenant during a meal with his disciples on the same night he was betrayed. The identification of this meal is the overriding contextual issue.

The problem stems from the apparent disagreement between the Synoptics and John over whether or not the Supper was a Passover meal. It is generally held that the Synoptics treat the Last Supper as a Passover meal (Matt 26:17-19; Mark 14:12-25; Luke 22:7-20). On the other hand, John has been interpreted as placing the Last Supper before the feast of the Passover (John 13:1, 2, 21-30) with the crucifixion of Jesus on the same day as the paschal lambs were slain (John 18:28; 19:12-14).[1]

---

[1] The alleged differences are summarized as follows. From the Johannine perspective, the Last Supper was not a Passover: (1) According to John 13:1, the events connected with the Last Supper took place before the feast of the Passover (πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα). (2) From John 18:28 it was revealed that the arrest of Jesus was also before the Passover. When Jesus was taken to the Praetorium after His arrest, John writes that the priests did not enter with Him so that they would not be defiled, but would be able to eat the Passover (ἀλλὰ φάγωσιν τὸ πάσχα). (3) In John 19:14 and 31, it is stated that the trial and crucifixion of Jesus occurred on the day before the Passover (ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα).

From the Synoptics' perspective, the Supper was a Passover meal: (1) Matthew, for example, relates the preparation for the Supper with the Passover. In Matthew 26:17 and 19, the disciples asked Jesus where they should prepare for Him to eat the Passover (σοι φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα). (2) Both Mark 14:12 and Luke 22:7 place the Last Supper on the evening following the slaying of the Passover lambs (ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθυον). (3) Luke 22:15 adds the statement by Jesus at the Supper that it was His desire to eat this Passover with them ('Επιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ

In an attempt to harmonize the apparent differences between the Synoptic and Johannine accounts, three solutions have been offered. (1) Those who hold in favor of the Synoptics, viewing the Supper as a Passover celebration, interpret the Johannine material accordingly.[1] (2) Others, assuming the Johannine perspective is correct, interpret the Synoptics accordingly. Generally, these suggest that the Supper was some other form of Jewish religious observance. The possibilities offered are (a) a chaburah, a meal connected with a religious association or fellowship group; or (b) a qiddush, a formal meal in which a qiddush (literally, a prayer of sanctification or blessing) is pronounced.[2] (3) A third group sees in the two accounts two different calendar calculations. According to this scheme, John follows one calendar which

---

πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν).
    In addition to the above, the Supper itself has been carefully scrutinized and either interpreted as supporting or not supporting a Passover celebration. See Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 42-84. The greatest obstacle against such an interpretation is the absence of any reference to the Passover lamb. In response, it is charged that such an obstacle is based on an argument from silence. The implicit connection between Jesus and the lamb made unnecessary any reference. See Douglas J. Moo, The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983), pp. 312-24.

[1]See Gustaf Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels, trans. P. P. Levertoff (New York: Macmillan Company, 1929), p. 106; Hans Lietzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy, with an Introduction and further inquiry by R. D. Richardson, trans. D. H. G. Reeve (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979), pp. 172-74; and NBD, s.v. "Lord's Supper," by R. P. Martin, p. 749.

[2]See ZPEB, "Lord's Supper," 3:978; and Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, 3d ed. (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1945), pp. 50-52. A variation of this approach is to follow the Johannine perspective, placing the supper in advance of the Passover, but interpreting it as a pre-Passover celebration. See Raymond E. Brown, The Gospel According to John (XIII-XXI): Introduction, Translation, and Notes, AB, eds. W. F. Albright and David Noel Freedman (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1970), p. 556.

places the Supper on the day preceding the Passover, while the Synoptics follow another which has the Supper taking place on the Passover.[1]

Discoveries from Qumran have suggested that two different calendars were in use among Jewish leaders during this period. However, evidence for two different Passover celebrations during the first century is slight. In addition, uncertainties concerning the method employed in calculating the Jewish calendar makes solutions of this nature speculative.[2]

There does not appear to be a consensus on the question. A review of the evidence from the sources mentioned suggests that the solution lies not in the direction of two calendars. There is little evidence that the existence of these led to two paschal observances. Rather, the solution seems to lie in harmonizing the accounts found in the gospels. At this point, the evidence slightly favors the position that the Supper was a Passover meal. The statements in John can be interpreted more easily to agree with this, than can the statements in the Synoptics be interpreted to the contrary.[3] However, the evidence

---

[1] See Patrick W. Skehan, "The Date of the Last Supper," CBQ 20 (April 1958): 197-98; Thomas and Gundry, eds., Harmony, pp. 321-22; and Harold W. Hoehner, Chronological Aspects of the Life of Christ (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1977), pp. 81-90.

[2] Shepherd concludes this: "The many efforts to solve the problem by recourse to astronomical calculations of the coincidence of the full moon of Nisan and the sabbath have all proved to be inconclusive. This is partly because of our ignorance of the precise method used by the Jews at that time in observing and calculating the date of the new moon, and partly because of uncertainties about the exact year, among several possibilities, of the death of Jesus" (IDB, "Last Supper," 3:73).

[3] See Marshall, Last Supper, pp. 57-75; and Norval Geldenhuys, Commentary on the Gospel of Luke: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes, NICNT, ed. F. F. Bruce (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977), pp. 649-70.

is such that caution must be exercised.

There is agreement, however, on seeing the Passover motif as the underlying theme behind the Last Supper.[1] Whether Jesus celebrated the Passover with his disciples the night He was betrayed or simply observed a solemn meal prior to the Passover, the thought of the Passover was clearly on the minds of all. Consequently, the words of Jesus spoken at the Last Supper must be understood in light of the paschal backdrop.

Interpretation

Following the canonical order, Matthew's account is treated first. As with the other two accounts, the immediate verse in which the covenant reference is found is the focal point. The surrounding context is treated only insofar as necessary in order to arrive at a proper interpretation of the passage. The order of consideration in each instance is to treat the textual issue first and then to exegete the pertinent phrases.

---

[1]Moo notes that "scholars of differing viewpoints are in agreement on this point" (Passion Narratives, p. 323). Shepherd concurs, noting this: "The question whether the Last Supper was a Passover meal or not may never be definitely settled in the light of our present sources of information. But at least it can be affirmed that the thoughts of the Passover season were in the mind and heart of Jesus and his disciples at the time" (IDB, "Last Supper," 3:74).
    Martin adds the following: "Whether the date of the Supper will ever be conclusively determined is uncertain; but we may certainly believe that, whatever the exact nature of the meal, there were Passover ideas in the Lord's mind when He sat down with the disciples. The Jewish Passover, based on Ex. xii and interpreted in the Haggadah for Passover and the Mishnaic tractate Pesahim, provides the indispensable key to an understanding of the meal and also the meaning of the Lord's Supper in the early Church" (NBD, "Lord's Supper," p. 749).
    A similar conclusion is drawn by Jeremias: "It should also be emphasized, however, that the Last Supper would still be surrounded by the atmosphere of the Passover even if it should have occurred on the evening before the Feast" (Eucharistic Words, p. 88).
    See also A. J. B. Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament, SBT, eds. T. W. Manson et al. (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1952), pp. 13-23.

Matthew 26:28

Text

The only significant textual question in verse 28 concerns the authenticity of the adjective καινῆς ("new").[1] The external evidence both with and without καινῆς is evenly divided with neither reading able to claim a degree of superiority over the other.[2] The internal evidence likewise is inconclusive, though it is generally easier to argue for the addition of καινῆς by a scribe in an attempt to assimilate Matthew's account with either Luke 22:20 or 1 Corinthians 11:25 than to argue for a scribal omission, whether accidental or intentional.[3] Because of the uncertainty here, it is best not to treat καινῆς as original. The evidence does not conclusively justify its inclusion. Consequently, its authenticity cannot be supported with confidence.

However, having concluded that Matthew may not have used the term does not mean that Jesus did not intend it when referring to this covenant. Jesus could either have used the adjective, and Matthew, for whatever reason, chose not to include it; or Jesus could simply have inferred it. The term is found in the longer reading of Luke 22, as well as in the account given in 1 Corinthians 11. Therefore, there is every

---

[1] For an extensive cataloging of the textual variants within the four accounts of the Last Supper, see Frederick G. Kenyon and S. C. E. Legg, "The Textual Data," in The Ministry and the Sacraments, ed. A. C. Headlam and R. Dunkerley (London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1937), pp. 272-86.

[2] Kenyon and Legg, "Textual Data," pp. 274-75. The evidence both with and without καινῆς is broadly based, both numerically as well as geographically.

[3] Bruce M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament, 3d ed. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1971), p. 64.

reason to assume that the covenant in view is the new covenant. Although Matthew may not have written the adjective, it is concluded that it was intended and that the information recorded involves the new covenant.[1]

Exegesis

Verse 28 contains two clauses. There is an initial declarative clause which gives the reason for the preceding command in verse 27.[2] After this is a participial clause which is in apposition to the predicate of the declarative clause and which functions adjectivally.

There are two issues which need to be treated in the declarative clause. The first concerns the significance of the copulative ἐστιν, and the second, the interpretation of the predicate τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης ("my blood of the covenant").

The demonstrative τοῦτο with which the verse begins has as its antecedent the pronoun αὐτοῦ in the preceding command, Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες ("all drink of it"). The pronoun refers either to the contents of the cup mentioned in verse 27 or by metonomy to the cup itself.[3]

---

[1]See C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures: The Substructure of New Testament Theology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953), p. 45; Leon Morris, The Cross in the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1965), pp. 51-52; Goppelt, Theology, 1:218-19; F. F. Bruce, New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968), p. 54. Moo affirms this: "While the covenant in Matthew/Mark is not specifically identified as 'new,' it is idle to deny that the concept is implicitly present in Jesus' claim that a covenant in his blood is about to be ratified" (Passion Narratives, p. 305).

[2]The past positive γάρ identifies the clause as illative.

[3]Gundry, Matthew, p. 528. Some take ποτήριον ("cup") in verse 27 as the antecedent to the demonstrative, though admitting it is not the cup, but the contents of the cup, that is intended. In favor of this identification is the construction τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ("this cup") in the parallel passage in Luke 22:20. See I. Howard Marshall, Luke:

τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν

The meaning of the copulative ἐστιν is questioned because of the relationship it indicates between the subject τοῦτο (= ποτήριον-γενήματος) and the predicate τὸ αἱμά μου. The copulative has a relatively broad semantic range from the simple "is," suggesting "identity" or "equality," to the more pregnant "represents," suggesting the idea of "symbolizes." The latter is well attested in the New Testament and signifies in all probability what the disciples would have understood by the statement.[1] For this reason, it is the interpretation embraced

Historian and Theologian (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1970), pp. 805-806.

However, the αὐτοῦ in the command, Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, is the closest antecedent for the neuter, singular τοῦτο. According to verse 29 the αὐτοῦ is in reference to the τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ("of the fruit of the vine") with which the cup had been filled. See R. C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Mark's Gospel (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1946), p. 624.

Assuming this is true, the construction ἐξ αὐτοῦ in verse 27 is identical to the ἐκ τούτου of verse 29 and both would refer to the beverage in the cup rather than the cup itself. The pronouns in each instance would be partitive genitives. BAGD, pp. 234, 236. In any case, the cup and its contents are associated by metonomy of adjunct. See E. W. Bullinger, Figures of Speech Used in the Bible; Explained and Illustrated (reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1968), p. 539; TDNT, s.v. "πίνω," by Leonhard Goppelt, 6:155, n. 70. William Hendriksen, New Testament Commentary: Exposition of the Gospel According to Matthew (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973), p. 910; Alfred Plummer, An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew (reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1982), p. 364; and Willoughby C. Allen, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew, ICC, eds. S. R. Driver, A. Plummer, and C. A. Briggs, 3d ed. (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1912), p. 276.

[1]H. A. W. Meyer calls this use of ἐστιν "the copula of symbolic statement" (A Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of Matthew, trans., rev., and ed. by Frederick Crombie and William Stewart [reprint ed., Winona Lake, IN: Alpha Publications, 1979], pp. 463-64). See also Ezra P. Gould, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark, ICC, eds. S. R. Driver, A. Plummer, and C. A. Briggs (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1896), p. 264; William Hendriksen, New Testament Commentary: Exposition of the Gospel According to Mark

here. Admittedly, the question must be answered on other than grammatical-lexical grounds.

τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης

The second issue with the declarative clause is the meaning of τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης. To a certain extent, the answer to this question is dependent upon a treatment of the following participial clause in that τὸ αἷμά is further defined by it. As a result, the conclusions drawn here must receive further confirmation in the discussion of the participial construction below.

The pronoun μου, modifying αἷμά, identifies the blood as Jesus'. Furthermore, the blood specifically has reference to Jesus' death for it is described by the accompanying participle as that which is "shed" or

---

(Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1975), pp. 573-74; Plummer, Matthew, pp. 362-63; and D. A. Carson, "Matthew," in vol. 8 of EBC, ed. Frank E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1984), p. 536.

Two arguments are offered in support of the meaning "represents." The first assumes an Aramaic original, either oral or written, and concludes that in Aramaic no copula would be employed. Hence, there would be "no thought of the material identity" between the element and Christ's person (Anderson, Mark, p. 313). The second argument, based on the prohibition in the Old Testament concerning the drinking of blood, is that no Jew would have drunk from the cup had he understood the statement in other than a symbolic sense. Scott McCormick, Jr., The Lord's Supper: A Biblical Interpretation (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), pp. 26-27; and Norman A. Beck, "The Last Supper as an Efficacious Symbolic Act," JBL 89 (June 1970):196.

At one time, there was a question whether or not the construction of the predicate where there is a substantive modified by a pronominal suffix followed by a genitive could represent a Semitic idiom. However, several have responded by demonstrating that the construction is attested in both Aramaic and Mishnaic Hebrew. See J. A. Emerton, "The Aramaic Underlying τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης in Mk XIV.24," JTS 6 (October 1955): 238-40; W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann, Matthew: Introduction, Translation, and Notes, AB, eds. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1971), p. 322. Jeremias accepts the possibility of such a construction in Semitic idiom, but does not think it would be entirely natural (Eucharistic Words, pp. 193-96).

"poured out," ἐκχυννόμενον. This combination, as used elsewhere in both the Old and New Testaments, is a figure to describe the death of the one whose blood is shed.[1] Qualified as it is by the genitive τῆς διαθήκης, the death described must also be understood in connection with this covenant. Assuming that the covenant in view is the new covenant, the declarative clause marks a necessary relationship between the death of Jesus and the new covenant.[2] The exact nature of this relationship cannot be defined until after an examination of the participial modifier.

τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον

As stated before, the participial construction is in apposition to αἷμά and functions adjectivally as a relative clause. In apposition to the preceding predicate, it further defines αἷμά and clarifies its meaning in the context. The clause consists of the participle and two prepositional phrases.

The participle itself is easily understood. As mentioned in the discussion of the declarative clause, the "pouring out of blood" is an

---

[1]TDNT, s.v. "ἐκχέω," by Johannes Behm, 467-68. Behm states this: "To shed blood is to destroy the bearer of life and therefore life itself. Hence αἷμά signifies 'outpoured blood,' 'violently destroyed life,' 'death,' or 'murder,'" (TDNT, "αἷμα," 1:173-74).
See also R. C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1943), p. 1030; Leon Morris, The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1955), pp. 109-124; Higgins, Lord's Supper, pp. 51-53; and Moo, Passion Narratives, pp. 308-310.

[2]The genitive τῆς διαθήκης could be understood in several ways. For example, it could represent a descriptive, possessive, an adverbial genitive of reference, or even a genitive of advantage. On the possibilities for the genitive, see F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, trans. and rev. Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), pp. 89-100.

expression which signifies a violent death.[1] Furthermore, the second prepositional phrase, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν ("for the forgiveness of sins"), identifies the purpose of this death. The preposition εἰς is commonly used to indicate the goal or aim of an action.

The expression ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν likewise is a familiar combination and points to the removal of judicial consequences of moral infractions against God. Combined with the preposition, the phrase identifies the purpose of the shedding of blood as the forgiveness of sins.[2]

περὶ πολλῶν

The initial prepositional phrase, περὶ πολλῶν ("for many"), presents some difficulties. The preposition περὶ with the genitive can be understood either in the sense of "for the advantage of" or in the sense of "in behalf of."[3] In either case, it marks the ones for whom the death takes place.

A more controversial question concerns the extent intended by the adjective πολλῶν. It is true that the term can suggest some

---

[1]If an Aramaic original is postulated, the present participle represents an equivalent construction in Aramaic that is used for the future. Gundry, Matthew, p. 528. A. H. McNeile calls it a prophetic present, pointing to the approaching passion (The Gospel According to St. Matthew: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices [reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980], p. 383). See also D. Edmond Hiebert, Mark: A Portrait of the Servant (Chicago: Moody Press, 1974), p. 352; and Marshall, Luke, p. 803.

[2]On the use of εἰς, see TDNT, s.v. "εἰς," by A. Oepke, 2:429. For the expression ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, see TDNT, s.v. "ἀφίημι," by R. Bultmann, 1:511; TDNT, s.v. "ἁμαρτάνω," by G. Quell et al., 1:294-95, 304; NIDNTT, s.v. "Sin," by W. Günther, 3:579-80; and NIDNTT, "Forgiveness," 1:700-701.

[3]TDNT, s.v. "περὶ," by E. H. Riesenfeld, 6:54-55.

degree of limitation, as opposed to the concept of πᾶς ("all"). However, at other times, the intent is to show a contrast between a few, or even one, and the many, without restricting the many. The information from the immediate context is too limited to identify what is intended. The question must, therefore, be determined from the greater context. At this point, there is nothing in the verse which demands a limitation be placed on those for whom the blood was shed.[1]

Old Testament Allusions

The last issue involved with verse 28 concerns the Old Testament allusions suggested by its expressions. The identification of these remains tentative because of the nature of an allusion. There are neither specific references cited nor direct quotations involved to assist in discerning what Old Testament antecedents may be indicated. Nevertheless, the concepts mentioned in the verse (a covenant, the shedding of blood, forgiveness of sins) are all inseparably linked to the Old Testament and would have been so understood by the disciples.

Three passages have been specifically identified as providing the conceptual antecedents to Jesus' remarks. The first, Exodus 24:8, is suggested because of the association between διαθήκη and αἷμα.[2] In

---

[1]TDNT, s.v. "πολλοί," by Joachim Jeremias, 6:543-45. See also Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indexes (London: MacMillan and Company, 1957), p. 546; Hiebert, Mark, p. 353; C. E. B. Cranfield, The Gospel According to Saint Mark: An Introduction and Commentary, Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary, ed. C. F. D. Moule (Cambridge: University Press, 1959), p. 427. Against, see Gundry who interprets the expression as a reference to the elect (Matthew, p. 528). See also Carson, "Matthew," p. 433; Hendriksen, Matthew, p. 911; and Barclay, Lord's Supper, pp. 43-45.

[2]The expression in the MT is דם הברית and in the LXX τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης.

addition, there would be the natural correlation in the minds of the

disciples between the Passover celebration and the Mosaic covenant with

which it was related.[1] However, the thought would not be on equating

the two covenants. As stated already, the adjective καινῆς, while not

confirmed here, is found in Luke 22:20 and 1 Corinthians 11:25, and

identifies this covenant as the "new covenant."[2] The point of the

allusion is the function of the blood with regard to the covenant. As

in Exodus 24:8, the shedding of blood (in this instance, the blood of

Jesus) signifies the inauguration of the covenant.[3] In other words,

---

[1] R. H. Gundry, The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel; with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope, NovTSup, eds. W. C. van Unnik et al. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), 28:57-58; Moo, Passion Narratives, pp. 301-303. Carson notes that the Mishnah (Pesahim 10:6), which may preserve traditions from the first century, uses Exod 24:8 to interpret the Passover wine. It views the wine as a metaphor signifying the blood which seals a covenant between God and his people ("Matthew," p. 537). See Dalman, Jesus, p. 167. Taylor acknowledges the point, but adds that Jewish exegesis also connected the blood of circumcision with the sealing of the covenant (Mark, p. 545).

E. W. Nicholson accepts the blood rite in Exod 24:8 as an essential part of the covenant ceremony, but with the primary significance of sanctification. The blood marks those sprinkled as holy, cleansed from all defilement ("The Covenant Ritual in Exodus XXIV 3-8," VT 32 [January 1982]:86). See also Morris, Preaching, pp. 69-72.

Barnabus Lindars objects, preferring to see here an allusion to Zech 9:11 (New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961], p. 132. See also John Bowman, The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah, SPB, eds. J. Bowman et al. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965), pp. 270-71.

[2] Support for the adjective καινῆς and the identification of the covenant with the new covenant is provided in the discussion on the Lucan account.

[3] In support, see TDNT, "αἷμα," 1:174; TDNT, "ἐκχέω," 2:468; Werner Georg Kümmel, The Theology of the New Testament, trans. John E. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972), p. 94; Meyer, Matthew, p. 466; Allen, Matthew, p. 276; Hiebert, Mark, p. 352; Moo, Passion Narratives, pp. 310-12; Carson, "Matthew," p. 537; and Marshall, Luke, p. 806.

based on the parallel with Exodus 24:8, the death of Jesus as a metonomy of cause and effect serves to inaugurate the covenant.

A second allusion to Isaiah 53:11-12 is suggested by the participial modifier. The combination of a life given (ἐκχυννόμενον) which would be for many (περὶ πολλῶν) and would result in forgiveness (ἄφεσιν) has caused several to see a reference to the work of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 52:12-53:12.[1] The parallels are not exact, but the thought in Isaiah of the Servant giving his life for many makes the association attractive.[2]

The last allusion to Jeremiah 31:31-34 is indicated for two reasons. The first is the designation of this covenant as a "new" covenant. As mentioned earlier, even though the use of the modifier καινῆς cannot be proven here, it is found in two of the parallel accounts and is taken to be a valid inference here. Because there is only one passage in the Old Testament which uses the expression "new covenant," Jeremiah 31:34, it is reasonable to conclude that Jesus is referring to that covenant.

---

[1]Moo, Passion Narratives, pp. 130-32; Gundry, Matthew, p. 528.

[2]The following parallels are noted: (1) "my blood of the covenant" calls to mind the references to the servant as a "covenant for the people" (Isa 42:6; 49:8); (2) "poured out" (ἐκχυννόμενον) may well reflect Isa 53:12 and the expression "He poured out himself to death" (הערה למות נפשו); (3) "for many"(περὶ πολλῶν) and "for the forgiveness of sins" (εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν) also recall Isa 53:12 and the statement "He himself bore the sins of many" (והוא חטא רבים נשא). Carson, "Matthew," p. 539. See also R. T. France, "The Servant of the Lord in the Teaching of Jesus," TynBul 19 (1968):37-39; Floyd V. Filson, A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew, Black's New Testament Commentaries, ed. H. Chadwick (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960), p. 274; A. Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1958), p. 231; and Dalman, Jesus, p. 169.

The second reason for relating Jesus' words with Jeremiah 31:34 is the association between the covenant and forgiveness. The one passage which most clearly connects the two is Jeremiah 31:34. Assuming a correlation is intended, Jesus, in effect, is saying that through his death the new covenant is inaugurated and the forgiveness promised in the covenant is provided.[1]

Mark 14:24

<u>Text</u>

Because Mark's account of the Supper closely parallels Matthew's, it is necessary only to identify the differences in Mark's reference to the covenant and to note the significance of each. The textual question, whether to treat the adjective καινῆς as original, is similar to Matthew's. The evidence with Mark is even less supportive of its inclusion than with Matthew.[2] Consequently, it is best to assume that Mark did not include it and proceed accordingly. As with Matthew, this conclusion on the textual question does not answer whether Jesus described the covenant as "new." The conclusion only involves the adjective in Mark's record. In anticipation of the discussion on Luke's account, it has been assumed to this point that the designation of the covenant as "new" is legitimate. For whatever reasons, Mark appears to have omitted the adjective.

---

[1]In support, see the entries from p. 145, nn. 1 and 2.
Carson warns about trying to narrow the Old Testament background to a single reference. Such attempts he labels reductionistic. His approach is to view Exod 24:8 as the primary reference with Isa 53:12 and Jer 31:34 as secondary ("Matthew," p. 537).

[2]For example, D includes καινῆς in Matthew, but does not in Mark. See Kenyon and Legg, "Textual Data," pp. 274, 276.

Exegesis

Mark's account of the covenant differs from Matthew's in two places, both within the participial clause. Mark omits the prepositional phrase εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν found in Matthew and changes the preposition in the other phrase from περὶ to ὑπέρ. The absence of a reference in Mark to the forgiveness of sins poses no problem. Whether Mark omitted what the Lord had spoken or Matthew added an explanatory phrase which Mark did not does not alter the interpretation.[1]

On the change from περὶ in Matthew to ὑπέρ in Mark, the two on a number of occasions are used synonymously in the New Testament, so that any distinction in this context would be artificial.[2] Both are found in the sense of "for the advantage of," and also "in the place of." The former connotes the idea of "benefit" which the covenant blood would secure for its recipients; the latter the idea that Jesus' blood served in a vicarious way for those for whom it was shed.[3] It is quite possible

---

[1]Some have attempted to see the phrase included by Matthew as an interpretive addition which Jesus did not actually say, but which nevertheless was understood by his disciples. Whether Jesus actually spoke the phrase or simply intended it to be understood is difficult to determine. In light of the Old Testament allusions discussed here, Mark's statement about blood being shed for many could, by itself, associate the death of Jesus with forgiveness. See Taylor, Mark, p. 546.

[2]TDNT, "περὶ," 6:54; TDNT, s.v. "ὑπέρ," by H. Riesenfeld, 8:507-513; Carson, "Matthew," p. 538; C. F. D. Moule, An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek, 2d ed. (Cambridge: University Press, 1959), p. 63; Maximilian Zerwick, Biblical Greek, Illustrated by Examples, trans. Joseph Smith (Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1963), p. 31; RG, p. 618; NIDNTT, s.v. "Appendix: Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament," by M. J. Harris, 3:1196-97.

[3]Meyer, Matthew, pp. 466-67; Hiebert, Mark, p. 353; Gould, Mark, p. 265; RG, pp. 630-32.
The question can be asked whether Jesus' death functions as an expiatory sacrifice or a covenant sacrifice. The context seems to

that both may have been intended. The information from the immediate
context prevents a more precise identification.

Luke 22:20

Luke offers a slightly different description of the Last Supper
from Matthew's and Mark's. As noted previously, there appears to be a
close affinity between the account of the Supper in 1 Corinthians 11:23-25
and Luke 22:17-20. Here also, the textual issue is considerably more
involved. There are basically two accounts of the Supper in the manu-
script evidence for Luke: a shorter text and a longer text. As a
result, the concerns here are two-fold. The first is to ascertain which
of the two readings is superior; the second is to note the differences
in Luke's account and to comment on their significance.

Text

There are actually several possibilities involved in Luke's
record of the Last Supper, but only two have sufficient manuscript evi-
dence to be considered as viable: a shorter reading which omits verses
19b-20; and a longer reading which includes verses 19b-20.[1] The internal
evidence appears fairly evenly divided between the two readings.

---

argue for both in that His death results in both a covenant and in
forgiveness. Hans Conzelmann's conclusion is that the question cannot
be answered conclusively based on the evidence from the immediate
context (An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament [New York:
Harper and Row, Publishers, 1969], pp. 56-58).

[1]Kenyon and Legg, "Textual Data," pp. 277-78; Jeremias, Eucha-
ristic Words, pp. 139-44. Metzger notes that there are six possibilities,
but four are so slightly supported that in effect only two are real
possibilities: "It is obvious that the chief problem is concerned with
the merits of the two principal forms of the text, since each of the
others can be accounted for more or less satisfactorily as modifications
of either the shorter or longer reading" (Textual Commentary, pp. 173-74).

It has been argued that the shorter text, because it is both shorter and more difficult, ought to be preferred.[1] Two of the canons of textual criticism are that the shorter reading and the more difficult reading generally are to be regarded as more probable in reproducing the original. In this instance, the shorter text is the more difficult because of its abruptness. It concludes with a reference to the bread as representing the body of Jesus without explaining the significance of that statement. In addition, it has also been argued that the longer text would more likely represent a scribal addition than the shorter would a scribal omission. The longer reading, in this case, would derive from a scribe adding to a shorter original to harmonize it with 1 Corinthians 11:23-25.[2]

Others, however, reason that the shorter reading could represent

---

[1] On the textual critical canons, see Metzger, Textual Commentary, pp. xxvi-xxxvii, 175; and idem, The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration, 2d ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp. 209-210. For a critique of these two canons, see Wilbur N. Pickering, The Identity of the New Testament Text, rev. ed. (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1980), pp. 79-85.
The following support the shorter reading: Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke, 5th ed., ICC, eds. A. Plummer, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1920), pp. 496-97; John Martin Creed, The Gospel According to St. Luke: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices (London: MacMillan and Company, 1930), pp. 263-65; A. R. C. Leaney, A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke, 2d ed., Black's New Testament Commentaries (reprint ed., London: Adam and Charles Black, 1971), pp. 72-75; Geldenhuys, Luke, pp. 558-59; Henry Chadwick, "The Shorter Text of Luke XXII.15-20," HTR (October 1957):257-58; Arthur Vööbus, "A New Approach to the Problem of the Shorter and Longer Text in Luke," NTS 15 (1969):462; and Martin Rese, "Zur Problematik von Kurz-und Langtext in Luk XXII.17ff," NTS 22 (1976):15-27.

[2] See note 1. Some add a third reason for the shorter reading, namely, that the longer reading contains linguistic and theological features that are non-Lucan. See Chadwick, "Shorter Text," p. 252; Rese, "Problematik," pp. 27-30. For a rebuttal, see Moo, Passion Narratives, pp. 128-30.

an intentional modification of a longer original. Such a modification would remove the reference to a second cup found in the longer reading. In that the other two Synoptics mention only one cup, the inclusion of a second in the longer text would have been viewed skeptically by a scribe endeavoring to harmonize the various accounts. The assumption is that the scribe would simply have excised the material thought to have been added.[1] Furthermore, the longer reading has a sufficient number of differences compared to the other Synoptics to rule out the possibility that it is an interpolation. The point would be that it is difficult to account for the difference in the longer version if it simply represents a compilation of material from the other accounts.[2]

In contrast to the internal evidence, the external evidence is not faced with the same ambiguity. The external evidence appears to favor decisively the longer reading.[3] It would be difficult, on the

---

[1] Ellis, Luke, p. 256; Kenyon and Legg, "Textual Data," pp. 285-87; Moo, Passion Narratives, pp. 129-30. The following support the longer reading in Luke: McNeile, Matthew, pp. 385-86; Marshall, Luke, pp. 799-807; Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 138-59; Klyne Snodgrass, "'Western Non-Interpolations,'" JBL 91 (September 1972):372.
Some have suggested an additional argument: A scribe purposely omitted verses 19b-20 to protect the eucharistic formula from abuse by non-Christian readers. Metzger describes this as disciplina arcana (Textual Commentary, p. 176). Interestingly enough, Leaney uses a similar argument in support of the shorter reading. He attributes the same desire to Luke who, in writing to Gentiles, omitted from his sources the same formula to avoid a misunderstanding of the material by his readers (Luke, p. 73). For a rebuttal of this approach, see Chadwick, "Shorter Text," pp. 233-35.

[2] I. Howard Marshall, The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text, NIGTC, eds. I. Howard Marshall and W. W. Gasque (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978), p. 800.

[3] Jeremias and others have noted that only the Western text, and then only a portion of it, favors the shorter reading. "To hold the short text as original would be to accept the most extreme improbability,

one hand, to explain how an original shorter text could be so sparsely supported. On the other hand, it would also be difficult to explain how a longer secondary text could become so widely distributed.[1] Therefore, on the basis of the external evidence, the longer reading is reckoned superior and the one which represents the original.[2]

Once the longer reading is accepted, the question of whether Jesus thought of the covenant as "new" is removed. There are virtually no textual variants regarding the adjective καινῆς in verse 20. Thus, the conclusion is that Jesus intended his words to be understood as a reference to a new covenant. Further, the evidence in the immediate context points undeniably to Jeremiah's new covenant as the intended antecedent. Additionally, Jeremiah 31:31 is the only occasion in the Old Testament where a covenant is designated as "new." The articular construction ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη stresses the identity of this covenant. The article may be viewed either as individualizing or possibly as anaphoric.[3] In either case, it would indicate that the covenant described was one that was well known or readily identifiable. Taken together, these argue forcibly for associating the covenant mentioned by Jesus with the new covenant in Jeremiah 31:31-34.

---

for it would be to assume that an identical addition to the text of Luke . . . had been introduced into every text of manuscripts with the exception of D a d ff2 i l syr cur sin!" (Eucharistic Words, p. 144).

[1]Shepherd, "Last Supper," p. 74; and Moo, Passion Narratives, p. 129.

[2]Moo adds a caution: "The originality of the longer text will . . . be presumed . . . with the implied qualification that the text is not absolutely free from question" (Passion Narratives, p. 130).

[3]RG, pp. 755-62; and Zerwick, Biblical Greek, p. 53.

Exegesis

Having chosen the longer text as the basis for the exegesis, the elements in Luke's account that are significantly different from those in Matthew's and Mark's must be interpreted. The major differences associated with the covenant involve the two prepositional phrases in verse 20. The first is ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου ("in my blood") which modifies the predicate ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ("the new covenant"), and the second is ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ("for you") which modifies the participial adjunct τὸ . . . ἐκχυννόμενον ("which is shed").

Although important in themselves, questions pertaining to the cup-bread-cup order and the relationship between the cups mentioned in verses 17 and 20 do not receive individual attention because they do not affect the interpretation of the covenant.[1] In addition, Luke specifically identifies the antecedent to the demonstrative τοῦτο ("this") in the construction "this . . . is the new covenant " as τὸ ποτήριον ("cup"), rather than "the fruit of the vine" as with Matthew and Mark. However, as with the other two accounts, the cup is identified with its content by metonymy of adjunct.[2] In all three Synoptics,

---

[1] It is generally held by those who view the Supper as a Passover that the cup in verse 17 represents the first of four cups used in the Passover ritual. The cup in verse 20, identical to the cup mentioned in Matthew and Mark, is the third cup which is referred to as the "cup of blessing." See TDNT, "πίνω," 6:153-54; Marshall, Luke, p. 805.

Filson, however, prefers to identify the cup in verse 20 as the fourth, rather than the third (Matthew, p. 274). The temporal infinitive clause in verse 20, μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι ("after the supper"), identifies this cup as one that is used after the actual meal. Either the third or fourth cup would qualify. See Bowman, Mark, p. 265. For a detailed description of the Passover ritual during the Tannaitic period, see Gordon J. Bahr, "The Seder of Passover and the Eucharisitc Words," NovT 12 (1970):180-82; and TDNT, "κλάω," 3:732-34.

[2] See p. 138, note 3.

it is ultimately the beverage in the cup that is the point of corre-
spondence.

Lastly, the temporal infinitive clause μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι ("after
the supper"), found only in Luke and 1 Corinthians 11:25, is not a
point of controversy. It clarifies more specifically the time of Jesus'
remarks, placing them after the eating of the meal itself.[1]
ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου

Luke's declarative statement τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη
ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου ("this cup [is] the new covenant in my blood") in
verse 20 closely follows the statement in 1 Corinthians 11:25. Both
have the cup and the covenant as subject and predicate, although Luke
does not have the copula ἐστίν which is included in the Corinthian
passage. The major difference between Luke and the other two Synoptics
is in the construction of the predicate. Luke reverses the order found
in Matthew and Mark of the predicate and one of its modifiers. In
Matthew and Mark, the predicate is τὸ αἷμα, modified by the genitive
διαθήκης. In Luke the predicate is ἡ διαθήκη , modified by the prepo-
sitional phrase ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου. Nevertheless, there is no reason to
suppose that the intent of Luke's statement is any different from that
of Matthew's and Mark's. The terms αἷμα and διαθήκη are joined in each
instance in a metonymy of cause and effect. The shedding of Jesus' blood
forms the foundation upon which a covenant is enacted. Whether Luke
describes the transaction as a "covenant in blood" or Matthew and Mark

---

[1]Matthew and Mark have the participial construction ἐσθιόντων
δὲ αὐτῶν ("while they were eating") which locates Jesus' statements
in connection with the meal. The genitive absolute functions temporally
in this instance. See BDF, p. 215.

as "the blood of the covenant" is of little importance. All three
Synoptics associate the shedding of the blood with the setting up of
the covenant.[1]

A final question raised in connection with the above is which of
the two accounts, Luke or Matthew-Mark, give the actual words of Christ.
The answer is that neither needs to. All that is required is that they
both accurately represent the intent of the Lord's statement concerning
the cup and the covenant at the time He spoke them. In other words, as
long as both accounts express accurately the ipsissima vox, then neither
needs to represent the ipsissima verba. The only caution is that the
accounts provided by the Synoptic authors cannot differ in their intent
from that of the original speaker or they cease to be the ipsissima vox
of the speaker. Since all three accounts can be interpreted as
expressing the same intent, there is no reason to assume that the
records they give are inaccurate.[2]

ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν

The other difference of note in verse 20 involves the second
prepositional phrase, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, in the participial construction τὸ . . . .

---

[1] In Luke's account, the prepositional phrase ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου
functions in an instrumental capacity, signifying the means or basis
whereby the covenant is initiated.
TDNT, s.v. "ἐν," by A. Oepke. Oepke translates the preposition
in the sense of "ground" or "basis." Marshall prefers to treat the
preposition as causative (Luke, p. 807). Barclay translates it with
"for the price of " (Lord's Supper, p. 46). On the instrumental use
of ἐν, see in addition to Oepke, RG, pp. 589-90; BDF, pp. 117-18;
J. H. Moulton, W. F. Howard, and N. Turner, A Grammar of New Testa-
ment Greek, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1908-1976), 3:252-53;
and NIDNTT, "Appendix: Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New
Testament," 3:1191-92.

[2] See, for example, Marshall, Luke, p. 801; and Jeremias,
Eucharistic Words, p. 203.

ἐχχυννόμενον, identifying those for whom the blood of Jesus was shed. The preposition ὑπέρ is the same used in Mark's account and needs no further discussion. The difference comes in the designation of the recipients of Jesus' statement. Matthew and Mark describe the recipients through the adjective πολλῶν as "the many." Luke, through the use of the second person plural pronoun ὑμῶν, identifies the recipients as the disciples who were with Jesus at the Supper.

The most obvious solution to the difference is that Luke's represents a more specific subset of Matthew and Mark's πολλῶν. The "many" for whom Jesus' blood was shed included those disciples ("you") who were gathered with Him at the Supper.[1] The two statements are in conflict only if it is presupposed that the accounts cannot be harmonized. Since they are able to be harmonized, it can therefore be assumed that no real conflict exists.

Summary

The following are the salient features brought out by the Synoptics regarding the new covenant: (1) Jesus associates the shedding of his blood with the new covenant. In light of the Old Testament covenant background, the death of Jesus must be understood specifically as that in connection with which the new covenant is ratified. (2) Jesus' death in conjunction with the covenant provides for the forgiveness of sins

---

[1] See Joseph Bonsirven who defines ὑμῶν as referring to the disciples, but the disciples as representatives of mankind (Theology of the New Testament [Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1963], p. 83).

The question of the ipsissima verba of Jesus must be answered in the same manner as with the declarative clause. All that needs to be shown is that both accurately reflect the ipsissima vox. Whether either represents the ipsissima verba is not essential and with the present level of information would be difficult to determine.

for many. The extent of those for whom forgiveness is provided cannot

be determined from the immediate context. All that can be said is

that those participating in the new covenant share also in this aspect

of it.[1]

---

[1]Eduard Schweizer, The Lord's Supper According to the New
Testament, trans. J. M. Davis, FBBS, ed. J. Reumann (Philadelphia:
Fortress Press, 1967), pp. 1-3. Mendenhall documents a similar
understanding of the Supper in extra-biblical literature in the
years following the New Testament (IDB, s.v. "Covenant," 1:722).

CHAPTER II

THE NEW COVENANT IN THE PAULINE EPISTLES

Introduction

In the epistles traditionally attributed to the apostle Paul,

there are three references to a new or future covenant: Romans 11:27,

1 Corinthians 11:25, and 2 Corinthians 3:6.[1] This chapter examines

---

[1]These are not the only passages in which the substantive διαθήκη
is employed. Altogether in the thirteen Pauline epistles, it is found
nine times, six times in the singular (Rom 11:27; 1 Cor 11:25; 2 Cor 3:6,
14; Gal 3:15, 17) and three times in the plural (Rom 9:4, assuming the
plural is to be read; Gal 4:24; Eph 2:12). The reference in Rom 9:4 has
in view those covenants which were associated with Israel (Ἰσραηλῖται)
and which were recorded in the Old Testament. As such, the new covenant
certainly could be included. Nevertheless, it does not warrant indi-
vidual attention because the passage does not develop further the nature
of the covenants in view. See C. E. B. Cranfield, A Critical and Exe-
getical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, 2 vols., ICC, ed. J. A.
Emerton and C. E. B. Cranfield (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1975, 1979),
2:462; Metzger, Textual Commentary, p. 519. The same can be said of
the reference in Eph 2:12.

The only additional reference which needs to be mentioned is
Gal 4:24. There is in this passage a covenant which is contrasted
with the Sinaitic covenant. However, it is not certain that this
covenant is the new covenant. In the preceding context (3:15-16) and
in the immediate verses, there is evidence to suggest that the two
covenants in view are the Abrahamic and the Sinaitic, and not the Sina-
itic and the new. For this reason, the Galatians' reference does not
receive individual attention in this study. See p. 200, n. 2.

For an approach to Gal 4:24 as a new covenant reference, see
Ernest De Witt Burton, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the
Epistle to the Galatians, ICC, eds. S. R. Driver, A. Plummer, and
C. A. Briggs (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, n.d.), pp. 257-69; and Hans
Dieter Betz, Galatians, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979),
pp. 243-52. For a development of the passage from the perspective that
it is the Abrahamic covenant in view, see F. F. Bruce, The Epistle to
the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text, NIGTC, eds. I. H.
Marshall and W. W. Gasque (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing
Co., 1982), pp. 218-27; and K. M. Campbell, God's Covenant (Philadelphia:
Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1974), p. 56.

the passages in their respective contexts in order to determine the contribution of each to an understanding of the new covenant. Following the established pattern, the procedure is to consider briefly the introductory matters and then to give a detailed exegesis of each passage.

Provenance

Few question the authenticity of the epistles under consideration. Both the internal evidence and the external evidence are overwhelmingly in support of the conclusion that the apostle Paul wrote all three.[1]

Interpretation

Romans 11:27

Nearer context

In this chapter, the canonical order is followed in the treatment of the three references. The first occurs in Romans 11:27. As such the verse falls within the section of Romans (chapters 9-11) in which Paul is considering the relationship and the ramifications between

---

[1]See, for example, the remarks by Kümmel, Introduction, pp. 275-76 (on 1 Corinthians); p. 287 (on 2 Corinthians); and p. 314 (on Romans).

Although the epistles are regarded as genuine overall, questions have been raised concerning certain sections within them, particularly with Rom 15-16 and 2 Cor 10-13. A discussion of the issues involved is beyond the scope and purpose of this study. The objections raised about the integrity of each have not proven insurmountable and have been answered adequately in support of the integrity of all three epistles. In any case, none of the sections in dispute involves the passages under consideration.

Surveys of the issues through 1970 have been provided by Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, pp. 400-414 (Romans) and pp. 430-37 (2 Corinthians); and Hiebert, Introduction, 2:135-44 (2 Corinthians) and 2:170-75 (Romans). For a recent update, see Martin, Foundations, pp. 177-84 (2 Corinthians) and pp. 194-96 (Romans). Martin does allow for the possibility of later additions being incorporated into the original documents.

the theme of the epistle (1:16-17) and the election of Israel. The question Paul asks and answers is whether Israel's rejection of the gospel has obviated her role as a recipient of divine election.[1]

Chapters 9-11 have traditionally been divided into four sections: (1) 9:1-5 serves as an introduction in which the privileges associated with the nation of Israel are enumerated; (2) 9:6-29 vindicates God's justice in his showing or withholding mercy, particularly his showing mercy in saving a remnant from the nation during this present period; (3) 9:30-10:21 identifies the cause of the nation's failure with

---

[1]The majority of commentaries are careful to note, and correctly so, that chapters 9-11 are neither a parenthesis nor an unrelated appendix to the central theme of Romans expressed in 1:16-17 and thereafter developed in the opening eight chapters. Paul's development of the theme, the gospel of God's grace, would have raised certain historico-theological questions in the minds of his readers about the relationship of Israel to the gospel. These questions would have needed clarification. Paul had identified at the very outset the place of priority and privilege the Jews enjoyed in God's redemptive plan (1:16, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον) and, as a natural corollary to this, the question would have been raised whether this place of prominence would have been forfeited due to the nation's almost wholesale rejection of the gospel message. In that its status before God as an elect nation had been the affirmation of previous revelation, at the very heart of the matter was the question of the integrity of God's promise. The apostle says this in 9:6a: οὐχ οἷον δὲ ὅτι ἐκπέπτωκεν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ("but it is not as though the word of God has failed"). See Alva J. McClain, Romans: The Gospel of God's Grace, ed. Herman A. Hoyt (Chicago: Moody Press, 1973), pp. 172-76; John Murray, The Epistle to the Romans; The English Text with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes, NICNT, ed. F. F. Bruce (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1965), pp. xii-xv; Peter Richardson, Israel in the Apostolic Church, SNTSMS, ed. M. Black (Cambridge, England: University Press, 1969), p. 143; and Cranfield, Romans, 2:445-50.

For a survey of approaches to the interpretation of Romans 9-11, see B. Corley, "Jews, the Future, and God (Romans 9-11)," Southwestern Journal of Theology 19 (Fall 1976):43-50. Corley opts for divine faithfulness as the theme with "mercy" as the key word. He shows through detailed comparisons the numerous corollaries between chapters 1-8 and 9-11. He sees as the unifying theme of the first eleven chapters the concept of "Jews and Gentiles in relationship to the righteousness of God" (p. 50, note 41). See also Craig A. Evans, "Paul and the Hermeneutics of 'True Prophecy': A Study of Romans 9-11," Bib 65 (1984):562.

reference to the gospel, viz., their rejection of the righteousness which comes by faith; (4) 11:1-32 clarifies the role of the nation in the out-working of God's plan of redemption, involving both the current as well as the future role of the nation; and (5) 11:33-36 serves as a conclusion, extolling the wisdom of God as reflected in his dealings with Israel.[1]

The covenant reference is found in the fourth section, 11:1-32. The theme of this section is established in verse 1 with Paul's question, μὴ ἀπώσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ; ("has God rejected his people?"). His answer follows in verse 2, οὐκ ἀπώσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ὃν προέγνω ("God has not rejected his people whom he foreknew"), and serves as a key to the subsequent development of the theme in this section.

The section can be divided into three paragraphs. In verses 1-11 Paul treats the concept of a remnant within the nation, demonstrating that God has not rejected Israel in totality. In verses 11-24 Paul uses an interrogative (μη ἔπταισαν ἵνα πέσωσιν; ["Did they stumble in order that they might fall?"], verse 11) to focus on God's design in Israel's obduracy and unbelief. Because of Israel's disobedience, the Gentiles have the opportunity to participate in the salvation of the gospel. At

---

[1]These divisions follow basically William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, 5th ed., ICC, eds. S. R. Driver, A. Plummer, and C. A. Briggs (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1902), p. 226; and Cranfield, Romans, 1:29. Support for these divisions can be found in Paul's frequent use of the particle οὖν with a form of interrogative expression, as at 9:30 and 11:1. Included also is 9:6 where Paul provides a response to an implied question. Corley, "Jews," pp. 46-47.

Moulton, Howard, and Turner (Grammar, 4:18) suggest that Paul is utilizing a rhetorical device, similar to that of Greek diatribe, in which he anticipates certain objections, puts these in the form of a question, and then presents his rebuttal. Turner cautions that such a device was also employed among the rabbis and that Paul, being a Jew, would have learned such a literary structure from the Jews, rather than from the Greeks. (See also 9:14, 19; 10:14; 11:11.)

the same time, the Gentiles, by their participation, provoke the Jews to jealousy. In verses 25-32 Paul concludes the discussion of Israel's rejection, revealing the nation's prospect of a future, ultimate deliverance.[1]

The covenant reference is found in the opening verses of the third paragraph, verses 25-27. The paragraph itself can, in turn, be divided into three elements: verses 25-26a present the thesis for the paragraph, the anticipated termination of Israel's obduracy and the promise of her deliverance; verses 26b-27 provide scriptural support regarding this thesis, particularly concerning Israel's deliverance; and verses 28-32 offer further corroboration for the thesis and draw to a conclusion through a series of explanatory clauses the argument of this chapter.[2]

Exegesis

The entire chapter is a notorious crux and the passage in question

---

[1] Commentaries generally agree on these divisions. Verse 11 begins with an inferential οὖν and, together with the interrogative μὴ ἔπταισαν ἵνα πέσωσιν, identifies a transition point in the argument. The same is true in verse 25 where the combination of an illative γὰρ with the vocative ἀδελφοί serves a similar purpose. See, for example, C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, HNTC, ed. H. Chadwick (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1967), pp. 206-208.
What variations have been suggested by certain writers usually involve the first two sections. See F. F. Bruce, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, TNTC, ed. R. V. G. Tasker (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1963), pp. 211-13. He prefers to make the second paragraph begin with verse 17. For a different approach, see Dan B. Johnson, "The Structure and Meaning of Romans 11," CBQ 46 (January 1984):91-103. Johnson, like Bruce, makes a transition at verse 17, but, unlike Bruce, he argues for a two-fold division of the chapter.

[2] Ernst Käsemann, Commentary on Romans, trans. G. W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1980), p. 312.

is no exception. The present inquiry limits the exegesis to the
immediate context of Romans 11:25b-27. At the same time, references to
the larger context are included in the course of discussion when neces-
sary to provide the proper perspective for the interpretation of this
passage.

Οὐ γὰρ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν

The section under consideration begins in verse 25 with an
explanatory clause, Οὐ γὰρ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν ("for I do not want you to
be ignorant"). In it the apostle expresses his desire to inform his
readers about God's redemptive program for Israel. Although the redemp-
tive activity as described in the preceding verses involved both Jew
and Gentile, the focus in these verses and throughout chapters 9-11 is
on Israel. This divine program of redemption is called a "mystery" (τὸ
μυστήριον) by the apostle. It is that which God previously had not
disclosed but which he was revealing through Paul.[1] Commensurate with
his stated desire, the apostle communicates to his readers the central
features of this mystery.

The content of the mystery which the apostle desires to reveal

---

[1] Consistent with his use of the term in 16:25-26, Paul signifies
by μυστήριον that which God had concealed but was now unveiling. See
TDNT, s.v. "μυστήριον," by G. Bornkamm, 4:817-24; NIDNTT, s.v. "Secret,
Mystery," by G. Finkenrath," 3:501-506; Murray, Romans, pp. 91-92; and
Cranfield, Romans, 2:573-74.
Calling God's redemptive activity a "mystery" does not mean that
it was something altogether unknown in Scripture before Paul's writing.
All that is required by the term is that either a feature heretofore
unknown is revealed or that something previously only partially indicated
is clarified. Cranfield notes this: "He does not state that what he is
imparting is a new revelation or that it has been revealed only to him-
self; and it can be maintained not unreasonably that the contents of
this mystery are to be discerned in the OT seen in the light of the
gospel events" (Ibid, p. 574).

to his readers is included in the ὅτι clause, beginning in verse 25b and
continuing through verse 26. The clause is in apposition to the sub-
stantive μυστήριον and functions as a secondary object to the infinitive
ἀγνοεῖν. It consists of three elements: the initial declarative clause
(25b), describing Israel's present condition; a temporal clause (26a),
marking the terminus for Israel's present state; and an adverbial clause
(26b), showing a consequence of the preceding statement.[1]

ὅτι πώρωσις ἀπὸ μέρους τῷ Ἰσραὴλ γέγονεν

Several elements in the initial declarative clause need defining.
The first concerns the expression πώρωσις ("hardening"). As may be seen
from verses 7-10, πώρωσις is used metaphorically, depicting God's judi-
cial hardening of the nation because of its rejection of the gospel.
This hardening is frequently mentioned in connection with the heart as
the seat of human understanding and results in the individual's inability
(here, the nation's) to discern and respond properly to divine reve-
lation.[2]

A second term in the declarative clause which needs to be
defined is Ἰσραὴλ. The apostle has distinguished the two entities,
Ἰσραὴλ and ἐθνῶν ("Gentiles") here and in the preceding verses. In that

---

[1]See Cranfield, Romans, 2:547; and Corley, "Jews," pp. 51-52.

[2]Note the cognate ἐπωρώθησαν in verse 7. As K. L. Schmidt
comments, the hardening is viewed both as a divine activity upon the
heart of the corporate nation, as well as a national activity in which
the nation is viewed as hardening its own heart in unbelief (TDNT, s.v.
"παχύνω," 5:1027). See also NIDNTT, s.v. "Hard," by Ulrich Becker,
2:155-56. The perfect tense of the verb γέγονεν suggests that the
hardening of the nation is something that has already occurred and will
continue until the terminus marked by the following temporal clause.
R. C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans,
(Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1936), p. 720.

the distinction, in light of the expression ἐθνῶν, must be regarded as ethnic, it can be concluded that Ἰσραὴλ refers to national Israel.[1]

The prepositional phrase ἀπὸ μέρους has raised two questions: With what is the phrase to be taken? And, what is its meaning? Based on Paul's other uses of the construction, some have taken the phrase adverbially, as modifying the verb γέγονεν.[2] Others, because of its position following the subject πώρωσις, take it adjectivally.[3] Regardless of its syntactical function, the context leaves no doubt as to its meaning. According to verses 5 and 7 only part of the nation has experienced hardening.[4] Consequently, what must be in view is not the

---

[1] In support of an ethnic identification of the term in chapters 9-11, several points should be noted. The first is that in 9:3 the apostle speaks of his kinsmen according to the flesh (τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα)whom he calls "Israelites" (Ἰσραηλῖται, 9:4). In 11:1 Paul's identification of himself as an Israelite (Ἰσραηλίτης) is supported by the facts concerning his physical descent. He says that he is from the seed of Abraham (ἐκ σπέρματος) and of the tribe of Benjamin (φυλῆς Βενιαμείν). Lastly, as mentioned, the apostle has made a distinction between the two terms Ἰσραὴλ and ἐθνῶν in the preceding verses (cf. 11:7 with 11:11-13). The distinction certainly may involve ethico-religious dimensions. The point is that the ultimate distinguishing feature between the two terms is that of descent or ethnic identity. See TDNT, s.v. "Ἰσραήλ," by W. Gutbrod, 3:386-87; TDNT, s.v. "ἔθνος," by K. L. Schmidt, 2:369-71; and NIDNTT, s.v. "People," 2:793-95.

[2] Cranfield, Romans, 2:575. The other uses by Paul include 15:15, 24 and 2 Cor 1:14.

[3] Lenski, Romans, p. 719; Barrett, Romans, p. 223.

[4] See, for example, the statement in verse 7, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐπωρώθησαν ("and the rest were hardened"). Craig Cooper, "Romans 11:25, 26," ResQ 21 (Second Quarter, 1978):88.
As Corley observes, when taken with either the verb γέγονεν or with the noun πώρωσις, as more naturally indicated by the context, the meaning can be understood in the same way. That is, only a part, not all of Israel, is experiencing the πώρωσις ("Jews," p. 52).
Shedd concurs, stating this: "The qualification is extensive, not intensive; denoting the number of the hardened, not the degree of

degree of hardening nor the length of hardening, but the extent of the hardening. It is a partial hardening in the sense that not all of the nation has been hardened.

ἄχρις οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθη

Several issues warrant exegetical consideration in the temporal clause. The first is with the significance of the temporal construction ἄχρις οὗ. Although this construction can be used in the sense of "while" (Heb 3:13), this interpretation is generally regarded as possible only when used in conjunction with the present tense. Here, with the aorist subjunctive εἰσέλθη, it is understood in the sense of "until." As such, it marks the terminus ad quem of the πώρωσις in the initial declarative clause.[1]

The verb εἰσέλθη ("has come in") is not frequently used by Paul. The term is found in the Gospels where it describes one's entering into life or the kingdom.[2] In the present context in which Paul is contrasting the faith of the Gentiles with the unbelief of the Jews, the term describes that to which faith gains access. It is used here in the sense

---

the hardening" (Commentary on Romans [reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980], p. 347). See also Cranfield, Romans, 2:575; H. A. W. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Romans, trans. John C. Moore and Edwin Johnson, rev. and ed. W. P. Dickson, supple. Timothy Dwight (reprint ed., Winona Lake: Alpha Publications, 1979), p. 446; F. L. Godet, Commentary on Romans (reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1977), p. 410; and William Hendriksen, New Testament Commentary: Exposition of Paul's Epistle to the Romans (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981), pp. 377-78.

[1]See RG, p. 975; Meyer, Romans, p. 447; Charles Hodge, Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974), p. 373; Godet, Romans, p. 410; and Murray, Romans, p. 92, n. 45.

[2]Sanday (Romans, p. 335) speaks of it as almost a technical term (terminus technicus). See also Murray, Romans, 93.

of entering into the righteousness of God which is obtained through faith.[1]

The most difficult expression in the temporal clause to interpret is the subject nominative construction τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν ("the fulness of the Gentiles"). What did Paul intend by this expression? Three possibilities have been offered. The first takes the term πλήρωμα to mean "complement," interpreting the entire construction to refer to those Gentiles who are filling up the place of the Jews who have fallen out of divine favor because of unbelief.[2] Support for this position is seen in verses 17-24. In these verses, the apostle speaks about certain of the Jews who have been removed from God's blessing and whose place has been taken by the Gentile believers.

A second approach is to take πλήρωμα in the sense of "full measure" or "entire number," interpreting the construction as referring to the total Gentile populace which is to experience salvation.[3] In other words, at some time, there is to be a wholesale conversion of the Gentile population of which the present response by a portion of the Gentiles is but an imperfect illustration. Support for this approach comes from the use of πλήρωμα in verse 12 where the contrast is established between the portion of Israel now experiencing blessing and the fulness (πλήρωμα) of the nation that will yet anticipate blessing. In that the term πλήρωμα in verse 12 refers to the whole in contradistinction to the part, so πλήρωμα in verse 25 is understood in the same

---

[1] Cranfield, Romans, 2:575-76. Cf. verses 20 and 23.

[2] Hodge, Romans, p. 373; Cranfield, Romans, 2:575-76.

[3] Sanday, Romans, p. 335.

sense.[1]   It is the Gentile populace as a whole which is respresented by
πλήρωμα in verse 25.

A third view is to understand πλήρωμα in the same sense as the
previously mentioned one meaning "full measure," but to limit its appli-
cation to the elect among the Gentiles.[2]   In this case, the construction
describes the total number of elect Gentiles who are presently being
called out by God for salvation.

It is difficult to decide which of the three views is correct.
The first and third views do not appear to be significantly different.
Whether the construction refers to the "complement" of Gentiles filling
up the place of those Jews who have been removed from blessing or to the
"full measure" of the elect Gentiles experiencing divine favor at the
present time makes little difference.   In either case, it is the elect
of the Gentiles presently being saved that the term describes.   The
second view presents something of a problem in that there is no corrob-
orating evidence to support the interpretation that at some time the
mass of Gentiles are to experience salvation.   Yet, it must be admitted
that the use of πλήρωμα in verse 12 suggests this sense for the construc-
tion in verse 25.

The third view appears to offer the least number of obstacles.

---

[1]Murray, Romans, pp. 93-95; and TDNT, s.v. "πλήρωμα," by G.
Delling, 6:305.   The contrast in verse 15 substantiates the meaning of
"full measure" or "entire number" for πλήρωμα in verse 12.   In verse 15
the apostle contrasts the casting away of the nation with their recep-
tion (πρόσλημψις).   Whatever portion has now been cast away will be
received back at some future time.   The reception of the rejected portion,
together with the remnant not rejected, will equal the entire nation,
the πλήρωμα.

[2]Lenski, Romans, p. 720.

It allows for a meaning of πλήρωμα consistent with its use in verse 12. At the same time, it avoids the problems of the second interpretation by limiting the application to the full number of elect Gentiles. There does seem to be some support for this limitation. Unlike the use of πλήρωμα in verse 12, its use in verse 25 does not involve a contrast. There is no distinction intended between the number of Gentiles experiencing divine favor now and the number anticipating divine favor in the future. For this reason, πλήρωμα can be interpreted in verse 25 in an absolute sense, referring to the totality of elect Gentiles, without implying a contrast between those now being saved and the number experiencing salvation in the future.

καὶ οὕτως πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται

The most debated construction in the verses under consideration involves the opening clause of verse 26. Two problems are encountered here. The first concerns the use of οὕτως, and the second, the meaning of πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ. The interpretation of σωθήσεται is not a point of contention. Paul has consistently used σώζω throughout these chapters in its full redemptive significance which includes the forgiveness of sins and the impartation of eternal life.[1]

The adverb οὕτως presents a difficult problem involving two questions: Does it relate its clause to that which proceeds or to that which follows? Is it to be understood as indicating manner or time?

The first question can be answered with a reasonable degree

---

[1]See TDNT, "σώζω," 7:992-94; and NIDNTT, "Redemption," 3:214. In the former article, Foerster calls this the theological use. Additional support for this meaning may be seen in verse 27 which specifically mentions in connection with this salvation the forgiveness of sins (ἀφέλωμαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν).

of certainty. The adverb καθώς ("just as") in verse 26b could suggest a correlation was intended between the two adverbial clauses, forcing οὔτως in verse 26a to refer to what follows in verses 26b-27.[1] However, two points argue against this conclusion. The first is that the adverb καθώς in verse 26b is used with γέγραπται and represents something of a fixed formula to introduce an Old Testament reference. The formula is frequently used in the New Testament when a writer draws upon the Old Testament to provide corroboration for a particular point, as Paul does here. As such καθώς does not function as a correlative with the preceding οὔτως, but independently.[2] The second point is that the καὶ with which verse 26 begins indicates that there is some connection between the adverbial clause in verse 26a and the preceding context. The καὶ οὔτως construction is frequently employed to associate a statement with what has preceded, and it may be assumed that is its function here.[3]

The second question with the adverb is whether it is to be taken as modal or temporal.[4] Of the two choices, the temporal use is preferred. It is not clear how the preceding verses reveal the manner in which the declaration πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται ("all Israel shall be saved") is realized. It is possible that the manner in which all Israel is saved is understood as a present process in which a remnant from Israel and

---

[1]BAGD, p. 598.

[2]Käsemann, Romans, p. 313. See also 9:13, 29, 33; 11:8.

[3]Murray, Romans, p. 96; Käsemann, Romans, p. 313. See, for example, Acts 7:8, Rom 5:12, and 1 Cor 7:17.

[4]Both possibilities have found advocates among competent scholars. In support of the modal use, see Godet, Romans, p. 411; and Sanday, Romans, p. 335. For support of the temporal use, see Bruce, Romans, p. 222; and Käsemann, Romans, p. 313.

the elect from the Gentiles are saved. However, this would require defining "Israel" in verse 26a as the total number of the elect from both Jews and Gentiles. The problem with this interpretation is that it gives a different meaning to Ἰσραὴλ in verse 26 than it carries in verse 25.

A second possibility would be that the manner in which all Israel is saved involves a sequence of events. The sequence begins with the salvation of a remnant during the present period in conjunction with which the full number of elect Gentiles are saved. This salvation of Gentiles in turn provokes the nation to jealousy, and the response is that the nation as a whole turns to God in faith.[1] Paul has indicated previously that God intends through the showing of mercy to the Gentiles to provoke Israel to jealousy (cf. verse 11). However, according to verse 14 this provocation is a present activity with the anticipation that only some of the Jews will be saved (τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν, "some of them"). Furthermore, a sequence of events as suggested above necessarily includes a temporal sequence as well.[2] The salvation of the elect from the Gentiles precedes and is the catalyst for the subsequent turning of the nation to God. If this is the case, it would be less awkward simply to treat the adverb as temporal. Despite the vocal objections of some, the temporal use of οὕτως is well attested. Additionally, this sense satisfies the demands of the present context and is the interpretation embraced here.[3]

---

[1]Cranfield, Romans, 2:576.   [2]Corley, "Jews," p. 53.

[3]Against such a use are Hendriksen, Romans, p. 379; and Lenski, Romans, pp. 724-25. Lenski's lengthy attempt at refuting the temporal use of οὕτως in the New Testament is necessitated, he avers, because of

Easily the most debated issue not only in this verse but in the entire context is the meaning of the expression πᾶς Ἰσραήλ. The construction has been given at least four interpretations: (1) all the elect, both from the nation and from the Gentiles; (2) all the elect of only the nation; (3) the entire nation without exception; and (4) the nation as a whole, but not necessarily everyone within the nation.[1]

The first possibility treats Ἰσραήλ in a different sense in verse 26 than in verse 25. In verse 25, as has been seen, it has reference to the nation, while in verse 26 it would refer to the elect, whether Jew or Gentile.[2] For this reason, it must be rejected. Paul has consistently employed the term throughout these chapters in reference to the nation. To give it here a different sense than what it signifies both in the immediate and greater contexts is untenable.[3] Any attempt

the theological bias of its supporters. His denial of the several obvious uses of the adverb in the New Testament as temporal serves only to raise the issue of his own theological objectivity. See, for example, Acts 20:11; 28:14; and 1 Cor 11:28. In the last two references the identical καὶ οὕτως construction is found. For further support, see Bruce, Romans, p. 222; Käsemann, Romans, p. 313; Corley, "Jews," pp. 53-54; and Everett F. Harrison, "Romans," in vol. 10, EBC, ed. Frank E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976), p. 124.

[1]See Cranfield, Romans, 2:576; Corley, "Jews," pp. 54-55; and Richard Batey, "So All Israel Will Be Saved," Int 20 (April 1966):218-20.

[2]Philip Mauro, The Gospel of the Kingdom, with an Examination of Modern Dispensationalism (Swengel, PA: Bible Truth Depot, n.d.), pp. 241-50; idem, The Hope of Israel: What Is It? (n.p., n.d.), pp. 149-50.

[3]Bruce, Romans, pp. 221-23; and Murray, Romans, p. 96. Murray states the conclusion succinctly: "It should be apparent from both the proximate and less proximate contexts in this portion of the epistle that it is exegetically impossible to give to 'Israel' in this verse any other denotation than that which belongs to the term throughout this chapter." See also Cranfield, Romans, 2:576; Corley, "Jews," p. 54; Charles M. Horne, "Meaning of the Phrase 'And Thus All Israel Will Be Saved' (Romans 11:26)," JETS 21 (December 1978):332; and G. C. Berkouwer,

to support such a two-fold sense of 'Ισραήλ by appealing to Romans 9:6 is a non sequitur. According to verses 6-13, the distinction in 9:6 involves a division within the nation and does not allow for a use of Ισραήλ that has reference to other than Jews.[1]

The second possibility which takes πᾶς Ισραήλ as a reference to the elect within the nation must likewise be rejected. As with the first possibility, it gives the term Ισραήλ in verse 26 a different connotation than it has in verse 25. In this instance, the distinction brought out in 9:6 is somewhat parallel, yet there is no apparent indication from the immediate context in chapter 11 that such a change in meaning is intended. As mentioned above, Paul has consistently used the term in chapter 11 as a designation for national identity. Further, to interpret πᾶς Ισραήλ in verse 26 to mean an elect portion of the nation and not the nation as a whole fails to take into consideration a distinction maintained by the apostle throughout the chapter. Paul has contrasted a remnant (λεῖμμα, verse 5) which represents a portion of the nation now enjoying mercy with the full number (πλήρωμα, verse 12), or the nation as a whole, which is yet to experience mercy. In that

---

The Return of Christ, trans. J. Van Oosterom, ed. M. J. Van Elderen, Studies in Dogmatics (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972), pp. 344-45.

    In the immediate context the distinction between the two terms is found both before and after verse 26. While not using the terms Ισραήλ and ἐθνῶν in verses 28-32, Paul nevertheless sustains his contrast between the two through the pronouns ὑμεῖς and αὐτοὶ and their related expressions.

[1]See Johannes Munck, Christ and Israel: An Interpretation of Romans 9-11, trans. I. Nixon (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), p. 36; Erich Dinkler, "The Historical and Eschatological Israel in Romans 9-11; A Contribution to the Problem of Predestination and Individual Responsibility," JR 36 (April 1956):109-127; and Howard W. Ferrin, "All Israel Shall Be Saved," BSac 112 (July 1955):236.

πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ corresponds to the πλήρωμα, or entire nation, it cannot be equivalent to the portion represented by the remnant.[1] If πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ refers only to an elect portion of the nation, it would in effect refer to the same group depicted as the remnant which is presently elected unto salvation. The contrast brought out in the chapter is then destroyed.

The argument ultimately focuses on the extent of the elect in the expression πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ. According to the supporters of this view, the elect described by the expression represents a portion and not the entire nation. By rejecting this view, there is no denial that all who are included in πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ are elect. It simply denies that the elect represent only a portion of the nation rather than the nation as a whole.

This leaves the third and fourth views as the two remaining possibilities. There is little significant difference between these two positions. The issue dividing them is whether the adjective πᾶς signifies "all," with or without exceptions.[2] In either case, πᾶς

---

[1]Corley concludes that to translate Ἰσραὴλ in verse 26 as referring to the elect of the nation renders the entire chapter a tautalogy ("Jews," p. 54). See also Cranfield, Romans, 2:576-77. This interpretation is widely held. See Hendriksen, Romans, pp. 381-82; idem, Israel in Prophecy (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1968), pp. 29-30, 41-42, 47-48; Philip E. Hughes, Interpreting Prophecy: An Essay in Biblical Perspectives (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1976), pp. 94-96; Horne, "Thus All Israel," pp. 333-34. Berkouwer translates the future indicative σωθήσεται as a prayer rather than a prediction (Return, p. 348).

[2]For support of the use of πᾶς which allows for exceptions, see Sanday, Romans, p. 335; and Barrett, Romans, pp. 223-24; Cranfield, Romans, 2:577; and TDNT, s.v. "πᾶς," by Bo Reicke and G. Bertram, 5:896. In support of no exceptions, see E. C. Blackman, "Divine Sovereignty and Missionary Strategy in Romans 9-11," CJT 11 (April 1965): 131-32.

Ἰσραὴλ would refer to the nation as a whole, and would be understood in contrast to the remnant or portion of the nation which heretofore has been the recipient of God's mercy. Whether there should be room for exceptions within this category is difficult to determine from the information provided in the passage. With either, the interpretation of the covenant would not be affected.

καθὼς γέγραπται

Having treated the issues preceding the Old Testament reference in verses 26b-27, the reference itself must be considered. Two questions are raised in the interpretation at this point. The first deals with identifying the Old Testament citation, along with the related textual issues. The second considers the identity of the covenant referred to in these verses.

The Old Testament is used by the apostle in verses 26b-27 as corroborating evidence for the preceding passage. The combination of the καθὼς with γέγραπται introduces supporting material which contains a similar, if not, identical thought to that which precedes it.[1] Since the reference focuses upon deliverance, it must provide support for the deliverance mentioned in verse 26a.

Verses 26-27 appear to be a composite reference from the LXX of Isaiah. The first three lines follow almost exactly the LXX reading of Isaiah 59:20-21a, replacing ἕνεκεν with ἐκ (possibly under the influence of Psalm 14:7 [13:7], 53:6 [52:7], or 110:2 [109:2]) and omitting the καὶ before ἀποστρέψει. The fourth line, in place of Isaiah 59:21b, reproduces the LXX of Isaiah 27:9, changing the singular αὐτοῦ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν

---

[1] BAGD, p. 391.

to the plural τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν. In all likelihood, this latter change
was made in order to bring the reference from Isaiah 27:9 into agreement
with the plural αὐτοῖς from Isaiah 59:21a in the previous line. There
is every reason to assume, because of the extent of the phrases and the
exactness of the wording, that these lines are an intended quotation.[1]

Ἥξει ἐκ Σιὼν ὁ ῥυόμενος

The paralleling of the participial substantive ῥυόμενος ("deli-
erer") in the first line with the declarative ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ("he
shall remove ungodliness") in the second indicates that the deliverance
in view clearly has a moral/ethical dimension. When combined with
ἀφέλωμαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν ("I shall take away their sins") in the
fourth line, they undeniably point to the nature of the deliverance shown
by σωθήσεται in verse 26a as involving the forgiveness of sins.[2] This is

---

[1]Although there is little variation between what the apostle
wrote and what is found in the LXX, the differences are considerably
greater when a comparison is made between either of these and the MT.
The major changes include the following: (1) For ἕνεκεν/ἐκ Σιὼν ("for
the sake of/out of Zion"), the MT has לציון ("to/for Zion"); (2) for
ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ιακώβ ("he shall remove godlessness from Jacob"),
the MT has ולשבי פשע ביעקב ("and to/for those who turn from trans-
gression in Jacob"); (3) for ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν ("when
I shall take away their sins"), the MT has לכן בזאת יכפר עון יעקב
("therefore, by this the iniquity of Jacob will be covered/atoned for").
    It is difficult to account for these changes. The LXX is
either an interpretive reproduction of the MT or based on a differenct
Vorlage. A detailed consideration of the variations is beyond the
purpose and scope of this study. None provides a sufficient obstacle to
prevent the identification or the interpretation of the covenant. In
any case, the exegesis must proceed on the basis of the text as recorded.
It may be assumed that Paul, in using the LXX, felt that it provided
a satisfactory representation of the original, at least for the purposes
of his argument. For discussion on the issues, see Meyer, Romans,
p. 450; Hodge, Romans, pp. 374-75; Sanday, Romans, pp. 336-37; Murray,
Romans, p. 99, note 54; Käsemann, Romans, p. 314; and TDNT, s.v.
"στρέφω," by G. Bertram, 7:721-22.

[2]See Cranfield, Romans, 2:579; TDNT, "ἁμαρτάνω," 1:316; TDNT,
s.v. "σέβομαι," by W. Foerster, 7:189; and TDNT, s.v. "ῥύομαι," by

not to deny that there may be other aspects included as well; it is to say that the focus in the immediate context is on the spiritual dimension in the redemptive activity of God toward Israel.

Two possibilities are offered for the time of the activity in the reference: Either the deliverance is connected with Christ's first advent and is now presently happening or will occur at some point in the present period; or it is something associated with the second advent which will occur then.[1]

In support of a present activity, the following arguments have been presented: (1) In verses 1, 2, 4, 13, 14, 30, and 31, the apostle speaks of what God is presently doing in Israel's behalf. The assumption is that the entire chapter should be interpreted accordingly. (2) In verse 15 the reception (πρόσλημψις) of the nation is mentioned in connection with Paul's own work toward Jews (cf. verse 14) and not some future work. (3) The regrafting of those Jews who have been removed from divine favor is represented as a present prospect and not a future one (cf. verses 20-24).[2]

However, there are difficulties with this position. The first is

---

W. Kasch, 6:1002. Kasch notes that when ῥύομαι is used in the New Testament, it is always with God as the subject and always with the sense of "saves." He adds that this meaning follows the Old Testament usage.

[1]Both views agree that the deliverer mentioned (ὁ ῥυόμενος) is Christ. In support of a present deliverer, see Herman Ridderbos, Paul: An Outline of His Theology, trans. J. R. DeWitt (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975), pp. 358-61; Corley, "Jews," pp. 55-56; and Horne, "Thus All Israel," p. 333. In support of a future deliverer, see Hodge, Romans, pp. 371-373; and Käsemann, Romans, p. 314.

[2]O. Palmer Robertson, "Is There a Distinctive Future for Ethnic Israel in Romans 11?" in Perspectives of Evangelical Theology, ed. Kenneth S. Kantzer and Stanley N. Gundry (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979), pp. 209-27.

that it is forced to understand πλήρωμα in verse 12 not in contrast to

the "some" (τινὰς, verse 14) presently being saved or to the remnant

(λεῖμμα, verse 5) who are presently the recipients of grace, but as

equal to them. That is, the remnant in verse 5 and the "some" in

verse 14 are simply different ways of describing the πλήρωμα of

verse 12.[1] There is no question that λεῖμμα does not necessarily mean

a "few," but may mean "many" in a given context.[2] Nevertheless, the

contrast indicated by the apostle between the remnant who presently are

responding to the gospel and the "full measure" who will respond pre-

vents equating the two terms.[3]

A second objection is that this approach is compelled to take

Ἰσραὴλ in verse 26 as designating a portion of the nation, rather than

the nation as a whole. As such, it is forced to adopt a different

meaning for the term in verse 26 than it has in the immediately prece-

ding verse.[4]

---

[1]Robertson states it in this fashion: "The 'remnant according to the election of grace' encompasses exactly the same individuals included in the 'fulness' of Israel" ("Ethnic Israel," p. 215).

[2]Cf. Mic 4:7; 5:5-6. TDNT, s.v. "λεῖμμα," by G. Schrenk and V. M. Herntrich, 4:204.

[3]Schrenk, commenting on Rom 9-11 and particularly on 11:5 notes this: "The quantitative aspect of the concept [remnant] is . . . indispensible." In light of the analogy with the remnant in Elijah's days the λεῖμμα must represent a comparatively few who are presently responding (TDNT, "λεῖμμα," 4:211).

[4]Robertson's admission at this point is telling: "The fact that the term Ἰσραὴλ is used in two different ways in two consecutive verses (Rom. 11:25, 26) should not be disturbing" ("Ethnic Israel," p. 226). His recourse to Rom 9:6 for support is less than convincing.

Corley adds a further argument, stating that the second νῦν in verse 31 effectively rules out an eschatological interpretation of the chapter. His point is that the second νῦν indicates that the disobedient portion of the nation is presently ("now") to receive mercy, not at

The other approach to the time of the deliverance which places it at the second advent focuses on the prepositional phrase ἐκ Σιών ("from Zion") in its support. The thought is that Σιών is a term used in the New Testament for "heaven"; thus, the expression, "the deliverer shall come out of Zion," is best understood as describing Christ's second advent.[1]

As with the preceding approach, there is some question over the force of this argument. Even if verse 26b should describe Christ's second advent, it is still not certain whether the prepositional phrase can be used to support this conclusion. The question is not over the use of Σιών for "heaven." Such passages as Hebrews 12:22 establish that possibility. The question is whether that meaning is what Paul intended in Romans 11. The problem arises in that Paul is not using the word himself but repeating in from an Old Testament quotation. In the Old Testament the term regularly occurs with regard to Jerusalem and its inhabitants, as well as to the nation itself.[2]

_____

some distant, future time ("Jews," pp. 55-56).

In response, the second νῦν in verse 31 does pose a problem to the eschatological interpretation of the chapter. However, two rebuttals may be offered. First, there is a textual issue involved which raises a question as to the legitimacy of this second νῦν. Second, this νῦν does not necessarily demand that the mercy described is presently realized. It may note the disobedient portion's qualification for mercy from God's perspective, without implying a present realization. According to verse 20, it was because of their unbelief (τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ) that they have been removed from divine favor. The very fact that Paul describes them as disobedient in verse 30 suggests that they have not yet removed the obstacle that would allow them presently to receive mercy.

[1]Cranfield, Romans, 2:578; Harrison, "Romans," p. 124; and Meyer, Romans, p. 450. See also NIDNTT, "Redemption," 3:203.

[2]Cf. 9:33. TDNT, s.v. "Σιών," by Georg Fohrer and Eduard Lohse, 7:309; Hendriksen, Romans, p. 383. Lenski goes so far as to say that

Unfortunately, the passage does not provide sufficient information to decide conclusively for either approach. The impression gained from the immediate context is that the deliverance depicted occurs in close proximity to the coming of the deliverer. As such, the view which interprets the passage in connection with the second advent is preferred. In either case, the deliverance involves the salvation of the nation as a whole. As such it is something still future since the deliverance of the nation is not something that has already transpired.

A greater concern in verses 26b-27 is with the identification of the covenant mentioned in verse 27. The demonstrative αὕτη in verse 27a serves as the subject of a simple clause with ἡ . . . διαθήκη as the predicate. As stated earlier, these verses represent a composite quote from the LXX of Isaiah 59 and 27. In Isaiah 59:21a the demonstrative points forward to an appositional statement in 59:21b which defines what is involved in the covenant. It does so here also. However, Paul has omitted the appositional statement from Isaiah 59:21b, replacing it with 27:9 which functions now as the antecedent for the demonstrative. The covenant, therefore, which Isaiah 59:21a mentions is defined further by Paul through the passage from Isaiah 27:9.

The passage in Isaiah 27:9 is an adverbial clause which describes one who forgives the sins of another. The meaning of the clause is fairly obvious. The subject by context is God. The recipient of the forgiveness is the nation, as indicated by the pronoun αὐτῶν ("their") attached to the substantive ἁμαρτίας ("sins"). Both the pronouns αὐτῶν

---

since "Zion" refers to earthly Zion, the entire phrase favors the first advent (Romans, p. 729).

and αὐτοῖς ("with them") in verse 27a have as their antecedent the

substantive Ἰακώβ ("Jacob") in verse 26b which in turn relates back to

πᾶσ Ἰσραὴλ in verse 26a.[1] Consequently, the adverbial clause signifies

that at the time God removes the sins of the nation His covenant with

them will be established.[2] Furthermore, since there can be little

question that Paul associates this covenant with the forgiveness of

sins and particularly with the forgiveness of Israel's sins, the refer-

ence here is to the new covenant.[3] As indicated before in the discussion

of Matthew 26:28, the only Old Testament covenant which includes an

unqualified promise concerning the nation's forgiveness is Jeremiah's new

covenant. Lastly, it was concluded in the discussion on Isaiah 59:20-21

that these verses in Isaiah did relate to the new covenant which was

subsequently developed by Jeremiah.

1 Corinthians 11:25

Paul's next new covenant reference is found in 1 Corinthians 11:25

where he recounts the tradition he had received (ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ

τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, verse 23) concerning the Lord's Supper

(κυριακὸν δεῖπνον, verse 20). His presentation, as mentioned earlier,

follows closely that found in the longer reading in Luke.[4] Because the

Lucan account has already been discussed, only those elements which are

---

[1]Hermann, Cremer, Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek, 4th ed., trans. William Urwick (reprint ed., Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1962), p. 616.

[2]The adverb ὅταν is temporal. See Cranfield, Romans, 2:579. Hodge notes a similar construction where a demonstrative is determined by ὅταν in 1 John 2:3 (Romans, p. 375).

[3]Harrison, "Romans," p. 124.   [4]See p. 132, n. 1.

unique to Paul's account will receive attention.

Nearer context

Paul's account of the Supper is found within his response to questions raised in a letter from the Corinthian believers.[1] In chapter 11 Paul treats two issues brought up in connection with public worship, one of which is the observance of the Lord's Supper (verses 17-34).[2]

Verses 17-34 can be divided into three paragraphs: verses 17-22 in which the apostle documents the abuses of the Lord's Supper by the Corinthians; verses 23-26 where Paul communicates the tradition which he had received concerning the institution of the Lord's Supper; and verses 27-34 in which the apostle warns of the consequences which improper conduct at the Lord's Supper incurs.[3]

---

[1] Cf. 7:1, Περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε. The apostle's response begins in 7:1, continuing through 16:18. See F. F. Bruce, 1 and 2 Corinthians, NCBC, eds. Ronald E. Clements and Matthew Black (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1971), pp. 25-27; and W. F. Orr and J. A. Walther, 1 Corinthians: A New Translation, Introduction with a Study of the Life of Paul, Notes, and Commentary, AB, eds. W. F. Albright and David Noel Freedman (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1976), p. 207.

[2] See C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, HNTC, ed. H. Chadwick (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1968), p. 29. Support for the two-part division of the chapter comes from the construction in verse 17, Τοῦτο δὲ παραγγέλλων οὐκ ἐπαινῶ ("but in this charge I do not praise you"), which balances by way of contrast the statement in verse 2, Ἐπαινῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς ("now I praise you'). The two statements thus mark the two divisions of the chapter. Orr states this: "Their holding fast the traditions is the basis of praise; their failure to keep a tradition is the basis of censure (1 Corinthians, p. 266).

[3] See W. Harold Mare, "1 Corinthians," in vol. 10 of EBC, ed. Frank E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976), p. 258; and James L. Boyer, For a World Like Ours: Studies in 1 Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1971), pp. 108-109.

It is in the second paragraph, verses 23-26, where Paul remarks about the institution of the Lord's Supper, that the reference to the covenant is located. In the opening verse, Paul indicates that the information he is recording concerning the Lord's Supper is that which he himself had received from the Lord.[1] In addition, he identifies the

---

[1]The question of the source of Paul's information is of some interest, though not bearing directly on the interpretation of the covenant. Even though Paul states that he received the information from the Lord, some say that this reception was only indirectly from the Lord and that Paul actually received it directly from church tradition. See Frederic Louis Grosheide, Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians: the English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes, NICNT, ed. F. F. Bruce (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953), p. 269; and Marshall, Last Supper, pp. 32-33.

Support for this is derived primarily from the interpretation of verse 23. The verbs παρέλαβον and παρέδωκα, it is held, are used of receiving and passing on of tradition (e.g., verse 2, παρέδωκα . . . τὰς παραδόσεις ["I delivered . . . the traditions"], and verse 15:30). TDNT, s.v. "λαμβάνω," by G. Delling, 4:13-14; TDNT, s.v. "δίδωμι," by Friedrich Büchsel, 2:171; Robert Paul Roth, "Paradosis and Apokalupsis in 1 Corinthians 11:23," LQ 12 (February 1960); 64-67; Hans Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, trans. James W. Leitch, bibl. and ref. James W. Dunkly, ed. George W. MacRae, Hermeneia, eds. Helmut Koester et al. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), pp. 196-97; and Bruce, 1 Corinthians, p. 110. In addition, it is stated that the preposition ἀπό in the construction ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου identifies the ultimate source, but does not exclude the possibilities of an intermediate agent. H. A. W. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians, trans. D. Douglas Bannerman, rev. and ed. William P. Dickson, suppl. Talbot W. Chambers (reprint ed., Winona Lake, IN: Alpha Publications, 1979), p. 261. Lastly, Jeremias has argued for an indirect reception based on alleged non-Pauline phrases in the tradition (Eucharistic Words, pp. 101-104).

These arguments notwithstanding, the mode of Paul's reception must be left open. The preposition ἀπό can be used for both direct and indirect sources. NIDNTT, "Appendix," 3:1181. Furthermore, the verbs employed, although suggestive of the passing on of tradition, do not demand that Paul receive this tradition indirectly from the Lord. NIDNTT, s.v. "Teach," by K. Wegenast, 3:773. For defense of a direct reception, see Frederick Louis Godet, Commentary on First Corinthians (reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1977), pp. 575-77; R. C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1937), pp. 464-63; Charles Hodge, An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians (reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974),

historical background for this information, namely, that it repeats what

the Lord said during the Last Supper on the night of his betrayal (ἐν τῇ

νυκτὶ ᾗ παρεδίδετο).[1]

The only addition of note in Paul's account of the institution

is the command in verse 25 to repeat the observance, which follows

the reference to the cup (τοῦτο ποιεῖτε). The command, without the

adverbial modifier, ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε ("as often as you drink [it]"),

---

pp. 221-23; and also the discussion in G. C. Berkouwer, The Sacraments, trans. H. Bekker, Studies in Dogmatics (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1969), pp. 198-201.

[1]TDNT, "δεῖπνον," by Johannes Behm, 2:34. There is considerable debate on the exact relationship between the Last Supper and the Lord's Supper. Some see the references to the breaking of bread in Acts as referring to communal meals which the Lord enjoyed with his disciples but which were not directly related to the Last Supper. Lietzmann, Mass, pp. 203-208; and Oscar Cullmann and R. J. Leenhardt, eds., Essays on the Lord's Supper, trans. J. G. Davies, Ecumenical Studies in Worship, eds. J. G. Davies and A. R. George (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1958), pp. 5-23. Others see a more direct relationship between the Last Supper and the meals depicted both in Acts and 1 Cor 11. IDB, s.v. "Lord's Supper," by M. H. Shepherd, Jr., 3:158-60; NBD, "Lord's Supper," pp. 750-51; ZPEB, "Lord's Supper," 3:983-84. The last article distinguishes the communal meals in Acts from the Last Supper, but says that by the time Paul wrote 1 Cor they had been combined (3:982-83). See also Marshall, Last Supper, pp. 130-33; Conzelmann, Outline, pp. 53-54; and Berkouwer, Sacraments, pp. 197-98.
Also a matter of dispute is the relationship between the Lord's Supper and the institution of the bread-cup sayings in verses 23-26. It is difficult to separate the Supper itself as a fellowship meal (1 Cor 10:16, 17;11:17-22) from the words of the institution which were spoken in connection with the Supper. Rawlinson, "Church, Baptism and Eucharist," pp. 255-57. They are certainly associated in the context of 1 Cor 11, assuming the δεῖπνον in verse 21 was a form of communal meal (cf. verse 26). It may be concluded here that the bread-cup institution was regularly associated with a communal meal in the first-century church. IDB, "Lord's Supper," 3:158-60; NBD, "Lord's Supper," p. 751; Boyer, 1 Corinthians, pp. 106-107.
On the question of the order, whether the meal or the institution came first, see B. W. Winter, "The Lord's Supper at Corinth: An Alternative Reconstruction," RTR 37 (September-December 1978):77-82. He concludes that the bread was observed first, then the meal, and then the cup.

is found in Luke's account only in connection with the bread. The command is expanded in the following verse where the purpose for the institution and for its repetition is indicated.[1] Its observance is to be a reminder both of the Lord's death, as well as of his return (τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε, ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθη, "you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes").[2]

---

[1] The explanation in verse 26 may represent something Jesus actually said at the Last Supper but which was not recorded in the Gospels, or it may represent a subsequent interpretation which Paul makes or borrows. The change from the first person in verse 25 (ἐμὴν) to the third person in verse 26 (τοῦ κυρίου) favors the latter.

[2] Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, 2d eds. ICC, eds. S. R. Driver, A. Plummer and C. A. Briggs (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1914), pp. 249-50. Marshall prefers to see a three-fold significance for the institution: (1) a memorial of Christ's death; (2) a fellowship with the risen Lord; and (3) an anticipation of his return (Last Supper, pp. 113, 123). While Marshall's second point may be a valid inference, all that is expressly mentioned in verse 26 is Christ's death and his future coming.
Jeremias has attempted to argue that the phrase in verse 25, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν ("in remembrance of me"), refers not to believers remembering the Lord's death but to God's remembering. It serves to remind God both of the death of His Son as well as of the promise of His Son's return (Eucharistic Words, pp. 251-55). His interpretation appears strained in light of Paul's explanation in verse 26 and the warning in verses 27-34. In both, Paul indicates that the remembrance has primary significance for the participants. See A. R. Millard, "Covenant and Communion in First Corinthians," in Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce on His 60th Birthday, eds. W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1970), pp. 245-47. Millard provides a critique of Jeremias. A recent survey of the issues involved is provided by NIDNTT, s.v. "Remember," by K. H. Bartels and C. Brown, 3:243-45. See also Douglas Jones, "ἀνάμνησιν in the LXX and the Interpretation of 1 Cor. XI.25," JTS 6 (October 1955):183-91.
J. Schniewind limits the "proclamation" associated with the ordinance to the words of the instutition and not to the elements or to the believers partaking of them (TDNT, s.v. "ἀγγελία," 1:72). In that the verb καταγγέλλετε relates back to the eating (ἐσθύητε) and drinking (πίνητε), it is difficult to distinguish between the actions and the words said in connection with them. It is better to see both involved in the proclamation. See NIDNTT, s.v. "Proclamation," by U.

As with the longer reading in Luke's account, Paul's record of
the Supper clearly identifies the covenant in view as the new covenant.
Although there may be legitimate grounds for questioning the authenticity
of the adjective καινή in the Synoptics, there is no doubt as to its
inclusion here. Consequently, it may be concluded that the Lord had the
new covenant in mind in his remarks recorded in the institution.[1]

Further, Paul undeniably associates the Lord's Supper with his
readers in that it was something in which they were participating. This
is demonstrated in 10:14-22 where Paul relates the Corinthian believers'
observance with their status as those who share in what the institution
signifies. Verses 16 and 17 specifically mention their participation
(κοινωνία) in the blood and body of Christ. According to 11:26, these
elements point to the death of Christ and signify the believers' partici-
pation in the purpose of that death.[2] Although from this, it cannot be

---

Becker et al., 3:47; and Barrett, First Corinthians, p. 270.

[1]Bruce, 1 and 2 Corinthians, pp. 112-13; and ISBE, s.v.
"Covenant, the New," by A. McCaig, 1:795.

[2]Ridderbos, Paul, pp. 416-18; and Marshall, Last Supper,
pp. 120-23. The purpose of Christ's death was discussed in the
preceding chapter. It was viewed as both a redemptive sacrifice and
a covenantal sacrifice. See Orr and Walther, 1 Corinthians, pp. 267,
273; and Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 199. Conzelmann avers that the
concepts of substitutionary atonement and covenant sacrifice are both
involved and that no sharp distinction between the two can be made.
See also Ernst Käsemann, Essays on New Testament Themes, trans. W. J.
Montague, in SBT, eds. C. F. D. Moule et al. (Naperville, IL: Alec R.
Allenson, 1964), p. 131; and Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 225-31.
Jeremias concludes that Jesus' "death is the vicarious death of the
suffering servant which atones for the sins of the 'many,' the people
of the world, which ushers in the beginning of the final salvation and
which effects the new covenant with God" (p. 231).
Millard concludes that the institution was in reality a covenant-
renewal ceremony. Each time the participants observe the institution,
they are renewing their commitment to the new covenant and their alle-
giance to God as the new covenant author ("Covenant," pp. 243-45). His

proven conclusively that their association with the institution demands
also their association with the new covenant, that would be the logical
conclusion based upon the immediate context.[1]

2 Corinthians 3:6

The last reference to a new covenant in the Pauline corpus occurs
in 2 Corinthians 3:6. Chapter 3 falls within the first division of the
epistle in which the apostle is defending his ministry against false
apostles (ψευδαπόστολοι, 11:13) who were opposing him and subverting his
work.[2]

---

suggestions are intriguing in light of ANE parallels and covenant-
renewal patterns. At the same time, they must remain somewhat specu-
lative in that they are based on inferences and not upon the express
statements of New Testament texts. See George E. Howard, "Christ, the
End of the Law: The Meaning of Romans 10:4ff," JBL 88 (September 1969):
108; and C. F. D. Moule, Worship in the New Testament, in Ecumenical
Studies in Worship, eds. J. G. Davies and A. R. George (Richmond: John
Knox Press, 1961), p. 21. Mendenhall argues similarly, taking Paul's
warnings in verses 27-34 as reflecting consequences which may be
incurred for covenant breaking (IDB, "Covenant," 1:722-23).

[1]Klappert (NIDNTT, "Lord's Supper," 2:533-34) notes the
relationship between partaking of the institution and participating in
the covenant. See also Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 213-37.
Schweizer (Lord's Supper, pp. 1-3) identifies a three-part motif in the
institution: (1) a proclamation of Jesus' death; (2) a confirmation of
God's new covenant; (3) an anticipation of the future Messianic banquet.
Ridderbos describes the Supper from the dual perspective of a redemptive
historical commemorative meal, as well as a covenantal congregational
meal (Paul, pp. 421-23).

[2]Although there is general agreement on the major divisions of
the epistle and even on the identification of the section in which
chapter 3 is located, there is considerable debate on the interpretive
issues within the chapter itself. These issues are treated as appro-
priate in the discussion of verse 6. The major divisions of the epistle
are chapters 1-7, 8-9, and 10-13. See Alfred Plummer, A Critical and
Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthi-
ans, ICC, eds. S. R. Driver, A. Plummer, and C. A. Briggs (Edinburgh:
T and T Clark, 1915), p. xx; and Murray J. Harris, "2 Corinthians," in
vol. 10 of EBC, ed. Frank E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Pub-
lishing House, 1976), p. 315. For two recent treatments of the issues

Nearer context

In the initial division, chapters 1-7, Paul recounts the events surrounding the sending of an earlier letter to the Corinthians in preparation for a personal visit. He was concerned with their response because of the critical nature of this letter. Consequently, the chapters in this division are structured around Paul's narrative and his search for Titus, the bearer of the epistle, in order to discover the manner in which the Corinthians had responded. As such, chapters 2:14 through 7:1, in which is found the new covenant statement, represent an extended digression to the overall structure. Paul interrupts his narration at 2:14 in order to discuss his ministry and does not resume his narrative remarks until 7:2.[1]

---

involved in chapter 3, see C. J. A. Hickling, "The Sequence of Thought in II Corinthians, Chapter Three," NTS 21 (April 1975):380-95; and Thomas E. Provence, "'Who is Sufficient for These Things?' An Exegesis of 2 Corinthians 2:15-3:18," NovT 24 (January 1982):54-81.
     Hickling concludes that Paul's remarks in chapters 3-6 should be understood as defending his own ministry and not as providing a polemic against the doctrine of his opponents ("Sequence," pp. 318, 384, and 386). That is, Paul's remarks should be understood on the personal, rather than the doctrinal, level. His remarks in these chapters can be interpreted apart from identifying any polemical thrust toward his opponents. However, because the epistle was engendered in part in response to opponents who were attempting to discredit his ministry, Paul's statements in this section can be understood as operating on both levels. His remarks not only provide information as to the nature of his ministry, but they also provide an answer to those opposing him (cf. 2:17; 4:2; 6:14-18). NIDNTT, s.v. "Scripture," by R. Mayer and C. Brown, 3:495.

   [1]Lenski (First and Second Corinthians, p. 908) objects to the term "digression" to describe chapters 3-6 because the apostle has not strayed from his overall focus in these chapters (i.e., reestablishing a proper relationship with the Corinthians), but is in fact continuing to pursue it. While it is true that these chapters are continuing the theme of Paul's ministry, they nevertheless do represent a digression simply because they break the narrative sequence in this division. See Bruce, 1 and 2 Corinthians, p. 171; and C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, HNTC, ed. Henry Chadwick (New

In order to identify the immediate context of the covenant,
chapter 3 is isolated from the surrounding chapters, described here
as the digression. In chapter 3, Paul is discussing the nature of
his ministry and that of his companions as a "new covenant" ministry
(verse 6), contrasting it to the ministry of Moses and the "old cove-
nant" (verse 14).[1]

The chapter is divided into the following paragraphs. The first,
verses 1-3, provides one reason why Paul has expressed confidence in
2:14-17 that his ministry is divinely ordained. He points to the changed
lives of the Corinthian believers as a validation of his ministry. The
second paragraph, verses 4-6, explains why Paul's ministry is able to
accomplish what it has. Its source and sufficiency are from God. The

---

York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1973), pp. 96-97.

Some prefer making the digression begin with chapter 3 (Robert-
son, Second Corinthians, p. 75) with 3:1-3 as the transition verses; the
majority, however, begin the digression at 2:14 with verses 14-17 marking
the transition. See, for example, Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, Paul's
Second Epistle to the Corinthians: The English Text with Introduction,
Exposition and Notes, NICNT, ed. F. F. Bruce (Grand Rapids: Wm. B.
Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962), pp. 76-77. Similarly, there is debate
over the exact point at which the digression is terminated. Although
the geographical references marking the discussion of Paul's search do
not reoccur until 7:5, it is assumed that the preceding verses (2-4)
provide the point of transition since verse 5 functions as an explanation
for the verses which have immediately preceded.

[1]R. Y. K. Fung ("The Nature of the Ministry According to Paul,"
EvQ 54 [July-September 1982]:132-33) comments on both the identification
of this section (3:1-6:10) as a "sustained exposition of the nature of
the Christian ministry," as well as Paul's use of the plural forms to
include his companions. Provence sees Paul both comparing and contrast-
ing his ministry with that of Moses in this chapter. Taking his cue
from 2:15-16, he identifies as Paul's theme the statement that his
ministry is one of both life and death. In verses 1-6 and 12-18, Paul
describes the life-giving aspect of his ministry, contrasting it to
Moses' ministry. In verses 7-11 he focuses on the death-giving aspect
of his ministry, comparing it to Moses' ("Who is Sufficient," pp. 56-57,
59). His treatment is intriguing but falls short of being convincing.
It is indirectly rebutted in the exegesis below.

third paragraph, verses 7-18, describes the character of Paul's ministry.
In a running commentary on Exodus 34:29-35, Paul contrasts his ministry
with that of Moses. Both come from God, but Paul's is the more glorious
in that it brings life and liberty rather than condemnation and bondage.[1]

The covenant reference is found in the second paragraph, verses
4-6. The paragraph consists of an initial explanatory clause (δέ,
verse 4) in which Paul gives the reason for his confidence (πεποίθησιν)
that the Corinthians were epistles of commendation (verses 1-3), vali-
dating his credentials as a true minister of God (2:17). This confi-
dence, he asserts, came through Christ (διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ) and was
expressed toward God (πρὸς τὸν θεόν). This is followed by a second
clause (verse 5), stating negatively and then positively the basis for
his confidence. The confident evaluation (λογίσασθαί) of his ministry
and its sufficiency is something which God has provided (ἡ ἱκανότης
ἡμῶν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, "our sufficiency is from God"). This, in turn, is
followed by two additional clauses (verse 6). The first, a relative
clause with an appositional adjunct, describes how God's sufficiency
was expressed toward Paul, constituting him as a specific kind of

---

[1]Technically, verses 7-18 can be divided into two paragraphs:
verses 7-11 and verses 12-18. In the former, Paul focuses on the glory
of his ministry as providing life; in the latter, on its glory as
providing liberty. The particle at verse 12 (οὖν) shows that verses
12-18 represent an inference drawn from the preceding verses.
As with the entire chapter, there is much debate over the inter-
pretation of verses 7-18, including the apostle's use of the Exod 34
narrative. See J. D. G. Dunn, "2 Corinthians III.17--'The Lord is the
Spirit,'" JTS 21 (October 1970):309-332; and W. C. Van Unnik, "'With
Unveiled Face,' An Exegesis of 2 Corinthians III.12-18," NovT 6 (July
1963):153-69. The divisions as marked out here are those generally
followed in the commentaries. See Meyer, Epistles to the Corinthians,
p. 459; Lenski, First and Second Corinthians, pp. 908-951 passim; and
Harris, "2 Corinthians," p. 317.

minister. The second, an illative clause, gives a reason for the previous description of Paul's ministry.[1]

Exegesis

Having indicated the progress of thought in the immediate context, attention is now given to the exegesis of the reference itself. The statements concerning the covenant in verse 6 are treated before proceeding to a consideration of the following verses and Paul's discourse on the nature of his ministry.

διακόνους καινῆς διαθήκης

The first issue encountered in verse 6 is the interpretation of the anarthrous construction διακόνους καινῆς διαθήκης ("new covenant ministers"). The construction functions as a second accusative of ἱκάνωσεν ("he made fit"), and answers in what way God has made Paul sufficient.[2] The relative ὅς identifies its antecedent, θεοῦ ("God, verse 5), as the subject of the clause.[3]

---

[1] See Meyer, Epistles to the Corinthians, pp. 463-64; Barrett, Second Corinthians, pp. 110-111; and Harris, "2 Corinthians," p. 335.

[2] BDF, pp. 85-87. In this case, the double accusative would involve an accusative of object, ἡμᾶς, and a predicate accusative, διακόνους (see pp. 86-87). The verb ἱκάνωσεν means "to equip, "to enable," or "to make fit" (BAGD, p. 374).

[3] The relative ὅς has been taken two ways. The first is as appositional, making the relative clause an explicit indicator of how God had made Paul's ministry sufficient (verse 5). See Lenski who calls this the demonstrative use of ὅς (First and Second Corinthians, p. 919). The second takes the relative as illative, providing an explanation for the way in which God had made Paul sufficient as a minister. See Charles Hodge, An Exposition of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1973), p. 54. Hodge's view is accepted, although the distinction between the two is minimal.

The καί could be taken either as adjunctive, suggesting God's

Because of the anarthrous construction of καινῆς διαθήκης, the questions are raised: Did Paul intend to identify this ministry (διακόνους) as similar to, but not identical with, the ministry of the new covenant? Or, did he consider himself and his companions as ministers of the new covenant and, through the anarthrous construction, simply draw attention to the character of this ministry?[1] The following context suggests the latter. Paul does not here treat the similarities between his ministry and the new covenant, which would be anticipated if the point is the similarity between the two. Instead, he contrasts his

activity in verse 6 on behalf of Paul and his companions was something in addition to His making them sufficient (verse 5); or as ascensive, restating more specifically what was involved in God's making them sufficient. The latter is preferred. In using the verb ἱκάνωσεν, Paul brings forward the thought expressed by the cognates ἱκανοί and ἱκανότης in verse 5, indicating that the relative clauses provide clarification as to the nature of this "sufficiency." See Meyer, Epistles to the Corinthians, p. 464; and Homer A. Kent, Jr., A Heart Opened Wide: Studies in II Corinthians, in NTS (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1982), p. 58. Kent relates 3:5-6, through the use of ἱκανός, back to 2:16, and the question Paul asks there, πρὸς ταῦτα τίς ἱκανός ("who is sufficient for these things"). According to Kent, Paul is answering in 3:5 the question put forward in 2:16.

[1]The genitive διαθήκης can either be possessive, "belonging to," or subjective, "originating from." The sense would not be substantially different. See BDF, pp. 89-90; RG, pp. 499-502.

The plural διακόνους includes not only the apostle, but those who labored with him in the ministry. The noun is taken in the sense of one performing religious service and, in the present context, specifically service involving the gospel of Christ. It is the non-technical use of διακόνος, rather than the technical use designating a particular office in the church. See Plummer, Second Corinthians, p. 85; TDNT, s.v. "διακονέω," by Hermann W. Beyer, 2:88-89; and NIDNTT, s.v. "Serve," by Klaus Hess, 3:546-47.

William L. Lane ("Covenant: The Key to Paul's Conflict with Corinth," TynBul 33 [1982]:16-17) argues for the definition "messenger" which is consistent with his understanding of the term in extra-biblical literature and his assumption that Paul is functioning as the messenger of a covenant lawsuit in these chapters. However, in light of Paul's use of the expression elsewhere, it is best to stay with the biblical definition here.

ministry and the old covenant (τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης, verse 14).[1] Thus, it must be assumed that Paul used the anarthrous construction not to indicate a similarity between his ministry and the new covenant as if the two were distinct, but to focus on the character of his ministry as a new covenant ministry.

οὐ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος

There are several issues raised with the appositional construction οὐ γράμματος, ἀλλὰ πνεύματος ("not of the letter but of the Spirit"). One involves its relationship to the relative clause. It appears to be used adjectivally, modifying διακόνους and identifying a specific characteristic of the ministry.[2]

Another issue with this construction is the meaning of the two genitives, γράμματος and πνεύματος, and the contrast intended by their use with οὐ and ἀλλὰ. Two possibilities have been suggested.[3] The first is that the two terms are indicating the distinction between the external (γράμματος) meaning of the covenant and the internal (πνεύματος).[4] The

---

[1]Meyer, Epistles to the Corinthians, p. 464.

[2]Plummer (Second Corinthians, p. 88) says that the genitives could modify either the accusative διακόνους or the genitive καινῆς διαθήκης without altering the meaning. Meyer (Epistles to the Corinthians, p. 465) disagrees, saying that the genitives must be understood as modifying διακόνους. The context supports Meyer. Paul does not contrast in the following verses two kinds of new covenant ministries, one of the γράμματος and one of the πνεύματος, but the ministry of the new covenant and the old.

[3]At least four solutions have been offered, but those have been combined under one of two approaches to the problem. See Provence, "Who is Sufficient," pp. 62-68.

[4]See Lenski, First and Second Corinthians, pp. 920-22; and Hughes, Second Corinthians, pp. 97-99. Hughes attempts to distinguish his position from that of Augustine and the Scholastics who also saw two sense levels--the literal and the spiritual. He says that the Scholastics

immediate context argues against such an interpretation. First, this interpretation uses πνεύματος differently than Paul has employed the expression both before (verse 3) and after (verse 17). In these uses, the term is generally understood as a reference to the Holy Spirit.[1] More importantly, the contrast Paul develops in the following verses is not between two kinds of ministries within the new covenant, one of the "letter" and one of the "spirit," but between two different covenants having two different ministries.[2] Therefore, the contrast in verse 6

---

understood these two levels as basically distinct, whereas Hughes associates them by basing the latter upon the former. His conclusion is this: "The distinction between the letter and the spirit indicates the difference between the law as externally written at Sinai on tablets of stone and the same law as written internally in the heart of the Christian believer" (p. 100).

While Hughes' remarks may give the impression that he is referring to the Holy Spirit when speaking of this internalization of the law, he later states this: "The American Revised Standard Version, in taking 'spirit' to mean the Holy Spirit and therefore spelling it with a capital S ('Spirit'), has the support of numerous scholars from the earliest centuries onwards . . . . But, while it is entirely true that the blessings of the new covenant may be experienced only through the operation of the Holy Spirit . . . within the heart of man, yet it is unlikely that a direct reference to the Holy Spirit is intended. The contrast is still (as in verse 3) between what is external and what is internal" (p. 101). Generally, the thesis which attempts to distinguish between the literal and the spiritual sense has been rejected by most modern commentaries. See Dunn, "2 Corinthians III.17," p. 310, n. 2.

[1] It would be difficult to understand the phrase πνεύματι θεοῦ ζῶντος in verse 3 as other than a reference to the Holy Spirit. Likewise, although there is some question as to the precise meaning of κυρίου, it is generally held that the construction πνεῦμα κυρίου in verse 17 refers also to the Holy Spirit. Bruce, 1 and 2 Corinthians, p. 193; and Harris, "2 Corinthians," pp. 334-35, 338. See also the discussion in TDNT, "πνεῦμα," 6:418-19; and NIDNTT, s.v. "Spirit," by E. Kamlah, J. D. G. Dunn, and C. Brown, 3:703. Hodge (Second Corinthians, pp. 73-75) and Kent (II Corinthians, p. 63) prefer to see in verse 17 a reference to Christ.

[2] Kaiser disagrees, saying that the clue to the distinction in verses 7-11 is found in Rom 2:9 where the distinction is between faith and no faith. Hence, Paul is not contrasting two covenants, but two ministries within a single covenant. Moses' ministry through the Law

cannot be understood as distinguishing the external meaning of the new covenant from the internal.

The second approach to the contrast is to see an intentional distinction between the two covenants having two ministries, the "letter" representing the Mosaic covenant and the "Spirit" representing the new.[1] Several points in the immediate context suggest that this is what the apostle meant. To begin with, it allows πνεῦματος to be translated in the same sense as it is in verses 3 and 17. Additionally, it continues the same contrast brought out by Paul in verse 3.

In the concluding portion of the third verse, a similar construction is found, with οὐ/ἀλλὰ showing a contrast. The contrast here is two-fold.[2] The initial contrast is between οὐ μέλανι ("not with ink") and ἀλλὰ πενύματι θεοῦ ζῶντος ("but with the Spirit of the living God"). Paul, in describing the Corinthians as his "epistle" (ἐπιστολὴ), indicates that as such they were not written (ἐγγεγραμμένη) through the medium of ink, but through the Spirit of God.

The subsequent contrast is an extension of the first and

---

leads to death only if the individual who approaches the Law does so apart from faith ("The Weightier and Lighter Matters of the Law: Moses, Jesus, and Paul," in Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney Presented by His Former Students, ed. G. F. Hawthorne [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975], pp. 187-89). For a response, see the discussion below.

[1]Kent, II Corinthians, p. 59; Dunn, "2 Corinthians III.17," p. 310. F. F. Bruce ("The Grace of God and the Law of Christ: A Study in Pauline Ethics," in God and the Good: Essays in Honor of Henry Stob, eds. C. Orlebeke and L. Smedes [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975], p. 26) says of this context that there is an indispensible link between letter and the old covenant and between Spirit and the new covenant.

[2]Hodge, Second Corinthians, pp. 51-52.

identifies the place where this "writing" occurred. It was not on tablets made of stone (οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶν λιθίναις), but on the fleshly tablets of the heart (ἀλλ' ἐν πλαξὶν καρδίαις σαρκίναις). Because these tablets of stone are identified in verse 7 (λίθοις) as those associated with Moses and Israel, they must refer to the Law. Furthermore, the ministry (διακονία) of Moses with these tablets is described as a ministry of death (θανάτου) and is contrasted in verse 8 with the ministry of the the Spirit (πῶς οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ἡ διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος). Because the contrast there is between Law and Spirit, the same contrast is to be understood in verse 3 as well.[1] This adds further support for a similar distinction in verse 6.

Finally, there is additional confirmation that γράμματος in verse 6 should be taken as depicting the Law. In verse 7 the plural γράμμασιν is used in describing that which was written in connection with Moses and Israel (ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντετυπωμένη λίθοις, "in letters inscribed on stones"). In verse 14 that which was written is further defined as the old covenant (τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης) read by Israel. Since the γράμματος in verse 6 is depicted in the plural as that which was written in connection with Moses and described subsequently as read by

---

[1]Taking verses 3 and 6 together, there is seen a close relation-ship between the Spirit and the new covenant. According to verse 3, it is through the activity of the Spirit that the individual benefits from the covenant that Paul ministers.

Several have noted that the thoughts presented in these verses are reminiscent of Jer 31:33 and the writing of the Law upon the heart, as well as Ezek 11:19 and 36:36 and the activity of the Spirit in removing the heart of stone to replace it with a heart of flesh. See F. F. Bruce, This is That: The New Testament Development of Some Old Testament Themes (Exeter, England: Paternoster Press, 1968), pp. 54-55; idem, 1 and 2 Corinthians, p. 190; and especially Hickling, "Sequence," pp. 388-90.

Israel, there can be no doubt that it stands for the Law.[1]

τὸ γὰρ γράμμα ἀποκτέννει

The major concern with the concluding clause in verse 6 is the meaning of the terms ἀποκτέννει ("kills") and ζωοποιεῖ ("makes alive") as used here.[2] Fortunately, the following verses assist in the interpretation of these expressions. As mentioned before, Paul continues the contrast in verses 7-18 which he began in verse 3 and repeats in verse 6. In verses 7-8 the contrast is between the ministry of death (ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου) and the ministry of the Spirit (ἡ διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος). In verse 9 the contrast is between the ministry of condemnation (ἡ διακονία τῆς κατακρίσεως) and the ministry of righteousness (ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης). Since Paul maintains a continuity throughout these verses in his contrasts, it can be concluded that ἀποκτέννει is associated with death and condemnation, and ζωοποιεῖ with the Spirit and righteousness. In other words, ἀποκτέννει and ζωοποιεῖ must be understood in their full theological senses as depicting divine condemnation and divine justification.[3] Consequently, when Paul describes the Law as killing, he

---

[1]Ridderbos concludes that the contrast in verse 3 between γράμματος and πνεύματος describes the respective spheres of operation for the two covenants. The Law, written in letters on stone, cannot touch the heart to transform the recipient. The new covenant, written by the Spirit upon the heart, represents the transaction which the old covenant could not accomplish (Paul, pp. 218-20).

[2]The γὰρ may function either in an illative sense, giving a reason for the contrast between the γράμματος and the πνεύματος, or in an explanatory capacity, offering an explanation for this contrast. The former is preferred, although the difference between the two is insignificant in this case. See Meyer, Epistles to the Corinthians, p. 456.

[3]See TDNT, s.v. "θάνατος," by Rudolph Bultmann, 3:16; TDNT, s.v. "ζάω," by Rudolph Bultmann, 2:874-75; NIDNTT, s.v. "Death," by Lothar Coenen and Walter Schmithals, 1:430, 436-37; and NIDNTT, s.v. "Life," by Hans-Georg Link, 2:481-82.

is saying that it brings condemnation and death. Conversely, when he describes the Spirit as making alive, he is stating that the Spirit brings righteousness.[1]

ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου

As noted above, additional support for the interpretation of verse 6 is provided in verses 7-18. Paul carries forward the contrast developed in verse 6 between his ministry and the Law through a selective commentary on Exodus 34:29-35. His argument in furthering the contrast in these verses is to show the greater glory of the new covenant ministry in which he was engaged.[2]

In verses 7-11 Paul notes three contrasts, two of which have already been mentioned. These two are the contrasts in verses 7 and 8 between the ministry of death and the ministry of the Spirit, and in verse 9 between the ministry of condemnation and the ministry of righteousness.[3] The initial element in both contrasts brings forward the

---

[1]Hodge, Second Corinthians, pp. 61-62. Whether each is viewed in the forensic sense or in the experiential sense is difficult to determine from the context. Possibly both are intended, although the reference to the Spirit as that by which the righteousness is received could point more to the outworking of righteousness, rather than the initial judicial imputation of it. See Barrett, Second Corinthians, pp. 116-17. Against, see Lenski, First and Second Corinthians, p. 930.

[2]Fung, "Nature of Ministry," pp. 133-34; Dunn, "2 Corinthians III.17," p. 311; and Van Unnik, "With Unveiled Face," p. 158. Van Unnik recognizes the point of Paul's argument in these verses: "In these conclusions 'a minori ad maius' Paul concludes that the glory of this new covenant must far exceed that of the old." Against, see Provence, "Who is Sufficient," pp. 68-73. While recognizing the relative differences between the glory of the old and the glory of the new, Provence nevertheless attempts to show that the focus of these verses is on their similarities, not their differences.

[3]It is possible to treat the genitives in these verses as subjective. In verse 7, for example, the Law is described by the construction ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου as a ministry derived from death. That

γράμματος of verse 6 and refers to the ministry of the Law. The second element in both relates back to the πνεύματος in verse 6 and portrays the new covenant ministry. Though recognizing the glory of the first, Paul indicates that the second has greater glory, as that which brings life is more glorious than that which ministers death.[1]

The one contrast in these verses heretofore unmentioned is found in verse 11. There Paul contrasts the two covenants in terms of their longevity: the old covenant he describes as "passing away" (καταργούμενον, cf. verse 7), while the new as "remaining" (μένον). The former is viewed as temporary, the latter as permanent and, as a result, more glorious.[2]

In verses 12-18 Paul uses an analogy to continue the thought of the transitory nature of the old covenant, as opposed to that of the new. The analogy comes from Moses' veiling his face in Exodus 34 after his reception of the Law from God. Moses' activity was prompted by the fading glory of his appearance which Paul interpreted as reflecting the

---

is, it is a ministry stemming from a document which condemns. In verse 8 the new covenant is defined as having a ministry which comes from the Spirit. However, it is best to take the genitives as objective. In this above example, the Law has a ministry which involves death; the new covenant has a ministry which involves the Spirit (i.e., the life which comes by the Spirit).

[1]The construction in verse 8 is πῶς οὐχὶ μᾶλλον and in verse 9, πολλῷ μᾶλλον. Both are used comparatively to mark the greater glory of the second element in the contrast.

[2]Hodge states that the participles καταργουμένην (verse 7) and καρταργούμενον (verse 11), used in conjunction with the Law, can be either imperfects, pointing to the actual process of passing away; or presents, pointing to the temporary nature of that described (Second Corinthians, p. 60). Meyer argues for the imperfects (Epistles to the Corinthians, pp. 468, 470).

nature of the Law itself as something that was transitory.[1] By

analogy, Paul applies this veiling to the nation's response to the Law

with the veil representing their obduracy, preventing them from seeing

---

[1]ISBE, "Covenant," the New," 1:796-97. There is much debate over
the understanding of verse 13 and Moses' activity in covering his face.
Dunn ("2 Corinthians III.17," p. 311) sees the purpose of Moses' veiling
as his attempt to hide "the temporary nature of the Mosaic law and
covenant." Hickling ("Sequence," pp. 390-92) concludes that Moses acted
as he did out of reverential concern "to conceal from the Israelites the
fading of the glory, not however in order to spare them disappointment
or disillusion, but from reverential motives" (p. 390). Provence argues
that the veiling was not something Moses initiated but was forced upon
him as a necessary consequence of Israel's unbelief. Because of their
unbelief, they could not bear to look upon the glory of God in the Law
as reflected in Moses' face. Moses, in covering his face because of
their hardness, inadvertently hid from the nation the intent of the
Law ("Who is Sufficient," pp. 74-80).

Hughes understands the verse similarly, treating Moses' act
as a parable of the consequence of sin in the nation. By veiling his
face, Moses was showing them that their hardened hearts were preventing
them from seeing the Law as intended by God (Second Corinthians,
pp. 107-110). Harris sees Moses attempting to teach the Israelites
through his veiling that the old covenant was temporary, but (ἀλλά,
verse 14) their hardened hearts prevented them from understanding
("2 Corinthians," p. 337).

To a certain extent, the problem with the interpretation of
verse 13 and Moses' action centers on the sense of the infinitive clause,
πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀτενίσαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὸ τέλος τοῦ καταργουμένου
("so that the sons of Israel should not gaze at the end of that which
was passing away"). Two questions are raised: How is the preposition
πρὸς to be understood? And, in what sense is the preposition εἰς to be
taken?

The first preposition, πρὸς, although interpreted by some as
"result" (Lenski, First and Second Corinthians, p. 937), should be taken
as "purpose." As Plummer notes, when used elsewhere by Paul (Eph 4:12;
1 Thess 2:9; and 2 Thess 3:8), it expresses the purpose of the agent.
Meyer concurs, adding that telic πρὸς plus an infinitive always points
to the purpose of the agent himself. In other words, Moses' purpose
was expressed by the construction (Epistles to the Corinthians,
p. 472).

The second preposition, εἰς, indicates "end" and not "goal" or
"aim." This meaning appears required in light of the sense of the
participle καταργουμένου with which it is taken (cf. verse 7 with 14
and 16). Hodge, Second Corinthians, p. 66; Meyer, Epistles to the
Corinthians, p. 472; Plummer, Second Corinthians, p. 97; and Barrett,
Second Corinthians, pp. 119-20.

the Law's true and temporary nature.[1]   In contrast, the new covenant is not veiled, but open, as is Paul's ministry associated with it.   Through the Spirit, anyone who responds to the gospel is able to see not only the true nature of the Law, but can also experience the transforming power of the gospel, a power the Law could not provide.[2]

---

[1]Bruce, 1 and 2 Corinthians, p. 192.

[2]NIDNTT, s.v. "Hide," by Wilhelm Mundle, 2:213-14.   See Hughes (Second Corinthians, pp. 107-120) who provides an excellent survey of the many interpretive issues raised in these verses.

The reference in verse 17 to ἐλευθερία ("freedom") has suggested to some that there is a parallel between the contrast of two covenants developed in these verses and in Gal 4:21-31.   The assumption is that in both, the contrast is between the old and new covenants.   It is true that in Gal 4:21-31 Paul contrasts two covenants, as he does here (cf. 4:24, αὗται γάρ εἰσιν δύο διαθῆκαι, "for these are two covenants").   In Gal 4 he identifies one of these as related to Mt. Sinai (verse 24, ὄρους Σινᾶ) which ostensibly is a reference to the Mosaic covenant.   The other, he associates with the heavenly Jerusalem (verse 26, ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ, "the Jerusalem above") which he describes as ἐλευθέρα ("free").   In that in both passages, 2 Cor and Gal 4, the second covenant is described as "free," there is support for seeing in both the same contrast.   In addition, the heavenly Jerusalem is associated in Heb 12:22 with the new covenant (12:24), further supporting this assumption.

While this is the case in 2 Cor 3, it is not necessarily so in Gal 4.   In Gal 3:15-20 Paul contrasts the Abrahamic covenant with the Mosaic, and there are indications the same is true in chapter 4.   In 4:22-23 Paul states that the contrast is between the two "sons" of Abraham: one begotten, ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ σάρκα ("by the bondswoman according to the flesh"); and the other, ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας δι' ἐπαγγελίας ("by the free [woman] by means of promise").   Previously, Paul has used the contrast, κατὰ σάρκα and δι' ἐπαγγελίας, to distinguish the Abrahamic inheritance from that which could be gained from the Mosaic covenant (cf. 3:3 with 3:5 and 3:18).   In addition, in 4:28 Paul applies his illustration to his readers, saying that they were children κατὰ Ἰσαὰκ ἐπαγγελίας ("like Isaac, of promise").   The most obvious association for Ἰσαὰκ in the context would be with the Abrahamic promise-covenant. Therefore, a good case can be made for taking the contrast in Gal 4 as not between the Mosaic and the new, but between the Mosaic and the Abrahamic covenant.   What similarities there are between 2 Cor and Gal 4 would be because of the common elements shared between the Abrahamic and new covenants.

For a slightly different approach to the contrast in Gal 4, see Paul S. J. Liao, "The Meaning of Galatians 4:21-31: A New Perspective," The Northeast Asia Journal of Theology 22 (March-September 1979): 124.

τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης

The last issue to be treated is Paul's perspective of the Law as expressed here. On the basis of the disparaging remarks Paul makes about the γράμματος (verses 6-18), several conclude that what is in view cannot be the Law as originally given by God through Moses. Instead, it is the Law as misunderstood and misinterpreted by legalists, whether these be the majority of the nation in the Old Testament, the Pharisees of the Gospels, or the Judaizers in Galatians and elsewhere.[1]

In other places, Paul does speak positively of the Law as that which directs toward life (ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωὴν, Rom 7:10); that which is holy, just and good (ἡ ἐντολὴ ἁγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή, Rom 7:12); that which is spiritual (πνευματικός, Rom 7:14); and as that which is not opposed to the promises of God (κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν, Gal 3:21). However, this does not prevent Paul's remarks in 2 Corinthians 3 from describing the Law rather than some abberation of it. The Law, as an expression of divine revelation for the nation, is all that the apostle declares it is. Paul can describe it as appointed of God to be the nation's guide (παιδαγωγὸς, Gal 3:24); to function as its guardian and manager (ἐπιτρόπους, οἰκονόμους, Gal 4:2); and to bring Israel to faith in Christ

---

[1]See Barrett, Second Corinthians, pp. 112-14. He states that "'letter' thus points to the way in which (in Paul's view) many of his Jewish contemporaries understood the law on which their religion was based, and through this to man-made religion in general, whether legalistic or antinomian and mystical " (p. 113).
See also Cranfield who, commenting on Rom 7:6 and the use of γράμματος in a similar context, adds that Paul "does not use 'letter' as a simple equivalent of 'the law.' . . . 'Letter' is rather what the legalist is left with as a result of his misunderstanding and misuse of the law. It is the letter of the law in separation from the Spirit. But, 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" (Romans, 1:339-40).

(γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν, Gal 3:24).

At the same time, the Law as divine revelation, given to the nation, entails moral obligation. For this reason, it also has a negative side since the Law requires an obedience from its recipients that it does not provide. As such, it is described as operating on a different principle from the gospel (Gal.3:12); as being unable to make alive (ὁ δυνάμενος ζῳοποιῆσαι, Gal 3:21); as bringing a curse (τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου, Gal 3:13); and as condemning and killing (εἰς θάνατον, Rom 7:10; cf. Eph 2:15 and Col 2:14).[1]

The three passages most commonly used in defending the first view are Romans 2:27-29; 7:6; and 9:30-32. In Romans 7:6, it is assumed that two approaches to the Law are contrasted: one with the Spirit and one apart from the Spirit.[2] This presupposes a distinction between the νόμος in verse 6 and the νόμος in verse 7. The νόμος in verse 6 is that from which Paul's readers had been released (κατηργήθημεν), described as γράμματος ("letter"), in opposition to πνεύματος ("Spirit"). It is

---

[1]Hodge, Second Corinthians, pp. 56-58; Kent, II Corinthians, p. 59; and Bruce, 1 and 2 Corinthians, p. 190. Bruce notes how Paul's understanding of the Law differs from that of the rabbis who viewed the Law as that by which life was gained. See Johannes A. Huntjens, "Contrasting Notions of Covenant and Law in the Texts of Qumran," RevQ 8 (March 1974):379; and E. P. Sanders, "The Covenant as a Soteriological Category and the Nature of Salvation in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism," in Jews, Greek and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity, eds. R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs (Leiden: E. J. Brill 1976), p. 40.

Hughes says the Law was not designed to kill. On the contrary, the keeping of the law is the way of life and love, Rom 10:5; 13:10 (Second Corinthians, p. 102). Clearly, sin is the cause of the death which the Law brings (Rom 7:9, 10), but it is also sin that prevents the Law from being a true means of achieving life (as Hughes later admits, pp. 103-104).

[2]Provence, "Who is Sufficient," pp. 64-66.

legalism.

In verse 7, though, νόμος is said to be the Law as intended by God and described in verse 12 as holy, just, and good. This attempt to distinguish the two uses of νόμος in 7:6,7 is unsatisfactory. The reason Paul asks the question in verse 7, ὁ νόμος ἁμαρτία("Is the Law sin?"), is that his previous statement in verse 6 concerning the Law (τοῦ νόμου) has raised it. If νόμος in verse 6 refers to legalism, his question in verse 7 would then be this: Is legalism sin? Furthermore, in verse 13 the Law which is called "good" (ἀγαθον) is also said to have wrought death (διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μοι κατεργαζομένη θάνατον). If, as in verse 12, the law in verse 13 is the true Law, why is it said to work death? If it is the same Law as in verse 6 (i.e., legalism), why is it called good?[1]

While both Romans 2:27-29 and 9:30-32 have been interpreted as distinguishing between two approaches to the Law, neither substantiates the position espoused by the first view. Romans 9:30-32 appears to make a distinction between pursuing the Law by faith and by works. The latter, it is held, represents legalism. This distinction is in appearance only. According to verses 30 and 31, the real distinction lies between faith righteousness and law righteousness. There is a righteousness which is gained through the Law, but it is not equivalent to the righteousness of God received by faith (cf. 10:5,6, taking the

---

[1]Hughes (Second Corinthians, pp. 55-56) concludes that γράμματος in all of these passages does not mean "legalism," but refers to the Law as given to Moses. It is called γράμματος because (1) it was written, (2) external, and (3) objective. It held up a standard and demanded obedience but did not provide the disposition nor the ability to obey.

δὲ as disjunctive).[1] Nothing is said about two approaches to the Law.

In Romans 2:27-29 a similar distinction has been argued between keeping the Law by the Spirit and keeping it by the letter (ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι, verse 29). Again, this interpretation is not supported by the text. The distinction in these verses is not between two uses of the Law, but between two kinds of circumcision: a circumcision accomplished according to the Law and one accomplished by the Spirit (καὶ περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι).[2] None of these passages, as has been shown, support two approaches to the Law. Neither do they demand that Paul, when speaking critically of νόμος, must have in view something other than the Law as given by God.[3]

---

[1] Schrenk (TDNT, "δίκη," 2:202) concurs, saying that there is a legal righteousness (i.e., that which can be gained through keeping the Law), but that this cannot be equal to the righteousness of God which comes by faith.

[2] Schrenk, regarding Rom 2:28-29, states this: "The antithesis is absolute insofar as the γράμμα can never accomplish what is done by the πνεῦμα. What is merely written does not have the power to produce observance. It is not even remotely suggested that the πνεῦμα might use the γράμμα to bring about observance. The whole point of the argument . . . is that the Spirit alone makes possible the true circumcision and true observance which the Jew cannot achieve by his Holy Scriptures" (TDNT, s.v. "γράμμα," 1:766).
Remarking on 2 Cor 2:6-18, he adds the following: "Neither here nor in R 7 can this killing be attributed only to a false use of the Bible or the Law. As always when Paul speaks radically of the negative operation of the Law, he is thinking in terms of divine purpose. The disposing of God is with a view to the exercise of judgment by Scripture as Law. What is merely written or prescribed can only kill" (ibid., 1:767). See also NIDNTT, "Scripture," 3:493; Westerholm "Letter and Spirit," pp. 240-41; and TDNT, s.v. "ἐλεύθερος," by Heinrich Schlier, 2:497-502. Schlier provides an extended excursus on the New Testament concept of freedom from the Law.

[3] A partial listing of recent works on the Law and its use in the New Testament which have not already been mentioned includes the following: Robert J. Banks, Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1975); F. F. Bruce, "Christ as Conqueror and Reconciler: Part 4 of Colossian Problems," BSac 141

Summary

Having examined the three references to the new covenant in the Pauline corpus, the following conclusions have been drawn: (1) The new covenant provides for the future deliverance of national Israel. This deliverance is accomplished through a savior; it encompasses the nation as a whole; it involves the forgiveness of sins and a removal of ungodliness; and it follows the present period of Gentile salvation. (2) The new covenant is something with which the believers in the present age are associated. They participate in the forgiveness provided through the death of Christ. Their observance of the Lord's Supper serves as a reminder not only of His death, but also of His promised return. (3) The

(October-December 1985):291-302; idem, "Paul and the Law of Moses," BJRL 57 (Spring 1975):259-279; D. A. Carson, The Sermon on the Mount: An Evangelical Exposition of Matthew 5-7 (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978); Roger D. Congdon, "Did Jesus Sustain the Law in Matthew 5?" BSac 135 (April-June 1978):117-125; Charles H. Cosgrove, "Mosaic Law Preaches Faith: A Study in Galatians 3," WTJ 41 (Fall 1978):146-164; C. E. B. Cranfield, "St. Paul and the Law," SJT 17 (March 1964):43-68; W. D. Davies, Jewish and Pauline Studies (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984); C. H. Dodd, "New Testament Translation Problems, II," BT 28 (June 1977): 101-116; James D. G. Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul," BJRL 65 (Spring 1983):95-122; idem, "Works of the Law and the Curse of the Law (Galatians 3.10-14," NTS 31 (October 1985):523-42; Daniel P. Fuller, Gospel and Law: Contrast or Continuum? The Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism and Covenant Theology (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1980); idem, "Paul and the Works of the Law," WTJ 38 (Fall 1975):28-42; Robert A. Guelich, The Sermon on the Mount: A Foundation for Understanding (Waco: Word Books, 1982); Hans Hübner, Law in Paul's Thought, trans. James C. G. Greit, ed. John Riches, in Studies of the New Testament and Its World, ed. John Riches (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1984); Alan E. Johnson, "Jesus and Moses: Rabbinic Backgrounds and Exegetical Concerns in Matthew 5 as Crucial to the Theological Foundations of Christian Ethics," in The Living and Active Word of God: Studies in Honor of Samuel J. Schultz, eds. M. Inch and R. Youngblood (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983); Walter C. Kaiser, "Leviticus 18:5 and Paul: Do This and You Shall Live (Eternally?)," JETS 14 (Winter 1971):19-28; Mark W. Karlberg, "Reformed Interpretation of the Mosaic Covenant," WTJ 43 (Fall 1980):1-57; Edvin Larsson, "Paul: Law and Salvation," NTS 31 (July 1985):425-36; Anne Lawton, "Christ: The End of the Law, A Study of Romans 10:4-8," TrinJ 3 (Spring 1974):14-30: Richard Longenecker,

new covenant is contrasted to the Mosaic covenant in terms of its ministry. The ministry connected with the new covenant is that in which Paul and others were engaged. It is a ministry empowered and made effective through the Spirit of God. In contrast to the Law, it brings life and righteousness, rather than condemnation and death. As a covenant, the new covenant continues while the old covenant does not. The new covenant is also imbued with greater glory than the old covenant.

Paul: Apostle of Liberty (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964); idem, "The Pedagogical Nature of the Law in Galatians 3:19-4:7," JETS 25 (March 1982):52-61; Alva J. McClain, Law and Grace (Winona Lake, IN: BMH Books, 1954); Neil J. McEleney, "The Principles of the Sermon on the Mount," CBQ 41 (October 1979):552-70; Brice Martin, "Paul on Christ and the Law," JETS 26 (September 1983):271-82; Douglas J. Moo, "Review of Gospel and Law: Contrast or Continuum? The Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism and Covenant Theology, by Daniel P. Fuller," TrinJ 3 (Spring 1982):99-103; idem, "Jesus and the Authority of the Mosaic Law," JSNT 20 (February 1984):3-49; idem, "'Law,' 'Works of the Law,' and Legalism in Paul," WTJ 45 (Spring 1983):73-100; idem, "Review of Paul and the Law, by Heikki Räisänen; and Paul, the Law and the Jewish People, by E. P. Sanders," TrinJ 5 (Spring 1984):92-99; Martin Noth, The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies, trans. D. R. AP-Thomas (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1966); J. Dwight Pentecost, "The Purpose of the Law," BSac 128 (July-September 1971):227-33; idem, The Sermon on the Mount: Contemporary Insights for a Christian Lifestyle, 2d ed. (Portland: Multnomah Press, 1980); Heikki Räisänen, "Galatians 2:16 and Paul's Break with Judaism," NTS 31 (October 1985):343-553; C. Thomas Rhyne, "Νόμος Δικαιοσύνης and the Meaning of Romans 10:4," CBQ 47 (July 1985):486-99; Charles C. Ryrie, "The End of the Law," BSac 124 (July-September 1967):239-47; E. P. Sanders, Paul, the Law and the Jewish People (Philadelphia: Fortress, Press, 1983); William R. Schoedel, "Pauline Thought: Some Basic Issues," in Transitions in Biblical Scholarship, ed. J. C. Rylaarsdam, in vol. 6 of Essays in Divinity, ed. J. C. Brauer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968); Thomas R. Schreiner, "Paul and Perfect Obedience to the Law: An Evaluation of the View of E. P. Sanders," WTJ 47 (Fall 1985):245-78; Joseph B. Tyson, "'Works of the Law' in Galatians," JBL 92 (September 1973): 423-31; and Stephen Westerholm, "The Law and the 'Just Man' (I Tim 1, 3-11)," ST 36 (1982):79-95.

CHAPTER III

THE NEW COVENANT IN HEBREWS

Introduction

The only other references to a new or future covenant in the
New Testament occur in Hebrews: 7:22; 8:6-13; 9:15; 10:15-18, 29; 12:24;
and 13:20. As has been the established pattern with the previous chap-
ters, the procedure followed is to consider the introductory matters of
the epistle before giving a detailed exegesis of the specific passages.

Provenance

Although an interesting issue, the question of authorship is
not germane to this study. The evidence available, particularly the
internal evidence, for identifying the author from among the many that
have been suggested is altogether too inconclusive to be able to make a
reasonably confident choice. Under the circumstances, it is best to
agree with Origen that the author is anonymous.[1]

---

[1]This is the advice of the majority of those writing on the
question. In addition to Guthrie, New Testament Introduction,
pp. 685-98; and Hiebert, Introduction, 3:71-81, see F. F. Bruce, The
Epistle to the Hebrews: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition,
and Notes, NICNT, ed. F. F. Bruce (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub-
lishing Co., 1964), pp. xxxv-xlii; and Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, A Com-
mentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans
Publishing Co., 1977), p. 19. Hughes remarks that "the absence both of
solid testimony, internal or external, and of any firm tradition means
that, as things are, the riddle of the authorship of Hebrews is incapable
of solution."
The question of the original language of the epistle is not
a concern in this study. The prevailing opinion among those treating
the question is that the canonical document does not give evidence of
being a translation. See Brooke Foss Westcott, The Epistle to the

As with the other introductory areas of the epistle, the issues
concerned with its provenance are the subjects of an ongoing debate.
Despite objections, it is concluded here that the epistle was written
before the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple by Titus in 70 A.D.
Furthermore, it was written to Jewish Christians who in all probability
were residing somewhere in the Diaspora.[1]

The occasion and purpose for writing the epistle were to encourage
converts from Judaism to grow in their profession of faith, regardless
of the increasing pressures brought to bear upon them by those outside
the Christian community.[2] At the same time, the epistle was also written

---

Hebrews: The Greek Text with Notes and Essays (reprint ed., Grand
Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974), pp. xxxii-xxxv; and
Bruce, Hebrews, p. xxxvi, note 60.

[1] See Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, pp. 698-700, 711-15;
Hiebert, Introduction, pp. 81-86, 88-89; Bruce, Hebrews, pp. xlii-xliv;
and Hugh Montefiore, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews,
Black's New Testament Commentaries, ed. Henry Chadwick (London: Adam
and Charles Black, 1964), p. 3. Montefiore concludes that had the
epistle been written after 70 A. D., the argument in which the AH
contrasts the two priestly ministries--Christ's and Aaron's--would
have become irrelevant. Furthermore, the best argument for the super-
session of the old covenant would have been the destruction of the
Temple. Against, see Kümmel, Introduction, pp. 398-402; and, in part,
Hughes, Hebrews, pp. 15-19.
The conclusion drawn involves the question of the title Πρὸς
Ἑβραίους ("to [the] Hebrews"). However, although attested early, it
was not part of the original document and cannot be determinative in
deciding the issue of the recipients. Bruce, Hebrews, pp. xxiii-xxv;
and Leon Morris, "Hebrews," in EBC, ed. Frank E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids:
Zondervan Publishing House, 1981), 12:4-5.
The relationship between the readers and the Essenes of Qumran
is contested. See Montefiore, Hebrews, pp. 16-18; and Bruce, Hebrews,
pp. xxvii-xxx. It is best to decide that whatever similarities exist
between the readers and Qumran are because of their common Jewish back-
ground. Bruce prefers to label the readers simply as having belonged to
non-conforming Judaism (ibid). In terms of the new covenant, Hughes notes
that although the Qumran community was looking for a new covenant, theirs
was really a renewal of the old and not Jeremiah's (Hebrews, pp. 303-304).

[3] Merrill C. Tenney, "A New Approach to the Book of Hebrews,"

to warn converts of the dangers involved should they fail to progress in their Christian experience.[1]

Text

Textual matters are discussed when appropriate in the exegesis of the pertinent passages.[2] The AH, when using the Old Testament, generally follows the LXX version, though he frequently chooses the particular reading that best serves his purposes.[3]

BSac 123 (July-September 1966):235-36.

[1]See Guthrie, _New Testament Introduction_, pp. 703-710; Hiebert, _Introduction_, pp. 86-88; R. C. H. Lenski, _The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistle of James_ (reprint ed., Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1966), p. 12; and Bruce, _Hebrews_, p. xxvi. Guthrie identifies the apostasy against which the readers are warned as a reembracing of Judaism (_The Letter to the Hebrews: An Introduction and Commentary_, TNTC, ed. Leon Morris [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1983], pp. 31-38).

[2]See Westcott, _Hebrews_, pp. xv-xxvi; and James Moffatt, _A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews_, ICC, ed. Alfred Plummer (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1924), pp. lxiv-lxxiii, for a compilation of the available textual data on specific textual issues.

[3]G. Howard ("Hebrews and the Old Testament Quotations," _NovT_ 10 [1968]:208-216) demurs, concluding that in the majority of instances the AH follows neither the MT nor the LXX and at times even prefers the MT over the LXX. See also J. C. McCullough, "The Old Testament Quotations in Hebrews," _NTS_ 26 (April 1980):364; Richard Reid, "The Use of the Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Th.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, n.d.), pp. 52-53; and George Wesley Buchanan, _To The Hebrews: Translation, Comment and Conclusions_, AB, eds. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1972), pp. xxvii-xxix. Buchanan notes the freedom the AH exercises in his representing the Old Testament. When using the LXX, it is generally recognized that the AH follows a text similar to that of A or B. See Bruce, _Hebrews_, p. xlix; and Kenneth J. Thomas, "The Old Testament Citations in Hebrews," _NTS_ 11 (July 1965): 310.
Several monographs written in recent years have compared the AH's use of the Old Testament with Philo and the Alexandrian school. A growing consensus favors distinguishing the two. Ronald Williamson (_Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews_ [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970]) comments concerning Hebrews 8:5: "There is no trace in the verse, or indeed anywhere else in the Epistle, of the fundamental attitudes or

Greater Context

There have been considerable differences in the attempts to

identify the structure employed by the AH in the development of his

---

convictions which constitute Platonism either in its original or in its
Philonic form" (p. 557). On the relationship between the AH and Philo,
he adds that the AH "differs radically from the outlook and attitude of
Philo. Neither in his basic judgment about the essential character of
the O. T. nor in his chief method of scriptural exegesis does the writer
of Hebrews appear to owe anything to Philo" (p. 538).

In a similar vein, Charles Carlston provides the following
summary: "[1] The 'Platonic' cosmology is central to the author's
thought. It enables him to conceive of a contrast between heavenly and
earthly realms and, by placing Jewish ordinances in the earthly realm,
to make them at once good and yet imperfect. [2] Nevertheless, the
Christian kerygma has modified this scheme in many ways. The 'hor-
izontal' eschatology of primitive Christian preaching is crucial in
the warning about holding fast to the end and in the promise of
Christ's coming (9:20). The heavenly sacrifice, the heavenly taber-
nacle, the heavenly high priesthood are all understood in Christianized
Platonic terms as Christ, in his death, is seen as having offered
a once-for-all sacrifice in the heavenly temple. It would be hard to
imagine anything more foreign to Philo's mode of thought. [3] Finally,
crucial Philonic emphases are missing: the interest in philosophy, the
notion of progress in virtue, the strong or the ethical, and a sense of
'training' or pedagogy. [4] In short, the unknown author of Hebrews
lived in the same generally 'Platonic' world as Philo. But as the
analysis of perfection makes clear, they were citizens of quite different
countries" ("The Vocabulary of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews," in Unity
and Diversity in New Testament Theology: Essays in Honor of George E.
Ladd, ed. R. A. Guelich [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.,
1978], p. 148).

A select bibliography of the issues involved includes the fol-
lowing: George Eldon Ladd, A Theology of the New Testament (Grand Rapids:
Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974), pp. 572-77; C. Spicq, L'Epitre
aux Hébreux: II, Commentaire, EBib (Paris: Gabalda, 1952), pp. 39-87;
C. K. Barrett, "The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews," in The
Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, eds. W. D. Davies
and D. Daube (Cambridge, England: University Press, 1956), pp. 363-93;
Sidney G. Sowers, The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews: A Comparison
of the Interpretation of the Old Testament in Philo Judaeus and the
Epistle to the Hebrews, Basel Studies of Theology, ed. Faculty of Theo-
logy, Basel (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1965), pp. 1-137; Markus Barth,
"The Old Testament in Hebrews, An Essay in Biblical Hermeneutics," in
Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Otto
A. Piper, eds. W. Klassen and G. F. Snyder (New York: Harper and
Brothers, Publishers, 1962), pp. 53-78; George B. Caird, "The Exegetical
Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews," CJT 5 (January 1959):44-51; and
Romald H. Nash, "The Notion of Mediator in Alexandrian Judaism and the

argument.[1] The parenetic sections within the course of the author's
argument have led some to conclude that the epistle originally was a
homily which was subsequently reworked and put into its canonical form.[2]
Whatever the background of the epistle may have been, the epistle itself
follows the frequently employed structure in which the author presents
his argument in the first part of the letter (1:1-10:18) and in the
latter portion (10:19-13:17) draws conclusions in applying the material
presented in the first part. Describing the demarcation of the epistle
in this fashion does not rule out the presence of hortatory sections in
the first ten chapters (e.g., 5:11-6:12). It does indicate that Hebrews
is divided at 10:19 between the author's presentation of his argument and
the formal application of it. Furthermore, without overlooking the dif-
ficulties associated with outlining the epistle, the conclusion is that
the argument of Hebrews centers on showing the superiority of Christ and
particularly of his priesthood to the Old Testament and the Levitical
system.[3]

Epistle to the Hebrews," WTJ 40 (Fall 1977):92-94. Buchanan (Hebrews,
pp. xix-xxx) views Hebrews from the perspective of Rabbinic midrash,
concluding that it was this approach that characterized the AH's treat-
ment of the Old Testament.

[1]See Kümmel, Introduction, pp. 389-90.

[2]See Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, pp. 724-27; Bruce,
Hebrews, pp. xlvii-xlviii; Morris, "Hebrews," pp. 3-4; Goppelt, Theology,
2:240-42. Against, see Moffatt, Hebrews, pp. xxvii-xxx. A. H. McNeile
(An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament, 2d ed., rev. C. S. C.
Williams [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953], pp. 225-29) presents an
elaborate outline of the epistle based on the formal divisions of a
discourse as employed by ancient rhetoricians.

[3]Hughes, Hebrews, pp. 2-4. On the pitfalls in developing the
structure of the epistle, Kümmel remarks as follows: "Although the
author has without doubt carefully planned the structure of his writing,
the arrangement that he has in mind is not readily to be perceived, and

Interpretation

Hebrews 7:22

Nearer context

The first occurrence of the term διαθήκη is found in Hebrews 7:22. In chapter 7 the AH is showing the superiority of Christ in His role as high priest. He does this by drawing a contrast between the Levitical priesthood and the Melchizedekian. He argues that the Melchizedekian order is superior to the Levitical, and since Christ is a priest after the order of Melchizedek, His is a superior priesthood. The chapter can be divided into two segments: the first, verses 1-10, in which Melchizedek is identified and his position as a priest of God is shown to be superior to that of the Levitical priests; and the second, verses 11-28, in which Christ is presented as a priest after the order of Melchizedek and his priesthood is consequently shown to be both different from and superior to the Levitical order.[1]

The second segment, verse 11-28, can, in turn, be divided into two paragraphs. The first, verses 11-19, is composed of two elements, verses 11-14 and 15-19. In the former, the priesthood of Christ is presented as different from that of the Levitical, necessitating a change

---

as a result, there are a multitude of proposed outlines for the writing" (Introduction, p. 390).

In support of the two-part division of the epistle and of the controlling theme of the first section, the superiority of Christ, see Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, pp. 710, 728-33. He concludes this: "The positive knowledge that the author aims to show the all-sufficiency and supremacy of Christ over other agencies and His complete fulfillment of the Jewish ritual system enables an intelligent interpretation of the argument, even if a more precise understanding of the readers' circumstances would throw added light upon certain obscurities in the statements made" (p. 710).

[1]See Westcott, Hebrews, p. 210.

in the legislation with which the priesthood is associated. In the latter, Christ's priesthood is argued to be better than the Levitical in that it was founded not on the basis of the Law, but on the basis of His eternal life.

The second paragraph, verses 20-28, consists of three elements in which the AH provides corroborating evidence in support of the superior nature of Christ's priestly office. In verses 20-22, this superiority is defended in that Christ's priesthood was ordained on the basis of a divine oath, whereas the Levitical was not. In verses 23-24 Christ's superiority is shown in that his ministry as a priest is not interrupted by death, as was the case of the Levitical priest. Finally, in verses 26-28 the superiority of Christ's priesthood is proved on the basis that it was established upon a better sacrifice than that of the Levitical system.[1]

The covenant reference is found in the initial section of the second paragraph, verse 20-22. Verse 20 begins with the construction καὶ καθ' ὅσον ("and inasmuch as") which, when used in connection with the construction κατὰ τοσοῦτο καὶ ("by so much also") in verse 22, indicates that its clause is in correlation to the clause in verse 22.[2] The initial constructions are used in the two verses as adverbs of degree.

---

[1] Similarly, Westcott, Hebrews, pp. 180-83; Guthrie, Hebrews, pp. 52-55; Hughes, Hebrews, p. 267; Morris, "Hebrews," pp. 69-73; and Simon J. Kistemaker, New Testament Commentary: Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), pp. 19,200-205. Buchanan attempts to identify an inclusion in verses 20-28 around the term ὁρκωμοσίας ("oath") (Hebrews, pp. 131-32).

[2] The καὶ in verse 22 is doubtful. See Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, eds., Novum Testamentum Graece, 26th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979), p. 572. Its presence or absence does not affect the relationship between verses 20 and 22.

Their correlation indicates that verse 20 is presented as support for verse 22. To the degree that the statement in verse 20 is true, to the same degree the statement in verse 22 is true.[1]

Because of this relationship between the initial clause in verse 20 and the clause in verse 22, the intervening statements, including verses 20b and 21, are to be viewed as a parenthesis. They provide confirmation (γὰρ) regarding the initial statement in verse 20a. Verse 20a states that Christ's appointment as a priest was confirmed by an oath. This, according to verses 20b-21a, was in contrast to the Levitical priests (οἱ μὲν γὰρ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας . . . ὁ δὲ μετὰ ὁρκωμοσίας, "For they indeed without an oath . . . but he with an oath"). In verse 21b the AH quotes, for the second time in the chapter, Psalm 110:4, in this instance to verify that Christ's appointment is based on God's promise and guarantees Christ's office as priest in perpetuity.[2] Having thus confirmed the statement in verse 20a, the AH then makes his corollary statement in verse 22.[3]

Exegesis

κρείττονος διαθήκης

Verse 22 consists of a single declarative clause, drawing a

---

[1]BAGD, p. 586. See also Gottlieb Lünemann, "Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Hebrews," trans. Maurice J. Evans, supple. Timothy Dwight, in vol. 9 of Meyer's Commentary on the New Testament (reprint ed., Winona Lake, IN: Alpha Publications, 1979), p. 570; Buchanan, Hebrews, p. 126; Morris, "Hebrews," p. 70; and Kistemaker, Hebrews, p. 201.

[2]Hughes, Hebrews, pp. 267-68; and Kistemaker, Hebrews, pp. 200-202.

[3]Lünemann, "Hebrews," pp. 570-71; and Kistemaker, Hebrews, p. 204.

conclusion based upon the superiority of Christ's priesthood. The
conclusion is that, as a consequence of his superior priesthood, Christ
has become the surety of a better covenant (κρείττονος διαθήκης γέγονεν
ἔγγυος).[1] The relationship between priesthood and covenant has already
been established in verses 11 and 12.[2] According to the AH, it was in
connection with the Levitical priesthood that the nation received the
Mosaic covenant or Law (νενομοθέτηται, verse 11). Furthermore, a change
in the priesthood necessitated (ἐξ ἀνάγκης, verse 12) a change in the
covenant.[3] Because Christ has been identified as having a priesthood
different from that of the Levites (cf. verses 13-16), the deduction is
that a different covenant must be involved. Therefore, the contrast
intended through the use of the comparative κρείττονος ("better") is
between the Law or old covenant with its Levitical priests and the
κρείττονος διαθήκης with Christ as priest.[4] Although at this point the
second covenant has not been identified, it is clear from the following
context, as will be seen, that it refers to Jeremiah's new covenant.[5]
ἔγγυος

In addition to describing this covenant as "better," the AH

---

[1]Hughes, Hebrews, p. 267. The perfect tense of γέγονεν indicates
that Christ's role as an ἔγγυος is not a future prospect, but a present
reality. Westcott, Hebrews, p. 189. Placing the subject nominative
Ἰησοῦς at the end of the verse next to the predicate ἔγγυος draws atten-
tion to Jesus as the one about whom the statement is predicated.
Montefiore, Hebrews, p. 128; and Bruce, Hebrews, p. 150.

[2]See Geerhardus Vos, Redemptive History and Biblical Interpre-
tation: The Shorter Writings of Geerhardus Vos, ed. R. B. Gaffin, Jr.
(Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1980),
pp. 134-35.

[3]Hughes, Hebrews, p. 297.   [4]Bruce, Hebrews, pp. 150-51.

[5]Guthrie, Hebrews, p. 166.

states that Christ is its ἔγγυος or guarantor. The term is not found

elsewhere in the New Testament and is not used in connection with

the Mosaic covenant. It is used outside of Scripture to refer to

one who acts as a guarantor, guaranteeing the stipulations of an agree-

ment, or to one who stands as security for an agreement.[1] The concept

as applied to Christ must be understood in these terms: It identifies

Christ as the one who guarantees the stipulations involved with the

better covenant.[2]

---

[1]Bruce, Hebrews, p. 151, note 70. Although it is found
only three times in the LXX (Sir 29:15, 16; and 2 Macc 10:28
[Hughes, Hebrews, p. 267; and TDNT, s.v. "ἔγγυος," by H. Preisker,
2:329]), it frequently occurs in the papyri, often in the sense of
one who accepts the obligation for payment in a bond, a guarantor.
See MM, p. 179.

[2]Geerhardus Vos, "The Priesthood of Christ in the Epistle
to the Hebrews," Princeton Theological Review 5 (July 1970):437.
Hughes concurs, seeing an intended contrast between the statement
in verse 18, "For there is an annulment of a foregoing commandment"
(ἀθέτησις μὲν γὰρ γίνεται προαγούσης ἐντολῆς), and the statement
in verse 22, "Jesus has become the surety of a better covenant"
(κρείττονος διαθήκης γέγονεν ἔγγυος Ἰησοῦς). The role of Jesus as
a surety (ἔγγυος) guarantees that there will be no setting aside
(ἀθέτησις) of that which pertains to the better covenant (κρείττονος
διαθήκης) as there was with the former (προαγούσης ἐντολῆς; cf. v. 19,
ὁ νόμος) (Hebrews, p. 267, note 32, and p. 268). Kistemaker adds this:
"The Aaronic priesthood was instituted by divine law; Christ's priest-
hood by divine oath. A law can be annulled; an oath lasts forever"
(Hebrews, p. 200; Exod 29:9 notwithstanding, p. 201).

On the relationship between ἔγγυος and μεσίτης, see the discus-
sion on 8:6 and the use of μεσίτης there. Several conclude that the
terms are to be understood here as synonymous. See, for example,
Moffatt, Hebrews, p. 100; Vos, Redemptive History, pp. 184-85; and
Kistemaker, Hebrews, pp. 201-202. However, as Bruce correctly observes,
the old covenant had a μεσίτης but not a ἔγγυος; that is, one who,
having brought the two parties together, could guarantee the fulfillment
of the covenant stipulations. He concludes this: "The ἔγγυος undertakes
a weightier responsibility than the μεσίτης . . .; he is answerable for
the fulfillment of the obligations which he guarantees" (Hebrews,
p. 151). See also Kent, Hebrews, pp. 137-38; and Morris, Preaching,
pp. 105-107.

As a guarantor for God, Christ assures the realization of the covenant promises; as a guarantor for man, He assures the satisfactory compliance of whatever obligations are involved.[1] In the immediate context, though, the focus is on his guaranteeing for man the divine promises associated with this covenant. Thus, the AH adds in verse 25 what Christ is able to accomplish for the ones who come to God through him: "wherefore also he is able to save completely" (ὅθεν καὶ σῴζειν εἰς τὸ παντελές).

<div align="center">Hebrews 8:6-13</div>

Nearer context

The second new convenant reference in Hebrews is the most extensive in the New Testament, beginning with 8:6 and running through 8:13. Chapter 8 continues the theme of the preceding chapters, showing the superiority of Christ's priestly office to that of the Levitical order.

The chapter can be divided into two paragraphs. The first involves verses 1-6 and develops the contrast between the Levitical ministry in the earthly tabernacle and Christ's in the heavenly. In that Christ's ministry is associated with the true tabernacle, it is shown to be superior to the Levitical (νυνὶ δὲ διαφορωτέρας τέτυχεν λειτουργίας, "But now he has obtained a more excellent ministry," verse 6). The second paragraph includes verses 7-13 and focuses attention on the better covenant in connection with which Christ functions as a priest. The

---

[1] Morris, "Hebrews," p. 70; Bruce, Hebrews, p. 151. Against, see Lenski, Hebrews and James, p. 235; Lünemann, "Hebrews," p. 572; and NIDNTT, s.v. "Covenant," by J. Guhrt and O. Becker, 1:372. Guhrt sees the ἔγγυος functioning on behalf of God for man only and not vice versa.

argument is that a better covenant with better promises demonstrates the superior nature of Christ's ministry to that of the Levites.[1]

Exegesis

Verse 6

Verse 6 serves a two-fold purpose. It makes a statement in support of the superiority of Christ's ministry over that of the Levites. At the same time, it allows for a transition from the location of that ministry (verses 1-5) to the covenant upon which it operates (verses 7-13). The point here is that a superior ministry necessitates a superior covenant.

The verse consists of three clauses: an initial declarative clause, followed by a correlative clause, and ending with a relative clause. These are treated in sequence, though it is the last two which develop the covenant concept and which are of import for this study.

νυνὶ δὲ . . . λειτουργίας. The combination νυνὶ δὲ, beginning verse 6, balances the μέν in verse 4, indicating that a logical contrast is intended here with verses 4 and 5. Verse 4 initiates the contrast by

---

[1]The divisions of the chapter, along with the themes, are those generally identified in the commentaries. See, for example, Buchanan, Hebrews, pp. 136, 139. He attempts to show an inclusion for both paragraphs, the first with the term λειτουργὸς (verses 2, 6) and the second with the term πρώτη (verses 7, 13).

There is some question concerning the sense of κεφάλαιον in verse 1. The term is given two interpretations. On the one hand, it can mean "chief" or "principal," indicating that what follows in chapter 8 develops the chief point of the preceding context. See Moffatt, Hebrews, p. 103; and Homer A. Kent, The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1972), pp. 145-46. On the other hand, it can also mean "summary," suggesting that in chapter 8 the AH is summarizing his argument from the preceding context. See Bruce, Hebrews, p. 161, note 1. The majority favors the former, though the evidence can be interpreted in favor of either.

introducing a premise in the form of a contrary-to-fact condition.[1] The premise is that if Christ were ministering on earth, he could not be a priest since the Law allows only Levites that privilege. However, since Christ's ministry is associated with the heavenly tabernacle, he is not disqualified. Furthermore, because of the superior place of his service, his is a superior ministry.[2]

The correlative particle ὅσῳ, joined by the adjunctive καί ("by so much also"), indicates that the AH sees a correlation between the superiority of Christ's ministry and the superior covenant under which his ministry functions. In other words, the former presupposes the latter.[3]

The expression κρείττονός . . . διαθήκης is identical to the expression previously discussed in 7:22. The immediate context removes any doubt that the better covenant in view is other than Jeremiah's new covenant, described by the AH in the quote from Jeremiah 31:31-34. This better covenant is contrasted in verse 7 to the first covenant (ἡ πρώτη).

---

[1]BDF, p. 182; and RG, pp. 1012-16.

[2]For a discussion of the minor textual questions in this clause, see Moffatt, Hebrews, p. 104. On the use of the construction νυνὶ δέ and the relationship between it and the εἰ μὲν οὖν of verse 4, see Lünemann, "Hebrews," p. 590; and Hughes, Hebrews, p. 295, note 15. Concerning the meaning of λειτουργίας, Montefiore notes that it is the term used in the LXX to describe the service of priests officiating in the Temple (cf. Num 7:5) (Hebrews, p. 133). H. Strathmann concurs, describing it as a technicus terminus when associated with priestly activities and the sacrificial rituals (TDNT, s.v. "λειτουργέω," by Strathmann and R. Meyer, 4:226). See also NIDNTT, s.v. "Serve," 3:552. Cf. Heb 10:10-11.

[3]The construction ὅσῳ καί , as Lünemann notes, is employed here to show that in the mind of the AH, there is a natural and necessary correspondence between the superior ministry and the superior covenant with which it is associated ("Hebrews," p. 591).

In verse 13 the contrast is stated to be between the first (τὴν πρώτην) and the new (καινὴν).[1] Since the quote from Jeremiah 31 is placed between these statements, the designation "first" must refer to the Mosaic covenant and the "better" to the new.

The only change of note between this clause and 7:22 is the replacement of ἔγγυος with μεσίτης. The term μεσίτης ("mediator") is common in covenantal contexts, being used, for example, of Moses in connection with the old covenant (cf. Gal 3:19). It describes the function of one who acts as an intermediary between the parties of an agreement. Just as Moses was the intermediary for the old covenant, so Christ is the intermediary for the new.[2]

However, there is a distinction between what Moses was able to accomplish as the mediator of the old covenant and what Christ accomplished as the mediator of the new. Moses, as a mediator, was instrumental in the transmission of the old covenant, functioning as the appointed representative for both God and the nation. Christ's mediatorial ministry goes beyond this. Christ, through his own death, was also involved in providing the very basis upon which the new covenant

---

[1]Wilhelm Michaelis notes that πρώτη is used here in a relative sense, meaning "former," rather than in an absolute sense, meaning "first." It is the former covenant which is contrasted to the latter (δευτέρας) (TDNT, s.v. "πρῶτος," 6:866). This can also be seen in verse 13 where the contrast is between the old (παλαιούμενον) and the new (καινὴν). See also NIDNTT, s.v. "First," by K. H. Bartels, 1:666.

[2]TDNT, s.v. "μεσίτης," by A. Oepke, 4:611-12. Oepke recognizes that μεσίτης and ἔγγυος can be used synonymously of a guarantor, but also acknowledges that μεσίτης can go beyond this in that it can denote the one who accomplishes what the ἔγγυος simply guarantees (p. 620). Against, see Guhrt and Becker who see a basic equivalence in the two terms in Hebrews (NIDNTT, s.v. "Covenant," 1:375).

is effected.[1] While the AH does not bring out here this relationship between Christ's sacrifice and His role as a covenant mediator, he does develop this relationship in the following chapter, discussed below.

ἥτις ἐπὶ . . . νενομοθέτηται. The last clause in this verse, introduced by the indefinite relative pronoun ἥτις, functions as a causal clause, giving the reason why the covenant in view is superior. It is superior because it is founded upon better promises (ἐπὶ κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις).[2]

The nature of these promises is not developed by the AH at this point, although the quote from Jeremiah 31:31-34 suggests what is involved. Instead, the AH focuses in the following chapters on the sacrifice of Christ upon which the covenant with its better promises is secured.

The only concern at this juncture is the meaning of the verb νενομοθέτηται. Its subject is the indefinite relative pronoun ἥτις. Although the antecedent to the pronoun could be the λειτουργίας in the initial clause of the verse, the subsequent context and the connection between covenant and promise clearly favors the closer substantive διαθήκης as the intended antecedent.[3]

---

[1]Oscar Cullman, The Christology of the New Testament, rev. ed., trans. S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall, New Testament Library, eds. A. Richardson et al. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959), pp. 90-92; Donald Guthrie, New Testament Theology (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1981), pp. 482-83; and Bruce, Hebrews, pp. 167-68. Oepke notes that Christ's mediation entailed his mediatorial death as that which made possible the relationship intended by the covenant (TDNT, s.v. "μεσίτης," 4:620).

[2]Lünemann, "Hebrews," p. 591; and Kistemaker, Hebrews, p. 223.

[3]See Hughes, Hebrews, p. 297, note 18. For λειτουργίας as the antecedent, see TDNT, s.v. "νόμος," 4:1090.

In the passive voice, as here, νενομοθέτηται has two basic meanings: to give law(s); or to enact according to law, to settle legally.[1] Although the former is generally regarded as the correct sense in 7:11 where it is used in connection with the old covenant and the giving of laws, the latter is preferred for its use in this verse. The reason is that, unlike the Mosaic, there are no specific obligations mentioned in connection with the new.[2] The thought is that the better covenant is legally enacted on the basis of or in connection with better promises.[3] The use of the perfect tense indicates that the better covenant has already been enacted and continues to be in force.[4]

Verses 7-8a

These verses, together with those which follow, advance the contrast begun in verse 6 between the better covenant (κρείττονός . . . διαθήκης) and its counterpart. Verse 7 consists of a contrary-to-fact

---

[1]Ibid.; Harm W. Hollander, "Hebrews 7.11 and 8.6: A Suggestion for the Translation of nenomothetētai epi," BT 30 (April 1978): 246-47.

[2]See, for example, Montefiore, Hebrews, p. 139; and TDNT, s.v "νόμος," 4:1090.

[3]On the use of ἐπὶ, see Lünemann, "Hebrews," p. 591; and TDNT, "νόμος," 4:1090.

[4]The two perfects employed in the verse (τέτυχεν and νενομοθέτηται) could be understood as taking place at the same time. That is, they both began simultaneously. However, all that the context demands is that both Christ's ministry and the better covenant with which it is associated be already in effect. The analogy of the Mosaic covenant suggests that the ministry is derived from and is therefore subsequent to the covenant, although some argue on the basis of 7:11 ("For on the basis of it [the Levitical priesthood] the people received the Law") that the opposite is true. In other words, the priesthood is anterior to the covenant, the latter being provided as the vehicle through which the former is expressed and regulated. See p. 215.

conditional clause.[1] In it, the AH states a premise and then makes an assertion based upon this premise. The conditional construction employed indicates that both the premise and the assertion are contrary to fact; i.e., the AH denies the validity of both.

The premise is that the first covenant was faultless (ἄμεμπτος). The assertion is that, as a consequence, there was no need for the seeking of its replacement. In effect, the AH is saying that the first covenant was not perfect, and, for this very reason, an occasion (τόπος) for a second covenant was sought.[2] While it is true that the fault lay not so much in the covenant as in the condition of those to whom it was given, nevertheless, because the covenant could not overcome that condition, the AH views it as being deficient.[3] The use of the imperfect ἐξητεῖτο suggests that the seeking of a second covenant was not something contemporaneous to the AH and his readers, but to those in the Old Testament who were associated with the first covenant.[4] Confirmation of this lack and the consequential need for the seeking of a second covenant is presented in verses 8-12. In 8a the AH states specifically through the construction μεμφόμενος γὰρ ("for finding fault") that a fault was

---

[1]Kistemaker, Hebrews, p. 229.

[2]See TDNT, s.v. "τόπος," by Helmut Köster, 8:206. Westcott translates τόπος in the sense of "room" or "opportunity" (Hebrews, p. 220). Kistemaker explains τόπος as referring to an "occasion" in the history of redemption (Hebrews, p. 229).

[3]Westcott (Hebrews, p. 219) describes the fault as the first covenant's inability to fulfill its purpose. According to 7:18-19, the Law could not make perfect (i.e., justify) its recipient. As a consequence, there was the need for bringing in that which provided a better hope where the individual could draw near to God. See also Montefiore, Hebrews, p. 140. Against, see NIDNTT, s.v. "Guilt," by C. Brown et al., 2:145.

[4]Westcott, Hebrews, p. 220.

found with the first covenant. In verses 8b-12 he then documents that a second covenant was anticipated by drawing upon the new covenant pericope from Jeremiah 31.

It has already been supported that ἡ πρώτη in verse 7 refers to the Mosaic covenant and that δευτέρας must also be understood as a reference to the new covenant in Jeremiah 31. The only concern in 8a is the textual question of whether to read the accusative αὐτοὺς or the dative αὐτοῖς. The evidence is fairly evenly divided. The verb μεμφόμενος can take an object in either case, assuming the pronoun functions as an object.[1] If the dative αὐτοῖς is read, there is the additional possibility that the pronoun is not modifying the participle but the verb λέγει.[2] If taken with the participle, the thought would be that the fault lay with the recipients of the old covenant ("finding fault with **them**") and not necessarily with the covenant itself. If taken with λέγει ("he says to **them**"), the thought would be that it was to the recipients of the old covenant that a reference to a new was made.[3] The evidence is too inconclusive to make a reasonably confident decision. Fortunately, whichever is preferred does not affect the identification of the covenant.

Verses 8b-12

In support of his point that the first covenant was not perfect, and, as a consequence, there was promised to those under it a second covenant, the AH quotes _in extenso_ the new covenant pericope recorded in

---

[1]Moffatt, _Hebrews_, p. 108; and Kistemaker, _Hebrews_, p. 224.

[2]Lünemann, "Hebrews," p. 592.

[3]Hughes, _Hebrews_, pp. 298-99, note 19.

Jeremiah 31:31-34.[1] Although some hold that the AH, in quoting from
Jeremiah 31, is attempting to support the better promises mentioned in
verse 6, this does not seem to be the point of the argument. While it
is true that the better promises are at least partially presented in
this passage from Jeremiah, this is not the focus of attention in the
immediate context. By referring to Jeremiah 31, the AH is attempting
to demonstrate that a new covenant was anticipated by those to whom the
first covenant had been given.[2] Therefore, it is not the promises per se
upon which the AH is concentrating in the immediate context, but on
the fact that those who were under the first covenant had been promised
a new covenant.[3]

Because of this emphasis, the AH does not dwell on the promises
in the new covenant passage in the following verses. He only mentions
the fact that a promised new covenant necessarily makes the old temporary
and ultimately obsolete. For this reason, it is unnecessary to give a
detailed treatment of the passage itself. This has already been accom-
plished in conjunction with the chapter on Jeremiah 31:31-34.[4] Further,

---

[1]See Bruce, Hebrews, p. 168; Kistemaker, Hebrews, p. 223; Lüne-
mann, "Hebrews," p. 591; Moffatt, Hebrews, p. 107

[2]See Buchanan, Hebrews, p. 137; Morris, "Hebrews," p. 77;
David Peterson, "The Prophecy of the New Covenant in the Argument
of Hebrews," RTR 38 (September-December 1979):74-81; idem, Hebrews
and Perfection: An Examination of the Concept of Perfection in the
Epistle to the Hebrews (Cambridge, England: University Press, 1982),
p. 132.

[3]Further confirmation that this is his emphasis is brought out in
verse 13 where the AH does not mention the promises themselves, but only
that a promised new covenant makes the old obsolete and, by implication,
inferior. Morris, "Hebrews," p. 79. See the discussion on verse 13.

[4]For a summary of the specific promises, see Bruce, Hebrews,
pp. 172-76.

it makes whatever textual divergencies there are between the LXX tradition of Jeremiah 31:31-34 and the AH's use of this passage somewhat irrelevant.[1] Ultimately, it is not to the promises themselves, but to the fact that a new covenant had been promised, that the AH is calling attention in the quotation.

Verse 13

With verse 13 the AH restates his point concerning the nature of the first covenant in light of this promise of a new covenant. The verse consists of a declarative statement, making an assertion about the first covenant. It is preceded by a temporal infinitive clause and followed by an explanatory clause, drawing out an implication from the initial assertion.

ἐν τῷ λέγειν . . . πρώτην. When referring to the Old Testament, the AH consistently portrays God as its author. As such, it can be assumed in this verse that the implied subject of the infinitive λέγειν and the perfect πεπαλαίωκεν is God and not simply the prophet Jeremiah.[2] The perspective of the initial clause is from Jeremiah's day. The argument is that at the time God promised through Jeremiah a new covenant, He made ipso facto the first covenant obsolete.[3]

_____

[1] For a treatment of these differences, see Westcott, Hebrews, pp. 240-21; McCullough, "Old Testament Quotations," pp. 365-67; Moffatt, Hebrews, pp. 109-110; Thomas, "Old Testament Citations," p. 130. Buchanan notes that it is difficult to determine whether the AH is following a different text, making intentional changes, or simply quoting from memory (Hebrews, p. 138). In any case, the differences are not substantial.

[2] Hughes, Hebrews, pp. 298, 302.

[3] TDNT, s.v. "πάλαι," by Heinrich Seesemann, 5:720; NIDNTT, s.v. "Old," by Hermann Haarbeck, 2:716; Westcott, Hebrews, p. 225; Moffatt, Hebrews, p. 111; and Lenski, Hebrews and James, p. 271. Lünemann takes the infinitive clause as causal ("Hebrews," p. 594).

τὸ δὲ παλαιούμενον . . . ἀφανισμοῦ. The remaining clause iden-
tifies an implication, based on the preceding assertion, concerning the
old covenant. The meaning appears obvious. That which is obsolete
must shortly pass away.

The problem arises in understanding the perspective of this
second clause. Two possibilities are suggested. The first is that
this clause is continuing the perspective of the previous clause.[1] In
this case, the point would be that even from the Old Testament perspec-
tive, the first covenant was reckoned as old and on the verge of passing
away. The second possibility is that the AH is expressing his own con-
clusions regarding the former covenant.[2] Here, the point would be that
if the first covenant were reckoned old in Jeremiah's day, how much more
so should it be considered from the standpoint of Hebrews.

The present participles, παλαιούμενον and γηράσκον, seem to
favor the latter approach.[3] Assuming that this is the case, such an
approach could easily be harmonized with the historical circumstances,
if the book is dated before the fall of Jerusalem with the destruction
of the Temple and the old covenant rituals associated with it.[4] Con-
versely, it would be somewhat difficult to understand how the AH could
describe the old covenant as near (ἐγγὺς) to passing away, if the letter
were written after the destruction of the Temple.

---

[1] Lünemann, "Hebrews," p. 594; and Kistemaker, Hebrews, p. 228.

[2] Hughes, Hebrews, p. 302.

[3] Westcott, Hebrews, pp. 225-26. Lenski, however, argues that
the neuter gender combined with the present tense points to treating the
statement as a general, timeless truth (Hebrews and James, pp. 271-72).

[4] Bruce, Hebrews, p. 179.

Hebrews 9:15

Nearer context

Hebrews 9:15 is the location of the third reference to a new covenant. Chapter 9 continues the AH's discussion on the priesthood of Christ, showing its superiority to the Levitical order. This chapter focuses on the differences between what could be gained through the ministry of the Levitical system and what could be gained through Christ's ministry as a priest. The chapter can be divided into two sections: verses 1-10 in which the operation of the Levitical service is briefly described, along with certain of its limitations; and verses 11-28 in which the contrast is developed, showing that in Christ's priestly activity, the limitations noted with the Levitical order are removed.[1]

The division of the last half of the chapter has been variously structured. Many divide verses 11-28 into three distinct paragraphs: 11-14 in which the sacrifice of Christ is shown to be superior; 15-22 in which the relationship between Christ's death and the new covenant is discussed; and 23-28 in which Christ's ministry in the heavenly tabernacle is presented.[2]

Others prefer to see in verses 11-12 an introductory statement of Christ's priestly activity, dividing the remaining verses according to their development of the introductory statement. For example, verses 13-22 discuss consequences of Christ's death, providing for the cleansing

---

[1] The divisions indicated reflect the consensus among the commentaries. See, for example, Buchanan (Hebrews, p. 146) who sees a chiastic arrangement of the chapter, as well as inclusion in its constituent parts.

[2] Montefiore, Hebrews, pp. 150, 155, and 159.

of the conscience and the establishing of a new covenant. Verses 23-28,

on the other hand, draw attention to Christ's presence in the true,

heavenly tabernacle and to the effectiveness of his sacrifice in removing

the consequences of sin.[1]

The two approaches are not that dissimilar, and, in any case,

there is virtual unanimity as to the theme and the relationship of

verses 15-22 to its context. As a result of his death, Christ has become

the mediator of a new covenant and has secured the redemption of those

called under the old covenant.[2]

---

[1]Westcott, Hebrews, pp. 242, 255, and 259.

[2]Westcott, Hebrews, p. 204. A question raised in connection
with the issues presented in this chapter concerns the relationship
between Christ's priesthood and his death. The question focuses on
whether or not in offering himself Christ was already functioning in the
capacity of a high priest. Most argue that because Christ's offering
of himself fulfilled that represented by the sacrifice on the Day of
Atonement, it would be impossible to divorce his sacrifice from his
priestly function. See NIDNTT, s.v. "Priest," by Jürgen Baehr,
3:41; TDNT, s.v. "ἱερός," by Gottlob Schrenk, 3:276; Goppelt,
Theology, 2:253-55; Vos, Redemptive History, pp. 219-20; Victor Reese
Gordon, "Studies in the Covenantal Theology of the Epistle to the
Hebrews, in Light of its Setting" (Ph.D dissertation, Fuller Theolo-
gical Seminary, 1979), pp. 218-19. John Walvoord concurs, concluding
that because Christ's role as mediator and intercessor began before his
death, his priestly office must be eternal (Jesus Christ Our Lord
[Chicago: Moody Press, 1969], p. 242). See also Philip Edgecumbe
Hughes, "The Blood of Jesus and His Heavenly Priesthood in Hebrews,"
BSac 130 (April-June 1973):209; and James R. Schaefer, "The Relationship
Between Priestly and Servant Messianism in the Epistle to the Hebrews,"
CBQ 30 (July 1968):359-85. John W. Baigent ("Jesus as Priest: An
Examination of the Claim that the Concept of Jesus as Priest May Be Found
in the New Testament Outside the Epistle to the Hebrews," Vox Evangelica
12 [1981]:35-41) rejects the correlation between intercessor-mediator
and priest in that the terms used of the former in the Old Testament are
not associated with priests.
Others argue that it was only after his death that Christ began
to function as a priest. These claim that Christ could not be both the
high priest offering the sacrifice and the sacrifice itself. Further-
more, the AH specifically places Christ's priestly activity in heaven,
not upon the earth. See MM, pp. 132-33; and Waltar Edward Brooks, "The
Perpetuity of Christ's Sacrifice in the Epistle to the Hebrews," JBL 89

Exegesis

The center of interest for this study is naturally on verse 15 with its reference to a new covenant. The verse consists of three constructions: an initial consecutive clause, stating a consequence (διὰ τοῦτο) of the preceding verses (13-14); a genitive absolute, identifying the circumstance for the concluding clause; and a final clause, indicating the goal of the initial consecutive clause.[1]

καὶ διὰ τοῦτο . . .

The initial clause repeats the description of Christ found in 8:6. Here, as there, He is designated as the mediator of a new covenant (διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης). In this instance the emphasis is not placed on μεσίτης since Christ has already been described as such, but on διαθήκης καινῆς which has been brought forward to mark this

---

(June 1970):207. In response to the last argument, Vos counters by saying that such passages as 8:4 must be taken as a qualified denial concerning the location of Christ's priestly activity, not an absolute denial ("Priesthood," pp. 602-603).

The verses involved in defense of either position are variously interpreted and, consequently, it is difficult to decide between the two views. A detailed survey of the issues is provided by Hughes, Hebrews, pp. 341-49. On the background of Christ as high priest, see Goppelt, Theology, 2:251-53; and for a survey of the teaching about Christ as high priest in Hebrews, see Ladd, Theology, pp. 578-84; George Barker Stevens, The Theology of the New Testament, International Theological Library, eds. C. A. Briggs and S. D. S. Salmond (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914), pp. 506-514; and Bernhard Weiss, Biblical Theology of the New Testament, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1892-1893), 2:183-201.

[1]Although the διὰ τοῦτο could be pointing forward to what is contained in the final clause (Moffatt, Hebrews, p. 126), the majority sees it pointing to what has preceded and particularly to verses 13 and 14 with the references to Christ's death as a sacrifice for sins. Kistemaker, Hebrews, p. 254; and John J. Hughes, "Hebrews IX 15 ff. and Galatians III 15ff.," NovT 21 (January 1979):33.

emphasis.[1] The relationship between Christ's death in verses 13-14 and the διαθήκης καινῆς in this verse is found in the nature of Christ's sacrifice. Being of a different kind from that associated with the old covenant, it must necessarily involve Him as a mediator of a different covenant.[2]

θανάτου γενομένου

The final clause (ὅπως) gives a consequence which Christ's mediatorial work was designed to secure in connection with the new covenant. Before treating the final clause, the absolute construction needs to be considered. The genitive absolute, θανάτου γενομένου ("a death having taken place") identifies the circumstance surrounding the exercise of Christ's mediatorial office.[3] It states that a death has taken place, and, by context, this death can refer only to the sacrificial death of Christ, mentioned in verses 13-14. In addition, this death is described as being for the redemption of the transgressions associated with the first covenant (εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων).[4] So it is that Christ's death secures the redemption of the transgressions committed in connection with the first covenant and provides the circumstance surrounding the consequence stated in the final clause.[5]

---

[1]Westcott, Hebrews, p. 263.

[2]Ibid; Hughes, "Hebrews IX 15ff.," p. 33; Bruce, Hebrews, p. 208.

[3]BDF, pp. 215, 218-19. The genitive construction could function here either as circumstantial or possibly causal.

[4]The aorist participle γενομένου is understood as connoting antecedent action to the verb λάβωσιν in the final clause. See Guthrie, Hebrews, p. 190; and Hughes, "Hebrews IX 15ff.," p. 33.

[5]Guthrie, Hebrews, pp. 191-92. He interprets the genitive construction to mean that the new covenant provides for the final

ὅπως . . . λάβωσιν οἱ κεκλημένοι

Having identified the activity associated with the final clause,
attention is now given to the clause itself. The particle ὅπως can be
taken either as indicating purpose or intended result.[1] As already
mentioned, it introduces a consequence which Christ's mediatorial work
secures in connection with the new covenant. The subjects of the clause
are identified by the substantival participle (κεκλημένοι) as those who
have been called.[2] The consequence itself is described as receiving

release of the sins which the Law pointed out but could not ultimately
cover.

    There is some question on the interpretation of the prepositional
phrase ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ. The ἐπὶ has been translated as indicating
a temporal relation (Lenski, Hebrews and James, p. 302), causal (Moffatt,
Hebrews, p. 126), or simply referential (Westcott, Hebrews, p. 264).
The last is accepted, though the differences are not dramatic in this
case, and all associate the transgressions mentioned with the tenure of
the old covenant.

    The redemption (ἀπολύτρωσιν) probably should be understood in
the sense of "release," "cancellation," "remission," although some
see here the possibility of the idea of "ransom" through the payment of
the price of release. See TDNT, s.v. "λύω," by Otto Procksch and F.
Büchsel, 4:352. Büchsel notes that the possibility of payment may be in
view with the reference to Christ's death in verses 13-14. However, he
cautions against the idea of "ransom" or "release" in verse 15 in that
sins (παραβάσεων) cannot be liberated (4:354-55). W. Mundle and C. Brown
prefer to view Christ's death as representing the means, rather than the
price, whereby release was gained (NIDNTT, s.v. "Redemption," 3:256).

    To this point, it has been assumed that the παραβάσεων refers to
transgressions. Kistemaker, however, prefers to take the articular
substantive as a reference to individuals, rather than to the trans-
gressions themselves (Hebrews, p. 256). Although the context could be
interpreted in support of either, the only other use of the term in
Hebrews (2:2) has reference to the act of transgression rather than to
the one committing the act, suggesting a similar sense here.

[1]See Lünemann, "Hebrews," p. 616; and Hughes, "Hebrews IX 15ff.,"
p. 33.

[2]The called (κεκλημένοι) are generally regarded as those who
have been called by God unto salvation, the term itself representing
the effectual calling of the elect. See TDNT, s.v. "καλέω," by K. L.
Schmidt, 3:489; Buchanan, Hebrews, p. 151; and Hughes, Hebrews,
p. 368.

(λάβωσιν) the promise (ἐπαγγελίαν) of the eternal inheritance (τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας).[1]

While this inheritance is not further defined in the clause, the surrounding context suggests that it must include the idea of the forgiveness of sins. That this concept is involved is seen from the focus on Christ's death, portrayed in the verses before and after. In verse 12, Christ's death, in contrast to the Old Testament sacrifices, is said to secure eternal redemption (αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν). In verse 14, his death effects not an outward cleansing as with the animal sacrifices, but a cleansing of the conscience (καθαριεῖ τὴν συνείδησιν).[2] In verse 26, unlike the repeated Levitical sacrifices, Christ offered him-self once and by his sacrifice is able to put away sin (εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας). When taken together with the circumstantial clause in verse 15 which speaks specifically of Christ's death providing for a remission of transgression, these verses undeniably point to forgiveness as the

---

[1] The genitive τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας is in apposition to the accusative of object, τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, further defining what the promise entails. See Lünemann, "Hebrews," p. 616; and Lenski, Hebrews and James, p. 304. Hughes (Hebrews, p. 367) adds that to receive the promise means to receive what is promised.

[2] TDNT, s.v. "ἐπαγγέλλω," by Julius Schniewind and Gerhard Friedrich, 2:584-85; Moffatt, Hebrews, pp. 126-27; and Hughes, Hebrews, pp. 364, 366-67. For a discussion on the differences between the forgiveness obtainable in connection with the Levitical sacrifices and the forgiveness obtainable through Christ's sacrifice, see the entries on p. 40, note 2. Without depreciating the forgiveness avail-able through the animal sacrifices, it must be recognized that there is a categorical distinction when speaking of the forgiveness available through Christ. Apparently, in light of the contrast mentioned by the AH in this chapter, the expressions "eternal redemption" and "cleansing of the conscience" represent transactions which the animal sacrifices could not provide. See the discussion by John C. Whitcomb, "Christ's Atonement and Animal Sacrifices in Israel," GTJ 6 (Fall 1985):208-213.

focus of this inheritance. Whether more is involved only the greater

context can determine; the focal point of the immediate context is

forgiveness.[1]

ὅπου γὰρ διαθήκη

The remaining verses of the paragraph (16-22) dwell on the

relationship between Christ's death and covenant inauguration.[2] The

AH appears to be drawing an analogy between the inauguration of the first

covenant through the shedding of blood (οὐδὲ ἡ πρώτη χωρὶς αἵματος

ἐγκεκαίνισται, verse 18) and the inauguration of the new through the

shedding of Christ's blood.[3] The relationship between these verses

and verse 15 is this: In that Christ's sacrificial death provides for

the inauguration of a new covenant, he can be described now as its

mediator, able to secure for the called the inheritance promised to

them.[4]

Hebrews 10:16-17

Nearer context

In the next reference to a new covenant, 10:16-17, the AH, for ·

---

[1]Several claim that although forgiveness is involved, there
is more to the promise than simply this. See TDNT, s.v. "κλῆρος,"
3:785; NIDNTT, s.v. "Promise," by E. Hoffmann, 3:73-74; and NIDNTT,
s.v. "Inheritance," by J. Eichler, 2:301. All of these see an escha-
tological dimension to the promise/inheritance. It includes more than
forgiveness and ultimately incorporates the various promises of God for
the redeemed.

[2]The question on the translation of διαθήκη in verses 16-17 is
the subject of a separate excursus and is not treated here. See
appendix B, pp. 299-305

[3]See TDNT, "καινός," 3:454; NIDNTT, "New," 2:673.

[4]Hughes, "Hebrews IX 15ff.," p. 38.

the second time, draws upon the verses from the new covenant pericope found in Jeremiah 31:31-34 to support his argument. The first eighteen verses of this chapter continue the contrast of the preceding chapters on the superiority of Christ's priestly ministry to the Levitical order. In particular, they bring to a conclusion the discussion begun in chap- ter 9 on the superiority of Christ's sacrifice over the sacrifices offered under the Law.[1] These verses can be divided into two paragraphs, 1-10 and 11-18, each of which consists of three elements: an initial argument (1-4, 11-14); an Old Testament citation (5-7, 15-17) brought in to support the point of the argument; and a conclusion (8-10, 18).

In the first paragraph, verses 1-10, the writer draws attention to the inability of the Levitical system with its animal sacrifices to provide complete forgiveness and hence to the need for an offering to replace these which would remove this deficiency. He then quotes from Psalm 40:6-8 to show that the psalmist recognized this inadequacy with the sacrificial system, acknowledging that what God desired was the offering of complete obedience from his servant. Finally, applying the psalmist's words to Christ, the AH concludes that in Christ's offering of himself as a sacrifice, true forgiveness has been provided.[2]

In the second paragraph, verses 11-18, the AH focuses on the repetition of the Levitical sacrifices as a mark of their inability to provide true, complete forgiveness as opposed to the once-for-all sacri- fice of Christ. Following this, he then supports the efficacy of Christ's

---

[1]Buchanan, Hebrews, p. 166. As elsewhere, he identifies an inclusion with verses 1-18, centered in the word "offering" (προσ- φέρουσιν, verse 1; and προσφορὰ, verse 18).

[2]Kaiser, "Abolition of Old Order," pp. 19-37.

sacrifice in obtaining complete forgiveness by referring again to Jeremiah 31:33-34, with it promise of forgiveness in connection with the new covenant. Lastly, he concludes by stating that the forgiveness accomplished through Christ's sacrifice has rendered all other sacrifices unnecessary.[1]

As noted above, verses 16 and 17 represent the second time the AH quotes from the new covenant reference in Jeremiah 31 in support of his argument.[2] Whereas in chapter 8 the new covenant pericope is cited in extenso, in this instance its citation is purposely truncated in order to bring attention to the forgiveness of sins mentioned in the prophecy.[3]

---

[1]See Moffatt, Hebrews, pp. 134, 139; and Kent, Hebrews, pp. 182-84.

[2]The quote is introduced by a statement attributing to the Holy Spirit ultimate authorship of Jeremiah's prophecy (μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον). The temporal infinitive construction μετὰ γὰρ τὸ εἰρηκέναι ("for after he said") is meant to be balanced by a second phrase, "he then said." There is a question whether the statement in verse 16, λέγει κύριος ("the Lord says"), found in the prophecy, represents this counterbalance, or whether a phrase needs to be added at the beginning of verse 17. In favor of the former are Lenski, Hebrews and James, p. 340; and Kent, Hebrews, p. 194. In favor of the latter are Westcott, Hebrews, p. 316; Bruce, Hebrews, p. 238; and Montefiore, Hebrews, p. 171. Regardless of which is chosen, all agree that the focus in this use of the prophecy falls on the phrase in verse 17. See Lünemann, "Hebrews," pp. 645-46.

[3]Montefiore, Hebrews, p. 171. The quotation, beginning at Jer 31:33 (LXX, 38:33) in the middle of Jeremiah's new covenant passage, omits all of verses 31 and 32. In addition, the AH, after citing the reference to a covenant and its initial promise from verse 33, leaves out the remainder of that verse and all but the concluding line of verse 34. This concluding line and its statement about the complete forgiveness of sins is the focus of his argument at this point.
    The variations between the two uses of Jer 31 by the AH and the difference between these and the LXX of Jeremiah have already been discussed in connection with chapter 8, p. 226, n. 1. Although there are several divergencies between the two citations and between these and the LXX, none substantially affects the meaning of the prophecy. See Morris, "Hebrews," p. 102; and Kistemaker, Hebrews, p. 283.
    Perhaps the key difference with this second citation of Jer 31

In addition, as with the preceding use of Jeremiah's prophecy, the AH is not interested here in developing its content to any extent. He simply refers to it and to the forgiveness mentioned in it to support his argument that Christ's sacrifice offers complete forgiveness of sins, negating the need for any other.[1]

Exegesis

The only issue raised in this context needing consideration is the identification of the subjects mentioned in the first part of the quote. The AH has argued that the sacrifice of Christ provides complete forgiveness for his readers (10:10). At the same time, he also has associated Christ's sacrifice with the forgiveness promised by Jeremiah in the new covenant prophecy. The question raised is whether he understood his readers to be the specific recipients addressed in Jeremiah's prophecy. Although an affirmative answer has been argued by several,[2]

---

is the addition of the phrase καὶ τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν ("and their lawless deeds") in verse 17, not found in either the LXX nor the initial quotation in Heb 8:12. The AH apparently conflates the last two lines of the prophecy, changing ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν to τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν, so as to combine for rhetorical emphasis the two genitives ἁμαρτιῶν and ἀνομιῶν.

[1]There is an implied relationship between Christ's sacrifice and the promise of forgiveness mentioned in the new covenant which the AH assumes his readers understood. In order for the AH to use the promise of forgiveness in Jeremiah's new covenant prophecy as proof for the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice, there must be a link between the two. The link is that Christ's sacrifice secures the forgiveness promised in the new covenant. The AH has already discussed this relationship in chapter 9 and assumes its truth in the present context. Bruce concurs, adding that the very fact of a repeated sacrifice argues against complete forgiveness; conversely, the complete forgiveness mentioned in connection with Christ argues for the efficacy of Christ's single sacrifice (Hebrews, pp. 241-42).

[2]See George Eldon Ladd, Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1952), p. 137; idem, The Last Things: An Eschatology for Laymen (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978), pp. 26-27; and Payne, Theology, pp. 76-78.

it is not necessitated by the context. The purpose of the quote was not to make a direct correlation between the designated recipients of the prophecy and his own readers, but simply to show that the new covenant, with which Christ's sacrifice had previously been associated, promises perfection in terms of forgiveness to those who receive its benefits.[1]

Jeremiah specifically addresses Israel in his prophecy. However, only if it can be shown that the AH identifies Jeremiah's addressees with his own can it be proven that he equates the two. Until otherwise established, it can be assumed that the AH saw in the promise of forgiveness recorded in Jeremiah's new covenant prophecy a wider application than its original designees. Since the AH does not use the phrase describing the original recipients (τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ, "with the house of Israel") found in the LXX and the MT and in the citation in 8:8, but uses instead the phrase πρὸς αὐτοὺς ("to them"), in itself proves nothing with regard to this issue. The change could have been prompted by a desire to prevent such an identification between Jeremiah's readers and his, rather than to show such.[2]

Hebrews 10:29

Nearer context

With 10:19, the AH begins the second major section of the epistle, focusing of the application of his argument. The remaining verses of the chapter fall into two segments: verses 19-25 in which

---

[1] See Morris, "Hebrews," p. 102.

[2] Lünemann argues that the αὐτοὺς was intentional so that the more difinite reference to natural descendants could recede to the background ("Hebrews," p. 646).

the AH gives a series of short exhortations on the efficacy of Christ's ministry and His sacrifice; and verses 26-39 in which the AH gives his fourth in a series of warnings regarding the consequences of a failure to heed the revelation which God had provided in the person of His Son.[1] The pattern in this warning passage follows closely that found in the third (5:11-6:12). Here, as there, the warning is given (verses 26-31), and then an exhortation is made (verses 32-39) in which the AH expresses his confidence that such action as depicted in the warning is not characteristic of his readers.[2]

The warning itself (verses 26-31) is composed of three elements. The first, verses 26-27, gives the initial warning; the second, verses 28-29, supports the principle involved through an illustration; and the third, verses 30-31, adds scriptural confirmation. The second element, with its reference to the covenant in verse 29, is of interest for this study.

The argument of verses 28-29 is clearly a fortiori.[3] Since a rejection of God's revelation through Moses brought certain and grave consequences, a greater punishment, the AH argues, is reserved for rejecting God's revelation through His Son (πόσῳ δοκεῖτε χείρονος ἀξιωθήσεται τιμωρίας, "how much more severe a punishment do you reckon he shall be worthy of?").

Exegesis

The one in verse 29 who is worthy of greater condemnation is

---

[1] See Buchanan, Hebrews, p. 173.

[2] Westcott, Hebrews, p. 332; and Bruce, Hebrews, p. 266.

[3] Montefiore, Hebrews, p. 178.

described by a series of relative clauses as committing three acts: treating with disdain the Son of God (τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καταπατήσας);[1] reckoning the blood of the covenant whereby he was sanctified as unclean (τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη); and insulting or outraging the Spirit of grace (τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας). Although the three clauses are not identical, it is assumed that they are interrelated. They represent collectively the counterpart in the a fortiori argument to rejecting the Law of Moses (ἀθετήσας τις νόμον Μωϋσέως, verse 28). Together, they describe what is involved in rejecting the greater revelation through God's Son (cf. 1:1-3).

τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης

In the second relative clause, the identity of the covenant and the interpretation of the clause are the issues of concern. The phrase τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης ("the blood of the covenant") is parallel to that found in Matthew and Mark in connection with Christ's words and the institution of the Last Supper. For this reason, the implication is that it refers here, as it does there, to the new covenant.

This identification is further supported in the immediate context. The a fortiori argument used by the AH in verses 28-29 compares the penalty meted out for rejecting the Law of Moses with that given for rejecting Christ. As previously developed by the AH, this comparison associates the Law of Moses with the first covenant (8:7, 13) and Christ with the new (7:22; 9:15). Hence, the covenant mentioned in this verse in connection with Christ would be the new covenant. Lastly, in chapter 9, the AH developed the relationship between sacrifice and covenant

---

[1]Literally, "trampling underfoot." See BAGD, p. 415.

inauguration and particularly between Christ's sacrifice and the inauguration of the new covenant. In light of the preceding context, the phrase "blood of the covenant" would be understood as referring to the sacrifice of Christ which provides for the inauguration of the new covenant and secures the forgiveness of sins promised in it.

Having identified the covenant, two questions remain in the interpretation of the clause. The first is the meaning of the participial construction κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος, while the second is the meaning of the adjectival clause ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη.

κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος

The meaning of κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος is relatively uncomplicated. When used in a religious context as here, it means to view something as unclean or impure, that is, to discount its religious use or value. When describing the response of one to Christ's sacrificial death, it is tantamount to saying that he is rejecting the value of that death. This one is reckoning the blood of Christ as common, no different from that of another or at least not as having the value which God places on it.[1]

ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη

The second expression, ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη, is somewhat more involved in its interpretation. The entire construction functions adjectivally. The antecedent to the relative pronoun ᾧ is the αἷμα of the preceding relative clause. The subject of the verb ἡγιάσθη is the same as the subject of the participle. The expression indicates something about the blood in relationship to the one described in the relative clause. The blood of the covenant which this one regards as unclean is the same blood

---

[1]See TDNT, s.v. "κοινός," by Friedrich Hauck, 3:797.

with which he is sanctified. Since this covenant blood has been previously described by the AH as providing forgiveness, to be sanctified by it means to experience the forgiveness which it provides.[1]

Perhaps the hardest question deals with the relationship between the individual described by the relative clauses and the judgments warned against in these verses, particularly verses 37 and 39. Several possibilities have been offered in an effort to explain this relationship.[2] One interpretation takes the judgment as eternal and views the individual described in verse 29 as not truly saved, not actually a participant in the new covenant and the forgiveness connected with it. A second interprets the judgment as temporal rather than as eternal. In this case, the individual is truly saved and, as a consequence of sin, experiences temporal chastisement rather than eternal condemnation. A third approach takes the judgment as eternal, the individual as saved, and the warning as hypothetical. The description in verse 29 would depict a response by a true believer that technically is not possible. The fourth sees the judgment as eternal, the individual as saved, and the warning as describing the consequences of an individual losing his salvation through sin.

This last approach is rejected as being inconsistent with the greater biblical context and the scriptural teaching of eternal security.[3]

---

[1] Cf. 10:10, 14. TDNT, s.v. "ἅγιος," by Otto Procksch and Karl Georg Kuhn, 1:112. Some have suggested that to be sanctified by the covenant blood means to be brought into a relationship to the covenant. See, for example, Kent, Hebrews, p. 206.

[2] See, for example, the discussion in Kent, Hebrews, pp. 206-207.

[3] Against, apparently, Westcott, Hebrews, pp. 327-32. See Kent, Hebrews, p. 206.

The second view appears to be ruled out as well. If the judgment
received for rejecting Moses involved physical death, the more severe
punishment (χείρονος . . . τιμωρίας) received for rejecting Christ
demands something beyond temporal chastisement.[1] In addition, the terms
used to describe this punishment, e.g., ἀπώλειαν (verse 39), are more
frequently used of eternal judgment.[2] The two remaining views are both
viable, and it would be difficult to decide between them. Both have been
effectively argued by a number of commentaries.[3] In either case, the
identification and interpretation of the covenant would remain unchanged.

Hebrews 12:24

Nearer context

In the twelfth chapter, the AH returns to the exhortations
begun in the last half of the tenth chapter after an extended treatment
of the principle of faith and its manifestation in the lives of various
figures from the Old Testament and intertestamental periods.[4] Although

---

[1]Kistemaker, Hebrews, p. 298.

[2]Oepke states that its predominate use in the New Testament "is
not simply extinction of existence . . . , but an everlasting state of
torment and death" (TDNT, s.v. "ἀπόλλυμι," 1:397). See also NIDNTT,
s.v. "Destroy," by H. C. Hahn, 1:464.

[3]In support of the first view, see Hughes, Hebrews, p. 423; and
Kistemaker, Hebrews, p. 295. For the third view, see Kent, Hebrews,
p. 206.

[4]Bruce, Hebrews, pp. 337-38; and Hughes, Hebrews, pp. 511-14.
In 10:39 the AH makes reference to the faith of his readers through
which they were to obtain deliverance from judgment (ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐσμὲν
. . . ἀλλὰ πίστεως εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς). It was this reference to
faith which led to his discussion of the principle of faith in chapter
11. At the same time, the focus in the concluding verses of chapter 10
was on the need for the readers to exercise endurance (ὑπεμείνατε,
verse 32; ὑπομονῆς, verse 36). It is this theme of endurance which is
reintroduced in chapter 12.

the general theme of endurance is apparent in chapter 12 (e.g., verse 1, δι' ὑπομονῆς τρέχωμεν; verse 7, εἰς παιδείαν ὑπομένετε), the chapter divisions are somewhat more problematic. For the sake of convenience, the chapter is divided into two segments. The first, verses 1-11, is an exhortation to endure in spite of whatever difficulties the readers might be facing. The second, verses 12-29, is the fifth and final warning passage of the epistle. In it, the AH exhorts his readers to endure, by warning them of the grave results if they should not.[1]

The warning passage, verses 12-29, can be divided into three paragraphs. The warning is begun in verses 12-17 with a series of short, hortatory statements, interrupted briefly in verses 18-24 with an explanatory section, and concluded in verses 25-29 with a resumption of the hortatory construction.

In the explanatory section, verses 18-24, the AH draws attention to his readers' privileged position in their relationship to God, as a basis upon which his exhortations and admonitions rest. He does this by contrasting the position of the Old Testament individual as he approached God in connection with the revelation at Mt. Sinai (verses 18-21) to the position of his readers as they approached God through the newer revelation communicated through the Son (verses 22-24).[2] The underlying

---

[1]Hughes, Hebrews, pp. 533-34. Kistemaker makes the same two-part division of the chapter, but prefers to divide it at verse 14. The inferential Διὸ of verse 12 can be used as a transitional marker. Furthermore, the second person plural imperative of verse 12 appears to be parallel to the second person plural imperative of verse 14, suggesting that the two verses should be taken together. In any case, the interest in this study is on the last half of the chapter where it is generally agreed that the AH is once again presenting a warning to his readers.

[2]Moffatt, Hebrews, p. 214; and Guthrie, Hebrews, p. 261. This

principle in this section is that greater privilege carries with it

greater responsibility and thus greater judgment.

Exegesis

In the course of describing the position of his readers, the AH

makes a series of statements, detailing what was theirs as a result of

this newer revelation.[1] Although there is considerable debate on the

interpretation of several of these statements, there is little contro-

versy associated with the reference to the covenant.[2]

---

contrast is indicated by the construction οὐ γὰρ προσεληλύθατε ("for
you have not come") in verse 18 which is balanced in verse 22 by the
construction ἀλλὰ προσεληλύθατε ("but you have come").

The perfect προσεληλύθατε is interpreted in both verses 18 and
22 metaphorically, representing the access and resultant position the
respective revelation provided the worshipper as he approached God. See
Morris, "Hebrews," p. 142. Johannes Schneider calls this use the
"cultic" sense which is used when depicting an individual's approach to
God (TDNT, s.v. "ἔρχομαι," 2:684). Bruce interprets the perfect tense
as pointing to the conversion of those described (Hebrews, p. 372).

[1]Although there is a question over the exact number of items,
it is best to view each use of καὶ as polysyndeton, marking off the
individual expressions, and to identify a total of eight statements.
Hughes, Hebrews, p. 553.

[2]A discussion of the debated issues is not germane to this
study. However, a brief listing of the most controversial may be help-
ful. The first is with the placement of πανηγύρει ("festal gathering")
and whether to take it with the preceding "angels" or with the following
"church." The decision to take each use of καὶ as marking a new item
requires taking πανηγύρει with "angels." The definition of the term
is also disputed, although most accept something like "festal gath-
ering." See TDNT. s.v. "πανήγυρις," by Heinrich Seesemann, 5:722.

The second problem noted here is with the identification of
those referred to by the terms εκκλησίᾳ πρωτοτόκων ("church of the
first-born") and πνεύμασι δικαίων ("spirits of righteous [men]") in
verse 23. For a discussion, see Lünemann, "Hebrews," pp. 717-19; and
Hughes, Hebrews, pp. 547-51, 554-55. Assuming a distinction is intended
between the two expressions, the former could refer to believers in the
present age, while the latter to believers in the age prior to the
first advent of Christ. See Kent, Hebrews, p. 218; and Montefiore,
Hebrews, p. 233.

The last issue is the contrast in verse 24 between the blood of
Christ and the blood of Abel. Most commentators see in the contrast the

The one important issue related to the covenant involves the adjective νέας. This is the only time νέας is used in the New Testament to describe the new covenant. The question is whether a distinction is intended between νέας used here and καινός used elsehwere by the AH to describe this new covenant. In the classical period of the language, καινός was used to signify that which was new in character or quality, whereas νέας was used to signify that which was new or recent in time.[1]

It has been argued that the use of the two adjectives in the koine suggests that this distinction had been blurred, if not removed.[2] Since this is the only occasion where the AH uses this word in all his references to this covenant and because a distinction between the two words was originally discernible, it may be that such was intended by the AH. The distinction would be that here the AH views the newness of the covenant in terms of time, rather than in terms of character or quality: it is recent or fresh, in contrast to that which is aged or

distinction between pardon, represented by Christ's blood, and vengeance, represented by Abel's. Moffatt, Hebrews, p. 218; and Montefiore, Hebrews, p. 233.

[1] William Barclay, "The One, New Man," in Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology: Essays in Honor of George E. Ladd, ed. R. A. Guelich (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978), pp. 74-80.

[2] Bruce, Hebrews, p. 379; Moffatt, Hebrews, p. 218; and Hughes, Hebrews, p. 551, note 162. Hughes notes the use of καινός in Eph 4:24 and νέας in a parallel expression in Col 3:10 as an example of this blurring of distinctions. See also R. A. Harrisville, "The Concept of the Newness in the New Covenant," JBL 74 (1955):70.
Not all hold that the overlapping of καινός and νέας in the koine removes the possibility of their having any distinction in a given context. See Richard Chenevix Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1880), p. 225; TDNT, s.v. "καινός," 3:447; Kent, Hebrews, pp. 273-74; and Kistemaker, Hebrews, p. 397. Barclay argues that the classical distinction is found among the Apostolic Fathers and hence may be valid in the New Testament as well ("One, New Man," p. 80).

worn. Assuming that this is the case, such a concept would fit well into the context. The new covenant is reckoned as new or recent in that it is associated with a revelation that had only recently been manifested (cf. 1:2).

On the other hand, it could also be arged from the context that the adjective signifies, as does καινός used elsewhere, the idea of "new-ness" in terms of character or quality. It is called a new covenant in that it is different in nature from the old, as indicated by the series of expressions contrasting the privileged position with which it is asso-ciated to that associated with the old covenant. Ultimately, the answer to the question rests on the interpretation of the context. Since either definition can be supported, it is difficult to know which the AH intended.

In either case, the concept of Christ as mediator of this cove-nant is one the AH has previously developed (cf. 7:22 and 9:15). Addi-tionally, from the surrounding verses, this covenant is associated with Christ's death and the forgiveness of sins (αἵματι ῥαντισμοῦ, verse 24), and is contrasted to the old or Mosaic covenant.[1] As such, this cove-nant has the same markings as the previous references and must refer, therefore, to the new.

---

[1]Montefiore, Hebrews, pp. 232-33; and Kistemaker, Hebrews, p. 395. Claus-Hunno Hunzinger notes that the expression αἵματι ῥαντισμοῦ cannot be understood apart from the greater context because in the immediate verse there is no corresponding ῥαντισμοῦ with Abel's blood. He treats the expression as a formula, depicting both cleansing from sin and covenant inauguration-participation as expressed in several Old Testament texts and expressly connected to Christ's blood and the new covenant by the AH (note especially 9:13-22 and 10:19-25) (TDNT, s.v. "ῥαντίζω," 6:981-83). See also NIDNTT, s.v. "Baptism," by G. R. Beasley-Murray, 1:225.

Hebrews 13:20

Nearer context

The concluding section of the epistle forms the context for the seventh and last reference to a new covenant. Although there is some question concerning the starting point at which the conclusion begins, whether with verse 17, 18, 20, or 22, there is virtual unanimity that verses 20-21 represent a prayer of the author for his readers. The approach in this study is to begin the conclusion with verse 18 and include the following divisions: Verses 18-19, a request for prayer by the author; verses 20-21, the author's own prayer for his readers; verses 22-23, his concluding remarks; verse 24, the final salutation; and verse 25, the benediction.[1]

The prayer in verses 20-21 has been called a "collect," a "prayer-form characteristic of the Western Church."[2] This form includes the following parts: (1) the invocation identifying the one to whom the prayer is made, ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ("now the God of peace"); (2) the basis or grounds for the main petition; in this instance, an adjectival clause modifying the one addressed in the prayer, ὁ ἀναγαγὼν ἐκ νεκρῶν . . . τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν ("who brought up from the dead . . . our Lord Jesus"); (3) the main petition, καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς . . . εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ("make you complete . . . to do his will"); (4) a secondary petition, ποιῶν ἐν ἡμῖν τὸ εὐάρεστον ("working in us that which is well-pleasing"); (5) the means or basis for the secondary petition;

---

[1] Westcott, Hebrews, p. 445.

[2] From the Latin collecta oratio, "a gathered-together prayer." Bruce, Hebrews, p. 410, note 114.

here a prepositional phrase stating the means, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
("through Jesus Christ"); (6) a doxology, ᾧ ἡ δόξα . . . ("to whom [be]
the glory . . . "); and (7) the ἀμήν.[1]

Exegesis

ὁ ἀναγαγὼν ἐκ νεκρῶν

The second element in the collect, identified here as the adjec-
tival clause, contains the covenant reference. In this clause, the
initial construction, ὁ ἀναγαγὼν, a substantival participial modifier,
has θεὸς as its antecedent and the substantive τὸν ποιμένα . . . τὸν
μέγαν ("the great shepherd") as its object. The identification of this
shepherd is provided by the appositional τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν ("our
Lord Jesus"). Taken with the prepositional phrase ἐκ νεκρῶν, the AH
describes God as having raised from the dead the great shepherd of the
sheep (τῶν προβάτων), the Lord Jesus.[2] In calling Jesus "the great shep-
herd," the AH is applying to Christ a motif found in both the Old and New
Testaments. It involves not only the concept of a national ruler,[3] but
also here, in connection with the previous reference to Jesus as high
priest, the idea of protector-deliverer.[4]

---

[1]Bruce, Hebrews, p. 410.

[2]Apparently, this is the sole reference to the resurrection in
Hebrews. See Lünemann, "Hebrews," p. 741; Bruce, Hebrews, p. 411;
and Kistemaker, Hebrews, p. 430. These last two note that the emphasis
throughout the epistle has been on the exaltation of Christ, rather than
on his resurrection. At the same time, the exaltation presupposes his
resurrection. See TDNT, s.v. "ἱερός," 3:274.

[3]Montefiore points to such passages as Ezek 34:23-24 in support
of this connotation (Hebrews, p. 251).

[4]Kistemaker lists John 10:14; 1 Pet 2:25 and 5:4, to show the
concept of the sacrificial nature of the shepherd's role as identified
with Christ. "In effect, the metaphor of the shepherd who dies for his

ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου

Having treated the initial construction, the problems are centered in the accompanying prepositional phrase, ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου ("by the blood of the eternal covenant"). Three questions are raised. The first is to decide how the preposition ἐν is used and what it modifies; the second is to understand the relationship between the prepositional phrase and the resurrection mentioned in the initial clause; and the third is to interpret the meaning of the adjective αἰωνίου.

The preposition ἐν presents several interpretive challenges. The initial problem is in identifying what it modifies. It can either modify the participle ἀναγαγὼν[1] or the substantive ποιμένα.[2] The former relates the blood to the resurrection of Christ, the latter to Christ's position as the great shepherd. Either can be effectively argued here. However, the former is preferred simply because the other prepositional phrase modifies the participal, and it is assumed this one does also.

The second question deals with the preposition's use. Again, two possibilities are suggested: it is either conveying the sense of means

---

sheep is equivalent to that of the high priest who offers himself as a sacrifice for his people. Especially the adjective great is telling, for the writer of Hebrews calls Jesus the great high priest (4:14). . . . This great shepherd shed his blood and laid down his life for his sheep --in other words, his people--to obtain for them eternal redemption and to establish with them the eternal covenant that God had promised" (Hebrews, p. 430). See also TDNT, s.v. "ποιμήν," by Joachim Jeremias, 6:486-97; and NIDNTT, s.v. "Shepherd," by Erich Beyreuther, 3:546-68.
There is a general consensus that the entire adjectival construction reflects several Old Testament passages, chief among them Isa 63:11 and Zech 9:11. See Buchanan, Hebrews, p. 239. In the Isaiah passage, Moses is depicted as the shepherd; if borrowed here, the AH sees in Moses one who illustrates the greater shepherd, Christ, in the deliverance of his people. Kent, Hebrews, p. 293.

[1]Moffatt, Hebrews, p. 242.   [2]Lünemann, "Hebrews," p. 742.

or of association.[1] The former signifies that Christ's death ("blood") was the basis or means whereby God raised him up; the latter indicates that Christ's death is associated with the resurrection, that the resurrection occurred in connection with his death. The former is preferred in that this use of the construction appears to be more frequent in Hebrews.[2] Again, however, either could be effectively argued here. The difference in this case would not be dramatic.

The assumptions that the prepositional phrase modifies the participle ἀναγαγών and the preposition ἐν signifies "means" raises the question of how the "blood" can represent the "means" or "basis" for raising up Christ. In response, it is generally held that the resurrection expressed God's approval of Christ's covenantal sacrifice. It was by means of the covenant blood and the divine satisfaction secured by this blood that Christ was raised from the dead.[3] The AH has previously linked Christ's death with covenant inauguration (9:15-23) and has used the expression αἵματι διαθήκης in 10:29 to describe the basis for forgiveness of sins associated with this covenant. The construction in this verse indicates that the blood was also the basis upon which God raised Christ from the dead, providing tangible, objective evidence of His acceptance and approval of Christ's sacrifice.[4]

---

[1]See Lenski, Hebrews and James, p. 494; Bruce, Hebrews, p. 411; and Hughes, Hebrews, p. 589.

[2]Cf. Heb 9:22, 10:19.

[3]Lenski, Hebrews and James, p. 494; Bruce, Hebrews, p. 411; and Hughes, Hebrews, p. 589.

[4]See TDNT, s.v. "αἷμα," 1:173-76; and NIDNTT, s.v. "Blood," by Fritz Laubach, 1:221-24.

The third question raised in connection with the prepositional phrase is the meaning of the adjective αἰωνίου, modifying διαθήκης. Ultimately, the question that must be answered is whether the combined expression διαθήκης αἰωνίου refers to the new covenant as previously identified by the AH. An affirmative answer is supported for four reasons. First, several passages in the Old Testament associated with the new covenant designate it as an eternal covenant (Jer 32:40, 50:5; Isa 55:3, 61:8; and Ezek 37:26). Second, the AH, in showing the superiority of Christ, contrasts the new covenant with which He is associated with that of the old covenant. An essential element in this contrast is between the transitory nature of the Mosaic and the lasting nature of the new (cf. 8:13). Third, Christ's ministry associated with the new covenant is described as perpetual (cf. 7:20-28). The perpetuity of the one would seem to demand the perpetuity of the other. Lastly, to introduce at this point an ancillary covenant to the two already presented in the epistle would be both confusing and inexplicable.

All of the above support an identification of the covenant in verse 20 as the same new covenant previously referred to in the epistle by the AH. Although the Mosaic covenant has also been described as "eternal" (Isa 24:5), in light of the contrast developed by the AH, it is concluded that the eternality of the new covenant should be understood in different terms.[1] In contrast to the old covenant which the author depicts as obsolete and in need of replacement, the new covenant apparently will never grow old nor be superseded by another. Consequently, it can

---

[1]See TDNT, s.v. "αἰών," 1:208; and NIDNTT, s.v. "Time," 3:827-33.

be viewed as truly eternal.[1]

Summary

In retrospect, the AH makes the following points in his development of the new covenant: (1) There is a direct and necessary relationship between the new covenant and Christ's role as high priest, just as there was between the Law or old covenant and the Levitical priests. (2) As a high priest in connection with the new covenant, Christ is viewed both as its mediator, providing by his death the foundation for the new covenant, as well as its guarantor, guaranteeing the fulfillment of its promises and stipulations. (3) As in 2 Corinthians 3, the AH contrasts the old covenant with the new. The new is shown to be superior both in terms of its ability to provide complete forgiveness and also in terms of its longevity, functioning as the replacement for the old. (4) The new covenant is described as already enacted, and the readers of Hebrews are portrayed as participating in the forgiveness which it promises. (5) When identifying the antecedent to this covenant, the AH twice draws upon the new covenant pericope recorded in Jeremiah 31, though it does not appear that he equates his readers with the original designees of the new covenant in Jeremiah.

---

[1]Guthrie, Hebrews, p. 278; and Morris, "Hebrews," p. 155; and Floyd V. Filson, "Yesterday": A Study of Hebrews in the Light of Chapter 13, SBT, eds. C. F. D. Moule et al. (Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, 1967), p. 59.

PART III

THEOLOGICAL CONSIDERATION

AND SUMMARY

CHAPTER I

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CHURCH

AND THE NEW COVENANT

Introduction

An issue frequently raised by modern interpreters in connection
with the new covenant is its relationship to the church. While several
of the other theological concerns were able to be discussed along with
a specific new covenant passage, because of the breadth of material
involved, the question of the new covenant and the church requires a
separate treatment. The procedure followed in this chapter is to give
a definition of the term "church," then to catalog briefly the basic
approaches to the question, and finally to consider a solution.

Definition

The church is identified as that entity within the family of the
redeemed called the "body of Christ."[1] Its inception was on the Day of
Pentecost, recorded in Acts 2,[2] and its completion will be at the coming

---

[1]Cf. Eph 1:22-23 and Col 1:18. The definition given is based
on the technical use of ἐκκλησία in the New Testament. Schmidt notes
that the dictionaries call this the ecclesiastical use (TDNT, s.v.
"καλέω," 3:502; see pp. 509-512). See also BAGD, pp. 240-41; and NIDNTT,
s.v. "Church," by Lothar Coenen, 1:298, 300.

[2]Support for this inception is based on a comparison of several
passages. The church as the body of Christ is formed in connection with
baptism and the Spirit of God (1 Cor 12:13, 27). Baptism in connection
with the Spirit was spoken of as yet future in Acts 1:4-5 and as some-
thing that had transpired in Acts 11:16. In Acts 11:15 Peter mentions
that this transaction with the Spirit was the same as that which occurred
"in the beginning" (ἐν ἀρχῆ), a phrase which would most readily be

of the Lord for His body, as described in 1 Thessalonians 4.[1]

By definition, a distinction is made between the term "church" and the term "Israel," whether this latter expression is used of national identity or of Jews experiencing personal redemption prior to Pentecost or after Christ's return for His body.[2] With regard to this second group, the definition for "church" does not imply that there is more than one way to be saved: all are saved by grace through faith.[3] Nor does it suggest that all believers are not included in the family of God or that some do not anticipate inheritance.[4] It is suggesting that a

identified with Acts 2 and the reference to the Spirit's activity at Pentecost (cf. 10:46 with 2:4). See NIDNTT, s.v. "Church," 1:303; TDNT, s.v. "βάπτω," by Albrecht Oepke, 1:539; NIDNTT, s.v. "Baptism," 1:146-48; and Earl D. Radmacher, The Nature of the Church (Portland: Western Baptist Press, 1972), pp. 197-212.

[2]Although the term ἐκκλησία is not used in 1 Thess 4:13-18, the expression "in Christ" (ἐν Χριστῷ, verse 16) is. According to 1:1, the expression "in Christ" is to be understood as referring to those in the body of Christ, that is, to those in the church. See TDNT, s.v. "καλέω," 3:507; and NIDNTT, s.v. "Church," 1:299.

[2]TDNT, s.v. "Ἰσραήλ," 3:384-88; and NIDNTT, s.v. "Israel," by Reinhold Mayer and Thomas McComiskey, 2:310-13, 315.

[3]This appears to be the point the apostle Paul is arguing in Rom 4 with regard to Abraham and his descendants. For a recent treatment of the issue, see Feinberg, "Salvation," pp. 39-77.

[4]See F. F. Bruce, The Time is Fulfilled: Five Aspects of the Fulfillment of the Old Testament in the New (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978), pp. 57-74. As Gal 3:29 indicates, all those belonging to Christ are a part of Abraham's seed and are heirs in accordance with God's promise. The particular promise mentioned in the context is that of justification (cf. 3:7-9). Against, see Albertus Pieters who, although recognizing the promise referred to in Galatians, assumes all other promises given to Abraham are incorporated within this one (The Seed of Abraham: A Biblical Study of Israel, the Church, and the Jew [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1950], p. 12). Holding a similar opinion is Hester who considers the various promises given to Israel in the Old Testament as having their fulfillment in the church (Paul's Concept of Inheritance; A Contribution to the Understanding of Heilsgeschicte, no. 14 in SJT Occasional Papers, eds. T. F.

distinction is to be made not only concerning the time in which they live, but also their identity within the redeemed of God.[1]

Since all do not accept this definition nor the distinctions indicated, it should be noted that nowhere in Scripture are the two terms "Israel" and "church" used as theological equivalents.[2] Furthermore, as indicated in the discussion of Romans 11, Scripture presents a future deliverance for national Israel, a deliverance that would be difficult to explain if it were assumed that the church supplanted Israel

---

Torrance and J. K. S. Reid [Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1968], pp. 63-68, 78-80). For a rebuttal, see Charles L. Feinberg, Premillennialism or Amillennialism? The Premillennial and Amillennial Systems of Biblical Interpretation Analyzed and Compared, 2d ed. (Wheaton: Van Kampen Press, 1954), pp. 277-82.

For a discussion of the background to Paul's statement concerning sonship and inheritance, see Brendan Byrne, "Sons of God"--"Seed of Abraham": A Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of All Christians in Paul Against the Jewish Background, AnBib (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979), pp. 138-40.

[1]Robert L. Saucy, The Church in God's Program (Chicago: Moody Press, 1972), pp. 70-82.

[2]The church is never designated in the New Testament as the "new," "true," or "spiritual" Israel. An excellent defense of this position is provided by Charles L. Feinberg, Millennialism: The Two Major Views. The Premillennial and Amillennial Systems of Biblical Interpretation Analyzed and Compared, 3d ed. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1982), pp. 229-49. See also TDNT, s.v. "Ἰσραήλ," 3:388; NIDNTT, s.v. "Israel," 2:310, 315; Radmacher, Nature of the Church, pp. 160-68; Saucy, Church in God's Program, pp. 70-74; and Paul E. Leonard, "Israel and the Church (Two Views): Two Peoples of God," in Dreams, Visions and Oracles: A Layman's Guide to Biblical Prophecy, eds. C. E. Amerding and W. W. Gasque (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977), pp. 228-29.

For those against, see Mauro, Gospel of the Kingdom, p. 81; Loraine Boettner, The Millennium (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1966), pp. 313-14; Pieters, Seed of Abraham, pp. 67-94; and Edmund P. Clowney, "Israel and the Church (Two Views): The New Israel," in Dreams, Visions, and Oracles: A Layman's Guide to Biblical Prophecy, eds. C. E. Amerding and W. W. Gasque (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977), pp. 207-220.

in the working out of God's redemptive program.[1]

Various Views

The various views on the relationship between the church and the new covenant can be cataloged under three approaches:[2] (1) The first view is that the promises recorded in Jeremiah and elsewhere concerning the new covenant are fulfilled entirely by the church.[3] (2) The second approach denies any direct relationship between Jeremiah's new covenant and the church. This incorporates those who allow a common denominator between the new covenant and the church, that being Christ, but who say that forgiveness involved with the church does not stem from the new covenant but from an antecedent decree in the redemptive program of God.[4] It also includes those who contend that there are two new covenants, one

---

[1]See pp. 171-80.

[2]See Kent, Hebrews, pp. 155-60.

[3]Generally, those who champion this position see the church as receiving and fulfilling the promises given to Israel in the Old Testament. See, for example, O. T. Allis, Prophecy and the Church (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1969), pp. 154-55; Roderick Campbell, Israel and the New Covenant (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1954), pp. 25, 31, 53; W. E. Cox, Biblical Studies in Final Things (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1967), pp. 6-10, 46-47, 70-78; idem, An Examination of Dispensationalism, (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1963), pp. 46-50; Philip Mauro, God's Present Kingdom (Boston: Hamilton Brothers, n.d.), pp. 217-22; Pieters, Seed of Abraham, pp. 67-71; Ridderbos, Paul, pp. 336-37; and Raymond O. Zorn, Church and Kingdom, International Library of Philosophy and Theology: Philosophical and Historical Studies Series, ed. R. J. Rushdoony (Grand Rapids: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1962), pp. 40-42.

[4]J. N. Darby, Notes on the Epistle to the Hebrews: From Notes on Lectures (reprint ed., Oak Park, IL: Bible Truth Publishers, 1970), pp. 72-73, 85-86; and idem, Synopsis of the Books of the Bible: Colossians-The Revelation, rev. ed. (reprint ed., New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1942), pp. 329-30, 340, 360, 367, 393.

in Jeremiah which relates to Israel and another found in certain New Testament references which is for the church.[1] (3) The third position views the new covenant as embracing aspects both for the church and for national Israel.[2] It is this third approach which is defended here as the position best supported by the exegesis of the new covenant passages.

Solution

The defense of this third approach is undertaken by answering three questions: (1) How many new covenants are presented in the New Testament? (2) Does Scripture indicate that the church participates in the new covenant? (3) Does Scripture point to the church as fulfilling the new covenant?

It was shown in the previous section that when the new covenant is mentioned in the New Testament it is frequently done in conjunction

---

[1]Lewis Sperry Chafer, Dispensationalism, rev. ed. (Dallas; Dallas Seminary Press, 1951), pp. 82-87; idem, Theology, 1:41-43; 4:325; 7:98-99; John F. Walvoord, "The New Covenant with Israel," BSac 103 (January-March 1946):22-26; idem, "The New Covenant with Israel," BSac 110 (July-September 1953):201-204; idem, The Millennial Kingdom (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1959), pp. 208-220; J. Dwight Pentecost, Things to Come: A Study in Biblical Eschatology (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Co., 1958), pp. 116-28; Charles Caldwell Ryrie, The Basis of the Premillennial Faith (Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1953), pp. 105-126; and idem, Biblical Theology of the New Testament (Chicago: Moody Press, 1959), p. 249. Apparently, Ryrie has abandoned this position in his later writings (Wycliffe Bible Encyclopedia, s.v. "Covenant, New," 1:392).
The verses in the New Testament generally agreed upon by these as referring to the new covenant for Israel are Heb 8:13 and 10:16-17.

[2]George Eldon Ladd, The Blessed Hope (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956), pp. 133-36; Rene Pache, The Return of Jesus Christ, trans. W. S. LaSor (Chicago: Moody Press, 1955), pp. 302-303; Stanley D. Toussaint, Behold the King: A Study of Matthew (Portland: Multnomah Press, 1980), p. 302; C. E. Piepgrass, "A Study of New Testament References to the Old Testament Covenants" (Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1968), pp. 179-82; and Kent, "New Covenant and Church," GTJ 6 (Fall 1985):289-90.

with references to the promises found in Jeremiah's new covenant. Not only is this intimated in the Synoptics and Paul, but it is also clearly indicated by the AH. Those who see two new covenants argue that Jesus' reference to the new covenant in the Synoptics is related to the church.[1] What they fail to show, though, is how this reference to a new covenant (mentioned to Jewish disciples in connection with the forgiveness of sins and in a Passover context) could have been understood by those in attendance as other than Jeremiah's new covenant.

It is also also argued by these that the references to a "new," "better," or "eternal" covenant in Hebrews 7:22, 8:6, 9:15, 10:29, 12:24, and 13:20 involve a different covenant than the references to Jeremiah's new covenant in 8:7-13 and 10:16-17. The former references supposedly represent the new covenant for the church; the latter the new covenant for Israel.[2] Yet if the AH intended to inform his readers concerning the new covenant for the church, interposing references to Jeremiah's new covenant for Israel would seem confusing and easily mis-construed if the two covenants were indeed distinct.

This is particularly seen in 8:7-13. In 8:6 the AH mentions a "better" covenant in conjunction with which Christ performs a superior ministry to that of the Levites and the Mosaic covenant. If this better covenant is for the church, then why does the AH support his statement concerning this better covenant by drawing upon Jeremiah's new covenant promise in verses 7-13?

---

[1]Chafer, Dispensationalism, p. 82; Pentecost, Things to Come, pp. 124-27; and Ryrie, Basis of Premillennial Faith, pp. 115-25.

[2]Walvoord, "New Covenant," 103:23-25; idem, "New Covenant," 110:203; and Ryrie, Biblical Theology, p. 249.

Moreover, in chapters 9 and 10, it was seen that the AH argues for the effectiveness of Christ's sacrifice in providing complete forgiveness. According to 9:15, Christ's sacrifice and its resultant forgiveness are related to his role as new covenant mediator. If this is the new covenant for the church and not Israel, as is contended, why does the AH in 10:16-17 quote Jeremiah 31:31-34 to support the forgiveness which this new covenant secures?[1] Any approach which attempts to distinguish two new covenants in the New Testament has not been supported by the exegesis of the pertinent passages and must rest on other grounds.

Having concluded that there is only one new covenant presented in the New Testament, the second question asks whether the church is depicted as participating in this covenant. The evidence argues for the affirmative. As mentioned before, Jesus' words during the Last Supper associate his death and the forgiveness which it provides with the new covenant. According to the apostle Paul in 1 Corinthians 10 and 11, when the Corinthian believers participated in the institution commemorating the Lord's words at the Supper, it was because they had become participants in the forgiveness which the institution signified. In other words, the blood of the new covenant had provided their forgiveness. It would be difficult to conceive that they could be partakers of the one and not of the other as well.

The AH, as noted above, offers a similar verification. In 10:11-18 he confirms that Christ's sacrifice secures the complete

---

[1]See Payne, _Theology_, pp. 76-78. Notice in 10:15 the AH states that the following quote from Jeremiah and its promise of forgiveness is something that the Holy Spirit is testifying to the author and readers of Hebrews (Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον).

forgiveness promised in Jeremiah's new covenant. In 10:19, 22, 29, he exhorts his readers as to their responsibilities, based on the fact that they had received this forgiveness. Again, it is inconceivable that they could be involved with the forgiveness and not with the covenant in connection with which this forgiveness is provided.

There are, moreover, additional indications that the church participates in the new covenant. For example, Paul states in 2 Corinthians 3 that he and his associates were ministers of the new covenant. Not only does Paul contrast this ministry to Moses' and the old covenant, but quite clearly he portrays his readers also as recipients of this new covenant ministry. Also included in this support is the description of Christ as a high priest in Hebrews. The AH intrinsically links Christ's role as a high priest with the new covenant, while, at the same time, he undeniably has Christ exercising his priestly office on behalf of the readers (cf., for example, 7:11-28).

All of this argues forcibly that the church does participate in the new covenant. Not only has the blood of Christ, the blood of the new covenant, secured forgiveness for those in the church, but Christ's priestly ministry, a ministry based on the new covenant, also presently benefits those in the church.

If, then, the New Testament indicates that the church participates in the new covenant, does it also suggest that the church fulfills the new covenant? Of the three questions, this third one is the most controversial and the most difficult to answer. The references to the new covenant in the Old Testament can only be understood in their own

contexts as representing God's promises to the nation Israel.[1] However, this does not answer the question. The concern is with the New Testament data and whether the church is depicted as supplanting Israel as the recipient of the new covenant promises.

In response, it is argued that the New Testament supports a dual application of the new covenant, involving both the church and national Israel. As mentioned earlier, the exegesis of Romans 11:25-27, undertaken in the previous section, identified a future function of the new covenant for Israel. If the church fulfills the new covenant promises, then why does the apostle mention a future deliverance of the nation in connection with this covenant?

Furthermore, the new covenant promises in the Old Testament included more than the forgiveness of sins. For example, the restoration and occupation of Canaan as the nation's promised land was an inherent part of the new covenant in the Old Testament. Moreover, the nation was promised a period of unparalleled peace and prosperity by the new covenant in connection with its return to the land. As was indicated in the discussion of the Old Testament references, if taken at face value, these promises cannot be interpreted as having been realized; therefore, their fulfillment must yet be future.[2] In addition, because the new covenant's

---

[1] None of these three approaches to the relationship contests this point. As noted in the discussion of the references to the new covenant in Isaiah, there was an indication that the covenant made provisions for the Gentiles as well. Cf. Isa 42:6 and 49:8.

[2] There is considerable debate on the issues of the land promise. Those who see the church fulfilling the new covenant conclude either that the land promise was historically fulfilled by the nation or that the promise points not to an earthly but to a heavenly inheritance. See, for example, the recent discussion by Thomas Edward McComiskey, The Covenants of Promise: A Theology of the Old Testament Covenants (Grand

promise of forgiveness as understood by the New Testament writers does not appear to be couched in figurative or hyperbolic language, it can be assumed that the same is true for these other promises as well. Finally, there is no express statement among the New Testament references which suggests that these promises are fulfilled by the church.[1] Consequently, it can be concluded that they will be fulfilled in connection with the future deliverance of the nation, as the Old Testament references indicate.

All of this argues against the church fulfilling the new covenant and argues for a dual application of the covenant involving blessings both for the church and for the nation. The third view is the only one which makes allowances for all of the data as described above. It recognizes, on the one hand, that the Old Testament addresses Israel as

---

Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985), pp. 199-209. See also William E. Cox, Amillennialism Today (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1966), pp. 37-38; Hughes, Interpreting Prophecy, pp. 18-20; Hester, Paul's Concept of Inheritance, pp. 78-81.

Those who see a future aspect of the new covenant for Israel generally conclude that the land promise will be realized in connection with the deliverance of the nation. See the recent treatments by Earl Radmacher, "The Current Status of Dispensationalism and Its Eschatology," in Perspectives on Evangelical Theology: Papers from the Thirtieth Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, eds. K. S. Kantzer and S. N. Gundry (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979), pp. 171-76; Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., "The Promise Theme and the Theology of Rest," BSac 130 (April-June 1973):135-50; idem, "The Promised Land: A Biblical Historical View," BSac 138 (October-December 1981):302-312; and Jeffrey L. Townsend, "Fulfillment of the Land Promise in the Old Testament," BSac 142 (October-December 1985):320-37.

[2]It must be noted that the church as a co-heir with Christ (Rom 8:17) and included within the seed of Abraham (Gal 3:29) may anticipate sharing in the many blessings that these relationships entail. This would include participating in the blessings associated with the future restoration and establishment of the nation in their land. The point, though, is that the promises concerning the land are neither abrogated nor taken from the nation. Whatever part the church plays in their enjoyment is based on the nation's receiving and fulfilling these promises.

the recipient of the new covenant. It further recognizes that the New Testament does not present anything that would prevent the original recipient from fulfilling the promises involved. At the same time, it also recognizes, on the other hand, that the New Testament clearly involves the church in the benefits of the new covenant. For this reason, the third view is identified as the correct approach to the relationship between the new covenant and the church.

CHAPTER II

SUMMARY

Introduction

A summary of the conclusions reached in the previous chapters
is provided here. The intent is to consolidate this material in order
to provide a comprehensive view of the new covenant in both the Old and
New Testaments.

The New Covenant in the Old Testament

The study of the new covenant in the Old Testament was limited
to the writing prophets and to those passages which specifically mention
a future covenant. It was determined that there were a total of thir-
teen direct references to the new covenant in the Old Testament prophets.
In addition to the only reference where the expression "new covenant"
is used, Jeremiah 31:31-34, these include Hosea 2:20 [18]; Isaiah 42:6,
49:8, 54:10, 55:3, 59:21, 61:8; Jeremiah 32:40, 50:5; and Ezekiel 16:60,
34:25, 37:26. In each case, the convenant statement involved the nation
and was found in an eschatological context in which the nation was
promised unparalleled blessing after a period of national chastisement.
These references revealed the following information concerning the new
covenant.

(1) The new covenant has as its counterpart the old or Mosaic
covenant. As such, it sustains a degree both of continuity and of
discontinuity with the old. In the few instances in which the two are

266

juxtaposed, invariably it is the discontinuity that is in focus, although the difference is often a relative one.

(2) The new covenant ensures the transformation of the human personality so that there is the desire as well as the capacity for obedience to the divine _torah_. This transaction is associated with the activity of the Spirit of God. While such a change was experienced during the tenure of the old covenant, it was not something that was derived from the old covenant. With the new covenant, this provision is guaranteed for all of its recipients.

(3) The new covenant provides for the full forgiveness of sins. Although there was a forgiveness associated with the old covenant, the forgiveness accomplished in connection with the new is of a greater magnitude.

(4) The new covenant establishes an inviolable relationship between Yahweh and the nation. This relationship is depicted through the covenant formula ("I will be their God and they shall be my people") and is based in part on the recipient's knowledge of God. Again, this knowledge and this relationship were both incorporated in the design of the old covenant, but were not realized, at least not to the same degree and extent as with the new.

(5) The new covenant is promised in conjunction with Israel's regathering and restoration to its geographic homeland after a period of national judgment and dispersion. The Assyrian and Babylonian captivities illustrate this judgment, and the return from exile, the restoration. Nevertheless, neither is viewed as satisfying the context demanded for the new covenant promise.

(6) The new covenant includes the cessation of warfare as a means God uses for disciplining the nation. As a corollary, the new covenant also establishes a harmonious relationship between the nation and the animal kingdom in that it too has been a vehicle God has used in national chastisement.

(7) The new covenant is accomplished by the Servant of Yahweh who is commissioned as its mediator. This servant is depicted as a future Davidide who both delivers and rules the nation. In addition, this servant functions in a salvific role for the Gentiles, granting spiritual discernment and deliverance to the ends of the earth.

The New Covenant in the New Testament

There were identified in the New Testament a total of thirteen references to the new covenant. These include the three references to the new covenant in the Synoptics--Matthew 26:28; Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20; the three references in the Pauline corpus--Romans 11:27, 1 Corinthians 11:25, 2 Corinthians 3:6; and the seven references in Hebrews--7:22; 8:6-13; 9:15; 10:15-18; 10:29; 12:24; 13:20. These brought out the following characteristics concerning the new covenant.

(1) The new covenant is intrinsically linked with the death of Jesus. It was His death which provided for the establishment of the new covenant and secured the forgiveness which it promised. Because of this, Jesus' death functioned both as an expiatory sacrifice and as a covenant ratification sacrifice.

(2) The new covenant is also inseparably joined to the role of Jesus as high priest. As a high priest, Jesus is viewed both as the mediator of the new covenant, providing for its inception, and as its

guarantor, guaranteeing the fulfillment of its promises. It is understood that Jesus' death and his role as high priest are necessary corollaries. As high priest, it was the offering of himself that qualified him to function as both mediator and guarantor for the new covenant.

(3) The new covenant is associated with believers in the present age. Believers participate in the forgiveness accomplished through Jesus' death; and through the observance of the Lord's Supper, they anticipate His return.

(4) The new covenant provides for the future deliverance of national Israel. This deliverance is accomplished through a savior; it encompasses the nation as a whole; it involves the forgiveness of sins and a removal of ungodliness; and it follows the present period of Gentile salvation.

(5) The new covenant is contrasted to the Mosaic covenant both in terms of its longevity and its ministry. The ministry connected with the new covenant is that in which Paul and others were engaged. It is a ministry empowered and made effective through the Spirit of God. In contrast to the Mosaic, this ministry brings life and righteousness, rather than condemnation and death. As such, the new covenant is imbued with greater glory than the old.

The New Covenant and the Church

During the course of the discussion on the new covenant, the question was raised concerning its relationship to the church. In the chapter where this issue was treated, the church was defined as that portion within the redeemed of God who experience salvation in the present age and who are called the "body of Christ." Of the three views identified,

the approach which recognizes in the new covenant aspects both for the church and for national Israel was defended for the following reasons.

(1) The passages examined in the New Testament make allowance for only one new covenant. In addition, when identifying this covenant, invariably the passages do so in connection with the new covenant promised in the Old Testament, particularly Jeremiah 31:31-34.

(2) In addition, these same passages clearly indicate that the church presently participates in this new covenant. Specifically, the church receives the forgiveness which the new covenant promises and benefits from the ministry of Christ as the new covenant's high priest.

(3) Lastly, the New Testament makes provision for a future application of the new covenant to Israel. For this reason, the church cannot be viewed as fulfilling all that is promised in the new covenant. This conclusion is further corroborated in that the new covenant in the Old Testament involved promises not directly applied to the church. For example, it was noted that the new covenant includes promises concerning the restoration and occupation by Israel of its geographic homeland. Nothing in either testament suggests that this promise has been deleted or that the church has supplanted Israel in its fulfillment. All of this argues for a dual application of the new covenant incorporating blessings both for the church and for the nation.

APPENDIX A

THE USE OF ברית IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

A lexical study of ברית is provided here as a foundation for
the treatment of the Old Testament covenant concept in the preceding
sections. ברית is chosen as representing the key Hebrew term used in
the Old Testament to express this concept.[1] The three areas included
are (1) a study of the etymology and semantic range of ברית; (2) a
study of the etymology and semantic range of the expression for making
a covenant; and (3) a consideration of the kinds of covenants found in
the Old Testament.

ברית

Etymology

There have recently been a considerable number of attempts to
identify the derivation and basal meaning of the term ברית.[2] These
attempts, which have drawn heavily upon cognate studies in an effort to

---

[1]Related Hebrew terms are treated when appropriate in the course
of this discussion. See Weinfeld, "Covenant Terminology," pp. 190-99;
Roland de Vaux, The Bible and the Ancient Near East, trans. Damian
McHugh (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1971), pp. 160-61; and IDB, s.v.
"Covenant," 1:715-16.

[2]For bibliographies, see TDOT, s.v. "ברית," by M. Weinfeld,
2:253-54; Dennis J. McCarthy, Treaty and Covenant: A Study in Form
in the Ancient Oriental Documents and in the Old Testament, 2d ed.
(Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), pp. 309-42; Walther Zimmerli,
OT Theology in Outline, trans. David E. Green (Atlanta: John Knox
Press, 1978), p. 58; and TRE, s.v. "Bund," by Ernst Kutsch, 7:401-403.

arrive at an understanding of ברית, fall into four categories:[1] (1) The substantive ברית is viewed as having derived from the verb ברה, meaning "to eat." The noun ברית would have developed from the relationship between the verb ברה and the eating of a ceremonial meal associated with covenant making. By association, ברית would have been used of the meal itself and then for the covenant which the meal concluded.[2] (2) A correspondence is seen between ברית and the Akkadian preposition birit, meaning "among," "between."[3] In this instance, the noun ברית would have developed through the adverbial use of the preposition ("in between") to a substantival use ("that which is between, a mediation, a covenant"). Although related to the Hebrew preposition בן, ברית would be a loan word from the substantized Akkadian preposition birit.[4] (3) ברית is understood to be related to the Akkadian substantive biritu, meaning "clasp," "fetter."[5] This association would be supported by a wide range of cognate terms found in the ANE for "covenant" or "treaty," all having

---

[1]TDOT, s.v. "ברית," 2:253-55.

[2]See Ludwig Koehler, "Problems in the Study of the Language of the Old Testament," JSS 1 (1956):7; Edmond Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament, trans. A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1958), p. 210; and Dennis J. McCarthy, Old Testament Covenant: A Survey of Current Opinions (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1972), p. 3. For arguments against, see TDNT, s.v. "διατίθημι," by Gottfried Quell, 2:107-108; and Noth, Laws in Pentateuch, p. 112.

[3]AD, s.v. "birit," eds. I. J. Gelb et al., 2B:249-52.

[4]This approach is defended by Noth, Laws in Pentateuch, pp. 112-15. See also Ronald Youngblood, "The Abrahamic Covenant: Conditional or Unconditional?" in The Living and Active Word of God: Studies in Honor of Samuel J. Schultz, eds. M. Inch and R. Youngblood (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983), pp. 34-35; and J. Alberto Soggin, "Akkadisch TAR BERITI und Hebraisch כרת ברית," VT 18 (1968):210-15. For objections, see TDOT, s.v. "ברית," 2:254.

[5]AD, s.v. "biritu," 2B:252-55.

the idea of a "bond."[1] (4) ברית is said to be derived from the Akkadian verb <u>baru</u>, meaning "to look for, to choose," which subsequently would have developed into the concept of "to determine," "to fix," and then "to pledge," "to commit," and finally "to covenant," "to make a covenant."[2] The interchange of ברית with חק ("statute," "law") or עדת ("law," "ordinance") in the Old Testament is seen by the supporters of this view as evidence in favor of this derivation.

The lack of agreement and the controversy involved make decisions regarding the etymology of ברית hazardous. It is best with the present level of understanding and the confusion engendered to conclude that the history of its development is uncertain. Ultimately, the context and usage must be the final arbiters in arriving at a definition.

Semantic Range

Attempts at defining ברית in its Old Testament use manifest a diversity similar to that seen above in the tracing of its derivation. Some view the biblical ברית as that which establishes or at least

[1]<u>TDOT</u>, s.v. "ברית," 2:255. See also W. F. Albright, "The Hebrew Expression for 'Making a Covenant' in Pre-Israelite Documents," <u>BASOR</u> 121 (February 1951):22; <u>IDB</u>, s.v. "Covenant," 1:715; O. Loretz,"ברית-- 'Band-Bund,'" <u>VT</u> 16 (1966):239-41; Frank Moore Cross, <u>Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel</u> (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), p. 267. Perhaps the most popular of the four approaches, this view nevertheless does have its detractors. See Eduard Nielsen, <u>Shechem: A Traditio-Historical Investigation</u> (Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1959), pp. 113-14; and Youngblood, "Abrahamic Covenant," p. 34.

[2]<u>AD</u>, s.v. "baru," B:115. For the development of this view, see especially Ernst Kutsch, "Gesetz und Gnade: Probleme des alttestamentlichen Bundesbegriff," <u>ZAW</u> 79 (1967):34-35; <u>THAT</u>, s.v. "ברית b^erit Verpflichtung," by Ernst Kutsch, 1:339-51. In response, see Dennis J. McCarthy, "B^erit and Covenant in the Deuteronomistic History," in <u>Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel</u>, VTSup, vol. 23 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972), pp. 65-85; Robertson, <u>Christ of the Covenants</u>, p. 4, n. 4.

formally recognizes a relationship between two parties. Without ignoring

the stipulations associated with this relationship, it is the relation-

ship which ברית signifies above all.[1] Others see in ברית an emphasis

on the concept of "imposition," "liability," "obligation," or "oath."

From this perspective, it was not the relationship which ברית connotes

so much as that which bound two parties together."[2] Still others

---

[1]Kline, for example, defines ברית as a "relationship under sanction." Every biblical covenant, he maintains, involves a sanction-sealed commitment to maintain a particular relationship or to follow a stipulated course of action (By Oath Consigned: A Reinterpretation of the Covenant Signs of Circumcision and Baptism [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968], pp. 16, 33).

John J. Mitchell expands on this by adding the following: "It is a relationship beyond those existing in nature or in law, and includes 'peace,' 'brotherhood,' or even 'love'" (Abram's Understanding of the Lord's Covenant," WTJ 32 [November 1969]:26). Elsewhere, he states that "this relationship might be constituted by means of an oath, a ritual, or by sovereign imposition; it might consist primarily of one-sided obligations, mutual alliances, or even unmerited bestowment. Yet the underlying common denominator is that of a bond-relationship estab-lished between the parties" (p. 29).

Clarence Mason, Jr., defines ברית similarly as "a sovereign pronouncement," establishing "a relation of responsibility" (Prophetic Problems with Alternate Solutions [Chicago: Moody Press 1973], p. 35).

Martin Buber adds the caution that concluding a ברית does not mean a previous relationship has not existed, only that a designated relationship within the bounds of certain stipulations is founded (Kingship of God, 3d ed., trans. R. Scheimann [New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1967], p. 31). See also W. J. Dumbrell, "The Covenant with Noah," RTR 38 (January-April 1979):2-3.

[2]ISBE, s.v. "Covenant (OT)," by J. A. Thompson, 1:790. According to Kutsch, a ברית "in itself does not mean 'covenant' or 'treaty' or the like, and it does not signify a relation between two partners. Origi-nally, it meant the engagement into which one has solemnly entered, and which has perhaps been confirmed by means of ritual curse. He who 'cuts' the berit either takes upon himself the liability, or he imposes it upon the other with whom he cuts it. Eventually both partners can cut the berit, and thus they mutually take liabilities upon themselves" ("Gesetz und Gnade," pp. 34-35).

See also Robertson, Christ of the Covenants, pp. 3-5. Weinfeld attempts to demonstrate through the use of cognate expressions (e.g., שבועה, "oath," and מצוה, "commandment"), used in connection with ברית that this indeed is what the term signified (TDOT, s.v. "ברית,"2:255-56). Similarly, IDB, s.v. "Covenant," 1:714.

discourage attempts at giving a single definition to the biblical ברית,
preferring rather to combine several meanings into a single definition[1]
or even to allow for a variety of meanings depending on the context.[2]

The absense of a consensus in these studies on the derivation of
ברית and its semantic range suggests the need for caution in pursuing a
definition. At the same time, from a survey of the above literature, it
appears that the choice regarding its meaning in the Old Testament lies
between the concepts of a "relationship specified" or an "obligation
undertaken."[3] Perhaps it is best, rather than attempting to choose
between these, to agree with those who combine them into a single defi-
nition. In other words, it may be assumed that one or both of these
concepts is intended when ברית is used in a given context. It is the
context which must finally determine the proper nuance, but only within
the range which these studies have suggested. For the sake of conven-
ience and in spite of the objections of a few, the terms "covenant" or

---

[1]For example, McCarthy appears to champion a combination of both
"relationship" and "obligation" in his definition of ברית (Treaty and
Covenant, pp. 21, 77, 177; "Covenant in the Old Testament: The Present
State of Inquiry," CBQ 27 [July 1965]:219, 239; and "Berit in Old Testa-
ment History and Theology," Bib 53 [1972]:84-85).

[2]Hans Joachim Kraus, "God's Covenant," The Reformed World 35
(1979):257-68; and Delbert R. Hillers, Covenant: The History of a
Biblical Idea (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969):6-7. Commenting
on the task of defining ברית, he says, "It is not the case of six blind
men and the elephant, but of a group of learned paleontologists creating
different monsters from the fossils of six separate species" (p. 7).

[3]Cleon Rogers adds a third possibility, namely, that ברית refers
to the formal ceremony associated with covenants ("The Covenant with
Abraham and Its Historical Setting," BSac 127 [July 1970]:243). See
also Vos, Biblical Theology, pp. 32-33, 277. Against this, Payne states
that such ceremonies were not always present, nor did such ceremonies
always involve a covenant (Theology, p. 79; and "The B'rith of Yahweh,"
in New Perspectives on the Old Testament, ed. J. B. Payne [Waco: Word
Books, 1970], p. 244).

"treaty" are employed in this study to translate בְּרִית.[1]

כרת ברית

Among the several expression employed in the Old Testament for establishing a covenant, easily the most frequent is כרת ברית (literally, "to cut a covenant").[2] Because of its frequency, this combination is recognized as the standard Old Testament expression for "making a covenant." Consequently, it receives the focus of attention in the discussion which follows.

---

[1]See criticism of the above terms by Kutsch, "Gesetz und Gnade," pp. 34-35; and THAT, s.v. "ברית bᵉrit," 1:339-51. In support of this definition, see McCarthy, "Bᵉrit and Covenant," pp. 65-85. He concludes that these translations are valid, the arguments of Kutsch notwithstanding. See also TDNT, "διατίθημι," 2:109; and Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings, ConB, Old Testament Series (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1976), p. 275.
Thompson notes that the terms are appropriate whether both parties are men or whether one of the parties represented is God. The latter, he says, is the religious use and is a metaphor of the former (ISBE, "Covenant [OT]," 1:790).
For a somewhat different approach, see ZPEB, "Covenant (in the Old Testament)," 1:1001-1010; and idem, Theology, pp. 71-96. Payne views ברית as a unifying theme in Scripture, but prefers to define it as a "testamentary disposition" rather than as a "covenant" when the parties involved are unequal in status. For a refutation of the testamentary idea, at least in the Old Testament usages of ברית, see Robertson, Christ of the Covenants, pp. 11-15.

[2]Although there are cognate expressions used, this expression predominates, and it is in light of this phrase that the other terms must be understood. For a treatment of the cognate phrases, see TDOT, s.v. "ברית," 2:259-61; and Weinfeld, "Covenant Terminology," pp. 196-97. His conclusion is that all are roughly synonymous and suggest the idea of establishing a covenant.
U. Cassuto disagrees, contending that כרת is used for the initiating of a covenant, whereas the other terms employed point to subsequent reaffirmations (The Documentary Hypothesis and the Composition of the Pentateuch, trans. Israel Abrahams [Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University, 1961], p. 47). It should be noted that the definitions he presents are in connection with his attempts to show that the variations in the covenant expressions do not necessarily point to different literary sources. See also Dumbrell, "Covenant with Noah," pp. 4-5.

Despite the few who discount tracing the initial significance of the phrase, there is general agreement that it initially referred to the "cutting up" of animals in connection with a covenant ceremony.[1] The significance of the disjecta membra is, however, variously understood. The most popular approach is to view it as a drohritus; that is, "an effective sign of the consequences of covenant breaking."[2] Those who oppose this position do not deny that the "cutting" of a covenant can signify a drohritus, only that the cutting ceremony always carried with it this meaning. Hasel, for example, accepts this significance generally for first-millennium treaty texts, but questions whether such was the case for treaties undertaken prior to the first millennium. His conclusion is that there was no single concept attached to the animal rite in the ANE. Although the majority of instances in the first millennium suggest the idea of a drohritus, in the centuries preceding, he concludes, the term suggests simply a rite of treaty ratification.[3]

Because of the clear consensus among those treating the question, it may be assumed that the expression "cutting a covenant" arose from

[1] IDB, s.v. "Covenant," 1:716.

[2] McCarthy, Treaty and Covenant, pp. 93-94. The popularity of this position makes further documentation superfluous.

[3] Gerhard F. Hasel, "The Meaning of the Animal Rite in Genesis 15," JSOT 19 (February 1981):61-78. His understanding of the extra-biblical treaty texts, to some extent, is colored by his assumption that the animal rite in Gen 15 cannot have the idea of self-imprecation. His conclusions concerning the second-millennium treaties rest largely on the treaty text from Mari and particularly the reference to the "slaying of an ass" as a covenant ratification ritual.

For a treatment of the Mari material, see Noth, Laws in the Pentateuch, pp. 110-12; George E. Mendenhall, "Puppy and Lettuce in Northwest-Semitic Covenant Making," BASOR 133 (February 1954):26-30; and Moshe Held, "Philological Notes on the Mari Covenant Rituals," BASOR 200 (December 1970):31-25.

the covenant ceremony in which animals were slain. Furthermore, this same general agreement suggests that the slaying of the animals involved a drohritus or sign of the consequences for breaking the covenant. Caution should be exercized, however, in this second issue in that the evidence from texts earlier than the first millennium is less that conclusive in support of this concept. Lastly, the entire phrase became a terminus technicus, probably by the second millennium, for the establishing of a covenant.[1]

Biblical Covenants

Kinds

The remaining issues to be considered center around the nature of the various covenants mentioned in the Old Testament. The first of

---

[1] For representative treatments of the issues mentioned above, see A. B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, ed. S. D. F. Salmond, The International Theological Library, eds. C. A. Briggs and S. D. F. Salmond (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), pp. 235-39; Jacob, Theology, pp. 210-11; John Van Seters, Abraham in History and Tradition (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), pp. 101-103; Walter G. Williams, "Tension and Harmony Between Classical Prophecy and Classical Law," in Transitions in Biblical Scholarship, ed. J. Coert Rylaarsdam, vol. 6 of Essays in Divinity, ed. J. C. Brauer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), pp. 77-78; F. C. Fensham, "The Treaty Between the Israelites and the Tyrians," in Congress Volume: Rome 1968, VTSup, vol. 17 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969), pp. 78-79; Z. W. Falk, "Hebrew Legal Terms: III," JSS 14 (Spring 1969):39-44; Manfred R. Lehmann, "Biblical Oaths," ZAW 81 (1969):75-77; Rogers, "Covenant with Abraham," pp. 247-49; idem, "The Covenant with Moses and Its Historical Setting," JETS 14 (Summer 1971):141-55; David L. Peterson, "Covenant Ritual: A Traditio-Historical Perspective," BR 22 (1977):7-18; John J. Collins, "The Meaning of Sacrifice: A Contrast of Methods," BR 22 (1977):19-34; and Youngblood, "Abrahamic Covenant," p. 34.

For a list of the various rites used in covenant making, see, for example, G. Herbert Livingston, The Pentateuch in Its Cultural Environment (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1974), pp. 157-58. For a treatment of the prepositions used with the phrase, see especially TDOT, s.v. "ברית," 2:259-61; TDNT, s.v. "διατίθημι," 2:108-109; and Koehler, "Problems in Language," pp. 4-24.

these issues deals with the kinds of covenants that are found. In the last several decades, a considerable amount of material has developed from the analysis of treaty forms in the ANE from the second millennium on and a comparison of these with the covenants in the Old Testament.[1] As a result of these studies, the covenants in the Old Testament are generally classified according to one of three categories: parity covenants, suzerainty covenants, and promissory or land grant covenants.

Initially, only the first two designations were identified from the Hittite treaties. Parity treaties were those in which two parties, willing to concede to each other equal status, entered into an agreement involving mutual, if not equal, obligations. In this case, the covenant was bilateral. A suzerainty treaty involved parties of unequal status where the greater imposed obligations upon the lesser. It is generally agreed that this covenant was unilateral in that, although the suzerain had obligations, his were voluntary and therefore not truly obligatory.[2]

---

[1]The value of these studies is recognized by many. Jon. D. Levenson echoes the sentiment of these when he says this: "One of the most fruitful advances in biblical scholarship since the Second World War has been in the understanding of covenant. The elucidation of various extra-biblical treaties, especially those of the Hittite Empire of the Late Bronze Age, has proven immensely heuristic" ("The Davidic Covenant and Its Modern Interpreters," CBQ 41 [April 1979]:205).

The initial work in the area, particularly with the treaties of the Hittite Empire, is credited to George E. Mendenhall, Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East (Pittsburgh: Biblical Colloquium, 1955); and Klaus Baltzer, The Covenant Formulary: In Old Testament, Jewish, and Early Christian Writings, trans. David E. Green (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971). Both drew upon the work of Victor Korosĕc, Hethitische Staatsverträge, ein Beitrag zu ihrer juristichen Vertung, Leipziger rechtswissenshaftliche Studien (Leipzig: Weicher, 1931). For bibliographies and recent interaction with the issues involved, see McCarthy, Treaty and Covenant, pp. 2-24.

[2]Mendenhall, Law and Covenant, pp. 29-30; J. A. Thompson, "The Near Eastern Suzerain-Vassal Concept in the Religion of Israel," JRH 3 (June 1964):3-4; ZPEB, s.v. "Covenant (OT)," 1:1001-1003; Herbert B.

A third category, the promissory covenant, is recognized,
although variously identified. Mettinger, for example, subsumes it
under the heading "suzerain," dividing suzerainty covenants between
vassal treaties and land grants.[1] Mendenhall, on the other hand, dis-
tinguishes between a promissory as a third category and a patron as a
fourth category, though his distinctions are somewhat unclear.[2] Most
follow Weinfeld and identify a third category, distinct from either of
the first two, calling it either a promissory covenant or a land grant.
Weinfeld states this: "Two types of official judicial documents have
been diffused in the Mesopotamian cultural sphere from the middle of
the second millennium onwards: the political treaty which is well known
to us from the Hittite empire and the royal grant, the classical form of
which is found in the Babylonian kudurru documents (boundary stones) but
which occurs as such also among the Hittites in the Syro-Palestine area,
and in the Neo-Assyrian period."[3]

The distinction between this and the suzerain covenant mentioned
previously is not so much one of form, but one of function:

> While the "treaty" constitutes an obligation of the vassal to his
> master, the suzerain, the "grant" constitutes an obligation of the
> master to his servant. In the "grant" the curse is directed
> towards the one who will violate the rights of the king's vassal,
> while in the treaty the curse is directed towards the vassal who

---

Huffmon, "The Exodus, Sinai and the Credo," CBQ 27 (1965):105; George
Snyder, "The Law and Covenant in Amos," ResQ 25 (Third Quarter 1982):
159; and Walter Vogels, "Covenants Between Israel and the Nations,"
Eglise et Theologie 4 (May 1973):171-96.

[1]Mettinger, King and Messiah, p. 303.

[2]Mendenhall, "Covenant," p. 717.

[3]Moshe Weinfeld, "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and
in the Ancient Near East," JAOS 90 (April-June 1970):184-85.

will violate the rights of his king. In other words, the "grant" serves mainly to protect the rights of the servant, while the treaty comes to protect the rights of the master.[1]

Sitz im Leben

Having said this, it should be noted that there is disagreement concerning the relationship the biblical covenants (specifically those where God is depicted as one of the parties involved) have with their extra-biblical counterparts. The question ultimately focuses on the Sitz im Leben of the divine covenants. While not denying the obvious similarities in form between the biblical covenants and those of the ANE, there are many who contend that the divine covenants of the Old Testament do not owe their origin to the extra-biblical pattern.[2]

---

[1]Ibid., p. 185. See also Campbell, God's Covenant, pp. 5-10; Jon. D. Levenson, "Who Inserted the Book of the Torah," HTR 68 (July-October 1975):224-29; and McCarthy, Treaty and Covenant, pp. 88-89, 163. For a critique of Weinfeld's treatment of extra-biblical parallels, see Van Seters, Abraham in History, pp. 102-103.

[2]For varying reasons and to varying degrees, the following are advocates of this position. C. F. Whitley, for example, states, "We may doubt if the Hittite treaties offer a close parallel to the Hebrew covenant" ("Covenant and Commandment in Israel," JNES 22 [January 1963]:37).

Georg Fohrer adds this: "Quite apart from the fact that the word berit does not mean a 'treaty, covenant,' there is really no parallelism: the Sinai tradition is not modeled after a treaty form" (History of Israelite Religion, trans. David E. Green [Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972], pp. 80-81).

McCarthy accepts the correlations, but questions the time at which they are introduced in the Old Testament, rejecting the ANE (i.e., the Hittite) treaty format as being the formative factor (Old Testament Covenant, p. 34). See also Dentan, Knowledge of God, pp. 48, 250-51; Ernest Wilson Nicholson, Exodus and Sinai in History and Tradition (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1973), p. 52; and Zimmerli, OT Theology, pp. 49-60.

The recent work by Ronald E. Clements summarizes the sentiment of these: "Once the Old Testament tradition is looked at critically, then the parallels that have been adduced to support a dependence upon this treaty form are much less prominent than has been maintained by its advocates. The amount of light that can, in consequence, be brought to bear upon the Old Testament by appeal to such a borrowing

Without depreciating the uniqueness of the divine covenants in the Old Testament, whether in respect to the parties involved or to their contents, the majority today does see intentional parallels between these covenants and their ANE counterparts. Thus employed, the covenant becomes a metaphor which adapts and expands the treaty format, apart from which the biblical expression cannot be properly understood. Remarking on one aspect of this relationship, Beyerlin comments: "The parallels between the above Hittite covenant-treaties and the Israelite Decalogue are so numerous and so striking that one can hardly avoid the view that the Ten Commandments are--formally--modeled on the covenant form that is revealed in the vassal-treaties of the Hittites and was probably in general use in the Near East of the second millennium B.C."[1]

Dating

Assuming that intentional borrowing is in fact the case, and the evidence seems overwhelmingly in support of that conclusion, the question is raised whether the biblical covenants can be dated based on the

---

becomes drastically reduced. Whether such a hypothesis can be sustained at all, therefore, remains in question, and it can offer little elucidation of the distinctive way in which the Old Testament interprets Israel's relationship to Yahweh after the analogy of a covenant" (Old Testament Theology: A Fresh Approach, New Foundation Theological Library, ed. P. Toon [Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1978], p. 100).

[1]Walter Beyerlin, Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions, trans. S. Rudman (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), pp. 54-55. See also Walther Eichrodt, "Covenant and Law: Thoughts on Recent Discussion," trans. L. Gaston, Int 20 (July 1966):308-309; Hillers, Covenant, pp. 3-5; Baltzer, Covenant Formulary, pp. 89-90; EncJud, s.v. "Covenant," by M. Weinfeld, 5:1022; J. Robert Vannoy, Covenant Renewal at Gilgal: A Study of 1 Samuel 11:14-12:25 (Cherry Hill, NJ: Mack Publishing Co., 1978), pp. 137-38; William A. Dyrness, Themes in Old Testament Theology (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1979), pp. 118-19; and ISBE, "Covenant (OT)," 1:792.

particular format followed. Can the type of treaty format employed assist in dating the period in which the particular covenant was formulated? Such an approach incorporates two assumptions: (1) that there were identifiably distinct formats for a given period; and (2) that the divine covenants offer sufficient information to make such recognition feasible.

The conclusions reached are divided. A number of scholars reject the idea of dating the divine covenants based on format by denying one or both of the above assumptions.[1] On the other hand, there are quite a few who feel that the evidence supports a positive correlation. That is, the covenant formats used in the Old Testament and in the ANE are

---

[1]See, for example, Thompson, "Suzerain-Vassal Concept," pp. 4-5; Johann Jakob Stamm and Maurice Edward Andrew, The Ten Commandments in Recent Research, SBT, 2d series, eds. C. F. D. Moule et al. (Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, 1967), pp. 64-66; A. F. Campbell," An Historical Prologue in a Seventh-Century Treaty," Bib 50 (1969):534-54; McCarthy, Old Testament Covenant, pp. 28-30; idem, Treaty and Covenant, pp. 122-24, 140; R. E. Clements, "Pentateuchal Problems," in Tradition and Interpretation : Essays by Members of the Society for Old Testament Studies, ed. G. W. Anderson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), pp. 114-16; George W. Ramsey, The Quest for the Historical Israel (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981), pp. 57-58; TDOT, s.v. "ברית," 2:267-68.
D. J. Wiseman summarizes this position: "The structure, form(ularies), and to a surprisingly large extent, the language of these oath-bound covenants are common to the peoples of the ancient near east from the fourth millennium down to the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Additional texts from Ebla, Ras Shamra, and other sites show us that they also are basically 'Mesopotamian' in form and concept, and bound up with the cultural and legal traditions of that area. . . . Attempts to use the 'structure' to determine date, e.g., distinguishing a second or first millennium origin of a treaty from the inclusion or omission of a historical prologue, the order of elements (such as witnesses and blessings or curses) as applied to the Deuteronomic writings, have been shown to be unreliable. Textual evidence shows that there was always a greater flexibility in the use of covenant forms (e.g., historical prologues occur in full, summary, oral, or implied form), and there is a far greater variety in the format used in both periods than is allowed by some ("'Is It Peace'--Covenant and Diplomacy," VT 32 [July 1982]:311-12).

sufficiently distinguishable to allow conclusions to be drawn concerning

the dating of the former vis-à-vis the latter.

Caution is certainly in order at this point, particularly because one of the most serious weaknesses of the form critical method as it has often been practiced is its tendency to encourage speculative and hypothetical reconstructions of a Sitz im Leben for particular forms, sometimes with little or no corroborating evidence. While recognizing the danger in this procedure and the excesses to which it has led, there nevertheless remains a definite validity to the notion that the presence of a particular form presupposes a historical setting which has given rise to the form in question and which accordingly provides insight into the reasons for and significance of its utilization. It is therefore apparent that judicious attempts to delineate the historical setting for particular forms can be a useful interpretive tool, and in the case of the "covenant form" the questions of when and how it was adopted in Israel are certainly matters of fundamental significance whose avoidance impoverishes the study of the forms and may contribute to misinterpretation of their significance.[1]

---

[1]Vannoy, Covenant Renewal, pp. 144-45.

The two who have pursued this position with the greatest vigor have been Meredith Kline and K. A. Kitchen. Kline concludes that not only the covenants of Exod 19-24 and Josh 24, but the entire book of Deuteronomy, reflect a covenant format consistent with the suzerain-vassal treaties of the second millennium which is distinct from the format of the first millennium (Treaty of the Great King: The Covenant Structure of Deuternomy, Studies and Commentary [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1963], pp. 12-14, 28-30).

Kitchen, responding to those who fail to take seriously the historical implications of the evidence from the aforementioned comparisons avers this: "McCarthy blithely makes the astonishing assumptions that the casual combination of J, E sources and rearrangement of text in Exodus (by redactors centuries later than second-millennium covenants, of course) should just happen to produce a direct correspondence with a covenant-form half a millennium obsolete!" (Ancient Orient and Old Testament [Chicago: Inter-Varsity Press, 1968], p. 101, n. 53).

See also Kitchen, "Ancient Orient, 'Deuteronism,' and the Old Testament," in Perspectives on the Old Testament, ed. J. B. Payne (Waco: Word Books, 1970), pp. 244-45; and idem, The Bible in Its World: The Bible and Archaeology Today (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1977), pp. 79-85. In this last work, having responded to the various objections, Kitchen's conclusion is as follows: "The clear distinctions in form between treaties of different periods--and especially between late second and the first millennium B.C.--as outlined above remain fully and immoveably valid, established as they are by the texts of forty treaties in fifty-four 'editions,' not counting merest fragments. This evidence is here to stay. The correlations between the Sinai covenant and renewals and the second millennium treaties and law collections also

The arguments mustered in favor of a correlation between covenant format and dating have not been satisfactorialy dealt with by those who oppose this position. Consequently, this position is embraced here as that which is most consistent with the available evidence. Although Vannoy's caution is well taken, there does appear to be a fundamental relationship between structure and provenance when dealing with the ANE treaty format and the biblical covenants.

Conditional vs. Unconditional

Another issue involved with the nature of biblical covenants is that of conditionality. The concern in this issue is with the divine covenants where God is represented as one of the parties. The question is whether there are obligatory elements in each of the divine covenants which would constitute them as conditional.

As a preliminary issue, the nature of a conditional element must first be defined. What is meant by a conditional element is this: any qualification or stipulation placed upon the human party as a necessary requirement conditioning the reception of the divine promise in the covenant. According to this definition, the presence of casuistic elements or the apodictic format is not the issue. Either of these can be present in the body of a covenant without constituting the covenant as conditional as long as they do not qualify the covenant promises.

---

stand out with crystal clarity, are also here to stay" (p. 85).

For additional support, see Mendenhall, Law and Covenant, pp. 26-50; William Foxwell Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process, 2d ed. (Garden City, NY: Double-day and Company, 1957), p. 16; Payne, "B'rith of Yahweh," pp. 240-63; Edward F. Campbell, Jr., "Moses and the Foundations of Israel," Int 29 (April 1975):149-50; Bright, Covenant and Promise, pp. 36-43; and Vannoy, Covenant Renewal, pp. 153-54.

Furthermore, the issue is not whether there are stipulations surrounding the covenant (viz., stipulations preceding the making of a covenant or following the covenant). Unless these stipulations actually qualify the covenant promises, technically they are not regarded as conditional elements for the purposes of the present discussion. Lastly, faith as a prerequisite for covenant blessing is not regarded in the same vein as obedience in this discussion of conditionality. It is not denied that faith can represent a true conditional element. However, in harmony with the fundamental distinction between faith and works as noted in the New Testament (e.g., Rom 4 and the basis for Abraham's receiving God's covenant promise), the requirement of faith is not viewed as constituting a covenant as conditional, at least in the same sense as obedience to commandments and prohibitions does.

Having identified a conditional element, the issue of conditionality with the divine covenants involves principally the Abrahamic and the Davidic (and, by association, the new). The Mosaic covenant is generally regarded as a conditional covenant. The inclusion of clearcut obligations placed upon the nation qualifying their reception of the promised blessings establishes this covenant as conditional (cf., e.g., Exod 19:5-9 with 24:7-8).[1] With regard to other divine covenants, three approaches have been offered regarding their conditionality: (1) all

---

[1]James Muilenberg, The Way of Israel: Biblical Faith and Ethics, Religious Perspectives, ed. Ruth Nanda Ashen (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1961), pp. 61-62; Walter Vogels, God's Universal Covenant: A Biblical Study (Ottawa: St. Paul University, 1979), pp. 46-50; and William G. Most, "A Biblical Theology of Redemption in a Covenant Framework," CBQ 29 (January 1976):1-7.
   This is true whether the Mosaic covenant is viewed as a gracious or a legal transaction. Against, see NIDNTT, s.v. "Covenant," 1:367.

are conditional; (2) none is conditional; and (3) there is a mixing of conditional and unconditional elements in all.

Proponents of the first position, while recognizing that the passages in which the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants are initially reported do not place obligations upon the recipient, argue from the greater contexts that such was implicitly intended. Allis points, for example, to Genesis 17:9-14; 18:16-19; 22:15-18; and 26:2-5, to show that the Abrahamic covenant was conditioned upon Abraham's obedience.[1] Martens does the same for the Davidic, pointing to such passages as Psalms 89:30-37; 132:11-12; 1 Kings 2:4; 8:25; 9:4-5; and 1 Chronicles 28:7.[2]

Proponents of the second position see a contrast between the Mosaic covenant, on the one hand, and the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants, on the other. They accept the conditional nature of the Mosaic, but reject the idea that such is true whether explicitly or implicitly with the others.

---

[1]Allis, Prophecy and the Church, pp. 32-36. According to Allis, Christ's obedience insures the ultimate fulfillment of the Abrahamic and the other divine covenants. He, nevertheless, insists that this does not preclude a corresponding obedience by Abraham or any other individual who would enjoy the benefits of the covenant.
See also Cox, Biblical Studies in Final Things, pp. 6-7, 52-55; Eichrodt, "Covenant and Law," pp. 306-313; Most, "Theology of Redemption," pp. 1-19; J. N. Schofield, Law, Prophets and Writings: The Religion of the Old Testament (London: S. P. C. K., 1969), pp. 19-20; Payne, "B'rith of Yahweh," pp. 253-54; and T. Desmond Alexander, "Genesis 22 and the Covenant of Circumcision," JSOT 25 (February 1983):17-22.

[2]Elmer A. Martens, God's Design: A Focus on Old Testament Theology (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981), pp. 147-48. Kline holds to this position in Treaty of the Great King, pp. 23, 38. However, he does seem to equivocate somewhat, allowing for a distinction between the Mosaic and the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants on the issue of conditions in his work entitled By Oath Consigned, pp. 16-24.

Quite a few supporters of this position base the distinction between the Mosaic and the other covenants largely on a rigid application of the form critical issue. They recognize basically two covenant traditions within the divine covenants--the promissory which places responsibilities upon God, and the obligatory which places responsibilities upon the human party. According to this perspective, only the Mosaic falls into the latter category and can be regarded as conditional.[1]

At the same time, there are a number who arrive at this position from a theological direction. The focus among these is on the distinction between law and grace. The former involves human responsibility and is associated with the Mosaic, while the latter, involving divine provision, is associated with the Abrahamic and Davidic. As such, only the Mosaic is regarded as conditional.[2]

---

[1]Weinfeld states the following: "In contradistinction to the Mosaic covenants, which are of an obligatory type, the covenants with Abraham and David belong to the promissory type. God swears to Abraham to give the land to his descendants, and similarly promises to David to establish his dynasty without imposing any obligations on them. Although their loyalty to God is presupposed, it does not occur as a condition for keeping the promise" (TDOT, s.v. "ברית," 2:270). He does acknowledge subsequent conditional obligations placed upon David, but attributes these to later editorial activity (IDB, s.v. "Covenant, Davidic," Supplementary volume:191). See also Mendenhall, Law and Covenant, pp. 35-36.
See, in addition, R. E. Clements, Abraham and David: Genesis XV and Its Meaning for Israelite Tradition, SBT, 2d series, eds. C. F. D. Moule et al. (Naperville, IL: A. R. Allenson, 1967), pp. 14, 53-56; Van Seters, Abraham in History, pp. 259-88; Bright, Covenant and Promise, pp. 196-98; and Raitt, Theology of Exile, pp. 21-22. McCarthy appears to equivocate, holding to the first position in his article "Covenant in the OT," pp. 217-18; and to the second in Old Testament Covenant, pp. 5-6, 54.

[2]For example, see Charles Fred Lincoln, "The Biblical Covenants," BSac 100 (April-June 1943):314-17. For a more recent defense of this position, see Paul Lee Tan, The Interpretation of Prophecy (Winona Lake: Assurance Publishers, 1974), pp. 190-92.

The third position represents something of a combination of the first two. On the one hand, there is the recognition that such covenants as the Abrahamic and the Davidic are in and of themselves unconditionally stated. On the other hand, there is also the understanding that subsequent revelation places conditions upon the recipients of these covenants. The solution, according to this position, is to view these covenants as unconditional from the divine perspective, but conditional from the human. They are unconditional in that their fulfillment lies solely in the ability of God to accomplish what he has promised. They are also conditional in that participation by any given individual or generation is nevertheless conditioned upon faith and obedience.[1] Supporters of this position disagree, however, on the place of the Mosaic covenant. Some emphasize its discontinuity with the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants while others argue for a basic continuity with these.[2]

---

[1] Among the earliest expressions of this position, see Robert Baker Girdlestone, The Grammar of Prophecy: A Systematic Guide to Biblical Prophecy (reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1955), pp. 29-30; and Willis J. Beecher, The Prophets and the Promise (reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1963), pp. 219-20, 232.

[2] In support of a discontinuity based on theological considerations, see Chafer, Major Bible Themes, pp. 141-49; and McClain, Greatness of the Kingdom, pp. 155-60. For those who arrive at the same conclusion based on a form-critical approach, see Michael Fox, "The Sign of the Covenant: Circumcision in the Light of the Priestly ôt Etiologies," RB 81 (October 1974):595-56; Levenson, "Who Inserted Torah," pp. 225-26; and idem, "Davidic Covenant," pp 210-19.

In support of a basic continuity, generally on theological grounds, see Kaiser, "Leviticus 18:5," pp. 23-24; idem, "The Promise Theme," p. 145; idem, "The Blessing of David: The Charter for Humanity," in The Law and the Prophets: Old Testament Studies Prepared in Honor or Oswald Thompson Allis, ed. J. H. Skilton (Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1974), pp. 305-308; idem, "The Promised Land," p. 307; Youngblood, "Abrahamic Covenant," pp. 31-46; W. J. Dumbrell, "The Davidic Covenant," RTR 39 (May-August 1980):45; and idem, "The Covenant with Abraham," RTR 41 (May-August 1982):42-50.

Taken at face value, the evidence does suggest that a distinction should be made in the format of a covenant between obligatory and promissory, whatever terms are employed to designate this distinction. On this basis the Mosaic can and should be described as an obligatory covenant. It represents a true suzerainty relationship where the covenant specifically places conditions in the form of stipulations upon the human party as a requirement for receiving the covenant promises. However, the Abrahamic and the Davidic covenants, at least in their initial expressions, represent the promissory format. There does not appear to be any condition placed upon the human party in the initial articulation of the covenant relationship.

As to the question of subsequent conditional stipulations with the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants, the evidence appears mixed. Ultimately, the question involves whether obedience expressed in meritorious acts is stated as a requirement for participation in the covenant blessings. It has already been mentioned that the requisite of faith in itself does not make a covenant conditional.[1] Weinfeld has noted that the basis for the "royal grant" or promissory covenant was the faithfulness of the recipient, but not as a condition included within the covenant, qualifying its promises.[2]

There are several passages which seem to indicate that there were conditions associated with both the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants. These passages speak of obedience to divine commandments as a

---

[1]Although faith can be defined in terms of obedience (e.g., 2 Thess 1:8 and 1 Pet 4:17), the obedience meant here is that expressed in meritorious acts (i.e., good works).

[2]TDOT, s.v. "ברית," 2:270.

prerequisite for participation in the covenant promises. This appears
to be the case not only for subsequent generations, but also for the
original designee.[1] At the same time, there are other passages which
suggest that these covenants are ultimately unconditional. In fact,
the Davidic covenant in its initial expression seems to guard against
such a condition for both David and those following him.

> Although their loyalty to God is presupposed, it does not occur
> as a condition for keeping the promise. On the contrary, the
> Davidic promise, as formulated in the vision of Nathan (2 S. 7),
> contains a clause in which the unconditional nature of the gift is
> explicitly stated: "I will establish the throne of his kingdom
> forever . . . . When he commits iniquity, I will chasten him, . . .
> but I will not take my steadfast love from him" (2 S. 7:13-15).[2]

To a certain extent the solution to the question rests on the
interpretation of the conditions. Using Abraham as an example, it is
uncertain what the conditions entail which qualify his reception of the
promises. The problem comes in understanding what is involved in the
circumcision mentioned in such passages as Genesis 17:9-14 and also the
relationship between Abraham's obedience following the covenant and his
participation in the covenant (cf. Gen 22:15-18). It could be that the
conditional statements in these verses reflect a subsequent confirmation
of Abraham's covenantal blessing rather than his initial qualification
for this. The major obstacle for allowing Abraham's good works as a
condition is that this seems to be the very thing against which Paul
inveighs in Romans 4 and Galatians 3. Without depreciating the dif-
ficulties involved, the conclusion is that the Abrahamic and the
Davidic covenants may be termed promissory and unconditional in contrast
to the Mosaic which is identified as obligatory and conditional.

---

[1]See p. 287.   [2]TDOT, s.v. "ברית," 2:270. Cf. Ps 89:30-37.

Furthermore, since in its various articulations, the new covenant follows the promissory format, it too is regarded as unconditional.[1]

ריב

Identifying the Mosaic covenant as conditional raises the last issue to be treated here, that of the covenant lawsuit. There is general agreement that in addition to the correspondence between the ANE treaty formats and the Old Testament covenants, there is also a correspondence between the treaty lawsuit (Gerichtsrede) and the Old Testament prophetic ריב or "controversy" pattern.[2] This ריב pattern, it is argued, represents God's lawsuit against the nation for violations of the Mosaic covenant. The lawsuit itself is intended to call the nation back to covenant-keeping by warning of the curses which the covenant stipulates as a consequence for such violations. Despite the reservations of a few, the parallels between the prophets' ריב and the ANE treaty lawsuits are too striking to assume coincidence.[3] As with the

---

[1]In support of this conclusion, see Rogers, "Covenant with Abraham," pp. 252-53; and Mason, Prophetic Problems, pp. 36-38.

[2]One of the earliest developments of this relationship is that by Huffmon, "Covenant Lawsuit," pp. 285-95. For bibliographies, see these two recent works: J. Carl Laney, "The Role of the Prophets in God's Case Against Israel," BSac 138 (October 1981):313-25; and Lane, "Covenant: Key to Paul's Conflict," pp. 3-5.

[3]On the lawsuit format, see Huffmon, "Covenant Lawsuit," pp. 285-95; and Laney, "Role of Prophets," pp. 321-32. Michael DeRoche presents a thoroughgoing critique of the aforementioned associations in "Yahweh's Rîb Against Israel: A Reassessment of the So-Called 'Prophetic Lawsuit' in the Preexilic Prophets," JBL 102 (December 1983):563-74. His chief concern appears to be that the prophetic ריב does not show a sufficient correspondence with the ANE lawsuit to be so associated, at least in every instance. Only when there is an identifiable third party who acts as an umpire of judge can the comparison be made (p. 569). His reticence seems to be the result of a too rigid application of the ANE pattern to the Old Testament. As a metaphor, the Old Testament ריב

treaty format, the ריב pattern suggests an intentional borrowing of a

concept to function as a metaphor, illustrating a further aspect in

the covenant relationship between God and the nation.[1]

must be allowed a certain amount of flexibility and freedom. See also
Harry Mowvley, Reading the Old Testament Prophets Today (Atlanta: John
Knox Press, 1979), pp. 112-13.

[1]Laney, "Role of Prophets," pp. 323-24.

APPENDIX B

THE USE OF ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Introduction

Two issues are discussed in connection with the use of διαθήκη
in the New Testament. The first is the choice of διαθήκη, rather than
συνθήκη, to express in the New Testament what ברית signifies in the Old.
The second issue concerns the semantic range of διαθήκη as it is used
by the authors of the New Testament.

Use of Διαθήκη

It is widely accepted that in the Mediterranean world during the
Classical and Hellenistic periods of the Greek language, διαθήκη was
used almost exclusively to represent the concept of a will or testament,
while συνθήκη was employed to express the concept of covenant.[1] The
question naturally arises as to why the New Testament chose to adopt
διαθήκη rather than συνθήκη as the term used to translate the concept
of covenant.

There is widespread agreement that the answer lies in the Greek

---

[1]This was true with inscriptions (W. D. Ferguson, The Legal
Terms Common to the Macedonian Inscriptions and the New Testament
[Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1913], pp. 42-44), as well as
with the papyri (Adolf Deissmann, Light From the Ancient East: The
New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Greco-
Roman World, trans. L. R. M. Strachan [Grand Rapids: Baker Book House,
1978], p. 337). The oft-quoted dictum of Moulton and Milligan bears
repeating: "In papyri and inscrr. the word [διαθήκη] means 'testa-
ment,' 'will' with absolute unanimity, and such frequency that
illustration is superfluous" (MM, p. 148).

translation of the Old Testament and not in secular usage. There is
every indication that the writers of the New Testament were simply fol-
lowing the precedent established by the LXX translators in their use of
διαθήκη for translating the Hebrew ברית.[1]

    The question remains, though, why or how this precedent was
established. The answer is found in the unilateral character frequently
associated with the biblical ברית. It is true that in the secular liter-
ature of this period συνθήκη was the term universally employed to desig-
nate a covenant or compact. Yet, by its very nature, the term suggests
something of a bilateral relationship, often between parties of roughly
equivalent stature, arrived at through negotiation. Διαθήκη, on the
other hand, suggests more of a unilateral arrangement, a disposition
where one party dictates terms to a second party without negotiations.
Because the most frequent need for such a concept in the secular world
was in the arena of wills or testamentary dispositions, that was how
διαθήκη was primarily and almost exclusively used. As several have
shown, however, there is evidence that διαθήκη was also used, howbeit
rarely, for a covenant, ostensibly where the unilateral concept was
evident.[2] For the above reasons, the translators for the LXX chose

---

    [1]Edwin Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek (Oxford: Clarendon
Press, 1889), pp. 47-48. In the almost three hundred uses of ברית in
the Old Testament, the LXX employs διαθήκη as a translation in all but
two instances--Deut 9:15 (μαρτύριον) and 1 Kgs 11:11 (ἐντολή). Outside
of its use for ברית, διαθήκη is employed only four other times
(Exod 31:7; Lev 26:11; Deut 9:5; and Zech 11:14), according to Robert
Baker Girdlestone, Synonyms of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B.
Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1897), p. 213. Gordon notes that not only the
New Testament but also the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha followed the
LXX in rendering the Hebrew ברית by διαθήκη ("Studies in Covenantal
Theology," pp. 92-96).

    [2]Moulton and Milligan state this: "Διαθήκη is properly an

διαθήκη over the much more common συνθήκη to capture what they felt was

a frequent characteristic of the biblical ברית, especially where God

was depicted as one of the covenanting parties.[1]

Semantic Range of Διαθήκη

Because of its use in the New Testament in translating the

Hebrew ברית, most acknowledge that the primary significance of διαθήκη

'arrangement' made by one party with plenary power, which the other
party may accept or reject, but cannot alter. A will is simply the most
conspicuous example of such an instrument, which ultimately monopolized
the word just because it suited its differentia so completely. But it
is entirely natural to assume that in the period of the LXX this monop-
oly was not established, and the translators were free to apply the
general meaning as a rendering of ברית" (MM, p. 148).
    See also TDNT, s.v. "διατίθημι," 2:106-197, 124; William
Barclay, New Testament Words (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964),
pp. 65-66; and Vos, Redemptive History, pp. 169-70.

[1]On the LXX translation of ברית, Hughes states this: "It seems
to me that the first requirement for a translation of ברית was to find a
word in the target language (Greek) that had virtually exclusive legal
usage, since ברית obviously denotes a relation defined, constituted and
founded upon legal precepts. The second requirement: find a legal word
that designates a relation inaugurated, defined and controlled by one
party, e.g., a legal term that denotes a unilateral unalterable action
on the part of the 'sovereign' or superior party. The third requirement:
find a legal term which designates a unilaterally enacted relation which
is defined by certain laws or stipulations and which may result in cer-
tain benefits or blessings for the 'inferior' party. The only term so
suited was διαθήκη" ("Hebrews IX 15ff.," pp. 30-31).
    Not all agree with the explanation offered. Payne argues
that διαθήκη should be understood in its more common sense of "will"
or "testament" throughout the New Testament and, in fact, argues for
the same significance for ברית in the Old Testament (ZPEB, s.v.
"Covenant, (in the New Testament)," 1:995-1000. See also idem, Theology,
pp. 82-96. The defense of his position begins with Heb 9:16-17 where
he translates διαθήκη as "testament" or "will." He then applies this
definition to the reference in 9:20 to the Mosaic covenant and from
there to the use of ברית in the Old Testament.
    The significance of ברית has been treated in appendix A.
The meaning of διαθήκη in the New Testament is discussed below. For a
critique of Payne's position, see Robertson, Christ of the Covenants,
pp. 11-14; and Morris, Preaching, pp. 89-92.

is that of "covenant."[1] The question asked, however, in the light of

its secular connotation, is whether it is also used in the sense of

"will" or "testament." The two passages where this question becomes an

issue are Galatians 3:15 and Hebrews 9:16-17.[2]

Galatians 3:15

Of the thirty-three times the noun διαθήκη occurs in the New

Testament, half of these are found in Hebrews. Of the remaining, the

majority are in the Pauline epistles. Only in Galatians 3:15 of the

Pauline occurrences is there widespread support for taking διαθήκη in

the sense of "will" or "testament," rather than in the sense of a

"covenant." The use of legal language, the concept of inheritance, and

the reference to a man's διαθήκη (ἀνθρώπου . . . διαθήκην) as understood

from the human perspective (κατὰ ἄνθρωπον), all within the immediate

context, have led many to conclude that Paul here is drawing upon the

familiar extra-biblical use of διαθήκη in the sense of "will" to

further his argument.[3]

---

[1]As indicated on p. 296, note 1, not all agree with the above conclusions. As Deissmann states, "No one in the Mediterranean world in the first century A. D. would have thought of finding in the word διαθήκη the idea of 'covenant.' St. Paul would not and in fact did not. To St. Paul the word meant what it meant in his Greek Old Testament, 'a unilateral enactment,' in particular 'a will or testament'" (Light from the Ancient East, p. 337).
    Deissmann's sentiments notwithstanding, the above conclusions represent the majority opinion. See also Hans Joachim Schoeps, Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History, trans. Harold Knight (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), p. 216.

[2]BAGD, p. 183.

[3]William M. Ramsey, A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (reprint ed., Minneapolis: Klock and Klock Christian Publishers, 1978), pp. 350-54. Behm and Quell concur, adding, "The many legal terms used in the passage make it clear that he is here

The arguments in favor of this interpretation have not proven conclusive. The terms Paul uses are sufficiently equivocal to support either translation. For example, the verbs in 3:15, κυρόω ("ratify"), ἀθετέω ("invalidate," "nullify"), and ἐπιδιατάσσομαι ("add a codicil to"), are all used in extra-biblical contexts to refer to activities outside of the domain of wills. In fact, the first two are used in Scripture in connection with the divine covenants (cf., for example, Gal 3:17 and Heb 10:28). Furthermore, the concept of inheritance (κληρονομία) is appropriate not only for testamentary dispositions but also for covenantal relationships, as is clear from Paul's use of the term in conjunction with the Abrahamic covenant (3:18). In that in the immediate context Paul is using the argument in verse 15 to develop a point pertaining to the Abrahamic covenant (verse 17) and because elsewhere Paul uses διαθήκη invariably in the sense of a covenant, it is concluded that "covenant" and not "will" is intended by Paul in 3:15.[1]

---

using the word διαθήκη in the sense of Hellenistic law" (TDNT, s.v. "διατίθημι," 2:129). More recently, see Betz, Galatians, pp. 155-56; and Bruce, Galatians, pp. 169-71.

[1]The arguments developed in defense of this conclusion are largely drawn from Hughes, "Hebrews IX 15ff.," pp. 66-91. For a somewhat different approach, see E. Bammel, "Gottes ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ (Gal 3:15-17) und das Jüdische Rechtsdenken," NTS 6 (1959-1960):313-19. Bammel argues that what is in view is the rabbinic practice of a testamentary disposition.

At the heart of this and other testamentary interpretations is the question of the irrevocability of such transactions. It has been shown that Roman law did allow for the altering or nullifying of wills after their validation (Vos, Biblical Theology, pp. 33-34). In an effort to overcome this problem with the testamentary translation in light of what Paul specifically says in verse 15, Ramsey has suggested a Greco-Syrian background for the legal concept (Galatians, pp. 350-55), whereas Bammel argues for the rabbinic. As Hughes has shown, none of the legal practices involving wills in the first century corresponds to what Paul describes in this verse. All were able to be altered and, for that very reason, Hughes argues that a will or testament cannot be what

Hebrews 9:16-17

There is also widespread support for taking διαθήκη in the sense

of "testament" or "will" in Hebrews 9:16-17. Again the legal language

used, the concept of inheritance in the immediate context, and especially

the reference to the death of the one making the διαθήκη (διαθεμένου)

have led many to embrace what may be regarded as the majority position.

In these verses, it is argued, the AH is purposely involving a play on

the word διαθήκη, drawing in its secular significance of "will" or "tes-

tament" to show the correlation between the death of the testator and

the reception of the inheritance.[1]

Paul had in mind ("Hebrews IX 15ff.," pp. 83-91).

    F. O. Norton states this: "We have seen that the adoption from
which the Greek will was derived was a legal contract which could not be
revoked without the consent of both parties to it. This . . . has
given rise to the idea that it (a will) was also a contract, and con-
sequently irrevocable. But . . . since even in its rudimentary stage of
testamentary adoption the εισποίησις was not compelled by the will itself,
it was not a contract in the eyes of the law, and consequently, while
adoption inter vivos was irrevocable except by the consent of both par-
ties, testamentary adoption could be revoked at the pleasure of the
testator" (A Lexicographical and Historical Study of ΔIAΘHKH: From
Earliest Times to the End of the Classical Period [Chicago: University
of Chicago Press, 1908], p. 63).

    Hester attempts to argue in favor of a Roman will, but must
modify the "no one" (οὐδεὶς) to mean "no one other than the one making
the will" in order to be consistent with what is known of Roman law
(Paul's Concept of Inheritance), pp. 73-74. Such an adjustment is
detrimental to Paul's argument if that indeed is what the apostle meant
with reference to the Abrahamic covenant.

    [1]Bruce notes this: "There is only one kind of διαθήκη of which
this is true: the attempts of Westcott and some others to keep the
general sense of 'covenant' throughout this passage and treat the death
which 'must be established' as the death of the covenant-victim are as
unnecessary as they are unconvincing" (New Testament Development,
pp. 56-57).

    Kent concurs, adding the following: "Efforts to treat the word
as 'covenant' in all places, although strongly asserted, are forced,
because it just is not true that the slaying of the animal in all Old
Testament covenants represented the death of the one making the cove-
nant" (Hebrews, p. 174). See also Morris, Preaching, pp. 86-88; and

Despite the seeming security of this position, there are a significant number who feel the evidence favors the meaning "covenant" and not "will."[1] To begin with, two points should be noted concerning the issue of inheritance. The first is that verses 16-17 do not indicate so much how the inheritance is obtained as why a death had to take place.[2] That is, these verses do not explain the relationship in verse 15 between Christ's death and the inheritance, but between Christ's death and his role as covenant mediator (διαθήκη καινῆς μεσίτης ἐστίν). Yet, as mentioned in the discussion of Galatians 3:15, even if the verses were indicating how the inheritance was obtained, that would still not require διαθήκη to be understood in the sense of "will." Both meanings, it has been shown, can have the idea of an inheritance associated with them.[3] Nor for that matter do the legal terms identified in these two verses (e.g., διαθεμένου) require the sense of "will" for διαθήκη. The terms are sufficiently broad in their uses to be associated with either a will or a covenant.[4]

P. E. Hughes, Hebrews, pp. 371-73.

[1]Westcott, Hebrews, pp. 264-66; G. D. Kilpatrick, "Διαθήκη in Hebrews," ZNW 68 (1977):263-65; and Robertson, Christ of the Covenants, pp. 138-44.

[2]As Hughes notes, "There [sic] verses are used to explain why Christ had to die in order to become the priestly mediator of the new covenant. They are not designed to explain why a death had to occur before there could be an eternal inheritance. The focus is upon death as it leads to priestly mediatorship of the new covenant, not death as it leads to inheritance" ("Hebrews IX 15ff.," pp. 38-39). See also Bruce, Hebrews, pp. 208-209. Against, see Vos, Redemptive History, pp. 180-81.

[3]Robertson, Christ of the Covenant, p. 149, note 9.

[4]Hughes, "Hebrews IX 15ff.," pp. 39-66. See also George Milligan, The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews (reprint ed., Minneapolis:

The crux of the problem focuses on the reference to the death of the one making the διαθήκη and whether such can be legitimately associated with the idea of covenant. Three terms in the context need to be considered in order to arrive at a solution to this question. The first is the use of τοῦ διαθεμένου. Although it is true that ὁ διαθέμενος is used in secular literature of the first century to refer to the "testator of a will," it is also used in the Greek Old Testament with reference to the one making or entering into a covenant. The evidence, at least with this phrase, is inconclusive; it could allow either translation for διαθήκη. As such, the evidence disproves neither.

The second term, φέρεσθαι, is crucial to the arguments of both sides. Those who hold to "will" translate the infinitive as if it were the equivalent of εἰμί. The resulting translation states that, for a διαθήκη to be in effect, the death of the one making it must have occurred. That such was not true with covenants in general and with the old covenant in particular is granted by both sides.

Proponents of the "covenant" translation are quick to point out that φέρεσθαι should not be given this sense in this verse and that the translation indicated above is not what was intended. They suggest the metaphorical sense of "to bring into the picture" or "to introduce" as is found elsewhere in its use in the New Testament (e.g., 2 Pet 1:21, 2:11; John 18:29). The resulting translation states that the death of the one making the covenant is "introduced" or "represented" in connection with the establishment of the covenant. Such a translation, they

James Family Christian Publishers, 1978), pp. 166-70; and "A Lawyer Looks at Hebrews 9:15-17," EvQ 40 (July-September 1968):151-56.

note, would be consistent with the idea of a covenant where the sacri-
fice of animals as a drohritus takes place, but not with the idea of
a will

> Verse 16 does not say that in the case of a διαθήκη "there must of
> necessity be the death of him that made it" (AV and RV); but that
> his death must be "brought in" (φέρεσθαι), that is, assumed,
> taken for granted, posited, according to a very common usage of
> this word--a meaning which is inapplicable in the case of a will
> which only comes into force after the death of the testator, but
> which falls in admirably with the idea of covenant based upon
> sacrifice.[1]

It becomes clear that the translation "covenant" in these verses rests
on whether or not such a representation was involved in the sacrificing
of animals at the ratification of the Old Testament covenants.[2]

The third term is the prepositional phrase ἐπὶ νεκροῖς. This
phrase is part of the construction which explains verse 16, indicating
a reason why the death of the one who makes or ratifies a διαθήκη must
be φέρεσθαι. The issue here for those supporting the idea of "will" for
διαθήκη is to explain why the AH uses the plural. If what is in view is
the death of the testator, why is the plural employed?[3] On the other

---

[1]Milligan, Theology of Hebrews, pp. 168-69. Hughes adds this
thought: "The person(s) himself did not have to die in order for the
treaty (covenant) to be ratified. Because of the necessity (ἀνάγκη)
for representing the death of 'the ratifier' the author of Hebrews has
used the verb φέρω" ("Hebrews IX 15ff.," p. 42).

[2]On the use of animals as covenant sacrifices and the concept
of a drohritus, see appendix A, pp. 277-78.

[3]Hughes asks, "Why not have said ἐπὶ νεκρῷ (or ἐπὶ νεκρώσει)
if he meant that a 'will' or 'testament' becomes valid or operative on
the basis of or at thee [sic] time of the dead [sic] of the testator?
Or why did he not employ the construction μετὰ νεκρόν if he meant that
a 'testament' or 'will' becomes valid only after the death of the
testator? To translate ἐπὶ νεκροῖς 'over the dead,' i.e., to take
νεκροῖς in a generic sense leaves the same problem . . . as mentioned
earlier. It is simply not true to the historical facts to maintain
that a will became operative on the basis of dead people or of a dead

hand, if what is in view is the death of the representative, the plural would simply be pointing to the animals used in the ceremony as covenant representatives and sacrifices.[1]

The problem with those holding to the idea of covenant in these verses is to explain why the AH uses νεκροῖς and not θυσίαις to show that the animals slain in the covenant ceremony are representatives of the covenant parties.[2] Furthermore, if the plural νεκροῖς in verse 17 refers to the dead sacrificial animals in a covenant ceremony, why does the AH change to the singular in the following clause, stating "since it [the διαθήκη] is never in effect while the <u>one making it</u> lives" (ζῇ ὁ διαθέμενος). Assuming the two participles (διαθεμένου/ος) in verses 16 and 17 refer to the same individual, verse 17 appears to be speaking about the condition of the one making the διαθήκη when it speaks of dead or living and not of sacrificial animals.[3]

---

person. It became operative as soon as it was properly drafted, witnessed and notarized" ("Hebrews IX 15ff.," p. 44).

Later, he adds this: "It is impossible, not just unlikely, that these verses refer to any known form of Hellenistic (or indeed of any other) legal practice." He further demonstrates that this is true not only for validation of the will but even if inheritance is the point in question (pp. 61-63).

[1]Milligan, Theology of Hebrews, pp. 169-70. Hughes points to the LXX rendering of Ps 49:5 [50:5], τοὺς διατιθεμένους τὴν διαθήκην αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ θυσίας, where not only are the covenant makers identified by the use of the participial construction, but the covenant is also said to be made on the "basis of sacrifice." He notes additionally that this psalm is alluded to by the AH in 12:23 and 13:15, showing the AH's familiarity with the psalm, thus suggesting the possibility of an allusion here ("Hebrews IX 15ff.," pp. 40, 43).

[2]Hughes' argument here seems weak. In effect, he states that νεκροῖς rather than θυσίαις better fits the general use of covenant ratification where it invariably depicts a self-maledictory rite and not necessarily also the idea of sacrifice ("Hebrews IX 15ff.," p. 44).

[3]Hughes' response is this: "If in v. 16 the author has already

When all has been said, it is still difficult to decide which of the two positions offers the superior arguments. However, because in the immediate context, both before and after these verses, the AH uses διαθήκη in the sense of "covenant," associating it with the new in verse 15 and with the old in verse 18, and because whatever is stated about the death of the one making the διαθήκη in these verses is shown to be parallel to the old (first) covenant,[1] the burden of proof still rests on those who see a reference to a "will" and not to a "covenant."[2]

---

made it clear that the necessary death is that of <u>representatives</u> (animals) which are brought forward on behalf of the one ratifying the covenant, then v. 17b must be read in light of this teaching and not isolated from its context. Furthermore, if the author had the actual (as opposed to representative) death of the διαθέμενος in mind, why did he contrast the death of plural subjects (ἐπὶ νεκροῖς) with the life of a singular διαθέμενος. . . . His use of the singular and plural in v. 17 is more naturally taken in terms of covenant and not testamentary practice" ("Hebrews IX 15ff.," pp. 45-46).

[1] Robertson states the following: "The strong connective between verses 17 and 18 must be considered. 'Wherefore (ὅθεν),' according to verse 18, 'the first covenant was not inaugurated without blood.' Now the reference clearly is to the blood-shedding procedure associated with <u>covenant inauguration</u>. If verse 18 is drawing an inference from verse 17 with respect to the blood shedding of covenant inauguration, it would appear mandatory to read verse 17 in terms of covenant rather than in terms of testamentary dispositon" (<u>Christ of the Covenants</u>, p. 143).

J. S. Purton suggests this: "The turning point, both of this analogy and this contrast is that both the covenants were inaugurated and ratified by death (θανάτου γενομένου), not ordinary, natural death but violent death. That such a death was meant is supported by the phrase following θανάτου γενομένου which is εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν . . . παραβάσεων. This would not fit the death of a testator because the implication would be natural death" ("Testament or Covenant: A Note on Hebrews 9:15-22," <u>The Expositor</u> 7 [1897]:75).

Behm and Quell note that it is just this parallel which makes "will" difficult. They conclude that "will" is the proper sense for vv. 16-17 but assume the author is guilty of a contradiction in that there is no real parallel with the death in view (<u>TDNT</u>, s.v. "διατίθημι," 2:131).

[2] The tension between the two positions has led several to embrace a dual inference in these verses. That is, the AH sees a parallel

Hughes concurs by saying this:

> The meaning of διαθήκη in vv. 16-17 is . . . qualified by its
> meaning in v. 15 since vv. 16-17 parenthetically explain the
> necessity of Christ's death. . . . Verses 16-17 develop a principle
> which is illustrated by and shown to have been true in the πρώτη
> διαθήκη (vv. 18-22). . . . Not only is the meaning of διαθήκη in
> verses 16-17 qualified by its meaning in v. 15, but its meaning in
> vv. 16-17 must be consistent with its meaning in vv. 18-22. This
> is shown not only by the fact of the larger syntactical relation of
> vv. 16-22 to v. 15 but also by the ὅθεν of v. 18, a strong inferen-
> tial particle which serves to introduce vv. 18-22, verses which thus
> show that the principle developed in vv. 16-17 was active in the
> πρώτη διαθήκη.[1]

---

between certain aspects of a covenant and a will and in effect has both
in mind with the use of διαθήκη in these two verses. See K. M. Campbell,
"Covenant or Testament: Hebrews 9:16-17 Reconsidered," EvQ 44 (April
1972):107-111. James Swetnam basically concurs, although arguing for
"will" in verses 16 and 17. His conclusions are founded on the assump-
tion that both the old covenant and the new were covenants, as well as
testaments ("A Suggested Interpretation of Hebrews 9:15-18," CBQ
[October 1965]:373-90).

[1]Hughes, "Hebrews IX 15ff.," p. 34.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED

Aland, Kurt, and Aland, Barbara, eds. Novum Testamentum Graece.
26th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979.

Albright, William Foxwell. From the Stone Age to Christianity: Mono-
theism and the Historical Process. 2d ed. Garden City, NY:
Doubleday and Company, 1957.

_____. "The Hebrew Expression for 'Making a Covenant' in Pre-
Israelite Documents." Bulletin of American Schools of Oriental
Research 121 (February 1951):21-22.

Albright, William Foxwell, and Mann, C. S. Matthew: Introduction,
Translation and Notes. Anchor Bible. Edited by W. F. Albright
and D. N. Freedman. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company,
1971.

Alexander, Joseph Addison. Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah.
Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976.

Alexander, T. Desmond. "Genesis 22 and the Covenant of Circumcision."
Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 25 (February 1983):
17-22.

Allen, Willoughby C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel
According to S. Matthew. 3d ed. International Critical Commen-
tary. Edited by Samuel Rolles Driver, Alfred Plummer, and
Charles Augustus Briggs. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1912.

Allis, Oswald T. Prophecy and the Church. Grand Rapids: Baker Book
House, 1969.

_____. The Unity of Isaiah: A Study in Prophecy. Reprint ed.
Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1977.

Anderson, Bernard W. "The New Covenant and the Old." In The Old Testa-
ment and Christian Faith: A Theological Discussion. Edited by
B. W. Anderson. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963.

Anderson, Francis I., and Freedman, David Noel. Hosea: A New Translation
with Introduction and Commentary. Anchor Bible. Edited by W. F.
Albright and D. N. Freedman. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and
Company, 1980.

Anderson, Hugh. The Gospel of Mark. New Century Bible. Edited by
Ronald E. Clements and Matthew Black. Grand Rapids: Wm. B.
Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1976.

Arayaprateep, Kamol. "The Covenant: An Effective Tool in Bible Study." The Southeast Asia Journal of Theology 18 (1977):21-31.

Archer, Gleason L., Jr. A Survey of Old Testament Introduction. Revised edition. Chicago: Moody Press, 1974.

Assyrian Dictionary. S.v. "baru," eds. I. J. Gelb et al.

Assyrian Dictionary. S.v. "birit," eds. I. J. Gelb et al.

Assyrian Dictionary. S.v. "biritu," eds. I. J. Gelb et al.

Aune, David E. Jesus and the Synoptic Gospels: A Bibliographic Study Guide. TSF-IBR Bibliographic Study Guides. Edited by Mark Lav Branson and David E. Aune. Madison: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980.

Averbeck, Richard E. "An Exegetical Study of Leviticus 1:4 with a Discussion of the Nature of the Old Testament Atonement." M.Div thesis, Grace Theological Seminary, 1977.

Bahr, Gordon J. "The Seder of Passover and the Eucharistic Words." Novum Testamentum 12 (1970):180-202.

Baigent, John W. "Jesus as Priest: An Examination of the Claim that the Concept of Jesus as Priest May Be Found in the New Testament Outside the Epistle to the Hebrews." Vox Evangelica 121 (1981): 34-44.

Baltzer, Klaus. The Covenant Formulary: In Old Testament, Jewish, and Early Christian Writings. Translated by David E. Green. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

Bammel, E. "Gottes ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ (Gal 3:15-16) und das Jüdische Rechtsdenken." New Testament Studies 6 (1959-1960):313-19.

Banks, Robert J. Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

Barclay, William. The Lord's Supper. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.

_____. New Testament Words. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.

_____. "The One, New Man." In Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology: Essays in Honor of George E. Ladd. Edited by R. A. Guelich. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978.

Barrett, C. K. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Harper's New Testament Commentaries. Edited by H. Chadwick. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1957.

Barrett, C. K. A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians.
     Harper's New Testament Commentaries. Edited by H. Chadwick.
     New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1968.

_____. A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians.
     Harper's New Testament Commentaries. Edited by H. Chadwick.
     New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1973.

_____. "The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews." In The
     Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology. Edited by
     W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge, England: At the Univer-
     sity Press, 1956.

Barth, Markus. "The Old Testament in Hebrews, An Essay in Biblical Her-
     meneutics." In Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation:
     Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper. Edited by W. Klassen and
     G. F. Snyder. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1962.

Batey, Richard. "So All Israel Will Be Saved." Interpretation 20
     (April 1966):218-228.

Bauer, Walter; Arndt, William F.; and Gingrich, F. Wilbur. A Greek-
     English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian
     Literature. 2d edition, revised and augmented by F. Wilbur
     Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker. Chicago : University of
     Chicago Press, 1979.

Beare, Francis Wright. The Gospel According to Matthew: Translation,
     Introduction, and Commentary. San Francisco: Harper and Row,
     Publishers, 1981.

Beck, Norman A. "The Last Supper as an Efficacious Symbolic Act."
     Journal of Biblical Literature 89 (June 1970):192-98.

Beecher, Willis J. The Prophets and the Promise. Reprint ed. Grand
     Rapids: Baker Book House, 1963.

Berkhof, L. Systematic Theology. 4th revised and enlarged edition.
     Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1941.

Berkouwer, G. C. The Return of Christ. Translated by J. Van Oosterom.
     Edited by M. J. Van Elderen. Studies in Dogmatics. Grand
     Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972.

_____. The Sacraments. Translated by H. Bekker. Studies in
     Dogmatics. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1969.

Betz, Hans Dieter. Galatians. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress
     Press, 1979.

Beyerlin, Walter. Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions.
     Translated by S. Rudman. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.

Blackman, E. C. "Divine Sovereignty and Missionary Strategy in Romans 9-11." Canadian Journal of Theology 11 (April 1965): 123-34.

Blackwood, Andrew W., Jr. Commentary on Jeremiah. Waco, TX: Word Books, Publisher, 1977.

_____. Ezekiel: Prophecy of Hope. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1965.

Blass, F., and Debrunner, A. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and revised by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Boadt, Lawrence. "Isaiah 41:8-13: Notes on Poetic Structure and Style." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 35 (January 1973):20-34.

Boettner, Loraine. The Millennium. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1966.

Bonnard, P.-E. Le Second Isaïe: Son Disciple of Leurs Editeurs, Isaïe 40-66. Etudes Bibliques. Paris: J. Gabalda et cie, Editeurs (Librarie Lecoffre, 1972).

Bonsirven, Joseph. Theology of the New Testament. Westminster, MD: The Newman Press, 1963.

Bowman, John. The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah. Studia Post-Biblica. Edited by J. Bowman et al. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.

Boyer, James L. For a World Like Ours: Studies in 1 Corinthians. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1971.

Briggs, Charles Augustus. Messianic Prophecy: The Prediction of the Fulfillment of Redemption Through the Messiah. 2d ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893.

Bright, John. Covenant and Promise: The Prophetic Understanding of the Future in Pre-Exilic Israel. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.

_____. "An Exercise in Hermeneutics: Jeremiah 31:31-34." Interpretation 20 (April 1966):188-209.

_____. Jeremiah. Anchor Bible. Edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1965.

Brooks, Waltar Edward. "The Perpetuity of Christ's Sacrifice in the Epistle to the Hebrews." Journal of Biblical Literature 89 (June 1970):205-14.

Brown, Raymond E. The Gospel According to John (I-XII): Introduction, Translation, and Notes. Anchor Bible. Edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1966.

_____. The Gospel According to John (XIII-XXI): Introduction, Translation, and Notes. Anchor Bible. Edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1970.

Bruce, F. F. "Christ as Conqueror and Reconciler: Part 4 of Colossian Problems." Bibliotheca Sacra 141 (October-December 1984):291-302.

_____. Commentary on the Book of the Acts. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Edited by F. F. Bruce. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954.

_____. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Edited by R. V. G. Tasker. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1963.

_____. The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and W. Ward Gasque. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1982.

_____. The Epistle to the Hebrews: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Edited by F. F. Bruce. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964.

_____. 1 and 2 Corinthians. New Century Bible Commentary. Edited by Ronald E. Clements and Matthew Black. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1971.

_____. "The Grace of God and the Law of Christ: A Study in Pauline Ethics." In God and the Good: Essays in Honor of Henry Stob. Edited by C. Orlebeke and L. Smedes. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975.

_____. New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968.

_____. "Paul and the Law of Moses." Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester 57 (Spring 1975):259-79.

_____. This Is That: The New Testament Development of Some Old Testament Themes. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1976.

_____. The Time Is Fulfilled: Five Aspects of the Fulfillment of the Old Testament in the New. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978.

Brueggemann, Walter. "Isaiah 55 and the Deuteronomic Theology." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 80 (1968): 191-203.

_____. Tradition for Crisis: A Study in Hosea. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1968.

Buber, Martin. Kingship of God. 3d ed. Translated by R. Scheimann. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1967.

Buchanan, George Wesley. To The Hebrews: Translation, Comment and Conclusions. Anchor Bible. Edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1972.

Bullinger, E. W. Figures of Speech Used in the Bible: Explained and Illustrated. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1968.

Burton, Ernest De Witt. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. International Critical Commentary. Edited by Samuel Rolles Driver, Alfred Plummer, and Charles Augustus Briggs. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, n.d.

Buswell, James Oliver. A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962-1963.

Byrne, Brendan. "Sons of God"--"Seed of Abraham": A Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of All Christians in Paul Against the Jewish Background. Analecta Biblica. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979.

Caird, George B. "The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews." Canadian Journal of Theology 5 (January 1959):44-51.

Campbell, A. F. "An Historical Prologue in a Seventh-Century Treaty." Biblica 50 (1969):534-35.

Campbell, Edward F., Jr. "Moses and the Foundations of Israel." Interpretation 29 (April 1975):141-54.

Campbell, K. M. "Covenant or Testament: Hebrews 9:16-17 Reconsidered." Evangelical Quarterly 44 (April 1972):107-111.

_____. God's Covenant. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1974.

Campbell, Roderick. Israel and the New Covenant. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1954.

Carlston, Charles. "The Vocabulary of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews."
    In Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology: Essays in
    Honor of George E. Ladd. Edited by R. A. Guelich. Grand Rapids:
    Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978.

Carroll, Robert P. From Chaos to Covenant. New York; Crossroad, 1981.

Carson, D. A. "Matthew." In vol. 8 of The Expositor's Bible Commentary.
    Edited by Frank E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing
    House, 1985.

_____. "Redaction Criticism: On the Legitimacy and Illegitimacy of
    a Literary Tool." In Scripture and Truth. Edited by D. A.
    Carson and J. D. Woodbridge. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing
    House, 1983.

_____. The Sermon on the Mount: An Evangelical Exposition of
    Matthew 5-7. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978.

Cassuto, U. The Documentary Hypothesis and the Composition of the
    Pentateuch. Translated by Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes
    Press, Hebrew University, 1961.

Chadwick, Henry. "The Shorter Text of Luke XXII.15-20." Harvard
    Theological Review 50 (October 1957):249-58.

Chafer, Lewis Sperry. Dispensationalism. Revised ed. Dallas: Dallas
    Seminary Press, 1951.

_____. Major Bible Themes: 52 Vital Doctrines of the Scripture
    Simplified and Explained. Revised by J. F. Walvoord. Grand
    Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1974.

_____. Systematic Theology. 8 vols. Dallas: Dallas Seminary
    Press, 1948.

Childs, Brevard S. Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture.
    Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

Clements, Ronald G. Abraham and David: Genesis XV and Its Meaning for
    Israelite Tradition. Studies in Biblical Theology. 2d series.
    Edited by C. F. D. Moule et al. Naperville, IL: A. R. Allenson,
    1967.

_____. Old Testament Theology: A Fresh Approach. New Foundations
    Theological Library. Edited by P. Toon. Atlanta: John Knox
    Press, 1978.

_____. "Pentateuchal Problems." In Tradition and Interpretation:
    Essays by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study. Edited
    by G. W. Anderson. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1979.

Clowney, Edmund P. "Israel and the Church (Two Views): The New Israel." In Dreams, Visions and Oracles: A Layman's Guide to Biblical Prophecy. Edited by C. E. Amerding and W. W. Gasque. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977.

Collins, John J. "The Meaning of Sacrifice: A Contrast of Methods." Biblical Research 22 (1977):19-34.

Congdon, Roger D. "Did Jesus Sustain the Law in Matthew 5?" Bibliotheca Sacra 135 (April-June 1978):117-25.

Conzelmann, Hans. 1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Translated by James W. Leitch. Bibliography and references by James W. Dunkly. Edited by George W. MacRae. Hermeneia. Edited by Helmut Koester et al. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

_____. An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1969.

Cooke, G. A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel. International Critical Commentary. Edited by Samuel Rolles Driver, Alfred Plummer, and Charles Augustus Briggs. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1936

Cooper, Craig. "Romans 11:25, 26." Restoration Quarterly 21 (Second Quarter 1978):84-94.

Corley, B. "Jews, the Future, and God (Romans 9-11)." Southwestern Journal of Theology 19 (Fall 1976):42-56.

Cosgrove, Charles H. "Mosaic Law Preaches Faith: A Study in Galatians 3." Westminster Theological Journal 41 (Fall 1978):146-64.

Cox, William E. Amillennialism Today. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1966.

_____. Biblical Studies in Final Things. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1967.

_____. An Examination of Dispensationalism. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1963.

Craigie, Peter C. The Book of Deuteronomy. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Edited by R. K. Harrison. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1976.

Cramer, George H. "The Messianic Hope of Jeremiah." Bibliotheca Sacra 115 (July 1958):237-46.

Cranfield, C. E. B. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Romans. 2 vols. The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Edited by J. A. Emerton and C. E. B. Cranfield. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1975, 1979.

_____. The Gospel According to Saint Mark: An Introduction and Commentary. Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary. Edited by C. F. D. Moule. Cambridge, England: At the University Press, 1959.

_____. "St. Paul and the Law." Scottish Journal of Theology 17 (March 1964):43-68.

Creed, John Martin. The Gospel According to St. Luke: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. London: MacMillan and Co., 1930.

Cremer, Hermann. Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek. 4th ed. Translated by William Urwick. Reprint edition. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1962.

Cross, Frank Moore. Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Cullmann, Oscar. The Christology of the New Testament. Revised ed. Translated by S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall. The New Testament Library. Edited by A. Richardson et al. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.

Cullman, Oscar, and Leenhardt, F. J., eds. Essays on the Lord's Supper. Translated by J. G. Davies. Ecumenical Studies in Worship. Edited by J. G. Davies and A. R. George. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1958.

Dalman, Gustaf. Jesus--Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels. Translated P. P. Levertoff. New York: MacMillan Company, 1929.

Darby, J. N. Notes on the Epistle to the Hebrews: From Notes of Lectures. Reprint ed. Oak Park, IL: Bible Truth Publishers, 1970.

_____. Synopsis of the Books of the Bible: Colossians-The Revelation. Revised ed. Reprint ed. New York: Loizeaux Brothers, Publishers, 1942.

Davidson, A. B. The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, with Notes and Introduction. The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Edited by J. J. S. Perowne. Reprint ed. Cambridge, England: At the University Press, 1906.

Davidson, A. B. The Theology of the Old Testament. Edited by S. D. F. Salmond. International Theological Library. Edited by C. A. Briggs and S. D. F. Salmond. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.

Davies, W. D. Jewish and Pauline Studies. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Davis, John J. "Regeneration in the Old Testament." Th.M. thesis, Grace Theological Seminary, 1964.

Deissmann, Adolf. Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Greco-Roman World. Translated by L. R. M. Strachan. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978.

Delitzsch, Franz. Isaiah. Translated by J. Martin. Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes. Edited by C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975.

Dentan, Robert C. The Knowledge of God in Ancient Israel. New York: Seabury Press, 1968.

DeRoche, Michael. "Yahweh's Rîb Against Israel: A Reassessment of the So-Called 'Prophetic Lawsuit' in the Pre-Exilic Prophets." Journal of Biblical Literature 102 (December 1983):563-74.

Dinkler, Erich. "The Historical and Eschatological Israel in Romans 9-11: A Contribution to the Problem of Predestination and Individual Responsibility." Journal of Religion 36 (April 1956): 109-127.

Dix, Gregory. The Shape of the Liturgy. 2d ed. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1945.

Dodd, Charles Harold. According to the Scriptures: The Substructure of New Testament Theology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953.

_____. "New Testament Translation Problems, II." Bible Translator 28 (June 1977):101-116.

Driver, Samuel Rolles. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy. 3d ed. International Critical Commentary. Edited by Samuel Rolles Driver, Alfred Plummer, and Charles Augustus Briggs. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1895.

Dumbrell, W. J. "The Covenant with Abraham." Reformed Theological Review 41 (May-August 1982):42-50.

Dumbrell, W. J. "The Covenant with Noah." Reformed Theological Review 38 (January-April 1979):1-9.

_____. "The Davidic Covenant." Reformed Theological Review 39 (May-August 1980):40-47.

Dunn, James D. G. "The New Perspective on Paul." Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester 65 (Spring 1983):95-122.

_____. "2 Corinthians III.17--'The Lord is the Spirit.'" Journal of Theological Studies, New Series 21 (October 1970):309-332.

_____. "Works of the Law and the Curse of the Law (Galatians 3.10-14." New Testament Studies 31 (October 1985):523-42.

Dyrness, William A. Themes in Old Testament Theology. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1979.

Eichrodt, Walther. "Covenant and Law: Thoughts on Recent Discussion." Translated by L. Gaston. Interpretation 20 (July 1966):302-321.

_____. Ezekiel: A Commentary. Translated by C. Quin. Old Testament Library. Edited by G. E. Wright et al. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970.

_____. Theology of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Translated by J. A. Baker. Old Testament Library. Edited by G. E. Wright et al. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961, 1967.

Eissfeldt, Otto. The Old Testament: An Introduction. Translated by P. R. Ackroyd. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.

Ellis, E. Earle. The Gospel of Luke. 2d ed. New Century Bible Commentary. Edited by R. E. Clements and M. Black. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974.

Ellison, H. L. The Prophets of Israel: From Ahijah to Hosea. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1969.

Emerton, J. A. "The Aramaic Underlying τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης in Mk XIV.24." Journal of Theological Studies 6 (October 1955): 238-40.

Encyclopedia Judaica. S. v. "Covenant," by M. Weinfeld.

Evangelical Dictionary of Theology. S.v. "Covenant Theology," by M. E. Osterhaven.

Evans, Craig A. "Paul and the Hermeneutics of 'True Prophecy': A Study of Romans 9-11." Biblica 65 (1984):560-70.

Falk, Z. W. "Hebrew Legal Terms: III." Journal of Semitic Studies 14 (Spring 1969):39-44.

Feinberg, Charles L. Jeremiah: A Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982.

_____. Millennialism: The Two Major Views. The Premillennial and and Amillennial Systems of Biblical Interpretation Analyzed and Compared. 3d ed. Chicago: Moody Press, 1982.

_____. Premillennialism or Amillennialism? The Premillennial and Amillennial Systems of Biblical Interpretation Analyzed and Compared. 2d ed. Wheaton, IL: Van Kampen Press, 1954.

_____. The Prophecy of Ezekiel: The Glory of the Lord. Chicago: Moody Press, 1969.

Feinberg, John S. "Salvation in the Old Testament." In Tradition and Testament: Essays in Honor of Charles Lee Feinberg. Edited by J. S. Feinberg and P. D. Feinberg. Chicago: Moody Press, 1981.

Fensham, F. Charles. "Covenant, Promise, and Expectation in the Bible." Theologische Zeitschrift 23 (September-October 1967):305-322.

_____. "The Treaty Between the Israelites and the Tyrians." In Congress Volume: Rome 1968. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, vol. 17. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969.

Ferguson, W. D. The Legal Terms Common to the Macedonian Inscriptions and the New Testament. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1913.

Ferrin, Howard W. "All Israel Shall Be Saved." Bibliotheca Sacra 112 (July 1955):235-47.

Filson, Floyd V. A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew. Black's New Testament Commentaries. Edited by H. Chadwick. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960.

_____. "Yesterday": A Study of Hebrews in the Light of Chapter 13. Studies in Biblical Theology. Edited by C. F. D. Moule et al. Naperville, IL: A. R. Allenson, 1967.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX): Introduction, Translation, and Notes. Anchor Bible. Edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1981.

Fohrer, Georg. History of Israelite Religion. Translated by David E. Green. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.

Fox, Michael. "The Sign of the Covenant: Circumcision in the Light of the Priestly 'ôt Etiologies." Revue Biblique 81 (October 1974): 557-96.

France, R. T. "The Servant of the Lord in the Teaching of Jesus." Tyndale Bulletin 19 (1968):26-52.

Freeman, Hobart E. An Introduction to the Old Testament Prophets. Chicago: Moody Press, 1968.

_____. "The Problem of the Efficacy of the Old Testament Sacrifices." Grace Journal 14 (Winter 1963):21-28.

Fuller, Daniel P. Gospel and Law: Contrast or Continuum? The Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism and Covenant Theology. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1980.

_____. "Paul and the Works of the Law." Westminster Theological Journal 38 (Fall 1975):28-42.

Fung, Ronald Y. K. "The Nature of the Ministry According to Paul." Evangelical Quarterly 54 (July-September 1982):129-146.

Gehman, Henry S. "An Insight and A Realization: A Study of the New Covenant." Interpretation 9 (July 1955):279-93.

Geldenhuys, Norval. Commentary on the Gospel of Luke: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Edited by F. F. Bruce. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977.

Girdlestone, R. B. The Grammar of Prophecy: A Systematic Guide to Biblical Prophecy. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1955.

_____. Synonyms of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1897.

Glueck, Nelson. "Hesed" in the Bible. Translated by Alfred Gottschalk. Edited by E. L. Epstein. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1967.

Godet, Frederic Louis. Commentary on First Corinthians. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1977.

_____. Commentary on Romans. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1977.

Goppelt, Leonhard. Theology of the New Testament. 2 vols. Translated by John E. Alsup. Edited by Jürgen Roloff. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1981, 1982.

Gordon, Victor Reese. "Studies in the Covenantal Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews in Light of Its Setting." Ph.D. dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1979.

Gould, Ezra P. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark. International Critical Commentary. Edited by Samuel Rolles Driver, Alfred Plummer, and Charles Augustus Briggs. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1896.

Greenberg, Moshe. "The Design and Themes of Ezekiel's Program of Restoration." Interpretation 38 (April 1984):181-208.

_____. Ezekiel 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. Anchor Bible. Edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1983.

Grosheide, F. W. Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Edited by F. F. Bruce. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953.

Guelich, Robert A. The Sermon on the Mount: A Foundation for Understanding. Waco: Word Books, 1982.

Gundry, Robert H. Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1982.

_____. The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel; With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 28. Edited by W. C. Van Unnik et al. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.

Guthrie, Donald. The Letter to the Hebrews: An Introduction and Commentary. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Edited by L. Morris. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1983.

_____. New Testament Introduction. 3d ed., revised. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1970.

_____. New Testament Theology. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1981.

Harper, William Rainey. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea. International Critical Commentary. Edited by Charles Augustus Briggs, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Alfred Plummer. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915.

Harris, Murray J. "2 Corinthians." In vol. 10 of Expositor's Bible Commentary. Edited by F. E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976.

Harrison, Everett F. "Romans." In vol. 10 of Expositor's Bible Commentary. Edited by F. E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976.

Harrison, R. K. Introduction to the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1969.

_____. Jeremiah and Lamentations: An Introduction and Commentary. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Edited by D. J. Wiseman. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1973.

Harrisville, R. A. "The Concept of the Newness in the New Covenant." Journal of Biblical Literature 74 (1955):69-79.

Hasel, Gerhard F. "The Meaning of the Animal Rite in Genesis 15." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 19 (February 1981): 61-68.

Hatch, Edwin. Essays in Biblical Greek. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1889.

Held, Moshe. "Philological Notes on the Mari Covenant Rituals." Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 200 (December 1970):31-35.

Henderson, Ebenezer. The Twelve Minor Prophets, Translated from the Original Hebrew with a Critical and Exegetical Commentary. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980.

Hendriksen, William. Israel in Prophecy. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1968.

_____. New Testament Commentary: Exposition of Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981.

_____. New Testament Commentary: Exposition of the Gospel According to Mark. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1975.

_____. New Testament Commentary: Exposition of the Gospel According to Matthew. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973.

Hester, James D. Paul's Concept of Inheritance; A Contribution to the Understanding of Heilsgeschichte. Occasional Papers, Scottish Journal of Theology, no. 14. Edited by T. F. Torrance and J. K. S. Reid. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1968.

Hickling, C. J. A. "The Sequence of Thought in II Corinthians, Chapter Three." New Testament Studies 21 (April 1975):380-95.

Hiebert, D. Edmond. An Introduction to the New Testament. 3 vols. Chicago: Moody Press, 1975-1977.

Hiebert, D. Edmond. Mark: A Portrait of the Servant. Chicago: Moody Press, 1974.

Higgins, A. J. B. The Lord's Supper in the New Testament. Studies in Biblical Theology. Edited by T. W. Manson et al. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1952.

Hillers, Delbert R. Covenant: The History of A Biblical Idea. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.

Hodge, Charles. Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974.

_____. An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974.

_____. An Exposition of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1973.

Hoehner, Harold W. Chronological Aspects of the Life of Christ. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1977.

Holladay, William L. A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1971.

Hollander, Harm W. "Hebrews 7.11 and 8.6: A Suggestion for the Translation of nenomothētetai epi." The Bible Translator 30 (April 1979):244-47.

Horne, Charles M. "Meaning of the Phrase 'And Thus All Israel Will Be Saved' (Romans 11:26)." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 21 (December 1978):329-34.

Howard, George E. "Christ the End of the Law: The Meaning of Romans 10:4ff." Journal of Biblical Literature 88 (September 1969): 331-37.

_____. "Hebrews and the Old Testament Quotations." Novum Testamentum 10 (1968):208-216.

Hübner, Hans. Law in Paul's Thought. Translated by C. G. Greig. Edited by J. Riches. Studies of the New Testament and Its World. Edited by J. Riches. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1984.

Huffmon, Herbert B. "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets." Journal of Biblical Literature 78 (December 1959):285-95.

_____. "The Exodus, Sinai and the Credo." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 27 (1965):101-113.

_____. "The Treaty Background of Hebrew Yada." Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 181 (February 1966):31-37.

Huffmon, Herbert B., and Parker, Simon B. "A Further Note on the Treaty Background of Hebrew Yada." Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 184 (December 1966):36-38.

Hughes, John J. "Hebrews IX 15ff. and Galatians III 15ff." Novum Testamentum 21 (January 1979):27-96.

Hughes, Philip Edgecumbe. "The Blood of Jesus and His Heavenly Priesthood in Hebrews." Bibliotheca Sacra 130 (April-June 1973): 99-109.

_____. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977.

_____. Interpreting Prophecy: An Essay in Biblical Perspectives. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1976.

_____. Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians: The English Text with Introduction, Expositon and Notes. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Edited by F. F. Bruce. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962.

Huntjens, Johannes A. "Contrasting Notions of Covenant and Law in the Texts from Qumran." Revue de Qumran 8 (March 1974):361-80.

Hyatt, James Philip. "The Book of Jeremiah: Introduction and Exegesis." In vol. 5 of The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick et al. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956.

International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. S. v. "Forgiveness," by W. C. Morro and R. K. Harrison.

International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. S. v. "Covenant, the New," by A. McCaig.

International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. S. v. "Covenant (OT)," by J. A. Thompson.

Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. S. v. "Covenant," by G. E. Mendenhall.

Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. S. v. "Covenant, Davidic," by M. Weinfeld.

Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. S. v. "Last Supper," by M. H. Shepherd, Jr.

Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. S. v. "Lord's Supper," by M. H. Shepherd, Jr.

Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. S. v. "New Covenant, The," by W. L. Holladay.

Jacob, Edmond. Theology of the Old Testament. Translated by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1958.

Janzen, J. Gerald. Studies in the Text of Jeremiah. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Jeremias, Joachim. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. 3d ed. Translated by N. Perrin. New York; Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966.

Johnson, Alan F. "Jesus and Moses: Rabbinic Backgrounds and Exegetical Concerns in Matthew 5 as Crucial to the Theological Foundations of Christian Ethics." In The Living and Active Word of God: Studies in Honor of Samuel J. Schultz. Edited by M. Inch and R. Youngblood. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983.

Johnson, Dan G. "The Structure and Meaning of Romans 11." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 46 (January 1984):91-103.

Jones, Douglas. "ἀνάμνησιν in the LXX and the Interpretation of I Cor. IX.25." Journal of Theological Studies 6 (October 1955): 183-91.

Kaiser, Walter C., Jr. "The Abolition of the Old Order and Establishment of the New: Psalm 40:6-8 and Hebrews 10:5-10." In Tradition and Testament: Essays in Honor of Charles Lee Feinberg. Chicago: Moody Press, 1981.

_____. "The Blessing of David: The Charter for Humanity." In The Law and the Prophets: Old Testament Studies Prepared in Honor of Oswald Thompson Allis. Edited by J. H. Skilton. Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1974.

_____. "The Current Crisis in Exegesis and the Apostolic Use of Deuteronomy 25:4 in 1 Corinthians 9:8-10." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 21 (March 1978):3-18.

_____. "Leviticus 18:5 and Paul: Do This and You Shall Live (Eternally?)." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 14 (Winter 1971):19-28.

_____. "The Old Promise and the New Covenant: Jeremiah 31:31-34." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 15 (Winter 1972): 11-23.

_____. "The Promise Theme and the Theology of Rest." Bibliotheca Sacra 130 (April-June 1973):135-50.

_____. "The Promised Land: A Biblical Historical View." Bibliotheca Sacra 138 (October-December 1981):302-312.

Kaiser, Walter C., Jr. Toward an Old Testament Theology. Grand Rapids:
     Zondervan Publishing House, 1978.

_____. "The Weightier and Lighter Matters of the Law: Moses, Jesus
     and Paul." In Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Inter-
     pretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney Presented by
     His Former Students. Edited by G. F. Hawthorne. Grand Rapids:
     Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975.

Käsemann, Ernst. Commentary on Romans. Translated by G. W. Bromiley.
     Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1980.

_____. Essays on New Testament Themes. Translated W. J. Montague.
     Studies in Biblical Theology. Edited by C. F. D. Moule et al.
     Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, 1964.

Karlberg, Mark W. "Reformed Interpretation of the Mosaic Covenant."
     Westminster Theological Journal 43 (Fall 1980):1-57.

Kautzsch, E., ed. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. 2d ed. revised by A. E.
     Cowley. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1910.

Keil, C. F. Minor Prophets. Translated by James Martin. In Commentary
     on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes. Edited by C. F. Keil and
     F. Delitzsch. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub-
     lishing Co., 1973.

_____. Ezekiel, Daniel. Translated by James Martin. In Commentary
     on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes. Edited by C. F. Keil and
     F. Delitzsch. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub-
     lishing Co., 1973.

_____. Jeremiah, Lamentations. Translated by D. Patrick and J.
     Kennedy. In Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes.
     Edited by C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids:
     Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1973.

Kent, Homer A., Jr. The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary. Grand
     Rapids: Baker Book House, 1972.

_____. A Heart Opened Wide: Studies in II Corinthians. New Testa-
     ment Studies. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1982.

_____. "The New Covenant and the Church." Grace Theological
     Journal 6 (Fall 1985):289-98.

Kenyon, Frederick G., and Legg, S. C. E. "The Textual Data." In The
     Ministry and the Sacraments. Edited by A. C. Headlam and R.
     Dunkerley. London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1937.

Kilpatrick, G. D. "Διαθήκη in Hebrews." Zeitschrift für die Neutesta-
     mentaliche Wissenschaft 68 (1977):263-65.

Kistemaker, Simon J. New Testament Commentary: Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984.

Kitchen, Kenneth A. Ancient Orient and Old Testament. Chicago: Inter-Varsity Press, 1968.

_____. "Ancient Orient, 'Deuteronism,' and the Old Testament." In New Perspectives on the Old Testament. Edited by J. B. Payne. Waco: Word Books, 1970.

_____. The Bible in Its World: The Bible and Archaeology Today. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1977.

Kline, Meredith. By Oath Consigned: A Reinterpretation of the Covenant Signs of Circumcision and Baptism. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968.

_____. Treaty of the Great King: The Covenant Structure of Deuteronomy; Studies and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1963.

Knight, George A. F. Deutero-Isaiah: A Theological Commentary on Isaiah 40-55. New York: Abingdon Press, 1965.

Koehler, Ludwig. "Problems in the Study of the Language of the Old Testament." Journal of Semitic Studies 1 (1956):4-24.

Korosec, Viktor. Hethitische Staatsverträge, ein Beitrag zu ihrer juristichen Vertung. Leipziger rechtswissenshaftliche Studien. Leipzig: Weicher, 1931.

Kraus, Hans Joachim. "God's Covenant." Reformed World 35 (1979):257-68.

Kümmel, Werner Georg. Introduction to the New Testament. Revised ed. Translated by H. C. Kee. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975.

_____. The Theology of the New Testament. Translated by J. E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.

Kutsch, Ernst. "Gesetz und Gnade: Probleme des alttestamentlichen Bundesbegriff." Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 79 (1967):18-35.

Ladd, George Eldon. The Blessed Hope. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956.

_____. Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1952.

_____. Jesus and the Kingdom: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism. Waco: Word Books, 1964.

Ladd, George Eldon. The Last Things: An Eschatology for Laymen. Grand
    Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978.

_____. A Theology of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B.
    Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974.

Laetsch, Theo. Bible Commentary: Jeremiah. Saint Louis: Concordia
    Publishing House, 1952.

Lane, William L. "Covenant: The Key to Paul's Conflict with Corinth."
    Tyndale Bulletin 33 (1982):3-29.

Laney, J. Carl. "The Role of the Prophets in God's Case Against Israel."
    Bibliotheca Sacra 138 (October 1981):313-25.

Larsson, Edvin. "Paul: Law and Salvation." New Testament Studies 31
    (July 1985):425-36.

LaSor, William Sanford; Hubbard, David Allan; and Bush, Frederic
    William. Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Back-
    ground of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans
    Publishing Co., 1982.

Lawton, Anne. "Christ: The End of the Law, A Study of Romans 10:4-8."
    Trinity Journal 3 (Spring 1974):14-30.

"A Lawyer Looks at Hebrews 9:15-17." Evangelical Quarterly 40 (July-
    September 1968):151-56.

Leaney, A. R. C. A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke. 2d
    ed. Reprint ed. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London:
    Adam and Charles Black, 1971.

Lehmann, Manfred R. "Biblical Oaths." Zeitschrift für die Alttestament-
    liche Wissenschaft 81 (1969):74-92.

Lemke, Werner E. "Jeremiah 31:31-34." Interpretation 37 (April 1983):
    183-87.

Lenski, R. C. H. The Interpretation of St. Mark's Gospel. Minneapolis:
    Augsburg Publishing House, 1946.

_____. The Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel. Minneapolis:
    Augsburg Publishing House, 1943.

_____. The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.
    Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1936.

_____. The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistles to
    the Corinthians. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1937.

Lenski, R. C. H. The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistle of James. Reprint ed. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1966.

Leonard, Paul E. "Israel and the Church (Two Views): Two Peoples of God." In Dreams, Visions and Oracles: A Layman's Guide to Biblical Prophecy. Edited by C. E. Amerding and W. W. Gasque. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977.

Leupold, H. C. Exposition of Isaiah. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1971.

Levenson, Jon. D. "The Davidic Covenant and Its Modern Interpreters." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 41 (April 1979):205-219.

_____. "Who Inserted the Book of the Torah?" Harvard Theological Review 68 (July-October 1975):203-233.

Liao, Paul S. H. "The Meaning of Galatians 4:21-31: A New Perspective." Northwest Asia Journal of Theology 22 (March-September 1979): 115-32.

Lietzmann, Hans. Mass and Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy. Translated by D. H. G. Reeve. Introduction and Further Inquiry by R. D. Richardson. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979.

Lincoln, Charles Fred. "The Biblical Covenants." Bibliotheca Sacra 100 (April-June 1943):309-323.

Lindars, Barnabus. New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.

Lindsey, F. Duane. "Isaiah's Songs of the Servant, Part I: The Call of the Servant in Isaiah 42:1-9." Bibliotheca Sacra 139 (January-March 1982):12-31.

Livingston, G. Herbert. The Pentateuch In Its Cultural Environment. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1974.

Longenecker, Richard N. Paul: Apostle of Liberty. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964.

_____. "The Pedagogical Nature of the Law in Galatians 3:19-4:7." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 25 (March 1982): 53-61.

Loretz, O. "ברית--Band-Bund." Vetus Testamentum 16 (1966):239-41.

Lünemann, Gottlieb. "Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Hebrews." Translated by M. J. Evans. Supplemented by T. Dwight. In vol. 9 of Meyer's Commentary on the New Testament. Reprint ed. Winona Lake, IN: Alpha Publications, 1979.

McCarthy, Dennis J. "Berit and Covenant in the Deuteronomistic History." In Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, vol. 23. Leiden; E. J. Brill, 1972.

_____. "Berit in Old Testament History and Theology." Biblica 53 (1972):110-121.

_____. "Covenant in the Old Testament: The Present State of Inquiry." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 27 (July 1965):217-40.

_____. Old Testament Covenant: A Survey of Current Opinions. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1972.

_____. Treaty and Covenant: A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and in the Old Testament. 2d ed. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1978.

McClain, Alva J. The Greatness of the Kingdom: An Inductive Study of the Kingdom of God. Winona Lake, IN: BMH Books, 1974.

_____. Law and Grace. Winona Lake, IN: BMH Books, 1954.

_____. Romans: The Gospel of God's Grace. Edited by Herman A. Hoyt. Chicago: Moody Press, 1973.

McComiskey, Thomas Edward. The Covenants of Promise: A Theology of the Old Testament Covenants. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985.

McCormick, Scott, Jr. The Lord's Supper: A Biblical Interpretation. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966.

McCullough, J. C. "The Old Testament Quotations in Hebrews." New Testament Studies 26 (April 1980):363-79.

McEleney, Neil J. "The Principles of the Sermon on the Mount." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 41 (October 1979):552-70.

McKenzie, John L. Second Isaiah: Introduction, Translation, and Notes. Anchor Bible. Edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1968.

McNeile, Alan Hugh. The Gospel According to St. Matthew: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980.

McNeile, Alan Hugh. An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament. 2d ed. Revised by C. S. C. Williams. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1953.

Malatesta, Edward. Interiority and Covenant: A Study of εἶναι ἐν and μένειν ἐν in the First Letter of Saint John. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978.

Mare, W. Harold. "1 Corinthians." In vol. 10 of The Expositor's Bible Commentary. Edited by F. E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976.

Marshall, I. Howard. The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Edited by I. H. Marshall and W. W. Gasque. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978.

_____. Last Supper and Lord's Supper. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1980.

_____. Luke: Historian and Theologian. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1970.

Martens, Elmer A. God's Design: A Focus on Old Testament Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981.

Martin, Brice. "Paul on Christ and the Law." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 26 (September 1983):271-82.

Martin, Ralph P. New Testament Foundations: A Guide for Christian Students. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975.

Mason, Clarence E., Jr. Prophetic Problems with Alternate Solutions. Chicago: Moody Press, 1973.

Mauchline, John. "The Book of Hosea: Introduction and Exegesis." In vol. 6 of The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick et al. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956.

Mauro, Philip. God's Present Kingdom. Boston: Hamilton Brothers, n.d.

_____. The Gospel of the Kingdom, with an Examination of Modern Dispensationalism. Swengel, PA: Bible Truth Depot, n.d.

_____. The Hope of Israel: What Is It? N.p., n.d.

May, Herbert G. "The Book of Ezekiel: Introduction and Exegesis." In vol 6. of The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick et al. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.

Mayhue, Richard Lee. "The Prophet's Watchword: The Day of the Lord." Th.D. dissertation, Grace Theological Seminary, 1981.

Mays, James Luther. Hosea: A Commentary. The Old Testament Library. Edited by G. E. Wright et al. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.

Mendenhall, George E. Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East. Pittsburgh: Biblical Colloquium, 1955.

_____. "Puppy and Lettuce in Northwest-Semitic Covenant Making." Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 133 (February 1954):26-30.

Mettinger, Tryggve N.D. King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings. Coniectanea Biblica: Old Testament Series. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1976.

Metzger, Bruce M. The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration. 2d ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

_____. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (Third Edition). New York: United Bible Societies, 1971.

Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Romans. Translated by J. C. Moore and E. Johnson. Revised and edited by W. P. Dickson. Supplemented by T. Dwight. Reprint ed. Winona Lake, IN: Alpha Publications, 1979.

_____. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians. Translated by D. D. Bannerman. Revised and edited by W. P. Dickson. Supplemented by T. W. Chambers. Reprint ed. Winona Lake, IN: Alpha Publications, 1979.

_____. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of Matthew. Translated, revised, and edited by F. Crombie and W. Stewart. Reprint ed. Winona Lake, IN: Alpha Publications, 1979.

Millard, A. R. "Covenant and Communion in First Corinthians." In Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce on His 60th Birthday. Edited by W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1970.

Milligan, George. The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Reprint ed. Minneapolis: James Family Christian Publishers, 1978.

Mitchell, John J. "Abraham's Understanding of the Lord's Covenant." Westminster Theological Journal 32 (November 1969):24-48.

Moffatt, James. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. International Critical Commentary. Edited by Samuel Rolles Driver, Alfred Plummer, and Charles Augustus Briggs. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1924.

Montefiore, Hugh. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. Black's New Testament Commentaries. Edited by H. Chadwick. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1964.

Moo, Douglas J. "Jesus and the Authority of the Mosaic Law." Journal for the Study of the New Testament 20 (February 1984):3-49.

_____. "'Law,' 'Works of the Law,' and Legalism in Paul." Westminster Theological Journal 43 (Spring 1983):73-100.

_____. The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983.

_____. "Review of Gospel and Law: Contrast or Continuum? The Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism and Covenant Theology, by Daniel P. Fuller." Trinity Journal 3 (Spring 1982):99-103.

_____. "Review of Paul and the Law, by Heikki Räisänen; and Paul, the Law and the Jewish People, by E. P. Sanders." Trinity Journal 5 (Spring 1984):92-99.

Morris, Leon. The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1955.

_____. The Cross in the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1965.

_____. "Hebrews." In vol. 12 of Expositor's Bible Commentary. Edited by F. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1981.

Most, William G. "A Biblical Theology of Redemption in a Covenant Framework." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 29 (January 1967):1-19.

Moule, C. F. D. An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek. 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

_____. Worship in the New Testament. Ecumenical Studies in Worship. Edited by J. G. Davies and A. R. George. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1961.

Moulton, James Hope; Howard, Wilbert Francis; and Turner, Nigel. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. 4 vols. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1908-1976.

Moulton, James Hope, and Milligan, George, eds. The Vocabulary of the
    Greek Testament, Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-
    Literary Sources. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans
    Publishing Co., 1974.

Mowvley, Harry. Reading the Old Testament Prophets Today. Atlanta:
    John Knox Press, 1979.

Muilenburg, James. "The Biblical View of Time." In Grace Upon Grace:
    Essays in Honor of Lester J. Kuyper. Edited by J. I. Cook.
    Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975.

_____. "The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 40-66: Introduction and
    Exegesis." In vol. 5 of The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by
    G. A. Buttrick et al. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956.

_____. "The Linguistic and Rhetorical Usage of the Particle Ki
    in the Old Testament." Hebrew Union College Annual 32 (1961):
    135-62.

_____. The Way of Israel: Biblical Faith and Ethics. Religious
    Perspectives. Edited by R. N. Ashen. New York: Harper and
    Brothers, Publishers, 1961.

Munck, Johannes. Christ and Israel: An Interpretation of Romans 9-11.
    Translated by I. Nixon. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

Murray, John. The Epistle to the Romans: The English Text with Intro-
    duction, Exposition and Notes. New International Commentary on
    the New Testament. Edited by F. F. Bruce. Grand Rapids: Wm. B.
    Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1965.

Nash, Ronald H. "The Notion of Mediator in Alexandrian Judaism and the
    Epistle to the Hebrews." Westminster Theological Journal 40
    (Fall 1977):89-115.

New Bible Dictionary. S. v. "Lord's Supper," by Ralph P. Martin.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Appendix:
    Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament," by Murray
    J. Harris.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Baptism,"
    by G. R. Beasley-Murray.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Blood,"
    by Fritz Laubach.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Church,"
    by Lothar Coenen.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Circumcision," by Hans-Cristoph Hahn.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Covenant," by Joachim Guhrt and Oswald Becker.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Death," by Lothar Coenen and Walter Schmithals.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Destroy," by Hans-Cristoph Hahn.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Fear," by Wilhelm Mundle.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "First," by Karl Heinz Bartels.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Forgiveness," by Herwart Vorländer.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Guilt," by Colin Brown et al.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Hard," by Ulrich Becker.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Hear," by Wilhelm Mundle.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Heart," by Theo Sorg.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Hide," by Wilhelm Mundle.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Inheritance," by Johannes Eichler and Wilhelm Mundle.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Israel," by Reinhold Mayer and Thomas McComiskey.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Knowledge," by Ernst D. Schmitz and Edward E. Schütz.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Law," by Hans-Helmut Esser.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Life," by Hans-Georg Link.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Lord's Supper," by Bertold Klappert.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "New," by Hermann Haarbeck, Hans-George Link, and Colin Brown.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Old," by Hermann Haarbeck.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Peace," by Hartmut Beck and Colin Brown.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "People," by Hans Bietenhard.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Present," by Georg Braumann, Wilhelm Mundle and Colin Brown.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Priest," by Jürgen Baehr.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Proclamation," by Ulrich Becker et al.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Promise," by Ernst Hoffmann.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Redemption," by Wilhelm Mundle, Colin Brown, and Johannes Schneider.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Remember," by Karl Heinz Bartels and Colin Brown.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Scripture," by Reinhold Mayer and Colin Brown.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Secret," by Günter Finkenrath.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Serve," by Klaus Hess.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Shepherd," by Erich Beyreuther.

New International Dictionary of New Testmaent Theology. S. v. "Sin," by Walther Günther.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Spirit," by Eberhard Kamlah, J. D. G. Dunn, and Colin Brown.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Teach," by Klaus Wegenast and Dieter Fürst.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. S. v. "Time," by Joachim Guhrt.

Nicholson, Ernest Wilson. "The Covenant Ritual in Exodus XXXIV 3-8." Vetus Testamentum 32 (January 1982):74-86.

_____. Exodus and Sinai in History and Tradition. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1973.

Nielsen, Edvard. Shechem: A Traditio-Historical Investigation. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1959.

North, Cristopher R. The Second Isaiah: Introduction, Translation and Commentary to Chapters XL-LV. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1964.

_____. The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah: An Historical and Critical Study. 2d ed. Oxford: At the Clarandon Press, 1956.

Norton, Frederick Owen. A Lexicographical and Historical Study of ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ; From the Earliest Times to the End of the Classical Period. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1908.

Noth, Martin. The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies. Translated by D. R. AP-Thomas. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1966.

Orelli, C. von. The Prophecies of Isaiah. Translated by J. S. Banks. Clark's Foreign Theological Library. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1889.

_____. The Prophecies of Jeremiah. Translated by J. S. Banks. Reprint ed. Minneapolis: Klock and Klock Christian Publishers, 1977.

Orr, William F., and Walther, James Arthur. 1 Corinthians: A New Translation, Introduction with a Study of the Life of Paul, Notes and Commentary. Anchor Bible. Edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1976.

Pache, Rene. The Return of Jesus Christ. Translated by W. S. LaSor. Chicago: Moody Press, 1955.

Payne, J. Barton. "The B'rith of Yahweh." In New Perspectives on the Old Testament. Edited by J. B. Payne. Waco; Word Books, 1970.

_____. The Theology of the Older Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962.

Peer, Peter. "The Church and the New Covenant of Jeremiah 31:31-34."
Th.M. thesis, Grace Theological Seminary, 1982.

Pentecost, J. Dwight. "The Purpose of the Law." Bibliotheca Sacra 128
(July-September 1971):227-33.

_____. The Sermon on the Mount: Contemporary Insights for a
Christian Lifestyle. 2d ed. Portland: Multnomah Press, 1980.

_____. Things to Come: A Study in Biblical Eschatology. Grand
Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Co., 1958.

Peterson, David L. "Covenant Ritual: A Traditio-Historical Perspective."
Biblical Research 22 (1977):7-18.

_____. Hebrews and Perfection: An Examination of the Concept of
Perfection in the "Epistle to the Hebrews." Cambridge, England:
Cambridge University Press, 1982.

_____. "The Prophecy of the New Covenant in the Argument of Hebrews."
Reformed Theological Review 38 (September-December 1979).

Pickering, Wilbur N. The Identity of the New Testament Text. Revised
ed. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1980.

Piepgrass, C. E. "A Study of New Testament References to the Old Testa-
ment Covenants." Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological
Seminary, 1968.

Pieters, Albertus. The Seed of Abraham: A Biblical Study of Israel,
the Church, and the Jew. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans
Publishing Co., 1950.

Plummer, Alfred. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel
According to S. Luke. 5th ed. International Critical Commentary.
Edited by Alfred Plummer, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Charles
Augustus Briggs. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1922.

_____. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of
St. Paul to the Corinthians. International Critical Commentary.
Edited by Samuel Rolles Driver, Alfred Plummer, and Charles
Augustus Briggs. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1915.

_____. An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mat-
thew. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1982.

Provence, Thomas E. "'Who Is Sufficient for These Things?' An Exegesis
of 2 Corinthians 2:15-3:18." Novum Testamentum 24 (January
1982):54-81.

Purton, J. S. "Testament or Covenant: A Note on Hebrews 9:15-22."
The Expositor 7 (1878):73-77.

Rad, Gerhard von. Old Testament Theology. 2 vols. Translated by
D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.

Radmacher, Earl D. "The Current Status of Dispensationalism and Its
Eschatology." In Perspectives on Evangelical Theology: Papers
from the Thirtieth Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological
Society. Edited by K.S. Kantzer and S. N. Gundry. Grand
Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979.

_____. The Nature of the Church. Portland: Western Baptist Press,
1972.

Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. Septuaginta. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibel-
stiftung, 1935.

Räisänen, Heikki. "Galatians 2.16 and Paul's Break with Judaism."
New Testament Studies 31 (October 1985):343-553.

Raitt, Thomas M. "Jeremiah's Deliverance Message to Judah." In
Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg.
Edited by J. J. Jackson and M. Kessler. Pittsburgh Theological
Monograph Series. Edited by D. Y. Hadidian. Pittsburgh: The
Pickwick Press, 1974.

_____. A Theology of Exile: Judgment/Deliverance in Jeremiah and
Ezekiel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

Ramsey, George W. The Quest for the Historical Israel. Atlanta: John
Knox Press, 1981.

Ramsey, William M. A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to
the Galatians. Reprint ed. Minneapolis: Klock and Klock
Christian Publishers, 1978.

Rawlinson, A. E. J. "Church, Baptism and Eucharist in the New Testa-
ment." In The Ministry and the Sacraments. Edited by A. C.
Headlam and R. Dunkerley. London: Student Christian Movement
Press, 1937.

Reid, Richard. "The Use of the Old Testament in the Epistle to the
Hebrews." Th.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, n.d.

Rese, Martin. "Zur Problematik von Kurz-und Langtext in Luk XXII.17ff."
New Testament Studies 22 (1976):15-31.

Rhyne, C. Thomas. "Νόμος Δικαιοσύνες and the Meaning of Romans 10:4."
Catholic Biblical Quarterly 47 (July 1985):486-99.

Richardson, A. An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament.
New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1958.

Richardson, Peter. Israel in the Apostolic Church. Society for New
     Testament Studies Monograph Series. Edited by M. Black.
     Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Ridderbos, Herman. Paul: An Outline of His Theology. Translated by
     J. R. DeWitt. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.,
     1975.

Ridderbos, J. Bible Student's Commentary--Deuteronomy. Translated by
     E. M. van der Maas. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House,
     1984.

Robertson, Archibald T. A Harmony of the Gospels for Students of the
     Life of Christ: Based on the Broadus Harmony in the Revised
     Version. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1922.

_____. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Histor-
     ical Research. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.

Robertson, Archibald T., and Plummer, Alfred. A Critical and Exegetical
     Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians.
     2d ed. International Critical Commentary. Edited by Samuel
     Rolles Driver, Alfred Plummer, and Charles Augustus Briggs.
     Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1914.

Robertson, O. Palmer. The Christ of the Covenants. Grand Rapids:
     Baker Book House, 1980.

_____. "Is There A Distinctive Future for Ethnic Israel in Romans 11?"
     In Perspectives on Evangelical Theology. Edited by K, S. Kantzer
     and S. N. Gundry. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979.

Rogers, Cleon L., Jr. "The Covenant with Abraham and Its Historical
     Setting." Bibliotheca Sacra 127 (July-September 1970):241-56.

_____. "The Covenant with Moses and Its Historical Setting." Journal
     of the Evangelical Theological Society 14 (Summer 1971):141-55.

Roth, Robert Paul. "Paradosis and Apokalupsis in 1 Corinthians 11:23."
     The Lutheran Quarterly 12 (February 1960):64-67.

Ryrie, Charles Caldwell. The Basis of the Premillennial Faith. Neptune,
     NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1953.

_____. Biblical Theology of the New Testament. Chicago: Moody
     Press, 1959.

_____. Dispensationalism Today. Chicago: Moody Press, 1965.

_____. "The End of the Law." Bibliotheca Sacra 124 (July-September
     1967):239-47.

Sakenfeld, Kathrine Doob. The Meaning of "Hesed" in the Hebrew Bible: A New Inquiry. Harvard Semitic Museum, Harvard Semitic Monographs. Edited by F. M. Cross. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978.

Sanday, William, and Headlam, Arthur C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. 5th ed. International Critical Commentary. Edited by Samuel Rolles Driver, Alfred Plummer, and Charles Augustus Briggs. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1902.

Sanders, E. P. "The Covenant as a Soteriological Category and the Nature of Salvation in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism." In Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity. Edited by R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

_____. Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.

Saucy, Robert L. The Church in God's Program. Chicago: Moody Press, 1972.

Schaefer, James R. "The Relationship Between Priestly and Servant Messianism in the Epistle to the Hebrews." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 30 (July 1968):359-85.

Schoedel, William R. "Pauline Thought: Some Basic Issues." In Transitions in Biblical Scholarship. Edited by J. C. Rylaarsdam. Essays in Divinity. Edited by J. C. Brauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Schoeps, Hans Joachim. Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History. Translated by H. Knight. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.

Schoefield, J. N. Law, Prophets, and Writings: The Religion of the Books of the Old Testament. London: S. P. C. K., 1969.

Schreiner, Thomas R. "Paul and Perfect Obedience to the Law: An Evaluation of the View of E. P. Sanders." Westminster Theological Journal 47 (Fall 1985):245-78.

Schweitzer, Albert. The Problem of the Lord's Supper According to the Scholarly Research of the Nineteenth Century and the Historical Accounts. 2 vols. Translated by A. J. Mattill, Jr. Edited by J. Reumann. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1982.

Schweizer, Eduard. The Lord's Supper According to the New Testament. Translated by J. M. Davies. Facet Books: Biblical Series. Edited by J. Reumann. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

Shedd, William G. T. Commentary on Romans. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980.

Skehan, Patrick W. "The Date of the Last Supper." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 20 (April 1958):192-99.

Skinner, John. The Book of the Prophet Isaiah, Chapters XL-LXVI: In the Revised Version with Introduction and Notes. The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Edited by A. F. Kilpatrick. Reprint ed. Cambridge, England: At the University Press, 1954.

_____. Prophecy and Religion: Studies in the Life of Jeremiah. Cambridge, England: At the University Press, 1922.

Smick, Elmer B. "Old Testament Theology: The Historico-Genetic Method." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 26 (June 1983):145-55.

Snaith, Norman H. The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament. New York: Schocken Books, 1964.

Snodgrass, Klyne. "'Western Non-Interpolations.'" Journal of Biblical Literature 91 (September 1972):369-79.

Snyder, George. "The Law and Covenant in Amos." Restoration Quarterly 25 (Third Quarter 1982):158-66.

Soggin, J. Alberto. "Akkadisch TAR BERITI und Hebräisch כרת ברית." Vetus Testamentum 18 (1968):210-15.

Sowers, Sidney G. The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews: A Comparison of the Interpretation of the Old Testament in Philo Judaeus and the Epistle to the Hebrews. Basel Studies of Theology. Edited by the Faculty of Theology, Basel. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1965.

Spicq, C. L'Épître aux Hebreux: II, Commentaire. Etudes Bibliques. Paris: Gabalda, 1952.

Stamm, Johann Jakob, and Andrew, Maurice Edward. The Ten Commandments in Recent Research. Studies in Biblical Theology, 2d series. Edited by C. F. D. Moule et al. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1967.

Stevens, George Barker. The Theology of the New Testament. International Theological Library. Edited by C. A. Briggs and S. D. S. Salmond. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914.

Swetnam, James. "A Suggested Interpretation of Hebrews 9:15-18." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 27 (October 1965):373-90.

Tan, Paul Lee. The Interpretation of Prophecy. Winona Lake, IN: Assurance Publishers, 1974.

Taylor, John B. Ezekiel: An Introduction and Commentary. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Edited by D. J. Wiseman. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1969.

Taylor, Vincent. The Gospel According to St. Mark: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indexes. London: MacMillan and Co., 1957.

Tenney, Merrill C. "A New Approach to the Book of Hebrews." Bibliotheca Sacra 123 (July-September 1966):230-36.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "ἀγγελία," by Julius Schniewind.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "ἅγιος," by Otto Procksch and Karl Georg Kuhn.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "αἷμα," by Johannes Behm.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "αἰών," by Hermann Sasse.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "ἀκούω," by Gerhard Kittel.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "ἁμαρτάνω," by Gottfried Quell, Georg Bertram, Gustav Stählin, and Walter Grundmann.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "ἀπόλλυμι," by Albrecht Oepke.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "ἀφίημι," by Rudolf Bultmann.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "βάπτω," by Albrecht Oepke.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "γινώσκω," by Rudolf Bultmann.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "γράμμα," by Gottlob Schrenk.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "δεῖπνον," by Johannes Behm.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "διακονέω," by
    Hermann Wolfgang Beyer.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "διατίθημι," by
    Johannes Behm and Gottfried Quell.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "δίδωμι," by
    Friedrich Büchsel.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "δίκη," by Gottfried
    Quell and Gottlob Schrenk.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "ἔγγυος," by Herbert
    Priesker.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "ἔθνος," by Georg
    Bertram and Karl Ludwig Schmidt.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "εἰρήνη," by Werner
    Foerster and Gerhard von Rad.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "εἰς," by Albrecht
    Oepke.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "ἐκχέω," by Johannes
    Behm.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "ἐλεύθερος," by
    Heinrich Schlier.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "ἐν," by Albrecht
    Oepke.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "ἐπαγγέλλω," by
    Julius Schniewind and Gerhard Friedrich.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "ἔρχομαι," by
    Johannes Schneider.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "ζάω," by Rudolf
    Bultmann.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "ἡμέρα," by Gerhard
    von Rad and Gerhard Delling.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "θάνατος," by Rudolf
    Bultmann.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "ἱερός," by Gottlob
    Schrenk.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "Ἰσραήλ," by Gerhard
     von Rad, Karl Georg Kuhn and Walter Gutbrod.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "καινός," by Johannes
     Behm.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "καλέω," by Karl
     Ludwig Schmidt.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "καρδία," by Fried-
     rich Baumgärtel and Johannes Behm.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "κλάω," by Johannes
     Behm.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "κλῆρος," by Werner
     Foerster and Johannes Herrmann.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "κοινός," by Fried-
     rich Hauck.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "λαμβάνω," by Gerhard
     Delling.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "λαός," by Hermann
     Strathmann and Rudolf Meyer.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "λεῖμμα," by Gottlob
     Schrenk and Volkmar Martinus Herntrich.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "λειτουργέω," by
     Hermann Strathmann and Rudolf Meyer.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "λύω," by Otto
     Procksch and Friedrich Büchsel.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "μεσίτης," by
     Albrecht Oepke.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "μισθός," by Herbert
     Preisker and Ernst Würthwein.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "μυστήριον," by
     Günther Bornkamm.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "νέος," by Johannes
     Behm.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "νόμος," by Hermann
     Martin Kleinknecht and Walter Gutbrod.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "πάλαι," by Heinrich
    Seesemann.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "πανήγυρις," by
    Heinrich Seesemann.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "πᾶς," by Bo Reicke
    and Georg Bertram.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "παχύνω," by Karl
    Ludwig Schmidt and Martin Anton Schmidt.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "περί," by Ernst
    Harald Riesenfeld.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "περιτέμνω," by
    Rudolf Meyer.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "πίνω," by Leonhard
    Goppelt.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "πλήρης," by Gerhard
    Delling.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "πνεῦμα," by Hermann
    Kleinknecht, Friedrich Baumgärtel, Werner Bieder, Erik Sjöberg,
    and Eduard Schweizer.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "ποιμήν," by
    Joachim Jeremias.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "πολλοί," by Joachim
    Jeremias.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "πρῶτος," by Wilhelm
    Michaelis.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "ραντίζω," by Claus-
    Hunno Hunzinger.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "ρύομαι," by Wilhelm
    F. Kasch.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "σέβομαι," by Werner
    Foerster.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "Σιών," by Georg
    Fohrer and Eduard Lohse.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "στρέφω," by Georg
    Bertram.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "σώζω," by Werner
  Foerster and Georg Fohrer.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "τόπος," by Helmut
  Köster.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "ὑπέρ," by Harald
  Riesenfeld.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. S. v. "φοβέω," by Horst
  Balz and Günther Wanke.

Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. S. v. "אח," by Helmer
  Ringgren.

Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. S. v. "בטח," by Alfred
  Jepsen.

Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. S. v. "ברית," by Moshe
  Weinfeld.

Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. S. v. "גאל," by Helmer
  Ringgren.

Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. S. v. "געל," by H. F. Fuhs.

Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. S. v. "חדש," by R. North.

Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. S. v. "חטא," by K. Koch.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "אחה," by Herbert Wolf.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "בטח," by John N.
  Oswalt.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "בעל," by Bruce K.
  Waltke.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "חטא," by G. Herbert
  Livingston.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "חסד," by R. Laird
  Harris.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "ידע," by Jack P.
  Lewis.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "יום," by Leonard J.
  Coppes.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "יסר," by Paul R.
  Gilchrist.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "ירא," by Andrew
    Bowling.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "ירה," by John E.
    Hartley.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "ישע," by John E.
    Hartley.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "לבב," by Andrew
    Bowling.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "מול," by Elmer B.
    Smick.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "מי," by Walter C.
    Kaiser.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "סלח," by Walter C.
    Kaiser.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "נחל," by Leonard J.
    Coppes.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "עלם," by Allan A.
    MacRae.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "פרר," by Victor P.
    Hamilton.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "קדש," by Thomas E.
    McComiskey.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "רוח," by J. Barton
    Payne.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "שלם," by G. Lloyd
    Carr.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "שמע," by Hermann J.
    Austel.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S. v. "שפט," by Robert D.
    Culver.

Theologische Realenzyklopädie. S. v. "Bund," by Ernst Kutsch.

Theologisches Handwörterbüch zum Alten Testament. S. v. "ברית berit
    Verpflichtung," by Ernst Kutsch.

Thiel, Winfried. "HĒFĒR BERIT Zum Bundbrechen Im Alten Testament."
    Vetus Testamentum 20 (April 1970):214-229.

Thomas, Kenneth J. "The Old Testament Citations in Hebrews." New Testament Studies 11 (July 1965):303-25.

Thomas, Robert L., and Gundry, Stanley N., eds. A Harmony of the Gospels with Explanations and Essays. Chicago: Moody Press, 1978.

Thompson, J. A. The Book of Jeremiah. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Edited by R. K. Harrison. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1980.

_____. Deuteronomy: An Introduction and Commentary. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Edited by D. J. Wiseman. London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1974.

_____. "The Near Eastern Suzerain-Vassal Concept in the Religion of Israel." Journal of Religious History 3 (June 1964):1-19.

Torrey, Charles Cutler. The Second Isaiah: A New Interpretation. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928.

Toussaint, Stanley D. Behold the King: A Study of Matthew. Portland: Multnomah Press, 1980.

Townsend, Jeffrey L. "Fulfillment of the Land Promise in the Old Testament." Bibliotheca Sacra 142 (October-December 1985):320-337.

Trench, Richard Chenevix. Synonyms of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1880.

Tyson, Joseph B. "'Works of the Law' in Galatians." Journal of Biblical Literature 92 (September 1973):423-31.

Vaillancourt, Norman Leo. "War and Covenant in the Prophet Jeremiah." Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1976.

Vannoy, J. Robert. Covenant Renewal at Gilgal: A Study of 1 Samuel 11:14-12:25. Cherry Hill, NJ: Mack Publishing Co., 1978.

Van Seters, John. Abraham in History and Tradition. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.

Van Unnik, W. C. "'With Unveiled Face,' An Exegesis of 2 Corinthians III 12-18." Novum Testamentum 6 (July 1963):153-69.

Vaux, Roland de. The Bible and the Ancient Near East. Translated by Damien McHugh. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1971.

Vööbus, Arthur. "A New Approach to the Problem of the Shorter and Longer Text in Luke." New Testament Studies 15 (1969):457-63.

Vogels, Walter P. B. "Covenants Between Israel and the Nations." Eglise et Theologie 4 (May 1973):171-96.

Vogels, Walter P. B. God's Universal Covenant: A Biblical Study. Ottawa: St. Paul University, 1979.

Vos, Geerhardus. Biblical Theology: Old and New Testaments. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954.

_____. "The Priesthood of Christ in the Epistle to the Hebrews." Princeton Theological Review 5 (July 1907):423-47.

_____. Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation: The Shorter Writings of Geerhardus Vos. Edited by R. B. Gaffin, Jr. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1980.

Wade, G. W. The Book of the Prophet Isaiah with Introduction and Notes. 2d ed., revised. Westminster Commentaries. Edited by W. Lock and D. C. Simpson. London: Methuen and Co., 1929.

Walvoord, John F. Jesus Christ Our Lord. Chicago: Moody Press, 1969.

_____. The Millennial Kingdom. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1959.

_____. "The New Covenant with Israel." Bibliotheca Sacra 103 (January-March 1946):16-27.

_____. "The New Covenant with Israel." Bibliotheca Sacra 110 (July-September 1953):193-205.

Weinfeld, Moshe. "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East." Journal of the American Oriental Society 90 (April-June 1970):184-203.

_____. "Covenant Terminology in the Ancient Near East and Its Influence on the West." Journal of the American Oriental Society (April-June 1973):190-93.

_____. "Jeremiah and the Spiritual Metamorphosis of Israel," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 88 (1976); 17-56.

Weiss, Bernhard. Biblical Theology of the New Testament. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1892-1893.

Westcott, Brooke Foss. The Epistle to the Hebrews: The Greek Text with Notes and Essays. Reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974.

Westerholm, Stephen. "The Law and the 'Just Man' (1 Tim 1, 3-11)." Studia Theologica 36 (1982):79-95.

_____. "Letter and Spirit: The Foundation of Pauline Ethics." New Testament Studies 30 (April 1984):229-48.

Westermann, Claus. Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. Old Testament Library. Edited by G. E. Wright et al. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.

Whitcomb, John C. "Christ's Atonement and Animal Sacrifices in Israel." Grace Theological Journal 6 (Fall 1985):201-217.

Whitley, C. F. "Covenant and Commandment in Israel." Journal of Near Eastern Studies 22 (January 1963):37-48.

Whybray, R. N. Isaiah 40-66. New Century Bible. Edited by R. E. Clements and M. Black. London: Oliphants, 1975.

_____. The Second Isaiah. Old Testament Studies. Edited by R. N. Whybray. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983.

Williams, Ronald J. Hebrew Syntax: An Outline. 2d ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.

Williams, Walter G. "Tension and Harmony Between Classical Prophecy and Classical Law." In Transitions in Biblical Scholarship. Edited by J. C. Rylaarsdam. Essays in Divinity. Edited by J. C. Brauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Williamson, H. G. M. "'The Sure Mercies of David': Subjective or Objective Genitive?" Journal of Semitic Studies 23 (Spring 1978): 31-49.

Williamson, Ronald. Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.

Winter, B. W. "The Lord's Supper at Corinth: An Alternative Reconstruction." Reformed Theological Review 37 (September-December 1978): 73-82.

Wiseman, D. J. "'Is It Peace?'--Covenant and Diplomacy." Vetus Testamentum 32 (July 1982):311-26.

Wolff, Hans Walter. Hosea: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Hosea. Translated by G. Stansell. Edited by P. D. Hanson. Hermeneia. Edited by F. M. Cross, Jr. et al. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

Wood, Leon J. The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976.

Woudstra, Marten H. "The Everlasting Covenant in Ezekiel 16:59-63." Calvin Theological Journal 6 (April 1971):22-48.

Wycliffe Bible Encyclopedia. S. v. "Covenant, New," by Charles C. Ryrie.

Wyrtzen, David B. "The Theological Center of the Book of Hosea." Bibliotheca Sacra 141 (October-December 1984):315-29.

Young, Edward J. The Book of Isaiah. 3 vols. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Edited by R. K. Harrison. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972.

Youngblood, Ronald. "The Abrahamic Covenant: Conditional or Unconditional?" In The Living and Active Word of God: Studies in Honor of Samuel J. Schultz. Edited by M. Inch and R. Youngblood. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983.

Zerwick, Maximilian. Biblical Greek, Illustrated by Examples. Translated by J. Smith. Roma: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1963.

Zimmerli, Walther. Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapter 1-24. Translated by R. E. Clements. Edited by F. M. Cross et al. Hermeneia. Edited by F. M. Cross et al. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

_____. Ezekiel 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 25-48. Translated by J. D. Martin. Edited by P. D. Hanson and L. J. Greenspoon. Hermeneia. Edited by F. M. Cross et al. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.

_____. Old Testament Theology in Outline. Translated by David E. Green. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1978.

Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible. S. v. "Baal," by Arthur E. Cundall.

Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible. S. v. "Covenant, (in the New Testament)," by J. B. Payne.

Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible. S. v. "Covenant, (in the Old Testament)," by J. B. Payne.

Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible. S. v. "Lord's Supper," by G. F. Hawthorne.

Zorn, Raymond O. Church and Kingdom. International Library of Philosophy and Theology: Philosophical and Historical Studies Series. Edited by R. J. Rushdoony. Grand Rapids: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1962.