

**“The Concept of Atonement in 1 John:
A Redevelopment of the Second Temple Concept of Atonement”**

By

Jintae Kim

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of

WESTMINSTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

2003

Faculty Advisor: _____
Dr. Dan G. McCartney

Second Faculty Reader: _____
Dr. Peter E. Enns

Chairman of the Field Committee: _____
Dr. Vern S. Poythress

Librarian: _____
Mr. Alexander Finlayson

ABSTRACT

“The Concept of Atonement in 1John”

Jintae Kim

The author of 1John interprets Christ’s death as the atoning sacrifice for the sins of the world (2:2; 4:10). According to 1John, the Son is the Savior of the world (4:14) in terms of his role as the atoning sacrifice (4:10), and on the basis of his accomplished work of atonement, the Son is the heavenly advocate for believers (2:1), and for his name’s sake the sins of the believers are forgiven (2:12).

This study is based upon the premise that this particular interpretation of the Christ event can be best understood against the backdrop of the two Jewish traditions of eschatological forgiveness and atonement, and the early church’s concept of realized eschatology. Part 1 focuses upon the hermeneutical milieu of the use of the atonement themes in 1John. Part 1 is divided into two sections. Part 2 draws together the elements of the two Jewish expectations, and uses them to elucidate the treatment of atonement and forgiveness in 1John.

We conclude: (1) that Second Temple Judaism had an eschatological expectation that God would restore the fortunes of Israel, and the later OT prophets and at least some Jews during the Second Temple period referred to these in the language of atonement and forgiveness of Israel’s corporate sin; (2) that 1John, building upon the Jewish traditions of forgiveness and cultic atonement in the OT and the Second Temple writings, combined the two traditions in its presentation of the atoning death of Jesus Christ and the forgiveness of sin; (3) that 1John is distinctive, in comparison with the later OT prophets and the Second Temple literature, primarily in its application of these Jewish elements to

the death of Jesus in the new way of universalizing, individualizing, and spiritualizing the national and corporate hopes of Israel; and (4) that this distinctive aspect of 1John has its roots in the early church's concept of realized eschatology as expressed in the Gospels, which is itself founded upon the kingdom teachings of Jesus.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
PART 1: THE ESCHATOLOGICAL EXPECTATIONS OF SECOND TEMPLE JUDAISM REGARDING THE PROBLEM OF SIN	13
Chapter 1: Eschatological Forgiveness	16
The OT Roots of the Concept of Eschatological Forgiveness	16
Eschatological Forgiveness according to Jeremiah	18
Eschatological Forgiveness according to Ezekiel	22
Eschatological Forgiveness according to Isaiah	28
The Second Temple Literature	30
Eschatological Forgiveness according to Baruch and Jubilees	31
Eschatological Forgiveness at Qumran	36
Summary and Conclusion	46
Chapter 2: Eschatological Atonement	47
The OT Roots of the Concept of Atonement	47
The Second Temple Literature	65
Eschatologizing of the OT Sacrifices in the Qumran Community	66
Philo's Writings	76
Eschatologizing of the OT Sacrifices in the LXX	83
Eschatologizing in the Righteous Martyrdom Traditions	89
PART 2: TWO TRADITIONS AND 1 JOHN	98
Chapter 3: The Use of the Two OT Traditions in 1 John	100
Assumptions	100
1 John and Jeremiah's New Covenant Passages	101
1 John and Levitical Expiatory Offerings	115
Conclusion	124
Chapter 4: The Distinctive Elements in 1 John's Use of Jewish Traditions	129
Universalizing, Spiritualizing, and Individualizing	129
1 John versus Other NT Books	157
Summary and Conclusion	165

Excursus: The Concept of Atonement in Early Rabbinic Thought	166
Introduction	166
The Five Groups of Tradition	169
Study of the Traditions	170
Summary and Conclusion	196
Chapter 5: The Fusion of the Two Jewish Expectations in 1 John	201
Assumptions	202
Six Lines of Evidence	206
Application of the Hypothesis	236
Summary and Conclusion	260
Excursus: The Relationship between 1John and the Gospel of John	265
Examination of the Passages on Atonement/Forgiveness	266
Examination of the Passages on the New Covenant	281
Summary and Conclusion	287
Chapter 6: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	290
WORKS CITED LIST	300
BIBLIOGRAPHY	320

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this dissertation is to investigate the roots of the concept of atonement in 1John, primarily in relation to the Jewish traditions on forgiveness and Christ's teachings on the kingdom of God. It is argued here: (1) that 1John uses the two Jewish traditions of eschatological forgiveness and atonement and ties them to Jesus' death and forgiveness of sin in the new way of universalizing and individualizing the national and corporate hopes of Israel; and (2) that the particular manner in which the author of 1John interprets the Jewish traditions in the light of the mystery of Christ has its background primarily in the early church's concept of realized eschatology, which was itself founded on Jesus' teachings on the kingdom of God.

Second Temple Judaism had an eschatological expectation that God would restore the fortunes of Israel, and the later OT prophets referred to these in the language of atonement and forgiveness of Israel's corporate sin. On the one hand, such OT prophets as Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Isaiah eschatologized the concept of divine forgiveness by identifying it with the return from the Exile and the reestablishment of the Jewish nation (Jer 31:31-34; Ezek 16:59-63; 36:22-32; 37:21-28; Isa 54:10; 55:3; 61:8). This eschatologizing of forgiveness is developed further in such Second Temple writings as Baruch, *Jubilees*, and Qumran literature. In particular, the Qumran community considered eschatological forgiveness as already realized in the history of their own times or in the inner life of their sect (Cross 1995, 156). On the other hand, the eschatologizing of the concept of atonement is developed in such Second Temple writings as Qumran literature, the LXX, Dan 3:38-40 LXX, and *4 Maccabees* (6:27-29; 17:21-22). These writings eschatologize the cultic atonement by interpreting it as foreshadowing something

else, such as a greater eschatological event. In the Qumran literature, we find three ways in which the OT sacrifices are eschatologized. First, the *New Jerusalem*, the *Temple Scroll*, and the *War Scroll* describe a new temple and its cult that will be established in the new age, which implies that the present sacrificial order is only provisional, pointing to a more perfect sacrificial order in the last days. Second, other literature, such as the *Rule of the Community* and the *Thanksgiving Hymns*, describe the community as a temple of God with its spiritual sacrifices. Thus, according to these writings, the OT sacrificial system points to the community. Third, a variant reading found in one of the Isaiah scroll (1QIsa^a 52:14) indicates that the community may have interpreted the Fourth Servant Song (Isa 52:13-53:12) messianically.

Evoking various strands of OT imagery, particularly Levitical forgiveness and atonement, and the prophetic expectation of eschatological forgiveness, 1John makes an important contribution to NT teachings by tying the two Jewish traditions to Jesus' death and forgiveness of sin in the new way of universalizing and individualizing the national and corporate hopes of Israel. According to 1John, "the Father has sent his Son as the Savior of the world (σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου)" (4:14) in terms of his role as "atoning sacrifice (ἱλασμός)" (4:10).¹ On the basis of his accomplished work of atonement, the Son is the heavenly advocate (παράκλητος) for believers (2:1) and "the atoning sacrifice for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world (περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου)" (2:2; cf. ὁ κόσμος ὅλος in 5:19). Thus, Jesus Christ established the reality of new

¹ Unless otherwise specified, the scriptural quotations are from the New Revised Standard Version for English translation, from the UBS third edition for the NT Greek text, and from Rahlfs edition of the Greek OT, Brenton's translation for the English translation of the LXX, and BHS for the Hebrew text, using Bibleworks 3.5 computer software. With regard to the abbreviated terms, we use the standard abbreviations according to the SBL Handbook of Style (Alexander 1999).

covenant forgiveness and other eschatological blessings such as knowledge of God, victory over evil, and eternal life, which are now available for his sake (2:12) to those who join the fellowship of believers by confessing Jesus as the Son of God (4:15; 5:5) and the Christ (2:22; 4:2; 5:1), and keep the new commandments of fraternal love and faith in Christ (2:3, 5; 3:24; 4:15; 5:1).

This way of interpreting the death of Jesus is partially or implicitly expressed in other NT writings, but the concept is not as pronounced and developed as in 1John. First of all, in the area of Christology, 1John makes an important contribution to the theology of atonement in two ways: (1) Prominent in 1John is the combination of the concept of the preexistent divine sonship of Jesus Christ with his role as the atoning sacrifice for the sins of the world (2:2; 4:9, 10, 14).² (2) In 1John, it is the death of Christ that takes a dominant place. As pointed out by Dodd, there is no direct allusion to the Resurrection in 1John, whereas the Resurrection has a dominant place in practically every other book of the New Testament with the exception of Hebrews, in which the only direct reference to it is in the liturgical language of the closing benediction and doxology (13:20-21) (Dodd 1946, xxxiii). Thus, according to 1John, the spiritual blessings of the new age (1John 2:12-14; 3:14; 5:4, 13) are already realized in the lives of individual believers because of Christ's atoning death.

The realized aspect of these spiritual blessings is another distinctive of 1John in two ways: (1) The national and corporate hopes of Israel are completely spiritualized and individualized, leaving no explicit trace of their Jewish roots, either positively or negatively. 1John, despite its obvious allusion to the new covenant prophecy in the use of

² The idea may be implied in the context of Rom 3:25 (cf. 1:3-4) and Heb 1:2-3.

the new covenant categories (1John 2:12-14), neither uses the expression “new covenant,” nor contrasts it to the old covenant, as seen in other NT writings (Luke 22:20; 1 Cor 11:25; 2 Cor 3:6; Heb 8:8, 13; 9:15; 12:24).³ As pointed out by Westcott, “There is no trace of any conflict between advocates of the Law and of the gospel, between champions of works and faith. The difference of Jew and Gentile, and the question of circumcision, have no place in the composition.... The main questions of debate are gathered round the Person and Work of the Lord” (Westcott 1883, xxxiv). Thus, 1John makes the soteriological value of the death of Christ more pronounced and prominent than other NT writings. (2) As argued by Lieu, 1John “affirms the ‘already’ of Christian existence over against the ‘not yet’ of future hope. This is a tension found throughout the New Testament; the early church were united in seeing in Jesus, in his preaching of the kingdom and in his resurrection, the inbreaking of the new age. With equal confidence they looked forward to the full accomplishment of that age. Different NT writers express the tension of the interim in different ways, and put varying emphasis on what is yet to come” (Lieu 1991, 107).

Moreover, 1John emphasizes the universality of Jesus’ atoning sacrifice more explicitly and comprehensively than other NT writings by applying peculiar expressions to the function of Christ in relation to his atoning ministry. Prominent are the three expressions in 1John: (1) ἵλασμός (2:2; 4:10), (2) σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου (4:14), and (3) παράκλητος (2:1). The word ἵλασμός “atoning sacrifice” (for the sins of the world), is used twice only in 1John, and the other two expressions are peculiar to the Johannine

³ The same applies to 1John’s use of the word ἵλασμός (“atoning sacrifice”), which alludes to the Day of Atonement ritual, but was not used in the context of contrasting the law and the gospel, as in the use of the cognate word ἱλαστήριον in Rom 3:25.

literature in the NT. But, compared to the Gospel of John, both terms are used distinctively in 1John to refer to Christ's atoning ministry for the sins of the world. The expression σωτήρα τοῦ κόσμου is used in 1John 4:10 and John 4:42, but in the Gospel it is not used in connection with Jesus' role as the atoning sacrifice. The term παράκλητος is used once in 1John 2:1, referring to Jesus' role as a heavenly advocate with the Father for the sins of believers, but in the Gospel of John it is used five times (14:15-17, 26; 15:26-27; 16:7-11, 12-14) to refer to someone who is not Jesus, nor in heaven (Brown 1970, 1135). The expression ἄλλον παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν in John 14:16 may imply that Jesus was the first παράκλητος, but in his earthly ministry, not in heaven, as in 1John 2:1. All three expressions emphasize the universal implication of Christ's atoning death. In particular, the first two expressions are used in combination with the word κόσμος in the passages (2:2; 4:14; cf. v. 9; 5:19) that show a salvific concern for the world in connection with Christ's role as the atonement. The word κόσμος occurs 185 times in the NT, of which 78 occurrences are in the Gospel of John, 23 are in 1John, and one is in 2 John – in sum, 55 percent of the total NT usage (Brown 1982, 222-23). Considering its short length, 1John uses the word more frequently than any other book in the NT, reflecting its author's concern for the salvation of the world.

1John's uniqueness is not confined to its use of peculiar expressions. The idea of the sacrifice of Jesus is rarely attested in the Gospels. As observed, the Gospel of John shares with 1John many important ideas and terms, but the Gospel is relatively quiet about the atonement that Christ wrought.⁴ In the Synoptic Gospels, the idea of the sacrifice of Jesus is not explicitly expressed outside the Last Supper narratives (Matt

⁴ The sacrificial connection of Christ's death may be implied in John 1:29 and 6:53-59.

26:26-29; Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:15-20) (Moo 1983, 329-30). Nor is the universal implication of Jesus' sacrificial death explicitly stated in the narratives.

The concept of the death of Jesus as an atonement is more explicitly stated in a few places in the NT (Rom 3:25; 1 Cor 11:25; 15:3; 1 Pet 1:18-19; Hebrews), but the universality of his atoning death is not clearly expressed in most of these writings. The cosmic significance of Christ's atoning work may be implied in the statement in Hebrews, "When he had made purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high," but the beneficiaries of Christ's self-sacrifice are still confined to God's people (2:16, "the descendants of Abraham"; 2:17, εἰς τὸ ἰλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ).⁵ The only exception to this phenomenon is Rom 3:25, which affirms the universality of sin and God's righteousness, and describes the death of Christ as the fulfillment of the Day of Atonement ritual (ἰλαστήριον) (Moo 1996, 28). Thus, the concept expressed in Rom 3:25 is closer to 1John than any other passage in the NT in this regard, but even in Rom 3:25 the concept of Christ's death as an atoning sacrifice for the sins of the whole world is not as explicitly and emphatically expressed as in 1John. Nor is the atonement of Christ explicitly connected with eschatological forgiveness in Rom 3:25. Whereas the primary emphasis of Rom 3:25 is on the righteousness of God and the contrast between the law and the gospel, 1John's emphasis is on the universal implication of the atoning death of Christ for the eschatological forgiveness of sins realized in the new covenant community.

⁵ With regard to these two expressions, "the descendants of Abraham" and "the people" (of God), Lane thinks that the author of Hebrews meant to transfer the titles to the Christian community (Lane 1991, 66). Ellingworth disagrees, saying that "the people of God in Moses' time (11:25), the time of the exodus (4:9), is still, despite its breaking of the old covenant, the same people in the new age, for whom the promises of God remain valid" (Ellingworth 1993, 68-69).

There are three lines of evidence that support our thesis. First, the manner in which the author of 1John interprets Christ's death has its roots in Jewish traditions on eschatological forgiveness and atonement in three ways: (1) According to 1John, Christ himself (emphatic αὐτός) is ἰλασμός not only for our sins but also for the whole world. We find no known instance of the usage of the word ἰλασμός in pre-Christian, non-Jewish Greek writings. Apart from Jewish writings, the six occurrences in Plutarch (*Mor.* 555C, 560D, 972C; *Sol.* 12; *Fab.* 18.1-3; *Cam.* 7) represent the earliest known usage of ἰλασμός, since his works date back to the NT period.⁶ In contrast, the word is used very frequently in the LXX and Philo in association with the cultic expiation by which sin is made ineffective (Lev 25:9; Num 5:8; Amos 8:14; Ps 129:4; Ezek 44:27; 2 Macc 3:33; Philo, *Alleg. Interp.* 3.174; *Posterity* 48; *Planting* 61; *Heir* 179; *Prelim. Studies* 89, 107; cf. ἐξιλασμός in Exod 30:10; Lev 23:27, 28; 1 Chron 28:11; Ezek 43:23; 45:19; Sir 5:5; 16:11; 17:29; 18:12, 20; 35:3; 1 Esd 9:20; 2 Macc 12:45; Wis 18:21). Such a relatively high frequency of usage in the Jewish sources considerably increases the probability that 1John depends upon Jewish sources rather than non-Jewish sources. This probability is even further increased by the fact that 1John's use of the term παράκλητος in the context of divine-human relations with respect to the forgiveness of sin has its contemporary parallels only in Jewish writings. The use of the word παράκλητος in reference to human relationships with gods is not attested in pre-Christian non-Jewish literature (Grayston

⁶ In Orpheus's *Argonautica*, the word ἰλασμός is used twice with the means of "propitiation." However, these two occurrences in *Argonautica* are irrelevant to our study because of its late dating. The *Argonautica* attributed to Orpheus is actually a pseudonymous work written in the form of autobiographical narrative, in which Orpheus tells the story of his participation in the expedition led by Jason. Scholars generally agree that Orpheus's *Argonautica* cannot be earlier and may be later than the fourth century A.D., and that it is ascribed to Orpheus in order to give it a proper dignity (West 1983, 37; Guthrie 1935, 15).

1981, 67-72). Thus, it is more likely that 1John depends upon Jewish sources in his use of the term of ἰλασμός, for Christ's role in the forgiveness of sin.

With his use of sacrificial language evoking the Levitical sacrifices (1:7; 2:2; 4:10; cf. Lev 25:9; Num 5:8; Ezek 44:27), the author of 1John applies the concept of cultic atonement expressed in the Levitical sacrifices to the innocent self-sacrifice of Christ. The word ἰλασμός occurs only twice in the NT, both in 1John (2:2; 4:10), and is used by the LXX in rendering the Hebrew חַטָּאת “sin offering” in Ezek 44:27 (cf. 45:19; 2 Macc 12:45, ἔξιλασμός) and חַטָּאת in Lev 25:9 and Num 5:8 (cf. Lev 23:27). The sacrificial categories in 1John point to a correspondence with the Levitical atonement rituals (Brown 1982, 203, 217-19; Westcott 1883, 34-37). In particular, 1John shares with the description of the Day of Atonement in Hebrews the concepts of atoning sacrifice (ἰλασμός in 1John 2:2; 4:14; cf. ἰλάσκεσθαι in Heb 2:17), blood, cleansing (1John 1:7; cf. Heb 9:13), the innocent victim, and the idea that the one who atones is himself in heaven continuing to atone (παράκλητος in 1John 2:1), thus offering sinners a basis for confidence (Spicq 1950, 258-69).

This way of interpreting Christ's death is built on a Jewish eschatologizing of forgiveness as seen in the righteous martyrs in Dan 3:38-40 LXX and *4 Maccabees*. Of particular importance to us is the fact that the sacrificial language of *4 Maccabees* finds a parallel in 1John's description of Jesus as an atoning sacrifice.⁷

(2) The author of 1John fuses the concept of atonement with the concept of eschatological forgiveness as promised in Jeremiah's new covenant prophecy by his use

⁷ In both 1John and *4 Maccabees*, the sacrifice is also the sacrificer. This may explain why the authors of these two writings did not use the concrete term ἰλαστήριον (one who offers atoning sacrifice), but abstract terms such as ἰλασμός and ἰλαστήριον despite the fact that they were describing persons (Brown 1982, 218). Paul's use of the term ἰλαστήριον in Rom 3:24 may imply the same idea.

of new covenant categories (2:12-14; 1:9) in connection with the atoning death of Christ (2:2). Moreover, the author spiritualizes the cultic atonement ritual by declaring that eschatological forgiveness is now available for his sake (2:12) to those who enter and remain in the new covenant community by confessing Jesus as the Son of God (4:15; 5:5) and the Christ (2:22; 4:2; 5:1). This way of interpreting Jeremiah's new covenant is built upon a Jewish eschatologizing of forgiveness as evidenced at Qumran, where the community identified itself both as the new covenant (CD 19:35; cf. 6:19; 8:21; 19:33-34; 20:12; 1QpHab 2:3) and the true temple (1QS 5:6, 21-22; 8:5-6, 8-9; 9:6) with spiritual sacrifices.

(3) The use of the term παράκλητος for Christ's intercessory role as heavenly advocate is built upon a Jewish eschatologizing of the temple cult as in Philo's writings (1John 2:2; cf. Philo, *Moses* 2.133).

The second line of evidence is found in the distinctive way of using the Jewish traditions in 1John. The use of the OT and Jewish sources in 1John is by no means formalistic or slavish. Rather, the author of 1John assimilates them in a particular way so that they are combined and interpreted in the light of the unique mystery of Jesus Christ (Malatesta 1978, 9). In particular, the author ties them to Jesus' death and forgiveness of sin in the new way of universalizing and individualizing the national and corporate hopes of Israel. The universal efficacy of Christ's atoning sacrifice is clearly expressed in emphatic statements such as "He is the atoning sacrifice for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world" (2:2), "The Father has sent his Son as the Savior of the world" (4:14), and "The whole world lies under the power of the evil one" (5:19). However, the benefits of Christ's atonement must be appropriated individually

through repentance and obedience to the apostolic proclamation of Christ's person and work of salvation (2:2; 4:2, 15). Moreover, there are other distinctive elements in 1John's interpretation of Christ's death that cannot be explained by the Second Temple literature alone: (1) its emphasis on the realized aspect of divine forgiveness (1John 2:12; 3:8, 16; 4:10; cf. Luke 5:20; Matt 9:2, 5; Mark 2:5, 9), (2) its theocentric viewpoint in offering the atoning sacrifice (4:9-10), and (3) the connection of atonement with the divine origin of Jesus ("Son of God" in 1:2; 3:5, 8; 4:9, 10, 14) and his messiahship ("Christ" in 1:3, 7; 3:23; 5:20).

Third, the particular manner in which the author of 1John interprets the Jewish traditions in the light of the mystery of Christ may have its roots in the early church's concept of realized eschatology. There is evidence to support this argument: (1) There are verbal and thematic correspondences between 1John and the kingdom teachings of Jesus. According to the Gospels, the eschatological kingdom promised in the OT was inaugurated at the coming of Jesus, but awaits its consummation. Two prominent features of the eschatological kingdom are the forgiveness of sins (Matt 9:2, 5; Mark 2:5, 9; Luke 5:20; 7:47; cf. 1John 2:12) and the conquest of evil (Matt 12:28-29; cf. 1John 2: 13, 14) (Ridderbos 1962, 211-32; Ladd 1993, 67-73; Guelich 1989, 86). The description of these eschatological blessings is significant in two ways: (1) It alludes to the two kingdom categories, as well as Jeremiah's new covenant categories. (2) The expression "your sins are forgiven" in 1John 2:12 is nearly identical to Jesus' words to the paralytic in Luke 5:20 (Matt 9:2, 5; Mark 2:5, 9; cf. Luke 7:47). Thus, according to 1John, the eschatological kingdom anticipated in Christ's person and ministry is now present in the

Christian community, an eschatological new covenant community, to which the epistle is addressed.

(2) Both the universalizing feature and the three distinctive facts of 1John identified in the foregoing discussion can be explained by appealing to the kingdom teachings of Jesus. In particular, the universalizing tendency and the realized eschatology are the two features that set the kingdom teachings of Jesus apart from Judaism (Ladd 1993, 62). As observed already, 1John's emphasis on the realized aspect of divine forgiveness finds its parallel in Jesus' word to the paralytic. The theocentric viewpoint in offering the atoning sacrifice in 1John (4:9-10) finds its parallel in the prayers of Jesus in connection with the coming of the kingdom (Matt 6:9, 10; Mark 14:35-36; Matt 26:39) and in the kingdom parables, such as the parable of the wicked tenants (Mark 12:1-12; Matt 21:33-46; Luke 20:9-19). Finally, the connection of atonement with the divine origin of Jesus ("Son of God" in 1:2; 3:5, 8; 4:9, 10, 14) and his messiahship ("Christ" in 1:3, 7; 3:23; 5:20) finds its parallel in the description of the Son of Man in the Gospels (Matt 26:63; Mark 15:61).

These three lines of evidence demonstrate that the author of 1John combines and interprets the OT and Jewish traditions of eschatological forgiveness and atonement, and ties them to Jesus' death and forgiveness of sins in the new way of universalizing and individualizing the national and corporate hopes of Israel, which reflects the early church's concept of realized eschatology founded on Jesus' kingdom teaching.

The plan of this dissertation is as follows: Part 1 examines how the two expectations of forgiveness and atonement were expressed in the OT and developed in the Second Temple literature, so that we may establish a literary context for the use of the

atonement themes in 1John. Part 1 is divided into two parts. Chapter 1 will deal with the expectation of forgiveness in the OT and in the Second Temple Judaism, and chapter 2 will deal with the expectation of atonement.

Part 2 shows how the author of 1John draws together the elements of the two Jewish expectations and applies them to the death of Jesus Christ. Part 2 is divided into five sections. Chapter 3 demonstrates that the author of 1John fuses the two traditions in his presentation of the atoning death of Jesus Christ. Chapter 4 demonstrates that, compared to the Jewish eschatologizing of forgiveness, 1John is distinctive in its way of applying the two Jewish traditions to the death of Jesus by universalizing, individualizing, and spiritualizing the primarily national and corporate hopes of Judaism. An excursus, “The Concept of Atonement in Early Rabbinic Thought,” provides a point of comparison with 1John’s concept of atonement. Chapter 5 demonstrates that 1John’s way of fusing the two traditions has its roots, though not its full development, in the church’s realized eschatology, which is in turn founded upon the kingdom teachings of Jesus. Another excursus, “The Relationship between 1John and the Gospel of John,” provides a point of comparison with 1John’s concept of atonement.

Chapter 6 summarizes the findings of this study and shows how it contributes to a better understanding of atonement in 1John and in the NT writings more generally.

PART 1

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL EXPECTATIONS OF SECOND TEMPLE
JUDAISM REGARDING THE PROBLEM OF SIN

In Part 1, we will examine how the two expectations of eschatological forgiveness and atonement were developed in the later OT and in the Second Temple literature, so that we may establish a literary context for the use of the atonement themes in 1John. In this section, we will demonstrate two things: (1) At least some Jews in the Second Temple period had the hope of eschatological restoration of the Jewish nation and identified it with divine forgiveness, which was preceded by the eschatologizing of the concept of forgiveness in the later OT prophets, especially Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Isaiah. (2) The eschatologizing of the concept of vicarious atonement expressed in the OT sacrifices can be observed in some Second Temple writings.

By “the Second Temple literature” we mean the body of Jewish literature derived from the Second Temple period, which began with the dedication of the Second Temple in approximately 516 B.C. during the period of Ezra and Nehemiah and ended with the destruction of the temple by Titus in A.D. 70. Among the literature included here are the Apocrypha and a part of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, as defined by James H. Charlesworth (Charlesworth 1983, 1:xxv), the writings of Philo and Josephus, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Excluded are the Targums and the sayings of the rabbis, recorded in the rabbinic literature such as the Mishnah (*ca.* 200), the two Talmuds (*yerusalmi: ca.* 400; *babli: ca.* 500-600), and the various collections of scriptural exegesis called *midrashim* (*ca.* 400-600). Both the Targums and some of the sayings of the rabbis may have been current orally during the Second Temple period and the NT period, but they will be used only as corroborating evidences for other Second Temple literature. Part 1 is divided into two parts. Chapter 1 will select and examine the passages in the OT and in the Second Temple literature that express the hope of the eschatological restoration of the

Jewish nation and identify it with divine forgiveness. Our study will show that this idea was developed in the later OT prophets and became popular among the Jews in the Second Temple literature. Chapter 2 will show that the concept of the vicarious cultic atonement of the OT sacrifices was applied to the self-sacrifices of innocent mediators both in some books of the OT and in the Second Temple literature.

CHAPTER 1

ESCHATOLOGICAL FORGIVENESS

In chapter 1, we will select and examine the passages in the OT and in the Second Temple literature that express the hope of the eschatological restoration of the Jewish nation and identify it with divine forgiveness, and demonstrate that the idea of eschatological forgiveness was developed in the later OT prophets and became popular among the Jews in the Second Temple literature.

First of all, there is definite evidence that different ideas of atonement and forgiveness were present in first-century Judaism. On the one hand, the idea of forgiveness was expressed as the return from exile and the reestablishment of the Jewish nation during the Second Temple period. N. T. Wright concludes:

The most natural meaning of the phrase ‘the forgiveness of sins’ to a first-century Jew is not in the first instance the remission of individual sins, but the putting away of the whole nation’s sins. And, since the exile was the punishment for those sins, the only sure sign that the sins had been forgiven would be the clear and certain liberation from exile. This is the major, national context within which all individual dealing-with-sin must be understood. (Wright 1992, 273)

This observation is important for our investigation here. As will be observed, at least some Jews in the Second Temple period identified the forgiveness of sins with the restoration of the fortunes of Israel. But before doing so, we will demonstrate that this concept of eschatological forgiveness has its root in the later OT prophets, especially Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Isaiah.

The OT Roots of the Concept of Eschatological Forgiveness

In the OT, forgiveness consists of the removal of sin (Ps 25:11) and the restoration of the covenant fellowship between God and Israel, and it depends solely on God’s love, mercy, and compassion towards the sinner and on his readiness to initiate the

processes of reconciliation and atonement (Exod 34:6-9; Ps 86:5; Dan 9:9) (Olivier 1997, 260). Forgiveness requires, and usually is accompanied by, the confession of sin, repentance, restitution, and renewal, and entails the nullification of guilt, the release of obligations, and the reduction or total relinquishment of punishment. Forgiveness in the OT is closely related with the cult and sacrificial practices as seen in the use of the word סלח regularly in connection with expiatory sacrifices in Leviticus and Numbers (Lev 4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:10, 13, 16, 18, 26; 19:22; Num 15:25, 26, 28) (Olivier 1997, 260). In the OT, “the true word for divine forgiveness is סלח, which is always used of God (described as good and נקב, Ps. 86:5) and means to be indulgent, to overlook an offence that has been committed” (Köhler 1957, 217). The word occurs 46 times in the OT, always with YHWH as its subject. The majority of its occurrences are clustered in Leviticus (10 in the Niphal), Numbers (3 in the Niphal, 5 in the Qal), 1 and 2 Kings (8 in the Qal), Jeremiah (6 in the Qal), and 2 Chronicles (6 in the Qal) (Stamm 1997, 797-98).⁸

During exilic and postexilic times, the concept of divine forgiveness gained new dimensions. In particular, Jeremiah and Ezekiel identified divine forgiveness with the eschatological restoration of the national fortunes of Israel. Seeing the imminent peril of the nation of Israel, they looked far beyond their contemporary horizon for eschatological forgiveness. Of particular interest to us is the fact that Jeremiah uses the verb סלח (31:34; cf. 33:8) in the context of the eschatological restoration of the fortunes of Israel in the new covenant passage (Jer 31:31-34). Thus, we will first examine Jeremiah’s new

⁸ Stamm lists other verbs that express YHWH’s forgiving action, such as רחק (Ps 103:12), שלך (Mic 7:19; Isa 38:17), כסה (Pss 32:1; 85:3; Neh 3:37), חנן (Pss 41:5; 51:3, 11; 59:6), לא זכר (Isa 43:25; 64:84; Jer 31:34; Ezek 18:22; 33:16; Pss 25:7; 79:8), לא חשב (Ps 32:2), and the verb טהר. In particular, טהר occurs 94 times in the OT, and the majority of the occurrences are in Leviticus (43), Numbers (5), Ezekiel (9), and 2 Chronicles (6) in cultic settings. These verbs represent a variety of perspectives on divine forgiveness, but the primary Hebrew verb for divine forgiveness in the OT is סלח. These expressions, like סלח, derive from cultic rites.

covenant passage with regard to eschatological forgiveness. We will then examine the relevant passages in Ezekiel and Isaiah, so that we may find out how they eschatologized divine forgiveness.

Eschatological Forgiveness according to Jeremiah

Eschatologizing of Forgiveness in the New Covenant Passage

Jer 31:31-34 is the only place where the term *new covenant* is used in the entire OT, and it belongs to the section generally called “the Book of Consolation” (Jer 30:1-31:40 [LXX 37:1-38:40]).⁹ The passage reads:

The days are surely coming, says the LORD, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. It will not be like the covenant that I made with their ancestors when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt—a covenant that they broke, *which I loathed in the midst of them*,¹⁰ says the LORD. But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the LORD: I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. No longer shall they teach one another, or say to each other, “Know the LORD,” for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest, says the LORD; for I will forgive their iniquity, and remember their sin no more (Jer 31:31-34).

The verb סלח, the primary Hebrew verb for divine forgiveness, is used six times in Jeremiah. The relatively high frequency of its occurrences in Jeremiah indicates the importance of divine forgiveness in Jeremiah. In particular, סלח is used in 31:34 in the

⁹ For the authenticity of the passage as a whole, Holladay lists three arguments (Holladay 1989, 197): “(1) the passage is authentic to Jeremiah and offers themes and phrases characteristic of his expression. (2) The likeness to Deuteronomic diction, notably in the first part, is deliberate, since the setting is the recitation of the Deuteronomic law during the feast of booths (tabernacles) in the autumn of 587, after the destruction of Jerusalem. (3) The passage structurally breaks in two, a prose section (vv 31-33α) and a poetic section (vv 33β-34), each chiasmic in form—the first section centering on the old covenant, the second on the new. This may explain the presence of “the Book of Consolation” in Jeremiah, in which the overwhelming message is that of doom. Jer 33:7-18 is a part of another section, in which more promises of compassionate restoration is given.”

¹⁰ Italics are my own translation. For the meaning of בעל, see בעל II, *BDB*, 127. The Hebrew verb בעל may signify “to loathe,” as indicated in the LXX and the Syriac translation.

future tense (אָסלַח in 31:34; cf. וְסַלַחְתִּי in 33:8). It is argued here that the context of this eschatological forgiveness is primarily YHWH's promise of the eschatological restoration of the fortunes of Israel and Judah. There are at least three lines of evidence that support this argument. First, it is supported by the literary context of the new covenant passage. The new covenant passage pertains to the so-called Book of Consolation (30:1-31:40 [37:1-38:40 LXX]), the primary focus of which is the restoration of the fortunes of Israel as observed in repeated emphatic statements such as "I will restore the fortunes of my people, Israel and Judah" (30:3) and "I am going to restore the fortunes of the tents of Jacob, and have compassion on his dwellings" (30:18). The restoration of the fortunes of Judah and Israel includes the return of the exiles (30:3, 10; 31:8-12, 16-17, 27), the rebuilding of Jerusalem (30:18; 31:38-40), the restoration of the cultus and the priesthood (31:14), the establishment of the nation under a Davidic king (30:9), and the restoration of covenant fellowship between God and his people (30:22; 31:11; cf. 31:33). Jeremiah identifies this national restoration with eschatological forgiveness by attributing it to YHWH's compassion towards his people and his mercy on them (30:18; 31:20).

Once the meaning of the new covenant passage is sought from this context, the meaning of some ambiguous expressions in the passage becomes clearer. According to Holladay, the statement "I will put my law within them (בְּקִרְבָּם), and I will write it on their hearts (וְעַל-לִבָּם)" (v. 33) suggests primarily a renewal of worship in the temple as

indicated in the use of קֶרֶב and לֵב by Jeremiah in other places in connection with Jerusalem and its temple (Holladay 1989, 198):¹¹

Thus “interior” (קֶרֶב) is used by Jrm of the city (6:1, where the Benjaminites are to flee from the “midst” of Jerusalem; 6:6, where there is nothing but extortion in her “midst”), and “heart” is used in parallelism with “altars” (17:1, where the sin of Judah is engraved upon the tablet of the “heart,” and on the horns of their altars). “Interior” and “heart” then both suggest the city within the land and the temple within the city (compare Pss 46:5-6 and 55:11-12 for similar diction). The priestly covenant formula, too (“I will be their God, and they shall be my people”), has associations for Jrm with the temple: it is cited in the context of sarcastic words about sacrifice (7:21-23; 11:4, 15).

According to the context of Jer 31:31-34, new covenant forgiveness entails the restoration of the fortunes of Israel. The blessings that this forgiveness brings are primarily the national and corporate hopes of Israel, as observed more explicitly in Jer 33 (“I will restore the fortunes of Judah and the fortunes of Israel” in v. 7 and v. 11).

I will restore the fortunes of Judah and the fortunes of Israel, and rebuild them as they were at first. The voice of mirth and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride, the voices of those who sing, as they bring thank offerings to the house of the LORD. I will cleanse them from all the guilt of their sin against me (וְנִטְהַרְתִּים מִכָּל-עֲוֹן אֲשֶׁר הָטְאוּ לִי), and I will forgive (וְקִלְמָתִי) all the guilt of their sin and rebellion against me. For I will restore the fortunes of the land as at first, says the LORD. Thus says the LORD of hosts: In this place that is waste ... there shall again be pasture for shepherds resting their flocks. (Jer 33:7-8, 11, 12)

The days are surely coming, says the LORD, when I will fulfill the promise I made to the house of Israel and the house of Judah. In those days and at that time I will cause a righteous Branch to spring up for David; and he shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. In those days Judah will be saved and Jerusalem will live in safety. And this is the name by which it will be called: “The LORD is our righteousness.” For thus says the LORD: David shall never lack a man to sit on the throne of the house of Israel, and the levitical priests shall never lack a man in my presence to offer burnt offerings, to make grain offerings, and to make sacrifices for all time. (Jer 33:14-18)¹²

¹¹ As discussed above and recognized by Holladay, this expression can be interpreted as referring to YHWH’s move to plant his law within the interior intentionality of the people, so that obedience becomes natural.

¹² Bright considers Jer 33:14-26 probably a later addition to the book because the passage is entirely lacking in the LXX (Bright 1965, 298). This idea is based upon the local text theory that favors the LXX tradition as representing the more original form of the book of Jeremiah (Cross 1995, 124-47). However, it is not certain that we can settle the Hebrew/Greek priority issue on the basis of the Qumran findings, which are not consistent either. As suggested by Soderlund, it would be misleading to suggest that the mere existence at one time of a shorter Hebrew text weighs the scales in favor of the LXX as the better text (Soderlund 1982, 990). It is probable that Jeremiah may have existed in the two text forms during the first century A.D. and much earlier.

The blessings include the return of the exiles (Jer 33:7; cf. 30:3; 31:27; 50:20), the restoration of the cultus and the priesthood (Jer 33:11, 18), and the establishment of the nation under a Davidic king (Jer 33:15-17; cf. 23:5; 30:9; Isa 9:7). The same is true with the new covenant passage (Jer 31:31-34) that expresses the same eschatological hope in covenantal language.

Second, the fact that Israel's sin, punishment, and forgiveness are the controlling themes of the new covenant passage implies that the object of new covenant forgiveness is primarily the national and corporate sin of Israel. Jeremiah's analysis of the history of Israel can be summarized as one of "total failure and total inability." The sin of Judah is written with an iron pen, and with a diamond point it is engraved on the tablet of their hearts and on the horns of their altars (17:1). All YHWH promises is that he will remember their iniquities and punish their sins (14:10; 16:18; 17:3; 36:31), and that promise is already being fulfilled in the covenant nation (5:25; 15:13; 30:14-15; 40:3; 44:23). Jeremiah's persistent intercession for his people avails nothing, and he is even forbidden to intercede for them because of their idolatry (7:16-18; 11:13-14; 14:11-12). Thus, YHWH announces through Jeremiah that the only hope lies in a new beginning that God will initiate on an entirely different plane. Before the new things to come, the old must go. The promise of divine forgiveness is basic to the new covenant, which is fundamentally different from the old covenant that the Israelites broke (31:32).

This way of describing the development of the history of the nation of Israel follows largely the Deuteronomistic view of history, all the central ideas of which are spelled out in emphatic fashion in such passages as Deut 28 and 32 and Lev 26. They involve YHWH's election of Israel (Deut 26:17-18; 32:5-6, 9; cf. Jer 31:32; cf. 11:10),

the covenant, Israel's disobedience of the divine law (Deut 28:15, 47; 32:5, 15-20), and redemptive punishment at the hand of YHWH (Deut 28:16-68; 32:22-35; Jer 31:28, 40; cf. 7:20; 21:6). Despite the disobedience of his people, YHWH still remembers his covenant with them and forgives them (Deut 32:36-43; Lev 26:41-45; cf. Jer 31:33).

Third, the beneficiaries of new covenant forgiveness are Israel and Judah (Jer 31:31). The national and corporate nature of new covenant forgiveness can be observed in the similarities between the circumstances of the new covenant forgiveness and the circumstances for covenant renewal outlined by K. Baltzer (Baltzer 1971, 51-60). Keown applies Baltzer's formula to the basic situation addressed by the new covenant prophecy in the context of the Book of Consolation (Jer 30-31) (Keown 1995, 131):

God's people Israel have violated the substance of the covenant by their apostasy, and the curse has come into effect (30:12-15, 23-24). The LORD alone decides and makes known whether the covenant has been broken (31:32; 11:10). The people repent of their sin, and the LORD alone decides whether to forgive (31:34; cf. Exod 34:9). The LORD indicates acceptance of the covenant renewal request with the statement אָנֹכִי פָּרַח בְּרִית "I make a covenant" (Exod 34:10). Jer 31:31-34 begins with an analogous statement. The LORD initiates this covenant making by promising it far ahead of time. No one like Moses (Exod 34:1-28) or the king (2 Kgs 23; Jer 34:8-22) leads the people in seeking it. All of the people, from least to greatest, participate in the renewal ceremony (31:34; cf. 2 Kgs 23:2). The goal of covenant renewal had been to avoid total destruction under the effects of the curse, but in Jer 31:28 the end of the destruction has already been announced. Just as the LORD had voiced the people's lament for them and then answered it in 30:12-17, here the LORD initiates the covenant renewal and then promises a new covenant in its stead.

Thus, we conclude that Jeremiah eschatologized the OT concept of forgiveness by using the verb פָּלַח in the new covenant passage and other related passage (31:33; 33:8) in the context of the national restoration of Israel in future.

Eschatological Forgiveness according to Ezekiel

In the foregoing discussion, we demonstrated that Jeremiah eschatologized the OT concept of forgiveness. We find the same phenomenon in Ezekiel. All the elements observed in Jeremiah's new covenant passage are also found in Ezekiel. There are three

passages in Ezekiel (Ezek 16:59-63; 36:22-32; 37:21-28) that are most relevant to our discussion. We will examine the first passage here:

Yes, thus says the Lord GOD: I will deal with you as you have done, you who have despised the oath, breaking the covenant; yet I will remember my covenant with you in the days of your youth, and I will establish with you an everlasting covenant. Then you will remember your ways, and be ashamed when I take¹³ your sisters, both your elder and your younger, and give them to you as daughters, but not on account of my covenant with you.¹⁴ I will establish my covenant with you, and you shall know that I am the LORD, in order that you may remember and be confounded, and never open your mouth again because of your shame, when I forgive you all that you have done (תַּשִּׁיחַ (בְּכַפְרֵי־לְךָ לְכַל־אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתָ), says the Lord GOD. (Ezek 16:59-63)

Critics tend to credit this section to the redactor(s) at work in the second generation of exiles (Allen 1994, 233; Zimmerli 1979, 353). As observed by Greenberg, such a redactional view presupposes (Greenberg 1983, 304): (1) that a single creative moment cannot contain so extreme a shift in mood from the furious denunciation of the first section to the serene and sublime reconciliation of Ezek 16:59-63, and (2) that the consolatory aspects of Ezek 16:59-63 defeat the purpose of the arraignment. According to this view, the unregenerate audience does not deserve to be comforted from the viewpoint of the prophet of doom. Greenberg does not agree with this redactional view because we find the analogous sequence of ruthless threats of doom and assurance of God's reconciliation with contrite survivors in Deut 28-30 and Lev 26.

This passage is the last section of chap. 16 that can be divided into three sections. According to Greenberg, “after the command to arraign Jerusalem for her abominations (vs. 2), comes A (vss. 3-43), an extended metaphor of the nymphomaniacal adulteress; B

¹³ I accept here NRSV rendering that conjectures an original בַּקְהָתִי following the LXX (Lucian 967) ἐν τῷ ἀναλαβεῖν με and the Syriac instead of the MT בַּקְהָתִי because חַקֵּל belongs with the following נָתַן.

¹⁴ The final phrase of v. 61, וְלֹא מִבְרִיתֶךָ, literally means “not from your covenant.” Brownlee lists a number of possible meanings presented in other translations (Brownlee 1986, 251-52): (1) “but not by thy covenant” (KJV, ASV); (2) “but not because of thy covenant” (JPS), or words to that effect (RSV, NRSV, NWT); and (3) “and they shall not be outside your covenant” (NEB). Another issue is which covenant is being discussed, the old broken covenant or the new covenant. The first two renderings presuppose that the old covenant is at issue, whereas the third presupposes that the new covenant is at issue. The rendering of the NRSV is preferable because it better represents the literal meaning of the Hebrew.

(vss. 44-58), the invidious comparison of Jerusalem to her sisters Sodom and Samaria; and C (vss. 59-63), a coda foretelling the mortification of restored Jerusalem before covenant-true YHWH” (Greenberg 1983, 292). Some scholars see the influence of Jer 31:31-34 in Ezek 16:59-63 because of the presence of many common elements between the two (Allen 1994, 232). First, YHWH promises to establish with Israel an everlasting covenant (ברית עולם in Ezek 16:60; cf. ברית שלום in 34:25; ברית חדשה in Jer 31:31). Second, this everlasting covenant is contrasted with the former covenant she has broken (Ezek 16:59; cf. Jer 31:32) and will restore the covenant relation between YHWH and his people (Ezek 16:60, 62; 36:28; cf. Jer 31:33). Third, this everlasting covenant is accompanied by divine forgiveness (Ezek 16:63; 36:25; cf. Jer 31:34).¹⁵

As observed in Jeremiah’s new covenant passage, the promise of eschatological forgiveness is identified with the restoration of the national fortunes of Israel in this passage, which can be detected in the parallelism of Ezek 16:60-61 and 16:62-63.

Ezek 16:60-61

60 ... and I will establish with you an everlasting covenant.

61 Then you will remember your ways, and be ashamed

when I take your sisters, both your elder and your younger, and give them to you as daughters....

Ezek 16:62-63

62 I will establish my covenant with you, and you shall know that I am the LORD,

63 in order that you may remember and be confounded, and never open your mouth again because of your shame,

when I forgive you all that you have done....

¹⁵ While in Jer 31:34 סלח is used for the promise of the forgiveness of sins, in Ezek 16:63 the verb כפר (Piel) is used with YHWH as its subject (cf. Deut 21:8; 32:43; 2 Chr 30:18; Pss 65:4; 78:38; Jer 18:23; Ezek 16:63). This is the only instance of such a use in Ezekiel. The meaning of the verb כפר (Piel) with YHWH in the nonritual usage is identical to Hebrew סלח (Jer 31:34; 33:8), the primary verb for divine forgiveness. In Ezek 36:25, the term used to express the divine forgiveness is טהר, which occurs primarily in cultic settings of ritual purification. Both סלח and טהר are used in Jer 33:8.

As observed, the expression “when I forgive you all that you have done” in v. 63 corresponds to the covenant blessings expressed in figurative language in v. 61. YHWH will take the elder and younger sisters of Jerusalem, namely Sodom and Samaria (vv. 53-56), and give them to Jerusalem (v. 61), which in concrete terms means the restoration of the ancient Davidic kingdom (cf. 37:15-22) with Jerusalem as its capital (Brownlee 1986, 251; Zimmerli 1979, 353). Thus, Ezekiel eschatologizes divine forgiveness by identifying it with the national restoration of Israel. The two other passages (Ezek 36:24-25 and 37:21-28) explicitly connect the restoration of the exiles with eschatological purification:

Therefore say to the house of Israel, Thus says the Lord GOD: It is not for your sake, O house of Israel, that I am about to act, but for the sake of my holy name, which you have profaned among the nations to which you came. I will sanctify my great name, which has been profaned among the nations, and which you have profaned among them; and the nations shall know that I am the LORD, says the Lord GOD, when through you I display my holiness before their eyes. I will take you from the nations, and gather you from all the countries, and bring you into your own land. I will sprinkle clean water upon you (וַיִּזְרַקְתִּי עֲלֵיכֶם מַיִם טְהוֹרִים), and you shall be clean from all your uncleannesses (מִכָּל אִשְׁמוֹתֵיכֶם וּשְׁתַּרְתֶּם מִכָּל), and from all your idols I will cleanse you (וּמִכָּל־גִּלּוּלֵיכֶם אֶטְהַר), and from all your idols I will cleanse you (אֶחַכֶּם). A new heart I will give you, and a new spirit I will put within you; and I will remove from your body the heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh. I will put my spirit within you, and make you follow my statutes and be careful to observe my ordinances. Then you shall live in the land that I gave to your ancestors; and *you shall be my people, and I will be your God.*¹⁶ I will save you from all your uncleannesses, and I will summon the grain and make it abundant and lay no famine upon you.... Then you shall remember your evil ways, and your dealings that were not good; and you shall loathe yourselves for your iniquities and your abominable deeds. It is not for your sake that I will act, says the Lord GOD; let that be known to you. Be ashamed and dismayed for your ways, O house of Israel. (Ezek 36:22-32)

... then say to them, Thus says the Lord GOD: I will take the people of Israel from the nations among which they have gone, and will gather them from every quarter, and bring them to their own land. I will make them one nation in the land, on the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king over them all. Never again shall they be two nations, and never again shall they be divided into two kingdoms. They shall never again defile themselves with their idols and their detestable things, or with any of their transgressions. I will save (וְהוֹשַׁעְתִּי) them from all the apostasies into which they have fallen, and will cleanse (וְשִׁתַּרְתִּי) them. Then *they shall be my people, and I will be their God.* My servant David shall be king over them; and they shall all have one shepherd. They shall follow my ordinances and be careful to observe my statutes. They shall live in the land that I gave to my servant Jacob, in which your ancestors lived; they and their children and their children's children shall live there forever; and my servant David shall be their prince forever. I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them; and I will bless them and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary (מִקְדָּשִׁי) among them forevermore. My dwelling place (מִשְׁכְּנִי) shall be with them; and *I will be their God, and they shall be my people.*

¹⁶ Italics are for emphasis.

Then the nations shall know that I the LORD sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary is among them forevermore. (37:21-28)

As indicated by the use of the two terms for the temple (“my dwelling place” and “my sanctuary” in Ezek 37:27-28; cf. Jer 33:11, 18) and the covenant formula (“they shall be my people, and I will be their God” in Ezek 37:23; “I will be their God, and they shall be my people” in v.27; cf. 36:28), the two prominent features of eschatological forgiveness are the restoration of the temple and the restoration of communion between God and his people, probably through the temple sacrifices. The word מִשְׁכָּן is used in Exodus in reference to the tabernacle, YHWH’s dwelling place among his people during the wilderness sojourn (Exod 25:9; 26:30), but מִשְׁכָּן could refer to the temple in general (Pss 26:8; 46:5; 74:7). The word מִקְדָּשׁ is a term that frequently appears in Ezekiel, and it signifies the temple and its precincts, both the old temple (Ezek 8:6; 9:6; 23:39; 25:3) and the eschatological temple (43:21; 44:1, 5). Therefore, the promise of מִשְׁכָּן and מִקְדָּשׁ in Ezek 37:26-28 signifies the reconstruction of the temple (Edanad 1987, 51-52). Thus, eschatological forgiveness entails the return of the exiles (Ezek 34:27; 36:24; 37:21; cf. Jer 31:27; 33:7), the establishment of the united kingdom under a Davidic king (Ezek 37:22-24; cf. Jer 33:15-17), the restoration of the temple, and the restoration of communion between God and his people.

Moreover, as observed in Jeremiah’s new covenant passage, the controlling theme of Ezekiel is Israel’s sin, punishment, and forgiveness. Whereas chap. 16 uses parabolic language in describing the same theme, chap. 36 uses concrete terms. This indicates that the object of this eschatological forgiveness is the national and corporate sin of Israel. The expression “total failure and total inability,” which we used to describe Jeremiah’s analysis of the history of Israel, can also be applied to Ezekiel’s. Ezekiel’s view follows

largely the Deuteronomistic view of history (Deut 28; 32; Lev 26). Being unclean, miserable, and hopeless by nature, Israel was elected by God as his covenant partner, and was clothed in splendor (Ezek 16:1-14; cf. Jer 31:32; Deut 26:17-18; 32:5-6, 9). But Israel has forgotten the grace of YHWH in its election and broke the covenant by committing lewdness beyond all its abominations through its idolatry among the Gentiles (Ezek 16:15-34; 36:17; cf. Deut 28:15, 47; 32:5, 15-20). Thus, YHWH is obliged to return Israel's shameful deeds upon its own head (Ezek 16:35-52; 36:19; cf. Jer 31:28, 40; Deut 28:16-68; 32:22-35). The judgment of YHWH is perfectly just. For in addition to its shameful ingratitude towards YHWH, Israel's abominations have far surpassed those of both Samaria and Sodom (Ezek 16:43-52). Despite the disobedience of his people, YHWH still forgives them by giving them the promise of the eternal covenant (Ezek 16:53-63; cf. Jer 31; 33; Deut 32:36-43; Lev 26:41-45).

Finally, as observed in Jeremiah's new covenant passage, the beneficiaries of eschatological forgiveness in Ezekiel are primarily the people of Israel (16:2, 60, 62). The circumstances for eschatological forgiveness in Ezek 16 closely resemble the circumstances for covenant renewal outlined by K. Baltzer (Baltzer 1971, 51-60). We may apply his formula to the basic situation addressed in Ezek 16. God's people Israel have violated the substance of the covenant by their apostasy, and the curse has come into effect (Ezek 16:15-52; cf. Jer 30:12-15, 23-24). YHWH alone decides and makes known whether the covenant has been broken (Ezek 16:59; cf. Jer 31:32; 11:10). YHWH remembers his covenant and decides to forgive (Ezek 16:63; cf. Jer 31:34; cf. Exod 34:9; Lev 26:42-45). In Exod 34:10, YHWH indicates acceptance of the covenant renewal request with the statement אָנֹכִי כֹרֵת בְּרִית, "I make a covenant." In Ezekiel, YHWH makes

analogous statements, such as וְהִקְמֹתִי לְךָ בְרִית עוֹלָם (“I will establish with you an everlasting covenant” in 16:60) and וְכָרַתִּי לָהֶם בְּרִית שְׁלוֹם (“I will make with them a covenant of peace” in 34:25; 37:26), which mean the same thing. Unlike the phrase כָּרַת בְּרִית, which always refers to the making of a new covenant, בְּרִית הַקָּם usually means “maintain a covenant” already concluded (Gen 17:19, 21; Lev 26:9; Deut 8:18), but in Ezek 16:60, בְּרִית הַקָּם seems to have the sense of establishing a new covenant (Greenberg 1983, 291). As indicated in Ezek 37:26, the covenant of peace is identical to the everlasting covenant. Thus, YHWH initiates this covenant making by promising it far ahead of time in connection with eschatological forgiveness.

Eschatological Forgiveness according to Isaiah

In the foregoing discussion, we demonstrated that both Jeremiah and Ezekiel eschatologized the OT concept of forgiveness by connecting the divine forgiveness with the eschatological restoration of the fortunes of Israel. We find the same phenomenon in Isaiah. First of all, the promise of divine forgiveness in 55:7 (“let the wicked forsake their way, and the unrighteous their thoughts; let them return to the LORD, that he may have mercy on them, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.”) is given in the context of an eternal covenant that YHWH promises to make with those who come to him. “I will make with you an everlasting covenant, my steadfast, sure love for David” (v. 3). This eschatological covenant is called the covenant of peace in Isa 54:10 (cf. Ezek 34:25; 37:26) and the eternal covenant in Isa 55:3 and 61:8 (cf. Ezek 16:59; 37:26).

Second, the new salvation basically consists of the restoration of intimate fellowship between YHWH and Israel (54:4-8), accompanied by repopulation of the city (vv. 1-3), its reconstruction and prosperity (vv. 11-13), and abiding peace (vv. 14-17).

Of particular importance to us is the fact that Isaiah's eschatological covenant shares many important features with the eschatological covenant promised in Jeremiah and Ezekiel (Hooker 1959, 36-40; Porubcan 1958, 259-75; Edanad 1987, 55). They agree in at least four ways: (1) As in Jeremiah, divine forgiveness is related to a covenant that YHWH will make with Israel (Isa 54:10; 55:3; 61:8; cf. Jer 31:31-34), which is eschatological in its fulfillment and involves restoration of the nation of Israel.

(2) Like Jeremiah's new covenant, the eternal covenant in Isaiah is a new covenant. These passages on the eschatological covenant and its blessings are anticipated at the beginning of the so-called book of comfort: "See, the former things have come to pass, and new things I now declare.... Sing to the LORD a new song" (Isa 42:9-10). "I am about to do a new thing; now it springs forth, do you not perceive it? I will make a way in the wilderness and rivers in the desert" (43:19). The emphasis is on newness and on the complete reversal of the nature of these things.

(3) Like Jeremiah's new covenant, the eternal covenant is the covenant of grace, which is based upon the infinitive love of YHWH as the covenant Lord for his people. No prophet before Isaiah portrayed YHWH's deep love for his people more convincingly (Herner 1942, 112). YHWH kept still and restrained himself while the Babylonians suppressed the Jews, but now he will cry out like a woman in labor (Isa 42:14). No other people can be compared to Israel in YHWH's eyes, and he would give Egypt, Ethiopia, and Seba as a ransom for Israel (43:3-4). YHWH's infinite love for Israel is compared to

a mother's love for her child. Even a mother may forget her child, but YHWH will not forget Israel (49:14-15). Because of this infinite and everlasting love, YHWH forgives Israel (54:7-10). This love is based on Israel's covenant relationship with YHWH, which is expressed in many different ways. Israel is a shoot of Abraham, YHWH's friend (41:8). Israel is the Servant of YHWH, whom he has chosen and formed in the womb (44:1-2). As the covenant partner and Lord, YHWH dearly loves Israel with infinite love and is not going to leave his people in the misery of sin and exile. Thus, YHWH's eschatological forgiveness is ultimately "for his sake" (43:25; 48:11; cf. "for his name's sake" in 48:9; Jer 14:7, 21; Ezek 20:9, 14, 22, 44; 36:22).

(4) Like Jeremiah's new covenant (Jer 31:33, 40), this covenant is permanent: "For the mountains may depart and the hills be removed, but my steadfast love shall not depart from you, and my covenant of peace shall not be removed, says the LORD, who has compassion on you" (Isa 54:10).

The Second Temple Literature

In the foregoing discussion, we have examined the relevant passages from the three OT prophets (Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Isaiah) with regard to eschatological forgiveness. Our examination demonstrated that these prophets eschatologized the OT concept of forgiveness by identifying it with the eschatological restoration of the Jewish nation.

The eschatological forgiveness developed in the later OT prophets is found in the Second Temple literature. These writings express the concept of eschatological forgiveness in diverse fashion, but they all manifest the eschatological hope for the

restoration of the fortunes of the Jewish nation. The Jews in this period in general understood that they were still in exile and looked forward to the ultimate national restoration (Sanders 1992, 289-90). Moreover, at least some Jews in this period linked this hope of national restoration to divine forgiveness, which is evident in Qumran literature, and other Second Temple writings such as Baruch and *Jubilees*. We will examine these writings in connection with eschatological forgiveness.

Eschatological Forgiveness according to Baruch and Jubilees

Jubilees

Jubilees is important to our study because it expresses the restoration of the Jews in terms of the covenant renewal as well as in terms of divine forgiveness. Scholars usually date the book in the second century B.C., based upon internal evidence and the Qumran findings (Wintermute 1985, 43-44). It is Jewish history rewritten in the form of a prophecy given to Moses during his forty days' stay at Mount Sinai. We are concerned here primarily with the first chapter of the book, in which God himself portrays to Moses the apostasy and ultimate eschatological restoration of his people. The book starts with the Deuteronomistic view of the history of the nation of Israel (Nickelsburg 1981, 78): "Set your mind on everything which I shall tell you on this mountain, and write it in a book so that their descendents might see that I have not abandoned them on account of all of the evil which they have done to instigate transgression of the covenant which I am establishing between me and you today on Mount Sinai for their descendents" (*Jub.* 1:5). All four elements of the Deuteronomistic view of history are summarized in this verse:

YHWH's election of Israel, the covenant, Israel's disobedience, and redemptive punishment at the hand of the YHWH. The Exile is the divine punishment for the sins of Israel:

They will forget all of my commandments ... and will serve their gods.... Many will be destroyed and seized and will fall into the hand of the enemy because they have forsaken my ordinances and my commandments and the feasts of my covenant and my Sabbaths and my sacred place... I shall hide my face from them, and I shall give them over to the power of the nations to be captive, and for plunder, and to be devoured. I shall remove them from the midst of the land, and I shall scatter them among the nations. (1:9-14)

This punishment is not final, but redemptive in its purpose. God will ultimately forgive them and restore them in the land of Palestine.

And for the children of Israel it has been written and ordained, "If they return to him in righteousness, he will forgive all of their sins and he will pardon all of their transgressions." (5:17)

And afterward they will turn to me from among the nations with all their heart and with all their soul and with all their might. And I shall gather them from the midst of all the nations... I shall transplant them as a righteous plant. And they will be a blessing and not a curse.... And I shall build my sanctuary in their midst, and I shall dwell with them. And I shall be their God and they will be my people truly and rightly. And I shall not forsake them, and I shall not be alienated from them because I am the Lord their God. (1:15-17; cf. Jer 24:7; 31:33)

I shall cut off the foreskin of their heart and the foreskin of the heart of their descendants. I shall create for them a holy spirit, and I shall purify them so that they will not turn away from following me from that day and forever. And their souls will cleave to me and to all my commandments.... I shall be a father to them, and they will be sons to me. And they will all acknowledge that they are my sons and I am their father in uprightness and righteousness. (*Jub.* 1:23-25)

As indicated in the two parallel passages, *Jub.* 5:17 and 1:15, God's promise of forgiveness is identified with the national restoration of the fortunes of Israel:

	5:17	1:15
Condition	If they return to him in righteousness	And afterward they will turn to me....
Promise	he will forgive all of their sins and he will pardon all of their transgressions.	And I shall gather them from the midst of all the nations.

As with Jeremiah, eschatological forgiveness, according to the author of *Jubilees*, entails the restoration of the exiles (1:16; cf. Jer 31:27; 33:7; 50:20), the rebuilding of the temple and its cultus (*Jub.* 1:17; cf. Jer 33:11, 18), the change of heart of the people, and

the restoration of intimate covenant fellowship between YHWH and his people (*Jub.* 1:17, 23-25; cf. *Jer* 24:7; 31:33).

This concept originated primarily from the prophetic tradition on forgiveness, an example of which is found in Jeremiah's new covenant prophecy (31:31-34) and its equivalents (33:2-16; 50:20) (Schreiber 1956, 24-36).

Baruch

Scholars differ in dating Baruch. Our concern is with the first half of the book (1:1-3:8) which DeSilva dates at any point during the Second Temple period (deSilva 2002, 204). Pfeiffer dates it more precisely between 250 and 150 B.C. (Pfeiffer 1949, 415). In the exiles' prayer (Bar 2:11-3:5), the author develops further the prophetic concept of eschatological forgiveness by applying the promise of eschatological forgiveness to the present salvation from calamities:

And now, O Lord God of Israel, who brought your people out of the land of Egypt with a mighty hand and with signs and wonders and with great power and outstretched arm, and made yourself a name that continues to this day, we have sinned, we have been ungodly, we have done wrong, O Lord our God, against all your ordinances. Let your anger turn away from us (ἀποστραφήτω ὁ θυμός σου ἀφ' ἡμῶν), for we are left, few in number, among the nations where you have scattered us.... Yet you have dealt with us, O Lord our God, in all your kindness and in all your great compassion (οἰκτιρμόν), as you spoke by your servant Moses on the day when you commanded him to write your law in the presence of the people of Israel, saying, "If you will not obey my voice, this very great multitude will surely turn into a small number among the nations, where I will scatter them. For I know that they will not obey me, for they are a stiff-necked people. But in the land of their exile they will come to themselves and know that I am the Lord their God. I will give them a heart that obeys and ears that hear; they will praise me in the land of their exile, and will remember my name and turn from their stubbornness and their wicked deeds; for they will remember the ways of their ancestors, who sinned before the Lord. I will bring them again into the land that I swore to give to their ancestors, to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and they will rule over it; and I will increase them, and they will not be diminished. I will make an everlasting covenant with them to be their God and they shall be my people; and I will never again remove my people Israel from the land that I have given them."... Hear, O Lord, and have mercy (ἐλέησον), for we have sinned before you.... Do not remember the iniquities of our ancestors, but in this crisis remember your power and your name. (Bar 2:11-13, 27-35; 3:2, 5)

Three observations are in order. First, divine forgiveness is implied in the words "Let your anger turn away from us" (Bar 2:11), because the divine action of turning away

his anger results in forgiveness. Similarly, the author of Baruch prays to God for national restoration and for salvation from the present calamities based upon his mercy (Bar 3:2; cf. kindness and compassion in 2:27), because God's merciful nature will move him to forgive. In the LXX, ἔλεος is normally used for the Hebrew רַחֵם, and less frequently (6 times) for the Hebrew רַחֲמִים, while ἐλεέω occurs mostly for the Hebrew verb רָחַן, though often for רַחַם piel (Bultmann 1964a, 479-80). As argued by Bultmann, both רַחֵם and רַחֲמִים are the grace of the forgiveness granted to Israel when it repents, thus becoming an eschatological hope (Deut 13:18; Amos 1:11; Zech 1:12; Ps 77:9).

Second, the logic of the prayer of repentance and divine forgiveness in Bar 1:15-3:8 follows the scheme of Deuteronomy 28-32, and language of both Deuteronomy and Jeremiah (Nickelsburg 1981, 110; deSilva 2002, 200; Harrington 1999, 92; Eissfeldt 1965, 593; Pfeiffer 1949, 415). Of particular importance to us is that the characteristics of this eschatological forgiveness described in Baruch clearly correspond to what we found in Jeremiah in three ways: (1) This hope for eschatological forgiveness, according to Baruch, is primarily the national and corporate hope of Israel for restoration of the fortunes of the Jewish nation: "I will bring them again into the land that I swore to give to their ancestors, to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and they will rule over it" (Bar 2:34; cf. Jer 31, 33; *Jub.* 1:24-25).

(2) As observed in Jeremiah, and the other Second Temple writings examined, the object of this eschatological forgiveness is the national and corporate sin of Israel. The Exile is primarily the consequence of Israel's breaking of the covenant: "We have sinned, we have been ungodly, we have done wrong, O Lord our God, against all your ordinances.... We are left, few in number, among the nations where you have scattered

us.... But we did not obey your voice.... You have carried out your threats” (Bar 2:12-24; cf. Jer 31; *Jub.* 1:8-14). Similarly, the controlling theme of Baruch in general is Israel’s sin, punishment, and forgiveness articulated in Deut 28-30, exemplified throughout the Deuteronomistic history and embraced by prophets such as Jeremiah (deSilva 2002, 198). Bar 1:1-3:8 describes the history of the nation of Israel largely according to the Deuteronomistic view of history (Nickelsburg 1981, 110; Harrington 1999, 92; Pfeiffer 1949, 415). Central to this view are YHWH’s election of Israel, the covenant, Israel’s disobedience of divine law, and the redemptive punishment at the hand of YHWH (Deut 28; Lev 26; cf. Tob 3:3-5; *Pss. Sol.* 8:1-26; Dan 3:28-38 LXX; 2 Macc 7:32, 39). Beginning with the historical introduction (Bar 1:1-14), the author makes the national confessions of sin, contrite recognitions that the Jews have disobeyed YHWH and transgressed his law since the days of the Exodus (1:15-19), and appeals for divine forgiveness and salvation (2:11-3:8).

The author sets the tone of the prayer with statement summarizing his view of history: “And you shall say: The Lord our God is in the right, but there is open shame on us today, on the people of Judah, on the inhabitants of Jerusalem” (1:15). So there has clung to them the covenant curse of Deut 28 (Bar 1:20; 2:27-29; cf. Deut 28:62; Dan 9:11), but they followed the intent of their own wicked hearts by serving other gods in spite of the warnings of the prophets whom God sent to them (1:21-22). Thus, God has carried out his threats (2:1-2), so that the Jews were subjected to and exiled by their enemies (2:4-5; cf. Jer 42:18). This punishment of God is redemptive in its purpose.

(3) As observed in Jeremiah, this ultimate restoration is expressed in terms of covenant renewal: “I will make an everlasting covenant with them to be their God and they shall be my people” (Bar 2:35; cf. Jer 31; *Jub.* 1:23-25).

Eschatological Forgiveness at Qumran

With reference to eschatological forgiveness, we have examined the two Second Temple writings that identify divine forgiveness with the restoration of the fortunes of Israel. Next to be discussed is the Qumran literature, in which we find an important use of the phrase הברית חדשה that is not known to have been used in any other literature of the Second Temple period or of the early Rabbinic period. The Qumran writings are full of covenantal expressions, including several uses of the term הברית חדשה. The phrase is found several times in the *Damascus Document* (6:19; 8:21; 19:33-34; 20:12) and once in *Peshar Habakkuk* (1QpHab 2:3), where ברית has to be supplied to fill in a lacuna before חדשה.¹⁷ Thus, with reference to divine forgiveness in 1John, the Qumran literature is primarily important because the community identified itself as the new covenant community, where divine forgiveness is available. This way of eschatologizing new covenant forgiveness is distinct from other Second Temple literature in two ways: (1) The true Israel is no longer identified with the biblical Israel, but with the spiritual descendents of Abraham, who have kept God’s precepts (CD 3:2-20; 7:12-13). (2) Jeremiah’s new covenant prophecy is considered to have been realized in the history of their own times or in the inner life of their sect (Cross 1995, 156). Thus, examination of

¹⁷ The *Damascus Document* will hereafter be called CD (referring to the Cairo Genizah copy).

the Qumran writings that used the phrase הברית חדשה is in order, so that we may demonstrate these two distinctive elements in them.

An Examination of the New Covenant Passages

CD 6:18-19.

As stated, the phrase הברית חדשה is found several times in CD and once in *Pesher Habakkuk*. The first passage to examine is CD 6:18-19 and its larger context, the primary importance of which lies in the nature of the new covenant mentioned in this passage: “... to keep the Sabbath day according to the exact interpretation, and the festivals and the day of fasting, according to what they had discovered, those who entered the new covenant (הברית חדשה) in the land of Damascus.”¹⁸

The nature of the new covenant will become clearer when this passage is read in its immediate context in CD. Both Christian and Jewish scholars in general seem to agree that by calling the community “the New Covenant,” the author of CD (19:35) had in mind the prophecy of Jer 31:31 and considered the community as its fulfillment (Ringgren 1963, 201; Cross 1995, 157; Bruce 1962-63, 220; Brownlee 1956/57, 16; Flusser 1957, 236). Collins, however, objects to this identification primarily for two reasons (Collins 1963, 572): (1) Jer 31:31-34 is not quoted there, nor in the rest of the extant literature of Qumran. (2) The rigid and legalistic notion of covenant that is implicit in the use of the expression “New Covenant” and its association with the Torah and the

¹⁸ Hereafter the English translation of Qumran literature, including the CD, is taken from Martinez’s new translation (Martinez 1996). For the consonantal texts of CD, I have used Rabin’s critical texts (Rabin 1954).

calendar is a persistent one in Qumran texts, but it does not seem to correspond to the characteristics of Jeremiah's new covenant.

These objections do not seem to be groundless. However, the Qumran communities or the community described in CD did not interpret literally the part of the prophecy that says that the new covenant will be made "with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah"; they saw it as a designation of the "true Israel," the remnant which God promised to raise up after exile, according to Lev 26 (Flusser 1957, 236). For the covenant community, all the eschatological prophecies in the OT find their fulfillment in their community. Thus, they have no problem identifying the remnant in Lev 26 with the beneficiaries of Jeremiah's new covenant blessings. The question then is: in what sense did the author of CD argue for its fulfillment? The context of CD 6:18-19 provides an answer.

CD 6:18-19 is part of a larger context, CD 6:11b-8:9, which provides the main points of the community's *halakhah*. The *halakhah* is primarily concerned with the proper observance of Sabbaths, feasts, and fasts by those who enter the new covenant in the land of Damascus. The context of this particular *halakhah* is directly related to the origin of the new covenant community and the blessings in it described in 5:20-6:11, which repeats the account of redemptive history described already in 1:1-2:13 and 2:14-3:20. This redemptive history revolves around the doctrine of the two covenants: the covenant with Israel and the new covenant with the remnant.

The first account (1:1-2:13) tells about the original election of the remnant from the ruins of the old covenant and the desertion by God of the remainder of Israel. The narrative runs from the sins of preexilic Israel to the arrival of a "Teacher of

Righteousness” who brings knowledge of God’s deeds to a “congregation of traitors” (1:3-12). Thus, the first account emphasizes the knowledge of God brought by the Teacher, and the congregation of traitors is contrasted with the congregation of the Teacher. The second account (2:14-3:20) repeats the same history, but places more emphasis on divine forgiveness and eternal life as blessings of the new covenant, and challenges the initiates of the covenant to choose either divine forgiveness or divine wrath as Moses did in Deuteronomy. The third account (5:20-6:11) deals with the same period, but places more emphasis on the new *halakhah*. Thus, the focus of redemptive history is on the broken covenant in preexilic times and the new covenant in postexilic times. This may explain why the Qumran community uses the phrase “new covenant.” The Qumran community may have been “attracted by the eschatological content of the new covenant in Jeremiah 31, especially as the prophet says that the new covenant will be different from the old broken one, and it saw in itself the ‘true Israel,’ walking in perfection (1QS 9:8; cf. 8:20; CD 20:2, 5, 7)” (Flusser 1957, 236). Cross seems to be right when he says that in the prophecies of the OT the Qumran covenanters “saw predicted the events of their own day, and where the prophets spoke of the last days and their signs (and even where they did not), the sectarian commentators discovered fulfillment in the history of their own times or in the inner life of their sect” (Cross 1995, 156).

I have argued that the Teacher and his followers understood their community as the fulfillment of Jeremiah’s new covenant prophecy. This argument is strengthened when Jeremiah’s new covenant categories are compared with the divine blessings in the new covenant in CD. Jeremiah’s new covenant categories are the knowledge of God,

divine forgiveness, the abiding presence of the Torah, and eternal fellowship with God. The new covenant in CD involves three divine blessings, each of which is equivalent to one of the new covenant categories in Jeremiah: (1) the gift of knowledge of the “hidden matters” (CD 3:14) and diagnosis of the problem of the first generation, (2) the gift of divine forgiveness (3:18; 4:9-10), and (3) the gift of a safe home (3:19-20) and eternal life (7:4-6; 19:1). These blessings of the new covenant community also appear in the *Rule of Community*: (1) divine forgiveness in terms of cleansing and purification (1QS 4:20-22), (2) knowledge of God (4:22), and (3) restoration of the glory of Adam (4:23). The new covenant categories also appear in the *Thanksgiving Hymns*, where the hymnist gives thanks to God for the gifts of knowledge, divine forgiveness, and the indwelling Spirit. A similar doctrine is found in 1QH 19:9-14, where salvation as a divine gift is described as (1) the gift of knowledge, (2) the gift of divine forgiveness in terms of purification from sin, and (3) eternal fellowship in the community (union with the sons of truth, in the lot of God’s holy ones, in an everlasting community, with the perpetual host and the everlasting spirits). Thus, divine forgiveness is a prerequisite for entering the covenant community, which is also the community where heavenly fellowship is available here and now. These three categories correspond to the new covenant categories in Jer 31:31-34.

First, the divine blessings in the new covenant in CD begin with the revelation of the knowledge of “hidden matters” (נסתרות) to the remnant of Israel, concerning which Israel had gone astray (CD 3:14). The problems of the first generation concern primarily incorrect interpretation of the law, which governs how to observe the Sabbath and feasts. This revelation is to be followed by a human response of obedience, which necessitates

the formation of a code of legal ordinances, a *halakhah*, and the study of the law (CD 6:4-8). The new covenant is founded on doing what “the exact interpretation (פרוש) of the law” prescribes (CD 6:14), and that means observing the Sabbath “as interpreted” (כפרוש) and keeping the festivals and the Day of Atonement (6:18-20). In *Pesher Habakkuk*, the new covenant is identified with the teachings of the Teacher of Righteousness, which primarily have to do with knowledge of the deeds of God for the last generation through the Teacher of Righteousness (CD 1:11-12) and the eschatological predictions (1QpHab 2:8). The parallel expression in the *Rule of Community* directly identifies this knowledge with the knowledge of the Most High (1QS 4:22).

Second, CD 3:18 states, אל כפר בעד עונם וישא לפשעם (“God atoned for their failings and pardoned their sins”). God, who pardoned the first members by establishing the new covenant with them, will also pardon (לכפר) those who will join the covenant later (4:9). The motive for divine forgiveness comes from God’s own nature, for he is willing “to atone for persons who repent from wickedness” (2:4-5). Furthermore, divine forgiveness is said to be the purpose of giving the new covenant (CD 4:9-10) and is also emphasized as a mark of the members of the new covenant community in the *Rule of Community*.

Note the triple expression of divine forgiveness and the double expression of cleansing in

1QS 3:6-10:

For, by the spirit of the true counsel concerning the paths of man *all his sins are atoned* so that he can look at the light of life. And by the spirit of holiness which links him with his truth he is *cleansed of all his sins*. And by the spirit of uprightness and of humility *his sin is atoned*. And by the compliance of his soul with all the laws of God his flesh is *cleansed* by being sprinkled with cleansing waters and being made *holy with the waters of repentance*. May he, then, steady his steps in order to walk with perfection on all the paths of God, conforming to all he has decreed concerning the regular times of his commands and not turn aside.

With reference to the theme of divine forgiveness, four motifs can be detected from the passages: (1) the Spirit (of true counsel, of holiness, of uprightness, and of

humility) as mediator of divine forgiveness; (2) obedience to the laws of God, as interpreted by the community, as the condition for divine forgiveness; (3) the blessing of divine forgiveness in terms of atonement and cleansing; and (4) the new covenant community as the realm where divine forgiveness is available.

Third, CD 3:19-20 states that God has built for them a safe home (בית נאמן) in Israel, so that those who remain steadfast in it will acquire eternal life and all the glory of Adam (cf. 1QS 4:23: “and to them shall belong all the glory of Adam”). What is meant by a safe home is not certain, but, when it is considered in its present context and as an allusion to 1 Sam 2:35, it would seem to refer to the new covenant community, which was established only after the Exile. For all those who join the community and walk in their teaching, the covenant of God is the guarantee that they will be saved from all the nets of the pit (CD 14:1-2) and that they shall live a thousand generations (7:4-6; 19:1). Thus, the community is the realm of divine blessings, where all three divine gifts are available to its members.

The new covenant in Damascus is not totally different from the old covenant. The remnant is contrasted to the Israel of the old covenant by their holding fast to the commandments and by their continuing fidelity. They will join an everlasting covenant, foreshadowed by the three patriarchs (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob) who were faithful to the covenant (CD 3:2-4). This establishment of the new covenant with the remnant is based upon the promise of God in the first covenant, that is, the Sinai covenant (CD 1:4; Lev 26). Thus, the new covenant in the land of Damascus is a renewed covenant, which, however, is on a different footing from the old covenant: (1) It has its own *halakhah*, which is the only *halakhah*, just as possessed by the community. (2) The beneficiaries of

the new covenant are described as the true Israel with “Judah” as their label, in contrast to those of the first one, labeled as “Ephraim” (CD 7:12-13). They may be labeled differently: the congregation of traitors and the children of Abraham (CD 3:2-4). Thus, the true Israel is no longer identified with the biblical Israel, but with the spiritual descendents of Abraham, who have kept God’s precepts (CD 3:2-20).

CD 8:20-21, 19:34, 20:11-13

The next passages to be examined are three passages in CD:

This is the word which Jeremiah spoke to Baruch, son of Neriah, and Elishah to Giezi his servant. All the men who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus. (8:20-21)

And thus, all the men who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus and turned and betrayed and departed from the well of living waters, shall not be counted in the assembly of the people and shall not be inscribed in their lists, from the day of the session of him who teaches of the teacher. (19:33-35)

... for they spoke falsehood about the holy regulations and despised the covenant of God and the pact which they established in the land of Damascus, which is the first covenant. And neither for them nor their families there shall be a parting the house of the law. (20:11-13)

All three passages warn against the danger of apostasy. The primary importance of these passages for our purposes is their emphasis on remaining in the covenant community as a condition for salvation. Both CD 8:21 and 19:34 focus on the same concern. Their immediate context is this: “Thus will be judgment of all those entering his covenant but who did not remain steadfast in them; they will have visitation for destruction at the hand of Belial” (CD 8:1-2; cf. 19:13). Then the history of the broken covenant is mentioned, and the members of the community are identified as heirs of the fathers’ covenant. The judgment on these traitors of the new covenant is reiterated in CD 19:32-35:

And like this judgment will be that of all who reject God’s precepts and forsake them and move aside in the stubbornness of their heart. And thus, all the men who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus and turned and betrayed and departed from the well of living waters, shall not

be counted in the assembly of the people and shall not be inscribed in their lists, from the day of the session of the teacher.

The history of the broken covenant of Israel becomes a mirror image of the situation of the community. Thus, entering the covenant community is one thing, but remaining in it is another. To have divine forgiveness and eternal life secured, one must both enter the covenant and remain in the covenant. The community is the realm of salvation and eternal fellowship, in which one must remain to have assurance of salvation.

CD 20:11-13 contains the last use of new covenant language in CD. The passage promises the same eschatological judgment for “everyone who enters the congregation of the men of perfect holiness and is slack in the fulfillment of the instructions of the upright” (20:2). Interestingly, their sins are described as idolatry, “for they have placed idols in their heart and have walked in the stubbornness of their heart” (20:9). The judgment covers even the families of the defectors in CD 20:13, for “neither for them nor their families shall there be a part in the house of the law.”

1QpHab 2:1-10a.

The last passage to be examined is 1QpHab 2:1-10a. This passage interprets Hab 1:5. The נִיִּים in the Hebrew text have become בְּנֵי־ in the pesher, which uses the term to describe three types of traitors:¹⁹ (1) the traitors with the Man of Lies, who do not believe in the words of the Teacher of Righteousness as coming from the mouth of God, (2) the traitors of the new covenant, who are not faithful to the covenant of God (the new

¹⁹ The same word בְּנֵי־ is used in CD 8:5 (=19:17) as a description of those with whom the community is contrasted and in 19:34 of defectors from the community. The first group of traitors in *Pesher Habakkuk* seems to be identical to the former, and the second to the latter. *Pesher Habakkuk* seems to depend upon CD in interpreting Hab 1:5 as attested in the pesher.

covenant) and have dishonored his holy name, and (3) the traitors in the last days, who will not believe the predictions of the Priest concerning the final generation, even though he has been given God's special revelation about how to interpret the prophetic message. The context is clearly polemical and apologetical. The purpose of *Pesher Habakkuk*, as explained by Brownlee, is true of this passage (Brownlee 1979, 35-36). Hab 1:5 is used as a proof text (1) to vindicate the Teacher of Righteousness and his followers against their opponents, by showing that the work and sufferings of the Teacher and the evil and blasphemous works of the Man of Lies have all been prophesied in Scripture, and (2) to strengthen the faith and endurance of the Teacher's adherents and warn the wavering of the dangers of apostasy. The context of this passage is similar to the three CD passages (8:20-21; 19:34; 20:11-13), but two important elements come to the fore in *Pesher Habakkuk*. In CD, the first blessing of the new covenant was the knowledge of "hidden matters" (relating to the issue of the calendar), and the sins of Israel were primarily violations of these truths. However, 1QpHab 2:1-10a emphasizes the words of the Teacher of Righteousness and the eschatological predictions of the Priest. Of these two, the first one is of primary interest to this dissertation.

Of particular importance is the fact that the words of the Teacher of Righteousness now assume the same authority as the words of God. As we may recall, in CD 1:11 God raised up the Teacher of Righteousness for the remnant who sought him with a perfect heart, in order to tell the deeds of God to the last generation. 1QpHab 2:1-10a states that it is faith in (and obedience to) his word that marks one as belonging to the community; he is the source of authority (from the mouth of God). He is (1) an interpreter of the words of the prophets (7:4-5; cf. 1QpPs^a I, 27), (2) the founder of the

elect of God (cf. 1QpPs^a II, 5), and (3) the Priest (cf. 1QpPs^a II, 19). His task is to instruct, to make known the mysteries of God, and his teaching imparts the saving knowledge to the chosen ones so that they will be saved from judgment (cf. 1QpMic 10:6-9). According to 1QpHab 8:1-2, God will free from punishment those who observe the law on account of their deeds and because of their loyalty to the Teacher of Righteousness.

Summary and Conclusion

In this section, we have first examined the passages from three OT prophets (Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Isaiah) with regard to divine forgiveness. Our examination demonstrated that these later OT prophets eschatologized the OT concept of forgiveness by identifying it with the eschatological hope of the restoration of Israel. We then examined the two Second Temple writings with regard to divine forgiveness. Our examination of these writings demonstrated that the eschatological forgiveness developed in Jeremiah and Ezekiel was preserved and developed in them.

Our examination of the Qumran literature, however, identified two distinctive elements in it, compared to other Second Temple writings. First, the community at Qumran spiritualized the national and corporate hopes of Israel by identifying the true Israel not with the biblical Israel, but with the spiritual descendents of Abraham, who have kept God's precepts (CD 3:2-20; 7:12-13).²⁰ Second, the Qumran community considered Jeremiah's new covenant prophecy to be fulfilled in the history of their own times or in the inner life of the community by identifying itself with the new covenant community, where the gifts of divine forgiveness and eternal life were available.

²⁰ However, according to the community, the "true" Israelites are a subset of physical Israel (hence a remnant), not an overlapping set as in the NT.

CHAPTER 2

ESCHATOLOGICAL ATONEMENT

Introduction

In the foregoing section, we observed that the Jews in the Second Temple period hoped for the eschatological restoration of the Jewish nation and identified it with divine forgiveness. But what is involved in divine forgiveness? As N. T. Wright puts it, “If Israel’s god was to deliver his people from exile, it could only be because he had somehow dealt with the problem which had caused her to go there in the first place, namely her sin” (Wright 1992, 272-74). In the OT, forgiveness presupposes the removal of sins, for which God provided atoning sacrifices as a part of the covenant between YHWH and his people (Eichrodt 1961, 2:444). We find in the Second Temple writings that the concept of vicarious cultic atonement through the Levitical sacrifices was understood as foreshadowing a greater eschatological event. We will examine first the OT roots of the concept of atonement.

The OT Roots of the Concept of Atonement

Levitical Atoning Sacrifices

Grabbe and Neusner have argued that the importance of the temple, its cult, and the priesthood in both the OT and the Second Temple period have not been fully appreciated by modern scholars, in part because of a bias against ritual in general and blood sacrifice in particular (Grabbe 1992, 538; Neusner 1995, 33). It is true that the OT

(Exod 25:9, 40; cf. 1 Chr 28:11-19) and some Second Temple writings (*Jub.* 3:10; 4:32; 18:19) interpreted the mundane physical acts of the daily temple cult symbolically, but “both priests and worshippers would have stood aghast at the thought that the sacrifice itself could be jettisoned once one appreciated its spiritual meaning” (Grabbe 1992, 539-40). They believed that the sacrifices, when properly carried out, had atoning effect (Lev 4:26, 31, 34; 5:6, 10). In particular, Leviticus explicitly mentions two types of expiatory offerings (the sin offerings and the guilt offerings) that produce atonement and forgiveness for the persons involved (Lev 4:26, 31, 34; 5:6, 10) or the nation as a whole (4:20). We will next examine the concept of cultic atonement as expressed in the Levitical sacrificial system.

The General Context of the Levitical Sacrifices

The Levitical sacrificial system was important to the Israelites primarily in two ways. First, it was a part of the covenant between YHWH and his people. YHWH brought the people of Israel out of Egypt and made a covenant with them on Mount Sinai. He first declared his purpose for electing Israel as his people: “You shall be for me a priestly kingdom and a holy nation” (Exod 19:6). As a part of this Mosaic covenant, Leviticus specifies Israel’s responsibilities as a priestly kingdom and a holy nation. Based upon this observation, Thompson concludes, “The sacrificial system in Israel operated for both the nation and the individual within the covenant and received its effectiveness before God and his worshipers by virtue of that fact” (Thompson 1963, 7-10).

Second, it was the divinely ordained means by which Israelites could restore their covenant relationship with God, and consequently its pattern follows the covenant

renewal formula. Lohse finds a pattern in the sacrificial system: sin, temporary disruption of the covenant relationship, offering of expiatory sacrifice, restoration of the covenant relationship with God (Lohse 1955, 14-18). This pattern is analogous to the covenant renewal formula identified by K. Baltzer (Baltzer 1971, 51-60):

Covenant Renewal Formula	Pattern in the Sacrificial System
1) The substance of the covenant is violated.	1) Sin(s) of individual or community
2) The curse comes into effect.	2) Temporary disruption of the covenant relationship
3) The people repent of their sin.	3) Offering of expiatory sacrifice
4) The LORD indicates acceptance of the request for covenant renewal by saying, אָנֹכִי פָרַח בְּרִיחַ, “I make a covenant” (Exod 34:10).	4) Restoration of the covenant relationship with God, with priestly declaration of forgiveness: “The priest shall make atonement for him/they, and he/they shall be forgiven”

Expiatory Sacrifices

First, we will deal primarily with expiatory sacrifices proper, not the sin offering on the Day of Atonement, which will be dealt with later. There were two kinds of expiatory offerings: sin offerings and guilt offerings. The sin offering (חַטָּאת) was very nearly the same as the guilt offering (עֲוֹן), and in fact it is difficult to differentiate between them. It is difficult even to identify the texts that deal with one or the other (cf. Lev 5:1-13) (Snaith 1965, 73-80; De Vaux 1964, 421). The chief difference between them was the requirement of restitution (5:16; 6:1-7).

Procedures

Certain precise rules were promulgated by the Mosaic law in the Pentateuch that meticulously regulated the sacrificial ritual. The ritual for the sin offering is completely

described in Lev 4:1-5:13 and 6:24-30.²¹ Rendtorff notes seven steps in the presentation of the sin offering (Rendtorff 1967, 212-22). (1) The victim was presented where alone it was lawful to sacrifice—“before YHWH” or at “the door of the tent of meeting,” where the altar of burnt offering stood (Lev 4:3, 4, 14, 23, 28, 32; 4:7-8, 11-12; 5:6, 15, 18, 25). (2) The offerer laid one hand (the high priest on the Day of Atonement laid both hands) on the victim’s head (4:4, 15, 24, 29, 33; cf. 16:21). (3) The victim was slain by the offerer (or by one of the elders, if the victim was presented by the community as a whole, or by the high priest on behalf of the nation on the Day of Atonement) (4:4, 15, 24, 29, 33). (4) The blood rite was performed (4:5-7, 16-18, 25, 30; 5:9), in which the priest presented some of the blood at the tent of meeting, dipped his finger in the blood, and sprinkled it seven times in front of the veil before YHWH’s presence. Some blood was put on the horns of the altar of incense in the tent of meeting. The remaining blood was poured out at the base of the altar of burnt offering. (5) The fat was removed (4:8-9, 19, 31, 35; cf. 5:12). (6) The fat was burned (4:10, 19, 26, 31, 35; 5:12). (7) The rest of the items were disposed of (4:11-12, 20).

Offenses Dealt with by the Expiatory Offerings

Among the sins atonable by expiatory offerings, the law recognizes a special category of sins committed unwittingly or inadvertently (Lev 4; 5; Num 15:22-31). Both Lev 4-5 and Num 15:22-26 speak clearly about inadvertent offenses against all of the commandments. Regardless of the nature of the commands, whether moral or not, any

²¹ Although the guilt offering ritual is described separately in Lev 7:1-6 without the first two steps, the description follows the sin offering ritual, and Lev 7:7-8 explicitly refers to the regulations of the burnt offering and the sin offering as valid for the guilt offering.

acts of disobedience to the Torah (the revealed will of YHWH) were considered sins, but as long as they were committed unwittingly or inadvertently, they could be atoned for by atoning sacrifices (Moore 1927, 1:460-61). These passages cover a wide range of moral, ritual, ceremonial, and civil laws, among which ritual and ceremonial regulations are the most prominent. Although the offenses that demand a sin offering in Lev 5:1-6 are for the most part of a nonmoral nature, such as contact with a dead body, with an unclean reptile, or with an unclean discharge from a human being, they also include offenses of a moral nature, such as allowing injustice to happen by withholding information or rash swearing that turns out to be false. As for sin offerings, two passages speak clearly about the comprehensive nature of the sins involved:

When anyone sins unintentionally (נָפֵשׁ כִּי־תִחַטֵּא בְשִׁגְגָה) in any of the LORD'S commandments about things not to be done, and does any one of them. (Lev 4:2)

But if you unintentionally fail to observe (כִּי תִשְׁגֶּה) all these commandments that the LORD has spoken to Moses—everything that the LORD has commanded you by Moses, from the day the LORD gave commandment and thereafter, throughout your generations. (Num 15:22-23)

The two Hebrew verbs used to express sins in Lev 4-5 and Num 15:22-26 are חָטָא and שָׁגָה. The former means “to miss a mark, fall short” in the Qal and “to remove sin, bring the sin offering” in the Piel. The primary sense of חָטָא is to deviate from the right way, and thus to fail to do something in relation to man or God (Grayston 1953, 138; Knierim 1997b). The latter (שָׁגָה) means “to err” in the Qal and “lead astray” in the Hiphil. The phrase חָטָא בְשִׁגְגָה (“to sin in error”) is formulaic (Lev 4:2, 22, 27; 5:15; Num 15:27-28). While the error in Lev 4 relates to חָטָא, “to sin,” in Num 15:29 it involves an unintentional act (שָׁגָה) (v. 22; cf. v. 24), and in Num 35:11, 15 and Josh 20:3, 9 the unintentional killing of a person. All the instances mentioned involve ritual or asylum

regulations that regulate atonement or asylum for unintentionally committed errors or sins of negligence (Knierim 1997c).

As for guilt offerings, the word זָשָׂא denotes the changed status of the agent from innocent to guilty, thus making him liable to discharge guilt by giving something. According to the biblical thought patterns, a man is responsible for all his actions, for every action has an effect on his soul, and this state of accountability is expressed by זָשָׂא . Milgrom lists four usages of the root זָשָׂא : the nouns “reparation” and “reparation offering” and the verbs “incur liability (to someone)” and “feel guilt” (without a personal object) (Milgrom 1976, 11). These meanings derive from the consequential זָשָׂא , i.e. the punishment or penalty incurred through wrongdoing. The fourth meaning, “feel guilt,” involves the self-punishment of conscience, the torment of guilt. The latter connotes a legal guilt.

The law also provides a category of sin that cannot be atoned for by expiatory offerings. Included in the category are such sins as sinning with a high hand (בְּיָד רְחֵה), willfully and defiantly (Num 15:30). The person who does anything willfully, whether native born or alien, blasphemes YHWH and must be cut off (וְנִכְרְתָהּ) from his people, for he despised the word of YHWH and broke his commands (15:30-31). The sin offering on the Day of Atonement seems to be an exception to this rule (Lev 16:21). The text seems to say that all sins are forgiven without restriction.

Atonement and Divine Forgiveness

When properly carried out, both the sin offering and the guilt offering resulted in atonement for the persons involved. Forgiveness was granted to the offerer (Lev 4:26, 31,

34; 5:6, 10) or the nation as a whole (4:20). Of particular importance is the repetitive use of the declarative formula in expiatory offerings: וְכַפֵּר עֲלֵהֶם הַכֹּהֵן וְנִסְלַח לָהֶם, “The priest shall make atonement for them, and they shall be forgiven” (4:20; cf. 4:26, 31, 35; 5:10, 13, 16, 18, 26; 19:22; Num 15:25, 26, 28).²² This declarative formula is employed for the expiatory offerings thirteen times in Leviticus and Numbers, in each case as the closing formula. The two stages of action involved in this formula describe the divine-human discourse that occurs through the expiatory offerings: (1) The first half has to do with the man who has to deal with the effects of sin through the atoning sacrifice. (2) The second half has to do with the divine response to the sacrifice, which comes in the remission of the sins themselves.

What, then, does divine forgiveness mean in this context? It has been argued here that atonement involves two things: (1) In blood rites, the blood is said to atone for objects or persons by cleansing them from the effects of sin (uncleanness and transgressions). (2) When a hand is laid on an animal and it is slaughtered, the animal vicariously bears the iniquities of the guilty person. Thus, the atoning ritual removes both the effects of sin (uncleanness and transgressions) and the consequences of sin (death), but the acts of sin themselves are still not taken care of.

Divine forgiveness seems to take care of the acts of sin in the form of a simple but solemn declaration of YHWH’s pardon. The Hebrew verb used for forgiveness here is סָלַח, which is always used of God and means “to be indulgent” or “to overlook” an offense that has been committed (Köhler 1957, 217).

²² The pronominal object of prepositions may vary in each case.

The Sin Offering on the Day of Atonement

Its Peculiarities and Importance

As it has been argued, the sacrificial language of 1John points primarily to the sin offering on the Day of Atonement. Although the ritual of the sin offering on the Day of Atonement is basically like the sin offerings on other occasions, it has its own peculiarities: (1) The sin offering ritual on the Day of Atonement includes public confession of sin (Lev 16:21; cf. 1John 1:9), which the high priest utters while laying both hands on the scapegoat before sending it away into the wilderness.²³ Whereas in the regular sin offering the offerer lays one hand on the sin offering, in the sin offering on the Day of Atonement the high priest lays both hands on the scapegoat for the sins of the people, thus separating the ritual into two parts with two goats. (2) The blood of both sacrifices is taken not merely into the Holy Place, but into the Holy of Holies, and sprinkled directly upon the propitiatory, the throne of YHWH, where YHWH meets his people (Lev 16:2; Exod 25:22). Here the culminative divine-human discourse takes place between YHWH and the high priest, who represents the whole nation of Israel (cf. 1John 2:1-2). (3) The blood is sprinkled seven times upon the holy places, the floor of the Holy of Holies and Holy Place, and the altar of the court; the blood is also applied to the media of atonement in the three divisions of the tabernacle, for the cleansing of the holy places from the uncleanness of the children of Israel.

When compared with sin offerings on other occasions, the sin offering ritual on the Day of Atonement seems to be most comprehensive in both qualitative and

²³ An individual's confession of sin is mentioned once in connection with guilt offerings (Lev 5:5).

quantitative terms. On the one hand, it is quantitatively comprehensive, primarily because the ritual produces divine forgiveness of the collective sins of the nation for the year. On the other hand, it is qualitatively comprehensive because this is the only occasion when the high priest enters the Holy of Holies, where the true divine-human discourse takes place through peculiar blood rites. It may even be said that all other expiatory rituals point to the Day of Atonement ritual (Wenham 1986, 115). H. Gese suggests an interesting way of tracing the development of these atoning rituals (Gese 1981, 110-13):

The guilt offering is, aside from its secondary character as an atonement, which accrued to all sacrifices, primarily a ritual for repentance, which developed out of the sacrificial meal. The sin offering (*hattat*) was used for cases where sins had been committed and also for ceremonies of consecration (Exod 29; Lev 8, 9; Ezek 43:18ff.; 45:18ff.).... The most important service of atonement was assigned a special day in the New Year festivities, Yom Kippur. The atonement accomplished here is the highest cultic act in Israel: the high priest entering the Holy of Holies for the only time during the year. Only on this day was the name Yahweh pronounced.... In the strict, cultic sense, atonement is accomplished by the sprinkling of blood in the Holy of Holies.

Thus, according to Gese, the minor blood rites in other expiatory offerings culminate in the atoning rites of the Day of Atonement, when the high priest entered the Holy of Holies, the place of the divine presence itself.

The Distinctive Function of Blood Rites

The law specifically says that all the major sacrifices make atonement (Exod 29:33), but some of the passages strongly indicate that there is a close relationship between the blood rites of sacrifice and atonement. In particular, atonement is directly connected with blood in the two passages concerning the sin offering on the Day of Atonement: (1) “The bull of the sin offering and the goat of the sin offering, whose blood was brought in to make atonement in the holy place” (Lev 16:27). (2) “He shall perform the atonement for it once a year with the blood of the atoning sin offering” (Exod 30:10). Of the rituals on the Day of Atonement, the essential rite of the atoning sacrifices carried

out by the priest alone was the blood rite, in which the blood was sprinkled either directly upon the *kapporeth* (כַּפֹּרֶת) on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16) or indirectly toward the veil that was before the *kapporeth* to obtain the remission of collective sins (Lev 4).

The blood rite on the Day of Atonement purifies the Holy of Holies, the tent of meeting, and the altar from the effects of sin. The effects of sin are ritualistic and legal. Two terms are important here with respect to the effects of sin (חַטָּאת): uncleanness (טְמֵאָה) and transgression (עֲשֵׂה). Two passages in Leviticus 16 describe the removal of these two effects of sin in a comprehensive fashion. The first passage is:

He shall slaughter the goat of the sin offering (חַטָּאת) that is for the people and bring its blood inside the curtain ... sprinkling it upon the mercy seat and before the mercy seat. Thus he shall make atonement (כַּפֵּר) for the sanctuary from the uncleannesses (טְמֵאָה; ἀκαθαρσία) of the people of Israel and from their transgressions (עֲשֵׂה; ἀδικηματα), because of all their sins (חַטָּאת; ἁμαρτία); and so he shall do for the tent of meeting, which remains with them in the midst of their uncleannesses. (Lev 16:15-16)²⁴

“Sins” (חַטָּאת) in v. 16 refers to sins in general, that is, to specific human acts of disobedience to the Torah, the revealed will of YHWH. Sin produces two effects. First, sin pollutes people, places, and objects, making them unclean for service to YHWH. Uncleanness (טְמֵאָה) in the OT includes ritual uncleanness and is also used of unclean conditions and actions, which often involve apostasy from YHWH, including pagan practices and the cults of other gods, sometimes in the form of prostitution.²⁵ Second, sin is ultimately unfaithfulness to the covenant and thus rebellion against YHWH, who is the

²⁴ This is my literal translation of the MT. The NRSV follows the LXX, but the literal translation of the MT is very different from the LXX. The most plausible interpretation of לְכֹל-טְמֵאָתָם in v. 16 is to see the phrase as a subjective genitive modifying both the uncleannesses and the transgressions that precede it.

²⁵ “The religio-historical similarity between uncleannesses and taboo has often been pointed out.... In an earlier day, under the influence of evolutionary thought, the history of religions viewed holiness and uncleanness as differentiated aspects of what had once been a single notion of taboo: the “good” divine taboo became holiness, the “evil” demonic taboo, which could be destructive, became uncleanness. Within the context of historical Israel and the OT, this interpretation is without any support. In the OT, holiness and uncleanness are absolutely antithetical (e.g., Isa 6:3f.; 35:8; 52:1, 11)” (Ringgren 1986, 331).

covenant-giver. The term *עֲשָׂה* refers to offenses against a superior (Gen 31:36; 50:17) or unfaithfulness to an agreement, which cause breaks in mutual relationships (1 Kgs 12:19; 2 Kgs 1:1; 3:5, 7). According to Knierim, *עֲשָׂה* was used very early as a legal technical term referring to crimes that were subject to legal penalties (Knierim 1997d, 1033-37). These two effects of sin violate the holiness and righteousness of God, respectively. Unless they are dealt with by atoning rituals, they cause the wrath of God against the sinner(s). Between the two effects of sin, the emphasis falls on uncleanness (*טִמְאָה*), which is the only category of sin repeated in the summation in v. 16.

In Lev 16:19, the same rite is repeated upon the altar for the same purpose, but using another verb: “cleanse it and hallow it from the uncleannesses of the people of Israel.” Here, atonement involves both cleansing and consecration of the objects on which the blood rites are performed.

The Distinctive Function of the Scapegoat Rite

Lev 16:5 clearly identifies both the he-goat for slaughter and the scapegoat as the sin offering, but the he-goat for Azazel was not for sacrifice. Milgrom suggests that the term “sin-offering” may have been applied to the scapegoat for its philological sense, “that which removes sin” (Milgrom 1991, 1018). Whereas in the regular sin or guilt offerings divine forgiveness is expressed by “it will be forgiven,” in the Day of Atonement ritual it is expressed in terms of cleansing from sin. The juxtaposition of the two expressions will show the differences more clearly:²⁶

²⁶ These two aspects of divine forgiveness are also employed in Jeremiah (31:34; 33:8) and 1John (1:7, 9; 2:12).

	Lev 4:20 (cf. 4:26, 31; 5:10, 13, 16, 18; 6:7)	Lev 16:30
Atonement	“The priest shall make atonement for them,”	“Atonement shall be made for you, to cleanse you;”
Forgiveness or Cleansing	“and they shall be forgiven.”	“from all your sins you shall be clean before the LORD.”

Both the regular sin offerings and the sin offering on the Day of Atonement are divided into two parts: (1) atonement on behalf of the person (4:20) or the people (16:30); (2) forgiveness (4:20) or cleansing (16:30). The declaration of divine forgiveness in the regular sin offering corresponds to the divine cleansing in the Day of Atonement ritual.

Although this particular rite is not a blood rite, it is complementary to blood rites because it deals with sin. Following the blood rite, the scapegoat rite deals with the two effects of כָּל-חַטָּאתָם, “all their sins.” It shows the obvious parallel with the blood rite by employing two terms to represent the effects of sin: כָּל-עֲוֹנוֹתָם, “all the iniquities” of the people of Israel and כָּל-פְּשָׁעֵיהֶם, “all their transgressions.” The relevant passage is Lev 16:20-22:

When he has finished atoning for the holy place and the tent of meeting and the altar, he shall present the live goat. Then Aaron shall lay both his hands on the head of the live goat, and confess over it all the iniquities of the people of Israel and all their transgressions, from *all their sins*, putting them on the head of the goat, and sending it away into the wilderness by means of someone designated for the task. The goat shall bear on itself all their iniquities to a barren region; and the goat shall be set free in the wilderness.

Of the two terms, “iniquities” and “transgressions,” the emphasis falls on the former, which is the only category of sin repeated in the summation in v. 22.²⁷ Thus, the

²⁷ The same phenomenon occurs in the Fourth Servant Song of Isaiah, where the Servant is said to suffer vicariously for the peoples’ transgressions and iniquities in Isa 53:5, but the only repeated category of sin is עֲוֹן in vv. 6 and 11. עֲוֹן becomes a dominant theological term in the Prophets, especially in Hosea, Isaiah,

term parallels and corresponds in importance to **טְהוֹרָה**, the term employed in summing up the purpose of the blood rite in v. 16. The only difference between the effects of sins cleansed by the blood rite and those removed by the scapegoat is that **טְהוֹרָה** is replaced by **עֲוֹנוֹת**. The blood rite removes the uncleanness of the holy places and the scapegoat rite removes the sins of the people by sending them away with the scapegoat.

The basic meaning of the verb form of **יָזַח** is “to pervert, twist, be of perverse intention” (Job 33:27; Prov 12:8; Ps 38:7), and the noun **יָזַח** means “perversion, twisting.” The concept always involves the guilty party’s consciousness, since **יָזַח** has its root in the idea of an evil disposition (Von Rad 1962, 263). According to Knierim, the verb and the noun of **יָזַח** are “mostly used to formally disqualify certain actions, behaviors, or circumstances and their effects,” and thus is often translated “guilt, iniquity (resulting in guilt)” (Knierim 1997a, 863). Thus, **יָזַח** is a more comprehensive term than **חַטָּאת** (“guilt-liability,” “resolution to guilt, reparation,” “culpability, punishment”), which primarily relates to the effects of guilt.

Vicarious Culpability as a Primary Working Principle

In the Day of Atonement ritual, the purpose and result of the atonement are expressed in terms of cleansing the sacral objects or the Israelites as a whole. Throughout the cultic process, vicarious culpability seems to be a primary working principle in achieving the purpose of cleansing. Although this principle works in all stages of the ritual, it is most prominently manifested in three aspects: (1) in the role of the high priest

Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. Out of 231 occurrences of the noun form in the OT, almost half are in these four prophets (25 in Isaiah, 44 in Ezekiel, 24 in Jeremiah, 10 in Hosea).

in the ritual (cf. 1John 4:9, 10, 14); (2) in the function of the blood used in the blood rite (cf. 1:7; 2:2); and (3) in the function of the scapegoat (cf. 3:5, 8).

First, the high priest's role in the ritual is clearly vicarious. It is his sacral duty to bear the iniquities (and their consequences) of the Israelites in order to prevent a disaster from happening to the people (Num 18:1). This duty is displayed most prominently in the ritual on the Day of Atonement. The high priest does everything in the ritual on behalf of the Israelites. He chooses two male goats and a ram for offerings (Lev 16:5), casts lots for the two goats (v. 8), slaughters the sacrificial animals, takes the blood into the Holy of Holies, performs the blood rites (vv. 15-19), brings the scapegoat, lays both hands on it, confesses over it all the sins of the Israelites, and sends it away into the wilderness (v. 21).²⁸ In particular, his act of laying both hands on the scapegoat and confessing the sins of the Israelites over it involves the two stages of vicariously bearing sins: the high priest bears them himself and transfers them to the scapegoat.

Second, the blood in the atonement ritual, the Day of Atonement ritual in particular, represents the ransom price for the offerer(s). It is often asked how blood rites can make atonement for persons or objects. Since neither the descriptive nor the prescriptive texts dealing with sacrifices in the OT explain the meaning of the rituals involved, some scholars look for clues in the sacrificial systems of other religions in Mesopotamia (Winckler 1909; Jeremias 1911; Jastrow 1911). But the fostering of atonement for sin seems to have been missing in the Mesopotamian sacrificial cults, and the particular blood rites that are central to Israelite sacrifice are not paralleled in

²⁸ Although the term *scapegoat* is an interpretation of the LXX and the Vulgate, it will be employed here for the live goat that is destined to לְעִזָּאֵל in the MT (Lev 16:8).

Mesopotamian religion (Carpenter 1988, 260-73; McCarthy 1969, 166-76; Wright 1950, 106).

Lev 17:11 is one passage that seems to explain why blood atones and thus produces divine forgiveness. The passage reads: “For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you for making atonement for your lives on the altar; for, as life, it is the blood that makes atonement”

כִּי נַפֶּשׁ הַבֶּשֶׂר בְּדָם הוּא וְאֲנִי נָתַתִּיו לָכֶם עַל-הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לְכַפֵּר עַל-נַפְשׁוֹתֵיכֶם כִּי-הַדָּם הוּא בְנֶפֶשׁ וְכַפֵּר

Scholars agree that this passage provides the answer, but they give different interpretations of the passage. The meaning of the passage is made clearer when it is seen in its immediate context. It is the prohibition of the use of blood as food that provides the occasion for the declaration of blood’s significance in sacrifice (vv. 10-11). Two reasons are offered for the prohibition in v. 11. First, “the life of the flesh is in the blood.” The semantic range of the Hebrew נַפֶּשׁ is very broad, encompassing such different English concepts as “throat,” “appetite,” “soul,” “life,” “person” (Seebass 1998, 497-519). In this context, “life” (as chosen by the NRSV) seems to be the most appropriate rendering. The meaning of this clause seems to be clear. The second reason for the prohibition is provided in the next clause: because blood is reserved for the specific purpose of “making atonement for your lives on the altar.” Scholars differ in their interpretation of this clause.

The center of contention is how to interpret בְּנֶפֶשׁ in the last clause of v. 11.

Janowski summarizes the debate on the interpretation of the preposition בְּ in three ways (Janowski 1982, 244): *beth instrumenti* (“through, by means of”) (Rendtorff 1967, 231; Gese 1981, 107; Von Rad 1962, 271; Janowski 1982, 245); *beth essentiae* (“as, in the form of”) (Milgrom 1971, 149; De Vaux 1964, 93; Lyonnet 1970, 176; Taylor 1959b, 54-5; Westcott 1883, 34-5; Schenker 1981, 96); *beth pretii* (“for, concerning”), whether with

the normal meaning of “for, at the price of” or with a form of the so-called “*beth of exchange*,” meaning “for, on behalf of, instead of” (Levine 1974, 68; Morris 1952, 217-19; Wenham 1979, 245; Spicq 1952, 2:276).²⁹ The real contention, however, seems to be not over the meaning of the preposition *per se*, but over whether it implies the idea of a ransom. On the one hand, scholars such as Westcott, Taylor, and Lyonnet translate it as “as life,” based upon their assumption that blood, as the life principle, is liberated from the victim during the shedding of the blood and serves as an instrument to purify and to consecrate at the sprinkling offered to the Deity. On the other hand, scholars such as Wenham translate it as “at the price of life,” based upon their assumption that the blood is the ransom price paid for man’s life. In the latter view, blood is understood not as the life principle, but as life yielded up in death as a ransom for man’s life.

The latter view is preferable for four reasons. First, the last clause is subordinate to the preceding clause, which clearly implies that blood is reserved for use as the ransom price for man’s life. The last clause, being a subordinate causal clause, ought to mean the same thing. Second, the most common use of בַּחַיִּים is to denote death by violence (Morris 1952, 217-18). According to Morris, the word בַּחַיִּים is used in the OT some 360 times, out of which at least 203 occurrences deal with a violent death of some kind. Third, the principle of vicarious culpability lies in the background of all the atoning sacrifices. Even the assignment of the Levites and priests to the sacral duties is occasioned by YHWH’s hostile reactions against the encroachment of the Israelites and the unauthorized priests (Num 18:1). Both the priests and the sacrificial animals make atonement by bearing the guilt of man and its consequences. Thus, blood represents the life of an innocent victim,

²⁹ This view agrees with the LXX, which renders the phrase as $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \psi\upsilon\chi\eta\varsigma$, which implies that the blood of the victim was shed instead of the blood of the man.

yielded up in death as a ransom for man’s life. Fourth, the immediate occasion of the Day of Atonement ritual (a solemn warning of death for those who approach the Holy of Holies in Lev 16:1-2) seems to imply that God’s wrath needs to be appeased.

Third, the principle of vicarious culpability is at work in the scapegoat rite. Of particular interest is the statement, “The goat shall bear (שָׂא) on itself all their iniquities”(Lev 16:22). Freedman and Willoughby investigate the occurrences of the root שָׂא in connection with terms for sin and related words, and define its meaning as ‘to bear (injustice, sin, transgressions).’ They list three specific situations to which this expression refers (Freedman and Willoughby 1999, 31-36): (1) “the bearing of one’s own iniquity in connection with the confession of one’s own guilt and an understanding of its punishment” (Lev 5:1, 17; 7:18; 17:16; 19:8; 20:17, 19, 20; 22:16; 24:15; Num 5:31; 9:13; cf. Lev 24:15; Num 9:13 with שָׂאָה); (2) the husband’s bearing of the consequences of his wife’s oath (Num 30:16), or priests and Levites bearing the consequences of the iniquities of priests, Levites, and the Israelites (Num 18:1-7); and (3) “the bearing of the guilt of another person for the purpose of forgiveness” (Gen 50:17). Among the three situations, the scapegoat rite seems to belong to the second one. In particular, it corresponds to the Levites bearing the iniquities of the Israelites so that they will not die for their sins (Num 18:22). Juxtaposing the ordination rite of the Levites and the scapegoat rite will elucidate the principle of vicarious culpability that is involved in both rites:

	Ordination of the Levites (Num 8:10, 19)	Scapegoat rite (Lev 16:20-22)
Occasion	The plague of the Korahites and consequent fear of the Israelites for the tabernacle	The death of the two sons of Aaron when they approached YHWH (Lev 16:1)

(Num 18:1)

Laying on of hands	“The Israelites shall lay their hands on the Levites” (8:10).	“And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions of all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat” (v. 21). ³⁰
Purpose of the rite	“to make atonement for the Israelites” (8:19)	“But the goat on which the lot fell for Azazel shall be presented alive before the LORD to make atonement over it” (v. 10). “And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities” (v. 22).
Sacrifice	The Levites as live sacrifice (bereft of the land)	The scapegoat as live sacrifice (bereft of the land)

Both are occasioned by God’s hostile action toward his people. In the case of the ordination of the Levites, the Israelites lay their hands on the Levites, but in the case of the scapegoat, the high priest, on behalf of the Israelites, lays his hands on it. In both cases, atonement is made in terms of bearing the iniquities (and their consequences) of the Israelites. The Levites bear the iniquities of the Israelites by their service for the sanctuary (Milgrom 1970, 28-29); the scapegoat bears iniquities by carrying them away into the wilderness. Thus, the scapegoat rite symbolizes divine forgiveness in terms of cleansing the people by removing the effects and consequences of sin. YHWH will let go of the sins of his people and accept them as if they were clean.

³⁰ This verse provides the best commentary on the meaning of laying hands on sacrificial animals. It symbolizes the transferring of sins or iniquities to the animal. In the case of the scapegoat, the high priest, on behalf of the people, lays both hands on the scapegoat. In this process, the principle of vicarious culpability is expressed in two ways: (1) The high priest bears the sins of the people when he lays his hands on the scapegoat. (2) The scapegoat bears the sins and carries them away into the wilderness.

The Second Temple Literature

In the foregoing discussion, we have examined the concept of cultic atonement expressed in the Levitical sacrifices. Discussing the beliefs of Israel during the Second Temple period, N. T. Wright asks an important question on the inner rationale of the sacrifice:

When questions of dealing with sin and enslavement were raised it was to the notion of sacrifice that Jews naturally turned. This is not surprising, considering the large place that the sacrificial system occupied within the social and religious life of Jews at this time. At this point we are faced with something of a puzzle. We know beyond any doubt that the great majority of Jews took part in the sacrificial system, but we do not know why – or rather, we do not know what they would have said if asked why they went through these rituals.... But was there an inner rationale? And how would we know if and when we had found it? ... according to what inner rationale was the killing of animals or birds thought to *effect* the atonement and forgiveness which those who did it clearly believed it did effect?... And if it is the case that sacrifices are simply a convenient occasion for the really effective act of atonement, which is repentance and confession, that still does not explain why sacrifices themselves have any meaning at all. (Wright 1992, 274)

Wright gives his own answer to this question (Wright 1992, 274-75): “It seems, to put the matter in general terms, as though the sacrificial system functioned as a regular pointer back to the great acts of redemption such as the exodus, and equally as a pointer forward to the great redemption still to come. Since it spoke of Israel’s reconciliation with her god, it could thus function as a cyclical reminder of a historical or historical/eschatological phenomenon.”

In other words, the act of sacrifice itself was never essential, but in some sense foreshadowed a greater eschatological event. This eschatological perspective of the sacrificial system can be found in Qumran literature and other Second Temple writings (Dan 3:38-40; *4 Macc.* 6:27-29; 17:21-22).

In the following discussion, we will examine the Second Temple writings with regard to the eschatologizing of the Levitical sacrifices. First, we will examine the Qumran writings in this regard.

Eschatologizing of the OT Sacrifices in the Qumran Community

In the Qumran literature, we find three ways in which the OT sacrifices are eschatologized: (1) The *New Jerusalem*, the *Temple Scroll*, and the *War Scroll* describe a new temple and its cult that will be established in the new age, which implies that the present sacrificial order is only provisional, pointing to a more perfect sacrificial order in the last days.³¹ (2) Other works, such as the *Rule of the Community* and the *Thanksgiving Hymns*, describe the community as a temple of God with its spiritual sacrifices. (3) A variant reading found in one of the Isaiah scroll (1QIsa^a 52:14) indicates that the community may have interpreted the Fourth Servant Song (Isa 52:13-53:12) messianically.

Eschatological Interpretation in the New Jerusalem, the Temple Scroll, and the War Scroll

Of the three types of eschatologizing, the first type is expressed primarily in the *New Jerusalem*, the *Temple Scroll*, and the *War Scroll*, which include a description of a new eschatological temple and its cults. The *New Jerusalem* (2Q4; 4Q554; 4Q555; 5Q15; 11Q18) gives an extensive description of the New Jerusalem that God has readied in heaven. The writer of the *New Jerusalem* obviously had in mind Ezekiel's vision of the heavenly temple (Ezek 40-48) waiting to be manifested in the last days, because 5Q15 takes up where Ezek 40-48 leaves off, providing exact dimensions for buildings associated with the cult. An angel takes the anonymous seer on a tour of the city and

³¹ Stegemann categorizes these writings as pre-Essene works, which, however, were dear to the heart of the Essenes (Stegemann 1998, 95).

temple of the last days. 11Q18 describes the sacrificial cult in detail. Thus, “in the description of the New Jerusalem offered by the Qumran manuscripts, the portrayal of the eschatological temple—just as in Ezekiel—is a principal part of the book” (Stegemann 1998, 98).

The same concept of the heavenly temple is implied in the *Temple Scroll* (11Q19), which “implicitly claims to be a new revelation to a Mosaic figure who, like Moses, speaks with God face to face” (Wise 2000, 1173). Columns III-XXXVI of 1Q19 give detailed descriptions of the eschatological temple complex, often in the language of the tabernacle description from Exodus, in which the allusions to Moses’ vision of the heavenly temple occur dealing with the tabernacle. Of particular importance to us is the fact that neither the *New Jerusalem* nor the *Temple Scroll* describes a temple precisely like that of Solomon, which may indicate that the writers responsible for these manuscripts considered that the present sacrificial order is only provisional and imperfect, pointing to a more perfect sacrificial order in the new age (Ringgren 1963, 217). They were looking forward to the new age, in which a new Jerusalem with a new temple will be established with a new sacrificial cult. Thus, the New Jerusalem and its temple are characterized by perfect purity, unlike the present ones:

Your cities will be pure and [...] for ever. The city which I will sanctify, installing my name and my temple [within it] shall be holy and shall be clean from all types of impurity which could defile it. Everything that there is in it shall be pure and everything that goes into it shall be pure: wine, oil, all food and all drink shall be pure.... You shall not defile the city within which I shall install my name and my temple.... They shall not defile my temple with the skins of the sacrifices of their abominations which they sacrifice in their land. (11Q19 XLVII, 3-14)

Column XXIX of the *Temple Scroll* describes the eschatological temple, which God will sanctify and establish for ever: “They shall be for me a people and I will be for them for ever and I shall establish them for ever and always. I shall sanctify my temple

with my glory, for I shall make my glory reside over it until the day of creation, when I shall create my temple, establishing it for myself for ever, in accordance with the covenant which I made with Jacob at Bethel” (11Q19 XXIX, 8-9). The *War Scroll* includes the description of the new sacrificial cult in the new age:

They shall arrange the chiefs of the priests behind the High Priest and of his second (in rank), with twelve chiefs to serve in perpetuity before God. And the twenty-six chiefs of the divisions shall serve in their divisions and after them the chiefs of the levites to serve always, twelve, one per tribe. And the chiefs of their divisions shall each serve in their place. The chiefs of the tribes, and after them the fathers of the congregation, shall have charge of the sanctuary gates in perpetuity. And the chiefs of the divisions with their enlisted shall have charge of their feasts, their new moons and their Sabbaths and all the days of the year—those of fifty years and upwards, these shall have charge of the holocausts and the sacrifices, in order to prepare the pleasant incense for God’s approval, to atone for all his congregation and in order to grow fat in perpetuity before him at the table of his glory. (1QM II, 1-6)

The establishment of the new sacrificial cult is part of the national restoration of Israel. Column XII of the *War Scroll* describes the national restoration from the perspective of a holy war tradition:

Get up, hero,
Take your prisoners, glorious one,
Collect your spoil, worker of heroic deeds!
Place your hand on the neck of your foes
And your foot on the piles of the dead!
Strike the nations, your foes,
And may your sword consume guilty flesh!
Fill the land with glory
And your inheritance with blessing:
Herds of flocks in your fields,
Gold, silver, and precious stones in your palaces!
Rejoice, Sion, passionately!
Shine with jubilation, Jerusalem!
Exult, all the cities of Judah!
Open the gates for ever
So that the wealth of the nations can come in!
Their kings shall wait on you,
All your oppressors lie prone before you,
[And they shall lick] the dust [of your feet].
[Daughters] of my people, shout with jubilant voice!
Deck yourselves with splendid finery!
Rule over the government of ...
[...] Israel, in order to reign for ever.
(1QM XII, 10-18)

Thus, the establishment of the new temple will be part of God's redemptive plan for the restoration of the fortunes of Israel. In the new age, the temple will be perfect, unlike the present temple and its sacrificial order.

Eschatological Application to the Community

In the foregoing discussion, we examined three Qumran writings with regard to their eschatologizing of the OT sacrificial system and demonstrated that their authors considered the OT sacrificial system to be only provisional, pointing to the more perfect one in the new age. There is also another type of eschatologizing in the Qumran writings. While waiting for the new sacrificial order, the Qumran community may have considered itself as an earthly embodiment of this eschatological temple. This way of eschatologizing the temple and its cultus can be detected in the *Rule of the Community*, according to which the Qumran community now replaces the temple and its cultus:

“When these things exist in Israel the Community council shall be founded on truth, like an everlasting plantation, a holy house (בית קדש) for Israel and the foundation of the holy of holies (סוד קדש הקדשים) for Aaron, true witnesses for the judgment and chosen by the will (of God) to atone for the earth and to render the wicked their retribution.... It will be the most holy dwelling for Aaron with total knowledge of the covenant of justice and in order to offer a pleasant aroma; and it will be a house of perfection and truth in Israel ... in order to establish a covenant in compliance with the everlasting decrees. And these will be accepted in order to atone for the earth and to decide the judgment of the wicked.” (1QS 8:4-10)

At least three lines of supporting evidence point to the community's identification of itself as a true temple on earth. First, this can be seen in the use of particular expressions applied to the community, such as “everlasting plantation,” “a holy house,” “the foundation of the holy of holies,” and “the most holy dwelling for Aaron.” As will be seen, all four expressions refer to the temple (Vermes 1995, 56-57).

The last three expressions clearly refer to the temple. In the OT, בית קדש and קדש הקדשים (1QS 8:4) were used to refer to the temple (Isa 64:10; 1 Chr 29:2) and to its rear

compartment (1 Kgs 6:16; 7:50; 8:6; 2 Chr 3:8, 10; 4:22; 5:7; Ezek 41:4), into which the high priest could enter only once a year to offer the sin offering for the sins of the whole nation.

The connection of the expression “everlasting plantation” (8:4) with the temple is not that obvious at first glance, but there are three pieces of evidence that point to its connection with the temple: (1) Of the three expressions used to describe the community in 1QS 8:4, both the second (בית קדש) and the third (קדש הקדשים) clearly refer to the temple. Thus, it is very likely that the first (“everlasting plantation”) may also refer to the same. (2) As will be observed, the descriptions of the community in the passage, its atoning function in particular, point to the temple. (3) The expression “everlasting plantation” is used in the *Thanksgiving Hymns* with reference to the community that is an Eden of glory, fed by all the streams of Eden hedged in by the shining flames of fire (1QH^a 9:15; cf. Gen 3:24), just as the Garden of Eden was (Mansoor 1961, 154). The Paradise imagery was used to describe the temple in the OT and some Second Temple literature. In Ezekiel, we find the imagery of the Paradise river flowing from the right side of the temple with trees lined on its banks (Ezek 47:1-12; cf. Zech 14:8; Ps 46:5). According to Hayward, the tree imagery used by Ben Sirach with reference to the temple and its cultus (Sir 24:13, 14) is an extension of the imagery used by Ezekiel, which implies that Ben Sirach intended to portray “the temple as an earthly Eden that sends out the Paradise waters of Wisdom” (Hayward 1991, 24-26). The same is true of *Jubilees*, which portrays the temple as an earthly Eden (8:19): “And he [Noah] knew that the garden of Eden is the holy of holies, and the dwelling of the LORD, Mount Sinai (was) in the midst of the desert and Mount Zion (was) in the midst of the navel of the earth. The three of these

were created as holy places, one facing the other.” Based upon the three pieces of evidence, we conclude that the writer of *Rule of the Community* had the temple in mind when he called the community “everlasting plantation.”

Second, the community’s self-identification can be seen in its function, which took the place of the temple sacrifices (Stegemann 1998, 175-76):

Apart from the annual slaughtering of the Passover lambs on the fourteenth day of the first month, the Essenes’ only slaughter of animals for purpose of ritual worship was the slaughter and burning of the red heifer in conformity with Numbers 19:1-10. The ashes of this heifer served for the production of water of purification, which everyone needed who had come in contact with the dead. This ritual was bound neither to a fixed calendar date, nor to the participation of the high priest, nor to a burnt offering. Nor was it a sacrifice in the proper sense. Thus it could continue to be practiced by the Essenes without any problem in terms of detriment to the elements of their boycott.

Consequently, the verb כפר, “to atone,” which in the OT is especially connected with cultic atonement through bloody expiatory sacrifices, is used with reference to the result of the community’s existence and activity in general (1QS 5:6; 8:6, 10; 9:4; 11:14):

When these exist in Israel in accordance with these rules in order to establish the spirit of holiness in truth eternal, in order to atone for the fault of the transgression and for the guilt of sin and for approval for the earth, without the flesh of burnt offerings and without the fats of sacrifice—the offering of the lips in compliance with the decree will be like the pleasant aroma of justice and the correctness of behaviour will be acceptable like a freewill offering—at this moment the men of the Community shall set themselves apart (like) a holy house for Aaron, in order to enter the holy of holies, and (like) a house of the Community for Israel, (for) those who walk in perfection. (1QS 9:3-6)

They should make atonement for all who freely volunteer for holiness in Aaron and for the house of truth in Israel and for those being entered together for the Community for the lawsuit and for the judgment. (1QS 5:6)

As indicated in 1 QS 9:4, the community considered their daily local prayer services, liturgically correct according to pattern of the temple ritual, and their manner of life conducted in strict accordance with the Torah, to be an adequate equivalent for all of the sacrifices prescribed in the Torah (Stegemann 1998, 175). The righteous life led within the community brings atonement to the land (8:6-7; 10:4) and obtains atonement

for the fault of transgression and for the guilt of sin (1QS 9:4; 5:6; 8:6-10). The same idea is applied to atonement for the members of the community:

For, by the spirit of the true counsel concerning the paths of man *all his sins are atoned* so that he can look at the light of life. And by the spirit of holiness which links him with his truth he is *cleansed of all his sins*. And by the spirit of uprightness and of humility *his sin is atoned*. And by the compliance of his soul with all the laws of God his flesh is *cleansed* by being sprinkled with cleansing waters and being made *holy with the waters of repentance*. May he, then, steady his steps in order to walk with perfection on all the paths of God, conforming to all he has decreed concerning the regular times of his commands and not turn aside. (1QS 3:6-10)

With reference to the concept of atonement, four motifs can be detected in this passage: (1) the spirit (of the true counsel, of holiness, of uprightness, and of humility) as the means of atonement; (2) obedience to the laws of God, as interpreted by the community, as the means of atonement; (3) the blessing of divine forgiveness in terms of atonement and cleansing; and (4) the community as the realm where atonement is available.

This spiritualizing of cultic forgiveness is further confirmed by P. Garnet's study of the verb כפר at Qumran.³² Garnet concludes, "The verb 'atone' was largely used metaphorically.... The overtones of penal substitution, detectable in connection with Old Testament sacrificial atonement, are absent from the noncultic atonement passages at Qumran" (Garnet 1977, 119).

Third, the community resembles the temple not only because its rites are equivalent to the temple service, but also because priests are as prominent in the sect as in the temple (Flusser 1957, 231). The community is always called "for Aaron and ...for Israel" (1QS 5:6, 21-22; 8:5-6, 8-9; 9:6). This indicates the special position of the priests in the community, which is confirmed by direct statements about its organization: "In every place where there are ten men of the Community council, there should not be a

³² The Hebrew root כפר is used more frequently (25 times), either in Piel (1QS 2:8; 5:6; 8:6, 10; 9:4; 11:14; 1QSa 1:3; 4:37; 17:12; 2:13; 1QM 2:5) or Pual form (1QS 3:6, 8; 1Q22 3:11; 4:3) at Qumran.

priest missing amongst them” (6:3). Again, “This is the rule for the session of the Many. Each one by his rank: the priests will sit down first” (6:8). Thus, the priests are the leaders of the community as seen in every aspect of community life. The priests are those who lead the ceremonies for entrance into the community (1QS 1:18-2:18), bless the firstfruits of the bread and of the new wine at the common meals (6:4-6), and lead the community to the final battle as seen in the *War Scroll*, in which the high priest plays an important role, but priests in general are also mentioned as leaders in the battle.

The fact that the community identified itself as a true temple is very important to our study because the concepts of eschatological atonement and eschatological forgiveness are fused in the identity of the community as both a true temple and the eschatological new covenant community. As observed in the foregoing section, the phrase *הברית החדשה* is found several times in CD (6:19; 8:21; 19:33-34; 20:12) and once in *Peshar Habakkuk* (1QpHab 2:3), where *ברית* has to be supplied to fill in a lacuna before *חדשה*. As argued in the foregoing section, by calling the community “the New Covenant,” the author of CD (19:35) had Jer 31:31 in mind and considered the community as the fulfillment of the prophecy” (Ringgren 1963, 201; Cross 1995, 157; Bruce 1962-63, 220; Brownlee 1956/57, 16; Flusser 1957, 236). Thus, according to the Qumran community, both the Levitical sacrificial system and Jeremiah’s new covenant prophecies point to their community, the eschatological temple and the new covenant community.

Messianic Interpretation of the Fourth Servant Song of Isaiah

Finally, we find another type of eschatologization of the OT sacrifices in the Qumran literature. According to D. Barthélemy and Brownlee, there is textual evidence

in the Isaiah scroll that the Qumran covenanters interpreted the Fourth Servant song in Isa 52:13-53:12 messianically (Barthélemy 1950, 546-49; Brownlee 1953b, 10). The variant is found in 1QIsa^a 52:14, which may be translated “As many were astonished at you—I so *anointed* (משחתו) his appearance beyond any one (else), and his form beyond that of (other) sons of men.”³³ Barthélemy defended the reading of משחתו (“anointed”) for משחת (“marred”) on three grounds: (1) The grammatical construction (משח מן) finds its exact parallel in Ps 45:8. (2) With the reading משחת (“marred”) in the MT, the syntactical structure (כִּן → כִּן → כִּן) makes the meaning of the text unintelligible, but the reading “anoint” restores the syntactical relationship with the subsequent verse by making the difficult word “sprinkle” in the next verse intelligible. For the anointing of the Servant would indicate his consecration for the priestly office so that he could “sprinkle” others. Barthélemy finds the rationale for the anointing of the Servant in Lev 16:32, “The priest who is anointed and consecrated as priest in his father's place shall make atonement.” Thus, he identifies the Servant with the Priest-Messiah who is the founder of a universal covenant and whose role is identical to that of Moses in the Sinai covenant (Exod 24:8). (3) The variant reading, משחתו, removes a *hapax legomenon*, משחת, standing in a difficult grammatical construction.

The difference between משחתו in 1QIsa^a 52:14 and משחת in the MT is only one consonant. Brownlee argues that the variant reading cannot be correct since it is not suited to the context; rather, it is a pun on the word משחת (“marred”), which was made for the purpose of interpretation by adding a single yod (י). This is “the clearest case of textual alteration for the purpose of giving the Servant a messianic interpretation”

³³ This translation is adopted from Brownlee (Brownlee 1953b, 10).

(Brownlee 1953a, 11). With reference to the messianic interpretation of the passage, we find a parallel in *Tg. Isa.* 52:13: “Behold, my servant, the Messiah (משיחא).” Since *Tg. Isa.* 52-53 is not attested in the Qumran literature, it is difficult to say whether there was a link between the messianic interpretation in 1QIsa^a 52:14 and *Tg. Isa.* 52:13, but they probably reflect a common tradition that interpreted Isa 52:13-53:12 messianically. In the former case, a single letter is added, while in the latter the whole word משיחא is added.

The concept of vicarious atonement seen in the Levitical sacrificial system is applied to the suffering and death of the Servant (עֶבֶד in 53:10; also vv. 5-7, 11-12). Thus, we have here a clear example of the eschatologizing of the OT sacrifices in the person and the roles of the Servant of YHWH at Qumran.

Summary

In the foregoing discussion, we examined the Qumran literature with regard to the eschatologizing of the OT sacrifices, and identified three types of eschatologizing: (1) The description of an eschatological temple and its cult in the *New Jerusalem*, the *Temple Scroll*, and the *War Scroll* indicates that the present sacrificial order is only provisional, pointing to a more perfect sacrificial order on the last days. (2) The description of the community as a temple of God in the *Rule of the Community* and the *Thanksgiving Hymns* indicates the view that the community is an embodiment of the eschatological temple on earth with its spiritual sacrifices. (3) The variant reading found in the Isaiah scroll (1QIsa 52:14) indicates that the community may have interpreted the Fourth Servant Song (Isa 52:13-53:12) messianically.

Philo's Writings

In this section, we will examine Philo's interpretation of the OT sacrifices. Philo, together with the LXX, represents Hellenistic Judaism during the time of Jesus Christ and the early Christian church. Philo, usually referred to as Philo Judaeus, wrote of himself as an "old man" around the year A.D. 42/43, which suggests that he was born about 25 to 20 B.C. (Sandmel 1979, 3). Thus, Philo's lifetime overlapped that of Herod the Great, the rabbinic sages Hillel, Shammai, and Gamaliel (the latter mentioned in Acts), Jesus, and Paul. He lived in Alexandria and wrote in Greek. Hence, in both theological and linguistic respects, his works may provide valuable background information on Hellenistic Judaism during the time of Jesus and the apostles.

The importance of Philo to our study is primarily in his use of the term παράκλητος in his exposition of the holy vestures of the high priest (*Moses* 2.133; cf. *Spec. Laws* 1.97). The author of 1John applies the same word to the intercessory role of Christ as the heavenly advocate (1John 2:2; cf. Philo).

The Vicarious Role of the High Priest

According to Philo, the high priest represents the whole human race, or rather the whole world. In his exposition of the holy vestures of the high priest (*Spec. Laws* 1.97), Philo describes the high priest as one who intercedes before God on mankind's behalf. Furthermore, the high priest is described as one whose nature is midway between man and God, holding all these creatures together as represented by the holy vesture. In this sense, Philo seems to identify the high priest with the divine Logos (*Flight* 108-110). On the one hand, the high priest represents the world as seen in his holy vesture and his

vicarious function in the cultus. On the other hand, he represents the divine Logos, the bond that holds all these things together, which is represented in his person as the one who wears the vesture. The high priest exercises this role of divine Logos only once a year on the Day of Atonement by entering the Holy of Holies (*Giants* 52).

The Divine Logos as παράκλητος

When the high priest enters the Holy of Holies, the divine Logos also enters allegorically with him as his advocate. In *Moses* 2.133-134, Philo elaborates on this idea. He uses the word παράκλητος in the sense of “advocate,” one whose duty is to plead the case of the high priest to achieve divine forgiveness and receive divine gifts (Str-B 3.776):

Thus is the high priest arrayed when he sets forth to his holy duties, in order that when he enters to offer the ancestral prayers and sacrifices there may enter with him that whole universe, as signified in the types of it which he brings upon his person, the long robe a copy of the air, the pomegranate of water, the flower trimming of earth, the scarlet of fire, the ephod of heaven, the circular emeralds on the shoulder-tops with the six engravings in each of the two hemispheres which they resemble in form, the twelve stones on the breast in four rows of threes of the zodiac, the reason-seat of that Reason which holds together and administers all things. For he who has been consecrated to the Father of the world must needs have that Father’s Son with all His fullness of excellence to plead his cause (παρακλήτω), that sins may be remembered no more and good gifts showered in rich abundance. (*Moses* 2.133-134 [Colson, LCL])

In contrast, such scholars as Badt, Colson, and Grayston argue that the “Son” here refers to the world, based upon the immediate context and the identification of the world (κόσμος) as the Father’s son in two other places in Philo (*Spec. Laws* 1.96; *Unchangeable* 31) (Badt 1962, 329 n. 10; Colson 1929, 515 n. b; Grayston 1981, 73). However, in neither of these places is the world identified as an advocate. Rather, in one passage (*Spec. Laws* 1.96) the world was brought in with the high priest as his fellow-ministrant (συλλειτουργῆ) for the service of the Creator and Begetter, and in the other passage the world was called the younger son of God in comparison with the intelligible universe

who is the elder son. Here Philo uses the word *son* analogically to express the Creator-creature relationship. There is no personal and filial relationship involved in the sonship of the world to the Creator.

In addition, if we identify the Son with the world, it is not clear in what capacity the world (κόσμος) can be an advocate before God. In Philo, the word παράκλητος is never used with reference to impersonal, material creations, but only with reference to persons or personalized virtues.³⁴ Thus, it is most natural to identify the Son with the divine reason from its immediate context. In *Moses* 2.133, Reason (the divine Logos) is clearly identified as one who holds together and administers all things.

Another consideration is the particular language employed in relation to the Son in the passage. Philo describes the Son as “Father’s Son with all His fullness of excellence” (τελειοτάτῳ τῆν ἀρετὴν υἱῶ). The noun ἀρετὴ is reserved for the moral excellence or virtue of a person or God and the manifestation of divine power (BAG, 105-6). In the LXX, the word is used twice to translate γῆη (“glory”), in Hab 3:3 and Zech 6:10. Although the word ἀρετὴ is used some 800 times in Philo’s works, it is never used to refer to the world (κόσμος). This description of the Son’s highly exalted status fits only the divine Logos.

³⁴ The word παράκλητος is not attested in the LXX, although the cognate word παρακλήτωρ appears in Job 16:2 (where the versions of Aquila and Theodotus use παράκλητος). Philo provides the most ample usage of the term, and he uses it with two distinguishable meanings. Grayston states, “When παράκλητος, properly a verbal adjective equivalent to the passive participle παρακεκλημένος is used as a noun it indicates someone called in to help another person, either (a) by giving advice about a difficult decision, or (b) by giving support to someone making a claim, or settling a dispute, or rebutting a charge” (Grayston 1981, 72). The first meaning is used twice by Philo (*Creation* 23, 165), and the second meaning is used eight times by him (*Flacc.* 13, 22, 151, 181; *Joseph* 222-231, 238-240; *Rewards* 166-67; *Spec. Laws* 1.237). The word is used primarily for persons, except for two uses for personified virtues (*Rewards* 166-167; *Spec. Laws* 1.237), but not for impersonal things.

The divine Logos is also called the First-born Son by Philo (*Confusion* 145-147). Here we encounter three kinds of sonship: (1) the eternal sonship of the divine Logos in relation to the Father, (2) the sonship of the world in relation to the Creator, and (3) the mediate sonship of believers in relation to the Father. The sonship of the divine Logos involves the unique filial relationship between the Father and the Son, which is both eternal and personal. The Logos exists apart from the creation of the world. The appellations attached to the Logos, such as the Beginning, the Name of God, His Word, the Man after his image, and “he that sees” make the Logos almost equal to God himself. Only the Logos is God’s invisible image that is invested with divine status. This is a unique element of the sonship of the Logos. Elsewhere the Logos is also called the divine Word (λόγον θεῖον), who is immune from all unrighteousness, whether intentional or unintentional (*Flight* 108) and the supreme “Word of Him that IS” (τοῦ ὄντος λόγος in 110, 112).³⁵ The sonship of the Logos is both qualitatively and quantitatively different from both the sonship of the world and that of believers. In contrast to the sonship of the Logos, the sonship of the world simply refers to the Creator-creature relationship that is impersonal and temporal. It also differs from the sonship of believers in that the sonship of the Logos involves an immediate filial relationship with the Father, whereas the sonship of believers is a mediate relationship with the Father through the Logos, who is the true image of God. In other words, man’s sonship is only analogical to the sonship of the Logos. Since man’s soul was fashioned in the image of the divine image (the Logos),

³⁵ This idea of the sinlessness of the Son finds its parallel in 1John 3:5, “In him there is no sin.”

man is able to achieve the goal of religion, which is to be united with the Logos so that he may see God as the Logos sees him.³⁶

With regard to the son's identity in *Moses* 2.133, there is another factor to consider: the role of παράκλητος can be taken only by a very powerful person who has a favorable relationship with the injured party in order to propitiate him. In *Flaccus* (13, 22, 151, 181), the word παράκλητος is used four times in the context of palace intrigue. Flaccus, the anti-Semitic prefect of Alexandria, lost favor with the new emperor Gaius, who executed Macro, Flaccus's παράκλητος; thus, Flaccus needed a very powerful παράκλητος to propitiate Gaius. The situation is similar in *Joseph* 222-240, where παράκλητος is employed in the same sense. Joseph, the governor of Egypt, tests his brothers by putting his silver cup in Benjamin's sack (Gen 44:2), and condemns him to slavery for stealing his cup. Judah pleads for Benjamin, whom he pledged to restore to his father. The only solution to save Benjamin is to propitiate the governor, so Judah offers himself to be enslaved in place of Benjamin. On all these grounds, Joseph is now convinced that there was no conspiracy to undo his mother's family; so, he discloses himself to his brothers: "The brother whom you sold into Egypt is I myself, whom you see.... *I forgive you and forget all what you did to me. Do not ask for any other advocate (παράκλητος). Of my own free, unbidden judgement I have voluntarily come to make my peace with you*" (*Joseph* 238-40 [Colson, LCL]).

³⁶ Philo's distinction between the sonship of believers and the sonship of the Logos is similar to what is seen in the NT (1John 3:1-2), but differs in two major respects: (1) In the NT, both Gen 1:26-27 and Gen 2:7 represent the same event. (2) In the NT, the divine Logos is said to have taken human form in the person of Jesus Christ (1John 2:22; 4:2). The primary contention between the author of 1John and his opponents seems to pertain to the incarnate nature of the Son, who is the divine Logos (1John 1:1-3).

Philo uses the same language with respect to human relationships with God. In *Rewards* 166-167, he states that the Jews have three intercessors (παράκλητοι) to plead for their reconciliation with the Father: God's clemency and kindness, the holiness of the founders of the race, and the reformation working in penitents. Philo also uses the word in *Spec. Laws* 1.237, in his exposition of Lev 6:2-7 concerning the guilt offering. A deliberate offender is required to propitiate the injured person by making restitution and paying a fine of an additional fifth; then, he must proceed to the temple to ask for the remission of his sins, taking with him as his irreproachable advocate (παράκλητος) the soul-felt conviction that has saved him from a fatal disaster. This soul-felt conviction seems to correspond to the third advocate mentioned in *Rewards* 166-167. Significantly, the advocates mentioned on these two occasions are personified virtues, which, according to Philo, pertain to the Logos. Sandmel suggests, "Since the Logos is the totality of archetypal ideas, Logos as 'reason' has some synonyms; for example, virtue, wisdom, and pure philosophy" (Sandmel 1979, 96) (cf. Philo, *Creation* 25).

Thus, the divine Logos satisfies both definitions of an advocate: (1) In a royal household, he is a powerful advocate who has favorable relations with the Ruler of all; in this way, he can propitiate God so that the sins of the culprits may be forgiven and their fellowship with God may be restored. He is none other than the First-born Son of the Father. (2) Before the throne of God, he is the one who is the totality of all virtues.

Finally, with reference to the question of the son's identity in *Moses* 2.133, there is another passage to consider. Philo gives a rationale for an injunction against eating the meat of the sin offerings on the Day of Atonement; he states, "For there is no one superior to the high priest or the nation to act as intercessor (παραιτητής) for the sinners"

(*Spec. Laws* 1.244 [Colson, LCL]). This passage employs *παραιτητής* instead of *παράκλητος*, but they are used synonymously here.³⁷ If there is no one superior to the high priest as an intercessor, who can act as his intercessor? “Man is the borderland between mortal and immortal nature, partaking of each so far as is needful, and that he was created at once mortal and immortal, mortal in respect of the body, but in respect of the mind immortal” (*Creation* 135 [Colson, LCL]). There is no man superior to the high priest. The world, the material universe, is inferior to man. The divine Logos is immortal. He is God’s First-born, the Word, who holds the eldership among the angels—their ruler, as it were. His names are the Beginning, the Name of God, his Word, the Man after his image, and “he that sees” (*Confusion* 146 [Colson/ Whitaker, LCL]). It is beyond doubt that the Logos is superior to the high priest; thus, he is capable of acting as an intercessor for the high priest.

We conclude, then, that the Son in *Moses* 2.133 can only be the divine Logos.

According to Philo, the fact that the high priest enters the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement with the blood of the sin offering for forgiveness of the sins of the whole world typifies a scene in the heavenly court (in the realm of pure intellect), where the

³⁷ The word *παραιτητής* in the singular is used once more in *On the Life of Moses*: “Struck with dismay, and compelled to believe the incredible tale, he yet took the part of mediator (*μεσίτης*) and reconciler (*διαλλακτής*) and did not hurry away at once, but first made prayers and supplications, begging that their sins might be forgiven. Then, when this protector (*κηδεμών*) and intercessor (*παραιτητής*) had softened the wrath of the Ruler, he wended his way back in mingled joy and dejection” (2.166 [Colson, LCL]). Moses here acts as an intercessor for the people of Israel after they have committed idolatry by worshiping the golden calf, and his function as an intercessor is the same as that of a *παράκλητος*. Moses propitiates the wrath of the Ruler, YHWH, with prayer and supplications, begging that their sins might be forgiven. The word *παραιτητής* appears twice in the plural in Philo’s works and the meaning remains the same: “Widows who have none to intervene on their behalf (*παραιτητάς*), neither husbands from whom they have been parted, nor fathers whom they left behind them . . .” (*Spec. Laws* 2.25 [Colson, LCL]). “It is the will of the ruler of all that though there be some *doomed to punishment* for their intolerable misdeeds, they should have *mediators* (*παραιτητάς*) to make intercession for them, who imitating the merciful power of the Father will dispense punishment with more moderation and in a kindlier spirit. Beneficence is the peculiar prerogative of a god” (*Names* 129 [Colson, LCL]).

Logos, as an advocate of the high priest, enters to propitiate the Father with supplication and intercession, so that the Father may grant forgiveness of sins and give gifts to those whom the Logos represents.

Eschatologizing of the OT Sacrifices in the LXX

In the foregoing discussion, we demonstrated that Philo interpreted the OT sacrificial order to mean something that is in the intellectual world.

In this section, we will examine the Fourth Servant Song in the LXX (Isa 52:13-53:12 LXX) and demonstrate its eschatological interpretation of the OT sacrifices.³⁸ The LXX Isaiah is known for its tendency to contemporize the old biblical text and revive it by instilling it with the religious conceptions of a new age, in which the translator thought he was living (Seeligmann 1948, 7). Seeligmann goes so far as to say that “he combined freedom amounting to license towards his text, with a tendency to put his own interpretation upon it” (Seeligmann 1948, 95). Seeligmann supports Ziegler’s view that “the translation gives free renderings of Hebrew parables and figures of speech; the license which the translator has taken in some cases goes so far that he allows himself to be carried away by some notion of his own, and under its spell to formulate a version not based upon the words of the Hebrew text at all. It is partly on account of this that, in a number of passages which in the Hebrew text are completely different from each other, the translator has used the same wording in the Greek translation” (Seeligmann 1948, 7; Ziegler 1934, 80).

³⁸ It is very difficult to establish the Hebrew text that the LXX translator had before him. In contrast, the Qumran Isaiah scroll proved the antiquity of the MT. Thus, our chief source of knowledge regarding the LXX translator’s tendency will be the discrepancies between the LXX and the MT.

As observed in the foregoing discussion, the presence of a variant reading in 1QIsa^a 52:14 may indicate that the Servant of YHWH was identified with the future Messiah. We find the same phenomenon in the LXX rendering of the Fourth Servant Song. The LXX messianically interprets the Servant (Zimmerli 1967, 676-77; Seeligmann 1948, 119).

First, the LXX makes it more explicit that the role of the Servant is primarily to restore the remnant of Israel. This is obvious in the Second Servant Song (Isa 49:1-6) in particular:

The MT of Isa 49:6

He says, “It is too light a thing (לְקָטָן) that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the survivors of Israel; I will give you as a light to the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth.”

The LXX of Isa 49:6

And he said to me, “It is a great thing for thee to be called my servant, to establish the tribes of Jacob, and to recover the dispersion of Israel:³⁹ behold I have given thee for the covenant of a race (εἰς διαθήκην γένους), for a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation (τοῦ εἰναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν) to the end of the earth.”

We find here that the primary emphasis is on the role of the Servant in restoring the fortunes of Israel, which the LXX makes more explicit than the MT. Two observations are in order from the interpretive paraphrase of the LXX: (1) The LXX reverses the emphasis of the Servant’s ministry from his mission to the Gentiles to his mission to Israel by adding εἰς διαθήκην γένους (“the covenant of a race”).⁴⁰ The LXX translates the same Hebrew phrase עַם בְּרִיתָא differently in 49:8 as εἰς διαθήκην ἔθνων,

³⁹ The LXX agrees with the Targum, which reads לְקָטָן in an interrogative sense: הוֹעִיר לְכֵן, “Do ye regard it a small thing...?” Thus, both the LXX and the Targum may have read לְקָטָן אִם in place of the MT לְקָטָן.

⁴⁰ Against the majority reading, both Codex Alexandrianus (A) and Codex Marchalianus (Q) do not have this phrase; thus agreeing with the MT. Ziegler argues that this insertion came from Isa 42:6.

which clearly indicates that the LXX translator identified עַמּוֹת with the nations, but in Isa 42:6, the LXX translator deliberately chose εἰς διαθήκη γένους, which indicates that he identified עַמּוֹת with the people of Israel (or more probably the remnant). According to Ziegler, there is a reciprocal relationship between Isa 42:6 and 49:6-8 in the LXX as well as in the MT (Ziegler 1934, 76). In my view, this interpretive addition reflects the translator's particular emphasis: the Servant's mission starts from Israel. The LXX translator's top priority was the restoration of Israel. (2) The LXX makes a stylistic change in the last clause: τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς. Thus, the LXX makes it clearer by attributing all three salvific roles to the Servant: the covenant of a race, a light to the Gentiles, and salvation to the end of the earth.

Second, in his rendering of the Hebrew text, the LXX translator seems to have deliberately chosen Greek words with a messianic connotation, such as δόξα (52:13; 53:2) and παιδίον (53:2) (Zimmerli 1967, 676-77). Compare the LXX text with the MT:⁴¹

Verse	The LXX	The MT
52:13	καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα	וְנִבְּחָה מְאֹד
52:14	ὄν τρόπον ἐκστήσονται οὕτως ἀδοξήσει ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων τὸ εἶδος σου καὶ ἡ δόξα σου ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων	כְּמִשְׁחַת מַאִישׁ מִרְאֵהוּ וְתִאֲרֹו מִבְּנֵי אָדָם כְּאִשֶׁר שָׁמְמוּ....
53:2	ὡς παιδίον ὡς ῥίζα ἐν γῆ διψώση οὐκ ἔστιν εἶδος αὐτῷ οὐδὲ δόξα	כִּי־וְנָק לְפָנָי וְכִשְׁרָשׁ מֵאֲרֶץ צֶדֶק לֹא־תֵאָר לֹו לֹא הָדָר

Zimmerli identifies two key words that bear the fundamental mark of messianic interpretation. The first is the recurring key word δόξα (52:13, 14b, c; 53:2), for which we

⁴¹ Refer to Ziegler's list for the variants in the LXX text of the Fourth Servant Song (Ziegler 1934, 24-25).

do not find a real Hebrew equivalent in the passages. The second is the rendering of Hebrew קָנִי of 53:2 with παιδίον that is familiar from the messianic statement in 9:5 and parallel to the correctly rendered ῥίζα, also reminiscent of the messianic 11:1. This tendency of the LXX translator is also seen in *Targum Isaiah*. In 52:13, the Servant is expressly identified with the Messiah—“Behold, my Servant the Messiah shall prosper.” Moreover, the Targum identifies the Servant in 53:1 with the Messiah, as does 53:10. It is clear that the Targum understands the whole of 52:13-53:12 to relate to the Messiah.⁴²

Third, the LXX translator emphasizes the vicarious nature of the Servant’s suffering for “our sins” by his interpretive choice of the Greek words and phrases:

Verse	The LXX	The MT
53:4	τὰς ἁμαρτίας...φέρει	קָלִינוּ...נָשָׂא
v. 11	τὰς ἁμαρτίας...ἀνοίσει	וְעֹנְתָם יִסְבֵּל
v. 12	ἁμαρτίας...ἀνήγειρεν	חָטָא...נָשָׂא

⁴² The characteristics of the Servant’s messianic mission correspond to the contemporary expectation of late Judaism in the Talmudic era. The Servant’s messianic mission combines the roles of all three anointed offices: (1) He is described as a kingly Messiah, who will deliver his people from bondage and rebuild the sanctuary, and will bring judgment upon the nations that have persecuted his people (52:15; 53:5, 8-12). For this end, the targumist employs a variety of exegetical techniques, including adding interpretive words. *Tg. Isa.* 53:5a, והוא יבנה בית מקדשא, “he shall build the sanctuary” is inserted from Zech 6:13 (וְהוּא יִבְנֶה אֶת-הַיְבֵלָה), based upon a common theme of Messiah’s ministry. The result of this insertion is that suffering is transferred to the sanctuary. Thus, the beneficiaries of the Servant’s messianic mission are limited primarily to Israelites, and the nations are consistently described as evil and wicked. The Servant is almost drastically changed from a vicarious sufferer to the majestic ruler and savior of his people. To achieve this shift, all the sufferings are distributed elsewhere. The sufferings may fall on Israel (52:14; 53:8, 10, 11) or on the Gentiles (53:3, 9). The statements that express the Servant’s vicarious sufferings were either paraphrased with noncultic expressions or removed completely. (2) The Servant is also described as a priestly Messiah, who will make intercession for the sins of his people and obtain divine forgiveness for them (53:4, 11, 12). (3) The Servant is described as a prophetic Messiah, who will teach the law (53:5) and subject many to the law (53:11, 12). A great emphasis is placed on the law and the Servant’s teaching office in his mission, without warrant from the Hebrew text. Divine restoration will be the result of the Servant’s teaching; divine forgiveness will also be the result of their devotion to his teaching (53:5), and those that perform the law of YHWH will prosper in his good pleasure (v. 10). The Servant’s mission to the nations is described in terms of his teaching office. By his wisdom, the Servant will justify the just (i.e., those who submit to the law) in order to subject many to the law (v. 11), and he has subjected many to the law (v. 12).

The Greek word ἁμαρτία is used here to render three different Hebrew words.⁴³ Of particular importance to us is the fact that מַלְטָה is rendered as τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν (v. 4), which indicates that the LXX translator understood sickness in v. 4 as a metaphor for sin (Stamm 1940, 83-84). Williams, following Euler, tries to deny the authenticity of this reading based upon the deviational reading in Matt 8:17 (Williams 1975, 113; Euler 1934, 59-62). This so-called deviational reading presupposes that Matthew is quoting strictly from the LXX. This argument, however, ignores the textual diversity in Matthew, as argued by Allison (Davies and Allison 1988, 45): (1) Matthew makes the Markan allusion closer to the LXX in some passages (3:16; 17:11; 26:3-4, 64; 27:35, 46b). (2) Matthew is closer to the MT against the LXX in passages such as 24:21, 29, 31; 26:28. (3) In some cases, Matthew is closer to targumic or other Jewish traditions (22:24; 24:31). This phenomenon leads Allison to conclude that Matthew could read the Scriptures in their original language. As argued by Gundry, therefore, Matt 8:17 may be the result of Matthew's independent translation from the Hebrew text in order to make the quotation apply to physical maladies of Jesus' healing (Gundry 1982, 150). The phrase τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν (Isa 53:4) is clearly an interpretive rendering because the

⁴³ As far as the terms for sin are concerned, ἁμαρτία and ἀνομία are the two dominant Greek nouns. In Isa 53, ἁμαρτία is used to render a variety of Hebrew nouns, such as נַפְשׁ (vv. 6, 11), עֲוֹן (v. 5), חַטָּאת (v. 4), and מַלְטָה (v. 10), and ἀνομία is used for נַפְשׁ (v. 5), עֲוֹן (vv. 8, 12), and חַטָּאת (v. 9). ἁμαρτία is the primary noun used in Isaiah to translate נַפְשׁ (1:4; 5:18; 13:11; 22:14; 30:13; 33:24; 50:1; 53:5, 6, 11; 59:3; 64:6, 8; 65:7) and מַלְטָה (1:18; 38:17; 43:24; 44:22; 59:2, 12), while ἀνομία is used for עֲוֹן (24:20; 43:25; 44:22; 50:1; 59:12), but the two Greek nouns are used for a variety of terms, thus blurring the boundary between them. Four observations are in order regarding the LXX Isaiah's use of the terms for sin: (1) ἁμαρτία became the favorite term for sin, translating a variety of Hebrew nouns whose precise connotations are no longer preserved in the LXX. The word ἁμαρτία seems to have gained popularity in the early church as a substitute for other Greek nouns for sin, such as ἀνομία (1 Pet 2:22). (2) The LXX renders מַלְטָה with περὶ ἁμαρτίας (53:10). (3) The two nouns ἁμαρτία and ἀνομία are used interchangeably in Isa 53, and either of the two can render the same Hebrew nouns. (4) ἁμαρτία is used to render חַטָּאת (53:4).

same Hebrew noun *לְחֻלָּי* is rendered literally as *τῆς πληγῆς* in v. 10. The LXX agrees with *Targum Isaiah* in its handling of illnesses as transgressions:⁴⁴

Isa 53:4a MT	<i>Tg. Isa. 53:4^a</i>
אָכַן חָלִינֵנוּ הוּא נֶשֶׂא	בְּכִין עַל חוֹבָנָא הוּא יַבְעוּ
“Surely he has borne our infirmities”	“Then he shall pray on behalf of our transgressions”
וּמְכַאֲבֵינוּ סְבָלָם	וְעוֹתָנָא בְּדִלְיָהּ יִשְׁתַּבֵּן
“and carried our diseases.”	“and our iniquities shall be pardoned for his sake.”

The Targum treats infirmities and diseases in the Hebrew text as transgressions and iniquities, which seems to reflect an old Jewish tradition that is probably pre-Christian. This understanding of illness as sin is also found in Mark 4:12, which follows *Tg. Isa. 6:10*, which implies the antiquity of the tradition (Manson 1967, 78; Black 1967, 213-14). The last clause of Mark 4:12 has *ἀφ'εθῆ αὐτοῖς* against the LXX *ιάσομαι αὐτούς*. The Markan rendering is an exact translation of *Targum Isaiah's* *וַיִּשְׁתַּבֵּי לְהוֹן*. This interpretation of illnesses as sins in the early church may underlie 1 Peter 2:24, *ὅς τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, ἵνα ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν, οὐ τῷ μώλωπι ἰάθητε* (Seidelin 1936, 212 n. 55). The Targum tends to give an explanatory paraphrase for the passages, which it understands as figurative, but are not explicitly expressed as figurative by prepositions such as “like” or “as” (Stenning 1953, xiii). Similarly, the LXX translator makes more explicit the idea of the vicarious suffering that is already presented in figurative language in the MT (Ziegler 1934, 80-81).

⁴⁴ The consonantal texts of the Targums are from the A. Sperber and A. Berliner edition (Sperber 1959-73). The English translation of the Targum Isaiah is by Stenning (Stenning 1953).

Fourth, the LXX translator makes it clear that the suffering of the Servant involves his death, choosing the interpretive *παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν* for the Hebrew *בו הפגיע* in 53:6. The emphasis of the LXX on the death of the Servant can be detected in other verses too:

Verse	LXX	MT
53:6	<i>παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν</i>	<i>הפגיע בו</i>
v. 12	<i>παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον...παρεδόθη</i>	<i>הערה למות... הפגיע</i>
v. 7	<i>ἐπὶ σφαγῆν ἤχθη</i>	<i>למבח יוקל</i>
v. 8	<i>ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον</i>	<i>נגע למו</i>

The LXX translator chose the Greek verb *παραδίδωμι* and the verb *ἄγω*, each rendering two different Hebrew verbs. In particular, the LXX translator’s use of the verb *παραδίδωμι* shows his tendency to use the word when he encounters an interpretive difficulty and to avoid the notion that God “struck” the Servant.

Eschatologizing in the Righteous Martyrdom Traditions

In the foregoing discussion, we demonstrated that both the presence of a variant reading in 1QIsa^a 52:14 at Qumran and the LXX rendering of the Fourth Servant Song (Isa 52:13-53:12) indicate that the first century Jews not uncommonly understood the Servant as one who will effect eschatological forgiveness for Israel. This way of applying the cultic concept of atonement to the righteous martyrs is still retained in the Second Temple writings such as Dan 3:38-40 LXX and *4 Maccabees*, which are in continuity with both the OT and the later rabbinic literature in their application of the Levitical atoning sacrifices to the death of the righteous (y. *Sanhedrin 30c*; *Sifre Deuteronomy 140a*; y. *Yoma 38b*; b. *Berakoth 62b*). We will look at several examples.

Dan 3:38-40 LXX

The first example comes from Dan 3:38-40 LXX, which is a penitential prayer that was originally composed in Hebrew and was inserted by an unknown author into the Greek additions to Daniel (Eissfeldt 1965, 589-90).⁴⁵ Van Henten dates it from the second half of the second century B.C., since the allusions to historical events in 3:28-32 can best be explained against the background of the repression of Antiochus IV in Jerusalem (Van Henten 1993, 111).

The writer of Dan 3:38-40 LXX describes the role of the would-be martyrs as an alternative sacrifice for the eschatological forgiveness of Israel. There are two lines of evidence that support this argument. First, the eschatological restoration of Israel provides the context of prayer. Prominent in this prayer (3:26-45) are the Deuteronomistic view of their history (cf. Bar 1:15-2:35; *Jub.* 1:5) and the hope for future reconciliation between God and his people. The prayer begins with doxology (Dan 3:26-27 LXX), followed by confession of national sin (vv. 28-30), contrite recognition of Israel's disobedience to divine law, redemptive punishment at the hand of YHWH (vv. 31-33; 37-38), and appeals for divine forgiveness and salvation for the sake of the covenant and their forefathers (vv. 34-35).

Second, the prayer focuses on the role of the would-be martyrs as an alternative sacrifice. In the LXX, the three men state that the temple cult no longer functions (v. 38) and hint at a symbolic or an alternative offering (vv. 39-40) (Van Henten 1993, 111-12). They offer themselves "as though it were with burnt offerings (ὡς ἐν ὀλοκαυτώμασι) of

⁴⁵ According to the LXX, this penitential prayer was spoken by all three men in the fiery furnace, whereas it was spoken by Azariah in the Theodotion version.

rams and bulls, or with (ὡς ἑν) tens of thousands of fat lambs; such may our sacrifice (θυσία) be in your sight today, to bring about atonement with you (καὶ ἐξιλάσαι ὀπισθέν σου)” (Dan 3:39-40 LXX; cf. Mic 6:7; Isa 53). Van Henten finds in the LXX text of Dan 3:39 allusion to the rhetorical question in Mic 6:7, “Will the LORD be pleased with thousands of rams, with ten thousands of rivers of oil [or: fat lambs]?” From this, van Henten draws his conclusion: “It indicates something which should function as a replacement of the offerings of the temple cult.” Certainly enough similarities are found between Dan 3:39 LXX and Mic 6:7 to support van Henten’s argument. In fact, we do not even have to appeal to Mic 6:7 for the concept of the alternative offering in Dan 3:39-40 LXX. The cultic context is clear enough to show that the concept of cultic vicarious atonement was applied to the three innocent martyrs’ self-sacrifice. This observation is important to our study because it presupposes the belief that atonement could be brought about by the sacrificial death of a mediator (Van Henten 1997, 163).

4 Maccabees

In the foregoing discussion, we examined Dan 3:38-40 LXX and demonstrated that it applies sacrificial language to the innocent death of the righteous martyrs in the context of the future reconciliation between God and his people. Next we will consider selected passages from *4 Maccabees*, in which the concept of vicarious atonement is expressed explicitly. The dating of *4 Maccabees* is disputed. Williams dates it as written during the Second Temple period (Williams 1975, 230). Internal evidences, such as the statements concerning Onias’s life tenure and the temple service (4:1-14), point to a date between 63 B.C. and A.D. 70 for the book. H. Anderson seems to agree with E.

Bickermann's more precise dating between A.D. 18 and 55, based upon linguistic evidence (Anderson 1985, 533). Van Henten and de Jonge, on the other hand, say it was probably written near the end of the first century A.D. (Van Henten 1997, 82; de Jonge 1998, 27). The earlier dating seems to be more probable if we assume a literary connection between the use of the term ἰλαστήριον in Rom 3:24 and 4 *Macc.* 17:22, which is certainly possible. Even though its dating may be relatively late, the book is still useful for our investigation here because the terms and ideas used in it may be older than the writing itself (de Jonge 1998, 28 n. 22).

We will examine the two passages in 4 *Maccabees* (6:27-29; 17:21-22). The first passage is an intercessory prayer by Eleazer before his death: "You know, O God, that though I might have saved myself, I am dying in burning torments for the sake of the law. Be merciful (ἴλεως γενοῦ) to your people, and let our punishment *be a satisfaction* for them (ἀρκεσθεὶς τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δίκη). Make my blood their purification (καθάρσιον), and take my life *as a ransom* for theirs (ἀντίψυχον αὐτῶν)."⁴⁶

In this passage, the author of 4 *Maccabees* applies the cultic concept of atonement to the death of Eleazer. Two observations are in order. First, the sufferings and death of the righteous martyrs are clearly understood as vicarious sacrifices that atone for the sins of the people of Israel (Anderson 1985, 539).

Second, the author does so by setting Eleazer's death in the context of the salvation history of the Jewish people. The passage presupposes the Deuteronomistic view of Jewish history: divine election of Israel, the covenant, Israel's disobedience to

⁴⁶ Italics are for emphasis.

the divine law, and redemptive punishment at the hand of YHWH. Thus, the death of Eleazer has eschatological importance in the future reconciliation of the Jews with God.

4 Macc. 17:21-22 also applies sacrificial terms to the death of the righteous martyrs: “The tyrant was punished, and *the homeland purified* (καθαρισθῆναι)—they having become, as it were, a *ransom for the sin* of our *nation* (ἀντίψυχον γεγονότας τῆς τοῦ ἔθνους ἀμαρτίας). And through the *blood* of those devout ones and their death as an *atonement sacrifice* (τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου τοῦ θανάτου αὐτῶν), divine Providence preserved Israel that previously had been mistreated.”

4 Maccabees uses sacrificial language in a way that is strongly reminiscent of both Levitical expiatory sacrifices and the role of the Servant of God in Isa 53.⁴⁷ *4 Macc.* 17:22 uses ἱλαστήριον for the Maccabean martyrs’ death, whereas Paul uses the same word for the atoning death of Christ. In Rom 3:24-25, Christ is described as one “whom God put forward as a sacrifice of atonement (ἱλαστήριον) by his blood, effective through faith.” The word is used by the LXX in rendering Hebrew קָרָבָן where YHWH will meet Moses (Exod 25:20). In the ritual on the Day of Atonement, the high priest enters the Holy of Holies and sprinkles the קָרָבָן with the blood of the sin offering in order to atone for the sins of the people of Israel (Lev 16:14). Thus, Paul’s use of the word ἱλαστήριον in connection with the atoning power of Christ’s blood strongly alludes to the rite performed in the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement (Hengel 1981, 44; Janowski 1982, 242-44).

The Maccabean martyrs’ death was described in the same language as Rom 3:25 in *4 Macc.* 17:22: “... and *the homeland purified* (καθαρισθῆναι).... And through the

⁴⁷ Cf. the combination of αἷμα, καθαρίζω etc. and ἐξιλάσκομαι in Exod 30:10; Lev 8:15; 12:7; 16:15-16, 19-20 (Van Henten 1993, 124 n. 2).

blood (διὰ τοῦ αἵματος) of those devout ones and their death as an *atonement sacrifice* (τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου τοῦ θανάτου αὐτῶν), divine Providence preserved Israel that previously had been mistreated.”

Moreover, there are numerous correspondences between the sacrificial language in *4 Maccabees* and Isa 53. Both typologically apply the Levitical expiatory offerings, especially the sin offering on the Day of Atonement, to the death of innocent martyrs for the sins of the nation. The common motifs include divine forgiveness (*4 Macc.* 28; Isa 53:5), divine satisfaction for the martyrs’ sacrifice (*4 Macc.* 6:28; Isa 53:11), the purifying power of their death (*4 Macc.* 6:29; 1:11; Isa 53:9-11; cf. Lev 16:30), ransom (*4 Macc.* 6:29; 17:21; Isa 53:9-11; cf. Lev 17:11 LXX ἀντὶ τῆς ψυχῆς), and voluntary sacrifice. Furthermore, both mention the vindication of the martyrs with life (*4 Macc.* 18:6-19; Isa 53:11).

Thus, we find at least two Second Temple writings that apply the cultic concept of atonement to the death of martyrs. In particular, these Second Temple writings combine the two related elements of the Mosaic covenant: (1) the Deuteronomistic view of the history of Israel and eschatological forgiveness (Deut 28; Lev 26), and (2) the concept of the Levitical atoning sacrifices as a means of removing the sins of the Israelites to restore the covenant relationship between God and his people. The combination of these two elements in these writings seems to indicate that the sacrificial system was understood by some Jews as a type for the great eschatological redemption promised in Deut 28 and Lev 26.

Summary of Part 1

In part 1, we have examined how the expectations of forgiveness and atonement were expressed in the OT and developed in the Second Temple literature. In chapter 1, we examined the relevant passages in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, and the Second Temple literature, with regard to the expectation of forgiveness. In the Second Temple literature, we paid particular attention to the Qumran literature and the passages in Baruch and *Jubilees* that explicitly connect divine forgiveness with covenant renewal. Our examination of these writings demonstrated: (1) that these OT prophets eschatologized the concept of divine forgiveness by identifying it with the return from exile and the reestablishment of the Jewish nation; and (2) that this eschatologizing of forgiveness is further developed in Second Temple literature.

Two observations were made from the Qumran literature: (1) the community at Qumran spiritualized the national and corporate hopes of Israel by identifying the true Israel not with the biblical Israel, but with the spiritual descendents of Abraham, who have kept God's precepts (CD 3:2-20; 7:12-13).⁴⁸ (2) The Qumran community considered Jeremiah's new covenant prophecy to be fulfilled in the history of their own times or in the inner life of the community by identifying itself with the new covenant community, where the gifts of divine forgiveness and eternal life were available.

These two observations are important because the author of 1John also applies the concept of eschatological forgiveness developed in Jeremiah to the divine forgiveness realized in the Christian community (1John 2:12). Like the Qumran community, the author of 1John identifies the true Israel, not with biblical Israel, but with spiritual Israel

⁴⁸ However, according to the community, the "true" Israelites are a subset of physical Israel (hence a remnant), not an overlapping set as in the NT.

represented by his Christian community. According to 1John, it is faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to the new commandment (of brotherly love) that separate children of God from children of the devil.

Chapter 2 dealt with the expectation of atonement. We first examined the OT passages dealing with the Levitical sacrifices in order to establish the context of eschatological atonement. We then examined the Qumran literature with regard to its eschatologizing of the concept of atonement. The Qumran literature is significant to our study in three aspects: (1) The Qumran community eschatologized the concept of atonement by envisaging the new temple and its cultus in the new age. This way of eschatologizing the sacrificial order implies that the present sacrificial order is only provisional, pointing to a more perfect sacrificial order in the last days. (2) The community identified itself with the eschatological new covenant community, representing a true temple with its spiritual sacrifices, in which divine forgiveness is available. (3) The community identified the Servant of YHWH in the Fourth Servant Song with the future Messiah.

All three elements find parallels in 1John: (1) As in the Qumran community, 1John's application of sacrificial terms to Christ's death (1:7; 2:2; 4:10) presupposes the belief that the Levitical sacrificial order was provisional, pointing to the perfect sacrifice of the Son of God in the last days. (2) Like the Qumran community, 1John's Christian community is described as the new covenant community, in which divine forgiveness is available (2:12-14). (3) 1John's use of the title "Christ" clearly points to Jesus' messiahship (2:22; 5:1).

We then examined Philo's use of the term παράκλητος in relation with the role of the high priest on the Day of Atonement. According to Philo, the Son (the divine Logos) is an advocate (παράκλητος) of the high priest before the Father when the high priest enters the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement (*Moses* 2.133-134). This picture of παράκλητος partially corresponds to the role of Jesus Christ the Son as an advocate (παράκλητος) for the believers before the Father (1John 2:1).

We then examined the interpretive rendering of the Fourth Servant Song in the LXX with regard to its eschatological interpretation of the OT sacrifices. Our examination of the LXX text demonstrated that the LXX eschatologizes the OT sacrifices by identifying the Servant with a messianic figure who will suffer and die vicariously for the sins of others. This picture of the Servant closely corresponds to that of Jesus Christ in 1John. According to 1John, the Son is the Savior of the world in terms of his atoning sacrifice (4:10, 14). As will be discussed in chapter 4, the title "Savior of the world" is closely related to the messianic ministry of the Son of God in 1John. 1John's choice of the particular term "the Savior of the world" is influenced by the universal implication of the atoning sacrifice of Jesus, which, however, is identical to his role as the Messiah.

Finally, we examined certain Second Temple writings (Dan 3:38-40 LXX and 4 *Maccabees*) and demonstrated that these writings apply the cultic concept of atonement to righteous martyrs in the context of the future restoration of the covenant relationship between God and his people. The concept that atonement could be brought about by the sacrificial death of a mediator is also found in 1John's interpretation of the death of Christ as atoning sacrifice.

PART 2
TWO TRADITIONS AND 1JOHN

In part 1, we concluded that the two Jewish traditions of vicarious sacrifice and eschatological forgiveness were present in the Second Temple literature. In part 2, we will draw together the elements of the two Jewish expectations, and will use them to elucidate the treatment of atonement and forgiveness in 1John. Part 2 will be divided into five sections. Chapter 3 will demonstrate that 1John fuses the two traditions in his presentation of the atoning death of Jesus Christ. Chapter 4 will identify what is distinctive in 1John, compared to the Jewish traditions. Our study will show that 1John is distinctive in its way of applying the two Jewish traditions to the death of Jesus by universalizing, individualizing, and spiritualizing the primarily national and corporate hopes of Judaism. An excursus, “The Concept of Atonement in Early Rabbinic Thought,” will provide a point of comparison with 1John’s concept of atonement. Chapter 5 will demonstrate that this way of fusing the two traditions has its roots in the church’s realized eschatology, which is in turn founded upon the kingdom teachings of Jesus. Another excursus, “The Relationship between 1John and the Gospel of John,” will compare 1John’s concept of atonement with the Gospel of John.

CHAPTER 3

THE USE OF THE TWO OT TRADITIONS IN 1JOHN

Our task in this section is to consider the use of these two Jewish traditions of eschatological forgiveness and eschatological atonement in 1John. In chapter 3, each possible allusion to the two OT motifs in 1John will be analyzed. Before doing so, however, certain assumptions in this analysis need to be clarified.

Assumptions

Two Assumptions

The first two assumptions are concerned with the influence of 1John's hermeneutical milieu on its use of the tradition. First, we do not find direct quotations of OT passages in 1John, but rather echoes of, and allusions to, the OT passages used in the oral tradition (Hays 1989, 19-33). By "allusions" I mean the use of scriptural words and phrases without introduction and without disrupting the flow of the narrative (Moo 1983, 20). This category can cover a rather broad range of scriptural usage, but here we are mostly concerned with verbal correspondences (loose quotations, references to events, intentional appeals to specific passages) and conceptual correspondences (broad undercurrents of themes) (Silva 1993, 634; McCartney 1989, 104).

Second, the author of 1John was a first-century Jewish Christian, who was familiar with hermeneutical principles and methods employed by contemporary Jews and Christians (Boismard 1972, 156-65; Ellis 1984, 16; Hengel 1989, 109-35; Price 1972, 9-37; O'Neill 1966, 6; Marshall 1978a, 46-47; Smith 1975, 238-40; Westcott 1883, xxx-

xxxi). The author, thus, would have been indebted to the interpretive traditions preserved in such literature as the LXX, the Targums, Qumran literature, other Second Temple literature, and other NT books. Thus, what we find in 1John may reflect OT passages indirectly by way of the sources used by the author or the tradition to which he appeals.

Assumptions for Evaluation

The second set of assumptions pertains to how to evaluate the given data.⁴⁹ First, if somewhere in 1John is found a clear allusion to an OT passage, the likelihood increases that 1John is dependent upon the same source in the case of a less clear example. Second, if there is found in the immediate context of an allusion one or two apparent additional allusions to the same source, the likelihood of dependence in the first case increases significantly. Third, if 1John alludes to the same OT passage as other early NT writings or Second Temple literature, the likelihood of 1John's dependence on that source increases significantly. Fourth, if the allusion contains a distinctive word or phrase found in the possible source, dependence is more likely. Fifth, this study proceeds on the basis of probabilities rather than certainties. Nevertheless, there is considerable cumulative value in knowing the likelihood of 1John's dependence upon the OT, either directly or indirectly.

1John and Jeremiah's New Covenant Passages

In the foregoing discussion, we clarified assumptions that will be employed in our analysis of the evidence. Our next task is to show that the author 1John fuses the two

⁴⁹ For these assumptions, I am indebted primarily to K. Berding's unpublished dissertation and my personal dialogue with him (Berding 1999, 41-49).

Jewish traditions of eschatological forgiveness and vicarious sacrifice in his presentation of the atoning death of Jesus Christ. We will first demonstrate the presence of the former by showing that the author of 1John consciously uses particular words, phrases, and expressions that echo Jeremiah's new covenant passages and organizes them in combination with the theme of divine forgiveness achieved through Christ's atoning sacrifice.

There are at least four lines of evidence that support our argument that the concept of new covenant forgiveness is present in 1John: (1) the presence of new covenant categories in 1John 2:12-14; (2) the distinctive expression ἵνα ἀφῆ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας καὶ καθάρισι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀδικίας (1John 1:9), which is virtually identical to Jer 33:8, a sequel to Jer 31:31-34; (3) 1John's use of the two expressions κοινωνία (1:2, 4; cf. Philo, *Moses* 1.158; *Spec. Laws* 1.131, 121) and "the new commandment" (2:7-9; cf. John 13:34), which indirectly allude to the new covenant passage(s); and (4) parallels in the NT and in the Second Temple writings for the use of the terms as κοινωνία and "the new commandment."

New Covenant Categories

As already indicated, I hope to show that two traditional elements are fused in 1John 2:12-14. The first element consists of the new covenant categories, which point to a correspondence with Jeremiah's new covenant passages. I will demonstrate the correspondences between 1John 2:12-14 and Jeremiah's new covenant passages, which indicate 1John's use of the tradition that interpreted the New Testament church as the new covenant community, which is where the eschatological promise of the forgiveness

of sins is a present reality (2:12-14; 1:9; cf. Jer 31:34; 33:8). A close examination of the passages in 1John will demonstrate that many of them echo Jer 31. The closest parallel between the new covenant categories of Jeremiah and those of 1John is found in the two eschatological blessings promised in Jer 31:34. 1John emphasizes how the two eschatological blessings, the forgiveness of sins and the knowledge of God, are already realized in the coming of Christ, and this is where 1John's presentation of the new covenant motifs is distinctive (1John 2:12-14; cf. Jer 31:34). With respect to the forgiveness of sins, 1John connects this new covenant motif with the death of Christ as the atoning sacrifice for sin (1John 2:2; cf. 1John 1:9; Jer 33:8). The first passage to be considered in this regard is 1John 2:12-14.

The Greek text of 1John 2:12-14 reads as follows:⁵⁰

- 12 Γράφω ὑμῖν, τεκνία, ὅτι ἀφέωνται ὑμῖν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι
διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.
13a γράφω ὑμῖν, πατέρες, ὅτι ἐγνώκατε τὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.
13b γράφω ὑμῖν, νεανίσκοι, ὅτι νενικήκατε τὸν πονηρόν.
14a ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, παιδία, ὅτι ἐγνώκατε τὸν πατέρα.
14b ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, πατέρες, ὅτι ἐγνώκατε τὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.
14c ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, νεανίσκοι, ὅτι
ἰσχυροί ἐστε
καὶ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν μένει
καὶ νενικήκατε τὸν πονηρόν.

The correspondences between 1John 2:12-14 and Jer 31 can be seen from multiple perspectives. First of all, there are clear allusions to the new covenant passages

⁵⁰ This passage has three problems of interpretation: (1) the interpretation of ὅτι, (2) identifying the groups of people addressed, and (3) explaining the alternation of tenses of the verb γράφω. With regard to the first issue, the conjunction ὅτι could be interpreted either causatively or declaratively. The NRSV takes it causatively. We adopt the NRSV translation here, as elsewhere, without thereby taking a position on whether ὅτι is causative or declarative. Either way, it does not affect our argument here. With regard to the second issue, we take the position that one group is addressed with three different names (Dodd 1937, 36-39; Marshall 1978a, 138; De la Potterie 1969, 89). With regard to the third issue, we do not take any position, since it is irrelevant to our discussion here.

in 1John.⁵¹ Even a cursory reading of 1John 2:12-14 brings the new covenant categories of Jer 31:31-34 to mind. “Your sins are forgiven” (v. 12) and “you *have known* the Father” (v. 14) clearly echo Jer 31:34, “They shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest, says the LORD; for I will forgive their iniquity, and remember their sin no more.” Similarly, the words “you have known the One from the beginning (τὸν ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς)” (2:13a, 14b) echo Jer 31:34, though the expression “the One from the beginning” seems to refer to Jesus Christ as the preexistent Son (Westcott 1883, 60; Smalley 1984, 73). Most scholars recognize the presence of new covenant categories in 1John (Bonnard 1983, 48; Brown 1982, 203; Brooke 1912, 16-29; Dodd 1946, 26; Edanad 1987, 109-10; Edwards 1996, 94; Grayston 1984, 60; Houlden 1994, 61; Marshall 1978a, 15; Schnackenburg 1992, 79-88; Strecker 1995, 30-31). The difference between Jeremiah and 1John is that the eschatological promise in Jeremiah is expressed in 1John as already accomplished in the Christian community.

Second, there are conceptual correspondences between them. A more careful reading produces additional correspondences between 1John and Jeremiah with regard to the inwardness of divine work (Malatesta 1977, 23-32). We have already noticed the correspondence with regard to the forgiveness of sins and the knowledge of God, but there are more. The words “the word of God abides in you” (2:14c) and “As for you, the anointing that you received from him abides in you” (2:27a) echo “I will *plant my torah* within them, and I will *inscribe* it on their hearts” in Jer 31:33. In the OT, YHWH’s word and the Torah are almost synonymous (Isa 1:10; 2:3; 30:9, 12; Jer 6:19; 8:8; 9:12; 26:4;

⁵¹ Since two other passages in Jeremiah (24:7; 33:8) clearly pertain to the new covenant promise, they will be included in our discussion here.

32:23; 44:23).⁵² As a result of the divine action of planting his word in the human heart, the word of God abides in believers' hearts, enabling them to know God and have personal fellowship with him. This fellowship with God is the ultimate goal of the new covenant that is assumed in 1John 2:12-14 as a prerequisite for enjoying forgiveness and the knowledge of God. Thus, those who have new covenant fellowship with God have the indwelling of the divine Word (2:14c) and his anointing (2:27a) that they may know God with no need to be taught by anyone (Jer 31:34a, "No longer shall they teach one another, or say to each other"; cf. 1John 2:27, "So you do not need anyone to teach you"). In 1John, however, the Torah (word) is applied to the preexistent Word.

Similarly, the author of 1John seems to have Jer 24:7 in mind when he says, "And we know that the Son of God has come and has given us understanding (*διάνοια*) so that we may know him" (5:20; cf. Jer 24:7, "I will give them a heart (*לב*) to know that I am the LORD"). The noun *διάνοια* is a common word in Greek, with the basic meaning of "thought" or "reflection," and it also refers to the power of thought and understanding (Behm 1967, 963). The LXX uses *διάνοια* mostly for *לב/לבֿ* ("heart") which, in fact, is more often translated as *καρδία*; but in many cases *διάνοια* is a better Hellenistic equivalent of *לב*, taking into consideration the psychic signification of the Hebrew *לב* (Gen 17:17; 45:26; Exod 28:3; 35:35; Deut 28:28; Isa 57:11; Job 1:5; Prov 2:10) (Behm 1967, 965; Boismard 1972, 161). The fact that *διάνοια* and *καρδία* are interchangeable terms is shown by the textual vacillation between the two (cf. Deut 28:47; Josh 14:8; Prov 4:4; 27:19). In the NT, *διάνοια* is either explicitly or implicitly equivalent to the

⁵² "In the LXX *λόγιον* is used for the Word of God (Num 24:4, 16; Isa 5:24; 28:13; Deut 33:9; Ps 18:14; 106:11). Thus, *λόγιον* τοῦ θεοῦ is more or less equivalent to *λόγος* τοῦ θεοῦ, though *λόγιον* is used mostly for the Hebrew *אָמַר, אִמְרָה, אָמַר*, *לֹגוֹס* for *דָּבַר*. Yet this is not a fixed rule (cf. Ps 147:4 [15]; 118:154, 169). Ps 118 is most instructive, for it very often equates the two terms. *לֹגוֹס* occurs 24 times, *לֹגִיוֹן* 22 times, and there is no palpable difference in sense" (Kittel 1967, 139).

Hebrew לִבָּ/לֵב (Heb 8:10; 10:16; Eph 4:18; 1 Pet 1:13) (Behm 1967, 966-67). Thus, the author of 1John seems to think that the promise of giving a heart is fulfilled in his Christian community.

Third, the correspondence between Jeremiah and 1John is not only at the verbal level, but also in the relationship between these categories. As observed in chapter 2, the statement “I will forgive your iniquity and I will remember your sin no more” is the basis of all the new covenant categories in Jeremiah, assuming that the last use of the particle כִּי in Jer 31:34 is climactic and motivational, rounding off the prophecy and bringing it to a climactic conclusion by announcing the divine act that will make the new relationship possible (Anderson 1963, 230). Thus, YHWH’s declaration, “For I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin I will remember no longer,” expresses the motive that forms the foundation of the other three blessings of the new covenant. This appears to be the case likewise with 1John, where “your sins are forgiven” appears first (2:12). The particular form of the text “your sins are forgiven” reminds the reader of the oral preaching they have heard. The original recipients of 1John were probably accustomed to hearing the declaration “Your sins are forgiven,” and hearing the first sentence read would have reminded them of that, so that the following five things would be understood as based upon that forgiveness (Noack 1959-60, 240; Smalley 1984, 72). The second category in Jeremiah is divine action of planting the Torah, resulting in the knowledge of YHWH by the people. In 1John 2:12-14, likewise, “You have known the Father” begins the second set of triadic statements (v. 14). The restoration of broken fellowship between YHWH and his people is expressed in Jeremiah by the covenant formula “I will be your God and you will be my people.” In 1John, it is expressed as fellowship (κοινωνία) with God and

the Son. The key word is *κοινωνία* which is used in a unique sense in 1John. The covenant is closely related to fellowship between God and man, but in the LXX the term *κοινωνία* occurs only three times (Lev 6:2; 3 Macc. 4:6; Wis 8:18) and is never employed to express the intimate fellowship between God and man, apparently because of the Jewish concern to safeguard God's transcendence. However, in pagan contexts, the term *κοινωνία* was used to express the relationship between God and man. In contrast to the LXX, Philo adopted the group *κοινων-* to express the religious fellowship between God and the righteous (Philo, *Moses* 1.158), and between God and the priests in the sacrifice (*Spec. Laws* 1.131, 121).

In summary, there seem to be clear correspondences between Jer 31:33-34 and 1John 2:12-14, and the author of 1John seems to be deliberately mentioning the new covenant categories to trigger his audience's memory of the Jer 31 passage and the particular situation in which the passage was cited. In so doing, the author of 1John assures his audience that the eschatological promise of salvation in Jeremiah's new covenant prophecy has been fulfilled in them. The poetic form of 1John 2:12-14 may be a mnemonic device to trigger the common memory of the community. Such a mnemonic device was often used in the OT and in rabbinic literature. According to Gerhardsson, aggadic doctrinal passages "are often very symmetrically constructed, to facilitate their reconstruction in the memory if only the beginning – or catch-word – were clear" (Gerhardsson 1961, 147). The poetic nature of 1John 2:12-14 keeps many interpreters from understanding how the author uses the new covenant categories. The parallel statements provide us with the blessed reality of the Christian community in terms of the new covenant categories, but the passage alone is not clear on how God has fulfilled

those promises and on how they become a reality for believers. That must have been obvious to the original audience of the epistle, but it must now be sought in the context of 1John as a whole.

1John 1:9 and Jer 33:8 (40:8 LXX)

1John 1:9 is another passage that has a close correspondence with Jeremiah with respect to divine forgiveness (Edanad 1987, 105-09; Strecker 1995, 30). Jer 33:8 is a part of the book of comfort in Jeremiah, to which the new covenant promise belongs, and it may be considered a commentary on Jer 31:34. Once 1John 1:9 is compared to Jer 33:8, the correspondence between them will become clearer.

1John 1:9	Jeremiah 40:8 LXX	Jeremiah 33:8 MT
<p>... ἵνα ἀφῆ ἡμῖν τὰς ἀμαρτίας καὶ καθαρίσῃ ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀδικίας</p>	<p>καὶ καθαριῶ αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν ἀδικιῶν αὐτῶν ὧν ἡμάρτοσάν μοι καὶ οὐ μὴ μνησθήσομαι ἀμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν ὧν ἡμαρτόν μοι καὶ ἀπέστησαν ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ</p>	<p>וְטַהַרְתִּים מִכָּל-עֲוֹן אֲשֶׁר חָטְאוּ לִי וְסָלַחְתִּי (לְכֹל-) [לְכָל-] עֲוֹנוֹתֵיהֶם אֲשֶׁר חָטְאוּ לִי וְאֲשֶׁר פָּשְׁעוּ בִּי:</p>
<p>“... he ... will <i>forgive</i> us our sins and <i>cleanse</i> us from all unrighteousness.”</p>	<p>“And I will <i>cleanse them from all their iniquities</i>, whereby they have sinned against me, and <i>will not remember their sins</i>, whereby they have sinned against me, and revolted from me.”</p>	<p>“I will <i>cleanse</i> them from all the guilt of their sin against me, and I will <i>forgive</i> all the guilt of their sin and rebellion against me.”</p>

1John 1:7 corresponds to Lev 16:19, 30 in terms of sacrificial categories, such as the cleansing effect of blood for all the sins of the community, but 1John 1:9 is different from 1John 1:7 in that it is God himself who cleanses the community from all unrighteousness. Also, it is different from the Levitical atonement in that divine forgiveness is no longer expressed in passive form, but in active form, which may reflect the two tendencies in the OT: whereas the Pentateuch emphasizes the legal character of

the covenant, in the Prophets the free action of divine love is its more prominent feature (Eichrodt 1961, 1:1, 54).

These two aspects of divine forgiving and cleansing are closely related to each other in 1John 1:9, which finds its closest parallel in Jer 33:8 (40:8 LXX). The text form of 1John 1:9 is closer to the MT than to the LXX. Included in both Jer 33:8 and 1John 1:9 are all the important motifs, such as the divine forgiveness of sin and the divine cleansing from sin. The LXX paraphrases the second half of the verse by rendering Hebrew verb נָשָׁח as οὐ μὴ μνησθήσομαι. In its rendering of נָשָׁח in Jer 33:8, the LXX appears to have been influenced by Jer 31:34, where divine forgiveness is expressed in two parallel clauses, “for I will forgive their iniquity, and remember their sin no more.”⁵³ The LXX translator chooses the latter expression in his rendering “I will forgive” in Jer 33:8. This may be an instance of the associative translation technique, in which “the translator employs similar phraseology in a parallel text in place of the phrase in his *Grundtext*” (Klein 1982, 134-40). Otherwise, the LXX translation is very close to 1John 1:9, except for inverting the order of forgiveness and cleansing, which may be explained as the interpretive adaptation of the Jeremiah passage by the author of 1John. Thus, we have here another passage in 1John that echoes one of Jeremiah’s new covenant passages. Like 1John 2:12-14, 1John 1:9 seems to provide clear evidence that Jeremiah’s new covenant passages provide a basis for 1John’s interpretation of the Christ event.

For the author of 1John, the emphasis is on divine forgiveness, as seen in 1John 2:12. The author connects Christ’s death with Jeremiah’s new covenant forgiveness,

⁵³ The Hebrew verb נָשָׁח is usually translated with the Greek ἀφίημι (Lev 4:20, 31, 35; 5:10, 13, 16, 18; 6:7 [5:26 in the LXX]; 19:22; Num 15:25, 26, 28) or ἵλεως εἰμί/γένωμαι (Jer 5:1; 31:34; 36:3; 50:20; 5:7). This passage in Jeremiah appears to be the only case in the LXX where it has been rendered οὐ μὴ μνησθήσομαι.

based upon the common motif of divine forgiveness, for which he selectively employs variant readings and rearranges the order of the parts as he sees fit.

The Use of Two Catchwords

The Term κοινωνία and Its Relationship to the New Covenant

We have shown that there are verbal and thematic correspondences between passages in 1John and Jeremiah's new covenant passages. Now we turn to the use of the particular term κοινωνία in 1John for the Christian community to which the epistle is addressed. I would suggest that the author used this term as one way of identifying his Christian community as the new covenant community that fulfilled Jeremiah's new covenant prophecy. The connection of the term κοινωνία with the new covenant can be seen in two ways. First, Paul's use of the term points to the connection. In 1 Cor 10:16, Paul describes the Eucharist as a participation (κοινωνία) in the body and blood of Christ, that is, in Christ himself, more specifically in the benefits of his atoning death. The word κοινωνία is further applied to the community of believers as the body of Christ in v. 17. Paul returns to the matter of eucharistic celebration in 1 Cor 11:25, which clearly connects this fellowship with the new covenant fellowship established by Christ's blood. Thus, the word κοινωνία is used by both Paul and the author of 1John to refer to both the new covenant fellowship between Christ and believers, and the new covenant community of believers.

Second, this connection between fellowship with God and fellowship in the new covenant community is paralleled by the Qumran covenanters' use of the term יְהוָה for

their new covenant community (1QS 1:1, 12, 16; 2:22, 26; 3:6, 12; 5:1; 8:1, 5) (Boismard 1972, 160; Brown 1982, 170). Both Josephus (*J.W.* 2.122-123) and Philo (*Good Person* 75-91) use the term *κοινωνία* to express the idea of community among the essenes, which is expressed in Qumran literature by the Hebrew *תַּחֲוּ*.⁵⁴

The New Commandment and Its Relationship to the New Covenant

We have shown that the use of the term *κοινωνία* in 1John may be one way in which the author of 1John identifies his Christian community with the new covenant community as the fulfillment of Jeremiah's new covenant prophecy, by showing its connection with Paul and the Qumran covenanters' use of the same term for the same concept. The author of 1John keeps pounding the ears of his immediate audience with important catchwords or catchphrases throughout his epistle.

Similarly, the author of 1John starts by repeating *κοινωνία* four times at the beginning of the epistle (1:3, 6, 7). In 1John 2, he does it again by repeating the catchphrase "new commandment" (1John 2:7-9; cf. 3:23; 4:21; 5:2-3) as another way of implicitly showing the link with the new covenant. The connection of the phrase "new commandment" with the new covenant can be seen primarily in two ways. First, the eschatological character of the new commandment connects the phrase with the new covenant. The author says, "Yet I am writing you a new commandment that is true in him and in you, because the darkness is passing away and the true light is already shining"

⁵⁴ This identification of the term *κοινωνία* with the Hebrew *תַּחֲוּ* is based upon the two assumptions made by Cross and Dupont-Sommer (Cross 1995, 66-87; Dupont-Sommer 1961, 44): (1) The Qumran covenanters were the Essenes described in Josephus and Philo. (2) Philo's term *κοινωνία* is a translation of *תַּחֲוּ*. The Essene origin of the Qumran community is supported by many scholars (Brownlee 1957, 33-53; Cullmann 1955, 213-26; Murphy-O'Connor 1974, 215-44; Stegemann 1998; Ringgren 1963, 241-42; Vermes 1995, 22).

(1John 2:8). This clearly indicates the eschatological nature of the new commandment, the fulfillment of which is a present reality to those who have become members of that new covenant community. Thus, “though the commandment is not new from a purely historical point of view, it is new as given by Jesus. Its proclamation is the assurance that the new aeon has dawned, and it will be practiced in the light of that love which Jesus is about to show in his death” (Harrisville 1955, 79).

Second, the use of the same phrase in John 13:34 may connect it with the new covenant. 1John’s use of this phrase points to the farewell discourses in the Gospel of John (John 13:34), which is indicated in the statement that the new commandment pertains to the testimony to which the tradition has borne witness “from the beginning” (1John 2:7) (Perkins 1979, 25). The author of 1John may be using the new commandment of love in order to implicitly link the Last Supper and the new covenant (Brown 1966, 612-14, 287). Brown bases his argument on the hypothesis that “the backbone of John 6:51-58 was made up of material from the Johannine narrative of the institution of the Eucharist, which originally was located in the Last Supper scene, and this material has been recast into a duplicate of the Bread of Life Discourse.” Thus, the mention of a “new commandment” in both John 13:34 and the Johannine epistles (1John 2:7-9; 3:23; 4:21; 5:2-3; 2 John 5) is significant. Considering the oral nature of the tradition that the author of 1John uses, Brown’s suggestion makes good sense here. Phrases such as “new commandment” could have played an important role in triggering the common memory of the community. Repetition of the phrase in 2:7-8, right before 2:12-14 (in which the new covenant categories are used), may have reminded its immediate audience of the

situation in which the phrase was used. As in the case of the word *κοινωνία* (1:3, 6, 7), the situation may well be closely connected with the Eucharist and the new covenant.

Evaluation of the Evidence and Conclusion

In the foregoing discussion, we have gathered all the evidence that indicates that 1John is dependent upon Jeremiah's new covenant passage(s). Now it is time to evaluate this evidence according to the suggested assumptions for evaluation. This evidence can be summarized in four categories: (1) The presence of the new covenant categories in 1John 2:12-14 clearly alludes to Jer 31:31-34. (2) The distinctive expression *ἵνα ἀφῆ ἡμῖν τὰς ἀμαρτίας καὶ καθάρσιον ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀδικίας* in 1John 1:9 is strongly reminiscent of Jer 33:8, a sequel to Jer 31:31-34. Since clear allusions to the new covenant passage are found in 1John's use of the new covenant categories, it is also likely that the author of 1John had the new covenant in mind when he wrote the particular expression (1:9) that is very close to Jer 33:8. (3) 1John employs the two distinct terms, *κοινωνία* (1:2, 4; cf. Philo, *Moses* 1.158; *Spec. Laws* 1.131, 121) and "the new commandment" (2:7-9; cf. John 13:34), which indirectly allude to the new covenant passage(s). Since clear allusions to the new covenant passage are found in 1John's use of the new covenant categories, it is also likely that the author of 1John has the new covenant prophecy in mind when he uses these two expressions. (4) 1John's use of the particular term *κοινωνία* as a way of identifying its Christian community is paralleled by Paul's use of the term in 1 Cor 10:16 and in the Qumran covenanters' use of the term *יְהוָה* for their new covenant community. The presence of these parallels in the NT and in the Qumran literature increases the probability of 1John's dependence on the new covenant

passage(s) in its use of the term *κοινωνία*. In the same way, 1John's use of the particular term "the new commandment" is paralleled by its use in John 13:34 and the other Johannine epistles, which significantly increases the probability of 1John's dependence on the new covenant passage(s) in its use of the term.

Having considered all four lines of evidence, we think it most likely that the author of 1John is dependent upon the new covenant passages in his use of particular words, phrases, and expressions in connection with the death of Christ. We will now apply our findings to the epistle in order to test this conclusion. (1) From the outset, the author of 1John makes it clear that his epistle has to do with *κοινωνία* (1:3), and his use of *κοινωνία* points both to the Last Supper tradition and to the Qumran covenanters' identification of their community with the new covenant community. (2) In the first set of antithetical statements (1:6-2:1), he connects the issue of *κοινωνία* (1:6-7) with the forgiveness of sins, one of the new covenant categories in Jer 31:34. (3) In so doing, he uses language in 1:9 that is strongly reminiscent of Jer 33:8, a sequel to Jer 31:31-34. (4) In the second set of antithetical statements (2:4-10), he introduces the catchphrase "new commandment" (2:7-8), which is strongly reminiscent of the Last Supper tradition and the new covenant, and he connects the new commandment with the knowledge of God, another new covenant category in Jer 31:34. (5) The conclusion that the new covenant passages form the background for 1John's use of *κοινωνία* and "new commandment," and for its language in 1:9, is supported by the presence of a clear allusion to Jer 31:31-34 in 1John 2:12-14. This passage brings 1John's discussion of new covenant fellowship to a climax. The author of 1John uses here a theme-variations presentation. He presents the theme in 1:3. The first triadic antithetical statements (1:6-2:1) form the first variation:

new covenant fellowship–forgiveness. The second triadic antithetical statements (2:4-10) form the second variation: new commandment–knowledge of God. The double triadic statements (2:12-14) form the third variation and climax: all the new covenant categories. The author accentuates 2:12-14 by using a peculiar formula in six identical sentences.

Did we prove our argument? The answer seems to be affirmative. We think it most likely that the author of 1John consciously used particular words, phrases, and expressions that echo Jeremiah’s new covenant passages, and organized them in combination with the theme of divine forgiveness achieved through Christ’s atoning sacrifice. In particular, the manner in which the author of 1John organizes them seems to show a conscious effort to make explicit the connection between them and the OT and their significance in terms of the death of Christ.

1John and Levitical Expiatory Offerings

In the previous section, we observed that the author of 1John included Jeremiah’s new covenant categories in the list of the realized blessings in his community. Thus, the author indicates that the eschatological forgiveness promised in both Jeremiah and the Second Temple literature is now the present reality in his Christian community. The question is, What is the basis of eschatological forgiveness? As argued in chapter 3, in both the OT and the Second Temple literature forgiveness presupposes the removal of sins, for which God provided atoning sacrifices as part of the covenant between YHWH and his people. Likewise, the author of 1John applies the concept of the vicarious cultic atonement of the Levitical sacrifices to the innocent self-sacrifices of Christ (2:1-2; 4:10), which becomes the basis of the realization of eschatological forgiveness (2:12) and

eternal life (4:9). There are three lines of evidence in 1John that point to 1John's use of the terminology of the Levitical expiatory offerings, especially the sin offering on the Day of Atonement: (1) 1John's use of the distinctive phrase ἀφέωνται ὑμῖν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι (2:12) clearly alludes to the Levitical expiatory offerings. (2) 1John's use of distinctive words such as καθαρίζω (1:7, 9; cf. Lev 16:19, 30), ἴλασμός (2:2; 4:10; cf. Lev 16:5, 9, 15), and ὁμολογέω alludes to the sin offering on the Day of Atonement. (3) 1John's allusions to the Day of Atonement rituals correspond to the description of the Day of Atonement in Hebrews. The first passage to examine in this regard is 1John 2:12.

The Phrase ἀφέωνται ὑμῖν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι (1John 2:12) and Levitical Expiatory Offerings

As observed in the previous section, the references to divine forgiveness and the knowledge of God in 1John 2:12-14 echo Jeremiah's two new covenant categories, although with two minor variations: (1) The selection of the verb ἀφίημι does not agree with the LXX, which translates the Hebrew verb פָּחַד as ἕλωσ ἔσομαι. (2) Whereas the reference to iniquity is singular in Jer 31:34, the plural ἁμαρτίαι is employed in 1John 2:12.⁵⁵ Here I will suggest that the author's choice of the expression "your sins are forgiven" may have been deliberate. The particular form of "your sins are forgiven" points to a possible connection with the Levitical expiatory offerings in the OT and with Jesus' divine authority to forgive sins.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ In this matter, 1John agrees with the LXX, which translates both nouns for sin in Hebrew into plural form in Greek.

⁵⁶ The expression in 1John 2:12 ἀφέωνται ὑμῖν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι finds its obvious parallel in the word of Jesus to the paralytic (ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου in Luke 5:20, 23; cf. Synoptic parallels in Matt 9:2, 5; Mark 2:5, 9) and the woman (Ἀφέωνταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι Luke 7:48). The correspondences among these

Such scholars as B. F. Westcott and Raymond Brown have argued for the presence of correspondences between 1John's cultic language and the Levitical atonement rituals primarily because of 1John's use of sacrificial categories, but they have failed to notice the distinct form of the verb ἀφέωνται in 1John 2:12 (Brown 1982, 203, 217-19; Westcott 1883, 34-37). V. Taylor gives a list of these categories in the NT in general:

“Blood,” “covenant,” “expiation,” “means of expiation,” the presence of the ideas of cleansing, redeeming, sanctifying, offering, eating and drinking, participating, believing, and in close association with this literary usage, the tremendous emphasis upon a deed of Christ which is vicarious and representative, and in which all man's hopes of reconciliation and peace are centered. (Taylor 1940, 187)

Most of these categories appear in 1John too, and the connections are found not only in the sacrificial categories, but also in the form of the particular confessional statements such as ἀφέωνται ὑμῖν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι” in 2:12.

As suggested already, the expression ἀφέωνται ὑμῖν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι in 1John 2:12 corresponds to the thirteen OT passages that describe expiatory offerings using terminology such as ἀφίημι and ἁμαρτία and the divine passive (Lev 4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:10, 13, 16, 18; 6:7 [5:26 in the MT and the LXX]; 19:22; Num 15:25, 26, 28). These thirteen passages represent all references to divine forgiveness in the Niphal perfect of the Hebrew פָּחַח in the entire OT. Divine forgiveness is directed to either the third person dative object (Lev 4:20, 26, 31; 5:16; Num 15:25, 26, 28) or the second person (Lev 4:35; 5:10, 13, 18, 26; 19:22) (Sung 1993, 21-24). We have argued that the word ἀφίημι may carry cultic connotations with it, especially when it is used in the passive form; thus, the use of ἀφέωνται in 1John 2:12 seems to be very significant. Of the 46 occurrences of פָּחַח in the OT, the translation of פָּחַח as ἀφίημι in the LXX is reserved primarily for the

three—the atonement ritual in the OT, the Synoptic accounts, and 1John—indicate that the death of Jesus was interpreted in the NT in terms of the concept of expiatory offerings in the OT.

declaratory sayings for divine forgiveness in Leviticus and Numbers (exceptions being Exod 34:9, Num 14:19, and Isa 55:7).

In all thirteen passages having the declaratory formula in the OT, the sacrifices atone for the offerer(s) of the sacrifice and divine forgiveness is promised for the sins or guilt of the person or congregation who committed sins before YHWH. Whereas the ten passages in Leviticus deal with the expiatory offerings that atone for the individuals for their unwitting sin or guilt by offering the sin or guilt offering, Num 15: 25 and 26 deal with expiatory offerings that atone for the congregation for their unwitting sins by offering a sin offering (חטאת) and Num 15:28 deals with the sin offering for the sins of individuals. Two types of expiatory offerings are mentioned: sin offerings for individual or collective sins and guilt offerings for individual sins. 1John's use of sacrificial categories may refer to all of these expiatory offerings, but there is a strong indication that the author of 1John may have had a specific expiatory offering in mind, i.e., the sin offering on the Day of Atonement, judging by 1John's choice of particular sacrificial terms in the crucial passages (1:7, 9; 2:1, 2; 4:10) (Brown 1982, 203, 217-22).

The Three Words in 1John 1:7-9 and the Sin Offering on the Day of Atonement

The fact that the author of 1John may have in mind the sin offering on the Day of Atonement is indicated by the usage of the verb טהר in the OT. The LXX regularly translates טהר, the technical term designating the cleansing of the OT congregation by the sin offering on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:19, 30), with the verb καθαρίζω which is employed in 1John 1:7, 9 to denote the purifying presence of the blood of Christ in the consecrated community. Thus, Lev 16:19 and 30 are closely paralleled in their use of the

particular term for the cleansing effect of the shed blood. These two passages from Leviticus represent all occurrences of the verb קָדַשׁ with the idea that blood cleanses from sins or uncleannesses in the OT except Ezek 43:20, 26, where there is reference to the cleansing of the eschatological temple. The Day of Atonement ritual has its own peculiarities, compared to the regular sin or guilt offerings, in which the idea of cleansing from sin does not appear. The formulaic expression in the regular sin or guilt offerings is “Thus the priest shall make atonement on your behalf for whichever of these sins you have committed, and you shall be forgiven.” Juxtaposing 1John 1:7, 9 and the two passages from Leviticus will show their parallels more clearly:

1John 1:7, 9	Lev 16:30	Lev 16:19
<p>...καὶ τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας... ἵνα ἀφῆ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας καὶ καθάριση ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀδικίας.</p>	<p>ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ ἐξιλάσεται περὶ ὑμῶν καθάρισαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν ἔναντι κυρίου καὶ καθαρισθήσεσθε.</p>	<p>καὶ ῥανεῖ ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τῷ δακτύλῳ ἑπτάκις καὶ καθαρῶσει αὐτὸ καὶ ἁγιάσει αὐτὸ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκαθαρσιῶν τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ</p>
<p>“... and <i>the blood</i> of Jesus his Son <i>cleanses us from all sin</i>..., he will forgive us our sins and cleanse us <i>from all unrighteousness</i>.”</p>	<p>“For on this day atonement shall be made for you, to <i>cleanse you; from all your sins</i> you shall be clean before the LORD.”</p>	<p>“He shall sprinkle some of the <i>blood</i> on it with his finger seven times, and <i>cleanse</i> it and hallow it <i>from the uncleannesses</i> of the people of Israel.”</p>

The sacrificial categories involved in the Levitical ritual on the Day of Atonement are all found in 1John: (1) The blood of Jesus corresponds to the blood of the sin offering that the high priest will bring into the Holy of Holies for the atonement of the congregation. The blood of Jesus denotes the idea of the violent death of Jesus on the cross, which corresponds to the violent death of the sacrificial animal to obtain its blood. As far as the idea of atonement is concerned, the use of the verb ἐξιλάσεται in Lev 16:5,

9, 15 corresponds to the use of its cognate noun ἵλασμός in 1John 2:2; 4:10. (2) The blood has a cleansing effect, removing all the sins of the community in both cases. The author's use of the pronoun "we" in 1John 1:7-9 seems to apply the passage to his Christian community in general. While 1John uses the singular form (πάσης ἁμαρτίας; πάσης ἀδικίας), the LXX uses the plural (πασῶν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν), but their meanings are virtually the same. (3) It is God himself who promises this forgiveness in both cases.

The confession of sin in 1John 1:9 is unique, and its use of the term ὁμολογέω in relation to divine forgiveness finds its obvious parallel in the practice of confessing sins prior to the sin offering on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:21) (Schnackenburg 1992, 81-82). In 1John 2:2 and 4:10, Jesus is represented as ἵλασμός, a word used frequently in connection with the sacrifices of the Day of Atonement (Lev 25:9; Num 5:8; cf. *4 Macc.* 17:22, τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου τοῦ θανάτου αὐτῶν). While the blood of the sin offering on the Day of Atonement atones for the sins of the covenant community of Israel, the blood of Jesus Christ atones not only for the sins of Christian community, but also for the sins of the whole world (1John 2:2; cf. 4:10).

1John and Hebrews

This particular interpretation of the Christ event is supported by Hebrews. Spicq finds 16 parallels between Hebrews and the Johannine writings (Spicq 1952, 1:110-38). In particular, the description of the Day of Atonement in Hebrews expresses 1John's concepts of atoning sacrifice (ἵλασμός in 1John 2:2; 4:14; ἱλάσκεσθαι Heb 2:17), blood, cleansing (1John 1:7; Heb 9:13), the innocent victim (1John 2:1; 3:5; Heb 4:15), and the idea that the one who atones is himself in heaven continuing to cleanse (παράκλητος in

1John 2:1; ἐντυγχάνειν in Heb 7:25; cf. ἐντυγχάνει in Rom 8:34), thus offering a basis of confidence for sinners.

Evaluation of the Evidence and Conclusion

Let us review all the evidence that points to 1John's dependence upon the Levitical expiatory sacrifices in its interpretation of the death of Christ. (1) First of all, 1John uses a distinctive phrase ἀφέωνται ὑμῖν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι (2:12) that clearly alludes to the declarative formula that is used exclusively in connection with the Levitical expiatory offerings in the OT. (2) 1John uses distinctive words such as καθαρίζω (1:7, 9; cf. Lev 16:19, 30), ἰλασμός (2:2; 4:10; cf. Lev 16:5, 9, 15), and ὁμολογέω that allude to the sin offering on the Day of Atonement. The clear allusion in 1John 2:12 makes it very likely that 1John's use of all three terms is also dependent upon the sin offering on the Day of Atonement. (3) Finally, 1John's allusions to the Day of Atonement rituals clearly correspond to the description of the Day of Atonement in Hebrews, which significantly increases the likelihood of 1John's dependence upon the sin offering on the Day of Atonement. These three lines of evidence most likely indicate that the author of 1John is dependent upon the OT tradition of the Levitical expiatory offerings in his use of particular words, phrases, and expressions in connection with the death of Christ.

We will now apply our findings to the epistle in order to test this conclusion. (1) In our investigation of the use of the new covenant motifs in 1John, we noted that the author of 1John starts his epistle by focusing on the issue of κοινωνία (1:3), which points both to the Last Supper tradition and to the Qumran covenanters' identification of their community as the new covenant community. In 1 Cor 10:16, the Eucharist is described as

a participation (κοινωνία) in the body and blood of Christ, that is, in Christ himself, more specifically in the benefits of the atoning death of Jesus. So, the author of 1John sets the stage for his presentation of Christ's death in the sacrificial language echoing the Levitical expiatory sacrifices by using the term κοινωνία at the outset of his epistle.

(2) In the first set of antithetical statements (1:6-2:1), the author of 1John makes explicit the connection between κοινωνία (1:6, 7) and Christ's atoning sacrifice by introducing a christological statement (1:7c: "The blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin") that echoes the sin offering on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:19, 30).

(3) The author of 1John connects the first set and the second set of antithetical statements with a crucial Christological statement (2:1-2: "We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the *atoning sacrifice for our sins*, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world") that echoes the Levitical expiatory sacrifices.

(4) In the second set of antithetical statements (2:4-10), the author of 1John indirectly connects the section with the theme of atonement by introducing another important catchphrase, "new commandment" (2:7, 8). This may be another way of calling attention to the Last Supper, in which Christ expressed his death in the sacrificial language that echoes the Levitical expiatory sacrifices.

(5) In the following proclamation (2:12-14), the author of 1John makes explicit the connection between the new covenant categories and the concept of atoning death in the Levitical expiatory sacrifices by starting the section with the distinct formula ἀφέωνται ὑμῖν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι, echoing the Levitical expiatory offerings. So far, the author of 1John has been primarily concerned with the surety of the new covenant blessings

(divine forgiveness in particular) in his community. He brings the thought to temporary closure with six climactic, formulaic statements in 2:12-14.

(6) 1John 3 and 4 are primarily devoted to what has been done on the divine side to make forgiveness available to Christians, and to what implications that has for believers' lives. There are six Christological statements that may be seen as functional centers of each chapter. The two Christological statements in 1John 3:5, 16 echo both the Levitical expiatory offerings and Isa 53 (vv. 4, 9, 11, and 12 in particular), whereas 4:10 clearly echoes the sin offering on the Day of Atonement.

(7) 1John 5 is devoted primarily to what is to be done on the human side to enter and remain in the new covenant community. Christological confession plays a crucial role in this chapter. The Christological confessions (5:1, 5, 10) pertain to the content of faith and are closely related to Christ's atoning sacrifice. In particular, the salvific value of Christ's death is clearly emphasized in 5:6: "This is the one who came by water and blood, Jesus Christ, not with the water only but with the water and the blood."

Do we have here enough evidence to support our argument for the presence of the two Jewish traditions in 1John? It seems very likely that the author of 1John typologically applied the concept of the Levitical expiatory offerings to the sin-forgiving ministry of Christ. The author of 1John uses particular words, phrases, and expressions that echo the Levitical expiatory offerings, and organizes them in combination with the theme of the new covenant. The author of 1John organizes his epistle in such a way that the two primary themes (the forgiveness wrought by Christ's death as the atoning sacrifice, and the identity of his Christian community as the new covenant community) may be played symphonically.

The manner in which the author of 1John organizes these themes can be compared to composing a symphony. He has composed a symphonic poem with two familiar, controlling themes, using familiar expressions that would remind his immediate audience of the two themes. Sometimes, the theme of the new covenant controls a section, but without losing touch with the atonement theme—and vice versa. At other times, they form one great stream with an emphatic symphonic explosion (2:12-14). In this plan, we may identify three groups of instruments. The first group consists of Christological statements that function as constant reminders to the author's immediate audience of the death of Christ as the atoning sacrifice. The second group consists of the new covenant categories (1:9; 2:7-8, 12-14, 20) and other related passages (2:27; 5:20), both of which function as reminders of the new covenant. The third group consists of the two expressions *κοινωνία* (1:3, 6, 7) and "new commandment" (2:7, 8), which function as reminders of both themes in their connection with the Last Supper tradition, in which both themes are fused to interpret the Christ event.

Conclusion

In chapter 3, we have examined whether the two Jewish traditions of vicarious sacrifice and new covenant forgiveness are present in 1John, and we concluded that the sacrificial categories in 1John correspond to the Levitical atonement rituals, and that the new covenant categories used in 1John reflect Jeremiah's new covenant passage. Thus, 1John fuses the two traditional concepts in his interpretation of the death of Jesus (1John 2:2; cf. 1John 1:9; Jer 33:8). According to 1John, new covenant forgiveness is effected through the death of Jesus Christ (1:7-9; 2:1-2, 12; 4:10). Christ is the atoning sacrifice

for sins (2:1-2; 4:10), and Christian believers are forgiven for the sake of his name (2:12). By doing that, the author of 1John indicates that the atoning death of Christ is the basis upon which the eschatological forgiveness promised in Jeremiah is realized in his Christian community.

This way of combining the two Jewish traditions comes from a Jewish eschatologizing of forgiveness and cultic atonement in the OT and the Second Temple writings. First of all, the eschatological application of Jeremiah's new covenant to the Christian community in 1John is built from a Jewish eschatologizing of forgiveness as at Qumran, where the community identified itself both with the new covenant (CD 19:35; cf. 6:19; 8:21; 19:33-34; 20:12; 1QpHab 2:3) and as a true temple (1QS 5:6, 21-22; 8:5-6, 8-9; 9:6) with spiritual sacrifices. As observed in chapter 1, the new covenant in Damascus involves three divine blessings, each of which is roughly equivalent to one of the new covenant categories in Jeremiah: (1) the gift of knowledge of the "hidden matters" (CD 3:14) and a diagnosis of the problem of the first generation, (2) the gift of divine forgiveness (3:18; 4:9-10), and (3) the gift of a safe home (3:19-20) and eternal life (7:4-6; 19:1). We also observed that these blessings of the new covenant community appear in the *Rule of Community* (1QS 4:20-23), and the *Thanksgiving Hymns* (1QH 19:9-14). Common in all three writings are divine forgiveness and knowledge of God, which we find in 1John 2:12-14 and other related passages in 1John.

Moreover, the eschatological application of Jeremiah's new covenant to the Christian community in 1John implies that the author of 1John identifies the true Israel, not with biblical Israel, but with spiritual Israel represented by his Christian community. According to 1John, it is faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to the new commandment

(of brotherly love) that separate children of God from children of the devil. This view is built from a Jewish eschatologizing of forgiveness, as at Qumran, which also spiritualized the national and corporate hopes of Israel by identifying the true Israel not with biblical Israel, but with the spiritual descendents of Abraham, who have kept divine precepts (CD 3:2-20; 7:12-13). According to 1QpHab 2:1-2:10a, it is faith in (and obedience to) his word that separates the faithful from the traitors. God will free the faithful from punishment on account of their deeds and because of their loyalty to the Teacher of Righteousness (1QpHab 8:1-2). There are certain correspondences between Jesus and the Teacher of Righteousness (Brownlee 1956/57, 13-30). As observed in chapter 2, the words of the Teacher of Righteousness assumed the same authority as the words of God in the Qumran writings. He is the one whom God raised up for the remnant who sought him with a perfect heart, in order to tell the deeds of God to the last generation (CD 1:11) and to impart saving knowledge to the chosen ones, so that they would be saved from judgment (1QpHab 2:1-2:10a; cf. 1QpMic 10:6-9). He is the source of authority (from the mouth of God); thus, he is (1) an interpreter of the words of the prophets (7:4-5; cf. 1QpPs^a I, 27), (2) the founder of the elect of God (cf. 1QpPs^a II, 5), and (3) the Priest (cf. 1QpPs^a II, 19).

Second, the application of the term παράκλητος to Christ's intercessory role as heavenly advocate in 1John comes from a Jewish eschatologizing of the temple cult, as in the intercessory role of the high priest on the Day of Atonement in Philo's writings (1John 2:2; cf. Philo, *Moses* 2.133). The role of the high priest on the Day of Atonement, as allegorically interpreted by Philo, provides an important clue to understanding the use of the term παράκλητος in 1John for the role of Jesus Christ before God the Father. On the

Day of Atonement, the high priest represents both the whole human race, as represented by the holy vesture, and a being whose nature is midway between man and God (i.e., the divine Logos) (Philo, *On Dreams* 2.185-189). The high priest not only represents the whole human race, but also beseeches and intercedes before God on mankind's behalf (*Spec. Laws* 1.97). This ministry of intercession of the high priest is described in a different analogy in other place. According to Philo, the Son (the divine Logos) is an advocate (παράκλητος) of the high priest before the Father when the high priest enters the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement (*Moses* 2.133-134). This picture of παράκλητος partially corresponds to the role of Jesus Christ the Son as an advocate (παράκλητος) for the believers before the Father (1John 2:1). However, there is a crucial difference between Philo and 1John. In 1John, the finished work of atonement accomplished by the Son's self-sacrifice, qualifies him for his role as παράκλητος, which is totally missing in Philo's discussion.

Third, the eschatological application of the concept of cultic atonement to the innocent self-sacrifice of Christ in 1John is built upon the innocent self-sacrifices of martyrs in the Second Temple writings (*Dan* 3:38-40 LXX; *4 Macc.* 6:27-29; 17:21-22). As observed in chapter 2, these writings eschatologize the cultic concept of atonement by applying it to the righteous martyrs in the context of the eschatological restoration of the covenant relationship between God and his people. Moreover, this way of interpreting Christ's death in 1John corresponds closely to the notion of vicarious atonement observed in the prayer of Azariah and his friends (*Dan* 3:38-40 LXX), and in *4 Maccabees*, primarily in four ways: (1) The language of cultic atonement is applied to the vicarious death of Christ, the mediator. (2) Christ is a willing sufferer (2:2; 3:5; 4:10) and

intercessor (2:1). (3) Christ's willing sacrifice and intercession bring about divine forgiveness (2:12). (4) Christ is ultimately vindicated (2:28; 3:2).

CHAPTER 4

THE DISTINCTIVE ELEMENTS IN 1JOHN'S USE OF JEWISH TRADITIONS

Introduction

In chapter 3, we demonstrated first that 1John fuses the two Jewish traditions of vicarious sacrifice and new covenant forgiveness in the interpretation of the death of Christ. We demonstrated then that this way of combining the two Jewish traditions in 1John is built up from a Jewish eschatologizing of forgiveness and cultic atonement in the OT and the Second Temple writings. In this chapter, we will demonstrate that 1John has its own distinctive elements in tying the Jewish traditions to Jesus' unique death and forgiveness of sin. As we will see, the author of 1John completely universalizes, spiritualizes, and individualizes the national and corporate hopes of Israel, leaving no explicit trace of their Jewish roots either positively or negatively, and the thoroughness of these three applications (universalizing, spiritualizing, and individualizing) sets 1John apart even from other NT books.

Universalizing, Spiritualizing, and Individualizing

Universalizing, spiritualizing, and individualizing can be detected in every area of the concept of atonement in 1John: in its presentation of (1) the nature of sin and its consequences, (2) the divine provision for them and its purpose, (3) the efficacy of the Son's atoning sacrifice, and (4) the mode of appropriating the benefits of his atoning sacrifice.

The Nature of Sin and Its Consequences

The Nature of Sin

First of all, the three new applications can be detected in 1John's presentation of the problem of sin. The author of 1John universalizes, spiritualizes, and individualizes the national and corporate hopes of Israel by dealing with the problem of sin with respect to the nature of man and the presence of the evil one, when he says, "If we say that we have no sin (ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔχομεν), we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (1John 1:8). With this statement, the author of 1John clearly emphasizes the universality of sin (Strecker 1995, 31). Here the word ἁμαρτία in the singular seems to refer to the sin nature, which is present in human nature as an inherent principle (Cook 1966, 252; Stott 1988, 82; Westcott 1883, 22). The inherent sin nature inevitably produces the sinful acts that have present consequences (cf. Sir 17:3; *T. Naph.* 2:5): "If we say that we have not sinned (οὐχ ἡμαρτήκαμεν), we make him a liar, and his word is not in us" (1John 1:10).

As has been observed, in the Jewish traditions of eschatological forgiveness and atonement, the object of forgiveness was the national and corporate sin of Israel, characterized primarily as the violation of the covenant with YHWH. In 1John, however, the object of forgiveness is the sin nature and the sinful acts of individual persons.

The same tendency can be detected in 1John's way of describing the problem of sin as the cosmic and spiritual battle between the Son of God and the devil. Thus, the problem of sin is universal and spiritual as well as individual, because the battle is being fought in the heart and through the external behavior of each individual. This aspect of the problem of sin is clearly implied when the author of 1John says, "Everyone who

commits sin is a child of the devil; for the devil has been sinning from the beginning. The Son of God was revealed for this purpose, to destroy the works of the devil” (3:8; cf. *Jub.* 10:11; 23:29; 40:9; CD 16:5; Wis 2:24). “ ‘Works’ are manifestations of the two spheres of Johannine dualism” (1John 3:12), and “the works of the devil” are sins (Brown 1982, 407). This is clear from the first line of 3:8, “Everyone who commits sin is a child of the devil,” and from the parallel statement in 3:5, “He was revealed to take away sins.” The second line of 3:8, “for the devil has been sinning from the beginning,” seems to connect the works of the devil to “the whole complex of Gen 1-4, a section which starts with ‘In the beginning,’ when God created all things good, but in which the diabolic serpent persuaded Adam and Eve to sin” (cf. Wis 2:24) (Brown 1982, 406). The devil is the ultimate source of sin, and sinners are those who live under the power of the devil and commit sin, such as Cain, “who was from the evil one and murdered his brother” (1John 3:12).

Consequences of Sin

The three new applications can be detected in the statements about the consequences of sin. The author of 1John emphatically states, “The whole world (ὁ κόσμος ὅλος) lies under the power of the evil one” (1John 5:19). Here the “world,” as in 1John in general and in the Gospel of John, does not refer to creation, “but to the world of human beings seen in their rebellion and hostility to God” (Ladd 1993, 660). Emphasized here is the universality and spiritual nature of the consequences of sin. The statement in 1John 5:19 implies that the world, in its natural state, is in bondage to the evil one and to the power of sin (cf. 1QS 1:23-24; 3:19, 20; 4:15-20, 23). Moreover, the fact that the

“whole” world lies under the power of the evil one necessitates a divine intervention for its salvation.

This bondage to the power of the evil one and to sin leads man to death, as implied in the statement of 1John 3:14: “We know that we have passed from death to life because we love one another. Whoever does not love abides in death (μένει ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ)” (cf. 4:9; Wis 2:24; 15:3). “Death” and “life,” two opposing categories in 1John, represent the totality of human existence before and after salvation from sin and its consequences. The spiritual aspect of the consequences of sin is implied in the use of the terms “death” and “life” in 1John, where they refer primarily to spiritual death and spiritual life. In particular, the term “life” means supernatural life, the divine life, and it is often specified as “eternal life” (cf. 1John 1:2; 2:25; 3:15; 5:11, 13, 20) (Edanad 1987, 75). This “life” can be “attained in believing commitment to the historical fact and the historical person of Jesus Christ” (Bultmann 1964b, 2:870-72). Thus, the term “death,” as opposed to “life,” means the loss of this divine life, exclusion from fellowship with God.

As we have observed, in the Jewish traditions of eschatological forgiveness and atonement, the consequence of sin is described primarily as the exile of the people of Israel and bondage to world powers. Thus, with regard to the consequences of sin, 1John universalizes, spiritualizes, and individualizes the national and corporate aspect of the Jewish eschatologizing of forgiveness.

Divine Provision and Purpose

The author of 1John sets the stage for the necessity of the coming of the Son of God by emphasizing the universality of the problem of sin and its consequences.

Consequently, the divine provision is described in the language of divine mission:

God's love was revealed among us in this way: God sent his only Son (τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ) into the world so that we might live through him (ἵνα ζήσωμεν δι' αὐτοῦ). (4:9)

In this is love, not that we loved God but that he loved us and sent his Son (τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ) to be the atoning sacrifice for our sins (ἵλασμόν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν) (v. 10)

And we have seen and do testify that the Father has sent his Son as the Savior of the world (σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου). (v. 14)

These three passages represent all the references to the “sending” of Jesus by the Father in 1John, and they state the same Christological truth from different perspectives. Thus, these three statements must be discussed as one entity. Most prominent here are the universal and cosmic implications of the divine provision and the realized aspect of its benefits. The three new applications in 1John can be seen in five areas: (1) the motive of the divine mission, (2) the choice of the term “Savior of the world,” (3) the connection of atonement with the divine origin and messiahship of the Son, (4) eternal life as the purpose of the mission, and (5) realized eschatology.

The Motive of the Divine Mission

First, the motive of the divine mission is the result of the Father's unilateral love for the world, that is, for all humanity, because the sending of the Son happens in and for the world (Edanad 1987, 83; Strecker 1995, 150). The author of 1John emphatically states twice, “God's love was revealed among us in this way.... In this is love, not that we loved God but that he loved us and sent his Son” (1John 4:9-10). This theocentric viewpoint has dual references, both to the Father and to the Son. It is the Father's will to

send the Son as an atoning sacrifice, and it is the Son's obedience that accomplishes what the Father wills. The whole process is theocentric. God provides the Son as the atoning sacrifice. Thus, in 1John both the offerer and the receiver of the offering are God the Father, who also provides the offering.

This is a distinctive of 1John, compared to the OT sacrifices and the righteous martyr traditions in the Second Temple period (Dan 3:38-40 LXX; 2 Macc 7; 4 Macc. 6:27-29; 17:21-22). In the OT sacrifices, a sinner provides a sacrificial victim. Similarly in the martyr traditions, the martyrs offer themselves as atoning sacrifices. Moreover, the author of 1John expands the scope of God's love to include the world of humanity in general that is subjected to sin and its consequences.

Savior of the World

Second, the author of 1John seems to deliberately choose the term "Savior of the world" (σωτήρα τοῦ κόσμου) to emphasize the universality of the mission of the Son. We find the term σωτήρ used twice to refer to Jesus Christ with reference to Jewish messianic hopes, but with forgiveness of sins as the content of redemption, in the book of Acts (5:31; 13:23) (Foerster 1971, 1015). The author of 1John adds τοῦ κόσμου to the term σωτήρ, because the Son's messianic mission is not confined to the Jews, but includes the world of humanity.

The application of σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου formally "sounds quite like Hellenistic emperor worship—indeed, it was used as a title attributed to Hadrian" (Cullmann 1963, 244). In non-Christian and non-Jewish Greek literature, there is no known occurrence of the expression σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου until the second century B.C. The title occurs once in

Philo's writing and is applied to God (*Spec. Laws* 2.198). It is attested primarily in the inscriptions attributed to Zeus or Roman emperors such as Tiberius (A.D. 14-37), Trajan (98-117), Hadrian (117-138), and Antonius Pious (138-161). Among these Roman emperors, Hadrian is the only one to whom the title is attributed twice. However, the expression σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου did not refer to the savior of the world in the sense of the one who brings in the golden age, nor did it necessarily imply the divinity of its bearer or the concept of a world ruler (Foerster 1971, 1010-11). Of particular importance to our study is that the title was not used in connection with the idea of atonement in Hellenism. Thus, σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου more likely has its background in the OT and Judaism. It seems proper to discuss σωτήρ and τοῦ κόσμου separately, because the significance of τοῦ κόσμου is found primarily in 1John's emphasis on the universal significance of Christ's atoning work.

The LXX uses σωτήρ in rendering the three Hebrew words שׁוֹׁמֵר (Pss 23:5; 26:1, 9; 64:6; 78:9), שׁוֹׁמֵר (Judg 3:9, 15; 12:3; 1 Sam 10:19; Isa 45:15, 21; Neh 9:27), and שׁוֹׁמֵר (Ps 62:2, 6), which all come from the same root שׁוֹׁ . The LXX reserves the title σωτήρ primarily for YHWH, who saves the people not only from physical tribulations, but also from sin itself (cf. Isa 33:22-23; Ezek 36:28-29; 37:23). The only exception to this is its use to refer to the judges whom God raised up to deliver the Israelites from their enemies (Judg 3:9, 15; Neh 9:27). Based upon his examination of both the OT and the NT passages with regard to the use of the root שׁוֹׁ , Lyonnet makes three important observations (Lyonnet 1970, 69-71): (1) that the root שׁוֹׁ in the OT became a technical term to designate a summary of all messianic blessings, both spiritual and material; (2) that the root שׁוֹׁ is mainly used in the NT in order to designate the same messianic

blessings; and (3) that the noun σωτηρία in the NT (with the exception of Acts 27:34) “always refers to messianic salvation, a salvation understood in the spiritual sense, namely a liberation from sin or, even better, in a positive sense, a summary of all divine blessings.” In particular, When Jesus is called σωτήρ, it is principally because he, like God in the OT, saves his people from sin (cf. Matt 1:21) and death (Cullmann 1963, 242-43). As Cullmann argues, this idea of salvation from sin and death lies behind the statements about the appearance of σωτήρ Jesus Christ at his birth (Luke 2:11), after his resurrection (2 Tim 1:10: “the appearing of our σωτήρ Christ Jesus, who abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel”) and at his still awaited coming in glory (Titus 2:13-14: “the manifestation of the glory of our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ. He it is who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity and purify for himself a people of his own”).

1John’s application of σωτήρ to Jesus agrees with its use in other NT books, in which the designation of Jesus as σωτήρ implicitly includes the idea of his atoning work, but 1John emphasizes its universal significance by adding τοῦ κόσμου (Cullmann 1963, 243). This way of using the term “Savior of the world” in 1John is rare in the NT. The term occurs in only one other place in the NT (John 4:42). In John, the term is not used explicitly in the context of Jesus’ atoning work, as it is in 1John. However, it is a recognition of the universal, or at least broader, scope of salvation. In John 4:22, the Samaritans are commenting that the Messiah is not exclusively the savior of the Jews.

The Son of God

Third, the cosmic dimension of the problem of sin is met with a divine provision of cosmic significance. The divine provision for the problem of sin is none other than the Son of God himself. This mission involves the death of the Son as an atoning sacrifice (1John 4:14), which will destroy the works of the devil, that is, the power of sin and its consequences (3:5, 8). The significance of the Son's death, therefore, is universal, cosmic, and spiritual, as clearly observed in the emphatic expression in 2:2: "He is the atoning sacrifice for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world."

Significantly, the author of 1John seems to have the divine origin of Jesus in mind when he speaks of the Son being revealed, sent into the world, or coming in connection with divine forgiveness. The author alludes to the preexistence of Jesus as the Son of God, and its crucial importance in his role as the atoning sacrifice (Bultmann 1973, 8; Conzelmann 1954, 194-201; Marshall 1978a, 100, 139-40; Matera 1999, 242; Smalley 1984, 7, 73-74; Westcott 1883, 3-4, 60). He writes of "the eternal life that was with the Father and was revealed (ἐφανερώθη) to us" (1:2).⁵⁷ This preexistent eternal life revealed to us is none other than the Son of God himself: "He was revealed to take away sins, and in him there is no sin" (3:5); "the Son of God was revealed (ἐφανερώθη) for this purpose, to destroy the works of the devil" (3:8); "he laid down his life for us" (3:16). Thus, the author of 1John combines the concept of eschatological atonement with the divine origin of Jesus in his universal application of Jesus' atoning death. Moreover, he connects the

⁵⁷ Cf. "Ὁ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, "one from the beginning" (2:13, 14). In both passages "Ὁ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς seems to refer to the preexistent Word.

concept of atonement with the messiahship of Jesus.⁵⁸ The author reminds his audience that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh (4:2, 3), and not with the water only, but with the water and the blood (5:6). By referring to the water and the blood, he emphasizes the baptism and death of Jesus, and here the emphasis is on the salvific value of his death (Brown 1979, 117; Burge 1996, 202; Culpepper 1998, 272; Dodd 1946, 130; Marshall 1978a, 232-34; Smalley 1984, 278; Stott 1988, 180; Strecker 1995, 182; Westcott 1883, 181-83).

The combination of the concept of atonement with the two Christological titles (Messiah and Son of God), as seen in 1John, is clearly attested in neither the OT nor any known Second Temple writings. The concept of a vicarious atoning death is observed in such Second Temple writings as Dan 3:38-40 LXX and *4 Maccabees*, in which, however, the martyrs are neither the Messiah nor divine figures. As observed in chapter 2, there is some evidence that the Servant in the Servant Songs of Isaiah was interpreted messianically in the LXX and the Isaiah scroll (1QIsa^a 52:14), which, however, did not identify him as the Son of God or a divine figure.

⁵⁸ As argued above, the title “Savior of the world” is closely related to the messianic ministry of the Son of God (Lyonnet 1970, 69-71; Longenecker 1970, 99-104). John’s choice of the particular term “the Savior of the world” is influenced by the universal implication of the atoning sacrifice of Jesus, which, however, is identical to his role as the Messiah. In 1John, the primary titles for identifying and confessing Jesus are “Son of God” (or “Son”) and “Christ,” the context of which is primarily related to Jesus’ role as the atoning sacrifice. On the one hand, the former title occurs 22 times in reference to Jesus, which points to Jesus’ divine origin. On the other hand, the use of the latter title is confined to two incidents in 1John (2:22; 5:1) which clearly points to Jesus’ messiahship. There is no clear indication in the text of how John differentiates these two titles, but in the Johannine writings the title “Christ” is used only for “the incarnate Jesus (namely, Jesus of the flesh) as a designation for the salvific aspect” of his career (Brown 1982, 493). Thus, I would suggest that “Christ” in 1John is to be understood as a functional title of Jesus in reference to his ministry of atonement, for which his death was necessary. The combined name “Jesus Christ” is used more often (8 times), usually in connection with the predicate “Son of God” (1:3, 7; 3:23; 5:20) or in reference to it (2:1), which implies that John connects Jesus’ sacrificial and atoning death with his divine origin and messiahship.

The Qumran literature shows the concept of the Messiah and divine visitation. The community envisions the eschatological day of divine visitation, which will be the Day of Judgment for the wicked, but the day of salvation for the people of God (1QpHab 12:2-4; 1QS 4:19-21; 1QM 1:5). The community expected the coming of two messiahs in connection with the last time and its visitation (CD 19:10-11; 20:1; 12:23; 14:19; 1QS 9:10-11), but they were simply the high priest and the prince of the congregation of the last days. Again, the concept of a messianic vicarious atoning death is missing in the Qumran literature (Garnet 1977, 119).

The closest parallel to the concept of the Son of God in 1John may be the description of the Son of Man in the Similitudes of Enoch (*1 Enoch* 37-71), in which some scholars have found a pre-Christian example of the fusion of the three OT concepts of the Isaianic Servant of YHWH, the Messiah, and the Danielic Son of Man (North 1948, 7-9; Jeremias 1967, 687-88). In the Similitudes, the Son of Man is equated with the Anointed One (Messiah); he is preexistent and is revealed as God's personal representative. The Son of Man is also the final judge on the Last Day at the resurrection of the dead (51:3-61:8; 69:27-29). Moreover, the Son of Man is described as having traits borrowed from the Servant sayings of Isaiah, which leads Jeremias to conclude that the Son of Man in the Similitudes combines the concepts of the Messiah and the Isaianic Servant of YHWH (Jeremias 1967, 687-88).

We find close parallels between the description of the Son of Man in the Similitudes and the description of the Son of God in 1John: (1) Both are equated with the Anointed One (Messiah) (*1 Enoch* 48:10; 52:4; cf. 1John 1:3, 7; 3:23; 5:20). (2) Both are

preexistent and are revealed as God's personal representative (*1 Enoch* 48:2-6; 62:7; cf. 1John 1:2; 3:8; 4:9, 10, 14). (3) Both will appear as the final judges on the Last Day (*1 Enoch* 51:3-61:8; 69:27-29; cf. 1John 2:28).⁵⁹ (4) Both are called "the righteous" (*1 Enoch* 38:2; 47:1, 4; 53:6; cf. 1John 2:1).

These parallels, together with other common themes, such as the motif of light and darkness (*1 Enoch* 92:4; cf. 1John 1:7) and not loving the world (*1 Enoch* 108:8; cf. 1John 2:15), lead Charles to conclude that many passages in 1John "either in phraseology or idea directly depend on or are illustrative of passages in 1 Enoch" (Charles 1912, xcvi). Isaac similarly concludes that the language and thought of *1 Enoch* influenced many NT writings including 1John (Isaac 1983, 10).

However, the concept of vicarious atonement is again missing in the description of the Son of Man in the Similitudes. In the Similitudes, the traits of the resultant combination of the Son of Man and the Servant are restricted to those that exalt the Servant's glory. This restriction is also present in *Targum Isaiah*, in which the Servant of YHWH is described as a kingly Messiah, who will deliver his people from bondage, rebuild the sanctuary, and bring judgment upon the nations that persecuted his people (*Tg. Isa.* 52:15; 53:5, 8-12; 42:1-7).

Moreover, the pre-Christian dating of the Similitudes is seriously questioned by scholars. Before the discovery of fragments of *1 Enoch* at Qumran, the consensus of

⁵⁹ This statement presupposes that the personal pronoun in 1John 2:28 (Καὶ νῦν, τεκνία, μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ, ἵνα ἐὰν φανερωθῆ σχωμεν παρησίαν καὶ μὴ αἰσχυθῶμεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ) refers to Christ. Despite the ambiguity of the key phrases in 1John 2:28, most commentators think the author of 1John must be referring to Jesus' second coming. This view seems to be preferable when we consider the statistical fact that of the 16 other Johannine uses of the verb φανερώω (9 in the Gospel of John and 7 in 1John, out of a total of 49 NT uses), 10 refer to Jesus, but none to God (Brown 1982, 379-80). Thus, the first coming of the Son is for the removal of sins, whereas the second coming is for the final judgment as the Judge.

critical scholars was that the Discourses were written about 105-64 B.C. (Charles 1913, 2:171; Pfeiffer 1949, 75). Charles even dated them more precisely to either 94-79 or 70-64, based upon allusions to historical events. Jeremias accepts their pre-Christian dating, whereas Milik argues for a late dating based upon their absence from the Qumran fragments of *1 Enoch* (Jeremias 1967, 687 n. 245; Milik 1971, 333-78; Dodd 1952, 116-17). Longenecker argues that the Discourses probably represent a syncretistic Jewish Christianity of the first or second century A.D. (Longenecker 1970, 13). Milik's hypothesis is not supported by any solid evidence and has been subjected to serious criticism. The present consensus of scholars is that the Discourses are Jewish and date from the first century A.D. (Charlesworth 1979, 315-23). Isaac concludes that *1 Enoch* already contained the Discourses by the end of the first century A.D. (Isaac 1983, 7). This much can be said: *1 Enoch* and 1John share a common interpretive milieu, but the origin of the concept of atonement in 1John must be sought elsewhere.

Eternal Life

Fourth, 1John 4:9 avers that believers, after conversion, have eternal life. As seen in the parallelism between v. 9 and v. 14, eternal life presupposes the removal of sin (cf. "atoning sacrifice" in v. 10). Thus, in 1John divine forgiveness is identified with eternal life, and, by doing so, the author spiritualizes the Jewish eschatologizing of forgiveness, which identified forgiveness with the national and corporate hopes of Israel.

Realized Eschatology

Fifth, the divine provision for the problem of sin has already come in the person of the Son of God, as implied in the tense of the verbs (perfect ἀπέσταλκεν in 4:9, 14; aorist ἀπέστειλεν in v. 10), and the benefits of the atoning sacrifice of the Son are the present reality of believers: “I write these things to you who believe in the name of the Son of God, so that you may know that you have eternal life (ὅτι ζωὴν ἔχετε αἰώνιον)” (5:13; cf. 2:12-14; 3:1). The divine visitation promised in the OT prophets has already occurred in the coming of the Son of God, the Messiah (cf. 1John 3:8). The decisive act of redemption has already taken place: the Son of God “laid down his life for us” (ἐκεῖνος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔθηκεν) (3:16). He is now the atoning sacrifice for our sins (2:2; 4:10), and new covenant forgiveness is the present reality to those who confess that Jesus is the Son of God and Christ: “your sins are forgiven on account of his name” (ἀφέωνται ὑμῖν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ) (2:12). As has been argued, the Jews in the Second Temple period identified divine forgiveness with liberation from the yoke of the Gentiles, and since this liberation did not occur for them, they were still looking forward to a future fulfillment of God’s promise of forgiveness. This is where the author of 1John departs considerably from the Jews in the Second Temple period. He clearly holds to realized eschatology.

There are some elements of realized eschatology in the Qumran literature. In particular, the identification of the community as the new covenant community in the CD (19:35) may indicate their understanding of the community as the fulfillment of Jeremiah’s new covenant prophecy. However, according to them, the age of divine visitation still lay in the future, as seen in *Pesher Habakkuk*. When the author of *Pesher*

Habakkuk mentioned “the last days” (1QpHab 2:5) and “the final generation” (2:7), he certainly considered the Qumran community to be living in the last days, expecting the imminent final judgment and redemption as prophesied by the OT prophets. But the author also recognized that this expectation had not been realized, and he sought an explanation for this: “And God told Habakkuk to write what was going to happen to the last generation, but he did not let him know the end of the age.... For the vision has an appointed time, it will have an end and not fail. Its interpretation: the final age will be extended and go beyond all that the prophets say” (7:1-8). Moreover, for the community, the divine visitation and the coming of the Messiah(s) lie still in future: “These shall escape in the age of the visitation; but those that remain shall be delivered up to the sword when there comes the messiah of Aaron and Israel” (CD 19:10-11; cf. 20:1; 12:23; 14:19).

The Efficacy of the Atoning Sacrifice

The Scope of Its Efficacy

The universalizing tendency of 1John can be detected in the statements about the efficacy of Christ’s atoning sacrifice. While the two statements in 1John (4:10, 14) speak of the universality of the divine purpose of mission, the statement in 2:2 speaks of the universal and permanent efficacy of Christ’s atoning sacrifice: “He is the atoning sacrifice for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world (περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου).” The emphasis of 1John is clearly on the phrase “περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου” (cf. 5:19: “The whole world [ὁ κόσμος ὅλος] lies under the power of the evil

one”). Thus, 1John expands the scope of the efficacy of Christ’s atoning death to include the whole world.

The cosmic significance of Christ’s atoning sacrifice is emphasized when the author of 1John speaks of παράκλητον ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δίκαιον (2:1). In 1John 2:1, Jesus is described as an intercessor and defending advocate who deprives the devil of his ancient legal role in relation to sinners before the judgment seat of God, because he has accomplished his mission of being the atoning sacrifice (Brown 1982, 216-17). The phrase πρὸς τὸν πατέρα is used in 1:2, where eternal life is said to be with the Father (ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα), and in John 1:1, where “the Word was with God.” The preposition πρὸς with accusative connotes both presence with (when it appears with εἰμί) and relationship toward (when it appears with ἔχω) (BDF §239); “it can be used to describe both a preincarnational and postresurrectional relationship between Jesus the Word and God the Father” (Brown 1982, 216).

Isaiah may have provided a basis for 1John’s universal application of Christ’s atoning sacrifice. The term “Savior of the world” (σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου) in 1John 4:14 alludes to Isa 49:6 LXX, in which the Servant is called “salvation” (σωτηρία) to the end of the earth. 1John’s description of Jesus as an intercessor has its parallel in Isa 53:12, where the intercession of the Servant for transgressors is juxtaposed with his bearing the sin of many. This emphasis on intercession is expressed more clearly in the Targum. *Tg. Isa.* 53:11-12 paraphrases the MT so that it corresponds better to the declaratory formula in Lev 4:20b. *Tg. Isa.* 53:11-12 reads, “And he shall make intercession for many transgressions and the rebellious shall be forgiven for his sake.” This statement in the

Targum implies that the Servant's intercession is considered an act of atonement that produces divine forgiveness.

We may see a universal implication of the Servant's salvation in Isa 49:6 in incipient form, but, as observed in chapter 1, the primary beneficiaries of salvation effected by the Servant are the people of Israel as a whole.

The Benefits of the Atoning Sacrifice

The three new applications of 1John can be detected in its descriptions of the benefits of the atoning sacrifice of Jesus. As will be observed, these benefits are described in 1John as spiritual blessings that are universally available to those who individually appropriate them by faith in Jesus. These benefits are described in 1John from two perspectives. Negatively, his sacrifice destroyed the works of the devil by taking away sin (3:5, 8; 4:10), thus freeing believers from the bondage of sin (3:5, 9), its consequences (3:14; 4:9), and the power of the evil one (2:13, 14; 5:18, 19). Positively, the atoning sacrifice of Jesus makes divine forgiveness (1:6-10; 2:12) and other blessings universally available for everyone. These blessings include eternal life (4:9), fellowship with God, knowledge of God (2:13; 5:20), and victory over the evil one (2:13, 14) and over the world (5:4-5). In particular, 1John 4:9 calls the totality of these blessings eternal life through the Son, whereas 1John 2:12-14 gives the list of these blessings unity by a common relation to the verb "to write," because they express different aspects of one reality (Boismard 1972, 380). All these terms fundamentally designate the reality of having been forgiven. Divine forgiveness is concerned with the problem of sin, whereas these four blessings are concerned with the consequences of sin, such as death, alienation

from God, bondage to evil, and the loss of true knowledge. Thus, divine forgiveness must precede all four blessings in order to make them available to believers.

Individualization in the Mode of Appropriation

The Necessity of Subjective Appropriation

As implied in the foregoing discussion, the fact that the Son is called “the Savior of the world” does not mean that everyone in the world will automatically enjoy the benefits of the atonement achieved by the atoning sacrifice of Jesus. That is the reason the author of 1John speaks of the whole world still lying under the power of the evil one, in opposition to the children of God (5:19). This means that the atoning sacrifice of the Son is the objective basis for divine forgiveness, which must be individually appropriated. The necessity of individual appropriation of forgiveness is a distinctive of 1John, compared to the Jewish eschatologizing of forgiveness and atonement, which identifies forgiveness primarily with the national and corporate restoration of Israel.

Three statements in 1John show the three prerequisites for forgiveness:

If we say that we have fellowship with him while we are walking in darkness, we lie and do not do what is true; but if we walk in the light as he himself is in the light, we have fellowship (κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν) with one another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanses (καθαρίζει) us from all sin. (1:6-7)

If we confess our sins, he who is faithful and just will forgive (ἀφή) us our sins and cleanse (καθαρίσει) us from all unrighteousness. (1:9)⁶⁰

Your sins are forgiven (ἀφέωνται) on account of his name (διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ). (2:12).

⁶⁰ The pronoun “we” in 1:7 and 1:9 represents the same people addressed as “you” (pl.) in 2:12-14.

The first statement emphasizes the necessity of fellowship with fellow believers, whereas the second and the third ones emphasize the necessity of repentance of their sins and faith in the name of Jesus. With regard to these three prerequisites for forgiveness, we will examine other passages in 1John.

Fellowship as the Means of Appropriation

Fellowship with the Son

Prominent in 1John is the theme of fellowship. According to 1John, fellowship with the Son is the means through which the benefits of the Son's atoning sacrifice are made available (1:7). The same thing is expressed in 2:12-14. As pointed out by Boismard, the forgiveness of sins (2:12) is closely related to the blessing of victory over the evil one (vv. 13, 14) in 1John (Boismard 1972, 380). Jesus Christ, by taking away sin, destroyed the works of the devil (3:5, 8), so that believers may no longer be under the bondage of sin and its consequences, but rather have victory over the devil (2:13-14; cf. 5:4-5). The blessing of victory over the evil one (v. 14) is related to the presence of ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ in believers, that is, of the Son of God in person, "who is from the beginning" (v. 14; cf. 1:1), because the Son of God protects them, and the evil one does not touch them (5:18) (Brown 1982, 303; Bultmann 1973, 32).⁶¹ The author of 1John also designates the presence of ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ as the knowledge of the One that is from the

⁶¹ Following the view of most of commentators, both Brown and Bultmann argue that the expression ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, both in 1:1 and 2:14, refers to Christ. As observed in the previous section, the indwelling presence of ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ in believers corresponds to the indwelling presence of the Torah of God, one of the new covenant blessings in Jeremiah (Jer 31:33: "I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts"). Thus, according to 1John, Jeremiah's promise of eschatological Torah in the heart is fulfilled in the coming of the Son of God into every believer's heart.

beginning, since, in his eyes, presence and knowledge are two ways of expressing the same reality. Consequently, the author can give this assurance to his readers: having known and having the presence of ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ in you, you have overcome the evil one and triumphed over sin. It is also the presence of the Son of God that enables believers to know the Father as indicated in 5:20: “And we know that the Son of God has come and has given us understanding so that we may know him who is true.”

The presence of the Son of God is expressed as fellowship with the Son: “We declare to you what we have seen and heard so that you also may have fellowship with us; truly our fellowship (κοινωνία) is with the Father (μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς) and with his Son Jesus Christ (μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ)” (1John 1:3). Edanad makes three important observations with regard to this statement (Edanad 1987, 183): (1) The emphatic addition, repeating the preposition μετὰ, “and with his Son Jesus Christ,” may signify that fellowship with the Father is only through the Son, and through fellowship with him. (2) The insertion of the full Christological title “his Son Jesus Christ” may have been motivated by the Christological error of the opponents. The title “Jesus Christ” occurs 7 times in the Johannine epistles, in three of which it is combined with his designation as God’s Son (1John 1:3; 3:23; 5:20). (3) This fellowship with the Father and the Son is the same as fellowship “with us.” In Bultmann’s words, “There is fellowship with the latter (i.e., Father and Son) only by virtue of the former, i.e., by virtue of the legitimate tradition” (Bultmann 1973, 12).

Fellowship in the New Covenant Community

The fact that the new covenant categories are used in 1John 2:12-14 as the blessings of the community implies that the Christian community understood itself as the fulfillment of the eschatological new covenant community promised in Jeremiah's new covenant prophecy. Therefore, belonging to the new covenant community determines whether one has divine forgiveness accomplished by the atoning sacrifice of the Son. This way of combining new covenant forgiveness with atonement in 1John is not clearly attested in the Second Temple literature. Unlike 1John's use of the concept of the new covenant, the concept of the new covenant was not explicitly used in combination with the concept of vicarious atonement. Even the phrase "new covenant" is not known to have been used in any literature of the Second Temple period or of the early rabbinic period, with the notable exception of the Qumran community, whose literature was full of covenantal expressions, including several uses of the term "new covenant" (CD 6:19; 8:21; 19:33-34; 20:12; 1QpHab 2:3). Both Christian and Jewish scholars in general seem to agree that by calling the community "the new covenant," the author of the CD (19:35) evidently wanted to describe his community as the fulfillment of the prophecy of a new covenant community in Jeremiah 31:31 (Ringgren 1963, 201; Cross 1995, 157; Bruce 1962-63, 220; Brownlee 1956/57, 16; Flusser 1957, 236). Thus, we find here an antecedent for the identification of the Christian community with the fulfillment of Jeremiah's new covenant prophecy. However, as observed by Garnet, the idea of atonement was largely used metaphorically at Qumran, and "the overtones of penal substitution, detectable in connection with Old Testament sacrificial atonement, are absent from the non-cultic atonement passages at Qumran" (Garnet 1977, 119).

Scholars such as W. H. Brownlee (Brownlee 1956/57, 18-20) and A. Dupont-Sommer (Dupont-Sommer 1950, 5) have tried to connect the idea of vicarious atonement with the suffering of the Teacher of Righteousness by identifying the Teacher of Righteousness with the Servant of YHWH in Isaiah, and they have tried to find the elements of suffering in the description of the Teacher, but their efforts have not been that convincing to other scholars. The *Thanksgiving Hymns* are often cited to prove the prominence of the suffering theme at Qumran. Dupont-Sommer thought that the Teacher of Righteousness was fully identified with the Servant, and Brownlee argued for an individual suffering Messiah. Against these efforts, Carmignac has pointed out that there are few actual quotations from the Servant songs, and that they are theologically insignificant (Carmignac 1960, 357-94). In another place, Carmignac has even denied any connection between suffering and atonement in the *Thanksgiving Hymns* (Carmignac and Guilbert 1961, 142). Furthermore, it is not certain that we can identify the hymnist with the Teacher of Righteousness. Cullmann concludes, "But nowhere do we hear that the Teacher of Righteousness voluntarily took upon himself the mysterious role of the Suffering Servant, suffering vicariously for the sins of the world" (Cullmann 1955, 225). Milik agrees with Cullmann, saying, "The fact and manner of the Teacher's death had for the Essenes no soteriological significance analogous to that seen by the early church in the death of Jesus of Nazareth" (Milik 1959, 80). What we can say at most is that there are allusions to the Servant image at Qumran, but that they are not overtly related to atonement.

Faith in the Name of the Son

In the foregoing discussion, we argued that fellowship in the new covenant community itself functions as a marker of eschatological life. But what is required to join the community? It is argued here that faith in the name of Son of God constitutes the condition for joining the fellowship, as implied in the statements in 1John 3:23 and 5:13. 1John 5:13 clearly indicate that the gift of eternal life is contingent on faith in the name of the Son of God: “I write these things to you who believe in the name of the Son of God, so that you may know that you have eternal life.” The same idea is implied when the author says, “And this is his commandment, that we should believe in the name of his Son Jesus Christ and love one another, just as he has commanded us. All who obey his commandments abide in him, and he abides in them. And by this we know that he abides in us, by the Spirit that he has given us” (3:23-24). In this passage, the gift of eternal life is not directly associated with faith in the name of the Son of God, but their connection is presupposed in its context. As observed in the following statements, eternal life is identified with the Son in 1John:

We declare to you what was from the beginning, what we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes, what we have looked at and touched with our hands, concerning the word of life—this life was revealed, and we have seen it and testify to it, and declare to you the eternal life that was with the Father and was revealed to us. (1:1-2)

And we know that the Son of God has come and has given us understanding so that we may know him who is true; and we are in him who is true, in his Son Jesus Christ. He is the true God and eternal life. (5:20)

Moreover, the statement “we are in him ... eternal life” (5:20) implies that the gift of eternal life is equivalent to having the Son or abiding in him. The same idea is expressed in other passages:

Let what you heard from the beginning abide in you. If what you heard from the beginning abides in you, then you will abide in the Son and in the Father. And this is what he has promised us, eternal life. (2:24-25)

And this is the testimony: God gave us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. Whoever has the Son has life; whoever does not have the Son of God does not have life. (5:11-12)

As observed in 3:23-24, abiding in the Son is the result of faith in the name of Jesus, the Son of God. Thus, 1John 3:23-24 also implies that the gift of eternal life is contingent on faith in the name of the Son of God. As argued earlier, in 1John forgiveness is identified with eternal life, whereas in the Jewish eschatologizing of forgiveness it is identified with the national restoration of Israel. Thus, according to 1John, divine forgiveness is also contingent upon faith in the name of the Son of God. The author has the same concept in view when he says: “Your sins are forgiven on account of his name” (2:12). However, in the passage the faith in the Son of God is not explicitly stated. The clue seems to lie in the perfect tense form of the verb ἀφέωνται (v. 12). Such scholars as Nauck, Bonnard, Smalley, and Perkins recognize a baptismal background of 1John 2:12 (Bonnard 1983, 48; Nauck 1957, 84-96; Perkins 1979, 29; Smalley 1984, 72). Brown argues, “The idea of being forgiven because of Christ’s name (which is God’s name), along with the address ‘Children,’ may indicate a baptismal background for 1John 2:12. The idiom of being baptized in the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 2:38; 8:16; see 1Cor 1:13, 15) probably involved a confession by the one baptized of Jesus as Messiah (Christ), Son of God, Son of Man” (Brown 1982, 302-03). Based upon his study on the themes of remembrance and commemoration in the NT and early Christian writings, Dahl makes an important observation:

Baptism was administered *in the name of Jesus Christ*. The gospel was the message concerning him. Basically, to recall the gospel and baptism is to evoke the memory of Jesus as Savior and Lord. 2 Timothy says it very clearly.... (2 Tim. 2:8).... To pray and to give thanks *in the name of Jesus* does not mean simply that one made use of the formula “*in the name of Jesus*,” but that in prayer and thanksgiving one mentioned *in the name of Jesus* and generally also what made him Savior and Lord of the church (cf. e.g., Act 4:24-30)” (Dahl 1976, 20).

So, the commandment “believe in the name of his Son Jesus Christ ” (1John 3:24) was probably also learned by Johannine Christians at the beginning (“For this is the message you have heard from the beginning” in v.11) (Brown 1982, 480; Dahl 1976, 15-21). The fact that 1John 3:23 identifies “to believe in the name of his Jesus Christ” and “to love one another” as one commandment implies that saving faith and fraternal love are the same reality. Thus, it is very likely that the initial message the Christians in the community heard, probably during the process of their conversion/initiation/baptism, included both the confession of faith as well as the commandment of fraternal love. The one condition for joining the community is faith in Son of God, which the believers would express by submitting to the baptismal rite.⁶²

Moreover, even the use of the expression “Your sins are forgiven” in 1John 2:12 may presuppose the faith in Jesus. The expression ἀφέωνται ὑμῖν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι in 1John 2:12 contains the sole occurrence of the passive form of the verb ἀφίημι with ἁμαρτία, except for 13 occurrences in the declaratory formula of the Levitical expiatory offerings in the OT and 7 occurrences in the words of Jesus to a sinful woman (Luke 7:48) and the paralytic (Matt 9:2, 5; Mark 2:5, 9; Luke 5:20, 23). Thus, behind the expression “Your sins are forgiven” in 1John 2:12 may lie Jesus’ words to the sinful woman (ἀφέωνταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι in Luke 7:48) and the paralytic (Luke 5:20, 23; Matt 9:2, 5; Mark 2:5, 9). Two observations can be made: (1) Among the four Synoptic accounts, Luke 7:48 is closest to 1John 2:12. The two agree verbatim except in their use of a pronoun. (2) Jesus’

⁶² The pronoun “his” in 1John 2:12 refers to Jesus, not the Father, because this is the first occurrence of τὸ ὄνομα in 1John, which will occur twice more with a special theological nuance (3:23 and 5:13: speaking of believing in “the name of the Son”). The last-mentioned “him” (2:8b), connecting with αὐτὸς in 2:6, is surely Christ (BDF 282³), and the phrase is a stock phrase used in the NT associated with Jesus (John 15:21; Matt 10:22; 24:9; Mark 13:13; Luke 21:17; Rev 2:3; Acts 4:30; 1 Cor 1:10) (Brown 1982, 302; Smalley 1984, 72; Bultmann 1973, 31).

declaration of the forgiveness to the woman is followed by another important statement: “Then he said to her, ‘Your sins are forgiven.’ But those who were at the table with him began to say among themselves, ‘Who is this who even forgives sins?’ And he said to the woman, ‘Your faith has saved you; go in peace.’ ” (Luke 7:48-50). In this passage, the declaratory saying “your sins are forgiven” is qualified by another declaratory saying “your faith has saved you.” Jesus makes it clear that forgiveness is contingent upon the faith of the person. Thus, the fact that the author of 1John uses the same declarative formula may imply that the faith of the person is assumed.

In this manner, 1John universalizes and individualizes the national and corporate hopes of Judaism. The beneficiaries of eschatological forgiveness are no longer confined to the Jews, but include everyone who believes in the name of the Son, regardless of his or her race. The only condition for salvation is the faith of each individual in the name of the Son of God.

The Content of Faith

The content of this faith is expressed clearly in Christological confessions used in 1John. These can be divided into two categories. The first one concerns his messiahship:

Who is the liar but the one who denies that Jesus is the Christ? This is the antichrist, the one who denies the Father and the Son. (1John 2:22)

By this you know the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is from God. (1John 4:2)

Everyone who believes that Jesus is the Christ has been born of God, and everyone who loves the parent loves the child. (1John 5:1)

The second category has to do with his divine origin: “God abides in those who confess that Jesus is the Son of God, and they abide in God” (1John 4:15). “Who is it that conquers the world but the one who believes that Jesus is the Son of God?” (1John 5:5).

As suggested as above, each is primarily concerned with the earthly work of Jesus Christ as the atoning sacrifice and his divine origin. In the foregoing discussion, we demonstrated that according to 1John life is contingent on faith (3:23; 5:13), and since denial is the opposite of faith, anyone who denies either of these propositions is outside of the realm of divine forgiveness and life. The content of faith expressed in these confessions is clarified further in the proclamation of the apostolic witnesses: “And we have seen and do testify that the Father has sent his Son as the Savior of the world” (4:14) and as “the atoning sacrifice for our sins” (4:10). These statements express the messianic mission of Jesus the divine Son in relation to his death as the atoning sacrifice for the problem of sin. This proclamation of the apostolic witnesses is rephrased in terms of the problem of evil as the work of the devil: “You know that he was revealed to take away sins” (3:5), that is, “to destroy the works of the devil” (3:8). Thus, accepting this proclamation of the apostolic witnesses presupposes both acknowledgment of the universality of sin in the human heart and repentance of one’s sins as emphasized in 1:9.

The statement in 1John 1:7 emphasizes that continual forgiveness (as implied by the present tense καθαρίζει) is contingent upon fellowship with God, which is the same as fellowship with one another, by remaining in the community (Strecker 1995, 30). What is involved in remaining in the new covenant community is summarized in 1John primarily as keeping the new commandments of fraternal love and faith in Christ (2:3, 5; 3:24; 4:15; 5:1). These two commandments represent one reality: faith in Christ must result in fraternal love. This unity of the commandments can be detected in the abrupt transitions between the plural τὰς ἐντολάς “the commandments” (3:22, 24), and the singular ἡ ἐντολή “the commandment”(v. 23). Between two statements about keeping the

commandments (vv. 22, 24), the author inserts v. 23, in which the commandments are spoken of in the singular, as a double-faceted commandment: “And this is his commandment, that we should believe in the name of his Son Jesus Christ and love one another, just as he has commanded us.”

The object of faith and confession remains the same as the proclamation of the apostolic witnesses, which the members of the community have originally heard and known (1:1-3), and must continue to believe in order to remain in the new covenant community (2:24). Thus, to believe “that Jesus is the Christ” is the criterion “that one has been born of God” (5:1), and to confess “Jesus is the Son of God” is the sign of the mutual abiding of God and the believer in one another (4:15).

Fraternal love is part of the message that the members of the new covenant community have heard from the beginning (2:7; 3:11). It is also the criterion of their abiding “in the light” (2:10), of being “children of God” (3:10; 4:7), of “knowing” God (4:7), of having passed from death to life and of having eternal life abiding in them (3:14-15), of God’s abiding in them and of his love having been “perfected” in them (4:12; cf. v. 16). This fraternal love is based upon the revelation of the love of God in his sending of his only Son to be the Savior of the world (4:9; cf. John 3:16). Therefore, it is inseparably bound to faith in the Son and is the natural response to this revelation (Barrosse 1957, 543-45). The model for Christian fraternal love provided in 1John is the perfect love manifested in Christ’s laying down of his life for the sake of his people (3:16). By exhibiting faith and fraternal love, believers respond to God’s love. 1John 5:1 expresses this truth clearly: “Everyone who believes that Jesus is the Christ has been born of God, and everyone who loves the parent loves the child.” Thus, the reason why

believers should love fellow believers is that they are also the children of God. They are thus brothers, and there cannot be any love for God, the Father, without loving one's brother.

1John versus Other NT Books

In the foregoing discussion, we argued that 1John ties the two Jewish traditions of vicarious sacrifice and new covenant forgiveness to Jesus' unique death and forgiveness of sin in the new way of universalizing, individualizing, and spiritualizing the national and corporate hopes of Israel. We then demonstrated how thoroughly 1John universalized, individualized, and spiritualized the Jewish hopes in its treatment of the nature and consequences of sin, divine provision for the problem, and the purpose of sending the Son, the efficacy of the atoning sacrifice of the Son, and the mode of appropriation. This is what sets 1John apart even from other NT books. 1John is distinctive, in comparison with the other NT books, not in its three applications of the two Jewish traditional elements to the death of Jesus *per se*, but in the thoroughness of its universalizing and spiritualizing of the national and corporate hopes of Judaism and in its emphasis on realized eschatology. With regard to the distinctiveness of 1John, we will first compare 1John with other NT books in general, and then more specifically with the Gospel of John due to the common roots between 1John and the Gospel of John.

1John vs. Other NT Books

The author of 1John emphasizes the universality of Jesus' atoning sacrifice more explicitly and comprehensively than other NT writings primarily in two ways. First of all,

the author of 1John connects the preexistent divine sonship of Jesus Christ with the universal implication of his death as the atoning sacrifice for the sins of the world (2:2; 4:9, 10, 14). The author gives a dominant place to the death of Christ, over against his resurrection, as opposed to the other NT books, which gives a dominant place to the Resurrection, with the exception of Hebrews (Dodd 1946, xxxiii). Even the idea of the sacrificial character of Jesus is rarely attested in the Gospels. The Synoptic Gospels do not explicitly state the sacrificial quality or the universal implication of Christ's death, except in the Last Supper narratives (Matt 26:26-29; Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:15-20) and Mark 10:45 (Moo 1983, 329-30).

The concept of the death of Jesus as atonement is more explicitly stated in a few places in the NT (Rom 3:25; 1 Cor 11:25; 15:3; 1 Pet 1:18-19; Hebrews), but the universality of his atoning death is not as pronounced in most of these writings as in 1John. In particular, the cosmic significance of Christ's atoning work as the divine Son may be implied in some passages in Hebrews and Romans. Important in this regard is Hebrews 1:1-4:

Long ago God spoke to our ancestors in many and various ways by the prophets, but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, through whom he also created the worlds. He is the reflection of God's glory and the exact imprint of God's very being, and he sustains all things by his powerful word. When he had made purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high, having become as much superior to angels as the name he has inherited is more excellent than theirs.

The divine origin of the Son is implicit in the description of the Son: he is (1) the one enthroned over all things, (2) the mediator of creation, (3) the revelation of God, and (4) the sustainer of all things by his word. This theme of the divine Son is intertwined with the theme of Christ's heavenly priesthood (v. 3, καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος). Thus, we find in Hebrews the combination of Christ's atonement with his

divine sonship. Moreover, Hebrews describes Christ's atonement in the imagery of the Day of Atonement ritual (Heb 2:17; 9:13), as in 1John (Spicq 1950, 258-69).

Hebrews, however, still falls short of 1John in its universalizing of the Jewish traditions in two ways: (1) The author of Hebrews, despite his emphasis on Christ's atoning death and the new covenant, still uses the expressions that explicitly echo their Jewish roots, and contrasts the new covenant to the old covenant (7:22; 8:6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13; 9:1, 4, 15, 18, 20; 10:16, 29; 12:24; 13:20). (2) The author of Hebrews describes the beneficiaries of Christ's self-sacrifice as the people of the old covenant (cf. Heb 2:16, "the descendants of Abraham"; 2:17, εἰς τὸ ἰλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ). Lane thinks that the author of Hebrews is referring to the Christian community with these two expressions (Lane 1991, 66). But Ellingworth objects to Lane's view: "The people of God in Moses' time (11:25), the time of the exodus (4:9), is still, despite its breaking of the old covenant, the same people in the new age, for whom the promises of God remain valid" (Ellingworth 1993, 68-69).

Another passage that is very important in this regard is Rom 3:20-27:

For "no human being will be justified in his sight" by deeds prescribed by the law, for through the law comes the knowledge of sin. But now, apart from law, the righteousness of God has been disclosed, and is attested by the law and the prophets, the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe. For there is no distinction, since all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God; they are now justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as a sacrifice of atonement by his blood, effective through faith. He did this to show his righteousness, because in his divine forbearance he had passed over the sins previously committed; it was to prove at the present time that he himself is righteous and that he justifies the one who has faith in Jesus. Then what becomes of boasting? It is excluded. By what law? By that of works? No, but by the law of faith. For we hold that a person is justified by faith apart from works prescribed by the law.

In this passage, Paul affirms the universality of sin and of God's righteousness, and describes the death of Christ as the fulfillment of the Day of Atonement ritual (ἰλαστήριον) (Moo 1996, 28). This concept, together with the allusions to the divine

origin of the Son and his messiahship in Rom 1:3 (τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα), is closer to 1John than any other passage in the NT in this matter (Moo 1996, 46).

Romans, like Hebrews, falls short of 1John in its universalizing of the Jewish traditions in two ways: (1) The evidence from other passages in Romans seems to indicate that Paul still holds on to the national and corporate hopes of Israel on the Last Day, when all Israel will be saved (Isa 59:20) and God will make a new covenant with Israel and forgive their sins (Isa 59:21; Isa 27:9; Jer 31:33-34) (Rom 11:26-27; cf. Heb 2:16, 17).⁶³ (2) Romans is still permeated with concern for the Jew-Gentile issues, such as the law and its relationship to the righteousness of God as revealed in Christ (Rom 1-3), circumcision (2:25-29), and the Mosaic covenant and its relationship to the new covenant initiated in Christ (Rom 9-11).

Thus, both the author of Hebrews and Paul are ambivalent in their universalizing of Jewish hopes. Moreover, both Hebrews and Romans still use terms and expressions that have explicit Jewish roots, and contrast the Christian identity to the people of the old covenant, which place both books short of 1John in the thoroughness of its universalizing of the national and corporate hopes of Judaism: (1) As has been observed, the author of

⁶³ Rom 11:26, the first clause in particular, is the storm center in the interpretation of Rom 9-11 and of NT teaching about the Jews and their future (Moo 1996, 719-23; Schreiner 2001, 477-80). One of the issues is how to understand the reference of πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ. Moo lists the three options: “(1) the community of the elect, including both Jews and Gentiles; (2) the nation of Israel; or (3) the elect within Israel.” Of these three, Moo opts for the second one based upon the context of Rom 11 for four reasons: (1) In his use of the term “Israel” so far in Rom 9-11 (9:6, 27, 31; 10:19, 21; 11:2, 7, 11, 23, 25), Paul has always used it to refer to ethnic Israel.” (2) Paul writes Rom 11:11-32 in order to counter a tendency for Gentiles to appropriate for themselves exclusively the rights and titles of “God’s people.” (3) The phrase πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ occurs 136 times in the LXX, and it is used mainly to refer to the corporate Israel (1 Sam 7:5; 25:1; 2 Sam 16:22; 1 Kgs 12:1; 2 Chr 12:1; Dan 9:11). (4) The third view requires a shift in the meaning of “Israel” from v.25b to v. 26a since the Israel that has been partially hardened is clearly national Israel. Thus, together with Moo and Schreiner, I take a position here that with his use of the OT quotations in Rom 11:26-27, Paul meant to say that the corporate and ethnic Israel will be saved at the end of history as prophesied in the OT.

1John, despite the obvious allusions to the new covenant prophecy in the use of new covenant categories (1John 2:12-14), does not use the phrase “new covenant,” but uses neutral expressions like “new commandment” (2:7-9; cf. 3:23; 4:21; 5:2-3) and *κοινωνία* (1:3, 6, 7) that indirectly echo the new covenant. The same may be true of his use of “eternal life” (2:25; 3:14; 5:11, 12, 13, 16) and *ἰλασμός* (2:2; 4:10) in place of more Jewish expressions like “kingdom of God” and *ἰλαστηρίον* (Exod 25:17, 20, 21; 31:7; 35:12; 38:5, 8; Lev 16:13, 14, 15; Amos 9:1; Ezek 43:14, 17; *4 Macc.* 17:22; Rom 3:25).

(2) 1John does not show any trace of conflict between advocates of the law and of the gospel, between champions of works and faith. Nothing is said of the difference between Jew and Gentile, or about the question of circumcision; nor does the author contrast the new covenant to the old covenant, as seen in other NT writings (Luke 22:20; 1 Cor 11:25; 2 Cor 3:6; Heb 8:8, 13; 9:15; 12:24) (Westcott 1883, xxxiv).

1John, together with the Gospel of John, predominantly emphasizes the “already” of Christian existence over against the “not yet” of future hope, unlike other NT writings (Lieu 1991, 107). Most of the NT books may be placed in the continuum between “already” and “not yet,” with the majority of them placed more towards the “not yet.” In this continuum, 1John seems to be more at the “already” end than other books. It is true that 1John connects the present reality of Christian blessings with the motif of future eschatology (3:2: “Beloved, we are God's children now; what we will be has not yet been revealed. What we do know is this: when he is revealed, we will be like him, for we will see him as he is”). 1John’s primary emphasis, however, is on the realized aspect of the eschatological blessings prophesied in the later OT prophets, epitomized in the double triadic statements in 1John 2:12-14. The author of 1John, thus, considers new covenant

forgiveness as the present reality of Christian believers (1John 2:12), in contrast to Paul, who still hopes for the fulfillment of new covenant forgiveness in the future in terms of the national and corporate hopes of Israel (Rom 11:26-27: “And so all Israel will be saved.... ‘And this is my covenant with them, when I take away their sins’ [Jer 31:33]”).⁶⁴ Paul, despite his emphasis on the realized aspect of salvation (Rom 8:24; 2 Cor 5:17; Eph 2:5), still looks forward to the Last Day, when all Israel will be saved, as prophesied in the later OT prophets (Rom 11:26; cf. Isa 59:20; Jer 31:33), and speaks of Christian citizenship being in heaven and of the coming of a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will transform the body of humiliation into the body of his glory (Phil 3:20; cf. 1 Cor 15). Thus, Paul leans more towards “not yet” in this continuum, because the realized blessings are just a foretaste of what is to come.

1John vs. the Gospel of John

In the foregoing discussion, we have demonstrated that though 1John’s use of the two Jewish traditions is paralleled in Romans and Hebrews, 1John is distinct in both its thoroughness of universalizing the Jewish hopes, and in its predominant emphasis on the

⁶⁴ The expression Ἦξει ἐκ Σιῶν ὁ ῥυόμενος, ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ in Rom 11:26 clearly points to Isa 59:20, but the expression καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἢ παρ’ ἐμοῦ διαθήκη, ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν in Rom 11:27 alludes to passages such as: (1) καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἢ παρ’ ἐμοῦ διαθήκη in Isa 59:21, (2) “this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel (לֹא אֶכְרַת אֶתְּבִית יִשְׂרָאֵל)... for I will forgive their iniquity” (כִּי יִשְׁכַּח עֲוֹנוֹתָיו) in Jer 31:33-34 (Hebrew), and (3) ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι αὐτοῦ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν in Isa 27:9. Moo considers the OT quotation in Rom 11:26-27 as a composite quotation consisting of Isa 59:20-21a in vv.26b-27a and a clause from Isa 27:9 in v.27b, and argues that Paul uses a clause from Isa 27:9 to interpret this covenant in terms of the forgiveness of sins. Other features of Rom 11:27, however, seem to point to Jer 31:33-34 as its source: (1) As argued by Moo, Paul combines the concept of an eschatological new covenant with the forgiveness of sins, which we find most clearly in Jer 31:33-34. (2) Greek ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν in Rom 11:27b agrees with Hebrew כִּי יִשְׁכַּח עֲוֹנוֹתָיו in Jer 31:34 exactly. Thus, I think it more likely that Paul had Isa 59:20 and Jer 31:33-34 in mind in his use of the OT passages in Rom 11:26-27.

realized aspect of the eschatological blessings. Two observations can be made: (1) These two distinctives of 1John over against Romans and Hebrews are found also in the Gospel of John. (2) In the Gospel of John, we do not find explicit references to the two traditions that have important place in 1John.

In regards to the first observation concerning the two distinctives found in both 1John and the Gospel of John: (1) The gospel uses peculiar words or phrases which are used in 1John for the universal function of Christ in relation to his atoning ministry: “the Savior of the world (σωτήρα του κόσμου)” (4:14; cf. John 4:10, 42); and “the heavenly advocate (παράκλητος)” (2:1; cf. John 14:15-17, 26; 15:26-27; 16:7-11, 12-14). Prominent in both 1John and the Gospel of John is the frequent use of the word κόσμος in the passages examined. What is emphasized in the use of the word κόσμος is the concern of both writings for the salvation of the world in connection with the messianic role. As observed, the word κόσμος occurs 185 times in the NT, of which 78 occurrences are in the Gospel of John, 23 are in 1John, and one is in 2John – in sum, 55 percent of the total NT usage (Brown 1982, 222-23). (2) The eschatological salvation of the eternal life is described in the Gospel of John as a present reality as in 1John (John 3:36; 5:24; 6:47, 53-54; cf. 1John 5:13).

The second observation concerns the two traditions of eschatological forgiveness and vicarious cultic atonement. As observed, the author of 1John applies the two Jewish traditions of vicarious sacrifice and new covenant forgiveness to the death of Jesus. In the Gospel of John, however, we do not find explicit references to these two Jewish traditions. It is possible that the sacrificial connection of Christ’s death may be implied in John 1:29 and 6:53-59, but the connection is not expressed as explicitly as in 1John. As

has been observed, the author of 1John applies peculiar expressions to the universal function of Christ in relation to his atoning ministry: ἵλασμός (“for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world [περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου]” in 2:2; cf. 4:10), σωτήρα τοῦ κόσμου (4:14; cf. John 4:10, 42), and παράκλητος (2:1; cf. John 14:15-17, 26; 15:26-27; 16:7-11, 12-14). Of these three expressions, the last two expressions are attested in the Gospel of John; however, they are not used in explicit relation to Jesus’ atoning ministry as in 1John.

Summary and Conclusion

In chapter 4, we first argued and demonstrated that 1John is distinctive in its use of the two Jewish traditions in its universalizing, individualizing, and spiritualizing of the national and corporate hopes of Israel by applying them to the unique death of Jesus Christ. In addition, we identified three other distinctive elements in 1John: (1) Prominent is its theocentric viewpoint with regard to the atoning sacrifice of the Son of God (4:9-10). (2) The author of 1John combines the concept of eschatological atonement with the divine origin of Jesus (“Son of God” in 1:2; 3:5, 8; 4:9, 10, 14) and his messiahship (“Christ” in 1:3, 7; 3:23; 5:20) in his universal application of Jesus atoning death. (3) 1John’s emphasis is on the realized aspects of the eschatological blessings promised in the two Jewish traditions of eschatological forgiveness and atonement (2:12-14; 3:1, 8, 16; 4:10; 5:13).

We then argued and demonstrated that these distinctive elements in 1John can be detected in other NT books, but that they are not as pronounced or thorough as they are in 1John. In particular, 1John’s thoroughness in its universalizing of Jewish hopes and its emphasis on realized eschatology set it apart even from other NT books.

EXCURSUS

THE CONCEPT OF ATONEMENT IN EARLY RABBINIC THOUGHT

Introduction

In this section, we will examine the rabbinic traditions that include the concept of vicarious atonement, and compare the result with 1 John's concept of atonement.

Rabbinic literature is important to our study primarily because the traditions quoted in it may be much older than the authorities to which they are attributed. This study will demonstrate three things: (1) There is a certain level of continuity among the OT, the Second Temple writings, and rabbinic literature in their concept of vicarious atonement. (2) There is an analogical connection between the concept of vicarious atonement in certain writings in rabbinic Judaism and that of 1 John. (3) Nevertheless, there are decisive differences between them. These rabbinic writings still have a particularistic focus.

What concerns us here is the fact that the concept of vicarious atonement found in the Second Temple literature is found more explicitly in rabbinic literature. The primary contribution to this subject is still the work of Lohse (Lohse 1955), who in turn depended upon Strack-Billerbeck and Moore (Moore 1927) for sources. Other scholars' works on the same subject are often fragmentary in their handling of rabbinic literature, and they usually depend upon the work of Lohse, whether they agree or disagree with his thesis.

My work in this excursus will be different from the works of Lohse and other scholars primarily in the extent of literature covered, in its methodology, and in its specific goal of shedding light on 1 John. In terms of the sources, my work is narrower

than other works. Whereas Strack-Billerbeck and Lohse include in their discussion everything related to the subjects of sufferings and atonement in the Second Temple literature and rabbinic literature, I will confine my sources to those that are directly relevant to the concept of vicarious atonement.

By rabbinic literature, we mean the canon of rabbinical writings that consists of (1) the Mishnah (*ca.* 200), “the Oral Torah,” that is, that body of tradition traced back to God’s unwritten revelation to Moses at Mount Sinai,⁶⁵ (2) the two Talmuds (*yerusalmi: ca.* 400; *babli: ca.* 500-600), systematic exegeses of the Mishnah, (3) and the various collections of exegeses of Scriptures called *midrashim* (*ca.* 400-600) (Neusner 1984, 11). With regard to the definition of vicarious atonement, we follow Kadushin’s: “Vicarious atonement ... is the doctrine that an individual Israelite atones through the sufferings visited upon his person for the sins of all Israel” (Kadushin 1932, 134).

This study will follow three steps. First, we will select the traditions in rabbinic literature that state the concept of vicarious atonement either implicitly or explicitly, and will divide the traditions into five groups according to their characteristics in content and form.

Second, each tradition in the five groups will be studied in its relationship to its literary and historical contexts. This means its ties to the OT, the Second Temple writings, other related traditions in the group, and other rabbinic literature, and their

⁶⁵ Unless otherwise specified, the English translations of the rabbinic writings hereinafter are quoted from: Danby’s translation for Mishnah (Danby 1980); Neusner’s edition for Jerusalem Talmud (Neusner 1982); the Soncino edition for Babylonian Talmud (Epstein 1935-52); Neusner’s edition for Tosefta (Neusner 1981); Lauterbach’s translation for *Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael* (Lauterbach 1961); the Soncino edition for *Midrash Rabbah Pentateuch* (Freedman 1983; Lehrman 1983; Israelstam and Slotki 1983); Neusner’s edition for *Song of Songs Rabbah* (Neusner 1989); Braude’s edition for *Midrash on Psalms* (Braude 1959); Braude’s edition for *Pesiqta Rabbati* (Braude 1968); Neusner’s edition for *Pesiqta de Rab Kahana* (Neusner 1987a); Hammer’s edition for *Sifre Deuteronomy* (Hammer 1986); and Levertoff’s edition for *Sifre Numbers* (Levertoff 1926). The Hebrew/Aramaic consonantal texts of these writings are from the Judaic Classics Library, CD-Rom version 2.2 (Kantrowitz 2001).

connections with rabbinic Judaism in general and their relations to the historical situations covered in the traditions, in the Roman world in particular. Considering the limited scope of this study, however, our discussion will be confined to the elements that are directly relevant to the concept of vicarious atonement. With regard to the authors and dates of composition of the traditions cited in rabbinic literature, four assumptions are adopted: (1) If a tradition is attributed to a particular authority and no contradictory evidence is found in its parallel account, it is probable that that tradition can be traced back to that authority. (2) If a tradition is attributed to a particular authority whose general teachings correspond to its content, it is highly probable that that tradition can be traced back to that authority. (3) If a tradition is attested in more than one place under the name of the same authority, it is very probable that that tradition can be traced back to that authority. (4) Like most other historical studies, this study proceeds on the basis of probabilities rather than certainties.

Third, the concept of vicarious atonement in these rabbinic traditions will be compared with that of 1 John. In previous sections, 1 John was compared with and contrasted to the Second Temple literature with regard to their concept of forgiveness and atonement, and the distinctive aspects of 1 John were identified. What was found to be true of the Second Temple literature is for the most part true of rabbinic literature in general, though the latter has its own distinctive aspects. Having discussed the concept as it appears in the Second Temple literature, we will confine our discussion of rabbinic literature here to its distinctive elements that are relevant to our subject.

The Five Groups of Tradition

The traditions to be discussed in this chapter belong primarily to the *aggadah*, which is usually defined as that portion of rabbinic teaching which is not *halakhah*, i.e., which is not concerned with religious and ethical laws, and regulations. *Aggadah* “seeks to clarify various historical, theological, and ethical assertions of the Torah, to rationalize them in the light of current knowledge and prevailing moral ideals, and to derive from them the generalizations that can inspire, guide, and edify life, in the existing conditions under which men lived” (Bokser 1951, 13). As will be observed from our inquiry, *aggadah* is primarily the creation of Palestinian Jewry, from the time of the Second Temple to the end of the talmudic period.⁶⁶

The traditions to be discussed here are for the most part ascribed to the *Amoraim*, but they also include early Tannaitic traditions attributed to such men as R. Ishmael (d. 135), who founded one of the two most important schools that revived the Torah after Bar Kokhba’s rebellion, R. Jonathan (ca. 140), who was one of the two pupils of R. Ishmael, and R. Simeon b. Yohai (ca. 150), who was one of the five pupils of R. Akiba who revived Torah studies together with R. Ishmael’s two pupils after 135.

We have divided these rabbinic traditions into five groups: (1) two Tannaitic traditions that attribute atoning efficacy to the death of righteous Jews without actually citing the maxim that the death of the righteous atones; (2) two Tannaitic and three Amoraic traditions that attribute atoning efficacy to the actions and the intercessions of the patriarchs and the prophets who risked their lives for Israel but did not die in the process; (3) four Amoraic traditions that attribute atoning efficacy to the death of

⁶⁶ The compilation of the Mishnah (ca. 200) forms a divide between *Tannaim* (teachers) and *Amoraim* (expositors).

exemplary figures such as Moses, Miriam, and Aaron, and connect their death with the maxim that the death of the righteous atones; (4) five Amoraic traditions in which God is described as the one who chastises or seizes the great ones to atone for the sins of their generation; and (5) a formulaic saying, “May I make atonement for you!” or parallel expressions that appear in many rabbinic writings.

Study of the Traditions

The First Group: Martyr Traditions

A Tradition Ascribed to Simeon b. Yohai

The first group to be discussed consisted of two Tannaitic traditions that seem to have a connection with Jewish martyrdom during the wars with Rome. They attribute atoning efficacy to the innocent death of Jews. A tradition is handed down in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai (ca. 150):

Therefore: “Your life shall go for his life, and your people for his people” (1 Kings 20:42). You find that when Israel went forth to war, of them all only Ahab, king of Israel, alone was the one who died. That is in line with the following.... (1 Kings 22:34). And how shall I interpret the statement, “And your people instead of his people”? R. Yohanan [d. 279] in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai: ‘Every drop (of blood) which flowed from that righteous man (אִתָּהּ הִטִּיפָה שֵׁנִיאָתָא) (בְּמֵיתוּתוֹ צָדִיק (the prophet who was killed by a lion in 1 Kings 20:36) brought about atonement for all Israel (בִּיפְרָה עַל כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל). (y. *Sanhedrin* 30c)

This is probably one of the earliest rabbinic traditions in which the concept of vicarious atonement is explicitly stated. The tradition is ascribed to Simeon b. Yohai. It does not have any parallel account in known rabbinic literature, but its message agrees with Simeon’s personal experience and teachings in general. Simeon was a faithful disciple of R. Akiba (50-135), who was executed by the Romans for treason after the failure of the Bar Kokhba revolt. According to a Jewish tradition, Akiba was tortured to

death, his flesh being torn from his body with iron combs (*b. Berakhot* 61b). Simeon and four other disciples of Akiba survived the failure of that revolt, and they were the ones who were credited for reviving Torah studies at that time (*b. Yevamot* 62b). The crushing defeat of Bar Kokhba did not deter Simeon from maintaining his staunch opposition to Rome. The complete paganizing of Jerusalem and the prohibition of circumcision during the Hadrianic era, and the cruel martyrdom of Akiba and other rabbis, only intensified Simeon's hatred of Gentiles in general and especially of the Roman people and its culture. As a result, Simeon was sentenced to death, and he had to hide in a cave for 12 years with his son Eleazar (*b. Shabbat* 33b). The style and content of the tradition about the disciple's death seems to fit the context of Simeon's time and his personal experience. So personal and emphatic is the statement: " 'every' drop (of blood) which flowed from 'that' righteous man brought about atonement for 'all' Israel" (*y. Sanhedrin* 30c). The statement points strongly to the bloodshed of the Jews during their wars against the Romans under Titus and Hadrian. Thus, Simeon's authorship of this particular tradition needs not be doubted.

The OT text that Simeon refers to is from 1 Kings 20, which tells the story of a prophet who would not strike another prophet, despite his earnest request. Because of his refusal, judgment was announced against him: "Because you have not obeyed the voice of the LORD, as soon as you have left me, a lion will kill you" (1 Kings 20:36). And when he had left him, a lion met him and killed him. In the story, the death of the prophet in 1 Kgs 20:36 foreshadows the destiny of Ahab (22:34), who let Ben-Hadad out of his hand, even though YHWH had devoted him to destruction (20:42). Thus, judgment was announced against Ahab: "Your life shall go for his life, and your people for his people"

(1 Kings 20:42). According to the OT context, this passage (1 Kings 20:42) means that Ahab and his people would perish in place of Ben-Hadad and his people, but the Jerusalem Talmud interprets the second half of the passage differently by connecting it with the death of the dead prophet on the basis of a common theme of vicarious death (y. *Sanhedrin* 30c). The Talmud appeals for its interpretation to silence about the death of Israelites other than Ahab in 1 Kings 22:34. The logic of the Talmud goes like this: since, when Israel went forth to war, of them all only Ahab died in the battle, “your people for his people” must not mean the death of Israelites in place of Arameans, but must point to something else. This something else the Talmud finds in Simeon’s authoritative statement that “your people” refers to the dead prophet and “his people” to Israel. Thus, the prophet died to atone for all Israel, proleptically fulfilling the prophecy.

Certainly, it is difficult for us to accept such a manipulative use of Scripture, but we are concerned with the roots of Simeon’s statement. His statement seems to point to three things: (1) The concept seems to have its background in the bloody conflict with Rome (Hengel 1981, 63). (2) The concept that the blood of one atones for all Israel (כיפרה על כל ישראל) seems to point to the Levitical atoning sacrifices, the blood rites on the Day of Atonement in particular (Lev 16). (3) Also involved here is the idea that the death of a righteous man is atonement for Israel, which may have its roots in the notion of “merit of the fathers,” “the doctrine that progeny benefit from the righteousness of their forebears” (Shmidman 1997). According to Jewish law, a criminal atones for his offence by his death (cf. Isa 22:14; *m. Sanhedrin* 6:2; *Sifre Numbers* §112 on Num 15:31), but what baffles the readers of the story is that the prophet in 1 Kings 20 did not seem to have committed a grave sin worthy of such a cruel death. Since the righteous man did not

deserve to die, his death was an atonement, not for his own sins, which were few, but for Israel as a whole (Kadushin 1987, 142).

An Anonymous Tannaitic Tradition

We have observed that the tradition ascribed to Simeon b. Yohai attributed atoning efficacy to the innocent death of a prophet. The same idea seems to be behind another Tannaitic tradition:

And doth make expiation for the land of His people (32:43): Whence do we learn that when Israelites are slain by the nations of the world (שהרוגתן של ישראל ביד אומות העולם), it serves them as expiation in the world to come (כפרה היא להם לעולם הבא)? From the verses, *A Psalm of Asaph: O God, the heathen are come into Thine inheritance.... They have given the dead bodies of Thy servants (to be food unto the fowls of the heaven, the flesh of Thy saints unto the beasts of the earth). They have shed their blood like water* (Ps 79:1-3). (*Sifre Deuteronomy* §333 [140a] on Deut 32:43)

This tradition in *Sifre Deuteronomy* 140a is important because it is another early example of the concept of vicarious atonement. The tradition amplifies Deut 32:43, which closes the Song of Moses with a glimpse of hope after the darkness of the judgment expressed so vividly in the rest of the Song (32:1-42). With the symbolic action of raising his hand, YHWH makes an oath (v. 40) and declares that he will take vengeance on his adversaries, who had been instrumental in the execution of YHWH's judgment on Israel. YHWH will avenge the blood of his servants (דַם-עֲבָדָיו), and he will make atonement for his land and his people (וְכַפֵּר אֶדְמָתוֹ עִמּוֹ) (v. 43). This is one of the two occasions in the Song in which YHWH calls Israel his servants (cf. v. 36: "Indeed the LORD will vindicate his people, have compassion on his servants [עֲבָדָיו], when he sees that their power is gone, neither bond nor free remaining"). YHWH will make atonement for (purify) the land by taking vengeance on the innocent blood of his servants (cf. Num 35:33: "You shall not pollute the land in which you live; for blood pollutes the land, and

no expiation can be made for the land, for the blood that is shed in it, except by the blood of the one who shed it”). The use of the expression עֲבָדָיו, thus, signifies the turn of fortune for the Israelites.

The writer of the *Sifre* seems to have connected the blood of his servants to the concept of atonement;⁶⁷ from this, he drew his conclusion that the Israelites killed by the Gentiles provide atonement for the world to come. This implies that the blood of the Israelites killed by the Gentiles atones in the same way as the blood of the atoning sacrifices (Neusner 1987b, 382).

Comparison with 1 John

We have observed that at least two Tannaitic traditions connect the innocent death of Jews with vicarious atonement as early as the middle of the second century. As observed in chapter 2, the concept of vicarious atonement and eschatological forgiveness was also observed in some Second Temple writings, such as Dan 3:38-40 LXX and 4 *Maccabees*, which are in continuity with the OT in their application of the Levitical atoning sacrifices to the sufferings of the righteous (cf. Isa 53). Moreover, we have also found that 1 John applies the Levitical atoning sacrifices to the death of Jesus Christ the righteous. Likewise, the group of rabbinical traditions studied here point to three OT concepts: (1) There is atoning power in the blood of the innocent victim in Levitical atoning sacrifices (Lev 16:27; 17:11; 1 John 1:7; y. *Sanhedrin* 30c). In particular, the idea that the blood of the innocent victim brings about an atonement for Israel is strongly

⁶⁷ By saying “the writer of the *Sifre*,” I do not assume the authorship of the *Sifre* by a single writer. A tradition reports that R. Simeon b. Yohai is the composer of the *Sifre* on Numbers and Deuteronomy, but now scholars agree that the *Sifre* is in both of its parts a combination of two midrashim from the two Tannaitic schools: R. Ishmael’s school and R. Akiba’s (Strack 1965, 206). The final compilation of the *Sifre* was made by Amoraim.

reminiscent of the Levitical atoning sacrifices on the Day of Atonement. (2) The death of the righteous atones (2 Sam 21:3, 14; Isa 53; 1 John 2:1, 29; 3:7; y. *Sanhedrin* 30c; *Sifre Deuteronomy* §333 [140a]). (3) The coming age will replace this age of sufferings (Isa 40:9-11; 51:6; 52:7; 60:1-3, 19; 65:17; 66:24; 1 John 2:12, 28; 3:2; *Sifre Deuteronomy* §32 [73b], §333 [140a]).

Of particular importance to us is the fact that the two traditions in *Sifre Deuteronomy* (73b and 140a) connect the concept of atonement with the world to come. The earliest source in which the phrase “the world to come” (עוֹלָם הַבָּא) occurs is 1 Enoch 71:15, which is dated in the first century A.D. by a majority of scholars (Isaac 1983, 7). There is no consensus on the dating of the Book of the Similitudes that includes this passage. Otherwise, the phrase does not occur in the Second Temple writings. As argued in chapter 2, the meaning of “the forgiveness of sins” to the Jews in the Second Temple period is primarily the return from exile and the reestablishment of the Jewish nation, which the author of *4 Maccabees* (6:27-29; 17:21-22) connected with the death of martyrs (Wright 1992, 273).

The idea that “the Israelites killed by the Gentiles are an expiation for the world-to-come” (*Sifre Deuteronomy* §333 [140a]) is certainly analogous to the concept of atonement in 1 John. In 1 John, the atoning sacrifice of Jesus the Messiah is the basis for the realized eschatological forgiveness of the new covenant Christians (2:12), as well as the basis of the ultimate redemption in the future: “And now, little children, abide in him, so that when he is revealed we may have confidence and not be put to shame before him at his coming” (1 John 2:28). “Beloved, we are God’s children now; what we will be has not yet been revealed. What we do know is this: when he is revealed, we will be like him,

for we will see him as he is. And all who have this hope in him purify themselves, just as he is pure” (1 John 3:2-3). This implies that there will be a final divine revelation that will involve the final judgment (v. 2) and the transformation of believers in Christ (v. 3), which happens to agree with the two primary features of the world to come in rabbinic literature (cf. *Pesiqta Rabbati* 11:7: “In this world, Israel cleave unto the Holy One But in the time-to-come they will become like [the Lord]”).

Compared to the rabbinic traditions in this group, 1 John is distinctive primarily by bringing in the person of Jesus and the universal efficacy of his sacrifice. In particular, the rabbinic traditions did not envision the messiah’s death as the atoning sacrifice.

Those Who Did Not Die, but Atoned

A Tannaitic Tradition Ascribed to Jonathan (ca. 140)

We have just examined a group of writings that attribute atoning efficacy to the death of innocent men. Another group of rabbinic writings applies the concept of vicarious atonement to the actions and intercessions of the patriarchs and the prophets who risked their lives for Israel. These situations do not involve the actual death of the mediator. The first tradition comes down to us in the name of R. Jonathan (ca. 140) concerning Jonah, Moses, and David:

R. Nathan says: Jonah made his voyage only in order to drown himself in the sea, for thus it is said: “And he said unto them: Take me up and cast me forth into the sea” (Jonah 1:12). And so you also find that the patriarchs and prophets offered their lives in behalf of Israel (נתנו נפשם על ישראל).

As to Moses, what did he say: “Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin; and if not blot me, I pray Thee, out of the book which Thou hast written” (Exod 32:32); “And if Thou deal thus with me, kill me, I pray Thee, out of hand, if I have found favor in Thy sight; and let me not look upon my wretchedness” (Num 11:15).

As to David, what did he say? “And David spoke unto the Lord, when he saw the angel that smote the people, and said: Lo, I have sinned and I have done iniquitously; but these sheep what have they done? Let Thy hand, I pray Thee, be against me, and against my father’s house” (2 Sam 24:17). Thus you find everywhere that the patriarchs and the prophets offered their lives in behalf of Israel. (*Mekilta, Pisha* 1:104-113)

Jonathan represents the school of R. Ishmael b. Elisha during the Hadrianic era, and his statements therefore appear mostly in the *Mekilta* and the *Sifre* on Numbers, which emanate from the school of R. Ishmael. The object of this aggadic tradition seems to be clear: Jonathan wanted to describe the heroes of ancient times such as Moses, David, and Jonah as the prototypes of Israelites to follow in the aftermath of the Roman wars. This tradition is distinctive in two ways: (1) The mediators are confined to a few patriarchs and prophets. (2) The atonement did not involve their deaths. So, here we have evidence that the concept of vicarious death was expressed in the traditions ascribed to the two authorities that represented the two schools during the Hadrianic era.

As observed in another tradition (*y. Sanhedrin* 130a), Jonah’s action receives a more favorable interpretation in this tradition than in the OT story itself. The key element that Jonathan emphasizes is Jonah’s attitude towards Israel: he cared for his people, even if that meant to disobey YHWH and be drowned in the sea. The expression “gave their life for Israel” (נתנו נפשם על ישראל) in *Mekilta* is strongly reminiscent of the words of a Maccabean martyr: “I, like my brothers, give up body and life (σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν προδίδωμι) for the laws of our ancestors, appealing to God to show mercy soon to our nation ... to bring to an end the wrath of the Almighty that has justly fallen on our whole nation” (2 Macc 7:37; cf. Dan 3:38-40 LXX; 4 Macc. 17:22; 1 John 3:14). They clearly share the concept of surrendering their lives for their nation. In particular, the expression נתנו נפשם in *Mekilta* is clearly equivalent to the Greek ψυχὴν προδίδωμι in 2 Macc 7:37. Jonathan finds correspondences between Jonah and the two exemplary figures in the OT:

Moses (Exod 32:30-34) and David (2 Sam 24:17). The two cases used by Jonathan are Moses' mediation after the golden calf episode and David's mediation after the census. The context seems to indicate that Jonathan considered Moses to be one of the prophets and David one of the patriarchs. The title "patriarchs" is usually reserved for Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (*b. Berakhot* 16b), but there is some indication that it was also used for David in the first century A.D. In the NT, Peter refers to David as "the patriarch David" (Acts 2:29).

In addition to their attitude toward their people, these two OT figures typify two eschatological figures who will liberate Israel from exile and reestablish the Jewish nation in the land of Israel. Moses is a type of the leader who will lead the people of Israel from bondage (Deut 18:18) and bring about the renewal of the covenant between YHWH and Israel. David is a type of the kingly Messiah, who will restore the golden days of the early monarchy (Jer 23:5; 30:9; 33:14-16; Zech 3:8; Hos 3:5; Sir 45:25; 47:11 cf. *y. Berakhot* 5a). Involved here are all four Jewish eschatological ideas: (1) the concept of the new covenant, (2) the concept of the eschatological kingdom, (3) the idea of divine forgiveness, and (4) the concept of vicarious sufferings. We find all four ideas in the NT interpretation of the life and the death of Jesus the Messiah.

Of particular importance to us is the fact that the idea of vicarious suffering is explicitly stated with a similar pattern in both cases: (1) the wrath of YHWH is upon the people because of the sins of the people (in Moses' case) or the leader (in David's case). (2) The leader steps in between the people and YHWH as a mediator. (3) During his attempt to mediate, the leader volunteers to suffer on behalf of them. (4) YHWH accepts

the leader's supplication and forgives them. Of the two cases, the primary emphasis seems to be on Moses' case, as indicated by its precedence over David's in the text.

The Exodus passage deals with Moses' intercession before YHWH after the golden calf episode. After that fateful event, Moses ascends the mountain a second time (Exod 32:30-34), and he states the purpose of his trip in v. 30: "You have sinned a great sin. But now I will go up to the LORD; perhaps I can make atonement for your sin (אֶכַּפֶּרָה בְּעַד חַטְאֹתֵיכֶם)." The expression אֶכַּפֶּרָה בְּעַד חַטְאֹתֵיכֶם points to the so-called *kipper* formula used for the two atoning sacrifices: "The priest shall make atonement for him/they, and he/they shall be forgiven" (Lev 4:20; cf. 4:26, 31, 35; 5:10, 13, 16, 18, 26; 19:22; Num 15:25, 26, 28). This cultic connection seems to imply that Moses made atonement by offering his life as a ransom during his attempt to mediate. Baltzer argues, "Here there is a double condition for the people's survival. Moses offers to take upon himself the consequences of the 'great sin,' on behalf of the people. To be blotted out of 'the book of life' – the list of citizens of heaven – means that his death will be final" (Baltzer 2001, 420-21). Williams, however, excludes any notion of vicarious death in this case, saying: "Moses expresses his desire to stand with them and to share their fate" (Williams 1975, 103). The issue is whether we may clearly differentiate between the concept of death in solidarity with the people and that of vicarious death in the OT. Such a distinction between representation and substitution is foreign to the writers of the OT or the rabbis. Moreover, when a human person is the subject of the action, *kipper* "denotes the action of a substitutionary mediator, effecting forgiveness of sin (Exod 32:30, 32), withdrawal of wrath (Num 25:11), or cessation of a plague (Num 17:13, 15)" (Lang 1995,

294). As will be observed, the rabbis noticed this, and applied the concept of cultic vicarious atonement to these OT passages.

Two Amoraic Traditions

The interpretation of Moses' mediation as an atonement, as seen in the preceding tradition, is supported by two Amoraic traditions. The first one is handed down in the name of Samuel (d. 254), a Babylonian *Amora*: "Moses besought (וַיִּתְחַל) the Lord his God (Exod 32:11)... Samuel says: 'It teaches that he risked his life for them [i.e., found a ground of absolution], as it says, And if not, blot me, I pray Thee, out of Thy book which Thou hast written (Exod 32:32)' " (*b. Berakoth* 32a). The second Amoraic tradition (*b. Sotah* 14a) is ascribed to R. Simlai (*ca.* 250), R. Samuel's contemporary, who applied the Servant passage (Isa 53:12) specifically to Moses' atonement.

Just as Jonathan's interpretation of Jonah's action was strongly reminiscent of the words of a Maccabean martyr (2 Macc 7:37), so is Simlai's interpretation of Moses' action. Like the Maccabean martyr, Moses' role involves both that of vicarious sacrifice and that of intercessor, which are closely associated with each other. He not only "surrendered himself to die" (cf. 1 John 3:14), securing atonement for Israel, but also "begged for mercy on behalf of sinners in Israel."

This way of interpreting Moses' action is paralleled by 1 John's concept of atonement in three ways: (1) As the people were under the wrath of God because of their sins in the case of Moses, so is the whole world subject to God's wrath because of their sins (1 John 3:14; 5:19). (2) As Moses was the leader of a new community of Israel based on a covenant, so is Jesus the leader of the new covenant community. (2) As Moses was a

willing sacrifice and intercessor, so is Jesus (3:5, 8, 16; 2:1, 2). In particular, the statement “He laid down his life for us” (3:16) is clearly reminiscent of expressions such as “The patriarchs and prophets gave their life for Israel (נחננו נפשנו על ישראל)” (*Mekilta, Pisha* 1: 104-113; cf. 2 Macc 7:37) and “surrendered himself to die” (*b. Sotah* 14a; cf. Isa 53:12; Mark 10:45). (3) As Moses’ mediation brought about divine forgiveness, so did the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ and his intercession. Their “sins are forgiven on account of his name” (1 John 2:12), and they “have passed from death to life” (3:14). 1 John, however, is distinctive in its universalizing tendency.

A Tannaitic Tradition regarding Phinehas’s Atonement

Another Tannaitic tradition (*Sifre* on Num 25:13) applies the same Servant passage (Isa 53:12), this time to Phinehas, Aaron’s grandson, who “was zealous for his God, and made atonement (וַיִּכַּפֵּר) for the Israelites” (Num 25:13). Levertoff considers this tradition as a fragment of a larger section where Isa 53 was interpreted as referring to Phinehas (Levertoff 1926, 143 n. 1). Phinehas shares an exalted position with Moses in both the OT and the Second Temple literature. Ben Sirach exalts Phinehas as the third in glory after Moses and Aaron (Sir 45:23). In the *Sifre* on Num 25:13, it is obvious that the writer wanted to emphasize the parallel between Moses and Phinehas. This argument is supported by three things: (1) Just as Isa 53 was interpreted as referring to Moses in *b. Sotah* 14a, so was it interpreted as referring to Phinehas in the *Sifre*. (2) The pattern of the event closely follows the golden calf episode. Like Moses in that episode, Phinehas acts as a mediator between YHWH and Israel in the apostasy at Baal Peor, this time accompanied by sexual relations between Israelites and pagan women. The wrath of

YHWH could only be appeased by the execution of all the leaders of the people, but Phinehas turned back YHWH's wrath from the Israelites by killing two conspicuous and defiant sinners in the very act (Num 25:6-8). (3) As Moses' mediation brought about divine forgiveness and restored the covenant relationship between YHWH and his people, so does the mediation of Phinehas and his intercession.

According to the *Sifre* on Num 25:13, it was Phinehas's zealous action that constitutes the atonement. The *Sifre* emphasizes Phinehas's zealous action by setting off his zeal against other Israelites' complacency. They even tried to lynch Phinehas, and they all despised him even after YHWH performed six miracles for him. For Phinehas's zealous action, the *Sifre* uses Isa 53:12: "Because he hath put out his soul unto death." "It does not say here 'כָּפַר,' he atoned once for all, but 'יִכָּפֵר'; for until this present time hath he not ceased (to do so), but he stands and atones, until the time shall come when the dead will live again." The *Sifre*'s interpretation is based upon the difference between the perfective כָּפַר and nonperfective יִכָּפֵר. When the combination of waw and prefix conjugation such as וַיִּכָּפֵר is preceded by a suffix form, as seen in Num 25:13, it usually expresses a perfective value (Waltke and O'Connor 1990, §33.3.1), but the *Sifre* considers the waw as just a conjunction that does not affect the tense of the verb יִכָּפֵר and interprets יִכָּפֵר as a nonperfective present tense. This way of reading the passage seems to have been prompted by the fact that the "eternal" possession of the priesthood was promised to Phinehas and his descendents as the covenant of peace.

This interpretation of Phinehas's action is in line with Simlai's interpretation of Moses' atonement, but adds to it the important element of the ongoing ministry of atonement by Phinehas, which may be based on YHWH's promise of "the covenant of an

everlasting priesthood” to Phinehas and his descendents (25:13). Nevertheless, this particular aspect of Phinehas’s atonement is paralleled by 1 John’s description of Jesus as an atoning sacrifice. Like the picture of Phinehas in the *Sifre*, Christ has not only accomplished atonement for our sins on the cross, but still stands and makes atonement for our present sins as our advocate (παράκλητον) with the Father (2:1-2).

An Amoraic Tradition on Isaac Ascribed to Jonathan b. Eleazar (ca. 220)

This way of connecting the Servant passage to exemplary figures is not limited to Moses and Phinehas. Isaac was described in the Midrash as the first to experience “sufferings” from God (*Genesis Rabbah* 65:9), and in *Tg. Job* 3:18 he is expressly called “the servant of YHWH.”⁶⁸ Based upon this observation, Rosenberg argues that “in Jewish tradition, Isaac was described as the prototype of the ‘Suffering Servant,’ bound upon the altar as a sacrifice” (Rosenberg 1965, 385). Rosenberg’s argument finds its support in a tradition (*b. Shabbat* 89b) handed down in the name of R. Jonathan b. Eleazar (ca. 220), in which Isaac is described as a voluntary atoning sacrifice. In this tradition, we find all the elements observed in rabbinic interpretations of Moses’ and Phinehas’s atonements. Emphasized again is the voluntariness of the sacrifice on Isaac’s part (“I offered myself up before thee [as a sacrifice]!), which can also be found in both the Second Temple literature and other rabbinical literature. According to Josephus, Isaac was twenty-five years old when he obeyed God’s command and went immediately to the altar to be sacrificed (*Ant.* 1.227-232). This aspect of the sacrifice is expressed more explicitly in a Tannaitic tradition handed down in the name of R. Meir (ca. 150): “And

⁶⁸ A fragment of *Targum Job* (11QtgJob) was found at Qumran; thus, we may say that this tradition is even earlier than the Qumran literature.

with all thy soul, as did Isaac, who bound himself upon the altar, as it is said, *And Abraham stretched forth his hand, and took the knife to slay his son* (Gen 22:10)” (*Sifre Deuteronomy* §32 [73b] on Deut 6:5).

Of particular importance to us, however, is the new element added to them: *Aqeda* of Isaac becomes the basis of Isaac’s intercession with YHWH (“And shouldst Thou say, they must all be upon me, lo! I offered myself up before Thee [as a sacrifice]!”). Involved here again is the fusion of the two concepts: the doctrine of the merits of the fathers, and the concept of the atoning sacrifice. This picture of Isaac is strongly reminiscent of that of Christ as the believer’s advocate with the Father in 1 John 2:1-2. Like the picture of Isaac in the talmudic tradition (*b. Shabbat* 89b), the accomplished fact of Christ’s atoning sacrifice on the cross becomes the basis of his continuing ministry of atonement before the throne of God (2:1-2). In addition to this, the sacrifice of Isaac parallels that of Jesus in another important respect: in both, the sacrifice itself does not have any inward connection with the sinner. The Isaac language is applied to Jesus in 1 John using *μονογενής* (1 John 4:9; cf. Heb 11:17), one of the two LXX terms that render the Hebrew word *יחיד* used for Isaac in Gen 22:2, 12, 16 (Best 1965, 169-73; Brown 1982, 517; Lane 1974, 57; Taylor 1959a, 162; Vermes 1961, 233). We may still find many differences between the two, despite these parallels. In particular, whereas Christ’s atoning sacrifice is for the whole world (2:2), the beneficiaries of Isaac’s atonement were confined to Israelites in the talmudic tradition.

The Death of the Exemplary Figures

There is also a group of traditions that attribute atoning efficacy to the death of exemplary figures. We have identified four traditions, which are all ascribed to the *Amoraim* in the third century. Like the Isaac tradition in the Babylonian Talmud (*b. Sanhedrin* 89b), these four Amoraic traditions combine the doctrine of the merits of the fathers with the concept of the atoning efficacy of the death of the righteous.

The first tradition is handed down in the name of R. Hama, son of R. Hanina (*ca.* 260), a Palestinian *Amora*: “*And He buried him in the valley in the land of Moab over against Beth-peor (Exod 34:28).... R. Hama son of R. Hanina also said: Why was Moses buried near Beth-peor? To atone for the incident at Peor*” (*b. Sotah* 14a). Thus, Hama connects Moses’ burial place to atonement for the event at Peor recorded in Num 25:1-3. Moses died a natural death, but that fact does not deter R. Hama from attributing atoning efficacy to his death. This tradition is attested only here.

Similarly, atoning efficacy is attributed to the death of Aaron in a tradition (*b. Moed Katan* 28a) handed down in the name of R. Eleazar (d. 279), a Palestinian *Amora*. The same atoning efficacy is attributed to the death of Miriam in a tradition (*Moed Katan* 28a) handed down in the name of R. Ammi (*ca.* 300), one of the two most outstanding Palestinian *Amoraim* of the period (*b. Megillah* 22a; *b. Sanhedrin* 17b). Finally, atoning efficacy is also attributed to the death of the two sons of Aaron and Saul’s sons in a tradition (*y. Yoma* 38b) handed down in the name of R. Hiyya b. Abba (*ca.* 280). In the OT, Nadab and Abihu, Aaron’s two sons, are remembered primarily in relation to their offering of “unholy fire” before YHWH and their tragic death (Lev 10:1-2). Here they receive a more favorable view in line with the rabbis’ favorable reinterpretation of their

history. R. Hiyya applied the known maxim “The death of the righteous effects atonement” to their death; thus, they are seen to be righteous, and their deaths have atoning efficacy for all Israel in the manner analogous to the rituals on the Day of Atonement.

All four traditions are nearly identical in their style of argument, content, and underlying maxim. In addition, they are all ascribed to the rabbinic authorities of the third century. Based upon our study of this group of traditions, we may conclude: (1) The concept of vicarious atonement was popular among the rabbis at this period of time. (2) The maxim that the death of the righteous effects atonement can be traced to the earlier period, as seen in a tradition ascribed to Simeon b. Yohai (*ca.* 150). The fact that these later traditions use the maxim explicitly seems to indicate that there was development of the concept of vicarious atonement. (3) Involved here is also the fusion of the concept of vicarious atonement and the concept of the merits of the fathers. This combining of concepts has a precedent in a tradition ascribed to Jonathan (*ca.* 220) concerning *Aqeda* of Isaac. These later traditions seem to have expanded their application of the concept by including Moses, Miriam, Aaron, and Aaron’s sons.

With regard to their interpretive handling of Scripture, we may hardly agree, except in the last case that has explicit connection with atonement (2 Sam 21:3). What determined the result of the rabbis’ exegesis was their hermeneutical goals, rather than any conscious subscription to method (McCartney 1988, 107-10). The rabbis’ interpretive goal was to establish that the death of exemplary figures atones. The maxim was that the death of the righteous atones, and assuming that these exemplary figures were righteous, their death had to atone. However, there is no explicit statement about the atoning

efficacy of their deaths in the scriptural texts; thus, the rabbis appealed to a variety of scriptural contexts for support of their premises. They consisted of the burial place, immediate literary contexts, and the date of death, from which the rabbis sought deeper meaning in connection with their premises (Doeve 1954, 89).

Of particular importance to us is the fact that rabbis attributed special atoning efficacy to the death of Moses, Aaron, and Miriam, who are mentioned together in Micah as those sent by God to lead Israel out of Egypt: “For I brought you up from the land of Egypt, and redeemed you from the house of slavery; and I sent before you Moses, Aaron, and Miriam” (Mic 6:4). The rabbis’ interpretation of these three figures is similar to 1 John’s description of Jesus Christ in three ways: (1) Just as the three are sent by God to redeem Israel from Egyptian bondage, so is Jesus sent by God to redeem his people from the bondage of sin and death: “God sent his only Son into the world so that we might live through him. In this is love, not that we loved God but that he loved us and sent his Son to be the atoning sacrifice for our sins” (1 John 4:9-10). (2) Like the death of the three figures, the blood of Jesus has atoning efficacy for his people’s sins: “But if we walk in the light as he himself is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin” (1:7). (3) They both use cultic language to express the atoning efficacy of the death of the mediator. As observed in chapter 3, the concept of atonement in 1 John points to its correspondence with the Levitical atonement rituals, especially on the Day of Atonement. This group of rabbinical traditions also connects the death of Aaron and Miriam (and Aaron’s two sons) to the Levitical atonement rituals. In the case of Aaron and his two sons, their deaths are directly compared to the Day of Atonement.

As seen in other respects, however, 1 John's concept of atonement is unique primarily because it has to do with Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the Messiah, and because of the extent of the atoning efficacy of his death.

God Chastising or Seizing the Great Ones to Aton

There is a group of rabbinical traditions that describe God as the one who chastises or seizes the great ones to atone for the sins of his generation. This group can be divided into two subgroups: (1) the cases in which no death of a mediator is involved, and (2) the cases in which the death of the mediator is involved. We will deal with the former first.

The Sufferings of the Great One(s)

The traditions pertaining to this subgroup are ascribed to authorities that belong to the Tiberias academy headed by R. Johanan in the later half of the third century. These authorities are Johanan, Abbahu, Resh Lakish, and Judah the son of Nahmani. Johanan was the teacher of both Abbahu and Hiyya. Resh Lakish was one of the most esteemed sages in the Tiberias academy headed by Johanan (*b. Ta'anit* 8a), and Judah, the interpreter of Resh Lakish, may well have been Johanan's disciple, considering his relationship with Resh Lakish.

The first tradition comes down to us in the name of R. Abbahu (*ca.* 300), a Palestinian *Amora*, who was a disciple of R. Johanan and also studied with Resh Lakish and Eleazar b. Pedat:

A certain Min said to R. Abbahu: 'Your God is a jester [i.e., He makes His prophets ridiculous], for He said to Ezekiel, Lie down on thy left side (Ezek 4:4), and it is also written, Lie on thy right side.' (Ezek 4:6) [Just then] a disciple came and asked him: 'What is the reason for the Sabbatical

year?' 'Now,' said R. Abbahu, 'I shall give you an answer which will suit you both equally. The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Israel, Sow your seed six years but omit the seventh, that ye may know that the earth is mine (cf. Lev 25:3, 23). They however, did not do so, but sinned and were exiled. Now, it is the universal practice that a king of flesh and blood against whom his subjects have rebelled, if he be cruel, kills them all; if merciful, he slays half of them; but if he is exceptionally merciful, he only chastises the great ones (מייסר הגדולים) [i.e., the leaders]. So, also, the Holy One, blessed be He, afflicted Ezekiel in order to cleanse Israel from their iniquities.' (*b. Sanhedrin* 39a)

Abbahu lived in Caesarea, then the center of Roman rule and of Palestinian Christianity, which may have provided the life-setting of this particular tradition.

Abbahu's interpretation is consistent with the description of Ezekiel's ordeal in the OT. Ezekiel was to "bear the punishment" (וְשָׂמַתְּ אֶת-עֲוֹנוֹ) of both Israel and Judah by his sufferings (Ezek 4:4-6), which Abbahu interprets as vicariously atoning for the sins of both nations.

The same dictum is applied in a tradition (*b. Kethuboth* 8b) to the sufferings of R. Hiyya (*ca.* 280), the outstanding disciple of R. Johanan. Behind these statements of rabbis, there lies a dictum that God chastises the great ones to atone for the sins of their generation. This dictum follows a general teaching that sufferings atone for sins: "For R. Simeon b. Lakish [Resh Lakish] said ... the sufferings wash away all the sins of a man" (*b. Berakhot* 5a). So, according to Judah the son of Nahmani, the fact that R. Hiyya suffered the loss of his child innocently implies that he is "important enough to be held responsible [lit. 'to be seized'] for the generation (with the sufferings, that come over you, you should expiate your generation vicariously)."

The Death of the Mediator Involved

We have examined the first subgroup of traditions, in which no death of the mediator is involved. In the second subgroup of traditions, the atoning death of the mediator *is* involved. The first tradition was handed down in the name of R. Eleazar (d.

279), who was born in Babylon (y. *Berakhot* 4b) and studied under Samuel (b. *Eruvin* 66a) and Rav (b. *Hullin* 111b). Eleazar later migrated to the land of Israel, and studied under R. Hanina (y. *Kil'ayim* 32c).

And He said to the Angel that destroyed the people, It is enough [גַּרְ] (2 Sam 24:16). R. Eleazar said: The Holy One, blessed be He, said to the Angel: take a great man [גַּרְ] among them, through whose death many sins can be expiated for them [According to the dictum that the death of the righteous is an atonement—Rashi.]. At that time there died Abishai son of Zeruiah, who was [singly] equal in worth to the greater part of the Sanhedrin. (b. Berakoth 62b)

Eleazar explains the cause of the death of Abishai by applying the well-known dictum that the death of the great one atones. He uses 2 Samuel 24:16 as a proof text for his argument. The context of that verse does not warrant his interpretation, but that does not deter him from drawing a conclusion on the basis of the word גַּרְ. Another tradition connects this dictum with the context of the Abrahamic covenant:

AFTER THESE THINGS (Gen 15:1). Misgivings were entertained there. Who entertained them? Abraham. He said to God: 'Sovereign of the Universe! Thou madest a covenant with Noah not to exterminate his children; then I arose and accumulated meritorious acts and pious deeds, whereupon my covenant superseded his. Perhaps another will arise and accumulate even a greater store of precepts and good deeds, and then a covenant with him will supersede Thy covenant with me?' Said the Holy One, blessed be He, to him: 'From Noah I did not set up shields of the righteous, but from thee I set up shields of the righteous. Moreover, when thy children take to transgressions and evil deeds, I will see one righteous man amongst them who will be able to say to My Attribute of Justice, "Enough!" whereupon I will take him and make him atone for them.' (*Genesis Rabbah* 44 [27b]; cf. *Song of Songs Rabbah* 1:14 [93b])

In *Genesis Rabbah*, this tradition is quoted anonymously, but in the parallel account in *Song of Songs Rabbah*, it is quoted almost verbatim in the name of R. Hama (ca. 260), a Palestinian *Amora* who also attributed atoning efficacy to the death of Moses (b. *Sotah* 14a). Since there is no other parallel account in the known rabbinic writings, it seems likely that Hama is responsible for this tradition too. The tradition interprets Gen 15:1 as focusing on the difference between the Abrahamic covenant and the Noachic covenant. Compared to the Noachic covenant, the Abrahamic covenant lacks one important element: a divine promise not to exterminate Abraham's descendants. The

tradition connects this difference to the maxim that the death of the righteous atones. Thus, according to this tradition, in place of the promise in the Noahic covenant, shields are given to the righteous in the Abrahamic covenant. For the basis of the shields, the tradition seems to appeal to 2 Sam 24:16. The expression “My Attribute of Justice, ‘Enough (רַב)!’ ” is strongly reminiscent of “It is enough (רַב)” in 2 Sam 24:16, which we observed in the tradition ascribed to R. Eleazar (*b. Berakoth* 62b). This argument is supported by the fact that the word רַב is connected to the attribute of justice. The use of the word רַב seems to presuppose the merciful act of God in taking the righteous man for the sins of the generation. The same idea is found in the talmudic tradition (*b. Berakoth* 62b).

Another tradition seeks to explain the root of the same maxim by connecting it to the destruction of the temple. A tradition is handed down in the name of R. Hoshya (*ca.* 225), a Palestinian *Amora* who was the head of the academy at Caesarea and studied under Bar Kappara and Hiyya and taught R. Johanan (d. 279) (Strack 1965, 120):

Another explanation of *And Thou shalt make the boards for the Tabernacle* (לְמִשְׁכָּן) (Exod 26:15). Why does it say לְמִשְׁכָּן? Should it not rather have said ‘into a tabernacle (לְמִשְׁכָּן)? R. Hoshya said: Because the sanctuary stands as a pledge [Reading: *And thou shalt make the boards* לְמִשְׁכָּן (for a pledge) instead of לְמִשְׁכָּן (for the tabernacle)], so that if the enemies of Israel [a euphemism for Israelites] became deserving of destruction, it would be forfeit as a pledge. Moses said to God: ‘Will not the time come when Israel shall have neither Tabernacle nor Temple? What will happen to them?’ The divine reply was: ‘I will then take one of their righteous men and retain him as a pledge on their behalf, in order that I may pardon all their sins.’ Thus too it says, *And He hath slain all that were pleasant to the eye* (Lam 2:4). (*Exodus Rabbah* 35:4 [95a] on Exod 26:15)

This particular tradition is attested only once in rabbinic literature. By applying a different vocalization to the word לְמִשְׁכָּן, the tradition interprets Exod 26:15 to mean that the tabernacle (and the temple) served as a pledge for the Israelites. From this interpretation of the passage, the tradition concludes that after the temple was destroyed, the righteous became a pledge on its behalf.

Williams cites this tradition as evidence for his position that the doctrine of vicarious expiatory suffering and death among the rabbis is a post-70 development (Williams 1975, 123-24). He takes Hoshya's statement literally: "Because of the destruction of the temple it is necessary for God to 'take'—apparently by death—a righteous man to expiate Israel's sins." Williams's argument is weak for two reasons: (1) As seen in the tradition attributed to R. Hama, rabbis seem to have known a maxim, the basis of which was sought later from a variety of biblical events, such as David's census-taking, the difference between the two covenants, etc. Hoshya too seems to have connected the maxim with the destruction of the temple. Thus, Hoshya's statement does not necessarily mean that vicarious atonement by the righteous was a new remedy for the destruction of the temple. (2) This is apparently the only occasion in which the vicarious death of the righteous is explained in connection with the destruction of the temple. We can hardly accept an argument based upon this one piece of evidence, without any other supporting proof.

Another tradition presents this idea as a general principle in the name of R. Gorion (*ca.* 350): "When there are righteous men in the generation, the righteous are seized [by death] for the [sins of the] generation; when there are no righteous in the generation, school children are seized for the generation" (*b. Shabbat* 33b).

These traditions suggest that the maxim that the righteous are seized for the sins of the generation was popular among the *Amoraim* between the early third century and the middle of the fourth century. The concept seems to be rooted in another maxim, that the righteous atone, but it is distinctive in saying that God takes the initiative in the whole process of atonement. The idea that God seizes the righteous to atone for the generation is

paralleled in Isa 53, but it is not found in the known Second Temple writings or in rabbinic literature except in writings examined here. The divine initiative in seizing the victim in these traditions is certainly analogous to 1 John's emphasis on the divine initiative in offering the Son as the atoning sacrifice for the sins of the world. Of course, 1 John's concept is distinctive in that it involves Jesus as the sacrifice and it universalizes the efficacy of his atoning death.

The Traditional Saying, "May I Make Atonement for You (or Them)!"

The last group of traditions that state the concept of vicarious atonement include the popular formula *אני כפרה*. This formula or its equivalent is found in many rabbinic writings from a very early period.⁶⁹ This formula is very important to our study because it is very old. It is attested in a tradition ascribed to R. Ishmael (d. 135): "R. Ishmael says: the Children of Israel (may I make atonement for them! [*אני כפרתי*]) are like boxwood, neither black nor white, but of the intermediate shade" (*m. Negaim* 2:1). It certainly expresses the concept of vicarious atonement, and became a popular formula among the rabbis to express their love for their people. At issue are the roots of the formulaic saying. The phrase *אני כפרה* is not attested in the OT or the Second Temple literature, but the similar phrase *אכפרה* is attested in Exod 32:30, in which Moses explains his purpose of ascending the mountain a second time after the golden calf episode: "Perhaps I can make atonement for your sin (*אכפרה בער הטאתכם*)."⁷⁰ It is possible that *אני כפרה* may have its roots in the expression *אכפרה* in Exod 32:30.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ Parallels given by Str-B 2:279-280 and 3:261 are: *t. Yoma* 1:12 (181); *t. Shebu'ot* 1:4 (446); *y. Yoma* 39d; *b. Yoma* 23a; *b. Sanhedrin* 2:1; *b. Nega'im* 2:1; *Sifra Leviticus* 13:2 (235a); *b. Qiddushin* 31b; *b. Sukkah* 20a.

As observed already, Jonathan (*ca.* 140) and other rabbis applied the concept of vicarious atonement to Moses' mediation after the golden calf incident (*Mekilta, Pisha* 1:107-109; *b. Berakhot* 32a; *b. Sotah* 14a), and he seems to have used these examples as prototypes for all Jews to follow, which may reflect the general mood among the rabbis during the two wars with Rome. Thus, it is certainly possible that the formula אָנִי כַפֶּרֶה may have its roots in reflection on Moses' mediation. The fact that R. Ishmael, Jonathan's teacher, used the formula may indicate that the concept of vicarious atonement was held by certain rabbis even before 135. There is evidence that this saying may have been used even earlier than Ishmael. The formula is used by a man who was involved in an episode that occurred before the destruction of the temple:

It once happened that two priests were running up the steps leading to the Altar.... he fell dead at the foot of the Altar. R. Zadduk [*ca.* 70] came and stood on the steps of the Temple-hall and said.... the father of the dead priest arrived, and found that his son was still struggling in his death agony. He turned to them all, saying: "May I be your atonement (אָנִי כַפֶּרֶה)! My son is still breathing, so the knife has not become defiled." Then comes the following remark ("May I be your atonement," a popular exclamation of the period.) (*Sifre Numbers* §161 [62b] on Num 35:24; cf. parallels in *t. Yoma* 1:12 [181], *t. Shevuot* 1:4 [446], *y. Yoma* 2:1 [39d], and *b. Yoma* 23a)⁷¹

This tradition may indicate that the concept of vicarious atonement was current before A.D. 70. because this event would have happened before the fall of the Second Temple (*Strack-B* 2: 275). R. Zadok (*ca.* 100), who is said to have delivered an address in this tradition was of priestly descent, and is known to have officiated in the temple. Lohse argues for the great antiquity of this "Jewish formula" based upon the testimonies of Paul (*Rom* 9:3) and Josephus (*J. W.* 5.419) (Lohse 1955, 101).

⁷⁰ Danby's English translation of the phrase in the Mishnah actually follows אֲכַפֶּרֶה.

⁷¹ The formula אָנִי כַפֶּרֶה "May I be an atonement for you" is attested in all parallel accounts except *b. Yoma* 23a, in which the pronoun of the formula is changed to the third person singular.

Williams, however, rejects both Strack-Billerbeck's and Lohse's arguments for pre-70 dating of the formula. While acknowledging that Josephus's language ("take my blood as the price of your salvation" in *J. W.* 5.419 [Thackeray, LCL]) expresses the underlying idea of vicarious atonement, Williams discounts its value as evidence, based upon his thesis that "in first century Judaism one finds clear expression of this idea in only one other writing: IV Maccabees" (Williams 1975, 125-26). Moreover, Williams totally rejects the argument of Lohse that אֲנִי כִפְרָה may stand behind the statement in Rom 9:3. In my judgment, however, we may find an indirect connection between the formula and Paul's statement in Rom 9:3. Williams seems not to have considered the possibility that Paul's statement alludes to Moses' word in Exod 32:31-32. Many commentators think that Paul probably has in mind the similar offer of Moses in Exod 32:32 (Moo 1996, 558-559; Dunn 1988b, 532; Munck 1967, 29). Moreover, we find allusions to Moses' history and person elsewhere in Rom 9-11 (9:14-18; 10:19; 11:13-14), which increases the likelihood of Paul seeing Moses as, to some extent, his own model in Rom 9:3. Here is how the passages correspond:

So Moses returned to the LORD and said, "Alas, this people has sinned a great sin; they have made for themselves gods of gold. But now, if you will only forgive their sin-- but if not, blot me out of the book that you have written." (Exodus 32:31-32)

For I could wish that I myself were accursed and cut off from Christ for the sake of my own people, my kindred according to the flesh (ἠύχόμην γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα). (Romans 9:3)

The idea expressed by Paul is clearly reminiscent of Moses' statement. As Moses was willing to give up his salvation on behalf of his people, so was Paul willing to be accursed on behalf of the Jews.⁷² Certainly what Paul meant is analogous to the idea

⁷² The phrase ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου in Rom 9:3 can be translated better in English as "on behalf of my brethren" because the Greek ὑπὲρ with the genitive often implies the idea of substitution (BDF 231).

expressed by the formula אָנִי כִפֶּרֶה. According to the Exodus account, Moses' mediation is considered to be his atonement for Israel. Moreover, as has been argued, the expression used by Moses (אֶכְפֶּרֶה in v. 30) is a term that is equivalent to אָנִי כִפֶּרֶה. Paul may have been familiar with the formula אָנִי כִפֶּרֶה; thus, he may have had the same concept in mind when he made the statement in Rom 9:3. Compare Paul's statement with that of R. Ishmael (d. 135): "the Children of Israel (may I make atonement for them!)" (*m. Negaim* 2:1). They certainly shared the same intensity of love for the people of Israel. Thus, it is not farfetched for Lohse to find the formula behind Paul's statement.

Moreover, as observed in chapter 2, this idea is certainly paralleled in the Second Temple writings. In Dan 3:38-40 LXX, the three men offer themselves as atoning sacrifices. Behind the expression "such may be our sacrifice to bring atonement with you" may lie the formulaic saying אָנִי כִפֶּרְכֶם. In *4 Macc* 6:27-29, Eleazer surrenders himself in order to atone for his nation: "You know, O God, that though I might have saved myself, I am dying in burning torments for the sake of the law. Be merciful (ἰλεως γενουῦ) to your people, and let our punishment *be a satisfaction* for them (ἀρκεσθεις τῆ ἡμετέρᾳ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δίκη). Make my blood their purification (καθάρσιον), and take my life *as a ransom* for theirs (ἀντίψυχον αὐτῶν)." Thus, it is certainly possible that the concept of vicarious atonement was current before A.D. 70.

Summary and Conclusion

In this excursus, we have examined the rabbinic traditions that state the concept of vicarious atonement. We divided them into five groups according to their characteristics, studied each tradition in its relationship to its literary and historical contexts, and compared their concept of vicarious atonement with that of 1 John.

First of all, as argued by a majority of scholars, we found that the concept was widespread among the rabbis, both temporally and geographically. These traditions were for the most part ascribed to the *Amoraim*, but they also included very early Tannaitic traditions. These Tannaitic authorities included R. Ishmael (d. 135), who founded one of the two most important schools that revived Torah studies after Bar Kokhba's rebellion, R. Jonathan (*ca.* 140), who was one of the two pupils of Ishmael, and R. Simeon b. Yohai (*ca.* 150), who was one of the five pupils of R. Akiba who revived Torah studies together with Ishmael's two pupils after 135.

In the Amoraic period, these traditions became popular. For the sake of convenience, we will here adopt the customary division of the Amoraic period into generations (Safrai 1997; Strack 1965, 119-34). The first five generations consist of both Palestinian and Babylonian *Amoraim*, whereas the last three generations are limited to Babylonian *Amoraim*, since the Palestinian Talmud had already been completed by then. Included among the first generation of Amoraic authorities (*ca.* 220-250) are: R. Jonathan b. Eleazar (*ca.* 220); R. Hoshya (*ca.* 225), the head of the academy at Caesarea; and Mar Samuel (d. 254), the head of the academy at Nehardea in Babylon. Included in the second generation of Amoraic authorities (*ca.* 250-290) are: R. Johanan (d. 279), the head of the academy at Tiberias; Eleazar (d. 279), also the head of the academy at Tiberias; R. Simlai (*ca.* 250); R. Abba (*ca.* 250); R. Hama (*ca.* 260); R. Judah b. Nahman (*ca.* 280); and R. Hiyya (*ca.* 280). Included in the third generation of Amoraic authorities (*ca.* 290-320) are: R. Abbahu (*ca.* 300), the head of the academy at Caesarea; and R. Ammi (*ca.* 300), the head of the academy at Tiberias. Included also was R. Gorion (*ca.* 350), a fourth-generation *Amora*.

Second, by at least the first half of the second century A.D., the concept of vicarious atonement was expressed in the traditions (*m. Negaim* 2:1; *Mekilta, Nezikin* 10:151-181) ascribed to R. Ishmael (d. 135), who was one of the chief spokesmen among the sages of Jabneh. Ishmael took part in, and expressed his view at, all its meetings and assemblies and was present on the day Rabban Gamaliel was deposed as *nasi* and Eleazar b. Azariah was appointed in his place (*m. Yadaim* 4:3). According to a tradition, Ishmael was a child at the time of the destruction of the temple, when he was taken captive to Rome and ransomed by R. Joshua (*b. Gittin* 58a), who took him as one of his disciples (*t. Parah* 10:3). Thus, these two traditions ascribed to Ishmael in the Mishnah and the *Mekilta* cannot have been composed before the destruction of the temple, but it is still possible that they may have been composed in the early second century A.D.

Third, there is continuity among the OT, the Second Temple literature, and later rabbinic literature in their concept of atonement. Jonathan (*ca.* 140), one of the two disciples of Ishmael, applied the concept of vicarious sufferings to all patriarchs and prophets who risked their lives for Israel, and used the cases of Moses and David as examples (*Mekilta, Pisha* 1:104-113). We have observed that the language and the concept applied by Jonathan to the patriarchs and prophets closely resemble those of the Second Temple writings studied in chapter 1 (Dan 3:38-40 LXX; *4 Macc.* 17:22; cf. *2 Macc* 7:37; Exod 32:30-34; Num 25).

This phenomenon was not confined to the school of Ishmael, but was found also in the school of Akiba (*ca.* 50-135), the most intimate colleague of Ishmael, who disputed with Ishmael on *halakhah*, *aggadah*, and in expositions of the OT. Simeon b. Yohai, one of the five disciples of Akiba, applied the language of Levitical atoning sacrifices to the

death of innocent Jews and attributed atoning efficacy to it (y. *Sanhedrin* 30c). This way of applying cultic language to the death of innocent Jews is paralleled in the Second Temple writings too.

We also argued that Simeon's view might reflect the view of his teacher, Akiba, and his school. The same may be true of the tradition ascribed to Jonathan, which may represent the view of his teacher, Ishmael. Jonathan and Simeon may have stamped their own individual outlook on the traditions ascribed to them, or those traditions may have come down to us in their original wording, but the ideas behind them did not originate with Jonathan and Simeon (Miller 1971, 41). This means that the concept of vicarious atonement observed in these traditions may represent the views of the two chief spokesmen of Jabneh (Ishmael and Akiba) and their schools, whose roots may be traced to the Second Temple literature studied in chapter 2, and ultimately to the OT traditions of atonement, such as the account of Moses' mediation after the golden calf episode (Exod 32:30-34; Num 25) and the prophecy of the Servant of YHWH (Isa 53) as typified in the Levitical atoning sacrifices.

Fourth, with regard to the concept of atonement, these rabbinic traditions agree with 1 John. First of all, both apply the two fundamental concepts to their interpretation of the OT passages as epitomized in the traditions ascribed to Simeon b. Yohai and Jonathan: (1) the concept that the sufferings or death of the innocent victim brings vicarious atonement and forgiveness (y. *Sanhedrin* 30c), and (2) the concept that exemplary figures such as Moses and David gave their lives for Israel (*Mekilta, Pisha* 1:104-113).

They also agree in their paradigmatic applications of the Servant motif to the vicarious atonement of the exemplary figures. We identified three traditions that applied the Isaianic Servant motif to the vicarious mediation of the exemplary figures such as Moses (*b. Sotah* 14a), Phinehas (*Sifre Numbers* on Num 25:13), and Isaac (*b. Shabbat* 89b). The last two traditions share with 1 John the concept that the mediator not only accomplished atonement for his people, but still stands and makes atonement for their present sins as their advocate (cf. 1 John 2:1-2). In particular, the picture of Isaac in *Shabbat* 89b corresponds clearly to that of Jesus Christ in 1 John, whose atoning sacrifice becomes the basis for his continuing ministry of atonement as the advocate before the throne of God.

Despite the similarities between 1 John and these rabbinic traditions, there are still decisive differences between them. Just as the Second Temple writings were particularistic in their focus, so are these rabbinic traditions. As we have argued, 1 John thoroughly universalizes, individualizes, and spiritualizes the national and corporate hopes of Israel by tying the two Jewish traditions of vicarious sacrifice and new covenant forgiveness to Jesus' unique death and forgiveness of sin. Thus, the manner in which 1 John fuses these two Jewish traditional elements is unique, compared to both the Second Temple writings and rabbinic writings. Thus, the origin of 1 John's distinctive use of the two traditional elements must be sought elsewhere.

CHAPTER 5

THE FUSION OF THE TWO JEWISH EXPECTATIONS IN 1JOHN

Introduction

In chapter 3, we demonstrated that 1John fuses the two Jewish traditions of vicarious sacrifice and new covenant forgiveness in its interpretation of the death of Christ. In chapter 4, we demonstrated that 1John ties these two Jewish traditions to Jesus' unique death and forgiveness of sin by universalizing, individualizing, and spiritualizing the national and corporate hopes of Israel.

So what is the origin of the use of the two Jewish expectations in 1John? We will attempt to answer this question in this section. Part of our thesis is that 1John's use of these traditions is to be understood against the background of the early church's concept of realized eschatology, which was itself founded on Jesus' teaching on the kingdom of God.

We will demonstrate our contention in three steps. We will first make plain the assumptions adopted in this study. We will then present the six lines of evidence that support our thesis. We will then apply our thesis to 1John, in order to show that the distinctive elements in 1John that were identified in chapter 4 can be explained by appealing to the realized eschatology of the early church, which was founded on Jesus' teaching on the kingdom of God. Before doing so, we will clarify certain assumptions pertaining to our study.

Assumptions

Three types of assumptions will be discussed: (1) definitions of the kingdom teachings and realized eschatology, (2) the two hermeneutical assumptions, and (3) the five assumptions regarding evaluation of alleged sources. The first to be discussed is the definition of the kingdom teachings and realized eschatology.

Kingdom Teachings

By Jesus' kingdom teachings, we mean the teachings ascribed to Jesus in the Gospels that are explicitly or implicitly related to the kingdom of God/heaven. The teachings in the Gospel of John are included in our discussion, but they are not used as direct evidence for our argument for two reasons: (1) Scholars such as Caragounis recognize that "The kingdom of God plays no significant role in John's Gospel, its place being taken by the typically Johannine concept of 'eternal life' " (Caragounis 1992, 429). (2) The two Jewish traditions which we are focusing our study on are not explicitly attested in the Gospel. However, considering the close relationship between the Gospel of John and 1John, we will add an Excursus devoted to the comparison between them in relation to 1John's use of the two Jewish traditions.

We take the position that "the kingdom of God" (ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ) and "the kingdom of heaven" (ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν) are synonymous expressions that comprise the central focus of the content of Jesus' preaching and teaching (Caragounis 1992, 417; Ladd 1952, 122-24). With regard to the meaning of the kingdom of God, we adopt Ladd's definition: "the kingdom of God is the redemptive reign of God dynamically active to establish his rule among human beings" (Ladd 1993, 89).

Included in the kingdom teachings are the “Lord’s prayer” petition and the kingdom parables such as the parables in Matt 13 and Mark 4, and the parables of the unmerciful servant (Matt 18:15-35) and the wicked tenants (Mark 12: 1-12; Matt 21:33-46; Luke 20:9-19). Also included are some of the Son of Man sayings and the Last Supper tradition. The former are included because the kingdom teachings and the Son of Man sayings are correlated in Jesus’ preaching (Matt 10:23; 13:41; 16:28; 19:28; 26:64; 16:18; Mark 9:1), since “the messianic character of the kingdom of God preached by Jesus is determined by the central place occupied by the Son of Man as the agent in the coming of the kingdom” (Matt 24:5, 23-44; Mark 13:21) (Ridderbos 1962, 31). This view finds its support from scholars such as Chilton, Marshall, and Caragounis (Chilton 1999, 283-85; Marshall 1966, 336-37; Caragounis 1992, 425). As argued by Chilton, Jesus’ references to the Son of Man make explicit what was always implicit in his preaching about the kingdom of God. Thus, “the kingdom is the public theme of Jesus’ ministry, what was spoken of openly and fully to anyone who would hear,” and “the Son of Man is the esoteric theme of Jesus’ ministry, the explanation, given to those who would respond to the message of the kingdom, of how Jesus could know all that he did” (Chilton 1999, 285). With regard to the authenticity of the Son of Man sayings, we take the position that all three types (the earthly Son of Man, the suffering Son of Man, and the apocalyptic Son of Man) come from Jesus and represent his own mind (Manson 1967, 211-34; Taylor 1959b, 21-32; Cranfield 1959, 272-77; Cullmann 1963, 152-63; Marshall 1966, 349-50; Ladd 1993, 156-57).

The Last Supper tradition is included because Jesus’ connection of the cup-word with the coming of the kingdom (Mark 14:25; cf. Matt 26:29) indicates that the

eucharistic sayings are also a part of the kingdom sayings. As observed in the preceding section, the connection between 1John and the Last Supper tradition can be seen in its use of the two important expressions, *κοινωνία* (1:3, 6, 7) and “new commandment” (2:7, 8; cf. 3:23; 4:21; 5:2, 3), which point to both the Last Supper and the new covenant (Brown 1966, 612-84, 287). Both the antiquity and the authority of the Last Supper tradition are confirmed by Paul’s use of the peculiar tradition formula in 1 Cor 11:23, “For I received (*παρέλαβον*) from the Lord what I also handed on (*παρέδωκα*) to you.” An identical tradition mark was used by Paul only once again in 1 Cor 15:3, “For I handed on (*παρέδωκα*) to you as of first importance what I in turn had received (*παρέλαβον*): that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures.” Jeremias, with other scholars, rightly argues that “to receive” (*παραλαμβάνω*) and “to hand over” (*παραδίδωμι*) represent the rabbinical technical terms *קַבַּל בֵּן* and *הִנָּחֵם* (*Abot* 1:1-12) (Jeremias 1964b, 101; Schlatter 1934, 320; Stauffer 1955, 300 n. 552; Davies 1967, 248-49; Du Toit 1979, 109). Based upon this observation, Jeremias concludes, “1 Cor 11:23 says nothing other than that the chain of tradition goes back unbroken to Jesus himself” (Jeremias 1964b, 101). By using this tradition formula, Paul is making it clear that the Lord Jesus Christ is the source as well as the bearer and the guarantor of the Last Supper tradition (Du Toit 1979, 108-10). The antiquity and the authoritative nature of the Last Supper tradition are supported further by the presence of themes of covenant and atonement in all four accounts.

Realized Eschatology

With regard to the meaning of realized eschatology, we adopt Ladd's definition. Thus, by the expression "realized eschatology," we mean the concept that the kingdom of God "which will appear as an apocalyptic act at the end of the age has already come into human history in the person and mission of Jesus to overcome evil, to deliver people from its power, and to bring them into the blessings of God's reign" (Ladd 1993, 89-90).

Two Hermeneutical Assumptions

With regard to hermeneutical assumptions, we will use the last two of the three assumptions identified in chapter 3, with minor modifications. First, in general, we do not find direct quotations of the kingdom teachings in 1John, but rather echoes of, and allusions to, the kingdom teachings used in the oral tradition.

Second, the author of 1John was a first-century Jewish Christian, who was familiar with the hermeneutical principles and methods employed by contemporary Christians (Boismard 1972, 156-65; Ellis 1984, 16; Hengel 1989, 109-35; Price 1972, 9-37; O'Neill 1966, 6; Marshall 1978a, 46-47; Smith 1975, 227, 238-40; Westcott 1883, xxx-xxx). Therefore, the author would have been indebted to the interpretive traditions preserved in the Gospels. Thus, what we find in 1John may reflect passages in the Gospels indirectly by way of the sources used by the author or the tradition to which he appeals.

Assumptions for Evaluation of Alleged Sources

We will use the five assumptions for evaluation identified in chapter 3, with minor modifications made according to the new context. First, if in 1John a clear allusion to the kingdom teachings of Jesus is found, the likelihood increases that 1John is dependent upon the same sources in the case of less clear examples. Second, if one or two apparently additional allusions to the same sources are found in the immediate context of an allusion, the likelihood of dependence in the first case increases significantly. Third, if 1John alludes to the same kingdom teaching as other early NT writings, the likelihood of 1John's dependence on that source increases significantly. Fourth, if the allusion contains a distinctive word or phrase found in the possible source, dependence is more likely. Fifth, this study proceeds on the basis of probabilities, rather than certainties. Nevertheless, there is considerable cumulative value in knowing the likelihood of 1John's dependence upon Jesus' kingdom teachings, either directly or indirectly.

Six Lines of Evidence

In this section, our task is to present evidence that supports our contention that 1John's use of these traditions is to be understood against the background of the early church's concept of realized eschatology, which was itself founded on Jesus' teachings on the kingdom of God. There are at least six lines of evidence that support our contention: (1) the use of a tradition formula in 1John, (2) the presence of the two features of the kingdom (the universalizing tendency and realized eschatology) in 1John, (3) the presence of the two kingdom blessings in 1John, (4) the allusions to the ransom

saying in 1John 3:16, (5) the allusions to the parable of the Wicked Tenants in the three sending statements in 1John, and (6) the use of the term “eternal life” in 1John.

The Use of a Tradition Formula in 1John

First of all, the use of a tradition formula in 1John points to a Jesus tradition. The author of 1John seems to be referring to an oral tradition by adding “what we have heard” (ἀκηκόαμεν) (1:1, 5; cf. 2:24; 3:11) (Perkins 1979, xvii-xxiii; Brown 1982, 158-61).⁷³ The authority of this tradition is confirmed by the presence of a particular tradition formula in 1:5 (cf. 1:1; 3:11): “This is the message we have heard (ἀκηκόαμεν) from him and proclaim (ἀναγγέλλομεν) to you” (also 2:7, “an old commandment that you have had from the beginning; the old commandment is the word that you have heard”). The diverse “heard” statements (1:1, 3, 5; 2:7, 18; 3:11) fit together on the subject of divine forgiveness. This tradition formula may be considered the Johannine equivalent to the Pauline tradition formula in 1 Cor 11:23: “For I received (παρέλαβον) from the Lord what I also handed on (παρέδωκα) to you.” Thus, Jeremiah’s argument that “to receive” (παραλαμβάνω) and “to hand over” (παραδίδωμι) represent the rabbinical technical terms קבלתן and חפצתן (*Avot* 1:1-12) may equally apply to 1John 1:5 (Jeremias 1964b, 101).

⁷³ Scholars debate the identity of “we.” The first person plural appears in 51 of 105 verses in 1John, whereas the first person singular is rarely used in the epistle (2:1, 7, 8, 12-14, 21, 26; 5:13, 16). Brown lists four options: (1) It is a plural of majesty or authority, so that the writer speaks as an authoritative figure in the early church or the Johannine community. (2) It is an editorial “we.” This differs from the plural of majesty in that it assumes no special status for the author, but is simply a writing convention. (3) It represents the author and his associates, but does not call attention to a group that is not included. (4) It represents a group that is distinct from the audience or the readers. The group may be either the eyewitnesses of Jesus’ lifetime or the Johannine School, “the tradition-bearers and interpreters who stand in a special relationship to the Beloved Disciple in their attempt to preserve his witness” as defined by Brown. The first two options seem to fail because the author of 1John is perfectly capable of writing “I” when he refers to himself (2:1, 7, 8, 12-14; 5:16). The third and the fourth options are both viable. While not taking a particular position on this matter, I prefer the third option to the fourth, because the former explains the emphatic sensory expressions of 1John 1:1 better than the latter.

As Paul uses a tradition formula in 1 Cor 11:23 and 15:3, so the author of 1John does here, making it clear that Jesus Christ is the source, as well as the bearer and the guarantor, of the account he is making. This means that the author refers to a Jesus tradition that represents eyewitness testimony to Jesus. As suggested by C. H. Dodd, in his use of the tradition formula, the author of 1John refers “to a body of traditional sayings of Jesus similar to that which we have in the Synoptic Gospels” (Dodd 1946, xli). Dodd presents the parallels between the Synoptic sayings and 1John (Dodd 1946, xxxix-xli):

Mark 12:29-31. The first is ...you shall love the Lord your God.... The second is this, “You shall love your neighbor as yourself.” There is no other commandment greater than these.

1John 4:21. The commandment we have from him is this: those who love God must love their brothers and sisters also.

Matthew 7:21. Not everyone who says to me, “Lord, Lord,” will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only the one who does the will of my Father in heaven.

1John 2:17. And the world and its desire are passing away, but those who do the will of God live forever.

Matthew 5:8-9. Blessed are the pure in heart, for they will see God. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God.

1John 3:1-3. See what love the Father has given us, that we should be called children of God.... we will see him as he is. And all who have this hope in him purify themselves, just as he is pure.

Matthew 24:11. And many false prophets will arise and lead many astray.

1John 4:1. Beloved, do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits to see whether they are from God; for many false prophets have gone out into the world.

Matthew 7:15, 20. Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing but inwardly are ravenous wolves.... Thus you will know them by their fruits.

1John 3:7. Little children, let no one deceive you. Everyone who does what is right is righteous, just as he is righteous.

Matthew 24:24. For false messiahs and false prophets will appear and produce great signs and omens, to lead astray, if

1John 2:18. Children, it is the last hour! As you have heard that antichrist is coming, so now many antichrists have

possible, even the elect.

Mark 13:5. Then Jesus began to say to them, “Beware that no one leads you astray.”

Matthew 5:48. Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect.
Luke 6:36. Be merciful, just as your Father is merciful.

Luke 6:22. Blessed are you when people hate you, and when they exclude you, revile you, and defame you on account of the Son of Man.

Matthew 7:8 (cf. Luke 11:10). For everyone who asks receives, and everyone who searches finds, and for everyone who knocks, the door will be opened.

Mark 11:24. So I tell you, whatever you ask for in prayer, believe that you have received it, and it will be yours.

Matthew 10:25. It is enough for the disciple to be like the teacher, and the slave like the master. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebul, how much more will they malign those of his household!

Matthew 11:30. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.

come. From this we know that it is the last hour.

1John 3:7. Little children, let no one deceive you....

1John 3:7. Everyone who does what is right is righteous, just as he is righteous.

1John 3:13. Do not be astonished, brothers and sisters, that the world hates you.

1John 3:22. And we receive from him whatever we ask, because we obey his commandments and do what pleases him.

1John 5:15. And if we know that he hears us in whatever we ask, we know that we have obtained the requests made of him.

1John 4:17. As he is, so are we in this world.

1John 5:3. His commandments are not burdensome.

These correspondences are primarily conceptual, but their similarities are extensive enough to suggest that they have common roots. Of particular importance to us is the fact that these synoptic parallels belong primarily to the kingdom teachings of Jesus, except for a few general sayings (Mark 12:29-31; Mark 11:24). The kingdom

teachings cited by Dodd include the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5:8-9, 48; 7:8, 15-20, 21; Luke 6:22, 36), the Olivet Discourse (Matt 24:11; Mark 13:5), and the Commissioning of the Twelve (Matt 10:25). Together with the presence of the tradition formula in 1John that is similar to the one found in Paul, these conceptual correspondences increase the likelihood that the author of 1John was dependent upon the traditions concerning Jesus' teachings on the kingdom of God. There are five lines of evidence in 1John that support this argument.

Two Features of the Kingdom: The Universalizing Tendency and Realized Eschatology

The first line of evidence that supports our approach is the presence of the two important features of the kingdom teachings of Jesus in 1John: (1) the universalizing tendency, and (2) realized eschatology. These are the two most distinctive features that set Jesus' kingdom teachings apart from Judaism (Ladd 1993, 62). As argued by Ladd, both in the OT (Amos 9:12; Mic 5:9; Isa 45:14-16; 60:12, 14; Zeph 3:9, 20; 2:2-4; Zech 8:20-23) and in Judaism, the kingdom was always pictured in terms of Israel. This particularistic tendency became even stronger in late Judaism; thus, the coming of God's kingdom for Judaism meant primarily the liberation of Israel from her political and national enemies and her sovereignty over them (*Pss. Sol.* 17:24, 31; *Sib. Or.* 3:616-617, 670-672). Jesus, however, universalized and spiritualized the concept of the kingdom, first by granting the Gentiles entrance to the eschatological kingdom (Matt 8:5-13; par. Luke 7:1-10; Matt 15:21-28; par. Mark 7:24-30), and second by making the response to his own person and gospel message the determining factor for entering the eschatological kingdom (Mark 1:15; 10:14; Matt 4:17; 13:38; 18:3).

Jesus also made it clear that the eschatological kingdom had arrived in his presence and ministry by declaring, “If it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come to you” (Matt 12:28). Although the precise meaning of the Greek word ἐφθασεν in Matt 12:28 (Luke 11:20) has been the object of much debate, the verb connotes actual presence, not merely proximity, as indicated in its uses in other NT books (Rom 9:31; 2 Cor 10:14; Phil 3:16) (Ladd 1993, 63). At issue is the possible relationship between ἐφθασεν and ἤγγικεν, the latter meaning literally “has drawn near” (Mark 1:15; Luke 10:9). As pointed out by Nolland, “Whatever larger interpretive difficulties result, in the present text the verb can bear no more than its ordinary sense (when followed by ἐπί + acc.) of ‘to come upon’ ” (Nolland 1993).

The fact that the same two features belong to the distinctive elements of 1John in its use of the Jewish traditions further increases the likelihood that the author of 1John built his application of the two Jewish traditions of forgiveness and atonement to the death of Jesus upon the kingdom teachings of Jesus.

The Presence of the Two Realized Kingdom Blessings in 1John

Two Blessings

The second line of evidence that supports our contention is the presence of the two realized kingdom blessings in 1John 2:12-14. The passage describes eschatological blessings realized in the Christian community as the new covenant community, to which 1John is addressed. Three realized blessings are noted: (1) forgiveness of sins (v. 12), (2) knowledge of God (vv. 13a, 14a/b), and (3) victory over the evil one (vv. 13b, 14c). The

description of these eschatological blessings is significant in two ways. First of all, they allude to the two kingdom categories, as well as Jeremiah's new covenant categories. There is evidence that supports this conclusion. As argued in chapter 3, the first two blessings pertain to the new covenant categories of Jeremiah 31, but the third blessing does not. Of particular interest to us is the fact that the third blessing belongs to the realized blessings of the kingdom in the Gospels. Two prominent features of the eschatological kingdom are the forgiveness of sins (Matt 9:2, 5; Mark 2:5, 9; Luke 5:20; 7:47; cf. 1John 2:12) and the conquest of evil (Matt 12:28-29; cf. 1John 2:13, 14) (Ridderbos 1962, 211-32; Ladd 1993, 67-73). These two kingdom blessings are included in the three realized blessings noted in 1John 2:12-14.

With regard to the kingdom blessing of the forgiveness of sins, we find a clear allusion to it in 1John 2:12, which is expressed in a form that is nearly identical to Jesus' words to the paralytic (ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου in Luke 5:20, 23; cf. synoptic parallels in Matt 9:2, 5; Mark 2:5, 9; *Tg. Isa.* 53:4, 11, 12) and the woman (Ἀφέωνταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι in Luke 7:48), particularly in Luke 5:20. As suggested by N. T. Wright, Jesus announced the arrival of the eschatological kingdom at his coming by proclaiming divine forgiveness to the paralytic and the woman (Wright 1996, 272).

Moreover, the expression ἀφέωνται ὑμῖν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι in 1John 2:12 contains the sole occurrence of the passive form of the verb ἀφίημι with ἁμαρτία, apart from 13 occurrences in the declaratory formula of the Levitical expiatory offerings in the OT and 7 occurrences in the words of Jesus to the paralytic (Matt 9:2, 5; Mark 2:5, 9; Luke 5:20, 23) and a sinful woman (Luke 7:48). Thus, it is very likely that the author of 1John was familiar with the tradition of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, particularly in the Lukan

account, and he may have found in the words of Jesus the new covenant promise of the forgiveness of sin that also pertains to the realized blessings of the kingdom in his person and ministry.

In 1John 2:12-14, we find another clear allusion to the kingdom blessing of the conquest of evil. The third realized blessing in the passage is the victory over the evil one expressed twice in the phrase νενικήκατε τὸν πονηρόν (“you have conquered the evil one”). In the Gospels, Jesus emphatically and explicitly announces the arrival of the kingdom in Matt 12:28 (cf. Luke 11:20): “But if it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come to you (ἔφθασεν ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ).” The casting out of demons proves that Jesus has gained a victory over the devil (Matt 12:29; Mark 3:27) and is evidence of the kingdom of God breaking through into the kingdom of Satan (Ridderbos 1962, 62). Thus, the fact that victory over the evil one is one of the realized eschatological blessings in the community (1John 2: 13, 14) indicates its possible relation to Jesus’ teachings on the kingdom of God as reported in the Synoptic Gospels. Moreover, since we find a clearer allusion to the first kingdom blessing in 1John 2:12, it is very likely that the author of 1John had the two kingdom blessings in mind when he used them in combination with the new covenant blessings. What, then, is the rationale behind the use of the realized kingdom blessings in 1John 2:12-14? It is to this question that we now turn.

Realized Eschatology

As we have indicated, we do not consider it coincidental that 1John shares the two realized eschatological blessings with the kingdom teachings of Jesus. The emphasis in

1John is on the “already” of Christian existence over against the “not yet” of future hope (Lieu 1991, 107). In the previous section, we argued that we may place all the NT books along the continuum between “already” and “not yet,” with the majority of them being placed more towards the “not yet,” and we placed 1John more toward the “already” side than other books along the continuum. Thus, the presence of the two realized kingdom blessings in 1John, together with the verbal agreement of ἀφέωνται ὑμῖν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι in 1John 2:12 with Luke 5:20, 23 and its synoptic parallels, significantly increases the probability that 1John’s emphasis on realized eschatology is built upon the concept of the realized kingdom as preserved in the Synoptic Gospels. According to 1John, the two kingdom blessings, the victory over the evil one that is anticipated in the exorcisms of Jesus, and the forgiveness of sins that is anticipated in Jesus’ word to the paralytic, are now present in the Christian community.

This leads to the important question whether the author of 1John understood that the kingdom partially realized in Jesus’ public ministry was inaugurated more fully at his death. The answer to this question is affirmative. As observed in the introduction, the death of Christ has a dominant place in 1John. We hardly find any direct allusion to the Resurrection in 1John, as opposed to other NT books, in which the Resurrection has a dominant place (with the exception of Hebrews) (Dodd 1946, xxxiii). Moreover, according to 1John, the kingdom blessings of the forgiveness of sin and victory over the evil one have already been realized in the Christian community, an eschatological new covenant community, because of the presence of Christ as the atoning sacrifice for the sins of the world, based upon his finished work of atonement on the cross (2:1, 2, 12-14). This view of realized eschatology is built upon the two Jewish traditions of

eschatological forgiveness and atonement, but is distinct from them primarily in its universalizing tendency and the realized aspects of it.

This view is anticipated in the Gospels, Matthew in particular. Allison presents two lines of evidence for the view that Matthew sees the kingdom of God being inaugurated through Jesus' passion and rejection (Allison 1985, 40-50): (1) Matthew connects Jesus' death (27:50) with the resurrection of the holy ones (27:51-53), and the passage alludes clearly to Zech 14:4-5 (LXX), which describes the coming of the Lord on the last day. This way of presenting Jesus' death seems to presuppose that it broke the bands of death and inaugurated the general resurrection (a clear end-time, or kingdom, expectation).

(2) The confessional statement of the Gentile centurion (27:54) may well be a sign of the beginning of Gentile salvation that was to occur at the end of history. The immediate context of the confessional statement supports this argument.

The confession of the centurion and those with him follows directly upon the ostensibly eschatological events recounted in 17:51b-53: "The earth shook, and the rocks were split. The tombs also were opened, and many bodies of the saints who had fallen asleep were raised. After his resurrection they came out of the tombs and entered the holy city and appeared to many." The connection between Matt 27:54 and 27:51b-53 brings the confession of the Gentiles into association with events otherwise eschatological (Allison 1985, 47).

The correspondences between the realized eschatology of Matthew and that of 1John, especially their emphasis on the death of Christ as the decisive turning point, further increase the probability that 1John's emphasis on realized eschatology is built upon the concept of the realized kingdom as preserved in the Synoptic Gospels. This argument is strengthened even further by another pair of correspondences that connect the concept of atonement in 1John with the kingdom teachings of Jesus, to which we turn next.

The Ransom Saying (Mark 10:45) and 1John 3:16

The Authenticity of the Markan Ransom Saying

The third line of evidence that supports our contention consists of the correspondences between the Markan ransom saying (“to give his life a ransom for many” in Mark 10:45b) and 1John 3:16. Before comparing the two passages, a short comment on the authenticity of the saying is needed. Page lists four arguments against its authenticity (Page 1992, 661): (1) “The idea of death as ransom is foreign to the preceding context and destroys the analogy between the behavior of the Son of Man and that expected of the disciples.” (2) The aorist tense of the main verb ἤλθεν looks back on the life of Jesus as being in the past. (3) The interpretation of Jesus’ death as a ransom is not attested elsewhere in Jesus’ teaching. (4) The ransom saying is not found in Luke 22:27 (“For who is greater, the one who is at the table or the one who serves? Is it not the one at the table? But I am among you as one who serves”), although it has a parallel to Mark 10:45a.

Page argues against these four arguments (Page 1992, 661). The first argument fails because it “wrongly assumes that the transition from the thought of a life of exemplary service to that of a unique, atoning death is awkward.” As Page indicates, we find a similar combination of ideas in other NT books (John 12:23-27; Phil 2:5-8; 1 Pet 2:21-25; 1John 3:16). The second argument is unwarranted because “the verb simply expresses a consciousness of having been divinely commissioned for a special task as observed in many sayings in which Jesus speaks of ‘coming’ (cf. Luke 12:49) or ‘being

sent' ” (Page 1992, 661). The third argument ignores the abundant evidence that Jesus anticipated that his life would end violently, and that he believed that this had been prophesied in Scripture, as may be seen in his passion predictions (Matt 16:21; pars. Mark 8:31 and Luke 9:22; Matt 17:22-23; pars. Mark 9:31 and Luke 9:44; Matt 20:18-19; pars. Mark 10:33-34 and Luke 18:31-33), as well as in his words over the cup at the Last Supper (Matt 26:28; Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20). The fourth argument wrongly assumes that the text with the richest theology must be secondary. Moreover, it does not consider other factors that may explain the absence of the ransom saying in Luke's allegedly parallel passage: (1) Luke may not be describing the same incident as Mark. (2) Luke may have drawn 22:24-27 from his special source(s), rather than from either Matthew or Mark. (3) As will be observed, the Semitisms in Mark 10:45 indicate that Mark is more primitive than Luke 22:27. Thus, Gundry argues that the absence of the ransom saying in Luke 22:27 may be “better explained by Lukan redaction, influenced by the new setting of the Last Supper into which Luke has transposed the material and by his redaction of v. 24” (“A dispute also arose among them as to which one of them was to be regarded as the greatest”) (Gundry 1993, 588).

In addition, even if the placing of the ransom saying in its present location were editorial, the saying itself could still be genuine. Considering all these factors, we think it very probable that the ransom saying originated in the mind of Jesus, not in the early church (Hengel 1981, 34; Cullmann 1963, 65; Cranfield 1959, 343-44; Lane 1974, 383-85; Taylor 1959a, 445-46; Gundry 1993, 586-88; Page 1992, 661; Moo 1983, 122-27).

Correspondences between the Markan Ransom Saying and 1John 3:16

The Markan ransom saying (Mark 10:45; cf. Matt 20:28) has many correspondences with the particular expression used in 1John 3:16. According to 1John, the divine visitation promised in the OT prophets has already occurred in the coming of the Son of God, the Messiah (cf. 1John 3:8), and the decisive act of redemption has already taken place (3:16). Thus, all the eschatological blessings (1:6-10; 2:12; 4:9; 5:4-5, 20) have been realized in the lives of those who confess Jesus as the Son of God and Christ (2:22; 4:2, 15; 5:5) and who obey his commandments (2:3, 5; 3:24; 4:15; 5:1). The correspondences between the two sayings indicate that the author of 1John considered the words of Jesus preserved in the Markan ransom saying to have already been fulfilled at the death of Christ because it inaugurated the coming of the kingdom and realized the blessings of the kingdom in their lives. Accordingly, some scholars consider 1John 3:16 to be a Johannine equivalent of Mark 10:45 (Dodd 1946, xxxii; Jeremias 1967, 710; Maurer 1972, 155-56). Juxtaposing the two will help us see their correspondences more clearly:

1John 3:16

Mark 10:45

Ἐκεῖνος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔθηκεν

*Ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ... δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.

Despite minor differences in the Greek wording, the two texts express the same concept of the vicarious death of Jesus. As suggested by Jeremias, their differences can be attributed to different renderings of the same underlying Semitic text (Jeremias 1967, 710). The differences between Mark 10:45 and 1John 3:16 are threefold: (1) Whereas Mark 10:45 quotes Jesus' own speech, 1John 3:16 refers to Jesus' salvific death as interpreted by the author of 1John.

(2) The concept of vicarious atonement seen in λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν in Mark 10:45 is expressed in 1John’s emphatic use of ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν (“for us”), which he places immediately after the subject ἐκεῖνος. The Markan choice of λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν is more explicit in rendering the Hebrew קָפָר than ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν in 1John.⁷⁴ Some scholars question the Markan choice of λύτρον because it is not the same as “a guilt offering” (קָפָר), as shown by the fact that the LXX never translates קָפָר with λύτρον or any of its cognates, and that none of the Hebrew words represented elsewhere in the LXX by λύτρον and its cognates appear in Isaiah 53 (Barrett 1959, 4-7; Gundry 1993, 591; Hooker 1959, 45-78). But this phenomenon may be attributed to the result of Mark’s interpretive rendering of the Hebrew/Aramaic tradition that preserved the sayings of Jesus. As early as Paul’s time, the idea of a ransom was connected with the idea of the vicarious atoning death of Jesus as shown in Rom 3:24-25 (Dunn 1988a, 169; Moo 1996, 229 n. 51; Morris 1955, 9-26): “They are now justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption (ἀπολυτρόσεως) that is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as a sacrifice of atonement (ἱλαστήριον) by his blood, effective through faith. He did this to show his righteousness, because in his divine forbearance he had passed over the sins previously committed.” The idea expressed by λύτρον in Mark 10:45 is equivalent to the idea expressed by the cognate ἀπολύτρωσις in Rom 3:24-25 (cf. 1 Cor 1:30; Eph 1:7; Col 1:14; 1 Tim 2:6; Tit 2:14; Heb 9:15). They both express the notion of a ransom as part of Jesus’ salvific work through his atoning death for his people. This indicates that, in his rendering of the Hebrew קָפָר with λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, Mark may have been influenced by the church’s understanding of Jesus’ atoning death in terms of a ransom.

⁷⁴ This statement assumes that Isa 53 provides the context for Jesus’ ransom saying.

(3) While 1John 3:16 employs the verb τίθημι, “to put, put off,” with ψυχή, “soul, life,” Mark 10:45 employs the verb δίδωμι, “to give,” with ψυχή. Jeremias attributes the difference between 1John 3:16 and the Markan ransom saying to different renderings of the underlying Semitic text, probably נָפְשׁוֹ יָמָיו (Isa 53:10 MT) or נָפְשׁוֹ נָסַר (Tg. Isa. 53:12) (Jeremias 1967, 710). As noted above, the expression τίθημι ψυχήν is rare in secular Greek and δίδωμι ψυχήν is the more widely used Greek term for the actual sacrifice of life, as indicated in Mark 10:45. The expression δίδωμι ψυχήν is “a traditional way of referring to the death of martyrs among the Jews and of soldiers among the Greeks” (1 Macc 2:50, δότε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ διαθήκης πατέρων ἡμῶν) (Büchsel 1964a, 166). The same expression δίδωμι ψυχήν may be behind the rabbinic tradition in *Mekilta* ascribed to Jonathan (*ca.* 140), which applies the concept of vicarious atonement to the actions and intercessions of the patriarchs and prophets who risked their lives for Israel (*Mekilta, Pisha* 1:104-113, נָתַנוּ נַפְשָׁם עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל). A counterpart in Aramaic is נָסַר נַפְשֵׁיהּ (Tg. Isa. 53:12), which probably lies behind δίδωμι ψυχήν in Mark 10:45.⁷⁵

Compared to the Hellenistic Greek parallels which use τίθημι, the expression τίθημι τὴν ψυχήν in 1John 3:16 has its own distinctiveness. In the former, the expression denotes taking a risk rather than making a full sacrifice of life (Homer, *Od.*, 2.237; 3.74;

⁷⁵ This argument is supported by two characteristics of the usage of Scripture ascribed to Jesus: a marked preference for the book of Isaiah and a tendency to cite Isaiah in a targumic form (Mark 4:12, citing Isa 6:9-10; Matt 26:52, citing Isa. 50:11; Mark 9:48, citing Isa 66:24), assuming its meaning as developed in the Targum (Isa 5 is assumed in Matt 21:33-46 [Mark 12:1-12; Luke 20:9-19]), and employing diction and themes that are characteristic of the Targum (Chilton 1984, 90-147; Evans 1999, 9; Wright 1996, 616). Of particular importance to us are two important phenomena: (1) The theme of announcing the kingdom, and the phrase “the kingdom of God” itself, are featured in the Targum (Tg. Isa. 40:9; 52:7; cf. Matt 3:2; 4:17; Mark 1:15), but not elsewhere in non-Christian Jewish literature. Thus, to a first-century Jewish listener, this announcement of the kingdom would itself evoke such passages as Isaiah 40 and 52, whose major theme is YHWH’s coming, his return, to Zion (Wright 1996, 632). (2) Occurrences of “good news” or “gospel” are found in the second half of Isaiah (Isa 40:1-11; 41:21-29; 52:7-12; 60:1-7; 61:1-11).

9.255), whereas the latter emphasizes the actual sacrifice of life (Maurer 1972, 155, 162). In 1John, Jesus Christ is described as the one who offered himself voluntarily and spontaneously as an atoning sacrifice (cf. 2:2; 4:10). Thus, the origin of τίθημι τὴν ψυχὴν in 1John must be sought elsewhere. The Greek OT does not help here because the meaning of τίθεμαι (τίθημι) τὴν ψυχὴν (Judg 12:3; 1 Sam 19:5; 28:21; Job 13:14) follows that of Hellenistic Greek. The linguistic features of the expression τίθημι τὴν ψυχὴν in 1John point to both the Gospel of John and Isa 53. First of all, the combination of τίθημι with ψυχὴ is rare in secular Greek, and in the NT it is peculiar to the Gospel of John (8 occurrences in 10:11, 15, 17, 18; 13:37, 38; 15:13) and 1John 3:16. Of its eight occurrences in the Gospel of John, it is used five times in chapter 10 in reference to Jesus as a good shepherd laying down his life for his sheep. Based upon this statistic, Brown argues that the idea that Jesus laid down his life on behalf of his people was well known to the Johannine community (Brown 1982, 448). This concept may have its origin in a primitive tradition of the early church as suggested by C. H. Dodd, according to whom the parable of the good shepherd (John 10) is “one more indication that John sometimes reaches back to primitive Aramaic tradition by way of a different Greek translation” (Dodd 1963, 383).

Provided that the expression τίθημι τὴν ψυχὴν in the Gospel of John and 1John has its origin in a primitive Aramaic (or Hebrew) tradition, the most natural place to seek its ultimate origin is Isa 53, because of two reasons. First, in Isa 53 the concept that a human mediator voluntarily offers himself as an atoning sacrifice is explicitly attested in the form of prophecy. We find a similar concept in both Moses’ mediation after the golden calf episode (Exod 32:30-34) and the martyrdom tradition in late Judaism that the

suffering of martyrs has atoning efficacy, as observed in *4 Maccabees* (6:28-29; 17:21-22). These traditions, however, fail “to account for the emphasis in the Gospels on the death of Jesus as a scriptural necessity” (Mark 14:21 and par. Luke 22:22; Luke 22:37; Mark 15:34; Mark 15:19 and par. Matt 27:30) (Page 1992, 660). Thus, Isa 53 is more credible as the primary background for the saying than either of these alternatives, although the OT tradition of Moses’ mediation or the martyrdom tradition as observed in *4 Maccabees* (6:28-29; 17:21-22) may have indirectly influenced Jesus. This argument is supported by the paradigmatic uses of the Isaianic Servant motif in some rabbinic traditions. We find in the rabbinic literature that the Isaianic Servant motif is applied to exemplary figures such as Moses (*b. Sotah* 14a) and Phinehas (*Sifre Numbers* on Num 25:13). All three traditions appeal to Isa 53:12 for their vicarious mediation. The fact that the tradition in the *Sifre* may well belong to the Tannaitic period indicates that the paradigmatic use of the Isaianic Servant motif may have been popular among the rabbis during the first century.

Second, the Greek expression ἐκεῖνος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔθηκεν in 1John 3:16 corresponds to the Hebrew of Isa 53:10 נָפְשׁוֹ מִפְּנֵי אֱשֵׁרֵי יְהוָה. The Greek τίθημι ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ corresponds exactly to the Hebrew נָפְשׁוֹ יְהוָה, while ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν is a rendering of מִפְּנֵי (Maurer 1972, 155; Jeremias 1967, 710): (1) There is close connection between Hebrew נָפְשׁוֹ and Greek τίθημι. The former stands behind some 260 of 560 τίθημι references in the LXX. This statistic leads Maurer to conclude, “the material Hebrew equivalent of τίθημι is נָפְשׁוֹ, which combines local and transferring elements and is thus predominantly translated by τίθημι and compounds” (Maurer 1972, 153).

(2) The rendering of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota$ by $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ $\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ is supported by the use of $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ formulae in the other NT references to the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus. The four prepositions ($\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota$, $\pi\epsilon\acute{\rho}\iota$, $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$, and $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$) are used in statements about the vicarious death of Jesus in the NT. Of the four, $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ is used most frequently (Mark 14:24; Luke 22:19, 20; John 6:51; 10:11, 15; 11:51-52; 15:13; 17:19; 18:14; Rom 5:6, 8; 8:32; 14:15; 1 Cor 1:13; 5:7; 11:24; 15:3; 2 Cor 5:14, 15, 21; Gal 1:4; 2:20; 3:13; Eph 5:2, 25; 1 Thes 5:10; 1 Tim 2:6; Tit 2:14; Heb 2:9; 7:27; 10:12; 1 Pet 2:21; 3:18; 4:1; 1John 3:16). In particular, it is used five times in the Gospel of John with “to lay down life,” including John 10:11, 15 (“And I lay down my life for the sheep [$\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\pi\rho\omicron\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$]”), in Rom 5:8 (“Christ died for us [$\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ $\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$]”), and in Mark 14:24 (“This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many [$\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$]”). This indicates that the preposition $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ had become standard in Christian descriptions of Jesus’ vicarious death (Brown 1982, 448).

In the foregoing discussion, we have shown the correspondences and the differences between the Markan ransom saying and 1John 3:16. Now we will evaluate them with regard to their mutual relationship. On the one hand, the extent of their correspondences points to their common origin, particularly in their correspondence in the allusion to Isa 53. On the other hand, the extent of the differences between the two seems to exclude the possibility of any direct literary relationship between these Greek texts. More likely, both 1John and Mark refer back to a primitive Aramaic (or Hebrew) saying of Jesus by way of different Greek translations (Dodd 1963, 383). This Semitic tradition may have included kingdom sayings of Jesus that interpreted his death as a vicarious atoning sacrifice, as shown in 1John 3:16, Mark 10:45, and the so-called parable of the good shepherd in John (10:11, 15, 17, 18).

Thus, together with the clear allusions to the two realized kingdom blessings in 1John 2:12-14, the allusions to the ransom saying in Mark 10:45 in 1John 3:16 makes it very likely that the author of 1John built his interpretation of the death of Jesus upon the church's realized eschatology, according to which the kingdom of God was inaugurated more fully at the death of Christ. In particular, the author seems to build his concept of the atoning death of Christ upon this particular kingdom saying as preserved in Mark 10:45 and in the parable in John (10:11, 15, 17, 18), thus making explicit the connection between the vicarious death of the Son of Man and the inauguration of the kingdom of God, which was implicit in the synoptic kingdom teachings of Jesus. This may explain the basis of 1John's concept of the atonement, according to which it is the accomplished work of the atoning death of Christ (1John 3:8, 16) that makes the eschatological blessings of forgiveness, victory over the evil one, and eternal life (1:6-10; 2:12; 4:9; 5:4-5, 20) presently available to those who confess Jesus as the Son of God and Christ (2:22; 4:2, 15; 5:5) and obey his commandments (2:3, 5; 3:24; 4:15; 5:1).

Sending Statements and the Parable of the Wicked Tenants

The Pre-Pauline Tradition of the "Formula of Mission"

The fourth line of evidence that supports our contention is the presence of verbal and thematic correspondences between the three sending statements in 1John (4:9, 10, 14) and the parable of the wicked tenants in Mark 12:1-12.

In the foregoing discussion, we argued that 1John may have built his concept of the atoning death of Christ upon a primitive saying of Jesus as preserved in the ransom

saying (Mark 10:45) and the parable of the good shepherd in John (10:11, 15, 17, 18).

There is evidence that further strengthens this argument. As observed in the previous section, the universalizing tendency of 1John is seen in his three statements about God the Father sending his divine Son as the provision for the problem of sin and the purpose of the coming of the Son (1John 4:9, 10, 14). These three statements represent all the references to the “sending” of Jesus by the Father in 1John, the basis of which may be found in the kingdom teachings of Jesus:

God's love was revealed among us in this way: God sent (ἀπέσταλκεν) his only Son (τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ) into the world so that we might live through him (ἵνα ζήσωμεν δι' αὐτοῦ). (4:9)

God ... sent (ἀπέστειλεν) his Son (τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ) to be the atoning sacrifice for our sins (ἰλασμὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν). (4:10)

The Father has sent (ὁ πατὴρ ἀπέσταλκεν) his Son (τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ) as the Savior of the world (σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου). (4:14)

Kramer identifies a definite pattern in these passages (Kramer 1966, 113): (1) the first clause speaks of the sending. (2) The next unfolds its salvific significance, sometimes by means of a ἵνα-clause (v. 9) and sometimes by means of a phrase of apposition (vv. 10, 14). Based upon this pattern and the language common to all these passages, some have argued for the presence of a fixed pre-Pauline tradition of the “formula of mission” behind these confessional statements, as well as similar statements in the Gospel of John (3:16-17) and the two Pauline epistles (Gal 4:4; Rom 8:3-4) (Strecker 1995, 150; Longenecker 1990, 167; Kramer 1966, 111-15; Schweizer 1966, 199-210). Dunn argues that this formula of mission may have its roots in Jesus’ kingdom teachings, and he cites the following synoptic traditions, in which Jesus both thought of himself as God’s son and spoke of himself as “sent” by God (Dunn 1989, 39-40, 56):

Whoever welcomes one such child in my name welcomes me, and whoever welcomes me welcomes not me but the one who sent me (τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με). (Mark 9:37; cf. pars. Matt 18:5; Luke 9:48)

He had still one other, a beloved son (ἕνα εἶχεν υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν). Finally he sent him to them (ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν ἔσχατον), saying, “They will respect my son.” (Mark 12:6; cf. pars. Matt 21:37; Luke 20:13)

He answered, “I was sent (ἀπεστάλην) only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.” (Matt 15:24)

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to bring good news to the poor. He has sent me (ἀπέσταλκέν με) to proclaim release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to let the oppressed go free. (Luke 4:18)

Whoever listens to you listens to me, and whoever rejects you rejects me, and whoever rejects me rejects the one who sent me (τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με). (Luke 10:16)

Of these synoptic traditions, Dunn thinks that the parable of the wicked tenants in Mark 12:1-12 is the most likely basis for the language and structure of the formula of mission observed in the three statements in 1John (4:9, 10, 14). Accordingly, we will compare the parable to the three sending statements in 1John to establish a possible relationship between them.

The Roots of the Formula of Mission

The Authenticity of the Parable of the Wicked Tenants

The parable of the wicked tenants is a kingdom parable “since it points to the final crisis in the dealings of God with his people” (Dodd 1961, 102). This parable is controversial because of its allegorical nature and the allusions to Jesus’ sonship (Mark 12:6), death (vv. 7-8), and resurrection (the cornerstone quotation in vv. 10-11) that critics widely regard as improbable. Vincent Taylor defends the authenticity of the parable from the two perspectives:

The narrative is not a pure allegory. The details are necessary elements in the story and the only symbolic figures are the owner, the husbandmen, and the son.... If this is so, no sufficient objection can be brought against the parable on this ground, unless it is held that Jesus invariably

used parables to convey general truths and never as pointed weapons.... The fact that Jesus alludes to His sonship and death in no way compels us to think of the theology of the Christian community, if regard is paid to viii.31, x.45, xiv.24f., and other prophecies of the passion. On the contrary, a representation which puts the death of the son on a level with that of the slaves, differing only in its malignity and the dishonour done to the body, and which does not mention the Resurrection, is the reverse of what might be expected in a community product.... the fundamental idea of the parable contains nothing which contradicts the teaching of Jesus. (Taylor 1959a, 472)

Blomberg defends the unity of the parable as it stands in Mark based upon its

coherent content:

The entire passage holds together as a coherent unit of thought, and there is no reason not to ascribe this unity to Jesus' original teaching. The three points deriving from the vineyard owner and two groups of tenants are fairly certain; the meaning of the additional detail about the son is more dubious. But the type of veiled self-reference postulated here fits precisely with the nature of Christ's teaching about himself elsewhere in the parables (and in the Synoptics more generally) (Blomberg 1990, 251)

We take the position of both Taylor and Blomberg that Mark 12:1-12, as it stands, can go back to the sayings of Jesus.

Comparison with 1John

The parable is recorded in all three Synoptic Gospels with slight variations (Mark 12:1-12; Matt 21:33-46; Luke 20:9-19), but its core is the same in each gospel (Wenham 1989, 125). Here we will focus our inquiry on the Markan account. It reads:

Then he began to speak to them in parables. "A man planted a vineyard, put a fence around it, dug a pit for the wine press, and built a watchtower; then he leased it to tenants and went to another country (Ἀμπελῶνα ἄνθρωπος ἐφύτευσεν καὶ περιέθηκεν φραγμὸν καὶ ὄρυξεν ὑπολήνιον καὶ ᾠκοδόμησεν πύργον καὶ ἐξέδετο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς καὶ ἀπεδήμησεν). When the season came, he sent a slave (δοῦλον) to the tenants to collect from them his share of the produce of the vineyard. But they seized him, and beat him, and sent him away empty-handed. And again he sent another slave (δοῦλον) to them; this one they beat over the head and insulted. Then he sent another, and that one they killed. And so it was with many others; some they beat, and others they killed. He had still one other, a beloved son (υἷον ἀγαπητόν). Finally he sent him (ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν ἕσχατον) to them, saying, 'They will respect my son.' But those tenants said to one another, 'This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and the inheritance will be ours.' So they seized him, killed him, and threw him out of the vineyard. What then will the owner of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the tenants and give the vineyard to others. Have you not read this scripture: 'The stone that the builders rejected has become the cornerstone; this was the Lord's doing, and it is amazing in our eyes?' " (Mark 12:1-11)

The evidence for 1John's dependence upon the parable is significant. In two respects they agree in their use of distinctive words and phrases: (1) We find in 1John's sending statements distinctive words (the verb ἀποστέλλω and the noun υἱός as the object of sending) that occur in the parable of the wicked tenants and other synoptic sayings with the sending language (Mark 9:37; pars. Matt 18:5 and Luke 9:48).

(2) The phrase τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ (1John 4:9) is distinctive, alluding to the same Hebrew tradition as the expression "beloved Son" (υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν) in Mark 12:6 (Guelich 1992, 519; Brown 1982, 517). The underlying Hebrew word is יִתְּיָ, "uniquely beloved," a meaning reflected in the two LXX terms that render it: μονογενής, "only, unique" (Ps 24:16; Amos 8:10), and ἀγαπητός, "beloved" (Gen 22:2, 12, 16; Jer 6:26) (Brown 1982, 517; Büchsel 1967b, 737-41; Cullmann 1950, 17; Fabry 1990, 40-48). The expression יִתְּיָ/ ἀγαπητός is used of Isaac, Abraham's specially loved son, in the context of his sacrifice at Mt. Moriah (Gen 22:2, 12, 16), as is μονογενής in the NT (Heb 11:12). The word μονογενής is attested both in 1John (4:9) and the Gospel of John (1:14, 18; 3:16, 18), whereas ἀγαπητός is attested in Mark (1:11; 9:7; cf. 12:6). This implies that Jesus saw himself as standing in a unique and intimate Father-Son relationship with God. Scholars trace the origin of these two words to the Isaac tradition (Brown 1982, 517; Best 1965, 169-73; Cullmann 1950, 17; Guelich 1992, 519; Lane 1974, 57; Taylor 1959a, 162; Vermes 1961, 233).

Together with their presence in similar statements in both the Gospel of John (3:16-17) and two Pauline epistles (Gal 4:4; Rom 8:3-4), the presence of these distinctive words and a distinctive phrase in both the three sending statements in 1John and the

parable makes it probable that 1John depends upon pre-Pauline kingdom teaching(s) of Jesus as preserved in the parable and other NT books.

This argument is strengthened further by the conceptual agreements between 1John and the parable. As will be observed, the three sending statements in 1John share at least three crucial features with the parable: (1) Both the parable and 1John have a theocentric view of the mission of the Son. We have observed that the author of 1John emphasizes the theocentric viewpoint of the mission of the Son in the three sending statements. As in 1John, God the Father is the subject of sending (*ἀποστέλλω*) in the parable, since the vineyard owner clearly stands for God, as implied by the allusions to the song of the vineyard (Isa 5:1-7) in Mark 12:1, the details of which are taken from the LXX text of Isa 5:1-7: *ἀμπελών, φυτεύω, περιτίθημι, φραγμός, ὀρύσσω, ὑπολήνιον* (*προλήνιον* in Isa 5:2), *οἰκοδομέω*, and *πύργος* appear in both (Taylor 1959a, 473 n.1). Based upon this observation, Wenham concludes, “It is the story of God, sending first the prophets and then Jesus to the people of Israel, patiently calling them to ‘bear fruit.’ It is the story of their violent rejection of that call, culminating in the killing of Jesus; and it is the story of God taking action to punish Israel and ‘to give the vineyard’ to others” (Wenham 1989, 127). Jesus’ view of the kingdom in the parable is theocentric. God the Father is the vineyard owner, the subject of sending, and the final judge. The theocentric viewpoint of the kingdom as described in the parable of the wicked tenants clearly parallels what we observed in 1John, particularly in the three confessional statements (4:9, 10, 14).

(2) Both 1John and the parable describe the sending of the Son as an eschatological event. The author of 1John has in mind a decisive eschatological event that

makes available the eschatological blessings of forgiveness and eternal life when he speaks of God sending his only Son using the language of revelation (4:9): “God’s love was revealed among us in this way: God sent his only Son into the world so that we might live through him.” The sending of the Son can be called an eschatological act, as implied by the word ἔσχατον in Mark 12:6. The eschatological implication of ἔσχατον is preserved, whether we understand ἔσχατον as an adjective modifying αὐτὸν as argued by Gundry, or as an adverb modifying ἀπέστειλεν (Gundry 1993, 686). Other scholars noticed the eschatological emphasis of the word ἔσχατον (De Jonge 1998, 16; Wenham 1989, 128). According to de Jonge, this implies that Jesus saw himself as God’s final envoy to his people, the last in a line of prophets who had been beaten, wounded, and killed. Wenham concludes, “He saw himself in continuity with the prophets, bringing the word of God and calling people to serve God, and yet, strikingly, he saw himself as not just a servant like the great prophets of God, but as the beloved Son and heir of the owner of the vineyard.”

(3) Both the three sending statements in 1John and the parable presuppose the coming death of the Son. Just as the coming death of the Son of God is presupposed in the two expressions referring to the Son in 1John (“atoning sacrifice” in 4:10 and “Savior” in 4:14), so is the rejection and the death of the Son as the Messiah foretold in the parable, which is especially evident in the “cornerstone” quotation from Ps 118:22 (Mark 12:10-11; pars. Matt 21:42 and Luke 20:17), a favorite early Christian messianic proof text (see Acts 4:11 and 1 Pet 2:7). Jeremias has demonstrated that Ps 118:22-23 was messianically interpreted by Jesus’ time (Jeremias 1964b, 256-62).

Thus, we have identified three conceptual correspondences between the three sending statements in 1John and the parable of the wicked tenants: (1) the theocentric viewpoint of the mission of the Son, (2) the sending of the Son as an eschatological event, and (3) the coming death of the Son. When considered together with the clear allusions to the parable in 1John, as well as in both the Gospel of John (3:16-17) and the two Pauline epistles (Gal 4:4; Rom 8:3-4), as identified in the foregoing discussion, these conceptual correspondences are probably not coincidental; rather, they confirm that behind the three sending statements in 1John lies a pre-Pauline formula of mission, which was itself founded upon the kingdom teachings of Jesus as best represented in the parable of the wicked tenants.

The Concept of the Kingdom and Eternal Life

In the foregoing discussion, we have presented five lines of evidence that support our contention: (1) the use of a tradition formula in 1John, (2) the universalizing tendency and realized eschatology, (3) the presence of the two realized kingdom blessings in 1John, (4) the correspondences between the ransom saying (Mark 10:45) and 1John 3:16, and (5) the correspondences between the three sending statements in 1John (4:9, 10, 14) and the parable of the wicked tenants (Mark 12:1-11). However, since the term “the kingdom” is absent from 1John, did the author of it really have the kingdom of God in view in his use of these kingdom categories? The answer to this question seems to be affirmative.

There are four pieces of evidence that point to this conclusion. First of all, “eternal life” in 1John, as in Gospel of John (cf. John 3) appears to be equivalent to “the

kingdom of God” in the Synoptic Gospels in three ways (Morris 1979, 214; Caragounis 1992, 425): (1) Both expressions refer to the blessed state of believers that can be experienced at present. As has been observed, 1John has its own distinctives, compared to the kingdom teachings in the Synoptic Gospels. In particular, the idea of eternal life as a present experience is lacking in the kingdom teachings, but the kingdom of God is “present in the person of Jesus, because he, as Son of man, is the agent of the kingdom of God” (Caragounis 1992, 425). As argued in chapter 5, “eternal life” is the category used by 1John to refer to the blessed state of believers after conversion in totality, which can be experienced at present, but will be experienced fully at the Parousia of the Son (3:2).

(2) Both expressions are identified with the person of Jesus Christ. The author of 1John proclaims that Jesus “is the eternal life who was with the Father and was revealed to us” (1:2; cf. 5:20). Jesus is also described as the mediator of the eternal life: “God gave us eternal life, and this life is in his Son” (5:11). Similarly in the Gospels, the kingdom of God is often identified with the person of Jesus Christ through his mighty works and teachings in the Gospels (Mat 12:28; cf. Luke 11:20): “But if it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come to you (ἐφθασεν ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ).” As previously stated, Jesus is described as the agent of the kingdom of God in the Gospels.

(3) Both expressions are inextricably connected with the death of Jesus Christ. As observed in the foregoing discussion, the three sending statements in 1John (4:9, 10, 14) state the same christological truth from different perspectives. In particular, v.9 states that the purpose of the divine mission is to give eternal life to the believers (“God sent his only Son into the world so that we might live through him”), whereas v.10 states that this

purpose will be achieved by the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ. According to 1John, since the decisive event has already taken place (3:16), eternal life is the present reality of believers: “I write these things to you who believe in the name of the Son of God, so that you may know that you have eternal life (ὅτι ζωὴν ἔχετε αἰώνιον)” (5:13; cf. 2:12-14; 3:1). Similarly in the ransom saying (Mark 10:45), Jesus states that the ultimate purpose of his coming as the Son of man is to give his life as a ransom for many. As argued by Ridderbos, “the messianic character of the kingdom of God preached by Jesus is determined by the central place occupied by the Son of Man as the agent in the coming of the kingdom” (Matt 24:5, 23-44; Mark 13:21) (Ridderbos 1962, 31). Thus, the ministry of Son of man as the agent of the kingdom finds its climax in his death at the cross, which will fulfill the divine mission for the arrival of the kingdom and its blessings. These three correspondences between “eternal life” in 1John and the kingdom of God in the Synoptics, together with correspondences between the 1John 3:16 and the ransom saying (Mark 10:45), indicate that 1John may have had the concept of the kingdom in mind in his use of the term “eternal life.”

The question is then, “What is the rationale behind 1John’s employment of the term ‘eternal life’ in place of the concept of the kingdom?” We may find the answer to this question in Jesus’ use of the two terms in the Synoptic Gospels, in which the two terms are used interchangeably:

It is better for you to enter *life* maimed than to have two hands and to go to hell, to the unquenchable fire... it is better for you to enter *the kingdom of God* with one eye than to have two eyes and to be thrown into hell. (Mark 9:43-47)

“Good Teacher, what must I do to inherit *eternal life*?”... Then Jesus looked around and said to his disciples, “How hard it will be for those who have wealth to enter *the kingdom of God!*”... “Children, how hard it is to enter *the kingdom of God!* It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for someone who is rich to enter *the kingdom of God.*” They were greatly astounded and said to one another, “Then who can be *saved?*” ... and in the age to come *eternal life*. (Mark 10:17-30; Matt 19:16-30; Luke 18:18-25)

Inherit the *kingdom* prepared for you from the foundation of the world.... Then he will answer them, "Truly I tell you, just as you did not do it to one of the least of these, you did not do it to me." And these will go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into *eternal life*. (Matt 25:34-46)

As observed in these passages, Jesus used such expressions as "to enter life," "to enter the kingdom of God," "to inherit eternal life," and "to inherit the kingdom" synonymously (Dodd 1946, xxxvii). Thus, eternal life, according to the Synoptic Gospels, is equivalent to the kingdom of God, but whereas the kingdom can be both present and future, eternal life is always described in the Gospels as a future blessing, as opposed to the idea of eternal life as a present experience in 1John as in Gospel of John.

The fact that both terms ("eternal life" and "the kingdom of God") are used synonymously in the Synoptic Gospels, together with the correspondences between eternal life in 1John and the kingdom in the Gospels, significantly increases the likelihood that the author of 1John had the concept of the kingdom of God in mind when he used the term "eternal life." Moreover, this argument finds strong support from the presence of many clear allusions to the kingdom teachings in 1John that we identified in the foregoing discussion. As suggested by Caragounis, the avoidance of the term "kingdom of God" in 1John may be due to its Hellenistic audience, especially because the term had been in rather rare use in the church (Caragounis 1992, 429).

Evaluation of the Evidence and Conclusion

In the foregoing discussion, we presented six lines of evidence that support our contention. Let us review this evidence together, following the suggested means of evaluation: (1) The use of a tradition formula in 1John points to its dependence upon a Jesus tradition. Moreover, C. H. Dodd found in 1John a variety of allusions to the sayings

of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, which are primarily in the kingdom teachings. This evidence points to the kingdom teachings as the sources of 1John's teachings. (2) Two important features of the kingdom of God, the universalizing tendency and realized eschatology, find their parallels in 1John, which universalizes the national and corporate hopes of Judaism and emphasizes the present availability of the eschatological blessings promised in the two Jewish traditions of forgiveness and atonement. (3) There are the clear allusions to the realized kingdom blessings (the forgiveness of sins and the conquest of evil) in the realized eschatological blessings of 1John 2:12-14. Moreover, these allusions contain a phrase that is nearly identical to the distinctive phrase found in Jesus' words to the paralytic (Luke 5:20, 23; pars. Matt 9:2, 5 and Mark 2:5, 9) and the woman (Luke 7:48), through which Jesus announced the arrival of the eschatological kingdom at his coming and indicated that his coming death would be the atoning sacrifice for sins. Thus, it is likely that the author of 1John was dependent upon the realized eschatology expressed in Jesus' kingdom teaching in his presentation of these two kingdom blessings as the blessings realized in his Christian community. (4) In 1John 3:16, we identified a less clear allusion to another kingdom teaching, the Markan ransom saying (Mark 10:45). After comparing the two sayings, we concluded that both 1John and Mark might reach back to a primitive Aramaic (or Hebrew) saying of Jesus by way of different Greek translations. The clear allusion to Jesus' kingdom teaching on the forgiveness of sins in 1John 2:12, and an allusion to the same source in the Gospel of John (8 times in 10:11, 15, 17, 18; 13:37; 15:13), significantly increase the probability of 1John's dependence upon Jesus' kingdom teaching as preserved in the Markan ransom saying. (5) This conclusion is supported by the allusions to the parable of the wicked tenants (Mark 12:1-

11) in the three sending statements in 1John. (6) Finally, we demonstrated that the term “eternal life” in 1John is equivalent to “the kingdom of God” in the Gospels.

Having considered all six lines of corroborating evidence, we think it most likely that the author of 1John was dependent upon the realized eschatology of the early church in his application of the two Jewish expectations of forgiveness and atonement to the death of Jesus in the new way of universalizing, individualizing, and spiritualizing the national and corporate hopes of Israel. As has been observed, 1John explicitly connects the concept of the vicarious death of Son of Man with the inauguration of the kingdom of God by combining these two kingdom blessings with new covenant categories in 1John 2:12-14 in connection with the atoning death of Christ. Thus, 1John’s presentation of the death of Christ presupposes the concept of realized eschatology that the kingdom blessings, the victory over the evil one anticipated in the exorcism of Jesus and the forgiveness of sins anticipated in Jesus’ word to the paralytic, are now present in his Christian community, an eschatological new covenant community because of Christ’s accomplished work of atonement on the cross. As has been argued, this concept of realized eschatology is anticipated in the Gospels, particularly in Matthew.

Application of the Hypothesis

In the foregoing discussion, we presented six lines of evidence that support our contention that 1John’s use of the two Jewish traditions is to be understood against the background of the early church’s concept of realized eschatology, founded upon Jesus’ kingdom teachings. Our task here is to apply this hypothesis to the distinctive facts of

1John identified in chapter 4 and demonstrate that they can be explained by appealing to Jesus' kingdom teachings.

The Beelzebul Controversy

The first example of kingdom teaching to be discussed is the so-called Beelzebul controversy (Matt 12:25-35; Mark 3:22-27; Luke 11:14-15, 17-23). As will be observed, most of the distinctive facts of 1John can be explained by appealing to the kingdom teaching presupposed in the traditional sayings of Jesus. We use here the saying as reported in Matthew:

He knew what they were thinking and said to them, "Every kingdom divided against itself is laid waste, and no city or house divided against itself will stand. If Satan casts out Satan, he is divided against himself; how then will his kingdom stand? If I cast out demons by Beelzebul, by whom do your own exorcists cast them out? Therefore they will be your judges. But if it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come to you. Or how can one enter a strong man's house and plunder his property, without first tying up the strong man? Then indeed the house can be plundered. Whoever is not with me is against me, and whoever does not gather with me scatters. Therefore I tell you, people will be forgiven for every sin and blasphemy, but blasphemy against the Spirit will not be forgiven. Whoever speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven, but whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come. "Either make the tree good, and its fruit good; or make the tree bad, and its fruit bad; for the tree is known by its fruit. You brood of vipers! How can you speak good things, when you are evil? For out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks. The good person brings good things out of a good treasure, and the evil person brings evil things out of an evil treasure. (Matthew 12:25-35; cf. pars. Mark 3:22-27 and Luke 11:14-15, 17-23)

This traditional saying appears in all three Synoptic Gospels with slight variations, but the core of the story is the same in each gospel. Matthew and Luke (Matt 12:25-26 and Luke 11:17-18) agree occasionally against Mark, but "even in their parallel to Mark 3:27, Matthew is far closer to Mark than to Luke" (Albright and Mann 1971, 154). Matthew records two incidents, the first being a reply to an accusation, and the other being Jesus' reaction to a demand for a sign. Luke combines both, but with interposed material at 11:27-28, without any parallel in Matthew. Based upon this observation, Albright and Mann conclude that what we have here may be best explained

by appealing to “fairly rigidly defined blocks of oral tradition, loosely associated with regard to context.”

Many distinctive features of 1John can also be found in the statement of Jesus preserved in Matt 12:25-35. We may identify the four interrelated concepts in Jesus’ statement, each of which corresponds to at least one aspect of the concept of the forgiveness of sins in 1John. First, we have shown in the foregoing section that 1John universalizes, spiritualizes, and individualizes the national and corporate hopes of Israel by dealing with the problem of sin with respect to the nature of man and the presence of the evil one, and this distinctive of 1John can be explained by appealing to the cosmic nature of Satan’s dominion in this age presupposed in Matt 12:25-35 and its synoptic parallels. The presence of the kingdom of Satan is presupposed and it is contrasted to the kingdom of God in the saying of Jesus: “Every kingdom divided against.... If Satan ... is divided against himself, how then will his kingdom stand?... But if it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come to you” (12:25-29).

The same idea is observed in Satan’s word to Jesus during his temptation (Matt 4:8-9): “Again, the devil took him to a very high mountain and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and their splendor; and he said to him, ‘All these I will give you, if you will fall down and worship me.’ ” The concept of Satan’s dominion over the world is more clearly expressed in the parallel account in Luke 4:5-7: “Then the devil led him up and showed him in an instant all the kingdoms of the world. And the devil said to him, ‘To you I will give their glory and all this authority; for it has been given over to me, and I give it to anyone I please. If you, then, will worship me, it will all be yours.’ ”⁷⁶

⁷⁶ There remains the question whether the devil really had authority over the world, as indicated in his offer to Jesus. Bock suggests that the devil’s offer is a mixture of truth and error, because while the devil is

The same concept of Satan's dominion seems to be in view when the author of 1John speaks of "the whole world (ὁ κόσμος ὅλος)" lying "under the power of the evil one" (1John 5:19). Moreover, when the author speaks of sin as ἀνομία (1John 3:4) or of the mortal sin (5:16-17), he seems to refer to sin as "the hostility and revolt of the forces of evil against the kingdom of God in the last days of the world," characterized by "its satanic aspect, by the control that is exercised by the devil" (De la Potterie 1971, 42).

This concept of sin can be explained by appealing to Jesus' differentiation between the unforgivable sin and forgivable sins in his statement preserved in Matt 12:31-32 and its synoptic parallels (Mark 3:28-29; Luke 12:10). By unforgivable sin (Matt 12:31-32), Jesus seems to have in mind a specific sin of eschatological rebellion against the kingdom of God. Similarly, the author of 1John warns against the deception of "antichrist" (ἀντίχριστος), who rejects Christ, the Son of God (2:22-23; 3:7), and the same teaching is anticipated by Jesus' kingdom teachings. In Matthew's Olivet discourse, Jesus speaks to the disciples of the time when many false christs (ψευδόχριστοι) and "false prophets (ψευδοπροφήται) will arise and lead many astray and because of the increase of lawlessness (ἀνομία), the love of many will grow cold" (Matt 24:11-12; cf. Mark 13:5-6). As observed by Dodd, the expression "Antichrist" is not identical with "false christs," but it is quite probable that the author of 1John "had in mind some such saying as this, and combined it with other current predictions" (Dodd 1946, xl). And in Matt 13:41, Jesus speaks of a time when "the Son of Man will send his angels, and they

pictured as wielding great authority on the earth in the NT (Rom 8:18-30; John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; 1John 5:19; Eph 2:2; 2 Cor 4:4; Rev 13:2), "Jesus' expulsion of demons is against such a view of Satan's absolute authority on the earth" (Bock 1994, 376). I would agree with Bock for his suggestion, but not with his rationale. In particular, Jesus' exorcism is to be understood as evidence for the kingdom of God breaking into the dominion of Satan in Jesus' messianic activities.

will collect out of his kingdom all causes of sin and all evildoers (τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὴν ἀνομίαν).”

There is another statement in 1John that alludes to the sayings of Jesus preserved in the Olivet Discourse. The author of 1John says, “Children, it is the last hour! As you have heard that antichrist is coming, so now many antichrists have come. From this we know that it is the last hour” (2:18). Thus, according to 1John, what Jesus prophesied is now being fulfilled in the community, to which the epistle is addressed.

Second, we demonstrated that 1John spiritualizes the national and corporate aspect of the consequence of sin by describing it as bondage to the power of the evil one, which is characterized by “death,” the loss of the divine life, exclusion from fellowship with God (1John 3:14; 4:9). This distinctive of 1John can also be explained by appealing to the features of the kingdom of Satan, which is characterized by human weaknesses including sin, sickness, mortality, and demon possession, as implied in Matt 12:25-35 and in the accounts of healing and exorcism performed by Jesus and his disciples. In Matt 12:25-35 and its synoptic parallels, demon possession and sickness are portrayed as two of the most prominent manifestations of the power of the evil one in humanity. Thus, when Jesus commissioned the twelve, he “gave them power and authority over all demons and to cure diseases, and he sent them out to proclaim the kingdom of God and to heal” (Luke 9:1-2; cf. pars. Matt 10:1 and Mark 6:7; 3:13-19). In another account of commissioning in Luke 10:1-9, we find Jesus sending seventy on ahead of him in pairs to every town and place where he himself intended to go. They were to “cure the sick who are there, and say to them, ‘The kingdom of God has come near to you’ ” (Luke 10:9). The latter account, however, seems to presuppose the giving of power and authority over

demons, because we find the disciples reporting with joy, “Lord, in your name even the demons submit to us!” (10:17). Thus, just as sickness and demon possession were overcome by Jesus’ authority in the Synoptic Gospels, so were sin and mortality overcome by the coming of Jesus as the Son of God (1John 4:9; 5:13).

Third, we also demonstrated that 1John universalizes, spiritualizes, and individualizes the national and corporate hopes of Israel by describing the problem of sin as the cosmic and spiritual battle between the Son of God and the devil. This distinctive can be explained by appealing to another concept presupposed in Matt 12:25-26: the enemies of God’s kingdom are no longer seen as hostile evil nations, as in the OT and the Second Temple literature, but as evil spiritual powers operating in the human heart (Ladd 1993, 65). But the kingdom of Satan has been invaded by the coming of Jesus, a fact that was affirmed by his messianic activity, especially the exorcism of demons (Matt 12:28; Luke 11:20) (Ladd 1993, 64). When the author of 1John speaks of the revelation of the Son of God to destroy the works of the devil (1John 3:8), he may have the same concept in mind. In the Gospels, the power of the kingdom of God is displayed in the healing of the sick and the exorcism of demons (Matt 4:23; par. Mark 1:39; Matt 9:35; 10:1, 8; pars. Mark 6:7 and Luke 9:1), as well as in its proclamation by the word of Jesus and his disciples. The two, miracles and teachings, reinforce one other. In particular, Jesus explicitly connects physical sicknesses with the problem of sin by announcing forgiveness of sins to the paralytic (Matt 9:2, 5; Mark 2:5, 9; Luke 5:20; cf. John 5:14).

Fourth, 1John universalizes, spiritualizes, and individualizes the beneficiaries of divine forgiveness by defining them as those who have fellowship with the Son of God (1John 1:3; 2:12; 3:23; 5:20). This distinctive can be explained by appealing to Jesus’

saying in Matt 12:30: “Whoever is not with me is against me, and whoever does not gather with me scatters” (cf. Luke 12:23). The kingdom of God, having come in the person and work of Jesus Christ, demands that men make a decision to enter his kingdom or to remain in the kingdom of Satan, and what determines membership in the kingdom of God is personal allegiance to Jesus, the kingdom-bearer.

The Use of Christological Titles in 1John and the Synoptic Gospels

In the foregoing discussion, we compared 1John with Matt 12:25-35 with regard to their universalizing and spiritualizing of the problem of sin, and we demonstrated that we can explain most of 1John’s distinctiveness by appealing to the kingdom sayings of Jesus as preserved in Matt 12:25-35. The concepts of atoning death and of Jesus’ divine origin, however, are not as explicitly stated in the Beelzebul controversy as they are in 1John. Thus, it is our task here to find other kingdom sayings that connect the concept of atoning death with Jesus’ divine origin and messiahship more explicitly.

The Son of Man in the Gospels

Jesus’ Divine Origin and Messiahship

With regard to Jesus’ divine origin and messiahship, the most important passage is Matt 26:63-64 (cf. Mark 14:61-62; Luke 22:67-70; Matt 19:28). The trial scene of Jesus is notorious for its complexity in the passion story, but what we are concerned with here is the part of the trial scene that reports Jesus identifying himself as Son of Man, who is also Son of God and the Messiah on the occasion of his trial before the

Sanhedrin.⁷⁷ This tradition belongs to one of the 57 context-parallel traditions that appear in all three Synoptic Gospels with slight variations, and they all report Jesus identifying himself as the Son of Man, who is also the Son of God and the Messiah (Reicke 1986, 43). The difference between Mark/Matthew and Luke is primarily the time of the trial. While Mark and Matthew place this saying at a nighttime trial, Luke places it at a daytime trial. Jesus' identification of himself as the Son of God and the Messiah in this tradition is anticipated in the parable of the wicked tenants, as observed in the foregoing discussion (Matt 21:42; pars. Mark 12:10-11 and Luke 20:17), and Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi (Matt 16:13-16; pars. Mark 8:27-29 and Luke 9:18-20).⁷⁸

The high priest put Jesus under oath and said to him, "Tell us if you are the Messiah, the Son of God" (Matt 26:63; cf. Mark 14:61; Luke 22:67). Mark agrees with Matthew, although Mark has "the Son of the Blessed One" (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ), a

⁷⁷ Against the historicity of this particular tradition, E. P. Sanders puts forward seven arguments (Sanders 1985, 297-98). The first two arguments are: (1) "There is nothing in the *public* teaching attributed to Jesus in the synoptic Gospels to explain the reported question of the High Priest: 'Are you the Christ, the Son of God?' (Mark, 'Son of the Blessed') (Matt 26:63//Mark 14:61)." (2) "It is striking that John, who earlier had written that 'the Jews' sought to kill Jesus because he 'called God his own Father, making himself equal with God' (John 5:18), nevertheless includes no such charge in his story of Jesus' appearances before Annas and Caiaphas (John 18:19, 24)." The first argument does not consider evidence in either the private teachings attributed to Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels or the account reported in John. Matthew earlier reported Jesus asking about the identity of the Son of Man and Peter answering, "You are the Messiah, the Son of the living God" (Matt 16:13-16). Since Judas, who betrayed Jesus, was one of the disciples who were present in the scene, it is probable that Judas reported the same account to the Jewish authorities. Moreover, we find in John 10:31-36 that Jews were trying to stone him for blasphemy because he said, "I am the Son of God." The second argument fails because the absence of such a charge in the trial accounts in John may be attributed to John's transferring it to a different part of his gospel, with the freedom noted as being characteristics of his method (Dodd 1963, 92). As has been observed, John has already reported Jesus being condemned for blasphemy because of his claim to be the Son of God before giving his account of Jesus' appearances before Annas and Caiaphas. Based upon the resemblance between the trial account in the Synoptic Gospels and John 10:24-36, Dodd argues that John has worked on an independent form of tradition, but that he did not have any theological motive for excluding material from his passion narrative. According to R. E. Brown, both Mark and John are dependent on earlier traditions that had in common Jewish legal proceedings against Jesus, and each evangelist has rewritten his respective tradition (Brown 1994, 428).

⁷⁸ In the latter tradition, Matthew mentions both the Messiah and the Son of God, whereas Mark and Luke do not mention the Son of God.

reverential substitute for the divine name, in place of “the Son of God” (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ) in Matthew (Gundry 1982, 544). Of the two christological titles, Luke only mentions the Messiah in 22:67, on which he focused early in his Gospel (2:11, 26; 3:15; 4:41; 9:20; 20:41), but he makes up for the omission later by adding another question in v. 70 with Jesus’ affirmative answer: “All of them asked, ‘Are you, then, the Son of God?’ He said to them, ‘You say that I am.’ ” Thus, all three Synoptic Gospels agree in the use of the two Christological titles.

In reply to the question of his own identity, Jesus speaks for the last time as the Son of Man (Matt 26:64; cf. Mark 14:62; Luke 22:69): “You have said so (Σὺ εἶπας). But (πλὴν) I tell you, From now on you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of Power [cf. Dan 7; Ps 110:1; *I Enoch* 55:4; 62:3-5] and coming on the clouds of heaven [cf. Dan 7:13].” Mark agrees with Matthew almost verbatim, whereas Luke omits the reference to “coming on the clouds of heaven.” Jesus was immediately sentenced to death on the ground of blasphemy.

What is the exact nature of the accusation? To answer this question, we need to establish the meaning of Jesus’ answer, especially the relation between Σὺ εἶπας in Matt 26:64 (and its synoptic parallels) and the Son of man saying. Let us try to establish the meaning of Σὺ εἶπας. The response in Mark, Ἐγὼ εἶμι (14:62), is unambiguously affirmative, whereas Σὺ εἶπας in Matthew (26:64) can be interpreted either affirmatively or negatively. However, R. E. Brown demonstrated that “the latter expression is not a negative, meaning ‘You have said so, but I disagree, or I would not say it’; nor is it an expression of complete personal uninvolvedness: ‘Whether or not it is true I cannot say’ ”

(Brown 1994, 491).⁷⁹ In support of his argument, he mentions (1) the fact that Jesus has already affirmed that the confession “the Messiah, the Son of living God” is a revelation from God (Matt 16:16-17); (2) the affirmative understanding of the members of the Sanhedrin, as seen in their saying to Jesus, “Prophecy for us, O Messiah” (Matt 26:68), a mockery that would make no sense if he denied being the Messiah; (3) similarly, the mockery of “the Son of God” in 27:40; and (4) the confirmation of the chief priests later in 27:43, “He said that ‘I am God’s Son.’ ” Brown, therefore, suggests that $\Sigma\upsilon\ \epsilon\lambda\pi\alpha\varsigma$ in Matthew is to be understood as a qualified affirmative (Brown 1994, 491-92):

There is truth in what the high priest has said, but he must take responsibility for the way he interprets it and the use he plans to make of it.... Matthew wants to make clear that the Jesus who answers the high priest affirmatively is perfectly aware of what is intended. Moreover, by putting responsibility on the questioner for what is being said, Jesus as the one questioned turns judgment against the high priest. When Jesus turns from “You have said it” to “Yet I say to you,” he will invoke the image of the Son of Man coming in judgment. There is irony for the perceptive readers in the issue of who is really being condemned here.

Of particular importance to our discussion of the nature of the accusation of blasphemy is Brown’s observation that the Son of Man saying qualifies Jesus’ affirmative answer to the high priest’s question about his identity as “the Messiah” and “the Son of God.” E. P. Sanders tries to deny the authenticity of the trial scene as reported in the synoptic account, arguing that “the exchange between the high priest and Jesus in the synoptic accounts, especially in Matthew and Mark, do not carry conviction” (Sanders 1985, 297). Sanders’ argument, however, does not consider the connection between these two Christological titles and the Son of Man saying. As argued by Sanders, neither the title Messiah nor the title Son of God points toward blasphemy according to Jewish law, but Jesus’ claim involved messiahship of divine origin, as indicated by his use of the Son of Man saying (Ladd 1993, 168). Fitzmyer demonstrated that the Jewish attitude toward

⁷⁹ The expression $\Upsilon\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \acute{\omicron}\tau\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \epsilon\iota\mu\iota$ in Luke 22:70 seems to conflate both Mark and Matthew.

blasphemy was derived from Lev 24:10-11, 14-16, 23, which refers to an abusive use of the “name of YHWH” (Fitzmyer 1981, 583). According to the Mishna, “the blasphemer is not culpable unless he pronounces the Name [i.e. YHWH] itself” (*Sanhedrin* 7:5). The Second Temple writings such as the LXX, Josephus (*Ag. Ap.* 2.33, 237), and Philo (*Decalogue* 19, 93) seem to indicate that during NT times, one could be executed for insulting the God of Israel through arrogance, as well as for naming the Name (Brown 1994, 521-23; Beyer 1964, 622). This argument is supported by the usage of the βλασφημ- words in the NT, in which Jesus is accused of arrogantly claiming for himself what belongs to God, and thus insulting God.

With regard to the exact nature of the accusation, no single proposal has won a consensus. More scholars, however, turn to the use of Dan 7 as the possible basis for a charge against Jesus of blasphemous arrogance in speaking of the “Son of Man” in heavenly exaltation (Ladd 1993, 168; Marshall 1978b, 216; Wright 1996, 642-43). N. T. Wright concludes:

When Jesus quotes Psalm 110 as part of his own messianic riddle (‘How can the scribes say that the Messiah is David’s son?’), he is quoting the one passage which can plausibly be advanced, alongside Daniel 7, to explain the ‘enthronement’ texts in 1 Enoch. According to the psalm, the Messiah is to share YHWH’s throne, sitting at his right hand. This meaning must then be carried over into the trial scene, where in Mark 14.62 and parallels Jesus predicts that Caiaphas and his colleagues will see him vindicated, enthroned as Messiah at YHWH’s right hand as in Psalm 110, and ‘coming on the clouds of heaven’ as in Daniel 7.... It was that, in explaining his Temple-action and Temple statements in terms of Messiahship, he did so by drawing together the two texts [Dan 7:13; Ps 110:1] which, in several parallel and independent traditions in second-Temple Judaism, pointed towards an enthronement in which the Messiah, or the ‘son of man’, would share the very throne of Israel’s god, would be one of the central figures in a theophany. (Wright 1996, 643)

As suggested by Wright, it is very likely that Jesus was condemned to death on the ground of blasphemy because of this claim to future exaltation and to the exercise of the prerogatives of God himself. Jesus’ use of the divine prerogative was not confined to his future heavenly judging, but also included the present activity of the Son of Man,

such as when he pronounced forgiveness to the paralytic (Matt 9:2; pars. Mark 2:5 and Luke 5:20) (Marshall 1978b, 216).

The Concept of Jesus' Vicarious Death

The description of the Son of Man includes his vicarious death as well as his divine origin: "For the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Mark 10:45). Moreover, the cup-word in Jesus' eucharistic saying explicitly connects his coming death with the atoning sacrifice: "For this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins" (Matt 26:28; cf. Mark 14:24). Thus, the way 1John connected Jesus' atoning death with his divine origin and messiahship finds a clear precedent in the description of the Son of Man in the Gospels.⁸⁰

Unlike the Gospels, but like the rest of the NT (except for Acts 7:56) and the early church, 1John does not describe Jesus as the "Son of Man." Marshall explains this phenomenon by appealing to both a theological factor and a linguistic factor: "In the early church, the title rapidly dropped out of use because of its unsuitability to express the fullness of the Church's belief about Jesus and especially because of its peculiarity in Greek translation. It was now possible to use the title 'Son of God' without restraint as the term best fitted to express His supreme place occupied by Jesus" (Marshall 1966, 351).

⁸⁰ This observation is supported by Hengel's argument that the interpretation of Jesus' death as a vicarious, atoning sacrifice stems from Jesus' own understanding of his death (Hengel 1981, 71-73). To support his argument, Hengel appeals to the ransom saying (Mark 10:45) and Jesus' words at the Last Supper (14:24), which imply that Jesus anticipated his death and understood himself in his death as fulfilling the role of the Suffering Servant of the Lord (Isa 52:13-53:12). Thus, the concept of the atoning death of Jesus in 1John, according to Hengel, is "not primarily the theological reflections of the author, but above all the interpretive sayings of Jesus at the Last Supper which showed them how to understand his death properly" (Hengel 1981, 73). According to Hengel, the interpretive sayings of Jesus include the ransom saying.

The Universal Efficacy of the Atoning Sacrifice

We have observed that 1John universalizes the national and corporate hopes of Judaism by extending the scope of the efficacy of Christ's atoning death to include the whole world, as most clearly expressed in his statement, "He is the atoning sacrifice for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world (περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου)" (2:2). The same emphasis on the universal efficacy of Christ's atoning death can be observed in 1John's application of the term "Savior of the world" to Jesus in 1John 4:14 in connection with his role as "atoning sacrifice" (v. 10).

In the foregoing discussion, we presented the universalizing tendency in 1John as the first fact that connects it with Jesus' kingdom teachings. Our task here is to show that this universalizing feature can be explained by appealing to the particular kingdom teachings of Jesus. Of particular importance to us is Matthew's description of Jesus granting the kingdom blessings to a Roman centurion (Matt 8:5-13; Luke 7:1-10) and a Canaanite woman (Matt 15:21-28; Mark 7:24-30). The fact that Matthew records both events implies that he intends to emphasize the universal efficacy of the gospel of the kingdom.

This emphasis on the universal scope of the gospel finds its consummation in the so-called Great Commission of Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew in two major ways. First, Jesus is now invested with universal sovereign authority, for "all authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me" (Matt 28:18). McKnight, while recognizing the presence of Jesus' personal authority (5:17-48; 7:29; 21:23, 24, 27) and authority over sickness and demons (9:6, 8; 10:1) prior to his resurrection, argues that "that authority is only fully

granted after his resurrection” (McKnight 1992, 535). Jesus’ authority is no longer confined to Palestine, but extended to include the whole universe. Second, Jesus, as the One with universal sovereign authority, commands his followers to disciple the entire world (μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη), regardless of race, social level, or gender, with the kingdom message (v. 19). As the emphasis of 1John 2:2 is clearly on περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου, so is the emphasis of Matt 28:19 on πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.

The universalizing in 1John is more evident and comprehensive than in Matthew. As argued in chapter 4, the author of 1John universalizes the hopes of Judaism so thoroughly that we find no trace of any conflict between advocates of the law and of the gospel, or between champions of works and faith, or of any difference between Jew and Gentile, or of the question of circumcision unlike other NT writings. Thus, what we find in 1John may represent a more advanced stage of development than what is found in the Gospels in its incipient form.

Individualization in the Mode of Appropriation

Fellowship in the New Covenant Community as a Means of Appropriation

As observed in chapter 4, one of the distinctive characteristics of 1John is its way of combining eschatological forgiveness with cultic atonement. In particular, it is belonging to the new covenant community that determines whether one has divine forgiveness accomplished by the atoning sacrifice of the Son (1John 1:3). We have also demonstrated that neither the phrase nor the concept of the new covenant was explicitly

used in combination with the concept of vicarious atonement in the Second Temple literature.

Thus, our task here is to show that the combination of new covenant forgiveness and atonement in 1John can be explained by appealing to a kingdom teaching of Jesus. It is argued here that 1John's fusion of the two traditions may have its roots in Jesus' teaching at the Last Supper. The Last Supper tradition appears in four accounts: Matt 26:26-29; Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:15-20; 1 Cor 11:23-26.⁸¹

Common in all four accounts of the Lord's Supper tradition are the covenant motif and atonement motif (Cullmann 1963, 64; Kümmel 1973, 91). 1 Cor 11:25 and Luke 22:20 explicitly connect the new covenant with the atoning death of Jesus Christ. Moreover, the concept of atonement in 1John (1:7; 2:3, 12; 3:16; 4:10) is closely paralleled by the cup-word in Jesus' eucharistic sayings, "for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins" (Matt 26:28; cf. Mark 14:24).

⁸¹ We have a textual problem with the Lukan account of the Last Supper, which "has been transmitted in two principal forms: (1) the longer, or traditional text of cup-bread-cup is read by all Greek manuscripts except D and by most of the ancient versions and Fathers; (2) the shorter, or Western, text (read by D; it^{a,d,ff2,i,1}) omits verses 19b and 20 (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ... ἐκχυνόμενον), thereby presenting the sequence of cup-bread" (Metzger 1971, 173-74). "The main arguments in favor of this shorter text are: (1) The unusual nature of the reading. It is clearly the more difficult reading, for it is unlikely that a scribe would have wanted to omit the more traditional ending. (2) It is a shorter reading, which on textual-critical principles would generally be the preferred reading. This is especially true here in the case of a Western non-interpolation (i.e., a reading not found in the Western family of manuscripts), and such shorter readings are contrary to the tendency of the Western scribal tradition" (Stein 1992, 445). As suggested by the majority of the committee members of the UBS third edition, the overwhelming manuscript evidence supports the longer form, and the origin of the shorter form may be explained by some scribal accident or misunderstanding. A scribe may have been confused by the cup-bread-cup sequence in Luke and omitted the second mention of the cup. Bock argues that the shorter form may be the result of a scribal reduction for liturgical reasons, and that the longer form should be accepted "on the basis of its exceptional attestation, and because it is the more difficult reading, introducing as it does a second cup that lack parallels in any of the other Last Supper accounts" (Bock 1994, 1722).

However, scholars such as Grässer and Hahn have argued that the Last Supper accounts in Mark and Matthew do not point to the new covenant, but to the old covenant made at Sinai (Exod 24:3-8) (Grässer 1985, 116-25; Hahn 1975, 370-71). The cup-word in Mark omits “for the forgiveness of sins,” while 1 Cor 11:25 records it in the form, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood” (cf. Luke 22:20). The common features of Luke and Paul, and Mark and Matthew, suggest the existence of two strands of the Last Supper tradition. We will compare these two strands of the tradition in order to see whether Grässer’s and Hahn’s argument is correct.

We use here Merklein’s chart to compare the two strands (Merklein 1977, 89-91). Merklein’s schematization is based upon a set of presuppositions: (1) Matthew is dependent upon Mark. (2) Luke and Paul are from the same strand of the tradition, but not dependent upon each other. Luke is closer to this strand than Paul, but shows traits that are explicable as secondary adaptations based upon Mark.⁸²

		Mark/Matthew	Luke/Paul
Context for Bread-word	(1)	εὐλογήσας	εὐχαριστήσας
Bread-word	(2) Atonement motif	—	Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (διδόμενον)
	(3) Anamnesis	—	τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν
Context for Cup-word	(4)	Λαβὼν	ὡσαύτως
	(5)	—	μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι
	(6)	εὐχαριστήσας	—
	(7)	ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς	—
	(8)	Mark 15:23b (in Matthew, part of cup-word)	—
Cup-word	(9)	Τοῦτο	Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον

⁸² Merklein’s schematization is slightly modified and translated into English here.

(10) Covenant motif	τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης	ἡ καινὴ Διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί (μου)
(11)	Parallel structure of bread and cup words	
(12) Atonement motif	ὑπὲρ (περὶ) πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον	ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (ἐκχυννόμενον)

As noticed by Grässer and Hahn, whereas the expression “blood of the covenant” in Mark/Matthew seems to point to Exod 24:8, where Moses initiates his people into covenant fellowship with God at Mt. Sinai, the expression “new covenant” in Luke/Paul seems to point to Jer 31:31. At first blush, these biblical data seem to support Grässer’s and Hahn’s argument: whereas Luke/Paul claim the realization of Jeremiah’s new covenant (Jer 31:31-34), Mark/Matthew point back to the old covenant made at Sinai (Exod 24:3-8). Both scholars, however, seem to miss the point of Mark/Matthew, which is that the old covenant typologically points to the eschatological new covenant as prophesied in Jer 31.

There are important features in Mark/Matthew that connect the Last Supper accounts with the concepts of vicarious atonement and the eschatological new covenant. First of all, in Mark/Matthew, the expression “blood of the covenant” is qualified by two interpretive additions: (1) a pronoun μου (Morrice 1975, 135); and (2) a vicarious atonement formula such as ὑπὲρ πολλῶν or περὶ πολλῶν. The former clearly implies the atoning death of the testator, which is not attested in the old covenant. Moreover, the latter, with the concept of blood poured out, alludes both to the Levitical sacrifices (Deut 15:23; cf. Ps 79:3) and to Isa 53:12: “because he poured out himself to death, and was numbered with the transgressors; yet he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.” The concept of vicarious atonement seen in the Levitical sacrifices is applied to the suffering and death of the Servant, and the roles of the Servant are

described in sacrificial terms, which correspond to the sin offerings, particularly to the sin offerings on the Day of Atonement. By comparing his shed blood with the shed blood of the Servant, Jesus connects his death with the vicarious atoning death of the Servant as a sin offering (Moo 1983, 309).

Second, in Mark/Matthew the expression “blood of the covenant” is qualified by the following so-called eschatological outlook (Mark 14:25; Matt 26:29) that connects the Last Supper accounts with the new covenant. The cup-word is immediately followed by Jesus’ statement, “Truly I tell you, I will never again drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God” (Mark 14:25; cf. Matt 26:29). The idea of newness is clearly there. This closing word makes it clear that Jesus understood himself as the Son of Man ushering in the new eschatological age with the blood of the covenant, which is very close to the new covenant in Luke/Paul. Scholars connect Jesus’ statement in Mark 14:25 with the somewhat mysterious covenant meal associated with the Sinai covenant (Exod 24:1-2, 9-11), which has its counterpart in the tradition of the eschatological meal on Mount Zion that was to be a feast for all peoples (Isa 25:6-8) (Lang 1975, 533; Levin 1985, 273; Morrice 1975, 135; Schweizer 1967, 16-17). Lang concludes, “Just as the old covenant was made with Israel at Sinai through Moses, so will the new eschatological covenant be made at Zion that is valid for all people. Just as the old covenant was given through a blood-rite (Exod 24:6-8) and a feast meal (Exod 24:11), so will the new covenant founded through the blood of Jesus be celebrated in a meal” (Lang 1975, 533).

So, what initially appears to be a great disparity between the cup-words of the two strands of the Last Supper tradition turns out to be only superficial, and both strands of

the Last Supper tradition intend to present Jesus' death as an unprecedented eschatological event (Wright 1996, 615; Hengel 1981, 72; Morrice 1975, 134; Jeremias 1964b, 169). Whereas Paul makes explicit the new covenant concept that is implicit in Mark/Matthew, Mark/Matthew make explicit the concept of vicarious atonement that is implicit in Paul. The Pauline version of the Last Supper tradition emphasizes the theme of the expiatory death of Jesus in three ways (Reumann 1984, 26): (1) The emphasis is clearly on the death of Jesus as seen in 1 Cor 11:26, "For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the *Lord's death* until he comes." (2) We find the same emphasis in the formula that Paul cites in reference to Jesus being "betrayed" (by Judas, in 1 Cor 11:23; cf. Luke 22:21, 22) or "handed over" (by God) to die. (3) The emphasis on Jesus' expiatory death may be found in the sacrificial language that is applied to his body ("broken for you" [in 1 Cor 11:24 in some editions and translations] and "given for you" [Luke 22:19]) and the cup as "the new covenant in my blood," because "blood" represents life poured out in self-sacrifice. They all point in the same direction: toward the death of Jesus as the atonement for human sin.

In the Last Supper accounts, the three elements are closely bound up together: (1) the kingdom of God, (2) the death of Christ, and (3) new covenant fellowship. The Last Supper anticipates the death of Jesus as an atoning sacrifice. This death is also the means by which Jesus initiates his people into new covenant fellowship with God. This new covenant fellowship is also the kingdom fellowship that anticipates the final messianic banquet with Jesus in the kingdom of God (Mark 14:25; cf. Matt 26:29).

Thus, what we find in the accounts of the Last Supper is an understanding of redemptive history: the new covenant is not entirely new, but consummates the old. All

the OT institutions, history of Israel, and prophecies find their eschatological fulfillment in the Christ event. According to the Last Supper accounts, Jesus is typologically not only the new Moses who leads his people to a new exodus and initiates them into the new covenant fellowship with God with his own blood (Exod 24:8; Jer 31:31), but is the atoning sacrifice for the sins of his people, as typified in the Levitical expiatory sacrifices. In the Last Supper accounts, therefore, we find in incipient form the same fusion of Jeremiah's new covenant forgiveness and the concept of vicarious atonement that we find in more developed form in 1John, which also applies the concept to the community addressed in it. In particular, the sacrificial quality of Jesus' death is clearly emphasized in 1John.

The Necessity of Faith

As observed in chapter 4, 1John individualizes and spiritualizes the national and corporate hopes of Israel by emphasizing the necessity of individual appropriation of forgiveness through faith in the name of the Son. Our task here is to show that 1John's emphasis on faith as the condition for forgiveness can be explained by appealing to the kingdom teachings of Jesus.

Of particular importance to us in this regard is Luke 7:36-50, in which Jesus declares forgiveness of sins in response to the faith of the sinful woman who expressed her faith in the loving service to Jesus.

One of the Pharisees asked Jesus to eat with him, and he went into the Pharisee's house and took his place at the table. And a woman in the city, who was a sinner, having learned that he was eating in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster jar of ointment. She stood behind him at his feet, weeping, and began to bathe his feet with her tears and to dry them with her hair. Then she continued kissing his feet and anointing them with the ointment. Now when the Pharisee who had invited him saw it, he said to himself, "If this man were a prophet, he would have known who and what kind of woman this is who is touching him-- that she is a sinner." Jesus spoke up and said to him, "Simon, I have something to say to you." "Teacher," he replied, "Speak." "A certain creditor

had two debtors; one owed five hundred denarii, and the other fifty. When they could not pay, he canceled the debts for both of them. Now which of them will love him more?" Simon answered, "I suppose the one for whom he canceled the greater debt." And Jesus said to him, "You have judged rightly." Then turning toward the woman, he said to Simon, "Do you see this woman? I entered your house; you gave me no water for my feet, but she has bathed my feet with her tears and dried them with her hair. You gave me no kiss, but from the time I came in she has not stopped kissing my feet. You did not anoint my head with oil, but she has anointed my feet with ointment. Therefore, I tell you, her sins, which were many, have been forgiven; hence she has shown great love. But the one to whom little is forgiven, loves little." Then he said to her, "Your sins are forgiven." But those who were at the table with him began to say among themselves, "Who is this who even forgives sins?" And he said to the woman, "Your faith has saved you; go in peace.

Three important observations may be made about this pericope. First, Jesus proclaims the coming of the kingdom of God in this age by declaring forgiveness of sins to the sinful woman (Wright 1996, 272). Jesus' use of the declaratory formula "your sins are forgiven" anticipates the great eschatological act of forgiveness that will be extended to the world through his death as the atoning sacrifice. The fact that these kingdom blessings are granted to those who ask for them by faith implies that Jesus has individualized and spiritualized the national and corporate hopes of Israel.

Second, as observed in the foregoing discussion, 1John's emphasis is clearly on the realized aspect of eschatological forgiveness and atonement, and on the consequent blessings realized in the lives of believers. The three realized blessings identified in 1John 2:12-14 are forgiveness of sins (v. 12), knowledge of God (vv. 13a, 14a/b), and victory over the evil one (vv.13b, 14c). As we have argued, these blessings belong to the realized blessings of the kingdom in the Synoptic Gospels. The first blessing in 1John is stated in the statement ἀφέωνται ὑμῖν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι, which agrees with Luke 7:40 (Ἀφέωνταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι) almost verbatim. This agreement may indicate that the author of 1John inherited a Jesus tradition preserved in the Synoptic Gospels. Thus, the author of 1John may have been familiar with the distinct expression "Your faith has saved you (Ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε)" in Luke 7:50.

Third, the concept of saving faith expressed in this pericope closely corresponds to the concept of saving faith in 1John in two ways: (1) By qualifying the declaratory saying “your sins are forgiven” with another declaratory saying “your faith has saved you,” Jesus makes it clear that forgiveness is contingent upon the faith of the person as in 1John (2:12; 3:23; 5:13; 2:22; 4:2; 5:1). The relation between faith and salvation observed in this pericope is also detected in the use of the noun πίστις in the Synoptic Gospels in general. In the Synoptic Gospels, πίστις is used primarily in relation to miracles of healing and exorcism (Mark 2:5; 5:34; 10:52; Matt 8:10; 9:2, 22, 29; 15:28; 17:20; Luke 5:20; 7:9, 50; 8:48; 17:19; 18:42).⁸³ Jesus uses the formula ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε in two healing stories: the woman who had bled for twelve years (Mark 5:34; Matt 9:22; Luke 8:48) and blind Bartimaeus (Mark 10:46; Luke 18:42). In addition to this formula, Matthew reports equivalent formulae in other healing stories, including Κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν γενηθήτω ὑμῖν in the story of the two blind men (Matt 9:27), ὡς ἐπίστευσας γενηθήτω σοι in the story of a centurion’s servant (Matt 8:13), and μεγάλη σου ἡ πίστις· γενηθήτω σοι ὡς θέλεις in the story of a daughter of a Canaanite woman (Matt 15:28). On each occasion, Jesus’ declarative statement “carries the weight of the entire story” (Guelich 1989, 299). The message is the gospel of the kingdom: the blessings of the kingdom of God are available here and now to those who claim them by faith. In this sense, we may say that the kingdom teachings of Jesus anticipate 1John’s emphasis on faith as the context for forgiveness.

⁸³ The word occurs 26 times in the Synoptic Gospels (10 times in the nominative and 14 times in the accusative case). In each case it is used in relation to miracles of healing and exorcism, with 9 exceptions (Matt 21:21; 23:23; Mark 4:40; 11:22; Luke 8:25; 17:5, 6; 18:8; 22:32).

(2) The emphasis of this pericope is the concept that saving faith is the faith expressed in loving action that is in response to the divine love expressed in salvation (“she has shown great love” in Luke 7:47) as in 1John (3:16, 24). The same concept of saving faith is found in the parable of the Lord’s Prayer in Matthew (“forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors” in 6:12) and more emphatically in the parable of the unmerciful servant:

"For this reason the kingdom of heaven may be compared to a king who wished to settle accounts with his slaves. When he began the reckoning, one who owed him ten thousand talents was brought to him; and, as he could not pay, his lord ordered him to be sold, together with his wife and children and all his possessions, and payment to be made. So the slave fell on his knees before him, saying, 'Have patience with me, and I will pay you everything.' And out of pity for him, the lord of that slave released him and forgave him the debt. But that same slave, as he went out, came upon one of his fellow slaves who owed him a hundred denarii; and seizing him by the throat, he said, 'Pay what you owe.' Then his fellow slave fell down and pleaded with him, 'Have patience with me, and I will pay you.' But he refused; then he went and threw him into prison until he would pay the debt. When his fellow slaves saw what had happened, they were greatly distressed, and they went and reported to their lord all that had taken place. Then his lord summoned him and said to him, 'You wicked slave! I forgave you all that debt because you pleaded with me. Should you not have had mercy on your fellow slave, as I had mercy on you?' And in anger his lord handed him over to be tortured until he would pay his entire debt. So my heavenly Father will also do to every one of you, if you do not forgive your brother or sister from your heart." (Matt 18:23-35)

Prominent in this kingdom parable is the concept that the example of divine love expressed through the Father’s forgiveness of our sins must be responded to by our living faith expressed in forgiving action towards our Christian brothers and sisters. The same principle is expressed more emphatically in 1John 3:16: “We know love by this, that he laid down his life for us-- and we ought to lay down our lives for one another.”

There remains a question, however, whether the content of faith in the Synoptic Gospels is the same as in 1John. Saving faith, according to 1John, is faith in the name of Jesus as the Son of God (3:23; 5:13) and Christ (2:22; 4:2; 5:1). These two titles express his divine origin and messiahship, which constitute the object of saving faith. Faith in the context of healing and exorcism in the Synoptic Gospels, however, “focuses on a

practical trust in the power of Jesus to meet physical need (or in the case of exorcisms, to bring spiritual deliverance). It is exemplified in the centurion, who recognizes in Jesus a functional authority akin to that of an army officer (Matt 8:8-10; Luke 7:7-8)... The correlative to the faith of the suppliant is the authority of Jesus” (France 1992, 223). Thus, the centurion’s recognition of Jesus’ supernatural authority is not the same as, but preliminary to, faith in the name of Jesus the Son as seen in 1John.

The concept of faith expressed in 1John, however, is implied by the use of “Son of God” and the “Messiah” as the titles of confession in Matt 16:16 (cf. Mark 8:29; Luke 9:20; John 6:71): “Simon Peter answered, ‘You are the Messiah, the Son of the living God.’ ” Mark may have a similar concept of faith in mind when he recorded the climactic statement of the centurion at the crucifixion (15:39; cf. Matt 27:54; Luke 23:47): “Now when the centurion, who stood facing him, saw that in this way he breathed his last, he said, ‘Truly this man was God's Son!’ ” (Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ κεντυρίων ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσε εἶπεν, Ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν). The centurion’s statement seems to epitomize Mark’s concept of faith: faith in Jesus as the divine Son and Messiah in connection with his atoning death on the cross.⁸⁴ Thus, such scholars as Schmidt, Gundry, Taylor, and Lane conclude that both Mark and the author of

⁸⁴ Matthew uses the synonymous ἐκατόνταρχος, and the added phrase καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ τηροῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν replaces Mark’s description of the centurion as ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ. In place of Mark’s earlier Ἰδὼν, “seeing,” Matthew has ἰδόντες because he adds the ones who were guarding Jesus under the centurion’s command. The content of the climactic statement in Matthew, however, agrees with Mark: Ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν οὗτος.. Luke’s rendering of the statement (Luke 23:47) is slightly simplified from Matthew: Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης τὸ γενόμενον ἐδόξαζεν τὸν θεὸν λέγων, Ὅντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν. Luke has δίκαιος in place of θεοῦ υἱὸς.

1John understood the concept of faith in the kingdom sayings of Jesus to mean faith in Jesus as the Son of God and the Christ (Schmidt 1968, 17; Gundry 1993, 32-36; Taylor 1959a, 152, 434; Lane 1974, 308).

Summary and Conclusion

In this chapter, we have attempted to demonstrate that 1John's use of the Jewish traditions is to be understood against the background of the early church's concept of realized eschatology, which was itself based on Jesus' teachings on the kingdom of God. We demonstrated our contention in three steps. We first made plain the assumptions used in our study: (1) the definitions of kingdom teachings and realized eschatology, (2) the two hermeneutical assumptions, and (3) the five assumptions for evaluating the evidence.

We then presented six lines of evidence that support our contention. The first line of evidence was the use of the tradition formula in 1John, which points to a Jesus tradition. The second line of evidence was the presence of two important features of Jesus' kingdom teachings in 1John: (1) the universalizing tendency and (2) realized eschatology.

The third line of evidence was the presence of the two realized kingdom blessings in 1John. In particular, the eschatological blessing of divine forgiveness is expressed in 1John 2:12 in a form that is clearly reminiscent of Jesus' word to the paralytic in Luke 5:20, 23 and its synoptic parallels. We concluded that the presence of the two realized kingdom blessings in 1John, victory over the evil one (1John 2:13, 14) and the forgiveness of sin (2:12), presupposes the concept of realized eschatology in the early church. The two kingdom blessings, victory over the evil one, as anticipated in the

exorcisms of Jesus, and forgiveness, as anticipated in Jesus' word to the paralytic, are now present in the Christian community, an eschatological new covenant community, because of the presence of Christ as the atoning sacrifice for the sins of the world, based upon his finished work of atonement on the cross.

The fourth line of evidence was the correspondences between the Markan ransom saying (Mark 10:45) and 1John 3:16. We concluded that the author of 1John built his concept of the atoning death of Christ upon this saying as preserved in Mark 10:45 and in the parable of the good shepherd in John (10:11, 15, 17, 18), thus making explicit the connection between the vicarious death of the Son of Man and the inauguration of the kingdom of God.

The fifth line of evidence was the correspondences between the three sending statements in 1John (4:9, 10, 14) and the parable of the wicked tenants (Mark 12:1-12). Their correspondences include: (1) the use of distinctive words (the verb ἀποστέλλω and the noun υἱός as the object of sending) in both, and in similar statements in John 3:16-17 and two Pauline epistles (Gal 4:4; Rom 8:3-4); (2) the presence of the phrase τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ in 1John 4:9, alluding to the same Hebrew tradition as the expression "beloved Son" (υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν) in Mark 12:6; and (3) three conceptual correspondences: their theocentric viewpoint concerning the mission of the Son, their concept of sending the Son as an eschatological event, and their concept of the coming death of the Son as the Messiah. We concluded that the three sending statements in 1John may have their roots in a pre-Pauline formula of mission, which was itself based upon the kingdom teachings of Jesus, as best represented in the parable of the wicked tenants.

The sixth line of evidence was the presence of correspondences between the concept of the kingdom in the Synoptic Gospels and the concept of eternal life in 1John. I also argued that with his use of the concept of eternal life, the author of 1John may have had the concept of the kingdom of God in mind, since 1John's concept of an eternal life that can be experienced at present, but will be experienced fully at the Parousia of the Son, parallels the concept of the kingdom in the Synoptic Gospels, as shown in the interchange of the two terms (Mark 9:43-47; 10:17-30; Matt 19:16-30; 25:34-46; Luke 18:18-25).

Having evaluated these six lines of evidence according to the suggested assumptions for evaluation, we concluded that the author of 1John was dependent upon the realized eschatology of the early church in his application of the two Jewish expectations of forgiveness and atonement to the death of Jesus in the new way of universalizing, individualizing, and spiritualizing the national and corporate hopes of Israel.

We then applied our hypothesis to 1John and the kingdom teachings in order to show that the distinctive aspects of 1John can be explained by appealing to the realized eschatology of the early church, which was itself founded on Jesus' teaching on the kingdom of God. First, we examined the kingdom teachings in the Beelzebul controversy in the Synoptic Gospels (Matt 12:25-35; Mark 3:22-27; Luke 11:14-15, 17-23) and saw that most of the distinctive aspects of 1John can be explained by appealing to this tradition. In particular, the Beelzebul controversy agrees with 1John in its universalizing, spiritualizing, and individualizing of the national and corporate hopes of Israel, first by dealing with the problem of sin as found in human nature and the presence of the evil

one, second by dealing with the consequences of sin as bondage to the power of the evil one, third by dealing with the problem of sin as the cosmic and spiritual battle between the Son of God and the devil, and fourth by defining the beneficiaries of forgiveness as those who have fellowship with the Son of God.

Second, we examined the use of the Christological titles in the Synoptic Gospels in order to establish their connection with the combination of the concept of atoning death with Jesus' divine origin and his messiahship in 1John. We demonstrated that this distinctive aspect of 1John can be explained by appealing first to the use of the title Son of Man in the Gospels, and then to the use of the Christological titles in Mark. In particular, we demonstrated that Jesus' use of the divine prerogative on the occasion of his trial and in the healing of the paralytic anticipated what we find in 1John's concept of atonement. We also showed that the description of the Son of Man includes his vicarious death, as observed in the ransom saying (Mark 10:45) and the cup-word in Jesus' eucharistic saying (Matt 26:28; Mark 14:24).

Third, we demonstrated that the emphasis of 1John on the universal efficacy of Christ's atoning death could be explained by appealing to the kingdom teachings of Jesus. For this purpose, we appealed to the accounts of Jesus granting kingdom blessings to Gentiles in Matthew (8:5-13; 15:21-28) and to the universal scope of the gospel of the kingdom expressed in the Great Commission (Matt 28:18-20).

Fourth, we demonstrated that the combination of new covenant forgiveness and atonement in 1John could be explained by appealing to Jesus' teaching at the Last Supper.

Lastly, we demonstrated that 1John's emphasis on faith as the condition for forgiveness can be explained by appealing to the use of the noun πίστις in the story of the sinful woman in Luke 7:36-50 and in the Synoptic Gospels in general, primarily in relation to the miracles of healing and exorcism.

By applying our hypothesis to the distinctive aspects of 1John identified in chapter 5, we have demonstrated that they could all be explained by appealing to the kingdom teachings of Jesus. Based upon this study, we conclude that 1John's concept of the atonement of Christ is to be understood primarily against the background of the early church's concept of realized eschatology, which was itself founded on Jesus' teachings on the kingdom of God, as well as against the backdrop of Jewish traditions on forgiveness and atonement. Conversely, although 1John's terminology may reflect a Hellenistic/pagan context, the roots of its theology are not to be found there.

EXCURSUS

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN 1JOHN AND THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

Introduction

In the previous section, we demonstrated that 1John's use of two Jewish traditions is to be understood against the background of the early church's concept of realized eschatology, which was itself based upon Jesus' teachings on the kingdom of God. In support of this argument, we appealed to the kingdom teachings preserved in the Synoptic Gospels. But we did not appeal to the Gospel of John for two reasons: (1) "The kingdom of God plays no significant role in John's Gospel" (Caragounis 1992, 429). (2) The two Jewish traditions, which our study focuses on, are not explicitly attested in John.

Since the Gospel of John and 1John share many important features, such as the universalizing of Jewish hopes and realized eschatology, it would be helpful to devote an excursus to the relationship of 1John's concept of forgiveness/atonement to that found in John. Our study will show that although John may not explicitly attest the two Jewish traditions used in 1John, there is nothing in that gospel that runs counter to these two traditions. Rather, we find allusions to these traditions in John, which point to the common authorship of the two works. There is no real "tension" between the Christology of the two works, as alleged by such scholars as Dodd and Kysar (Dodd 1937, 144-45; Kysar 1992, 909-10).

An Examination of the Passages on Atonement/Forgiveness

We will use the two sending statements in John 3:16-17 and the three sending statements in 1John (4:9, 10, 14) as the starting point for our comparison between John and 1John in relation to the use of the two Jewish traditions of eschatological forgiveness and vicarious cultic atonement. These sending statements are chosen primarily for two reasons: (1) It is in these statements that such scholars as Loader and Dodd find striking differences as well as striking similarities (Loader 1992, xxi; Dodd 1937, 9-10). (2) These sending statements are explicitly connected with Jesus' teaching on the kingdom of God (John 3:4, 5). The phrase "the kingdom of God" is attested only in John 3:4, 5.⁸⁵

Thus, we will examine the two sending statements in John and compare them with the three sending statements in 1John. We will first identify the correspondences and the differences between John and 1John. We will then evaluate the result to determine whether these differences show any tension between the two works in their interpretation of the death of Christ. At this stage, we will use other passages in John that illuminate its use of the forgiveness/atonement theme. In particular, we will focus our inquiry on the alleged absence of the theme of atonement in John.

1John

ἐν τούτῳ ἐφανερώθη ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν, ὅτι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ ἀπέσταλκεν ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα ζήσωμεν δι' αὐτοῦ

John

Οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ' ἔχη ζωὴν αἰώνιον

⁸⁵ This view presupposes the unity of the section 3:1-21. Some scholars argue against its unity in view of the alleged change of speaker. Thus, they argue that the dialogue with Nicodemus ends at v. 12 (Schnackenburg 1982, 361; Beasley-Murray 1987, 50) or v. 15 (Westcott 1951, 54; Lightfoot 1956, 115) and that the rest of the section is a commentary by the Evangelist. Brown, however, does not find any evidence that Jesus stopped speaking either after v. 12 or after v. 15 (Brown 1966, 149). Thus, Brown defends the unity of 3:1-21 on the basis of its homogeneity of style and other evidence of unity.

“God’s love was revealed among us in this way: God sent his only Son into the world so that we might live through him” (4:9).

ἐν τούτῳ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη, οὐχ ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἠγαπήκαμεν τὸν θεόν ἀλλ’ ὅτι αὐτὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἰλασμὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν

“In this is love, not that we loved God but that he loved us and sent his Son to be the atoning sacrifice for our sins” (4:10).

ὁ πατὴρ ἀπέσταλκεν τὸν υἱὸν σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου

“The Father has sent his Son as the Savior of the world” (4:14).

“For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, so that everyone who believes in him may not perish but may have eternal life” (3:16).

οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα κρίνη τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ’ ἵνα σωθῆ ὁ κόσμος δι’ αὐτοῦ.

“Indeed, God did not send the Son into the world to condemn the world, but in order that the world might be saved through him” (3:17).

Correspondences

The correspondences between 1John and John can be shown in both form and content. First, we will identify the formal correspondences.

Formal Correspondences

The formal correspondences between 1John and John are extensive, involving common vocabulary, phraseology, syntactic structure, and rhetorical style. (1) Almost every word in John 3:16, 17 is attested in 1John, frequently verbatim: θεός, ἀγαπάω, κόσμος, υἱός, μονογενής, ἵνα, ἀποστέλλω, and σῶζω. In particular, the word μονογενής is a distinctively Johannine word that is attested only in 1John 4:9 and John 1:14, 18; 3:16,

18. In both the Gospel of John and 1John, the word υἱός is used to describe the relationship of Jesus to God.⁸⁶

(2) They follow a similar pattern in structuring sentences. As observed by Kramer, the first clause speaks of the sending, while the next unfolds its salvific significance, sometimes by means of a ἵνα-clause (v. 9) (Kramer 1966, 113). The absence of a ἵνα-clause in 1John 4:10, 14 may be seen as 1John's stylistic variation.

(3) Both use the rhetorical features of repetition and variation. Just as John 3:17 expresses the same thought as John 3:16, with slight variation, so do 1John 4:10, 14 express the same thought as v. 9, with slight variation.

Thematic Correspondences

The correspondences between 1John and John are not confined to their formal characteristics, but also include their content. We find thematic correspondence in five major areas: (1) There is a theocentric focus in both: God the Father is the sender of the Son. The sending of Jesus by the Father is a common notion in both works (Brown 1982, 516). The verb ἀποστέλλω in reference to Jesus occurs seventeen times in the gospel and three times in the epistle (4:9, 10, 14) in statements about God's sending of the Son.

(2) In both, the motif of universal mission is described as the love of God: "God's love" in 1John 4:9; "he loved us" (1John 4:10); "God so loved the world" (John 3:16).

Prominent in both is the frequent use of the word κόσμος in the positive sense (Brown 1982, 517). The world is the object of divine salvation. What is emphasized in the use of

⁸⁶ The same is true of the Gospel of John and 1John in general. Except in the case of John 12:36, both books use the word υἱός to describe the relationship of Jesus to God (John 1:34; 3:18, 36; 5:19, 21, 22, 25, 26; 6:27; 8:36; 10:36; 11:4, 27; 14:13; 17:1, 12; 20:31; 1John 2:22, 23, 24; 4:9, 10, 14; 5:10, 11, 12, 20), whereas τέκνον is used for believers as God's children (John 1:12; 11:52; 1John 1:12; 3:1, 2, 10).

the word κόσμος is the salvific concern for the world in connection with the messianic role.⁸⁷

(3) In both, the love of God is expressed in his sending of the only begotten Son (ὁ υἱός ὁ μονογενής) for the salvation of the world (1John 4:9; John 3:16). The Son is described in both works (1John 1:1-3; John 1:1-5) as the pre-existent, divine Logos and source of eternal life, which qualifies him for his ministry to the world as its Savior (σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου in 1John 4:14; John 3:16; cf. σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου in 4:42).

(4) Both express salvation in a spiritual sense by identifying it as eternal life (1John 4:9; John 3:16). As observed in the previous section, eternal life is described in both John and 1John as the eschatological blessing that can be experienced in the present (1John 5:12, 13; John 3:36; 5:24; 6:47, 54) as well as in the future, and in this sense eternal life in 1John and John is equivalent to the kingdom of God in the Synoptic Gospels (Morris 1979, 214; Caragounis 1992, 425). In chapter 5, we demonstrated that the three sending statements in 1John have their roots in the kingdom teachings of Jesus. In the two sending statements in John, eternal life is explicitly connected with seeing the kingdom of God (John 3:4, 5).

(5) In both, salvation is not automatic, but has to be individually appropriated by believing in the Son (John 3:16, 17; cf. 1John 5:13). The emphasis of John 3:16 is clearly on faith in Jesus, which is not explicitly mentioned in 1John. However, faith in the Son is presupposed in 1John, as stated in the immediate context of 1John 4:9:

And this is his commandment, that we should *believe in the name of his Son Jesus Christ* and love one another, just as he has commanded us.... Beloved, do not *believe every spirit*.... By this you know the Spirit of God: every spirit that *confesses* that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is from

⁸⁷ The word κόσμος occurs 185 times in the NT, of which 78 occurrences are in John, 23 are in 1John, and one is in 2 John—in sum, 55 percent of the total NT usage (Brown 1982, 222-23).

God.... Little children, you are *from God*.... We are *from God*. *Whoever knows God* listens to us.... Beloved, let us *love* one another, because love is *from God*; everyone who loves is *born of God* and *knows God*. Whoever does not love does not know God, for God is love. (3:22-4:8)

We have demonstrated that the correspondences between 1John and John are extensive, both in form and in content. Most prominent are their correspondences in vocabulary, phraseology, syntactical structure, rhetorical style, and content. The result of our comparison of the two supports the argument of the majority of scholars who have investigated the relationship between the two works (Brooke 1912, i-xix; Hengel 1989, 109-34; Marshall 1978a, 42-44; Stott 1988, 17; Westcott 1883, xxx-xxxi). Westcott argues:

The question of the authorship of the Epistle cannot be discussed as an isolated question. The writer is so closely connected the Fourth Gospel in vocabulary, style, thought, scope, that those two books cannot but be regarded as works of the same author.... It is not that the author of the Epistle directly uses the materials contained in the Gospel: he has found in them his starting-point and his inspiration, but at once he goes on to deal independently with problems which are before him.... The Evangelist writes in this case not as a narrator of the Lord's words, but in his own person.

Differences

As we have demonstrated, the correspondences between 1John and John are quite extensive. However, there are differences between them. Their differences are primarily twofold. First, as observed by Brown, love in 1John is oriented toward Christians (“we”), while in John 3:16 God loves the world (Brown 1966, 1:133). This difference, however, does not present a real problem for the proponents of common authorship for two reasons: (1) The change of emphasis from the world to “us” in 1John may be attributed to internal conflicts in the community. (2) The concept of the divine love of the world may be implied in 1John’s use of the expression *σωτήρα τοῦ κόσμου* in 4:14 and “the atoning

sacrifice for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world (περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου)” in 2:2.

Second, 1John has the two important expressions, ἰλασμός (4:10) and σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου (4:14), which are absent in John 3:16-17. Thus, according to 1John, the Son is sent into the world as the “Savior of the world (σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου),” who carries out his role as the “atoning sacrifice (ἰλασμός)” (4:10). Of the two expressions, the latter occurs only in 1John in the NT, whereas the former occurs elsewhere once in John 4:42.

The author of 1John is more explicit than the author of John in clarifying the role of the Son in the salvation of the world. By introducing the “atoning sacrifice (ἰλασμός)” (4:10), 1John connects the divine mission with the atoning sacrifice for sins (4:10). In the gospel, neither the coming of the pre-existent Son nor his role as the “Savior of the world” is explicitly connected with the death of Jesus as the atoning sacrifice.

The distinctive expression ἰλασμός in 1John leads some scholars to argue against the common authorship of the gospel and the epistle (Dodd 1937, 144-45; Edwards 1996, 51-53; Kysar 1992, 909-10; Loader 1992, xxi). One of the three themes that Dodd finds lacking in the Gospel of John is that of atonement (Dodd 1937, 144-45):

The death of Christ is in the Epistle interpreted as an ἰλασμός for the sin of the world (ii. 2), much as Paul describes it a ἰλαστήριον. God has provided this ἰλασμός (iv. 10) and thereby “forgives us our sins and cleanses us from all unrighteousness” (i. 9). The doctrine of the Epistle then seems clear. It is similar to that which is set forth in Rom. iii. 25 and in Hebrews passim, and implied in 1 Pet i. 18-19, Mt. xxvi. 28. In other words it corresponds with general Christian belief. In the Fourth Gospel the death of Christ is first and foremost that by which Christ is “glorified” or “exalted” (xii. 23, 32-33, xiii. 31), and by virtue of which He “draws” all men into the sphere of eternal life (xii. 32, xi. 52). It is the means by which the virtue and power of His own being—His flesh and blood—are released for the sustenance of eternal life in mankind (vi. 51). His death is a sacrifice, on the one hand as being self-dedication (ἀγιάζω ἑμαυτόν xvii. 19), and on the other hand, as an expression of His “love to the end” for His own (xiii. 1), as a man will lay down his life for a friend (xv. 13), or a shepherd for his flock threatened by the wolf (x. 15). It is not a sacrifice for the expiation of sin.

Dodd's view is for the most part closely followed by other scholars, who argue against common authorship (Kysar 1992, 909-10; Loader 1992, xxi-xxii; Edwards 1996, 51-53). Loader argues (Loader 1992, xxi):

Comparing the first epistle with the gospel, we find both similarities and differences which are striking, precisely because of those similarities. The gospel proclaims the coming of the Son who has been sent in love from the Father to make the Father known.... The underlying model is that of the revealer, sent from above.... When we turn to the epistle we find that the saving work of Christ is presented in a way which, unlike the gospel, does not depend primarily on the revealer model of the envoy sent to make the Father known. Rather salvation comes because the Father sent the Son to perform an act of atonement.... In other words, the author of the gospel and the author of the epistle have a different understanding of how Christ brought salvation to us.

However, is the idea of Christ's atonement in 1John really absent from the sending statements in John? Brooke answers this question in the negative: "The same is true of the conception of the death of Christ as propitiatory. Ἰλασμός occurs only in the Epistle. The idea is more prominent in the Epistle. It is not absent from the gospel. It is to be found both in what the Evangelist puts into the mouth of others, and also in his own comments" (Brooke 1912, xviii). Brooke's comment is very important to our study, but unfortunately he fails to support his argument. Thus, we will present the concrete evidence of the theme of atonement in the Gospel of John.

The Alleged Absence of the Atonement/Forgiveness Theme

Let us now closely examine John 3:16, 17 in relation to its immediate context and to the gospel in general with regard to the theme of atonement/forgiveness. As argued by Dodd, eternal life (John 3:16-17) presupposes the lifting up of the Son of man: "No one has ascended into heaven except the one who descended from heaven, the Son of Man. And just as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up (οὕτως ὑψωθήναι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), that whoever believes in him may have eternal life" (3:13-15). There is good reason to think that 1John's use of

ἰλασμός for the role of Jesus as the Savior of the world may be an application of the idea expressed in John 3:14-15 to the new situation the author is facing (Westcott 1883, xxxi).

There are four lines of evidence that support this view:

First of all, the forgiveness of sin is presupposed in the two sending statements in the gospel. The two expressions μὴ ἀπόληται (3:16) and κρίνη τὸν κόσμον (3:17) presuppose that the world has to face divine judgment. But the question is, “Judgment for what?” There are two passages in the gospel that provide a clue to the answer:

Again he said to them, “I am going away, and you will search for me, but you will die in your sin. Where I am going, you cannot come.” Then the Jews said, “Is he going to kill himself? Is that what he means by saying, ‘Where I am going, you cannot come’?” He said to them, “You are from below, I am from above; you are of this world, I am not of this world. I told you that you would die in your sins, for you will die in your sins unless you believe that I am he.” (8:21-24)

Very truly, I tell you, anyone who hears my word and believes him who sent me has eternal life, and does not come under judgment, but has passed from death to life. (5:24)

Included in 5:24 and 8:21-24 are the concepts of eternal life, faith, judgment, and the world that clearly echo John 3:16, 17.⁸⁸ These passages not only echo the concept expressed in John 3:16, 17, but also make explicit the concepts implicit in the two sending statements. 5:24 expresses the condition of unbelieving humanity as death, which is identified with judgment. In 8:21, 24, the condition of the world apart from Christ is that of one doomed to death in sin. Thus, eternal life is the same as salvation from sin. From this, we may reasonably conclude that in John eternal life is identified as the forgiveness of sin, just as in 1John.

Second, evident in the context of John 3:16, 17 is the necessity of the death of Christ. That the phrase ὑψωθῆναι in v. 14 refers to Jesus’ death on the cross seems to be clear from the immediate context (in comparison with the serpent on the pole in v. 14)

⁸⁸ In the Gospel of John, the concepts of believing in God who sent the Son and believing in Jesus are used synonymously (5:23, 24; 6:29, 40).

and the explanation in 12:32-33 (“ ‘And I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all people to myself.’ He said this to indicate the kind of death he was to die”) (Brown 1966, 145; Morris 1979, 225-26). Thus, the gift of eternal life presupposes the death of the Son on the cross. In previous discussion, we demonstrated that eternal life is identified in John as the forgiveness of sins. Thus, we may say that the death of the Son is directly related to the problem of sin. But how are they related? How does the death of the Son effect the forgiveness of sins? This question brings us to the third point.

In the third place, the particle *δεῖ* and the verb *ὑψώω* in John 3:14 imply that the author may have the theme of atonement in mind when he used the two expressions (Brown 1966, 145). There are two arguments to support this: (1) The use of particle *δεῖ*, together with the use of the title Son of man referring to Jesus (3:4, 5), echoes the passion prediction in Mark 8:31 (cf. 9:12, 31; 10:33-34, 45) (Brown 1966, 145; Schnackenburg 1982, 395; Beasley-Murray 1987, 51). Compare John 3:14 with Mark 8:31:

Mark 8:31

Then he began to teach them that the Son of Man must undergo great suffering, and be rejected (*δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι*) by the elders, the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again.

John 3:14

And just as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up (*οὕτως ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*).

We find in John three statements spoken by Jesus concerning the “lifting up” of the Son of Man (3:14; 8:28; 12:31). Brown argues:

These statements are the Johannine equivalents of the three predictions of the passion, death, and resurrection found in all the Synoptics (Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34 and par.).... There is no reason to think that the fourth evangelist is dependent on the Synoptics for his form of the sayings; indeed, on a comparative basis the Johannine sayings are far less detailed and could be more ancient. (Brown 1966, 145)

Brown's statement means that the two sending statements in John 3:16-17 presuppose the sufferings and death of the Son as a divine necessity (Gundry 1993, 428; Cranfield 1959, 272; Schnackenburg 1982, 395; Beasley-Murray 1987, 51). But, the theme of atonement is not explicitly stated in the passion predictions in the Synoptic Gospels. The use of emphatic $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$, however, may imply the scriptural necessity for the suffering and death of the Son of man (Grundmann 1964, 25). Then, to which scriptural passage(s) does John refer in his use of the $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ statements? The use of the verb $\upsilon\psi\acute{\iota}\omega$ provides a clue to answering this question.

(2) Based upon the linguistic features of the verb $\upsilon\psi\acute{\iota}\omega$, such scholars as Brown and Beasley-Murray argue that it may point to Isa 52:13 (Brown 1966, 145; Beasley-Murray 1987, 51; Borgen 1987, 110; Lindars 1995, 17). Behind $\upsilon\psi\acute{\iota}\omega$ may lie either Hebrew שׂוּן or Aramaic ܦܩܝܘܢ , which can cover the ideas of both death and glorification, as in Gen 40:13 and 19. The Aramaic ܦܩܝܘܢ means both "to lift up on a cross, crucify, hang" and "to raise up" (Jastrow 1971, 408; Bertram 1972, 610). Such scholars as Brown and Beasley-Murray argue that the Evangelist had both meanings in mind when he used the verb $\upsilon\psi\acute{\iota}\omega$ (Brown 1966, 145; Beasley-Murray 1987, 51; Bertram 1972, 610; Lindars 1995, 17). Both meanings are evident in Isa 52:13: "See, my servant shall prosper; he shall be exalted and lifted up, and shall be very high ($\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\eta\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ $\acute{\omicron}$ $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\upsilon\psi\omega\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\delta\omicron\zeta\alpha\sigma\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ $\sigma\phi\acute{\omicron}\delta\omicron\rho\alpha$)." Provided that Brown's observation is correct, the statement that the Son of man must be lifted up reflects the theme that the crucifixion of Jesus is the fulfillment of the prophecy of the Servant of YHWH in Isa 52:13-53:12.

Brown's argument certainly makes sense when we consider that the two themes, the death of Jesus and his glorification, are often correlated in John (7:39; 12:16, 23)

(Taylor 1940, 147; Morris 1979, 226; Beasley-Murray 1987, 51; Bertram 1972, 610; Lindars 1995, 17). The fact that John 3:14 reflects the thought that the death of Jesus is the fulfillment of the Servant prophecy may imply that the concept of atoning sacrifice is assumed in the two sending statements in John 3:16-17. If that is the case, the use of ἱλασμός in 1John 4:10 cannot be considered as evidence against the common authorship of John and 1John. But the question still remains, Does the connection with Isa 52:13 automatically lead to the concept of atoning sacrifice? Lindars answers to this question affirmatively. Referring to the use of the title “Son of man” in John, Lindars argues “It establishes his intention to use this reference in order to bring in the notion of the sacrifice of Christ.... As far as John is concerned, this is not a title of honor, but a self-designation used by Jesus in speaking of his sacrificial death” (Lindars 1995, 20). To buttress Lindars’ argument, we will need to examine our fourth line of evidence for the atonement theme in John: other passages in John in which the theme of atoning sacrifice is implied.

The Concept of Atonement in John 1:29

The first passage to be examined in this regard is John 1:29. Here Jesus is described by John the Baptist as “the lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world (“Ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου!).” In this passage, there are multiple connections with other passages. While the expression τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου echoes John 8:21-24, the expression ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ and κόσμος as the object of salvation echoes John 3:16, 17. Earlier, I argued that eternal life in John 3:16 presupposes the death of Christ and the forgiveness of sin. This means that the death of Christ effects

the forgiveness of sin. How can his death effect forgiveness? John 1:29 seems to provide the answer to this question. But is the concept of atoning sacrifice present in John 1:29? That depends on the meaning of ὁ ἄμνος τοῦ θεοῦ and ἀΐρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν.

The meaning of “the lamb of God” has been hotly debated among scholars. The Aramaic ܐܠܝܢ means either “lamb” or “servant.” Based upon the Aramaic background of John 1:29, Jeremias argues that this represents a tradition that interpreted the Isa 53:12 prophecy as fulfilled in the coming of Jesus as the Servant of YHWH (Jeremias 1967, 702; Burney 1922, 107-08; Ball 1909/10, 92-93; Wolff 1952, 81-82; Cullmann 1963, 71).⁸⁹ Four other possibilities are suggested by other scholars: (1) the messianic horned ram of Jewish apocalyptic (Dodd 1965, 233-36),⁹⁰ (2) the paschal lamb (Barrett 1954-55, 210-18; Lohse 1955, 144-45; Hooker 1959, 104), (3) the Servant of Isaiah, who suffers like a “lamb led to the slaughter” (Isa 53:7) (Taylor 1959b, 227; Barth 1961, 39; Stanley 1954, 403), and (4) the sacrifice of Isaac (Vermes 1961, 93-94).

None of these views has gained a scholarly consensus. Marshall opts for the messianic horned ram, but still recognizes its connection with the Passover sacrifice and the Servant of YHWH (Marshall 1992, 433). Brown seems to opt for the view that the Evangelist intended “the lamb of God” to refer both to the Suffering Servant and to the paschal lamb because both fit into John’s Christology and are well attested in first-century Christianity (1 Pet 2:22-25) (Brown 1966, 63). Although I do not take a particular position in this matter, the Suffering Servant is preferable to the paschal lamb for three reasons: (1) The Servant of YHWH is described as a sin offering, whereas the paschal

⁸⁹ The suggestion that ἄμνος is a mistranslation of the Aramaic ܐܠܝܢ is effectively refuted by Dodd (Dodd 1965, 235-36).

⁹⁰ Dodd’s view assumes that John the Baptist expected a Davidic Messiah that is represented as a conquering lamb in apocalyptic literature. Brown doubts Dodd’s assumption (Brown 1966, 60).

lamb was not considered as an expiatory sacrifice in the first century (Dodd 1937, 10).

(2) Jesus is implicitly identified by the Evangelist as the Servant in John 12:38 (quoting Isa 57:1): “This was to fulfill the word spoken by the prophet Isaiah: ‘Lord, who has believed our message, and to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?’ ” (3) As argued above, the use of particle $\delta\epsilon\iota$ and the verb $\upsilon\psi\acute{\omega}$ in John 3:14 may imply that the death of Jesus is the fulfillment of the Servant prophecy. Thus, Jesus is identified as the Servant of YHWH in relation to his coming death, which is directly related to the problem of sin.

Despite their disagreement on the reference of “the lamb of God,” most scholars agree that there is a sacrificial idea in the expression (Jeremias 1967, 702; Burney 1922, 107-08; Ball 1909/10, 92-93; Grisby 1995, 76-77; Wolff 1952, 81-82; Cullmann 1963, 71; Marshall 1992, 433; Morris 1979, 147-48; Vermes 1961, 93-94). Thus, L. Morris does not opt for a particular interpretation, but concludes, “He is making a general allusion to sacrifice. The lamb figure may well be intended to be composite, evoking memories of several, perhaps all, of the suggestions we have canvassed. All that the ancient sacrifices foreshadowed was perfectly fulfilled in the sacrifice of Christ” (Morris 1979, 147-48). The sacrificial connection of the phrase “the lamb of God” is supported by its predicate, “taking away the sin of the world” ($\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου).

The combination of the verb $\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega$ and ἁμαρτία as its object occurs in 1John 3:5 in connection with the revelation of Christ, which is later qualified by a sending statement (his atoning sacrifice in 4:10): “You know that he was revealed to take away sins, and in him there is no sin (καὶ οἴδατε ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ἐφανερώθη, ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἄρῃ, καὶ ἁμαρτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν)” (3:5); “he loved us and sent his Son to be the atoning

sacrifice for our sins” (4:10). Thus, a sacrificial death is clearly meant by the expression “take away sins” in 1John.

The phrase *αἴρω ἁμαρτίαν* can be interpreted in two ways (Marshall 1992, 433): (1) It can mean “to remove sin” by making expiation for it (Lev 10:17, referring to the sin offering; 1 Sam 15:25; 25:28). (2) It can mean “to remove sin” by bearing the penalty attached to it on behalf of others (cf. Num 14:33-34; Isa 53:12; Ezek 18:19-20; cf. 1 Pet 2:24). L. Morris argues that the Evangelist may have both meanings in mind in his use of the phrase (Morris 1979, 148 n.61). Jeremias argues that the text originally referred to the Servant of God and hence to “the representative bearing of the punishment of sin,” but that the Evangelist took it to refer to “the setting aside of sin by the expiatory power of the death of Jesus ... by the atoning power of His blood” (Jeremias 1964a, 186). However, as observed by Marshall, “these two explanations may come down to the same thing in the passage” (Marshall 1992, 433).

Based upon our findings, we conclude here that John 1:29 points to the coming death of Christ as an atoning sacrifice for the sin of the world, which will be more fully explained in John 3:14-17.

The Concept of Atonement in John 10:15

In addition to John 1:29, the concept of atoning death may be alluded to in the statements of Jesus in John 10:15 (vv. 11, 17, 18; cf. 13:37, 38; 15:13): “And I lay down my life for the sheep (*καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν μου τίθημι ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων*).” In chapter 5, we demonstrated (1) that these statements in the Gospel of John and 1John 3:16 are Johannine equivalents to the Markan ransom saying (Mark 10:45), (2) that their linguistic

features point to Isa 53, and (3) that the author of 1John built his concept of the atoning death of Christ upon the particular kingdom saying as preserved in Mark 10:45 and in the parable in the Gospel of John (10:11, 15, 17, 18). As we have observed, 1John 3:16 is very close to John 10:15:

1John 3:16

ἐκεῖνος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔθηκεν·

John 10:15

καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν μου τίθημι ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων

There are two differences between 1John and John: (1) In the gospel, the Evangelist as the narrator of the word of Jesus quotes it in direct speech, whereas in 1John the author recasts the traditional saying of Jesus in indirect speech. (2) The gospel uses metaphorical language, calling believers sheep. These differences are minor and can be easily explained as coming from the same author's recasting of the same message in a different context.

Summary and Conclusion

In the foregoing discussion, we have compared the two sending statements in John 3:16, 17 with the three sending statements in 1John (4:9, 10, 14), and showed that John and 1John have extensive correspondences in both form and content. However, we also identified the important differences between the two works. In particular, 1John uses the distinctive expression ἰλασμός, which does not appear in the John or in any other NT writings. The absence of ἰλασμός and the supposed absence of the theme of atonement in John have led some scholars to deny the common authorship of the two works. Our examination of passages in the Gospel of John, however, has demonstrated that the theme of atonement is present in John 3:16, 17 and elsewhere.

An Examination of the Passages on the New Covenant

As we have argued, 1John uses the two Jewish traditions of the vicarious cultic atonement and eschatological forgiveness. In particular, 1John uses the new covenant categories. We have demonstrated that the atonement/forgiveness theme is present in John. But can we find allusions to the new covenant in John? The answer to this question is affirmative. Allusion to the new covenant can be found in the phrase “new commandment” of love (John 13:35; 15:12, 17) and in the eucharistic language in John 6.

The New Commandment of Love

The phrase “new commandment” is used both in John and in 1John:

John	1John
“I give you a new commandment, that you love one another. Just as I have loved you, you also should love one another (ἐντολήν καινήν δίδωμι ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους, καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους).” (13:34)	“... new commandment ... Yet I am writing you a new commandment.” (2:7-8) “And this is his commandment ... we should love one another, just as he has commanded us (καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτοῦ, ἵνα ... ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους, καθὼς ἔδωκεν ἐντολήν ἡμῖν).” (3:23-24)
“By this everyone will know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another (ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκονται πάντες ὅτι ἐμοὶ μαθηταί ἐστε, ἐὰν ἀγάπην ἔχητε ἐν ἀλλήλοις).” (13:35)	“By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and obey his commandments (ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἀγαπῶμεν τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅταν τὸν θεὸν ἀγαπῶμεν καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ ποιῶμεν).” (5:2)

In these passages, the correspondences between John and 1John are complete.

Judging from these passages, we may say that the same writer is repeating the same thought without significant variation in both works as argued by Brooke.

Brown argues that both John (13:34; 15:12, 17) and 1John (2:7-9; 3:23; 4:21; 5:2-3) may be using the new commandment of love in order to implicitly link the Last Supper and the new covenant (Brown 1966, 612-14).⁹¹

The very idea that love is a commandment is interesting. In the OT the Ten Commandments have a setting in the covenant between God and Israel at Sinai; traditionally they were the stipulations that Israel had to observe if it was to be God's chosen people. In speaking of love as the new commandment for those whom Jesus had chosen as his own (xiii 1; xv 16), and as a mark by which they could be distinguished from others (vs. 35), the evangelist shows implicitly that he is thinking of this Last Supper scene in covenant terms. The Synoptic accounts of the Eucharist make this specific (Mark xiv 24: "my blood of the covenant"; Luke xxii 20: "the new covenant in my blood"; also I Cor xi 25). . . . In what sense is the commandment to love another a "new commandment"? . . . The newness of the commandment of love is really related to the theme of covenant at the Last Supper—the "new commandment" of John xiii 34 is the basic stipulation of the "new covenant" of Luke xxii 20.

Beasley-Murray, following Brown, connects the "new commandment" to the new covenant, the Lord's Supper, and the kingdom of God (Beasley-Murray 1987, 247):

The expression 'new order' is deliberately ambiguous. We have in mind the era of the new covenant, established through the sacrificial self-giving of Christ and his resurrection to rule. The establishment of the new covenant is integral to the traditions of the Last Supper (cf. Mark 14:24 par.), which were perpetually remembered in the celebrations of the Lord's Supper, and therefore will have been assumed in this record of the Last Discourse of Jesus. . . . The new command is the rule of life for the new age, the kingdom of God, the saving sovereignty that makes people new for God's new world.

The Eucharistic Language in John 6

The argument of Brown and Beasley-Murray is supported by the presence of the eucharistic language in John 6. According to Betz and Schweizer, eucharistic language pervades John 6 as a whole, and 6:51-58 unmistakably deals with the Eucharist itself (Betz 1979, 22-23; Schweizer 1952/53, 353-63).⁹² John 6:51-58 reads:

"I am the living bread that came down from heaven. Whoever eats of this bread will live forever; and the bread that I will give for the life of the world is my flesh." The Jews then disputed among themselves, saying, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" So Jesus said to them, "Very

⁹¹ Culpepper connects the new commandment of love with the new covenant (Culpepper 1998, 258-60).

⁹² This view is supported by current scholarship in general (Brown 1966, 557; Bultmann 1951, 1:147-48; Cullmann 1963, 186; Culpepper 1998, 163; Dodd 1963, 64; Hahn 1975, 343-44; Jeremias 1964b, 107-08; Kümmel 1973, 262; Smalley 1998, 49; Whitacre 1999, 166-67).

truly, I tell you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you have no life in you. Those who eat my flesh and drink my blood have eternal life, and I will raise them up on the last day; for my flesh is true food and my blood is true drink. Those who eat my flesh and drink my blood abide in me, and I in them. Just as the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father, so whoever eats me will live because of me. This is the bread that came down from heaven, not like that which your ancestors ate, and they died. But the one who eats this bread will live forever.”

John 6:51-58 is closely similar to the institutional formula of the Eucharist in the Synoptic Gospels and in 1 Corinthians primarily in three ways (Brown 1966, 284-87; Dodd 1963, 58-64): (1) Jesus himself dominates as the agent and the source of salvation. (2) The emphasis of the passage is clearly on eating Jesus’ flesh and drinking his blood. They reproduce the words we read in the Synoptic account of the institution of the Eucharist (Matt 26:26-28): “Take, eat; this is my body; ... drink... this is my blood.” (3) John 6:51 (“The bread that I will give for the life of the world is my flesh”) resembles the Lukan form of the words of institution: “This is my body, which is given for you” (Luke 22:19). Brown suggests that the Johannine form of the words of institution in John 6:51 may actually be closer to the original language of Jesus than what we find in the Synoptic Gospels.

Based upon these observations, Dodd concludes: “There is very strong probability that the Fourth Gospel depends on a form of tradition entirely independent of the Synoptics: its rendering of the ‘words of institution,’ which seems to presuppose a translation of the original Aramaic different from that which underlies the Synoptic rendering” (Dodd 1963, 64). In our examination of the Lord’s Supper tradition in chapter 5, we found in incipient form the fusion of Jeremiah’s new covenant forgiveness and the concept of vicarious atonement that we found in a more developed form in 1John. But did the Johannine eucharistic tradition include the themes of the new covenant and atonement? As Dodd suggests, the form may not be exactly the same as the form seen in

the Synoptic Gospels and 1 Corinthians, but in general the Johannine eucharistic tradition is essentially congruent to the other eucharistic traditions. There are at least four factors that lead to this conclusion: (1) The words of institution as witnessed in John 6:51 are very close to those of Luke 22:19, which may indicate that the rest of the Johannine eucharistic tradition is close to the other traditions as well.

(2) Mark and Matthew on the one hand and Luke and Paul on the other have given fundamentally concordant reports about this last will and testament of Jesus (Cullmann 1963, 64; Reicke 1986, 145). There is no particular reason why the Johannine tradition would be otherwise.

(3) As implied in 1 Cor 11:23-26, in which Paul reports that the celebration of the Eucharist (as ἀνάμνησις of Christ) was invariably (ὁσάκις ἐὰν κ.τ.λ.) accompanied by a recital of his passion, the report on the institution of the Eucharist has found an organic extension in the passion narratives that cover Christ's arrest and condemnation, crucifixion, burial, and resurrection (Dodd 1963, 59; Reicke 1986, 147-49). The Synoptic Gospels show a heavy concentration of context-parallel triple traditions in and around the text units that deal with Christ's baptism and passion (Reicke 1986, 65, 148-49). Reicke rightly argues that in early oral traditions the passion story had the value of a most hallowed sanctuary, as testified by Paul (1 Cor 15:1-7) and Ignatius (*Phil.* 8:2). Thus, it was memorized with special care, and had many fewer variations in its contents and their order than in other parts of the gospel tradition. In particular, the saying about humility and service in the Lukan passion narrative finds its counterpart in the story of foot washing in John 13:4-17. The relative congruence of the passion narratives in the

Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of John suggest that they should all share the same essential elements in their eucharistic words as part of the passion narratives.

(4) The *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus (ca. 215) records the eucharistic liturgies, in which we find echoes of both John 6 and the eucharistic words preserved in the Synoptic Gospels and Paul (Mark 14:24; Matt 26:28; Luke 22:20; 1 Cor 11:23-26) (Dix 1937, 40-43). *Apostolic Tradition* 23:1 has both bread-words and cup-words: (1) “the bread into the representation of the Flesh (σάρξ) of Christ,” (2) “the cup mixed with wine for the antitype of the Blood which was shed for all who have believed in Him.” The former seems to reproduce John 6:51, “The bread ... is my flesh (σάρξ),” but is identical in meaning to the Synoptic-Pauline “This is my body (σῶμά)” (Matt 26:26; Luke 22:19; 1 Cor 11:24). The latter seems to reproduce such eucharistic words as “This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many” (Matt 26:28; Mark 14:24), “This cup that is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood” (Luke 22:20), and “This is the new covenant in my blood” (1 Cor 11:25), but the last relative clause seems to echo John 6:40, “All who see the Son and believe in him may have eternal life” (cf. vv. 29, 47, 64). *Apostolic Tradition* 23:5, “And when he breaks the Bread in distributing to each a fragment (κλάσμα) he shall say: The Bread of Heaven in Christ Jesus,” clearly echoes John 6. Finally, *Apostolic Tradition* 23:13, “And we have delivered to you briefly these things concerning Baptism and the Oblation because you have already been instructed concerning the resurrection of the flesh (σάρξ) and the rest according to the Scriptures (κατὰ τὰς γραφάς),” seems to echo both 1 Cor 11:23 and 1 Cor 15:3-4. As a whole, this particular record of the eucharistic tradition seems to follow the Johannine tradition, but its features also resemble the other eucharistic traditions preserved in the Synoptic

Gospels and Paul, which seems to imply that the Johannine eucharistic tradition may have shared the same essential features with the other eucharistic traditions.

Assuming the congruence between the Johannine eucharistic tradition and the other eucharistic traditions, what we have observed from the comparison of the two strands of Last Supper (Mark/Matthew and Luke/Paul) may equally apply to the Johannine tradition. The most important observation from the two strands of tradition was their dual emphasis on the eschatological covenant and the fulfillment of the Servant prophecy in Christ's death. W. G. Kümmel regards "God's new eschatological covenant with men" as the heart of the saying in the Upper Room and the culmination of Jesus' activity and teaching (Kümmel 1973, 91-95). Schweizer makes it the second of his three motifs in the NT: "Every celebration is a new confirmation of God's covenant with his church" (Schweizer 1967, 2, 16-17). The conceptual basis of the covenant concept in the Supper traditions may be found in Exod 24:8-11, where blood sacrifice and a heavenly meal appear in connection with the institution of the covenant, and from its counterpart in the analogous meals practiced by the Qumran sect. Schweizer concludes that "probably all three of the theological motifs which were later given expression in the accounts of the Last Supper, i.e., the sacrificial death, the covenant with its table fellowship, and the eschatological perspective that looked toward the heavenly meal, were from the very beginning implicitly bound up with the Supper." Considering these four factors, together with the allusions to the eschatological new covenant in the expression "new commandment" (John 13:35; 15:12, 17), we think it is very likely that the Johannine eucharistic tradition would have included these three theological motifs.

Summary and Conclusion

In this section, we compared the Gospel of John with 1John with regard to the theme of atonement/forgiveness. First, we focused our inquiry on the two sending statements in John (3:16, 17) and the three sending statements in 1John (4:9, 10, 14). We identified the correspondences and the differences between John and 1John. We demonstrated that their correspondences are extensive in both form and content. However, as pointed out by some scholars who argue against the common authorship of the two works, the theme of atonement is not explicitly attested in John. Compared to John, 1John is distinct primarily in its use of ἰλασμός for the role of Jesus as the Savior of the world. We have suggested that 1John's use of ἰλασμός may be a way of recasting the same idea as expressed in the immediate context of John 3:16, 17 and applying it to the new situation. We defended our argument by presenting four lines of evidence: (1) The forgiveness of sin is presupposed in such expressions as μὴ ἀπόληται (3:16) and κρίνη τὸν κόσμον (3:17), when they are seen together with 8:21-24 and 5:24. (2) Jesus' death is presupposed in the expression ὑψωθῆναι as implied in v. 14 and the explanation in 12:32-33. (3) The use of the particle δεῖ and the verb ὑψώω in John 3:14 points to the passion predictions of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels and the Servant of YHWH in Isaiah. Based upon this observation, we concluded that the concept of an atoning sacrifice is assumed in the two sending statements in John 3:16-17. (4) Two other passages in the gospel (John 1:29; 10:13) echo the language of atonement.

We then focused our inquiry on finding possible allusions to the new covenant tradition in John. We demonstrated that although the theme of the new covenant is not explicitly stated in John, it is implied both in the use of the phrase “new commandment”

of love (John 13:35; 15:12, 17) and in the eucharistic language in John 6, which echoes the eucharistic words of Jesus given in the Synoptic Gospels and Paul.

We may summarize our findings in this section in two parts: First, although the two Jewish traditions of vicarious cultic atonement and eschatological forgiveness are not explicitly attested in the Gospel of John, they are presupposed in the passages that we examined.

Second, although the term “kingdom of God” is attested only twice in John (3:4, 5), the theme forms the background of the Evangelist’s presentation of Jesus as the Son of Man and the Son of God in the passages examined (3:4-17; 5:24; 8:21-24; 10:15). In chapter 5, we demonstrated that 1John’s application of the two Jewish traditions to the death of Jesus has its roots in the kingdom teachings of Jesus that are presented in the Gospels. 1John does show greater similarity than the Gospel of John to the kingdom teachings preserved in the Synoptic Gospels. However, in this section we have shown that the kingdom teachings are at least implicit in John (in chaps. 3, 5, 6, 10, 13, 15). Correspondences between John and 1John seem to indicate that the author of 1John was familiar with the kingdom teachings presupposed in the Gospel of John as well as those presented in the Synoptic Gospels.

Third, with regard to the universalizing of the Jewish hope and of realized eschatology, 1John is closer to John than any other book in the NT. One crucial similarity of the two books is their description of eternal life as an eschatological blessing that can be experienced in the present as well as in the future.

Based upon these observations, we conclude that although no particular position is taken here on the authorship of John and 1John, it is very likely that the same mind is

behind these two works, considering their extensive correspondences in form and content, their universalizing of the Jewish hopes and realized eschatology in particular. As observed, John does not run counter to the two Jewish traditions used in 1John. Evidently the writer of the gospel saw no need to include these traditions, whereas the writer of the epistle did, whether the same person wrote the two works or not.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this dissertation was to investigate the roots of the concept of atonement in 1John, primarily in relation to the Jewish traditions of forgiveness and Christ's teachings on the kingdom of God. The thesis argued was: (1) that 1John uses the two Jewish traditional elements of eschatological forgiveness and atonement and ties them to Jesus' death and forgiveness for sin in the new way of universalizing and individualizing the national and corporate hopes of Israel; and (2) that the particular manner in which the author of 1John interprets the Jewish traditions in the light of the mystery of Christ has its background primarily in the early church's concept of realized eschatology, which was itself founded on Jesus' teachings on the kingdom of God.

Part 1 was devoted primarily to the study of selected writings in the OT and in the Second Temple literature in order to demonstrate that Second Temple Judaism had an eschatological expectation that God would restore the fortunes of Israel, and that the later OT prophets and at least some Jews during the Second Temple period referred to these in the language of atonement and forgiveness of Israel's corporate sin. We divided part 1 into two chapters, one devoted to the eschatological expectation of forgiveness, the other to the eschatological expectation of atonement. In chapter 1, we first examined the passages in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Isaiah (Jer 31:31-34; Ezek 16:59-63; 36:22-32; 37:21-28; Isa 54:10; 55:3; 61:8), and demonstrated that these three prophets eschatologized the OT concept of forgiveness by identifying it with the eschatological hope of the restoration of Israel. We then demonstrated that the eschatological forgiveness developed in these OT prophets was preserved in such Second Temple writings as Baruch, *Jubilees*,

and the Qumran literature. Two distinctive elements were identified in the Qumran literature, as opposed to other Second Temple writings: (1) The community at Qumran spiritualized the national and corporate hopes of Israel by identifying the true Israel, not with the nation of Israel, but with the spiritual descendents of Abraham, who have kept God's precepts (CD 3:2-20; 7:12-13). (2) The Qumran community considered Jeremiah's new covenant prophecy to be fulfilled in the history of their own times or in the inner life of their own community, by identifying itself as the new covenant community.

In chapter 2, we first examined the OT passages on the Levitical expiatory sacrifices in order to establish the context of eschatological atonement. We then examined the Second Temple writings with regard to their eschatologizing of the concept of atonement. Our examination of the Qumran literature demonstrated that the community eschatologized the concept of atonement in three ways: first, by envisioning the new temple and its cultus in the new age; secondly, by identifying itself as the eschatological new covenant community, representing a true temple with its spiritual sacrifices; thirdly, by identifying the Servant of YHWH in the Fourth Servant Song with the future Messiah. We examined Philo's writings with regard to the role of the high priest on the Day of Atonement ritual. According to Philo, the Son (the divine logos) is an advocate of the high priest before the Father when the high priest enters the Holy of Holies (*Moses* 2.133-134). We have shown that the picture of the advocate partially corresponds to the role of Christ as an advocate for the believers before the Father. Our examination of the LXX text demonstrated that the LXX eschatologizes the OT sacrifices by identifying the Servant with a messianic figure who would suffer and die vicariously for the sins of others. Finally, our examination of Dan 3:38-40 LXX and *4 Maccabees*

demonstrated that they apply the cultic concept of atonement to righteous martyrs in the context of the future restoration of the covenant relationship between God and his people.

Part 2 was devoted to demonstrating our thesis by drawing together the elements of the two Jewish expectations, and using them to elucidate the treatment of atonement and forgiveness in 1John. We divided part 2 into five parts. In chapter 3, we demonstrated that 1John fused the two traditions in his presentation of the atoning death of Jesus Christ by evoking various strands of OT imagery, particularly Levitical forgiveness and atonement, and the prophetic expectation of eschatological forgiveness. We also demonstrated that this way of combining the two Jewish traditions is built up from a Jewish eschatologizing of forgiveness and cultic atonement in the OT and the Second Temple writings. In particular, the author of 1John fuses the concept of atonement with the eschatological forgiveness promised in Jeremiah's new covenant prophecy by his use of new covenant categories (2:12-14; 1:9) in connection with the atoning death of Christ (2:2). By doing that, the author of 1John indicates that the atoning death of Christ is the basis upon which the eschatological forgiveness promised in Jeremiah is realized in his Christian community.

In chapter 4, we contrasted 1John to the later prophets and the Second Temple writings with regard to the use of the two Jewish traditions of eschatological forgiveness and the atonement in order that we may establish the context for our contention that 1John's use of the Jewish traditions is to be understood against the early church's concept of realized eschatology, which was itself founded on Jesus' teachings on the kingdom of God. Our study demonstrated that 1John is distinctive, in comparison with the later OT prophets and some Second Temple writings, primarily in its application of these Jewish

elements to the death of Jesus in the new way of universalizing, individualizing, and spiritualizing. We also observed that the author of 1John completely universalizes, spiritualizes, and individualizes the national and corporate hopes of Israel, leaving no explicit trace of their Jewish roots either positively or negatively, which sets 1John apart even from other NT books. In addition, we identified three other distinctive elements in 1John: (1) its theocentric viewpoint with regard to the atoning sacrifice of the Son of God (4:9-10); (2) its combining of the concept of eschatological atonement with the concept of the divine origin of Jesus (“Son of God” in 1:2; 3:5, 8; 4:9, 10, 14) and his messiahship (“Christ” in 1:3, 7; 3:23; 5:20) in his universal application of Jesus’ atoning death; and (3) its emphasis on the realized aspects of the eschatological blessings promised in the two Jewish traditions of eschatological forgiveness and atonement (2:12-14; 3:1, 8, 16; 4:10; 5:13).

An excursus was devoted to “The Concept of Atonement in Early Rabbinic Thought” in order to provide a point of comparison with 1John’s concept of atonement. Our study of rabbinic traditions demonstrated the four things: (1) There is a certain continuity among the OT, the second Temple literature, and later rabbinic literature in their concept of atonement. (2) The concept of vicarious atonement was widespread among the rabbis, both temporally and geographically. These Tannaitic authorities included R. Ishmael (d. 135), R. Jonathan (*ca.* 140), and R. Simeon b. Yohai (*ca.* 150). Considering the antiquity of these early traditions, it is possible that the concept in them may have been current during NT times. (3) They share two fundamental concepts with 1John: the concept that the sufferings or death of the innocent victim brings vicarious atonement and forgiveness (*y. Sanhedrin* 30c), and the concept that exemplars such as

Moses and David gave their lives for Israel (*Mekilta, Pisha* 1:104-113). (4) Despite these similarities between 1John and these rabbinic traditions, there still exist decisive differences between them. Like the Second Temple writings, these rabbinic traditions are particularistic in their focus.

Chapter 5 was devoted to demonstrating our contention that 1John's use of the Jewish traditions is to be understood against the background of the early church's concept of realized eschatology, which was itself founded on Jesus' teachings on the kingdom of God. We first presented six lines of supporting evidence and evaluated them according to suggested assumptions for evaluation. They were: (1) the use of the tradition formula in 1John that points to a Jesus tradition; (2) the presence of two important features of the kingdom teachings of Jesus (the universalizing tendency and realized eschatology) in 1John; (3) the presence of two realized kingdom blessings in 1John; (4) correspondences between the Markan ransom saying (Mark 10:45) and 1John 3:16; (5) correspondences between the three sending statements in 1John (4:9, 10, 14) and the parable of the wicked tenants (Mark 12:1-12); and (6) correspondences between the concept of the kingdom in the Synoptic Gospels and the concept of eternal life in 1John. Based upon this evidence, we concluded that the author of 1John was dependent upon the realized eschatology of the early church in his application of the two Jewish expectations of forgiveness and atonement to the death of Jesus in the new way of universalizing, individualizing, and spiritualizing the national and corporate hopes of Israel. In particular, the presence of the two realized kingdom blessings in 1John and the presence of correspondences between the Markan ransom saying and 1John 3:16, together with other lines of evidence, presuppose the early church's concept of realized eschatology: the two kingdom

blessings, victory over the evil one anticipated in the exorcism of Jesus, and forgiveness anticipated in Jesus' word to the paralytic, are now present in the Christian community, an eschatological new covenant community because of the presence of Christ as the atoning sacrifice for the sins of the world, based upon his finished work of atonement on the cross.

We then tested our hypothesis by applying it to 1John and the kingdom teachings to see whether the kingdom teachings adequately explain the distinctive elements of 1John identified in chapter 4. First, our examination of the Beelzebul controversy in the Synoptic Gospels (Matt 12:25-35; Mark 3:22-27; Luke 11:14-15, 17-23) demonstrated that most of distinctive aspects of 1John could be explained by appealing to this tradition. In particular, we demonstrated that the Beelzebul controversy agreed with 1John in its universalizing, spiritualizing, and individualizing of the national and corporate hopes of Israel: (1) by dealing with the problem of sin with respect to the nature of man and the presence of the evil one; (2) by dealing with the consequences of sin as bondage to the power of the evil one; (3) by dealing with the problem of sin as the cosmic and spiritual battle between the Son of God and the devil; and (4) by defining the beneficiaries of forgiveness as those who have fellowship with the Son of God. Second, our examination of the use of the Christological titles in the Synoptic Gospels demonstrated that 1John's distinctive combination of the concept of atoning death with the concept of Jesus' divine origin and messiahship could be explained by appealing first to the use of the title Son of Man in the Gospels, and then to the use of the Christological titles in Mark. Third, our examination of selected passages in the Synoptic Gospels demonstrated that 1John's emphasis on the universal efficacy of Christ's atoning death could be explained by

appealing to them. The passages examined included Jesus' granting of kingdom blessings to Gentiles in Matthew (8:5-13; 15:21-28) and the Great Commission of Jesus in Matthew (28:18-20). Fourth, our examination of Jesus' teaching at the Last Supper demonstrated that the combination of new covenant forgiveness and atonement in 1John could be explained by appealing to the Last Supper tradition. Sixth, our study of the use of the noun πίστις in the story of the sinful woman in Luke 7:36-50 demonstrated that 1John's emphasis on faith as the condition for forgiveness can be explained by appealing to it.

Another excursus was devoted to "The Relationship between 1John and the Gospel of John" in order to provide a point of comparison with 1John's concept of atonement. Our study demonstrated that although the two Jewish traditions of vicarious cultic atonement and eschatological forgiveness are not explicitly attested in the Gospel of John, they are presupposed in the passages that we examined.

Based upon this study, we conclude: (1) that Second Temple Judaism had an eschatological expectation that God would restore the fortunes of Israel, and the later OT prophets and at least some Jews during the Second Temple period referred to these in the language of atonement and forgiveness of Israel's corporate sin; (2) that 1John, building upon a Jewish eschatologizing of forgiveness and cultic atonement in the OT and the Second Temple writings, combined the two traditions in its presentation of the atoning death of Jesus Christ and the forgiveness of sin; (3) that 1John is distinctive, in comparison with the later OT prophets and the Second Temple literature, primarily in its application of these Jewish elements to the death of Jesus in the new way of universalizing, individualizing, and spiritualizing the national and corporate hopes of

Israel; and (4) that this distinctive aspect of 1John has its roots in the early church's concept of realized eschatology as expressed in the Gospels, which is itself founded upon the kingdom teachings of Jesus.

With regard to the concept of atonement in the NT, the primary contribution of 1John is to develop the concept in the Synoptic Gospels more fully in three ways. (1) The author of 1John makes explicit the connection between the divine sonship of Jesus the Messiah and his atoning death, which is implicit in the Synoptic Gospels for the most part. Thus, the author puts the dominant emphasis on the two concepts and their universal implication (2:2; 4:9, 10, 14). What we find in 1John is rarely observed elsewhere in the NT (cf. Rom 3:25; 1 Cor 11:25; 15:3; 1 Pet 1:18-19; Hebrews). (2) Because the author of 1John thoroughly universalizes and spiritualizes the national and corporate hopes of Judaism, he does not leave any explicit trace of those Jewish roots in 1John, either negatively or positively. (3) The author of 1John develops realized eschatology more fully in two ways: first, by including not only the kingdom blessings, but also the new covenant blessings and eternal life in the list of realized blessings (2:12-14; 3:14-15; 5:11-13); and secondly, by placing predominant emphasis on the death of Christ as the decisive turning point for the fulfillment of these eschatological blessings.

Among the NT writings, we identified two works that, like 1John, apply the universalizing, individualizing, and spiritualizing of Jewish hopes to the atoning death of Jesus the Messiah as the preexistent divine Son. These two works are Hebrews (cf. 1:2-3) and Romans (cf. 3:25). However, they still fall short of 1John in the thoroughness of their universalizing of the Jewish hopes in three ways: (1) They still expect the salvation of ethnic Israel in the last days. Thus, their eschatological focus is still on the Last Day,

when the promise of the corporate restoration of the Jews will be fulfilled (Rom 11:26; Heb 2:16-17). (2) The two books are permeated with issues related to such Jew-Gentile problems as the conflict between advocates of the law and of the gospel, the conflict between champions of works and faith, the differences between Jews and Gentiles, and the question of circumcision (Rom 1-3; 2:25-29; 9-11; Heb 7:22; 8:6-10, 13; 9:1, 4, 15, 18, 20; 10:16, 29; 12:24; 13:20). (3) Accordingly, they still use terms and expressions that have explicit Jewish roots and contrast Christians with the people of the old covenant (1 Cor 11:25; 2 Cor 3:6; Heb 8:8, 13; 9:15; 12:24).

Moreover, for both Paul and Hebrews, the realized blessings are primarily a foretaste of what is to come, whereas 1John's primary emphasis is on the realized aspect of the eschatological blessings. In particular, Paul still hopes for the fulfillment of new covenant forgiveness in terms of the national and corporate hopes of Israel (Rom 11:26-27: "And so all Israel will be saved.... 'And this is my covenant with them, when I take away their sins' [Jer 31:33]"), and speaks of Christian citizenship being in heaven and of the coming of a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will transform the body of humiliation into the body of his glory (Phil 3:20; cf. 1 Cor 15).

We suggested that we can place most of the NT books along the continuum between the "already" and the "not yet," with the majority of them placed more towards the "not yet," which is certainly true of Romans and Hebrews. 1John, however, may be placed far more at the "already" end than those two books. We may also place most of the NT books along the continuum between particularism and universalizing, based upon their use of expressions with explicit Jewish roots and comments about the status of the

Jewish people. 1John surely finds its place far more at the “universalizing” end than Romans and Hebrews.

WORKS CITED LIST

- Albright, W. F., and C. S. Mann. 1971. *Matthew*. The Anchor Bible, vol. 26. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Alexander, P. H. et al., ed. 1999. *The SBL Handbook of Style*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- Allen, L. C. 1994. *Ezekiel 1-19*. Word Biblical Commentary Series, edited by D.A. Hubbard, G. W. Barker, and J. D. W. Watts, vol. 28. Dallas: Word.
- Allison, D. C. 1985. *The End of the Ages Has Come*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Anderson, B. W. 1963. The New Covenant and the Old. In *The O.T. and Christian Faith*, edited by B. W. Anderson, 225-40. NY: Harper and Row.
- Anderson, H. 1985. 4 Maccabees. In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by J. H. Charlesworth, vol. 2. New York: Doubleday.
- Badt, B. 1962. *Philo von Alexandria: Die Werken in deutscher Übersetzung*. Edited by L. Cohn et al. Vol. 1, 2nd, 329 n. 10. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Ball, C. J. 1909/10. Had the Fourth Gospel an Aramaic Archetype? *Expository Times*, 21: 90-93.
- Baltzer, K. 1971. *The Covenant Formulary*. Translated by D.E. Green. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- . 2001. *Deutero-Isaiah*. A Commentary on Isaiah 40-55. Translated by M. Kohl. Edited by P. Machinist. Hermeneia - A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Barrett, C. K. 1954-55. The Lamb of God. *New Testament Studies*, 1: 210-18.
- . 1959. The Background of Mark 10:45. In *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson, 1893-1958*, edited by A. J. B. Higgins, 1-18. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Barrosse, T. 1957. The Relation of Love to Faith in St. John. *Theological Studies*, 18: 538-59.
- Barth, M. 1961. *Was Christ's Death a Sacrifice?* SJT Occasional Papers, vol. 9. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd.
- Barthélemy, D. 1950. Le Grand Rouleau d'Isaie trouvé près de la Mer Morte. *Revue biblique*, 57: 530-49.

- Beasley-Murray, G. R. 1987. *John*. Word Biblical Commentary, edited by D. A. Hubbard and R. P. Martin, vol. 36. Waco: Word.
- Behm, J. 1964 Αἶμα, trans. G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 1, 172-177. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Berding, K. 1999. Polycarp and Paul. Ph. D. Diss., Westminster Theological Seminary.
- Bertram, G. 1972. ὑψόω, trans. G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, vol. 8, 602-20. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Best, E. 1965. *Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology*. Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series, vol. 2. Cambridge: University Press.
- Betz, J. 1979. *Eucharistie In der Schrift und Patristik*. Freiburg: Herder.
- Beyer, H. W. 1964. Βλασφημία, trans. G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 1, 621-25. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Black, M. 1967. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. Clarendon: Oxford University Press.
- Blomberg, C. L. 1990. *Interpreting the Parables*. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Bock, D. L. 1994. *Luke*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, edited by M. Silva, vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Boismard, M. E. 1972. The First Epistle of John and the Writings of Qumran. In *John and Qumran*, edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 156-65. London: Geoffrey Chapman.
- Bokser, B. Zion. 1951. *The Wisdom of the Talmud*. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Bonnard, P. 1983. *Les Épitres Johanniques*. Commentary Du Nouveau Testament Series, vol. 2/13c. Geneva: Labor et Fides.
- Borgen, P. 1987. *Philo, John and Paul: New Perspective on Judaism and Early Christianity*. Brown Judaic Studies, edited by J. Neusner et al, vol. 131. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Braude, W. G., Trans. 1959. *The Midrash on Psalms*. Yale Judaica Series, vol. 8. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- , Trans. 1968. *Pesikta Rabbati*. Yale Judaica Series, vol. 18. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Bright, J. 1965. *Jeremiah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 2nd. Edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. Anchor Bible, vol. 21. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Brooke, A. E. 1912. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles*. International Critical Commentary Series. Edinburgh: Clark.
- Brown, R. E. 1966. *The Gospel according to John I-XII*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 29. Garden City: Doubleday.
- . 1970. *The Gospel according to John XIII-XXI*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 29A. Garden City: Doubleday.
- . 1979. *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*. New York: Paulist.
- . 1982. *Epistles of John*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 30. New York: Doubleday.
- . 1994. *The Death of the Messiah*. New York: Doubleday.
- Brownlee, W. H. 1953a. The Cross of Christ in The Light of Ancient Scrolls. *The United Presbyterian*, 30/11: 6-8.
- . 1953b. The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 132 (Dec.): 8-15.
- . 1956/57. Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament. *New Testament Studies*, 3: 12-30, 195-210.
- . 1957. John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls. In *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, edited by K. Stendahl, 33-53. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- . 1979. *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, vol. 24. Missoula: Scholars Press.
- . 1986. *Ezekiel 1-19*. Word Biblical Commentary, edited by J. D. W. Watts, vol. 28. Waco: Word.
- Bruce, F. F. 1962-63. 'To the Hebrews' or 'to the Essenes'? *New Testament Studies*, 9: 217-32.
- Bultmann, R. 1951. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

- . 1964a. Ἐλεέω, trans. G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 2, 477-87. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 1964b. John's View of Life as Present, trans. G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 2, 870-72. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 1973. *The Johannine Epistles*. Translated by R. P. O'Hara, L. C. McGaughey, and R. W. Funk. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Burge, G. M. 1996. *Letters of John*. The NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Burney, C. F. 1922. *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Büchsel, F. 1964a. Δίδωμι, trans. G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 2, 166. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 1967c. Μονογενής, trans. G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 4, 737-41. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Caragounis, C. C. 1992. Kingdom of God/Heaven. In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. H. Marshall. A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship, 417-25. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Carmignac, J, and P. Guilbert. 1961. *Les Textes de Qumran traduits et annotés*. Paris: Letouzey et An.
- Carmignac, J. 1960. Les citations de l'Ancien Testament, et spécialement des Poèmes du Serviteur, dans les Hymnes de Qumrân. *Revue de Qumran*, 2, no. 7, June: 357-94.
- Carpenter, E. E. 1988. Sacrifices and Offerings in the Old Testament. In *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, edited by G. W. Bromiley, vol. 4, 260-73. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Charles, R. H. 1912. *The Book of Enoch*. Edited by R. H. Charles. Oxford: Clarendon.
- , ed. 1913. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*. 2 Vols. London: Oxford University Press.
- Charlesworth, J. H. 1979. The New Testament Studies Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch. *New Testament Studies*, 25: 315-23.
- , ed. 1983. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 Vols. NY: Doubleday.

- Chilton, B. 1984. *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible*. Good News Studies, edited by R. J. Karris, vol. 8. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier.
- . 1999. (The) Son of (The) Man, and Jesus. In *Authenticating the Words of Jesus*, edited by B. Chilton and C. A. Evans, 259-87. Leiden: Brill.
- Collins, R. F. 1963. The Berith-Notion of the Cairo Damascus Document and its Comparison with the NT. *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses*, 39b: 555-94.
- Colson, C. H. 1929. *Philo*. Edited by T. E. Page et al. Vol. 6. Translated by F. H. Colson, 515. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Conzelmann, H. 1954. 'Was von Anfang war.' In *Neutestamentliche Studien für R. Bultmann*, edited by W. Eltester. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, vol. 21, 194-201. Berlin: Topelmann.
- Cook, W. R. 1966. Hamartological Problems in First John. *Bibliotheca sacra*, 123: 249-60.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. 1959. *The Gospel According to Saint Mark*. Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary. Cambridge: University Press.
- Cross, F. M. 1995. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. 3rd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Cullmann, O. 1950. *Baptism in the New Testament*. Translated by J. K. S. Reid. London: SCM.
- . 1955. The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 74: 213-26.
- . 1963. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Translated by S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Culpepper, R. A. 1998. *The Gospel and Letters of John*. Interpreting Biblical Texts. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Dahl, N. A. 1976. Anamnesis: Memory and Commemoration in Early Christianity. In *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church*, 11-29. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Danby, H., Trans. 1980. *Mishnah*, Reprinted lithographically from the first edition 1933. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Davies, W. D. 1967. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*. NY: Harper and Row.

- Davies, W. D., and D. C. Allison. 1988. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew: Vol. 1, Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I-VII*. The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and the New Testaments, edited by J. A. Emerton et al. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- De Jonge, M. 1988. Jesus' death for others and the death of the Maccabean martyrs. In *Text and Testimony: Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honor of A. F. J. Klijn*, edited by T. Baardas, 142-51. Kampen: Kok.
- De la Potterie, I. 1969. La connaissance de Dieu dans le dualisme eschatologique d'après I Jn, ii, 12-14. In *Au Service de la Parole de Dieu. Mélanges A.-M. Charue.*, 77-99. Gembloux: Duculot.
- . 1971. Sin is Iniquity. In *The Christian Lives by the Spirit*, edited by S. Lyonnet and I. de la Potterie, 37-55. Staten Island: Alba House.
- DeSilva, D. A. 2002. *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- De Vaux, R. 1964. *Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Dix, G. 1937. *The Treatise on The Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dodd, C. H. 1937. The First Epistle of John and the Fourth Gospel. *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library*, 21: 129-56.
- . 1946. *The Johannine Epistles*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- . 1952. *According to the Scriptures*. London: Lowe & Brydone.
- . 1961. *The Parables of the Kingdom*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- . 1963. *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1965. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Doeve, J. W. 1954. *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptics Gospels and Acts*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Du Toit, A. B. 1979. Section B: The Canon of the New Testament, trans. D. R. Briggs. In *Guide to the New Testament by J. H. Roberts and A. B. Du Toit*, 77-272. Pretoria: Kerkboekhandel Transvaal.

- Dunn, J. D. G. 1988a. *Romans 1-8*. Word Biblical Commentary, edited by D. A. Hubbard, G. W. Barker, and R. P. Martin, vol. 38A. Dallas: Word.
- . 1988b. *Romans 9-16*. Word Biblical Commentary, edited by D. A. Hubbard, G. W. Barker, and R. P. Martin, vol. 38B. Dallas: Word.
- . 1989. *Christology in the making*. London: SCM.
- Dupont-Sommer, A. 1950. Le commentaire d'Habacuc découvert près de la Mer Morte. *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*.
- . 1961. *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. Translated by G. Vermes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Edanad, A. 1987. *Christian Existence and the New Covenant*. Bangalore: Dharmaram.
- Edwards, R. B. 1996. *The Johannine Epistles*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Eichrodt, W. 1961. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Translated by J. A. Baker. 2 Vols. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Eissfeldt, O. 1965. *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, 1st ed. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. New York: Harper and Row.
- Ellingworth, P. 1993. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary, edited by I. H. Marshall and W. W. Gasque. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Ellis, E. E. 1984. *The World of St. John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Epstein, I., ed. 1935-52. *The Babylonian Talmud*. London: Soncino.
- Euler, K. F. 1934. *Die Verkündigung vom leidenden Gottesknecht aus Jes. 53 in der griechischen Bibel*. Beiträge Zur Wissenschaft Vom Alten und Neuen Testament, vol. 66. Stuttgart-Berlin: W. Kohlhammer Verlag.
- Evans, C. A. 1999. Authenticating the Activities of Jesus. In *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus*, edited by B. Chilton and C. A. Evans, 3-30. Leiden: Brill.
- Fabius Maximus Cunctator, Quintus. 1998. In *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 4, 648. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica.
- Fabry, H. -J. 1990. יִתְּן, trans. D.E. Green. In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. J. Betterweck and H. Ringgren, vol. 6, 40-48. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

- Fitzmyer, J. A. 1981. *The Gospel according to Luke (I-IX)*. The Anchor Bible. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Flusser, D. 1957. The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity. *Scripta hierosolymitana*, 4: 236-65.
- Foerster, W. 1971. Σωτήρ, trans. G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, vol. 7, 1003-12. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Forestell, J. T. 1979. *Targumic Traditions and the New Testament*. Chico: Scholars Press.
- France, R. T. 1992. Faith. In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. H. Marshall. A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship, 223-26. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Freedman, D. N., and B. E. Willoughby. 1999. סַּוּרָה, trans. D. W. Stott. In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. J. Betterweck, H. Ringgren, and H.-J. Fabry, vol. 10, 31-36. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Freedman, H., Trans. 1983. *Midrash Rabbah Genesis*. London/New York: Soncino.
- Garnet, P. 1977. *Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck.
- Gerhardsson, B. 1961. *Memory and Manuscript*. Translated by E. J. Sharpe. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells.
- Gese, H. 1981. The Atonement, trans. K. Crim. In *Essays on Biblical Theology*, 93-116. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Grabbe, Lester L. 1992. *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Grayston, K. 1953. A Study of the Word 'Sin.' *The Bible Translator*, 4: 138-42.
- . 1981. The meaning of parakletos. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 13: 67-82.
- . 1984. *The Johannine Epistles*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Grässer, E. 1985. *Der Alte Bund im Neuen*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck.
- Greenberg, M. 1983. *Ezekiel 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible, edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman, vol. 22. New York: Doubleday.

- Grisgby, B. H. 1995[1982]. The Cross as an Expiatory Sacrifice in the Fourth Gospel. In *The Johannine Writings*, edited by S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans. Biblical Seminar, vol. 32, 69-94. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Grundmann, W. 1964. δέι, trans. G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, vol. 2, 21-25. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Guelich, R. A. 1989. *Mark 1-8:26*. Word Biblical Commentary, edited by D. A. Hubbard, G. W. Marker, and R. P. Martin, vol. 34A. Dallas: Word.
- . 1992. Mark, Gospel of. In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. H. Marshall. A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship, 512-25. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Gundry, R. H. 1982. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 1993. *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Guthrie, W. K. C. 1935. *Orpheus and Greek Religion*. London: Methuen.
- Hahn, F. 1975. Abendmahl und Bundesgedanke im NT. *Evangelische Theologie*, 35: 524-38.
- Hammer, Reuven, Trans. 1986. *Sifre: A Tannaitic Commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Harrington, D. J. 1999. *Invitation to the Apocrypha*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Harrison, J. 1955. *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*. New York: Meridian Books.
- Harrisville, R.A. 1955. The Concept of Newness in the New Testament. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 74: 69-79.
- Hays, R. B. 1989. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hayward, R. 1991. Sacrifice and World Order: Some Observations on Ben Sira's Attitude to the Temple Service. In *Sacrifice and Redemption: Durham Essays in Theology*, edited by S. W. Sykes, 22-34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hengel, M. 1981. *Atonement: The Origins of the Doctrine in the New Testament*. Translated by J. Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- . 1989. *The Johannine Question*. Translated by J. Bowden. London: SCM.
- Herner, S. 1942. *Sühne und Vergebung in Israel*. Lund.
- Holladay, W. L. 1989. *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 26-52*. Hermeneia Series. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Hooker, M. D. 1959. *Jesus and the Servant*. London: S.P.C.K.
- Houlden, J. L. 1994. *A Commentary on the Johannine Epistles*. Harper's NT Commentaries; Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Black.
- Isaac, E. 1983. 1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch. In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by J. H. Charlesworth, vol. 1, 5-89. New York: Doubleday.
- Israelstam, J., and J. J. Slotki, Trans. 1983. *Midrash Rabbah Leviticus*. London/New York: Soncino.
- Janowski, B. 1982. *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien Zum Alten und Neuen Testament, vol. 55. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Jastrow, M. 1911. *Aspects of Religious Belief and Practice in Babylonia and Assyria*. New York: Putnam's Sons.
- . 1971. *Dictionary of the Targumim, Talmud Babli, Yerushalmi and Midrashic Literature*. New York: Judaica.
- Jeremias, A. 1911. *OT in the Light of the Ancient East*. Translated by C.L. Beaumont. 2 Vols. London: Williams & Norgate.
- Jeremias, J. 1964a. ἄρω, trans. G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, vol. 1, 185-86. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 1964b. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. Translated by N. Perrin. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- . 1967. Παῖς θεοῦ, trans. G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, vol. 5, 677-717. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Kadushin, Max. 1932. *The Theology of Seder Eliahu*. New York: Bloch Publishing Co.

- . 1987. *A Conceptual Commentary on Midrash Leviticus Rabbah: Value Concept in Jewish Thought*. Brown Judaic Studies, edited by J. Neusner et al., vol. 126. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Kantrowitz, D. 2001. *Judaic Classics Library v.2.2*. Davka Corp.
- Keown, G. et al. 1995. *Jeremiah, 26-52*. Word Biblical Commentary Series, edited by D. A. Hubbard, G. W. Barker, and R. P. Martin, vol. 27. Dallas: Word.
- Kittel, G. 1967. Λόγιον, trans. G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 4, 137-41. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Klein, M. L. 1982. Associative and Complementary Translation in the Targumim. *Eretz-Israel*, 16: 134-40.
- Knierim, R. 1997a. עֵץ, trans. M. E. Biddle. In *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann, vol. 2, 863-66. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- . 1997b. חָטָא, trans. M. E. Biddle. In *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann, vol. 1, 406-11. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- . 1997c. שָׁנָה, trans. M. E. Biddle. In *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann, vol. 3, 1302-04. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- . 1997d. פָּשַׁע, trans. M. E. Biddle. In *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann, vol. 2, 1033-37. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- Köhler, L. 1957. *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by A. S. Todd. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Kramer, W. 1966. *Christ, Lord, Son of God*. Translated by B. Hardy. Studies in Biblical Theology, vol. 1/50. Naperville: Allenson.
- Kümmel, W. G. 1973. *The Theology of the New Testament According to its Major Witnesses: Jesus-Paul-John*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Kysar, R. 1992. John, Epistles of. In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, edited by D. N. Freedman et al., vol. 3, 900-12. New York; London; Toronto; Sydney; Auckland: Doubleday.
- Ladd, G. E. 1952. *Crucial Questions about the Kingdom of God*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 1993. *A Theology of the New Testament*, revised and edited by D. A. Hagner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

- Lane, W. R. 1974. *The Gospel of Mark*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 1991. *Hebrews 1-8*. Word Biblical Commentary, edited by D. A. Hubbard, G. W. Barker, and R. P. Martin, vol. 47. Dallas: Word.
- Lang, B. 1995. Kipper, trans. D. E. Green. In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. J. Betterweck, H. Ringgren, and H-J. Fabry, vol. 7, English translation, 288-303. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Lang, F. 1975. Abendmahl und Bundesgedanke im Neuen Testament. *Evangelische Theologie*, 35: 524-38.
- Lauterbach, Jacob Z., Trans. 1961. *Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America.
- Lehrman, S. M., Trans. 1983. *Midrash Rabbah Exodus*. London/New York: Soncino.
- Levertoff, Paul P., Trans. 1926. *Midrash Sifre on Numbers: Selections from Early Rabbinic Scriptural Interpretations*. New York: The MacMillan Co.
- Levin, C. 1985. *Die Verheissung des neuen Bundes in ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt*. Forschungen Zur Religion und Literaur Des Alten und Neuen TestameNew Testament Studies, vol. 137. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Levine, B. A. 1974. *In the Presence of the Lord*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lieu, J. M. 1991. *The Theology of the Johannine Epistles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lightfoot, R. H. 1956. *St. John's Gospel*. Edited by C. F. Evans. London: Oxford University Press.
- Lindars, B. 1995[1981]. Discourse and Tradition in John. In *The Johannine Writings*, edited by S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans. Biblical Seminar, vol. 32, 13-30. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Loader, W. 1992. *The Johannine Epistles*. London: Epworth.
- Lohse, E. 1955. *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Longenecker, R. N. 1970. *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*. London: SCM.

- . 1990. *Galatians*. Word Biblical Commentary, edited by D. A. Hubbard, G. W. Barker, and R. P. Martin, vol. 41. Dallas: Word.
- Lyonnet, S., and S. Sabourin. 1970. *Sin, Redemption, and Sacrifice*. *Analecta Biblica*, vol. 48. Rome: Biblical Institute.
- Malatesta, E. 1977. Covenant and Indwelling. *The Way*, 17: 23-32.
- . 1978. *Interiority and Covenant*. *Analecta Biblica*, vol. 69. Rome: Biblical Institute.
- Manson, T. W. 1967. *The Teaching of Jesus*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Mansoor, M. 1961. *The Thanksgiving Hymns*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Marshall, I. H. 1966. Synoptic Son of Man Sayings. *New Testament Studies*, 12: 327-51.
- . 1978a. *The Epistles of John*. New International Commentary on the New Testament Series. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 1978b. *The Gospel of Luke*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 1992. Lamb of God. In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. H. Marshall. A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship, 432-34. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Martinez, F. G. 1996. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 2. Edited by F. G. Martinez. NY: Brill.
- Matera, F. J. 1999. *New Testament Christology*. Louisville: Westminster.
- Maurer, C. 1972. Τίθημι, trans. G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, vol. 8, 152-68. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- McCarthy, D. J. 1969. The Symbolism of Blood and Sacrifice. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 88: 166-76.
- McCartney, D. G. 1988. The New Testament's Use of the Old Testament. In *Inerrancy and Hermeneutic*, edited by H. M. Conn, 101-16. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- . 1989. The Use of the Old Testament in the First Epistle of Peter. Ph. D. Diss., Westminster Theological Seminary.

- McKnight, S. 1992. Matthew, Gospel of. In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. H. Marshall. A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship, 526-41. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Merklein, H. 1977. Erwägungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der neutestamentlichen Abendmahlstraditionen. *Biblische Zeitschrift (N.F.)*, 21: 88-101, 235-44.
- Metzger, B. M. 1971. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. Stuttgart: U.B.S.
- Milgrom, J. 1970. *Studies in Levitical Terminology, I*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1971. A Prolegomenon to Lev. 17:11. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 90: 149-56.
- . 1976. *Cult and Conscience: The Asham and the Priestly Doctrine of Repentance*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1991. *Leviticus 1-16*. Anchor Bible Commentary Series, vol. 3. New York: Doubleday.
- Milik, J. T. 1959. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*. London: SCM.
- . 1971. Problèmes de la littérature Hénochique à la lumière des fragments araméens de Qumrân. *Harvard Theological Review*, 64: 333-78.
- Miller, Merrill P. 1971. Targum Midrash and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament. *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period*, 29-82.
- Moo, D. J. 1983. *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*. Sheffield: Almond Press.
- . 1996. *The Epistle to the Romans*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament, vol. 6. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Moore, G. F. 1927. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era the Age of Tannaim*. 2. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Morrice, W. G. 1975. New Wine in Old Wine-Skins. *The Expository Times*, 86 (Feb.): 132-36.
- Morris, L. 1952. The Biblical Use of the Term Blood. *Journal of Theological Studies*, 3: 216-27.
- . 1955. *The Apostolic Preachings of the Cross*. London: Tyndale.

- . 1979. *The Gospel according to John*. The New International Commentary of the New Testament, edited by F. F. Bruce. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Munck, Johannes. 1967. *Christ & Israel: An Interpretation of Romans 9-11*. Translated by Ingeborg Nixon. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 1974. The Essenes and their History. *Revue biblique*, 81: 215-44.
- Neusner, J., Trans. 1981. *The Tosefta*. New York: Ktav.
- , ed. 1982. *The Talmud of the Land of Israel*. Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism, vol. 1-31. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- , trans. 1987a. *Pesiqta deRab Kahana*. Brown Judaic Studies, edited by J. Neusner et al., vol. 122-123. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- . 1987b. *Sifre to Deuteronomy: An Analytical Translation. Volume Two*, Rev. Brown Judaic Studies, vol. 101. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- , trans. 1989. *Song of Songs Rabbah*. Brown Judaic Studies, edited by J. Neusner et al., vol. 197. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- . 1995. *Rabbinic Judaism*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E. 1981. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Noack, B. 1959-60. On 1 John II. 12-14. *New Testament Studies*, 6: 236-41.
- Nolland, J. 1993. *Luke 9:21-18:34*. Word Biblical Commentary, edited by B. M. Metzger et al., vol. 35B. Dallas: Word.
- North, C. R. 1948. *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Olivier, J. P. J. 1997. סלח. In *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology & Exegesis*, edited by W. A. VanGemeren, vol. 3, 259-64. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- O'Neill, J. C. 1966. *The Puzzle of 1 John*. London: S.P.C.K.
- Page, S. 1992. Ransom Saying. In *A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*, edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. H. Marshall, 660-62. Downers Grove: IVP.

- Perkins, P. 1979. *The Johannine Epistles*. New Testament Message, vol. 21. Wilmington: Michael Glazier.
- Pfeiffer, R. H. 1949. *History of New Testament Times*. NY: Harper and Brothers.
- Porúbcan, S. 1958. *Il patto nuovo in Is. 40-66*. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Price, J. L. 1972. Light from Qumran upon Some Aspects of Johannine Theology. In *John and Qumran*, edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 9-37. London: Geoffrey Chapman.
- Rabin, C. 1954. *The Zadokite Document*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Reicke, B. 1986. *The Roots of the Synoptic Gospels*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Rendtorff, R. 1967. *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im Alten Israel*. Neukirchen-Bluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Reumann, J. 1984. *The Supper of the Lord*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Ridderbos, H. 1962. *The Coming of the Kingdom*. Translated by H. de Jongste. Edited by R. O. Zorn. Philadelphia: P&R Pub.
- Ringgren, H. 1963. *The Faith of Qumran*. Translated by E. T. Sander. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- . 1986. מַנְיָא, trans. D.E. Green. In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. J. Betterweck and H. Ringgren, vol. 5, 331-33. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Rosenberg, R. A. 1965. Jesus, Isaac, and the Suffering Servant. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 84: 381-88.
- Safrai, Shmuel. 1997. AMORAIM. *Encyclopedia Judaica - CD-ROM Edition Version 1.0*. Judaica Multimedia (Israel) Ltd. In.
- Sanders, E. P. 1985. *Jesus and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- . 1992. *Judaism, Practice and Belief 63 B.C.E.-66 C.E.* London: SCM.
- Sandmel, S. 1979. *Philo of Alexandria*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Schenker, A. 1981. *Versöhnung und Sühne*. Freiburg: Verlag Schweizerische Katholisches Bibelwerk.
- Schlatter, A. 1934. *Paulus, der Bote Jesu*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag.

- Schmidt, J. 1968. *The Gospel according to Mark*. Regensburger Neues Testament. Cork: Mercier.
- Schnackenburg, R. 1982. *The Gospel according to St. John*. Introduction and Commentary on Chapters 1-4. Translated by K. Smyth. New York: Crossroad.
- . 1992. *The Johanne Epistles*. Translated by R. Fuller and I. Fuller. New York: Crossroad.
- Schreiber, R. 1956. Der neue Bund im Spätjudentum und Urchristentum. Ph. D. Diss., Tübingen.
- Schreiner, T. R. 2001. *Paul Apostle of God's Glory in Christ*. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Schweizer, E. 1952/53. Das johanneische Zeugnis vom Herrenmahl. *Evangelische Theologie*, 12: 341-63.
- . 1966. Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der 'Sendungsformel' Gal 4,4f., Rm 8,3f., Joh 3,16f., 1 Joh 4,9. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*, 57: 199-210.
- . 1967. *Lord's Supper according to the New Testament*. Translated by J. M. Davis. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Seebass, H. 1998. שָׁבַע, trans. D. W. Stott, and D. E. Green. In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. J. Betterweck, H. Ringgren, and H-J. Fabry, vol. 9, 497-519. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Seeligmann, I. L. 1948. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Segal, M. H. 1951. The Habakkuk 'Commentary' and the Damascus Fragments (A Historical Study). *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 70: 131-41.
- Seidelin, P. 1936. Der Ebed Jahwe und die Messiasgestalt im Jesajatargum. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 35: 194-231.
- Shmidman, Joshua H. 1997. ZEKHUT AVOT. *The Encyclopaedia Judaica CD-ROM Edition*. Judaica Multimedia (Israel) Ltd. In.
- Silva, M. 1993. Old Testament In Paul. In *Dictionary of Paul and His Letter: A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*, edited by G. F. Hawthorne et al., 630-42. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Smalley, S. S. 1998. *John, Evangelist and Interpreter*, 2nd. Downers Grove: IVP.

- . 1984. *1,2,3, John*. Word Biblical Commentary Series, vol. 51. Waco: Word.
- Smith, D. M. 1975. Johannine Christianity. *New Testament Studies*, 21: 222-48.
- Snaith, N. H. 1965. The Sin-offering and the Guilt-offering. *Vetus Testamentum*, 15: 73-80.
- Soderlund, S. K. 1982. Book of Jeremiah. In *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, edited by G. W. Bromiley, vol. 2, fully revised, 985-91. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Sperber, A., ed. 1959-1973. *The Bible in Aramaic*. 5 Vols. Leiden: Brill.
- Spicq, C. 1950. L'origine johannique de la conception du Christ-petre dans l'Epitre aux Hebreux. In *Aux Sources de la tradition Chretienne: Melanges M. Goguel*, edited by O. Cullmann and P. H. Menoud, 258-69. Neuchatel: Delachaux & Niestle.
- . 1952. *L'Epitre aux Hebreux*. 2 Vols. Paris: Gabala.
- Stamm, J. J. 1940. *Erlösen und Vergeben im Alten Testament*. Bern: A. Francke.
- . 1997. סלח to forgive, trans. M. E. Biddle. In *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann, vol. 2, 797-803. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- Stanley, D. M. 1954. The Theme of the Servant of Yahweh in primitive Christian Soteriology and its Transposition by St. Paul. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 16: 385-425.
- Stauffer, E. 1955. *New Testament Theology*. London: SCM.
- Stegemann, H. 1998. *The Library of Qumran*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Stein, R. H. 1992. Last Supper. In *A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*, edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. H. Marshall, 444-50. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Stenning, J. F., ed. 1953. *The Targum of Isaiah*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Stott, J. R. W. 1988. *The Letters of John*, Revised. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, vol. 19. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Strack, Herman L. 1965[1931]. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, First Harper Torchbook. New York: Harper and Row.

- Strecker, G. 1995. *The Johannine Letters*. Translated by L. M. Maloney. Hermeneia Series, edited by H. Attridge. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Sung, C-H. 1993. *Vergebung der Sünden: Jesu Praxis der Sündenvergebung nach den Synoptikern und ihre Voraussetzungen im Alten Testament und frühen Judentum*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2, vol. 57. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck.
- Taylor, V. 1940. *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching*. London: Epworth.
- . 1959a. *The Gospel according to St. Mark*. London: Macmillan.
- . 1959b. *Jesus and His Sacrifice*. London: Macmillan.
- Thompson, R. J. 1963. *Penitence and Sacrifice in Early Israel Outside the Levitical Law*. Leiden: Brill.
- Van Henten, J. W. 1993. Tradition-Historical Background of Rom. 3.25. In *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*, edited by Marinus C. De Boer. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, vol. 84. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press.
- . 1997. *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, edited by John J. Collins, vol. 57. Leiden: Brill.
- Vermes, G. 1961. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*. Studia Post-Biblica, vol. 4. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1995. *The Dead Scrolls in English*, Revised and Extended 4th Edition. New York: Penguin Books.
- Von Rad, G. 1962. *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. 2 Vols. New York: Harper.
- Waltke, Bruce K., and M. O'Connor. 1990. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Wenham, D. 1989. *The Parables of Jesus*. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Wenham, G. J. 1979. *The Book of Leviticus*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 1986. Leviticus. In *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, edited by G. W. Bromiley, vol. 3, fully revised, 110-17. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

- West, M. L. 1983. *The Orphic Poems*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Westcott, B. F. 1883. *The Epistles of St. John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 1951. *The Gospel according to St. John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Whitacre, R. A. 1999. *John*. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Williams, S. K. 1975. *Jesus' Death as Saving Event: The Background and Origin of a Concept*. Harvard Dissertations in Religion, edited by C. Bynum and G. Rupp, vol. 2. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press.
- Winckler, H. 1909. *Kelinschriftliches Textbuch zum Alten Testament*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs Verlag.
- Wintermute, O. S. 1985. Jubilees: A New Translation and Introduction. In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 35-142. New York: Doubleday.
- Wise, M. O. 2000. Attitudes toward the Temple. In *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, edited by C. A. Evans and S. E. Porter, 1171-73. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Wolff, H. W. 1952. *Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum*, 3d edition. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Wright, G. E. 1950. *The Old Testament Against its Environment*. London: SCM.
- Wright, N. T. 1992. *The New Testament and the People of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- . 1996. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Ziegler, J. 1934. *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*. Münster: Aschendorffschen.
- Zimmerli, W. 1967. Παῖς θεοῦ, trans. G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, vol. 5, 654-77. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 1979. *Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel Chapters 1-24*, translated by R. E. Clements. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Bibliography

- Abba, R. "The Origin and Significance of Hebrew Sacrifice." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 7 (1977): 123-38.
- Albright, W. F., and C. S. Mann. *Matthew*. The Anchor Bible, vol. 26. Garden City: Doubleday, 1971.
- . "Qumran and the Essenes: Geography, Chronology, and Identification of the Sect." In *The Scrolls and Christianity: Historical and Theological Significance*, edited by M. Black, 11-25. London: S.P.C.K., 1969.
- Alexander, P. H. et al., ed. *The SBL Handbook of Style*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999.
- Allen, L. C. *Ezekiel 1-19*. Word Biblical Commentary Series, vol. 28. D.A. Hubbard, G. W. Barker, and J. D. W. Watts, general editors. Dallas: Word, 1994.
- . *Ezekiel 20-48*. Word Biblical Commentary Series, vol. 29. D.A. Hubbard, G. W. Barker, and J. D. W. Watts, general editors. Dallas: Word, 1990.
- Allison, D. C. *The End of the Ages Has Come*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Alter, R. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: HarperCollins, 1981.
- Anderson, B. W. "The New Covenant and the Old." In *The O.T. and Christian Faith*, edited by B. W. Anderson, 225-40. NY: Harper and Row, 1963.
- Anderson, H. "4 Maccabees." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by J. H. Charlesworth, vol. 2. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- Argyle, A. W. "1 John iii. 4f." *The Expository Times* 65 (1953): 62-63.
- "Athenaeus." In *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 1, 667. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1998.
- Athenaeus. *The Deipnosophists*. Translated by C. B. Gulick. 7 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-1941.
- Aulén, G. *Christus Victor*. Translated by A. G. Hebert. London: S.P.C.K., 1961.
- Aytoun, R. A. "The Servant of the Lord in the Targum." *Journal of Theological Studies* 23 (1922): 172-80.
- Badt, B. *Philo von Alexandria: Die Werke in Deutscher Übersetzung*. Edited by L. Cohn et al. 2nd. Vol. 1, 329 n. 10. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1962.

- Baker, C. J. *Covenant and Liberation*. European University Studies, vol. 23. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1991.
- Ball, C. J. "Had the Fourth Gospel an Aramaic Archetype?" *Expository Times* 21 (1909/10): 90-93.
- Baltzer, K. *Deutero-Isaiah*. A Commentary on Isaiah 40-55. Translated by M. Kohl. Edited by P. Machinist. Hermeneia - A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
- . *The Covenant Formulary*. Translated by D.E. Green. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.
- Balz, H. R. "Johanneische Theologie und Ethik im Licht der 'letzten Stunde.'" In *Studien Zum Text und Zur Ethik Des Neuen Testament: Festschrift für H. Greeven*, edited by W. Schrage, 35-36. Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, vol. 47. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986.
- Barrett, C. K. "The Background of Mark 10:45." In *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson, 1893-1958*, edited by A. J. B. Higgins, 1-18. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959.
- . *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Black's NT Commentaries. London: A. & C. Black, 1957.
- . *Essays on John*. London: S.P.C.K., 1982.
- . "Jews and Judaizers in the Epistles of Ignatius." In *Jews, Greeks and Christians*, edited by R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- . "The Lamb of God." *New Testament Studies* 1 (1954-55): 210-18.
- Barrosse, T. "The Relation of Love to Faith in St. John." *Theological Studies* 18 (1957): 538-59.
- Barth, M. *Was Christ's Death a Sacrifice?* SJT Occasional Papers, vol. 9. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1961.
- Barthélemy, D. "Le Grand Rouleau d'Isaie trouvé près de la Mer Morte." *Revue Biblique* 57 (1950): 530-49.
- . "Notes en marge de publications recentest sur les Manuscrits de Qumran." *Revue Biblique* 59 (1952): 187-218.

- Bauer, D. R. "Son of God." In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. H. Marshall, 769-75. Downers Grove: IVP, 1992.
- Bauer, W. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Translated by Team from the Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins. Edited by R. Kraft and G. Krodel. 2d ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.
- Baumgärtel, D. F. "Zur Liturgie in der Sektenrolle vom Toten Meer." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 65 (1953): 263-65.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. *John*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 36. D. A. Hubbard and R. P. Martin, general editors. Waco: Word, 1987.
- Beavis, M.A. "The New Covenant and Judaism." *The Bible Today* 22 (1984): 24-30.
- Behm, J. "Αἶμα," translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 1, 172-177. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- . "Διάνοια," translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 4, 963-67. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Bell, W.E. "The New Covenant." Th. M. Thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1963.
- Berding, K. "Polycarp and Paul." Ph. D. diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1999.
- Bertholet, A. "Zum Verständnis des alttestamentlichen Opfergedankens." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 49 (1979): 19-56.
- Bertram, G. "ὑψώω," translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, vol. 8, 602-20. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.
- Best, E. *Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology*. Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series, vol. 2. Cambridge: University Press, 1965.
- Betz, J. *Eucharistie in der Schrift und Patristik*. Freiburg: Herder, 1979.
- Betz, O. "Jesus' Gospel of the Kingdom." In *The Gospel and the Gospels*, edited by P. Stuhlmacher, 53-74. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- . *What Do We Know About Jesus*. 1965. Translated by M. Kohl. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968.

- Beyer, H. W. “Βλασφημία,” translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 1, 621-25. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- . “Festgabe für A. Jülicher.” *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 54 (1929): 606-17.
- Bietenhard, H. “Ὄνομα,” translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, vol. 5, 242-83. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Black, M. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. Clarendon: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- . *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Doctrine*. London: The Athlone Press, 1966.
- . *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1961.
- Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated by R. W. Funk. A translation and revision of the 9th-10th German ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Blomberg, C. L. *Interpreting the Parables*. Downers Grove: IVP, 1990.
- Bock, D. L. *Luke*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, vol. 3. M. Silva, general editor. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.
- Bogart, J. *Orthodox and Heretical Perfectionism in the Johannine Community as Evident in the First Epistle of John*. SBL Dissertation Series, vol. 33. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1973.
- Boismard, M. E. “La Connaissance de Dieu dans L’Alliance Nouvelle D’après la Première Lettre de Saint Jean.” *Revue Biblique* 56 (1949): 365-91.
- . “The First Epistle of John and the Writings of Qumran.” In *John and Qumran*, edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 156-65. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1972.
- Bokser, B. Zion. *The Wisdom of the Talmud*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951.
- Bonnard, P. *Les Épîtres Johanniques*. Commentary Du Nouveau Testament Series, vol. 2/13c. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1983.
- . “La première Épître de Jean est-elle johannique?” In *L’Évangile de Jean*, edited by M. de Jonge, 301-05. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, vol. 44. Leuven: University Press, 1977.

- Borgen, P. *Philo, John and Paul: New Perspective on Judaism and Early Christianity*. Brown Judaic Studies, vol. 131. J. Neusner et al, general editors. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Bori, P. C. *KOINWNIA*. Brescia: Paideia Editrice, 1972.
- Bourassa, F. "Expiation." *Science et Esprit* 22 (1970): 149-70.
- Bowker, J. *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Bradley, I. *The Power of Sacrifice*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1995.
- Braude, W. G., trans. *The Midrash on Psalms*. Yale Judaica Series, vol. 8. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.
- , trans. *Pesikta Rabbati*. Yale Judaica Series, vol. 18. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.
- Braun, H. "Literaranalyse und Theologische Schichtung Im Ersten Johannesbrief." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 48 (1951): 262-92.
- Brichto, H. C. "On Slaughter and Sacrifice, Blood and Atonement." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 47 (1979): 19-56.
- Bright, J. *Jeremiah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. 2nd. Anchor Bible, vol. 21. Garden City: Doubleday, 1965.
- Bromiley, G. W. "Atonement." In *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, vol. 1, 352-60. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.
- Brooke, A. E. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles*. International Critical Commentary Series. Edinburgh: Clark, 1912.
- Brooke, G. J. *Exegesis at Qumran*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament-Supplement Series, vol. 29, 1985.
- Brown, J. B. "The Sacrificial Cult and Its Critique in Greek and Hebrew." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 24 (1979): 159-73.
- Brown, R. E. *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*. New York: Paulist, 1979.
- . *The Death of the Messiah*. New York: Doubleday, 1994.

- . *Epistles of John*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 30. New York: Doubleday, 1982.
- . *The Gospel According to John I-XII*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 29. Garden City: Doubleday, 1966.
- . *The Gospel According to John XIII-XXI*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 29A. Garden City: Doubleday, 1970.
- Brownlee, W. H. "The Cross of Christ in The Light of Ancient Scrolls." *The United Presbyterian* 7/12 1953: 11.
- . "The Cross of Christ in The Light of Ancient Scrolls." *The United Presbyterian* 30/11 1953: 6-8.
- . "The Cross of Christ in The Light of Ancient Scrolls." *The United Presbyterian* 21/12 1953: 12-13.
- . "The Cross of Christ in The Light of Ancient Scrolls." *The United Presbyterian* 28/12 1953: 10-11.
- . *Ezekiel 1-19*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 28. J. D. W. Watts, general editor. Waco: Word, 1986.
- . "The Habakkuk Midrash and Targum of Jonathan." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 7 (1956): 169-86.
- . "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls." In *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, edited by K. Stendahl, 33-53. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.
- . "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 3 (1956/57): 12-30, 195-210.
- . *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, vol. 24. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.
- . "The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 132 (Dec. 1953): 8-15.
- . "The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 135 (Oct. 1954): 33-8.
- Brox, N. "Doketismus - eine Problemanzeige." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 95 (1984): 301-14.

- Bruce, F. F. "Biblical Exposition at Qumran." In *Gospel Perspectives: Studies in Midrash and Historiography*, edited by R. T. France and D. Wenham, 77-98. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983.
- . *The New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.
- . "'To the Hebrews' or 'to the Essenes'?" *New Testament Studies* 9 (1962-63): 217-32.
- Brueggemann, W. *A Commentary on Jeremiah: Exile and Homecoming*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Brunner, E. *The Mediator*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1947.
- Bruns, J. E. "A Note on John 16:33 and 1 John 2:13-14." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 86 (1967): 451-53.
- Bultmann, R. "Analyse des ersten Johannesbriefes." In *Festgabe für A. Jülicher Zum 70. Geburtstag*, edited by R. Bultmann and H. F. von Soden, 105-23. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1967.
- . "The Early Christian Use of $\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$," translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 1, 242. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- . "' $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\omega$,'" translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 2, 477-87. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- . *History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by J. Marsh. Revised. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1963.
- . *The Johannine Epistles*. Translated by R. P. O'Hara, L. C. McGaughey, and R. W. Funk. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973.
- . "John's View of Life as Present," translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 2, 870-72. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- . "Die kirchliche Redaktion des ersten Johannesbriefes." In *In Memoriam E. Lohmeyer*, edited by W. Schmauch, 189-201. Stuttgart: Evangelisches, 1951.
- . *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.

- Bultmann, R., and D. Lührmann. "Φανερόω in the New Testament," translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, vol. 9, 5. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Burge, G. M. *The Anointed Community*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- . *Interpreting the Fourth Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992.
- . *Letters of John*. The NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Burkert, W. *Greek Religion*. 1977. Translated by J. Raffan. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985.
- Burney, C. F. *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*. London: Oxford University Press, 1922.
- Büchsel, F. "Δίδωμι," translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 2, 166. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- . "Ἰλασμός," translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 3, 317-18. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965.
- . "Μονογενής," translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 4, 737-41. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.
- . "Zu den Johannesbriefen." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 28 (1929): 235-41.
- Calvin, J. *Commentaries on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah and the Lamentations*. Translated by J. Owen. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950.
- "Camillus, Marcus Furius." In *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 2, 769. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1998.
- Campbell, J. Y. "KOINWNIA and Its Cognates in the New Testament." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 51 (1932): 352-80.
- Campbell, R. *Israel and New Covenant*. Philadelphia: P & R, 1954.
- Candlish, R. S. *The First Epistle of John*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1869.

- Caragounis, C. C. "Kingdom of God/Heaven." In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. H. Marshall, 417-25. A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship. Downers Grove: IVP, 1992.
- . "Kingdom of God/Heaven." In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. H. Marshall, 417-30. A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship. Downers Grove: IVP, 1992.
- Carmignac, J. "Les Citations de l'Ancien Testament, et spécialement des Poèmes du Serviteur, dans les Hymnes de Qumrân." *Revue de Qumran* 2, no. 7 (June 1960): 357-94.
- Carmignac, J, and P. Guilbert. *Les Textes de Qumran traduits et annotés*. Paris: Letouzey et An, 1961.
- Carpenter, E. E. "Sacrifices and Offerings in the Old Testament." In *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, edited by G. W. Bromiley, vol. 4, 260-73. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Corrington, G. *The Divine Man*. New York: Peter Lang, 1986.
- Carroll, R. P. *Jeremiah*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- Carson, D. A. "John and Johannine Epistles." In *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*, edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson, 245-64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- . "The Three Witnesses and the Eschatology of 1 John." In *To Tell the Mystery: Essays on New Testament Eschatology in Honor of Robert H. Gundry*, edited by T. E. Schmidt and M. Silva, 216-32. Journal for the Study of the New Testament-Supplement Series, vol. 100. Sheffield, 1994.
- Cassem, N.H. "A Grammatical and Contextual Inventory Fo the Use of Κόσμος in the Johannine Corpus with Some Implications for a Johannine Cosmic Theology." *New Testament Studies* 19 (1972-3): 81-91.
- Cazelles, H. "הבר," translated by D.E. Green. In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. J. Betterweck and H. Ringgren, vol. 4, 193-97. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Chanderlin, F. "Do This as My Memorial." Ph. D. diss., The Claremont Graduate School, 1982.
- Charles, R. H., ed. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*. 2 Vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1913.

- . *The Book of Enoch*. Edited by R. H. Charles. Oxford: Clarendon, 1912.
- Charlesworth, J. H. "The New Testament Studies Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch." *New Testament Studies* 25 (1979): 315-23.
- , ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 Vols. NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- Chilton, B. "(The) Son of (The) Man, and Jesus." In *Authenticating the Words of Jesus*, edited by B. Chilton and C. A. Evans, 259-87. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . *A Feast of Meanings*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 72. C. K. Barrett et. al, general editors. Leiden; New York; Köln: E. J. Brill, 1994.
- . *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible*. Good News Studies, vol. 8. R. J. Karris, general editor. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1984.
- . *The Glory of Israel*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, vol. 23. Sheffield: JSOT, 1983.
- . "Imitatio Christi." In *Comparing Spiritualities*, 113-31. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000.
- . "Jesus and Israel's Scriptures." In *Studying the Historical Jesus*, edited by B. Chilton and C. A. Evans, 281-335. New Testament Tools and Studies, vol. 6. Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 1994.
- . *Jesus' Baptism and Jesus' Healing*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998.
- . *Targumic Approaches to the Gospels*. Studies in Judaism. J. Neusner, general editor. Lanham; New York; London: University Press of America, 1986.
- Churgin, P. *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927.
- Clapperton, J. A. "Ten Harmartian (I John 3, 4)." *The Expository Times* 47 (1935-6): 92-93.
- Clavier, H. "Notes sur un mot-clef du Johannisme et de la soteriologie Biblique: Hilasmos." *Neotestamentica* 10 (1968): 287-304.
- Cohn, L. et al., eds. *Philo von Alexandria: Die Werke in deutscher Übersetzung*. 2. 6 Vols. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1962.
- Collins, J. J. "The Meaning of Sacrifice." *Biblical Research* 22 (1977): 19-37.

- Collins, R. F. "The Berith-Notion of the Cairo Damascus Document and Its Comparison with the NT." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 39b (1963): 555-94.
- Colson, C. H. *Philo*. Translated by F. H. Colson. Edited by T. E. Page et al. Vol. 6, 515. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929.
- Conzelmann, H. "Was von Anfang War." In *Neutestamentliche Studien für R. Bultmann*, edited by W. Eltester, 194-201. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, vol. 21. Berlin: Topelmann, 1954.
- Cook, W. R. "Hamartological Problems in First John." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 123 (1966): 249-60.
- Cooper, E. J. "The Consciousness of Sin in 1 John." *Laval Théologique et Philosophique* 28 (1972): 237-48.
- Coppens, J. "Les Affinités Qumrâniennes de L'épître aux Hébreux." *La Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 94 (1962): 128-41, 257-82.
- . "La nouvelle Alliance en Jeremie 31, 31-34." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 25 (1963): 12-21.
- Corley, B. "Trials of Jesus." In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. H. Marshall, 841-54. A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship. Downers Grove: IVP, 1992.
- Couture, P. "The Teaching Function in the Church of 1 John (2,20.27)." Ph. D. diss., Pontifical Gregorian University, 1968.
- Cox, S. "The Sin Unto Death. 1 John V. 16." *Expositor 2d Ser.* 2, no. 1 (1881): 429-31.
- Craig, C. T. "The Identification of Jesus with the Suffering Servant." *Journal of Religion* 24 (1944): 240-45.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *The Gospel According to Saint Mark*. Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary. Cambridge: University Press, 1959.
- Crockett, L. "The OT in Luke with Emphasis on the Interpretation of Isa. 61:1-2." Ph. D. diss., Brown University, 1966.
- Cross, F. M. *The Ancient Library of Qumran. 3'rd ed.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- Cullmann, O. *Baptism in the New Testament*. Translated by J. K. S. Reid. London: SCM, 1950.

- . *The Christology of the New Testament*. Translated by S. C. Guthries and C. A. M. Hall. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.
- . “The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research Into the Beginnings of Christianity.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 74 (1955): 213-26.
- . “Urchristentum und Gottesdienst.” *Abhandlungen Zur Theologie Des Alten und Neuen Testaments* 3 (1950): 89-113.
- Culpepper, R. A. *1 John, 2 John, 3 John*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1985.
- . *The Gospel and Letters of John*. Interpreting Biblical Texts. Nashville: Abingdon, 1998.
- Cunliffe, R. J. *Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect*. London: Blackie and Son, 1924.
- Dahl, N. A. “Anamnesis: Memory and Commemoration in Early Christianity.” In *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church*, 11-29. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976.
- . “Der Erstgeborene Satans und der Vater des Teufels.” In *Apophoreta*, edited by Fs. E. Haenchen, 70-84. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, vol. 30. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1964.
- Dalman, G. *Aramäische Dialektproben*. 2. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1927.
- . *Grammatik Des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1905.
- . *Der Leidende und der Sterbende Messias der Synagoge im Ersten Nach-Christlichen Jahrtausend*. Berlin, 1888.
- . *The Words of Jesus: Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language*. Translated by D. M. Kay. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902.
- Danby, H., trans. *Mishnah*. Reprinted lithographically from the first edition 1933. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Daniélou, J. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Primitive Christianity*. Translated by S. Attanasio. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1958.
- Daube, D. *Sin, Ignorance and Forgiveness in the Bible*. London: Liberal Jewish Synagogue, 1960.
- Davenport, G. L. *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971.

- Davies, D. J. "An Interpretation of Sacrifice in Leviticus." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 89 (1977): 387-99.
- Davies, P. R. *The Damascus Covenant*. The Damascus Covenant. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament-Supplement Series, vol. 25. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982.
- Davies, W. D. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*. 2. NY: Harper and Row, 1967.
- . *Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come*. JBL Monograph Series, vol. 7. Philadelphia: SBL, 1952.
- Davies, W. D., and D. C. Allison. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew: Vol. 1, Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I-VII*. The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and the New Testaments. J. A. Emerton et al., general editors. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- . *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew: Vol. 3 Commentary on Matthew XIX-XXVIII*. The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and the New Testaments. J. A. Emerton et al., general editors. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.
- De Jonge, M. *Christology in Context*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988.
- . *God's Final Envoy*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . "Jesus' Death for Others and the Death of the Maccabean Martyrs." In *Text and Testimony: Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honor of A. F. J. Klijn*, edited by T. Baardas, 142-51. Kampen: Kok, 1988.
- De Lacy, P., and B. Einarson. "Introduction: On the Delay of the Divine Vengeance." In *Plutarch Moralia*, edited by G. P. Goold, vol. 7, 168-79. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- De la Potterie, I. "Anointing of the Christian by Faith." In *The Christian Lives by the Spirit*, edited by S. Lyonnet and I. de la Potterie, 79-143. Staten Island: Alba House, 1971.
- . "La Connaissance de Dieu dans le Dualisme eschatologique d'après I Jn, II, 12-14." In *Au Service de la Parole de Dieu. Mélanges A.-M. Charue.*, 77-99. Gembloux: Duculot, 1969.

- . “La Notion de 'Commencement' dans les Écrits johanniques.” In *Die Kirche des Anfangs. H. Schürmann Festschrift.*, edited by R. Schnackenburg et al., 379-403. Leipzig: St. Benno, 1977.
- . “Sin is Iniquity.” In *The Christian Lives by the Spirit*, edited by S. Lyonnet and I. de la Potterie, 37-55. Staten Island: Alba House, 1971.
- . *La Vérité dans Saint Jean*. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1977.
- Demosthenes. *Demosthenes*. Translated by J. H. Vince et al. 7 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930-1949.
- De Vaux, R. *Ancient Israel*. Translated by Longman and Todd Ltd. Darton. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- . *Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1964.
- De Waard, J. *A Comparative Study of the OT Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the NT*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 4. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Deissmann, A. *The Philology of the Greek Bible*. Translated by L. Strachan. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908.
- Denis, A.-M. *Les Thèmes de Connaissance dans le Document de Damas*. Louvain: University of Louvain, 1967.
- Dequeker, L. “Het Nieuwe Verbond Bij Jeremia, Bij Paulus en in de Brief Aan de Hebreëen.” *Bijdragen* 33 (1972): 234-61.
- DeSilva, D. A. *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002.
- Devescovi, U. “Annotazioni Sulla Dottrina Di Geremia Circa la Nuovo Alleanza.” *Revista Biblica* 8 (1960): 102-28.
- Dix, G. *The Treatise on The Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome*. New York: Macmillan, 1937.
- Dodd, C. H. *According to the Scriptures*. London: Lowe & Brydone, 1952.
- . *The Bible and the Greeks*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935.
- . “The First Epistle of John and the Fourth Gospel.” *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library* 21 (1937): 129-56.

- . “Hilaskesthai, Its Cognates, Derivatives and Synonyms in the Septuagint.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 32 (1931): 352-60.
- . *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- . *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: University Press, 1965.
- . *The Johannine Epistles*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1946.
- . *The Parables of the Kingdom*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961.
- Doeve, J. W. *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptics Gospels and Acts*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1954.
- Drazin, I., ed. *Targum Onkelos to Leviticus*. New York: Ktav, 1994.
- Du Toit, A. B. “Section B: The Canon of the New Testament,” translated by D. R. Briggs. In *Guide to the New Testament by J. H. Roberts and A. B. Du Toit*, 77-272. Pretoria: Kerkboekhandel Transvaal, 1979.
- Dugmore, C. W. *The Influence of the Synagogue Upon the Divine Office*. London: Oxford University Press, 1944.
- Dunn, J. D. G. *Christology in the Making*. London: SCM, 1989.
- . *Romans 1-8*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 38A. D. A. Hubbard, G. W. Barker, and R. P. Martin, general editors. Dallas: Word, 1988.
- . *Romans 9-16*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 38B. D. A. Hubbard, G. W. Barker, and R. P. Martin, general editors. Dallas: Word, 1988.
- Dunnill, J. *Covenant Sacrifice in the Letter to the Hebrews*. Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series, vol. 75. Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Dupont-Sommer, A. “Le Commentaire d’Habacuc découvert près de la Mer Morte.” *Comptes Rendus de L’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* (1950).
- . *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. Translated by G. Vermes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961.
- . *Observations sur le Commentaire d’Habacuc découvert près de la Mer Morte*. Paris: Stanislas Lassale, 1950.

- . “Le Testament de Lévi [XVII-XVIII] et la Secte juive de l’alliance.” *Semitica* 4 (1951): 47-53.
- Edanad, A. *Christian Existence and the New Covenant*. Bangalore: Dharmaram, 1987.
- Edwards, M. J. “Martyrdom and the First Epistle of John.” *Novum Testamentum* 31 (1989): 164-71.
- Edwards, R. B. *The Johannine Epistles*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Ehrhardt, A. *The Framework of the New Testament Stories*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Eichrodt, W. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Translated by J. A. Baker. 2 Vols. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961.
- Eising, H. “זִכָּרֹן,” translated by D.E. Green. In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. J. Betterweck and H. Ringgren, vol. 4, 64-82. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Eissfeldt, O. “The Ebed-Jahwe in Isaiah XI-Lx in the Light of the Israelite Conceptions of the Community and the Individual, the Ideal and the Real.” *The Expository Times* 44 (1933): 261-68.
- . *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. 1st ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Ellingworth, P. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. I. H. Marshall and W. W. Gasque, general editors. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Elliot, J. H. “Ministry and Church Order in the NT: A Traditio-Historical Analysis (1 Pt 5,1-5 & Plls.)” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 32 (1970): 367-91.
- Ellis, E. E. *The Gospel of Luke*. The New Century Bible Commentary. M. Black, general editor. London: Marshall, Morgan, and Scott Publishing, 1974.
- . *The Making of the New Testament Documents*. Biblical Interpretation Series, vol. 39. R. A. Culpepper, R. Rendtorff, and D. E. Orton, general editors. Leiden; Boston; Cologne: Brill, 1999.
- . “Midrash, Targum, and NT Quotations.” In *Neotestamentica et Semitica (Black, M. Festschrift)*, edited by E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox, 61-69. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1960.

- . *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957.
- . *The World of St. John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
- Epstein, I., ed. *The Babylonian Talmud*. London: Soncino, 1935-52.
- Euler, K. F. *Die Verkündigung vom Leidenden Gottesknecht aus Jes. 53 in der Griechischen Bibel*. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, vol. 66. Stuttgart-Berlin: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1934.
- Euripides. *Euripides*. Translated by A. S. Way. 4 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1912.
- . *Iphigenia Avlidensis*. In *Euripidis Fabulae. Recognovit Brevique Adnotatione Critica Instruxit Gilbertus Murray*, G. Murray, ed. Oxonii: E Typographed Clarendoniano, 1913.
- . *Iphigeneia at Aulis*. W. S. Merwin and G. E. Jr. Dimock, trans. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Evans, C. A. "Authenticating the Activities of Jesus." In *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus*, edited by B. Chilton and C. A. Evans, 3-30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . "Authenticating the Words of Jesus." In *Authenticating the Words of Jesus*, edited by B. Chilton and C. A. Evans, 3-14. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . "A Book Review of Humphries, Michael L., *Christian Origins and the Language of the Kingdom of God*." In *Review of Biblical Literature*. The Society of Biblical Literature. Cited on Dec 15, 2000. Online: <http://www.bookreviews.org/Print/0809322307-P2.html>. 2000.
- Evans, J. W. "The Doctrine of Sin in the Johannine Writings." Ph. D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1964.
- "Fabius Maximus Cunctator, Quintus." In *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 4, 648. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1998.
- Fabris, R. "La lettera agli ebrei el' Antico Testamento." *Revista Biblica* 32 (1984): 237-52.
- Fabry, H. -J. "כָּל," translated by D.E. Green. In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. J. Betterweck, H. Ringgren, and H-J. Fabry, vol. 7, 399-437. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

- . "יָהֳרִי," translated by D.E. Green. In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. J. Betterweck and H. Ringgren, vol. 6, 40-48. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- . "סַמָּךְ," translated by D. W. Stott. In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. J. Betterweck, H. Ringgren, and H.-J. Fabry, vol. 10, 281-82. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Feld, H. *Das Verständnis Des Abendmahls*. Erträge der Forschung, vol. 50. Darmstadt: wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976.
- Fishbane, M. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.
- Fitzner, G. "Der Ort der Versöhnung nach Paulus: zu Frage des 'Sühnopfers Jesus'." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 22 (1966): 161-83.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. "4Q Testimonia and the NT." *Theological Studies* 18 (1957): 513-37.
- . *The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)*. The Anchor Bible. Garden City: Doubleday, 1981.
- . "The Use of Explicit OT Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the NT." *New Testament Studies* 7 (1960-61): 297-333.
- Flusser, D. "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity." *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4 (1957): 236-65.
- Foerster, W. "Σωτήρ," translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, vol. 7, 1003-12. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.
- . "Σωτήρ in the New Testament," translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, vol. 7, 1015-18. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.
- Forestell, J. T. "Review of Brown's Epistle of John." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* (1983): 679-81.
- . *Targumic Traditions and the New Testament*. Chico: Scholars Press, 1979.
- France, R. T. "Faith." In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. H. Marshall, 223-26. A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship. Downers Grove: IVP, 1992.
- . *Jesus and the Old Testament*. London: Tyndale, 1971.

- . “The Worship of Jesus: A Neglected Factor in Christological Debate?” In *Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology Presented to Donald Guthrie*, edited by H. H. Rowdon, 17-36. Downers Grove: IVP, 1982.
- Francis, F. O. “The Form and Function of the Opening and Closing Paragraphs of James and 1 John.” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 61 (1970): 110-26.
- Freedman, D. N., and B. E. Willoughby. “שָׁמַיִם,” translated by D. W. Stott. In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. J. Betterweck, H. Ringgren, and H.-J. Fabry, vol. 10, 31-36. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Freedman, H., trans. *Midrash Rabbah Genesis*. London/New York: Soncino, 1983.
- Friedmann, M. *Seder Eliahu Rabba and Seder Eliahu Zuta*. Wien, 1902.
- Funk, R. W. “Form and Structure of 2 and 3 John.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 86 (1967): 424-30.
- Garnet, P. “Atonement Constructions in the Old Testament and the Qumran Scrolls.” *Evangelical Quarterly* 46 (1974): 131-63.
- . *Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1977.
- Gärtner, B. “The Habakkuk Commentary and the Gospel of Matthew.” *Studia Theologica* 8 (1954): 1-25.
- . *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- Gerhardsson, B. *Memory and Manuscript*. Translated by E. J. Sharpe. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1961.
- Gertner, N. “Midrashim in the NT.” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 7 (1962): 267-92.
- Gese, H. “The Atonement,” translated by K. Crim. In *Essays on Biblical Theology*, 93-116. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981.
- Gesenius, W., and F. Buhl. *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*. 17. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1949.
- Gesenius, W., and E. Kautsch. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. 1909. Translated by A. E. Cowley. Edited by E. Kautsch. 2nd. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1910.

- Goldberg, A. "De-Be R. Akiba Ude-Be R. Ishmael Be-Sifre Debarim, s. I-54." *Te'udot* 3 (1983): 9-16.
- . "Lesonot Dabar Aher Be-Midrese Ha-Halakah." In *Studies in Rabbinic Literature, Bible, and Jewish History*, edited by Ezra Zion Melamed, 99-107. Ramat-Gan, 1982.
- Goldstein, J. A. *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 41a. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Gordon, R. P. "The Citations of the Targums in Recent English Bible Translations (RSV, JB, NEB)." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 26 (1975): 50-60.
- Göbel, C. "'Denn bei Dir ist die Vergebung' – Slh im AT." *Theologische Versuche* 8 (1977): 21-33.
- Grabbe, Lester L. *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Grayston, K. *The Johannine Epistles*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
- . "The Meaning of Parakletos." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 13 (1981): 67-82.
- . "A Study of the Word Sin." *The Bible Translator* 4 (1953): 138-42.
- Grässer, E. *Der Alte Bund im Neuen*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1985.
- Green, E. M. B. *The Meaning of Salvation*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965.
- Greenberg, M. *Ezekiel 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible, vol. 22. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman, general editors. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Greig, C. G. "The Teacher of Righteousness and the Qumran Community." *New Testament Studies* 2 (1955-6): 119-26.
- Greßmann, H. "Die literarische Analyse Deuterocesajas." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 34 (1914): 254-97.
- Grisby, B. H. "The Cross as an Expiatory Sacrifice in the Fourth Gospel." 1982. In *The Johannine Writings*, edited by S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans, 69-94. Biblical Seminar, vol. 32. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

- Grundmann, W. “δεῖ,” translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, vol. 2, 21-25. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Guelich, R. A. *Mark 1-8:26*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 34A. D. A. Hubbard, G. W. Marker, and R. P. Martin, general editors. Dallas: Word, 1989.
- . “Mark, Gospel of.” In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. H. Marshall, 512-25. A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship. Downers Grove: IVP, 1992.
- Guillaume, A. *Prophecy and Divination*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938.
- Guillet, J. *Themes of the Bible*. Translated by A. J. LaMothe Jr. Notre Dame: Fides Publishers, 1960.
- Gundry, R. H. *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- . *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Gunneweg, A. H. J. “Schuld ohne Vergebung?” *Evangelische Theologie* 36 (1976): 2-14.
- Gutbrod, W. “The Law in the Old Testament,” translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 4, 1036-47. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Guthrie, W. K. C. *Orpheus and Greek Religion*. London: Methuen, 1935.
- Hahn, F. “Abendmahl und Bundesgedanke im NT.” *Evangelische Theologie* 35 (1975): 524-38.
- . “Die alttestamentlichen Motive in der urchristlichen Abendmahlsüberlieferung.” *Evangelische Theologie* 27 (1967): 337-75.
- Hammer, Reuven, trans. *Sifre: A Tannaitic Commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.
- Hanhart, R. “The Translation of the Septuagint in Light of Earlier Tradition and Subsequent Influences.” In *Septuagint, Scrolls, Cognate Writings*, edited by G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars, 339-79. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Harrington, D. J. *Invitation to the Apocrypha*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

- Harrison, J. *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*. New York: Meridian Books, 1955.
- Harrison, R. K. "Servant of the Lord." In *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, edited by G. W. Bromiley. Fully revised, vol. 4, 421-23. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Harrisville, R.A. "The Concept of Newness in the New Testament." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 74 (1955): 69-79.
- Hasel, G. F. "Health and Healing in the Old Testament." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 21 (1983): 191-202.
- Hass, C., M. De Jonge, and J. L. Swellengrebel. *A Translator's Handbook on the Letters of John*. New York: U.B.S., 1972.
- Hauck, F. "Κουωνός," translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 3, 789-809. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965.
- Hausemann, J. "סלה," translated by D. W. Stott. In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. J. Betterweck, H. Ringgren, and H-J. Fabry, vol. 10, 258-65. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Hays, R. B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Hayward, R. "Sacrifice and World Order: Some Observations on Ben Sira's Attitude to the Temple Service." In *Sacrifice and Redemption: Durham Essays in Theology*, edited by S. W. Sykes, 22-34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- . *The Targum of Jeremiah*. The Aramaic Bible 12. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1987.
- Hegermann, H. *Jesaja 53 in Hexapla, Targum und Peschitta*. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1954.
- Heise, J. *Bleiben*. Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie, vol. 8. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1967.
- Hengel, M. *Atonement: The Origins of the Doctrine in the New Testament*. Translated by J. Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.
- . *The Johannine Question*. Translated by J. Bowden. London: SCM, 1989.

- Heraclitus, of Ephesus. *Fragments: The Collected Wisdom of Heraclitus*. B. Haxton, trans. New York: Viking, 2001.
- Hering, Jean. "Y a-t-il des Aramaïsmes dans la Première Epître Johannique?" *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 36 (1956): 113-21.
- Herner, S. *Sühne und Vergebung in Israel*. Lund, 1942.
- Herodotus. *Herodotus*. Translated by A. D. Godley. 4 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1921-1924.
- Hiebert, D. E. *The Epistles of John*. Greenbille, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1991.
- Hill, D. "The Interpretation of HILASKESQAI and Related Words in the Septuagint and in the New Testament." In *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings*, 23-48. Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series, vol. 5. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Hillers, D. R. *Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1969.
- Hillyer, N. "The Servant of God." *Evangelical Quarterly* 41 (1969): 143-60.
- Hindley, J. C. "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch. An Historical Approach." *New Testament Studies* 14 (1968): 551-65.
- Hodges, Z. C. "Fellowship and Confession in 1 John 1:5-10." *BiBibliotheca Sacra* 129 (1972): 48-60.
- Hoffman, T. A. "1 John and the Qumran Scrolls." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 8 (1978): 117-25.
- Hoffmann, D. *Zur Einleitung in die halachischen Midraschim*. Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Rabbiner-Seminars zu Berlin 5647(1886-87). Berlin: M. Driesner, 1887.
- Hofius, D. "Erwägungen zur Gestalt und Herkunft des paulischen Versöhnungsgedankens." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 77 (1980): 186-99.
- Holladay, W. L. *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 26-52*. Hermeneia Series. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Holm-Nielsen, S. *Hodayot*. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960.
- Homer. *Iliad/ Homer*. Translated by A. T. Murray and revised by William F. Wyatt. 2nd ed. 2 vols. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.

- . *Odyssey/Homer*. Translated by A. T. Murray and revised by G. E. Dimock. 2nd ed. 2 vols. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Hooker, M. D. *Jesus and the Servant*. London: S.P.C.K., 1959.
- Houlden, J. L. *A Commentary on the Johannine Epistles*. Harper's NT Commentaries; Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Black, 1994.
- Hull, W. L. *The Fall and Rise of Israel*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1954.
- Humbert, P. "Le Messie dans le Targum des Prophètes." *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* 43 (1911): 5-46.
- Huntjens, J. A. "Contrasting Notions of Covenant and Law in the Texts from Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 8 (1972-75): 361-80.
- Hyatt, J. P. "Torah in the Book of Jeremiah." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 60 (1941): 381-96.
- Ilg, N. "Überlegungen zum Verständnis von Berit in den Qumrantexten." In *Qumran: sa Piété, sa Théologie et son Milieu*, edited by M. Delcor, 257-73. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, vol. 46. Leuven: Leuven University, 1978.
- Inman, V. K. "Distinctive Johannine Vocabulary and the Interpretation of I John 3:9." *Westminster Theological Journal* 40 (1977): 136-44.
- Isaac, E. "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by J. H. Charlesworth, vol. 1, 5-89. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Isocrates. *Isocrates*. Translated by G. Norlin. 3 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928-1945.
- Israelstam, J., and J. J. Slotki, trans. *Midrash Rabbah Leviticus*. London/New York: Soncino, 1983.
- Janowski, B. "Auslösung des verwirkten Lebens." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 79 (1982): 25-59.
- . *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen*. wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, vol. 55. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982.

- Jastrow, M. *Aspects of Religious Belief and Practice in Babylonia and Assyria*. New York: Putnam's Sons, 1911.
- . *Dictionary of the Targumim, Talmud Babli, Yerushalmi and Midrashic Literature*. New York: Judaica, 1971.
- Jaubert, A. *La Notion d'alliance dans le Judaïsme aux Abords de l'ère Chrétienne*. Paris: Le Seuil, 1963.
- Jenks, G. C. *The Origins and Early Development of the Antichrist Myth*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1991.
- Jeremias, A. *OT in the Light of the Ancient East*. Translated by C.L. Beaumont. 2 Vols. London: Williams & Norgate, 1911.
- Jeremias, J. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. Translated by N. Perrin. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964.
- . "ἄλρω," translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, vol. 1, 185-86. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- . "Παῖς Θεοῦ," translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, vol. 5, 677-717. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Johnson, L. T. *The Gospel of Luke*. Sacra Pagina Series, vol. 3. D. J. Harrington, general editor. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Jones, D. R. *Jeremiah*. New Century Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities*. Translated by L. H. Feldman. 9 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- . *The Life: Against Apion*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Joüon, Paul. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Translated by T. Muraoka. Reprint of First Edition, with Corrections. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1993.
- Jungmann, A. A. "Altchristliche Gebetsordnung im Lichte des Regelbuches von 'En Fescha.'" *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* 75 (1953): 215-19.

- Kadushin, Max. *A Conceptual Commentary on Midrash Leviticus Rabbah: Value Concept in Jewish Thought*. Brown Judaic Studies, vol. 126. J. Neusner et al., general editors. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- . *The Theology of Seder Eliahu*. New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1932.
- Kaiser, W. C. “The Old Promise and the New Covenant: Jeremiah 31:31-34.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 15 (1972): 11-23.
- Kantrowitz, D. *Judaic Classics Library v.2.2*. Davka Corp., 2001.
- Kaufmann, Y. *The Religion of Israel*. Edited and translated by M. Greenberg. Abridged. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Kavanagh, A. *The Shape of Baptism: The Rite of Christian Initiation*. New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1978.
- Käsemann, E. “Anliegen und Eigenart der paulischen Abendmahlslehre.” *Evangelische Theologie* 7 (1947/8): 263-383.
- . “Ketzer und Zeuge.” *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 48 (1951): 292-311.
- . “Zum Verständnis von Römer 3, 24-26.” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 43 (1950-51): 150-54.
- Keil, C. F., and F. Delitzsch. *Psalms*. Translated by Francis Bolton. Commentary on the Old Testament, vol. 5. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Kellermann, D. “אֱשֵׁר,” translated by J. T. Willis. In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. J. Betterweck and H. Ringgren. Rev., vol. 1, 429-37. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Kennedy, H. A. A. “The Covenant-Conception in the First Epistle of John.” *The Expository Times* 28 (1916-17): 23-26.
- Keown, G. et al. *Jeremiah, 26-52*. Word Biblical Commentary Series, vol. 27. D. A. Hubbard, G. W. Barker, and R. P. Martin, general editors. Dallas: Word, 1995.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. “Two Johannine Idioms in the Johannine Epistles.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 12 (1961): 272-73.
- Kim, Seyoon. *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.
- Kistemaker, S. *New Testament Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1986.

- . *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Amsterdam: Van Soest, 1961.
- Kittel, G. “Λόγισον,” translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 4, 137-41. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.
- . “אמת in Rabbinic Judaism,” translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 1, 237-38. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Klauck, H-J. *Die Johannesbriefe*. Darmstadt: wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1991.
- Klein, G. “Das wahre Licht scheint schon.” *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 68 (1971): 261-326.
- Klein, M. L. “Associative and Complementary Translation in the Targumim.” *Eretz-Israel* 16 (1982): 134-40.
- Klöpper, A. “Zur Lehre von der Sünde im 1. Johannesbrief.” *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 43 (1900): 580-602.
- Knierim, R. “עוֹן,” translated by M. E. Biddle. In *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann, vol. 2, 863-66. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997.
- . “אשם,” translated by M. E. Biddle. In *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann, vol. 1, 191-95. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997.
- . “חטִי,” translated by M. E. Biddle. In *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann, vol. 1, 406-11. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997.
- . “שגג,” translated by M. E. Biddle. In *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann, vol. 3, 1302-04. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997.
- . “פשע,” translated by M. E. Biddle. In *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann, vol. 2, 1033-37. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Koch, K. “עוֹן,” translated by D. W. Stott. In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. J. Betterweck, H. Ringgren, and H-J. Fabry, vol. 10, 546-62. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

- . “Messias und Sündenvergebung in Jesaja 53-Targum.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 3 (1972): 117-48.
- . “Der Spruch ‘Sein Blut Bleibe auf Seinem Haupt’ und die Israelitische Auffassung Vom Vergossenen Blut.” *Vetus Testamentum* 12 (1962): 396-416.
- . “Sühne und Sündenvergebung um die Wende von der exilischen zur nachexilischen Zeit.” *Evangelische Theologie* 26 (1966): 217-39.
- Kosmala, H. *Hebräer-Essener-Christen*. Leiden: Brill, 1959.
- Köhler, L. *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by A. S. Todd. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1957.
- Kramer, W. *Christ, Lord, Son of God*. Translated by B. Hardy. Studies in Biblical Theology, vol. 1/50. Naperville: Allenson, 1966.
- Kretschmar, G. “Zur religionsgeschichtlichen Einordnung der Gnosis.” *Evangelische Theologie* 13 (1953): 354-61.
- Kruse, C. *The Letters of John*. Grand Rapids; Leicester: Eerdmans; Apollos, 2000.
- Kugel, J. L., and R. E. Greer. *Early Biblical Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- Kuhn, K. G. “Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament.” *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 47, no. 2 (1950): 192-211.
- . “Die Sektenschrift und die iranische Religion.” *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 49 (1952): 296-316.
- . “Über den ursprünglichen Sinn des Abendmahls und sein Verhältnis zu den Gemeinschaftsmahlen der Sektenschrift.” *Evangelische Theologie* 10 (1950-51): 508-27.
- Kutch, E. “Das Herbstfest in Israel.” Ph. D. diss., Johannes-Gutenberg-Universität zu Mainz, 1955.
- Kümmel, W. G. *Promise and Fulfillment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus*. Translated by D. M. Barton. London: SCM, 1957.
- . *The Theology of the New Testament According to Its Major Witnesses: Jesus-Paul-John*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1973.

- Kysar, R. "John, Epistles of of." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, edited by D. N. Freedman et al., vol. 3, 900-12. New York; London; Toronto; Sydney; Auckland: Doubleday, 1992.
- Ladd, G. E. "Apocalyptic." In *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, edited by W. L. Elwell, 61-64. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984.
- . *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952.
- . *A Theology of the New Testament*. Edited by D. A. Hagner. Rev. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Lagrange, M.-J. "La Secte juive de la Nouvelle Alliance au Pays de Damas." *Revue Biblique* 9 (1912): 213-40.
- Lane, W. R. *The Gospel of Mark*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- . *Hebrews 1-8*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 47. D. A. Hubbard, G. W. Barker, and R. P. Martin, general editors. Dallas: Word, 1991.
- . "A New Commentary Structure in 4Qflor." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78 (1959): 343-46.
- Lang, B. "Kipper," translated by D. E. Green. In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. J. Betterweck, H. Ringgren, and H-J. Fabry. English translation, vol. 7, 288-303. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- . "כפר," translated by D.E. Green. In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. J. Betterweck, H. Ringgren, and H-J. Fabry, vol. 7, 288-303. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Lang, F. "Abendmahl und Bundesgedanke im Neuen Testament." *Evangelische Theologie* 35 (1975): 524-38.
- Lauterbach, Jacob Z., trans. *Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1961.
- Leaney, A. R. C. "The Eschatological Significance of Human Suffering in the Old Testament and the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 16 (1963): 286-301.
- Lehne, S. *The New Covenant in Hebrews*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament-Supplement Series, vol. 44. Sheffield: JSOT, 1990.

- Lehrman, S. M., trans. *Midrash Rabbah Exodus*. London/New York: Soncino, 1983.
- Lempp, W. "Bund und Bundeserneuerung bei Jeremias." Ph. D. diss., Tübingen, 1955.
- Levertoff, Paul P., trans. *Midrash Sifre on Numbers: Selections from Early Rabbinic Scriptural Interpretations*. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1926.
- Levey, S. H. "The Date of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets." *Vetus Testamentum* 21 (1971): 186-96.
- Levin, C. *Die Verheissung des neuen Bundes in ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt*. Forschungen Zur Religion und Literaur Des Alten und Neuen TestameNew Testament Studies, vol. 137. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985.
- Levine, B. A. *In the Presence of the Lord*. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- . *Leviticus*. New York: JPS, 1989.
- Lietzmann, H. *Mass and Lord's Supper*. Translated by D. H. G. Reeve. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- Lieu, J. M. "Authority to Become Children of God." *Novum Testamentum* 23 (1981): 210-28.
- . "Blindness in the Johannine Tradition." *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988): 83-95.
- . *The Theology of the Johannine Epistles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- . "What Was from the Beginning: Scripture and Tradition in the Johannine Epistles." *New Testament Studies* 39 (1993): 458-77.
- Lightfoot, R. H. *St. John's Gospel*. Edited by C. F. Evans. London: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Lindars, B. "Discourse and Tradition in John." 1981. In *The Johannine Writings*, edited by S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans, 13-30. Biblical Seminar, vol. 32. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- . *New Testament Apologetic*. London: SCM, 1961.
- Loader, W. *The Johannine Epistles*. London: Epworth, 1992.

- Lohfink, N. *The Covenant Never Revoked*. Translated by J. J. Scullion. New York: Paulist, 1991.
- Lohmeyer, E. "Über Aufbau und Bliederung Des Ersten Johannesbriefes." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 27 (1928): 225-63.
- Lohse, E. *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955.
- Longenecker, R. N. *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*. London: SCM, 1970.
- . *Galatians*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 41. D. A. Hubbard, G. W. Barker, and R. P. Martin, general editors. Dallas: Word, 1990.
- Louw, J. P. "Verbal Aspect in the First Letter of John." *Neotestamentica* 9 (1975): 98-104.
- Lowe, M. "From the Parable of the Vineyard to a Pre-Synoptic Source." *New Testament Studies* 28 (1982): 257-63.
- Luz, U. "Der alte und der neue Bund bei Paulus und im Hebraerbrief." *Evangelische Theologie* 27 (1967): 318-36.
- Lyonnet, S., and S. Sabourin. *Sin, Redemption, and Sacrifice*. Analecta Biblica, vol. 48. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1970.
- Mackintosh, H. R. *The Christian Experience of Forgiveness*. Edited by G. W. Bromiley. Revised. London: NISBE, 1934.
- Malatesta, E. "Covenant and Indwelling." *The Way* 17 (1977): 23-32.
- . *Interiority and Covenant*. Analecta Biblica, vol. 69. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1978.
- Manson, T. W. *The Teaching of Jesus*. Cambridge: University Press, 1967.
- Mansoor, M. *The Thanksgiving Hymns*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.
- Marbury, C. H. "Old Testament Textual Traditions in the New Testament." Ph. D. diss., Harvard University, 1968.
- Marchel, W. *Abba, Père! La Prière du Christ et des Chrétiens*. Rome: Biblical Inst., 1971.
- Marcus, R. *Preface to Josephus with English Translation*. Loeb Classical Library, vol. 5. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934.

- Marshall, I. H. "The Divine Sonship of Jesus." *Interpretation* 21 (1967): 87-103.
- . *The Epistles of John*. New International Commentary on the New Testament Series. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- . *The Gospel of Luke*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- . "Incarnational Christology of the New Testament." In *Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology Presented to Donald Guthrie*, edited by H. H. Rowdon, 1-16. Downers Grove: IVP, 1982.
- . "Johannine Theology." In *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, edited by G. W. Bromiley, vol. 2, 1081-91. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- . "John, Epistles of." In *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, edited by G. W. Bromiley, vol. 2, 1091-98. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- . "Lamb of God." In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. H. Marshall, 432-34. A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship. Downers Grove: IVP, 1992.
- . "Synoptic Son of Man Sayings." *New Testament Studies* 12 (1966): 327-51.
- Martin-Achard, R. "La nouvelle Alliance selon Jérémie." *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* 12 (1962): 172-96.
- . "Quelques Remarques sur la nouvelle Alliance chez Jérémie. (Jérémie 31, 31-34)." *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* 33 (1974): 141-64.
- Martinez, F. G. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*. Edited by F. G. Martinez. 2. NY: Brill, 1996.
- . "Qumran Origins and Early History." *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1988): 113-36.
- Matera, F. J. *New Testament Christology*. Louisville: Westminster, 1999.
- Maurer, C. "Τίθημι," translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, vol. 8, 152-68. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.
- McCarthy, D. J. "The Symbolism of Blood and Sacrifice." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969): 166-76.

- McCartney, D. G. "The New Testament's Use of the Old Testament." In *Inerrancy and Hermeneutic*, edited by H. M. Conn, 101-16. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988.
- . "The Use of the Old Testament in the First Epistle of Peter." Ph. D. diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1989.
- McClendon, J. W. "The Doctrine of Sin and the First Epistle of John." Ph. D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1953.
- McCullough, J.C. "The Old Testament Quotations in Hebrews." *New Testament Studies* 26 (1979-80): 364-67.
- McDermott, M. "The Biblical Doctrine of KOINWNIA." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 19 (1975): 64-77, 219-33.
- McDonald, H. D. "The Kerygmatic Christology of Rudolph Bultmann." In *Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology Presented to Donald Guthrie*, edited by H. H. Rowdon, 311-25. Downers Grove: IVP, 1982.
- McKane, W. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*. International Critical Commentary Series. Edinbergh: T&T Clark, 1986.
- McKeating, H. "Divine Forgiveness in the Psalms." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 18 (1965): 69-83.
- McKnight, S. "Matthew, Gospel of." In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. H. Marshall, 526-41. A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship. Downers Grove: IVP, 1992.
- Meeks, W. "'Am I a Jew?' Johannine Christianity and Judaism." In *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Part 1*, edited by J. Neusner, 163-86. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Merklein, H. "Erwägungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der neutestamentlichen Abendmahlstraditionen." *Biblische Zeitschrift (N.F.)* 21 (1977): 88-101, 235-44.
- Metzger, B. M. *An Introduction to The Apocrypha*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.
- . *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. Stuttgart: U.B.S., 1971.
- Meyer, B. F. "The Pre-Pauline Formula in Rom 3:25-26a." *New Testament Studies* 29 (1983): 198-208.

- Michaud, J. P. "Le Passage de l'ancien au Nouveau, selon l'Épître aux Hébreux." *Science et Esprit* 35 (1983): 33-52.
- Michl, J. "Der Geist als Garant des rechten Glaubens." In *Vom Wort des Lebens*, edited by N. Adler, 142-51. Munster: Aschendorf, 1951.
- Milgrom, J. *Cult and Conscience: The Asham and the Priestly Doctrine of Repentance*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- . "Israel's Sanctuary." *Revue Biblique* 83 (1976): 390-99.
- . *Leviticus 1-16*. Anchor Bible Commentary Series, vol. 3. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- . "A Prolegomenon to Lev. 17:11." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90 (1971): 149-56.
- . "Sin-Offering or Purification-Offering?" *Vetus Testamentum* 21 (1971): 237-39.
- . *Studies in Levitical Terminology, I*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.
- Milik, J. T. "Problèmes de la Littérature Hénochique à la Lumière des Fragments Araméens de Qumrân." *Harvard Theological Review* 64 (1971): 333-78.
- . *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*. London: SCM, 1959.
- Millard, A. R. "Covenant and Communion in First Corinthians." In *Apostolic History and the Gospel*, edited by W. W. Gasque and R. R. Martin, 242-48. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970.
- Miller, J. W. *Das Verhältnis Jeremias und Hesekiels Sprachlich und Theologisch Untersucht*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1955.
- Miller, Merrill P. "Targum Midrash and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* (1971): 29-82.
- Mills, D. W. "The Concept of Sinlessness in 1 John in Relation to Johannine Eschatology." Ph. D. diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1998.
- Moo, D. J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament, vol. 6. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

- . *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983.
- Moore, G. F. "The Covenanters of Damascus; A Hitherto Unknown Jewish Sect." *Harvard Theological Review* 4 (1911): 330-77.
- . *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era the Age of Tannaim*. 2. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Morgenstern, J. "The Suffering Servant - A New Solution." *Vetus Testamentum* 11 (1961): 292-320, 406-31.
- . "Two Additional Notes to 'The Suffering Servant - A New Solution'." *Vetus Testamentum* 13 (1963): 321-32.
- Morrice, W. G. "New Wine in Old Wine-Skins." *The Expository Times* 86 (Feb. 1975): 132-36.
- Morris, L. *Apocalyptic*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.
- . *The Apostolic Preachings of the Cross*. London: Tyndale, 1955.
- . "Asham." *Evangelical Quarterly* 30 (1958): 196-210.
- . "The Biblical Use of the Term Blood." *Journal of Theological Studies* 3 (1952): 216-27.
- . *The Gospel According to John*. The New International Commentary of the New Testament. F. F. Bruce, general editor. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.
- . *New Testament Theology*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
- Muilenburg, J. "The Linguistic and Rhetorical Usage of the Particle Ki in the OT." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 32 (1961): 135-60.
- . *The Way of Israel*. New York: Harper and Row, 1961.
- Munck, Johannes. *Christ & Israel: An Interpretation of Romans 9-11*. Translated by Ingeborg Nixon. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. "The Essenes and Their History." *Revue Biblique* 81 (1974): 215-44.
- Nauck, W. *Die Tradition und der Charakter Des Ersten Johannesbriefes*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1957.

- Neufeld, D. *Reconceiving Texts as Speech Acts*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Neusner, J. *Judaism in the Beginning of Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- , trans. *Pesiqta DeRab Kahana*. Brown Judaic Studies, vol. 122-123. J. Neusner et al., general editors. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- . *Rabbinic Judaism*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- . *Sifre to Deuteronomy: An Analytical Translation. Volume Two*. Rev. Brown Judaic Studies, vol. 101. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- , trans. *Song of Songs Rabbah*. Brown Judaic Studies, vol. 197. J. Neusner et al., general editors. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- , ed. *The Talmud of the Land of Israel*. Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism, vol. 1-31. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.
- , trans. *The Tosefta*. New York: Ktav, 1981.
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E. *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.
- Nielsen, H. K. *Heilung und Verkündigung: das Verstandnis der Heilung und ihres Verhältnisses zur Verkündigung bei Jesus und in der alteresten Kirche*. Translated by D. Harbsmeier. Acts Theologica Danica, vol. 22. Leiden/New York: Brill, 1987.
- Nilsson, M. P. *A History of Greek Religion*. Translated by F. J. Fielden. 2nd. London: Oxford University Press, 1949.
- Noack, B. "On 1 John II. 12-14." *New Testament Studies* 6 (1959-60): 236-41.
- Nolland, J. *Luke 9:21-18:34*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 35B. B. M. Metzger et al., general editors. Dallas: Word, 1993.
- North, C. R. *The Second Isaiah*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- . *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah*. London: Oxford University Press, 1948.
- North, R. "The Damascus of Qumran Geography." *Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement* 87 (1955): 34-48.

- Oke, C. C. "The Plan of the First Epistle of John." *The Expository Times* 51 (1939-1940): 347-50.
- Olivier, J. P. J. "סלח." In *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology & Exegesis*, edited by W. A. VanGemeron, vol. 3, 259-64. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.
- Omanson, R.I. "A Superior Covenant: Hebrews 8:1-10:18." *Review and Expositor* 82 (1985): 361-73.
- Orpheus. *Argonautica*. Edited by J. G. Schneider. Jenae: Sumtibus suis F. Fromann, 1803.
- Osborne, G. "Type, Typology." In *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, edited by W. A. Elwell, 1117-18. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984.
- Oswalt, J. N. *The Book of Isaiah Chapters 1-39*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. R. K. Harrison, general editor. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- . *The Book of Isaiah Chapters 40-66*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. R. K. Harrison, general editor. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Otto, R. *Kingdom of God and Son of Man*. Translated by F. V. Filson and B. L. Woolf. London: Lutterworth, 1943.
- O'Neill, J. C. *The Puzzle of 1 John*. London: S.P.C.K., 1966.
- . *The Theology of Acts in Its Historical Setting*. London: S.P.C.K., 1961.
- Östborn, G. *Tora in the Old Testament*. Lund, 1945.
- Packer, J. I. "Justification." In *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, edited by W. A. Elwell, 593-97. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984.
- Page, S. "Ransom Saying." In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. H. Marshall, 660-62. Downers Grove: IVP, 1992.
- Painter, J. "The Opponents of 1 John." *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 48-71.
- Pancaro, S. "'People of God' in St. John's Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 16 (1969-70): 114-29.
- "Pausanias." In *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 9, 212. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1998.

- Payne, J. B. "The Day of Atonement." In *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, vol. 1, 360-62. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.
- Perkins, P. *The Johannine Epistles*. New Testament Message, vol. 21. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1979.
- . "Koinonia in 1 John 1:3-7." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45 (1983): 631-41.
- Peterson, D.G. "The Prophecy of the New Covenant in the Argument of Hebrews." *Reformed Theological Review* 38 (1979): 74-81.
- Pfeiffer, R. H. *History of New Testament Times*. NY: Harper and Brothers, 1949.
- Philo. *Philo*. Translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. 10 Volumes Plus 2 Supplementary Volumes. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929-1962.
- Plato. *Plato*. Translated by H. N. Fowler. 12 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914-1927.
- Plummer, A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke*. Edited by A. Plummer, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. 5'th. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922.
- Plutarch. *Plutarch's Lives*. Translated by B. Perrin. 11 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914-1926.
- . *Plutarch's Moralia*. Translated by F. C. Babbitt et al. 15 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-1976.
- Porúbcan, S. *Il patto nuovo in Is. 40-66*. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1958.
- Poythress, V. S. "Testing for Johannine Authorship by Examining the Use of Conjunctions." *Westminster Theological Journal* 46 (1984): 350-69.
- . *Understanding Dispensationalists*. Phillipsburg: P&R Pub., 1994.
- . "The Use of Intersentence Conjunctions *de*, *Oun*, *Kai*, and *Asyndeton* in the Gospel of John." *Novum Testamentum* 26 (1984): 312-40.
- Price, J. L. "Light from Qumran Upon Some Aspects of Johannine Theology." In *John and Qumran*, edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 9-37. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1972.

- Pryke, J. "Eschatology in the Dead Scrolls." In *The Scrolls and Christianity*, edited by M. Black, 45-57. London: S.P.C.K., 1969.
- "Ptolemy IV Philopator." In *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 9, 773. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1998.
- Quell, G. "Δικη," translated by G. W. Bromiley and J. T. Willis. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel. Revised, vol. 2, 174-78. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- Rabin, C. "Notes on the Habakkuk Scroll and the Zadokite Documents." *Vetus Testamentum* 5 (1955): 148-62.
- . *Qumran Studies*. London: Oxford University Press, 1957.
- . *The Zadokite Document*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1954.
- Rabinowitz, I. "The Second and Third Columns of the Habakkuk Interpretation Scroll." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 69 (1950): 31-47.
- . "The Sequence and Dates of the Extra-Biblical Dead Sea Scroll Texts and Damascus Fragments." *Vetus Testamentum* 3 (1953): 175-85.
- Rainey, A. F. "The Order of Sacrifices in Old Testament Ritual Texts." *Biblica* 51 (1970): 485-98.
- Redlich, E. B. *The Forgiveness of Sins*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1937.
- Reicke, B. *The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism*. Kobenhavn: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1946.
- . "Remarques sur l'histoire de la Forme (Formgeschichte) des Texts de Qumran." In *Les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte*, 38-40. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1957.
- . *The Roots of the Synoptic Gospels*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- Reimer, D. J. "צדק," In *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology & Exegesis*, edited by W. A. VanGemeren, vol. 3, 744-69. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.
- Rendtorff, R. *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im alten Israel*. Neukirchen-Bluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967.

- . “Zur Bedeutung der Handaufstimmung bei den Opfern.” In *Leviticus*, edited by M. Noth and H. W. Wolff, 32-48. Biblischer Kommentar AT, vol. III/1. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985.
- Reumann, J. *The Supper of the Lord*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Ridderbos, H. *The Coming of the Kingdom*. Translated by H. de Jongste. Edited by R. O. Zorn. Philadelphia: P&R Pub., 1962.
- Ringgren, H. *The Faith of Qumran*. Translated by E. T. Sander. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963.
- . “טמא,” translated by D.E. Green. In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. J. Betterweck and H. Ringgren, vol. 5, 331-33. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Ritschl, A. *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*. Edited and translated by H. R. Mackintosh and A. B. Macaulay. Clifton: Reference Book, 1966.
- Rivera, A. *La Redención en las Epistolas y en el Apocalipsis de S. Juan*. Rome: Gregorian University, 1939.
- Roark, D.M. “The New Covenant.” *The Theological Educator* 32 (1985): 63-68.
- Robinson, H. W. “Hebrew Sacrifice and Prophetic Symbolism.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 43 (1942): 129-39.
- Robinson, J. A. T. “The Destination and Purpose of the Johannine Epistles.” *New Testament Studies* 7 (1960-61): 56-65.
- Robinson, J. M., ed. *The Nag Hammadi Library*. Leiden: Brill, 1988.
- Roper, D. H. *The New Covenant in the Old Testament*. Waco: Word, 1976.
- Rosenberg, R. A. “Jesus, Isaac, and the Suffering Servant.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 84 (1965): 381-88.
- Ross, A. *The Epistles of James and John*. New International Commentary on the New Testament Series. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954.
- Rost, L. *Die Damaskusschrift*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1933.
- Roth, W. M. W. “The Anonymity of the Suffering Servant.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 83 (1964): 171-79.

- Rowley, H. H. "Jewish Proselyte Baptism and the Baptism of John." *Hebrew Union College Annual* (1940): 313-34.
- . "The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 33 (1950): 74-110.
- . "The Prophets and Sacrifices." *The Expository Times* 58 (1946-47): 305-07.
- . *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament*. London: J. Clarke, 1946.
- . *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament*. London: Lutterworth, 1952.
- . *Worship in Ancient Israel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.
- Ruckstuhl, E. *Die Literarische Einheit Des Johannesevangeliums*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.
- Safrai, Shmuel. "AMORAIM." *Encyclopedia Judaica - CD-ROM Edition Version 1.0*. Judaica Multimedia (Israel) Ltd. In, 1997.
- Sakenfeld, K. D. "The Problem of Divine Forgiveness in Numbers 14." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 37 (1975): 317-30.
- Sanders, E. P. "The Covenant as a Soteriological Category." In *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity*, edited by R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs, 11-44. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- . *The Historical Figure of Jesus*. London: Penguin Books, 1993.
- . *Jesus and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- . "Jesus and the Kingdom: The Restoration of Israel and the New People of God." In *Jesus, the Gospels, and the Church: Essays in Honor of William R. Farmer*, edited by E. P. Sanders, 225-39. Macon: Mercer U. P., 1987.
- . *Judaism, Practice and Belief 63 B.C.E.-66 C.E.* London: SCM, 1992.
- . *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- Sandmel, S. *Philo of Alexandria*. NY: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Saydon, P. "Cult and Prophecy in Israel." *Melita Theologica* 5 (1952): 7-16.

- Schaefer, J. R. "The Relationship Between Priestly and Servant Messianism in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 30 (1968): 359-85.
- Schenker, A. "Koper et Expiation." *Biblica* 63 (1982): 32-46.
- . *Versöhnung und Sühne*. Freiburg: Verlag Schweizerische Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981.
- Schlatter, A. *Paulus, der Bote Jesu*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1934.
- Schlier, H. "Die Bruderliebe nach dem Evangelium und den Briefen des Johannes." In *Mélanges Bibliques en Hommage au R. P. Béda Rigaux*, edited by A. Descamps and A. de Halleux, 235-45. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970.
- Schmidt, J. "Qumrân et la première Génération Judéo-Chrétienne." In *Qumran: sa Piété, sa Théologie et son Milieu*, edited by M. Delcor, 385-402. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, vol. 46. Leuven: Leuven University, 1978.
- . *The Gospel According to Mark*. Regensburger Neues Testament. Cork: Mercier, 1968.
- Schnackenburg, R. "The Church in the Johannine Writings Including the Apocalypse." In *The Church in the New Testament*, 103-17. New York: Herder and Herder, 1965.
- . *The Johanne Epistles*. Translated by R. Fuller and I. Fuller. New York: Crossroad, 1992.
- . "Die Johanneische Gemeinde und Ihre Geisterfahrung." In *Die Kirche des Anfangs: H. Schurmann Festschrift*, edited by R. Schnackenburg et al, 277-306. Leipzig: St. Benno, 1977.
- . *The Gospel According to St. John*. Introduction and Commentary on Chapters 1-4. Translated by K. Smyth. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- Schneider, J. "Ἡκω," translated by G. W. Bromiley and J. T. Willis. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel. Revised, vol. 2, 928. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- Schnelle, U. *Antidocetic Christology in the Gospel of John*. Translated by L. M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Scholer, D. M. "Sins Within and Sins Without." In *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation*, edited by G. F. Hawthorne, 230-46. Eerdmans, 1975.

- Schreiber, R. "Der neue Bund im Spätjudentum und Urchristentum." Ph. D. diss., Tübingen, 1956.
- Schreiner, T. R. *Paul Apostle of God's Glory in Christ*. Downers Grove: IVP, 2001.
- Schrenk, G. "'Αδικία," translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 1, 153-57. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- . "Δικαιόω," translated by G. W. Bromiley and J. T. Willis. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel. Revised, vol. 2, 211-19. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- Schubert, K. "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen Hebräischen Handschriften." *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 74 (1952): 1-62.
- . "Die jüdischen und judenchristlichen Sekten im Lichte des Handschriftenfundes von 'En Fescha." *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 74 (1952): 1-62.
- Schürer, Emil. *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*. 5 Vols. Translated by John Macpherson, Sophia Taylor, and Peter Christie. Hendrickson Publishers, Inc. edition. Hendrickson, 1998.
- Schweizer, E. *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des alten und neuen Testaments, vol. 28. Zürich: Zwingli, 1962.
- . "Das johanneische Zeugnis vom Herrenmahl." *Evangelische Theologie* 12 (1952/3): 341-63.
- . *Lordship and Discipleship*. London, 1960.
- . *Lord's Supper According to the New Testament*. Translated by J. M. Davis. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.
- . "Υἱός," translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, vol. 8, 354-57, 363-92. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.
- . "Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der Sendungsformel Gal 4,4f., Rm 8,3f., Joh 3,16f., 1 Joh 4,9." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 57 (1966): 199-210.

- Scroggs, R. "The Earliest Christian Communities as Sectarian Movement." In *Part 2 of Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults*, edited by J. Neusner, 1-23. *Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity*, vol. 12. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Seebass, H. "נִבְשָׁ," translated by D. W. Stott and D. E. Green. In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. J. Betterweck, H. Ringgren, and H-J. Fabry, vol. 9, 497-519. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Seeberg, R. "Die Sünden und die Sündenvergebung nach dem ersten Brief des Johannes." In *Das Erbe Martin Luthers und die Gegenwärtige Theologische Forschung*, edited by R. Jelke, 19-31. L. Ihmels Festschrift. Leipzig, 1928.
- Seeley, D. *The Noble Death: Graeco-Roman Martyrology and Paul's Concept of Salvation*. JSNTSup, vol. 28. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
- Seeligmann, I. L. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1948.
- Segal, A. F. "Covenant in Rabbinic Writings." *Studies in Religion* 14, no. 1 (1985): 54.
- Segal, M. H. "The Habakkuk Commentary and the Damascus Fragments (A Historical Study)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 70 (1951): 131-41.
- Segond, A. "1re Epître de Jean, Chap. 5:18-20." *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 45 (1965): 349-51.
- Segovia, F. "Love and Hatred of Jesus and Johannine Sectarianism." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 43 (1981): 259-72.
- Seidelin, P. "Der Ebed Jahwe und die Messiasgestalt im Jesajatargum." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 35 (1936): 194-231.
- Seifrid, M. A. "In Christ." In *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, edited by G. F. Hawthorne, R. P. Martin, and D. G. Reid, 433-36. Downers Grove: IVP, 1993.
- Seybold, K. "סִלְחָ," translated by D.E. Green. In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. J. Betterweck and H. Ringgren, vol. 4, 399-409. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Shmidman, Joshua H. "ZEKHUT AVOT." *The Encyclopaedia Judaica CD-ROM Edition*. Judaica Multimedia (Israel) Ltd. In, 1997.
- Shrenk, G. "Δίκαιος in the NT," translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel, vol. 2, 187-91. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.

- Silva, M. "Old Testament In Paul." In *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, edited by G. F. Hawthorne et al., 630-42. Downers Grove: IVP, 1993.
- Skinner, J. *Prophecy and Religion*. Cambridge: University Press, 1922.
- Smalley, S. S. *John, Evangelist and Interpreter*. 2nd. Downers Grove: IVP, 1998.
- . *1,2,3, John*. Word Biblical Commentary Series, vol. 51. Waco: Word, 1984.
- . "What About 1 John?" In *Studia Biblica (1978)*, edited by E. A. Livingstone, 3, 337-43. Journal for the Study of the New Testament-Supplement Series, vol. 3. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980.
- Smith, D. M. "Johannine Christianity." *New Testament Studies* 21 (1975): 222-48.
- Smith, M. "What is implied by the variety of messianic figures?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78 (1959): 66-72.
- Snaith, N. H. "The prophets and sacrifices and salvation." *The Expository Times* 58 (1946-47): 152-53.
- . "Sacrifice in the Old Testament." *Vetus Testamentum* 15 (1965): 73-80.
- . "The Sin-Offering and the Guilt-Offering." *Vetus Testamentum* 15 (1965): 73-80.
- Soderlund, S. K. "Book of Jeremiah." In *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, edited by G. W. Bromiley. Fully revised, vol. 2, 985-91. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- "Solon." In *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 10, 950-51. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1998.
- Sophocles. *Sophocles*. Translated by H. Lloyd-Jones. 3 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994-1996.
- Sperber, A., ed. *The Bible in Aramaic*. 5 Vols. Leiden: Brill, 1959-1973.
- Sperber, D. "TANNA, TANNAIM." *Encyclopedia Judaica - CD-ROM Edition Version 1.0*. Judaica Multimedia (Israel) Ltd. In, 1997.
- Spicq, C. *L'Épître aux Hébreux*. 2 Vols. Paris: Gabala, 1952.
- . "L'origine johannique de la Conception du Christ-Prêtre dans l'Épître aux Hébreux." In *Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne: Mélanges M. Goguel*, edited

- by O. Cullmann and P. H. Menoud, 258-69. Neuchatel: Delachaux & Niestle, 1950.
- . “La Place Ou le Rôle Des Jeunes dans Certaines Communautés Néotestamentaires.” *Revue Biblique* 76 (1969): 508-27.
- . “La Theologie des deux Alliances dans l’Épître aux Hébreux.” *Revue des Sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 33 (1949): 15-30.
- Stamm, J. J. *Erlösen und Vergeben im Alten Testament*. Bern: A. Francke, 1940.
- . “סלח,” translated by M. E. Biddle. In *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann, vol. 2, 797-803. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Stanley, D. M. “The Theme of the Servant of Yahweh in Primitive Christian Soteriology and Its Transposition by St. Paul.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 16 (1954): 385-425.
- Starchy, J. “Les quatre Étapes du Messianisme à Qumran.” *Revue Biblique* 70 (1963): 481-505.
- Stauffer, E. *New Testament Theology*. London: SCM, 1955.
- Stegemann, H. *The Library of Qumran*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Stein, R. H. “Last Supper.” In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. H. Marshall, 444-50. Downers Grove: IVP, 1992.
- Stenning, J. F., ed. *The Targum of Isaiah*. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.
- Stott, J. R. W. *The Letters of John*. Revised. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, vol. 19. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Strack, Herman L. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. 1931. First Harper Torchbook. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Strack, H. L., and P. Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*. 4 Vols. München: C. H. Beck'sche, 1924-1928.
- Strecker, G. “Die Anfänge der johanneischen Schule.” *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 31-47.
- . *The Johannine Letters*. Translated by L. M. Maloney. Hermeneia Series. H. Attridge, general editor. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.

- Streeter, B. H. *The Primitive Church*. New York: Macmillan, 1929.
- Stuhlmacher, P. "Zur neueren Exegese von Röm 3, 24-26." In *Jesus und Paulus: Festschrift W.G. Kümmel zum 70. Geburtstag*, edited by E.E. Ellis and E. Grässer, 315-33. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.
- Sturch, R. L. "Can One Say 'Jesus is God?'" In *Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology Presented to Donald Guthrie*, edited by H. H. Rowdon, 326-40. Downers Grove: IVP, 1982.
- Sukenik, E. L., ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*. Jerusalem, 1955.
- Sung, C-H. *Vergebung der Sünden: Jesu Praxis der Sündenvergebung nach den Synoptikern und ihre Voraussetzungen im Alten Testament und frühen Judentum*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2, vol. 57. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1993.
- Surkau, Hans-Werner. *Märtyrien in Jüdischer und frühchristlicher Zeit*. Göttingen, 1938.
- Swadling, H. C. "Sin and Sinlessness in 1 John." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 35 (1982): 205-11.
- Swete, H. B. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. New York: Ktav, 1968.
- Synge, F. C. "1 John 3,2." *Journal of Theological Studies* 3 (1952): 79.
- T. E. Page et al., eds. *Philo*. Translated by F. H. Colson. 10 Vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935.
- Talbert, C. H. "A Non-Pauline Fragment at Romans 3: 24-26?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 85 (1966): 287-96.
- Talmon, S. "DSI as a Witness to Ancient Exegesis of the Book of Isaiah." *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 1 (1962): 62-72.
- Taylor, V. *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching*. London: Epworth, 1940.
- . *Forgiveness and Reconciliation*. London: Macmillan, 1952.
- . *The Gospel According to St. Mark*. London: Macmillan, 1959.
- . *Jesus and His Sacrifice*. London: Macmillan, 1959.
- . "Jesus and the Servant." *The Expository Times* 70 (1958/9): 300-01.

- Teicher, J. L. "The Damascus Documents and the Origin of the Jewish Christian Sect." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 2 (1951): 115-43.
- Thiering, B. "Suffering and Ascetism at Qumran, as Illustrated in the Hodayot." *Revue de Qumran* 8 (1974): 393-405.
- Thompson, J. A. *The Book of Jeremiah*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Thompson, M. M. *1-3 John*. IVP NT Commentary. Downers Grove: IVP, 1992.
- Thompson, R. J. *Penitence and Sacrifice in Early Israel Outside the Levitical Law*. Leiden: Brill, 1963.
- Thornton, T. C. G. "Propitiation or Expiation? Hilasterion and Hilasmos in Romans and 1 John." *The Expository Times* 80 (1968/69): 53-55.
- Thucydides. *History of the Peloponnesian War*. Translated by C. F. Smith. 4 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919-1923.
- Thyen, H. *Studien Zur Sündenvergebung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.
- Tov, E. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. Jerusalem: Simor, 1981.
- Tödt, H. E. *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by D. M. Barton. London: SCM, 1965.
- Trepp, L. *A History of the Jewish Experience*. New York: Behrman House, 1962.
- Van Henten, J. W., ed. *Die Entstehung der jüdischen Martyrologie*. Leiden: Brill, 1989.
- . *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, vol. 57. John J. Collins, general editor. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . "Tradition-Historical Background of Rom. 3.25." In *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*, edited by Marinus C. De Boer. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, vol. 84. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Van Unnik, W.C. "The Authority of the Presbyters in Irenaeus' Works." In *God's Christ and His People: N. A. Dahl Festschrift*, edited by J. Jervell and W. A. Meeks, 248-60. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1977.

- . “‘Η Καινή Διαθήκη – a Problem in the Early History of the Canon.” *Studia Postbiblica* 1 (1961): 212-27.
- Van Zijl, J. B. *A Concordance to the Targum of Isaiah*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Vanhoye, A. “Le Dieu de la nouvelle Alliance dans l’Épître aux Hébreux.” In *La Notion biblique de Dieu*, edited by J. Coppens, 315-30. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, vol. 41. Louvain, 1976.
- Vermes, G. *The Dead Scrolls in English*. Revised and Extended 4th Edition. New York: Penguin Books, 1995.
- . “A Propos des Commentaires bibliques découverts à Qumrân.” *Revue d’Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses* 25 (1955): 95-102.
- . *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*. Studia Post-Biblica, vol. 4. Leiden: Brill, 1961.
- Vielhauer, P. “Paulus und das Alte Testament.” In *Studien Zur Geschichte der Reformation*, edited by L. Abramowski and J. F. G. Göters, 33-62. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.
- Vitrano, S. “The Doctrine of Sin in 1 John.” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 25, no. 1 (Spring 1987): 123-31.
- Volz, P. “Die Handauflegen beim Opfer.” *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 21 (1901): 93-100.
- Von Dobschütz, E. “Johanneische Studien.” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 8 (1907): 1-8.
- Von Harnack, A. *Marcion*. Translated by J. E. Steely and L. Bierma. Durham: Labyrinth, 1990.
- Von Rad, G. *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. 2 Vols. New York: Harper, 1962.
- Vorster, W. S. “Heterodoxy in 1 John.” *Neotestamentica* 9 (1975): 87-97.
- Vouga, F. “The Johannine School.” *Biblica* 69 (1988): 371-85.
- Wade, L. E. “Impeccability in 1 John.” Ph. D. diss., Andrews University, 1986.
- Walbank, F. W. “Plutarch.” In *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 9, 529-30. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1998.

- Wallis, W. "Irony in Jeremiah's Prophecy of a New Covenant." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 12 (1969): 107-10.
- Waltke, Bruce K., and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Warfield, B. B. "Christ Our Sacrifice." *Princeton Theological Review* 15 (1917): 385-422.
- Watson, D. F. "1 John 2.12-14 as Distributio, Conduplicatio, and Expolitio." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 35 (1989): 97-110.
- . "Amplification Techniques in 1 John: The Interaction of Rhetorical Style and Invention." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 51 (1993): 99-123.
- . "An Epideictic for Increasing Adherence to Community Values." *Eastern Great Lakes Biblical Society* 11 (1991): 144-52.
- Watts, J. D. W. *Isaiah 34-66*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 25. D. A. Hubbard, G. W. Barker, and R. P. Martin, general editors. Waco: Word, 1987.
- Weeden, T. J. *Mark - Traditions in Conflict*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.
- Weise, M. *Kultzeiten und kultischer Bundesschluss in der "Ordensregel" vom Toten Meer*. Leiden: Brill, 1961.
- Weiss, K. "Die Gnosis im Hintergrund und im Spiegel der Johannesbriefe." In *Gnosis und Neues Testament*, edited by K. -W. Troger, 341-56. Berlin: Eveng. Verlassanstalt, 1973.
- . "Orthodoxie und Heterodoxie im 1. Johannesbrief." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 58 (1967): 247-55.
- Wendt, H. H. "Der Anfang am Beginne des I Johannesbriefes." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 21 (1922): 38-42.
- Wengst, K. *Christologische Formeln und Lieder Des Urchristentums*. Gütersloh, 1972.
- . *Häresie und Orthodoxie im Spiegel des ersten Johannesbriefes*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1976.
- Wenham, D. *The Parables of Jesus*. Downers Grove: IVP, 1989.
- Wenham, G. J. *The Book of Leviticus*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.

- . “Leviticus.” In *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, edited by G. W. Bromiley. Fully revised, vol. 3, 110-17. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Wennemer, K. “Der Christ und die Sünde nach der Lehre des ersten Johannesbriefes.” *Geist und Leben* 33 (1960): 370-76.
- West, M. L. *The Orphic Poems*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1983.
- Westcott, B. F. *The Epistles of St. John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1883.
- . *The Gospel According to St. John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951.
- Westermann, C. *A Thousand Years and a Day*. Translated by S. Rudman. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1962.
- . *Isaiah 40-66*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.
- Whitacre, R. A. *Johannine Polemic*. SBL Dissertation Series, vol. 68. Chico: Scholars Press, 1982.
- . *John*. Downers Grove: IVP, 1999.
- Whitaker, E. C. *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy*. London: S.P.C.K., 1970.
- Whybray, R. N. *Isaiah 40-66*. New Century Bible Commentary. M. Black, general editor. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- Wieder, N. “Habakkuk Scroll and the Targum.” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 4 (1953): 14-18.
- Williams, S. K. *Jesus' Death as Saving Event: The Background and Origin of a Concept*. Harvard Dissertations in Religion, vol. 2. C. Bynum and G. Rupp, general editors. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975.
- Wilson, W. G. “An Examination of the Linguistic Evidence Adduced Against the Unity of Authorship of the First Epistle of John and the Fourth Gospel.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 49 (1948): 147-56.
- Winckler, H. *Kelinschriftliches Textbuch zum Alten Testament*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1909.
- Windisch, H. “Die fünf johanneischen Parakletsprüche.” In *Festgabe für A. Jülicher*, edited by R. Bultmann and H. von Soden, 110-37. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1927.

- . *Die Katholischen Briefe*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1930.
- Wintermute, O. S. “Jubilees: A New Translation and Introduction.” In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 35-142. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- Wise, M. O. “Attitudes Toward the Temple.” In *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, edited by C. A. Evans and S. E. Porter, 1171-73. Downers Grove: IVP, 2000.
- Wolff, H. W. *Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum*. 3d ed. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1952.
- Woll, D. B. *Johannine Christianity in Conflict*. SBL Dissertation Series, vol. 60. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.
- Wright, C. H. H. “The Pre-Christian Jewish Interpretation of Isaiah LII., LIII.” In *The Expositor*. 3rd series, vol. 7, 364-77, 401-20. London, 1888.
- Wright, G. E. *The Old Testament Against Its Environment*. London: SCM, 1950.
- Wright, N. T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- . *The New Testament and the People of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Wright, R. B. “Psalms of Solomon.” In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by J. H. Charlesworth, vol. 2. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- Yadin, Y. “The Dead Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews.” *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4 (1957): 36-55.
- Yarbrough, R. W. “Israel's Past in 1 John: Resources for Pan-Biblical Theology?” A Paper presented at ETS meeting in 2000, 2000.
- Yerkes, R. K. *Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism*. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1952.
- Yonge, C. D. *The Works of Philo*. Trans. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993.
- Young, E. J. *The Book of Isaiah*. 3 Vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973.
- . *An Introduction to the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949.

Ziegler, J. *Untersuchungen Zur Septuaginta Des Buches Isaias*. Münster: Aschendorffschen, 1934.

Zimmerli, W. “Παῖς Θεοῦ,” translated by G. W. Bromiley. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, vol. 5, 654-77. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.

———. *Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel Chapters 1-24*. Translated by R. E. Clements. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

VITA

Personal Information

Date of Birth: December 15, 1952

Marital Status: Married to Myungja You, May 2, 1978

Children: Eunjung Kim 1/23/78

Jay Jun Kim 12/24/82

Grandchild: Josiah Kim 5/1/2002

Ordination

Ordained by Christian & Missionary Alliance, 1994

Ecclesiastical membership

New Jersey Cornerstone Alliance Church, Fort Lee, New Jersey

Professional Experience

Associate Professor (Bible), Nyack College, New York, 1994-2003

Associate Professor (New Testament), Alliance Theological Seminary, New York, since 2003

Education

Earned Degrees

Ph. D. Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA, May 2003

Dissertation Title, "The Concept of Atonement in 1John"

M. Div., Alliance Theological Seminary, Nyack, New York, May 1993

B.A., Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea, September 1977