

Durham E-Theses

Christ as the Covenant: Justin Martyr's Interpretation of the New Covenant in Jeremiah 31.31-32

TOMITA, YUJI

How to cite:

TOMITA, YUJI (2012) *Christ as the Covenant: Justin Martyr's Interpretation of the New Covenant in Jeremiah 31.31-32*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online:
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/3433/>

Use policy

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

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

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

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Christ as the Covenant:

Justin Martyr's Interpretation of the New Covenant
in Jeremiah 31.31-32

Yuji Tomita

Abstract

This thesis attempts to reveal a neglected facet of Justin Martyr's idea of the new covenant (NC), with a focus on Justin's identification of the new covenant with Christ. It is an effort to seek its Jewish origins.

Justin's interpretation of the NC in Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 is indebted to an early liturgical tradition preserved in Luke 22 and 1 Corinthians 11. This interpretation of the NC as the Sacrament is linked with his identification of the NC with Christ, since Justin views the Eucharist as the embodiment of the divine Logos, which Justin considers to be equal to Christ. Justin's NC does not only refer to the Eucharist, but baptism as well. Although Justin's identification might have been partly influenced by the *Kerygma Petri*, which identifies the Law with the Lord, it is rather significantly influenced by the Jewish traditions.

This element in Justin's use of the NC is shaped by the textual/exegetical traditions of the OT/Hebrew Bible such as LXX, a Jewish recension (a καίε type/'Theodotion', or Aquila), and the PT tradition in its oral stage. Particularly, Justin detects the theme of the 'coming/going out of תורה/תורה' in Isaiah 2.3/51.4 and the Book of the Covenant—the context of the NC text of Jeremiah (30-31 [37-38])—with his knowledge of a Hebraizing reading of Jeremiah 30.19 attested in the version of Aquila; Justin's juxtaposition of these verses in *Dialogue* 11 and 24 indicates that he views תורה in Isaiah 2.3 and 51.4 as identical with תורה/εὐαγγέλιον in Jeremiah 30.19. Moreover, Justin learned the Midrashic tradition on the water of Marah, which involves Jewish metaphors of 'tree (of life)' and 'water' as the Torah, orally from the early PT tradition. Justin's knowledge of this Midrashic tradition, together with his recognition of LXX Jeremiah 11.19 which associates 'tree' with 'bread', and LXX Exodus 23.25 which juxtaposes 'bread, water, and wine', has facilitated his identification of Christ with the new Law/covenant, namely the Sacraments. The identification of the messianic symbol of 'ruler's staff' with the 'covenant of kingship' in 4Q252 strengthens our view that Justin's identification of the NC with Christ is rooted in Jewish traditions, since in *Dialogue* 86, Justin also associates 'sceptre/rod' with the 'tree of life', which is the new Law/covenant and Christ.

The findings of this thesis have an implication on the scholarly view of Justin's use of the testimony sources. This study confirms the fact that Justin's OT texts are often quoted from secondary sources. As far as his use of Jeremiah 31.31-32 and his OT citations in *Dialogue* 86 are concerned, however, his combinations and alterations of the biblical texts are related to his theological view of the NC, so that they may indicate Justin's reworking of the OT/source material; the influence of contemporary Jewish traditions can be traced even in the upper layer of Justin's source material.

Contents

<i>Abstract</i>	2
<i>Contents</i>	3
 INTRODUCTION	 8
A. Topic	8
B. Preceding studies 1: Justin's notion of the new covenant	8
1. Scarce attention given to the idea of covenant	8
2. Everett Ferguson	9
3. Knut Backhaus	12
4. Directions for further studies on Justin's notion of the new covenant	13
C. Preceding studies 2: Jewish influence on Justin	15
1. Parallels between Jewish sources and Justin	15
2. Jewish traditions of the Hebrew Bible	16
3. Testimony hypotheses	19
4. Directions for further studies on Jewish influence on Justin's OT interpretation	22
D. Objectives	22
E. Scope and methods	23
F. Some clarifications	25
 PART ONE	
<u>EARLY CHRISTIAN NOTIONS OF THE NEW COVENANT</u>	<u>29</u>
 <u>Chapter I. Jeremiah's new covenant before the time of Justin</u>	<u>30</u>
A. Introduction	30
B. New Testament documents	32
1. Synoptic accounts of the Last Supper	32
a. Mark 14.22-24 and Matthew 26.26-28	33
b. Luke 22.15-20	36
2. Pauline epistles	39
a. 1 Corinthians 11.23-26	40

b. 2 Corinthians 3.1-6	41
c. Romans 11.26-27	44
3. The Letter to the Hebrews	47
B. Apostolic Fathers	50
1. <i>The Shepherd of Hermas</i>	50
2. <i>The Epistle of Barnabas</i>	52
C. The <i>Kerygma Petri</i> (KP)	56
D. Concluding remarks	58
 <u>Chapter II. Preliminary observations of Justin's notion of the new covenant</u>	 61
A. Introduction	61
B. Absence of διαθήκη in the <i>Apologies</i>	63
C. Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 in the <i>Dialogue</i>	65
1. <i>Dialogue</i> 11-12	65
2. <i>Dialogue</i> 22	67
D. Justin's usage of διαθήκη	71
E. Early Christian influence on Justin's notion of the new covenant	74
1. Influence of NT documents	74
2. Justin and the Apostolic Fathers	76
3. Justin's possible contact with KP	78
a. KP fr. 5 and <i>Dialogue</i> 67.9	78
b. Identification of Law with Lord in KP fr. 1	80
F. Concluding remarks	82
 <u>Chapter III. The new covenant in early Fathers after the time of Justin</u>	 84
A. Introduction	84
B. Irenaeus	85
1. Διαθήκη/ <i>Testamentum</i>	86
2. Jeremiah 31(38).31-34	87
3. Summary	89
C. Tertullian	90
1. <i>Testamentum</i>	90

2. Jeremiah 31(38).31-34	92
3. Summary	94
D. Clement of Alexandria	95
1. Διαθήκη	95
2. Jeremiah 31(38).31-34	98
3. Summary	100
E. Concluding remarks	101

PART TWO
THREE PASSAGES OF THE OT/HEBREW BIBLE
IN DIFFERENT TRADITION 103

<u>Chapter IV. Jeremiah 30-31 (37-38)</u>	<u>106</u>
A. Introduction	106
B. Two texts of Jeremiah	106
C. Jeremiah 30-31 (MT)	109
D. LXX translation of ברית	112
E. LXX Jeremiah 37-38	117
F. 'Theodotion' and Aquila	123
1. Barthélemy's <i>Devanicers d'Aquila</i>	123
2. Book of the covenant in θ' and α' Jeremiah	126
G. Tg Jeremiah 30-31	128
H. Influence of Jeremiah 30-31 (37-38) on Justin Martyr	134
I. Justin's use of the metaphors of 'tree' and 'water'	138
1. Justin's use of the metaphor of 'tree'	140
a. 'Tree' as true Israel	140
b. Pauline use of 'tree'	142
c. Fusion of Pauline metaphor and Midrashic traditions	144
d. Further Jewish influence on Justin's use of 'tree'	146
e. 'Tree' as Eucharistic element	150
f. Sacraments as channels of mysterious power	151
2. Justin's use of the metaphor of 'water'	153
3. Justin's source of the metaphors of 'tree' and 'water'	156

J. Concluding remarks	159
 <u>Chapter V. Exodus 19-24</u>	 163
A. Introduction	163
B. The Masoretic Text	163
C. The Septuagint	166
D. ‘Theodotion’ and Aquila	172
E. Aramaic Targums	173
1. Common features	173
2. <i>Targum Psuedo-Jonathan</i>	179
3. <i>Targum Neofiti I</i>	181
F. Exodus 19-24 in Justin Martyr	183
1. Exodus 23.20-21 in <i>Dialogue</i> 75	184
2. Exodus 19.21; 24.17 in <i>Dialogue</i> 127-128	186
3. King and priest (Exod 19.6)	189
4. Bread, wine and water (LXX Exod 23.25)	190
5. Justin’s use of ‘blood’	191
G. Concluding remarks	197
 <u>Chapter VI. Genesis 17</u>	 201
A. Introduction	201
B. The Masoretic Text	201
C. The Septuagint	204
D. Genesis 17 in Justin Martyr	205
1. ‘Father of many nations’ (Gen 17.4b)	206
2. Justin’s polemic against circumcision	208
E. Concluding remarks	209
 PART THREE	
<u>JEWISH SOURCES IN THE SECOND TEMPLE PERIOD</u>	<u>211</u>
 <u>Chapter VII. <i>Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum</i> and 4Q252 V</u>	 213
A. Introduction	213

B. <i>Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum</i>	213
C. ‘Ruler’s staff’ in 4Q252 V	218
D. Concluding remarks	222
<u>Excursus: Philo of Alexandria</u>	<u>223</u>
 <u>CONCLUSION</u>	 <u>229</u>
A. Results	229
B. Implications	236
C. For further enquiries	239
 <i>Appendix:</i>	
<u><i>Early Christian usages of διαθήκη/testamentum</i></u>	<u>239</u>
1. Classification of διαθήκη in Justin Martyr	239
2. Classification of διαθήκη/testamentum in Irenaeus	240
3. Classification of testamentum in Tertullian	241
4. Classification of διαθήκη in Clement of Alexandria	242
 <i>Abbreviations</i>	 245
<i>Bibliography</i>	253

INTRODUCTION

A. Topic

The topic of this thesis is Justin Martyr's interpretation of the new covenant (NC) in Jeremiah 31.31-32. It will focus on the identification of the NC with Christ (e.g. *Dial.* 11-12; 24.1-2). This identification in the *Dialogue with Trypho* has Jewish backgrounds. This contribution to the study of the history of Christian biblical interpretations will explain why Justin used the phrase NC derived from the OT text in this way, and how this exegetical phenomenon was shaped not only by early Christian traditions, but by Jewish traditions as well.

B. Preceding studies 1: Justin's notion of the new covenant

1. Scarce attention given to the idea of covenant

This undertaking is justified because no study has been done particularly on Justin's interpretation of the NC of Jeremiah.¹ Even the idea of the covenant as held by Justin Martyr has received little scholarly attention. Everett Ferguson in his pioneering essay, 'The Covenant Idea in the Second Century', published in 1980, discusses this lack of attention:

There have been a number of important studies of the covenant idea in the Bible, and there have been studies of the covenant as articulated in the Middle Ages and Reformation. Thus far, however, I have found no monograph on this important theological idea dealing with patristic literature.²

¹ T. G. Stylianopoulos has recognised Justin's identification of Christ with the new Law/covenant, but he does not go further to ask why Justin made this identification: *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975), 73, 81. In this study, I use the phrase 'Justin's interpretation of the NC' often as interchangeable with the phrase 'Justin's notion of the NC', since they are closely related to each other in Justin's thought.

² E. Ferguson, 'The Covenant Idea in the Second Century', in M. Eugene (ed.), *Texts and Testaments* (San Antonio: Trinity University, 1980), 135.

In fact, the notable attention given to the subject of early Christian use of διαθήκη, including Justin's use of the term, has come from scholars discussing the origin of the title of the NT.³

2. Everett Ferguson

Ferguson's study, 'The Covenant Idea in the Second Century', shares a common interest with preceding studies concerning the title of the NT.⁴ But its primary purpose is to recognise 'the way the concept of covenant functioned in the writings of second- and early third-century authors'.⁵ By expanding the scope of the study to the theological concept of the covenant and its function in the theological debates, Ferguson has demonstrated that the significance of διαθήκη in early Christian use is not limited to the title of the NT and its pre-history.

In his essay, Ferguson delineates the process of the development of the second-century Christian idea of the covenant. The term was first used in the defence of

³ This issue had been addressed by Th. Zahn's monumental study on the NT canon. According to him, the naming of the NT as καινή διαθήκη is a late development and the result of a misunderstanding: *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, vol. 1; *Das Neue Testament vor Origenes*, 1st half (Erlangen: Andreas Deichert, 1888-92), 85-111, cited in W. Kinzig, 'Καὶνὴ Διαθήκη: The Title of the New Testament in the Second and Third Centuries', *JTS* 45 (1994), 520. Harnack, by admitting that καινή διαθήκη for the title is developed later, sought an origin in the Pauline dichotomy of the Law and the Gospel that corresponds to the old covenant and the new. In his view, however, it was not until the Montanist crisis that the main-stream churches held the idea that the coming of Christ and the works of the apostles completed the covenant: *Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments und die wichtigsten Folgen der neuen Schöpfung* (Leipzig, 1914), 10ff., cited in W. van Unnik, 'Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη - a Problem in the Early History of the Canon', in *SP* 4, part 2 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961), 215-16. Harnack's view comes under the scrutiny of van Unnik. His study focuses on Irenaeus: in his refutation against Gnosticism and Marcion, Irenaeus used the concept of the covenant for his defence of the OT Scriptures which the Gnostics and Marcion had rejected; at the same time, van Unnik thinks that Irenaeus' concept of the covenant was also rooted in the Jewish-Christian debates, as demonstrated in Justin's *Dialogue*: van Unnik, 'Καὶνὴ Διαθήκη', 226. Acknowledging Irenaeus' role, von Campenhausen points out that Irenaeus' concept originated from Asia Minor; hence like Harnack, von Campenhausen seems to regard the Montanist crisis as an important factor in subsequent promotion of καινή διαθήκη as the title of the Scriptures: *The Formation of the Christian Bible*, trans. J. Baker (London: A&C Black, 1972), 264-68. In reply to van Unnik and von Campenhausen, Kinzig argues that the use of καινή διαθήκη as the title of the NT canon is rooted in Marcion: 'Καὶνὴ Διαθήκη', 519-44.

⁴ Ferguson, 'Covenant', 151.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 135-36.

Christian belief against the Jews (as, for example, in *Barnabas* and Justin's *Dialogue*). It then emerged as an important concept in the orthodox response that Irenaeus made against the Gnostics and the Marcionites. According to Ferguson, Irenaeus developed Justin's idea of the covenant further towards the subsequent identification of the old and new covenants with the OT and NT Scriptures.⁶

Ferguson understands Justin's idea of the covenant primarily as a category linked with Justin's view of salvation history. His understanding is articulated in the passage below:

Justin's view of salvation-history was in the tradition of Paul and Luke, although without explicit use of their writing. For Justin the covenant was an important category for interpreting God's saving plan as it related to Jews and Christians.⁷

Ferguson underscores that Justin derived his covenant interpretation of the salvation history from the 'tradition of Paul and Luke'. This phrase 'tradition of Paul and Luke' could refer to the liturgical tradition reflected in 1 Corinthians 11 and Luke 22. The reference is however to the 'tradition of Paul and Luke', not the 'liturgical tradition of Paul and Luke', and the phrase reflects Ferguson's assumption that the Pauline and Lukan use of the phrase 'new covenant' is anchored to the Law/Gospel dichotomy held by the apostle Paul (e.g. 2 Cor 3).⁸ Ferguson seems to assume that this dichotomy is also reflected in the Lukan use of the NC in the Last Supper account (Luke 22.20), and the phrase 'tradition of Paul and Luke' seems to be used from this perspective. Ferguson therefore understands the Pauline and Lukan idea of the NC primarily as the salvation historical concept.

⁶ Ferguson, 'Covenant', 139, 145, 147.

⁷ Ibid., 139.

⁸ Or the dichotomy of the 'Mosaic and Christian dispensations': ibid., 136.

Thirteen years later, Ferguson published another essay entitled ‘Justin Martyr on Jews, Christians, and Covenant’, which focuses on Justin’s idea of the covenant.⁹ In this essay, Ferguson repeats his view of Justin regarding the two covenants.¹⁰ He also reiterates how the idea of the covenant functioned in the theological debates of the second century:

Where the sense of proximity to Judaism was strong, as with the Ebionites, or where the sense of alienation was strong, as with Marcion and the Gnostics, covenant was not an important word Covenant was an important concept where Christians wanted to maintain both a significant continuity and a significant discontinuity with their Jewish heritage.¹¹

To put it in another way, the view which has prevailed in the development of Christian ideas of the covenant is identified in the middle ground of the two extremes. Ferguson thinks that this course of development was built upon Justin’s idea of the two covenants.¹²

To summarize, Ferguson views Justin’s idea of the NC primarily in terms of the salvation-historical category. He considers this idea to be rooted in the Law/Gospel dichotomy held by the apostle Paul and Luke. This dichotomy is developed by Justin in the theological debates with the two extremes—Jews and the Marcionites. His idea of the covenant is forged further in the next generations, and it eventually came to be used as the title of the two-part Christian Scriptures. In Ferguson’s view, the covenant was an important theological concept among Christians who sought to maintain both continuity and discontinuity with Jewish heritage.

⁹ E. Ferguson, ‘Justin Martyr on Jews, Christians and the Covenant’, in F. Manns (ed.), *Early Christianity in Context* (Jerusalem: Franciscan, 1993), 395-405.

¹⁰ Ferguson, ‘Covenant’, 140-41; idem., ‘Justin’, 397-98.

¹¹ Ibid., 401. The same remark is made in Ferguson, ‘Covenant’, 144.

¹² Ferguson describes Irenaeus as the successor and elaborator of Justin’s view: ‘Justin’, 398-402.

3. Knut Backhaus

After Ferguson's two essays, a few contributions have been made on Justin Martyr's concept of the covenant.¹³ Among them, Knut Backhaus' study deserves attention.¹⁴ Although this study focuses on the covenant in the Letter to the Hebrews, it extends its scope to Justin Martyr's *Dialogue* as a helpful comparison with Hebrews.

Backhaus argues that Justin's notion of the NC was much influenced by its presentation in Hebrews. He identifies significant parallels between Justin and Hebrews.¹⁵ Backhaus thinks that an association of new Law/covenant with 'Zion' in *Dialogue* 24.1 should be attributed to Hebrews 12.22-24. Moreover, he finds an allusion to Hebrews 8.13 in Justin's argument that the Mosaic Law became obsolete (*Dial.* 11.2).¹⁶ In this respect, Backhaus points out a correspondence between the salvation-historical concept of διαθήκη in Hebrews and that of Justin, although he admits that Justin further developed the concept as it is given in Hebrews.¹⁷ According to Backhaus, Justin developed the covenant idea of

¹³ W. McKane has reviewed the 2nd-century Christian use of the Old and New Covenant (Testament) out of his interest in the origin of the titles of the Scriptures: in his brief discussion on Justin Martyr, he rightly points out that Justin never used the NC as the title of the NT books; he also acknowledges that Justin's use of the NC is principally related to Jeremiah 31.31: 'Old and New Covenant (Testament): A Terminological Enquiry', in *Understanding Poets and Prophets* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 227-35. J. L. Duncan has submitted his doctoral dissertation to Edinburgh University under the title of *The Covenant Idea in Ante-Nicene Theology* (Ph.D. thesis submitted to New College, University of Edinburgh, 1995). He gives a brief description of Justin Martyr's idea of the covenant in the section dedicated to the Apostolic Fathers (mainly *Barn*) and Apologists: Duncan, *Covenant Idea*, 88-100. This study, which is motivated by the concerns of Reformed theology, focuses on Melito of Sardis, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Hippolytus of Rome. His purpose is to establish a common feature in the covenant theology of the Ante-Nicene fathers. Like Ferguson ('Covenant', 138), Duncan thinks that the quotation of Isa 42:6-7 in *Barn.* 14.7 indicates *Barnabas'* identification of the covenant with Christ: *Covenant Idea*, 96.

¹⁴ K. Backhaus, *Der neue Bund und das Werden der Kirche* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1996).

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 319-320. For example, Backhaus points out that both Heb and Justin quote Psa 110.4 (LXX 109.4) and that both view Melchizedek as a type of Christ.

¹⁶ Backhaus, *Bund*, 320.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 312.

Hebrews to the form in which it was adopted by Irenaeus of Lyon and Tertullian, and eventually received by the ‘great church’ through them.¹⁸

Backhaus therefore agrees with Ferguson when he views Justin’s concept of the covenant as belonging to the salvation-historical/dispensational category. He also emphasises that Justin played a pivotal role in transmitting the NT covenant idea to subsequent generations. In Backhaus’ view, however, it is neither the apostle Paul nor Luke, but the author of Hebrews to whom Justin owes the greatest debt.

4. Directions for further study on Justin’s notion of the new covenant

Our brief review of the preceding studies on Justin’s concept of the NC provides us with the followings directions for a further inquiry.

(1) In the previous studies, scholars have seen Justin’s idea of the NC primarily as a salvation-historical/dispensational concept. Based on this view, Ferguson identifies its root in the Pauline Law/Gospel dichotomy in 2 Corinthians 3, whereas Backhaus rather argues that Justin’s concept was deeply influenced by the Letter to the Hebrews. Yet the previous studies have paid less attention to the possible influence of the use of the phrase NC transmitted through the early liturgical tradition which is retained in 1 Corinthians and Luke. Thus a further study examining the possibility of Justin’s dependence on the early Christian idea of the NC as expressed in the liturgical tradition may bring a better understanding to the origins of this term in his works.

(2) Previous studies of early Christian ideas of the covenant seem to be less attentive to Justin’s identification of the NC with Christ. This identification is not explicit in the NT documents and the Apostolic Fathers.¹⁹ If one seeks to

¹⁸ Backhaus, *Bund*, 315-24.

¹⁹ Ferguson and Duncun argue that the quotation of Isa 42:6-7 in *Barn.* 14.7 indicates *Barnabas*’ identification of the covenant with Christ: Ferguson, ‘Covenant’, 138; Duncun, ‘Ante-Nicene Theology’, 96.

understand this element in Justin's covenant idea, one should ask this question: Under whose, or what, influence did Justin establish this identification? This question needs to be investigated further.

(3) The studies of Justin's idea of the NC do not seem to have paid as much regard to early Jewish background of Justin's notion of the covenant as they should. Although the *Dialogue* was written in the days when the tension between Jews and Christians was high, the two groups nevertheless had many theological traditions in common.²⁰ Thankfully, we now have the benefit of excellent surveys done on Jewish-Christian relations in the first two centuries to further our understanding in this area. James Dunn's recent revision of *The Partings of the Ways* has reinforced our understanding of the history of the earliest Christianity, not as a sudden departure from the Jewish matrix, but as a lengthy process of several turning points, which may even be traced in the second century. Writing on the period that covers Justin's lifetime, Stephen Wilson has shown that in the middle of the second century, the partition between Judaism and Christianity was not as stable as we may have thought, and that all Christian groups would have felt their 'proximity with Judaism' in the period.²¹

In view of the recent development in the study of second-century Jewish Christian relations, it is likely that Justin's biblical interpretations were related to the contemporary biblical exegeses then current among both Jewish and Christian groups. It is possible that some elements of his interpretation of the NC in Jeremiah may have come from Jewish textual/exegetical traditions. It is therefore important that a further investigation of Justin's notion of the NC extend its scope to Jewish traditions, with which Justin may have been familiar.

²⁰ J. D. G. Dunn, *The Partings of the Ways*, 2nd edn. (London: SCM, 2006), xviii-xxiv.

²¹ S. Wilson, *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians 70-170 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995). This study is undertaken on the basis of the 'partings of the way' model. Some scholars, however, seek to establish another paradigm: J. Carleton Paget, *Jews, Christians and Jewish Christians in Antiquity*, WUNT 251 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 1-39.

D. Preceding studies 2: Jewish influence on Justin

1. *Parallels between Jewish sources and Justin*

The above observations by no means imply that scholars have neglected the issue of Jewish influence on Justin's OT exegesis.²² Justin's knowledge of Jewish traditions preserved in the Rabbinic sources has been well recognised by modern scholars.²³ In 1873, for example, A. H. Goldfahn had already investigated the parallels between Justin and the Rabbinic sources.²⁴ In his English translation of the *Dialogue*, A. Lukyn Williams added more findings in the footnotes of his text.²⁵ Drawing mainly on Goldfahn's pioneering work and Williams' translation, Willis A. Shotwell provides a list of those parallels; he also argues that Justin adopted Rabbinic exegetical methods.²⁶ Jack P. Lewis has also recognised the Jewish influence on Justin; he suspects Justin's contact with Jewish Rabbis.²⁷ Parallels between Jewish exegetical traditions and Justin's OT material are also pointed out by William Horbury in his essay first read in Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium held in 1989.²⁸ In his study comparing Justin's *Dialogue* and *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Yishmael*, Marc Hirshman acknowledges Justin's contacts

²² Scholars have acknowledged parallels between Philo of Alexandria and Justin, although these parallels are not decisive enough to show Justin's use of Philo's works. Cf. W. A. Shotwell, *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr* (London: SPCK, 1965), 41-46, 93-113; D. Runia, 'Philo and the Early Christian Fathers', in A. Kamesar, *The Cambridge Companion to Philo* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009), 214. See also 'Excursus: Philo of Alexandria', pp. 223-28.

²³ Justin knew Jewish sects, religious practices, and exegetical traditions: Barnard, *Justin*, 39-52.

²⁴ 'Justinus Martyr und die Agada', *Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 22 (1873), 49-60, 104-115, 145-153, 193-202, 257-269, cited in Skarsaune, *Proof*, 248-49.

²⁵ A. L. Williams (trans.), *Justin Martyr, the Dialogue with Trypho* (London: SPCK, 1930). Cf. Skarsaune, *Proof*, 248.

²⁶ Shotwell, *Exegesis*, 71-93.

²⁷ J. Lewis, *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 181. Some scholars argue that Trypho, Justin's opponent of the dialogue, was a real figure, who was in fact identical with the Rabbi Tarphon; this identification seems to be first made by Th. Zahn ('Studien zu Justinus Martyr', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 8 [1885-86]: 1-84): cf. Falls & Halton, *Dial.*, xii-xiii. It is dismissed by Barnard: *Justin*, 24-25; cf. Schürer, *History*, 2:378-79.

²⁸ W. Horbury, 'Jewish-Christian Relations in Barnabas and Justin Martyr', *Jews and Christians: In Contact and Controversy* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 151-52.

with Rabbinic exegetical traditions.²⁹ In view of such a wide recognition of Justin's knowledge of Jewish traditions preserved in early strata of Rabbinic sources, there seems to be no reason to doubt that Justin may have learned Jewish exegetical traditions from his dialogues with other Jews (*Dial.* 50.1).

2. Jewish traditions of the Hebrew Bible

In addition to many parallels with Rabbinic sources, scholars have recognised that some quotations of the OT in Justin testify to his use of the Scriptural texts transmitted among the Jews. Just as he borrowed Jewish traditions preserved in the early strata of the Rabbinic sources to defend his arguments, Justin seems to have intentionally used the textual traditions of the Scriptures then being circulated among the Jews, in order to make his discussions more effective in his dialogue(s) with them.³⁰ In *Dialogue* 131.1, Justin quotes both from a certain Jewish Scriptural text of Deuteronomy 32.7-9³¹ and from LXX Deuteronomy 32.8; to his opponents, he expresses his confidence in his argument, by saying that he has quoted their (Jewish) 'exegesis' (ἐξήγησιν), since both texts (LXX and a Jewish recension) are able to prove point. Justin's use of the term 'exegesis', which identifies a certain (Jewish) scriptural text with Jewish exegesis, reveals his understanding that the interpretive traditions are often inseparable from the textual ones.³² Thus, his use of the Jewish Scriptural traditions should be recognised as a part of his exegetical practices.

²⁹ M. Hirshman, *A Rivalry of Genius* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996), 55-66. He considers Justin's knowledge of Rabbinic exegetical traditions to be 'unimpressive'.

³⁰ I assume that the *Dialogue with Trypho* was based on Justin's real contacts with certain Jews, even though he would have later embellished their details. M. Hirshman rejects the historicity of the dialogues: 'Polemic Literary Units in the Classical Midrashim and Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*', *JQR* 83 (1993), 383.

³¹ Justin's text of Deut 32.8 concurs with θ' and α': Sibinga, *Text*, 99. It also shows similarities with *I Cl.* 29.2: Skarsaune, *Proof*, 189.

³² In *Dial.* 71.2, Justin uses the plural of ἐξηγήσεις to describe the LXX translations. Thus ἐξηγήσεις in Justin may also indicate that the LXX translations were regarded as the interpretations of the Hebrew original texts.

The research history of the non-LXX, Hebraizing features of Justin's OT quotations goes back to the first half of the nineteenth century. As early as in 1838, K. A. Credner recognised the features, asserting that Justin's quotations were authentic.³³ Even after the publication of his monograph, the divergent sections were often attributed to scribal revisions³⁴ or early Christian interpolations to LXX.³⁵ Dominique Barthélemy's study of the Minor Prophets Scroll discovered at Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr) marked a turning point.³⁶ A comparison of Justin's text with the newly discovered Greek version led him to conclude that the sections assimilated to proto-MT reflect Justin's use of the Palestinian Jewish recensions of LXX, such as 8ḤevXIIgr, although Barthélemy still suspected that the copyists might sometimes have glossed them with the LXX texts.³⁷ The report of this discovery is incorporated into *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, in which Barthélemy extended his investigation to the sections of the Minor Prophets not preserved in 8ḤevXIIgr. He supposes that assimilations to MT represent Justin's dependence on the Jewish recension. His conclusions regarding Justin's reliance on the Jewish recension attested by 8ḤevXIIgr have gained wide scholarly support.³⁸

³³ *Beiträge zur Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften*, vol. 2: *Das alttestamentlich Urevangelium* (Halle, 1838), cited in Skarsaune, *Proof*, 17-18. Credner attributed the Hebraizing readings to early Jewish-Christian revisers of LXX before Justin.

³⁴ E. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889), 188, 192.

³⁵ That is, the interpolations to the LXX texts that would have been used by Justin. P. Katz, 'Justin's Old Testament Quotations and the Greek Dodekapropheton Scroll', in SP 1, part 1 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957), 343-44; A. Rahlfs, 'Über Theodotion-Lesarten im Neuen Testament und Aquila-Lesarten bei Justin', *ZNW* 20 (1921), 198-99.

³⁶ The discovery of the scroll is first reported in D. Barthélemy, 'Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante', *RB* 60 (1953), 18-29. Based on palaeographic examination, E. Tov estimates 8ḤevXIIgr to have been written in the later 1st century BCE: C. H. Roberts allows a dating as late as c. 50 CE: E. Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahar Hever (8ḤevXIIgr)*, DJD 8 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 26.

³⁷ Barthélemy also thinks that Justin used Christian testimony sources as well as the OT citations in the NT documents: *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, VTSup 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 212.

³⁸ Its importance was already recognised by P. Katz in his 1955 paper presented in the 2nd Patristic Conference at Oxford: 'Justin's OT Quotations', 343-353. P. Prigent admits Justin's reliance on 8ḤevXIIgr in some sections: *Justin et l'Ancien Testament* (Paris: Gabalda, 1964), 143-44, 289. Skarsaune acknowledges its positive impact; he also admits Justin's use of the κατὰ recension for his quotation of Zech 2:14-3:2: *Proof*, 18-20, 74. In his recent essay on

Justin's use of Jewish Scriptural traditions may have been extended even to the Aramaic Targums. Perhaps inspired by Barthélemy's discovery, Joost Simit Sibinga embarked on a study which compares Justin's OT quotations with ancient versions including LXX, Jewish recensions, and the Aramaic Targums. In the comparisons, Sibinga notes that Justin's texts show sometimes resemblances to the Targumic sources.³⁹ Recently, C. T. R. Hayward hints that Justin knew Jewish exegetical traditions now included in the Aramaic Targums regarding Jacob's change of name to Israel.⁴⁰

Of course, those who are sceptical about Justin's command of the Semitic languages will object to my supposition that Justin had contact with the Targumic traditions in their oral stage. These scholars deny Justin's proficiency in Hebrew, and they seem to imply that Justin never had access to any sources written or spoken in the Semitic languages.⁴¹ Yet such scepticism neglects the possibility of him having knowledge of the local language(s) which surrounded him in his youth living in a Samaritan town near Shechem.⁴²

LXX, M. Hengel confirms Barthélemy's conclusion: *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture*, trans. M. E. Biddle (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001), 29.

³⁹ Sibinga, *Text*, 37, 135-36.

⁴⁰ Hayward, *Interpretations*, 336-42.

⁴¹ For example, D. Aune, 'Justin Martyr's Use of the Old Testament', *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* 9 (1966), 182; Barnard, *Justin*, 43; D. Rokéah, *Justin Martyr and the Jews* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 20-21. Their arguments, however, are inconclusive. For the evidence of Justin's ignorance of the Semitic language(s), Barnard and Rokéah point out Justin's reliance on the LXX texts where MT preserves different readings. Moreover, Rokéah attributes Justin's knowledge of the Hebrew etymologies to the lost work of Aristo of Pella (*Disputation between Jason and Papiscus*). Rokéah's attribution of Justin's knowledge of the Hebrew etymologies to Aristo of Pella, however, raises more questions than it solves. Rokéah's judgment seems to be dependent on Skarsaune's theory that one of the Jewish Christian testimony sources used by Justin was identical with *Disputation*, the fragments or remnants of which may be preserved in later Christian documents: Rokéah, *Justin*, 21 with n. 6; Skarsaune, *Proof*, 234-42. In his recent essay, W. Rutherford expresses his scepticism on Skarsaune's association of the 'recapitulation source' with this lost title: 'Altercatio Jasonis et Papisci as a Testimony Source for Justin's "Second God" Argument?', in Parvis and Foster, *Justin*, 137-44. In view of the limitation of our knowledge of *Disputation*, it is very difficult to establish Justin's contact with Aristo of Pella. Sceptics therefore have not yet convincingly disproven Justin's proficiency of the Semitic languages.

⁴² Hayward, *Interpretations*, 337-38.

3. Testimony hypotheses

In view of the correspondences of the OT texts seen in *I Apology* and the *Dialogue*,⁴³ some scholars think that the non-LXX readings in Justin's OT material require further explanation. Together with Justin's apparently haphazard selections of the OT passages, those scholars attribute them to his use of certain *testimonia* (testimony sources).⁴⁴

Rendel Harris was the first to articulate the testimony hypothesis in early Christian literature. Based on his observations of the NT and early Christian use of the OT, he proposed 'the hypothesis that a collection of "messianic proof-texts" was compiled at a very early date'.⁴⁵ His theory of early Christian use of a certain testimony source was adopted by some of the subsequent studies of OT quotations in early Christian literature.⁴⁶

This approach is systematically applied to the study of Justin's use of the OT by Pierre Prigent.⁴⁷ Based on his observations of the corresponding OT texts found

⁴³ That is, the common clusters of OT citations and the correspondences in the non-LXX readings in the OT texts between *I Apol.* and *Dial.*, in spite of Justin's high regard for the LXX translations of the OT: *I Apol.* 31; *Dial.* 71.1.

⁴⁴ For example, Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 212; H. Chadwick, 'Justin Martyr's Defence of Christianity', *BJRL* 47 (1964), 281; Shotwell, *Exegesis*, 67-69; W. Frend, 'Old Testament in the Age of the Greek Apologists, AD 130-180', *SJT* 26 (1973), 144. *Testimonia* is the 'systematic collections of citations' from the OT. In early Christian literature, Cyprian's *Testimonia* is the earliest surviving document of this kind (Cyprian, *Ad Quirinum*, CCSL 3:1-179): *EEC*, 821. A fragment of the Qumran scrolls (4QTest) is also a witness of this literary genre in the Second Temple period: G. J. Brooke, 'Testimonia', *ABD* 6:391-92.

⁴⁵ R. Harris, *Testimonies*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1916-20), cited in C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (London: Nisbet, 1952), 23-24. This theory assumes that if two early Christian documents show the same divergence from the Scriptural text (LXX), there exists a common testimony source behind the two. In addition, it also assumes that an apparently faulty attribution of the verse of Malachi to Isaiah in Mark 1.2-3 indicates Mark's use of a testimony source.

⁴⁶ For example, C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (London: Nisbet, 1952); M. Albl, 'And Scripture Cannot Be Broken', *NovTSup* 46 (Leiden Brill, 1999).

⁴⁷ Prior to Prigent's study, attempts to recognise the common testimony source(s) behind *I Apol.* and *Dial.* have been made by A. F. von Ungern-Sternberg, W. Bousset, F. M.-M. Sagnard, and H. Koester. Among them, W. Bousset's theory of *Schriftbeweistractate* (tract used in a school setting) has been influential: *Jüdisch-Christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom, Literarische Untersuchungen zu Philo und Clement von Alexandria, Justin und Irenaeus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1915), 282-308; cf. Skarsaune, *Proof*, 135-37.

in *1 Apology* and the *Dialogue*, he has proposed his theory that Justin's OT material in *1 Apology* and the *Dialogue* is derived from the now lost treatise of Justin's *Syntagma*.⁴⁸ Prigent's theory, however, seems to be unsuccessful in gaining wide scholarly support.⁴⁹

The application of the testimony hypothesis to Justin's use of the OT sees its culmination in Oskar Skarsaune's erudite work, *The Proof from Prophecy*.⁵⁰ Skarsaune concludes that Justin's long quotations are taken from LXX, whereas his shorter quotations are mainly from two testimony sources: one is called the 'kerygma source', and the other is the 'recapitulation source'.⁵¹ In terms of their formats, Skarsaune regards Bousset's proposal as commendable;⁵² Bousset has supposed that Justin's OT texts in *1 Apology* and the *Dialogue* would have been often quoted from the *Traktate* for the lectures read in Justin's school.⁵³ Further elaborating this proposal, Skarsaune attempts to uncover the layers underneath Justin's testimony sources. For the 'recapitulation source', Skarsaune conjectures it to be roughly identical with *Disputation between Jason and Papiscus* by Aristo of Pella;⁵⁴ concerning the 'kerygma source', Skarsaune points out the parallels between this testimony source and Jewish-Christian documents such as the *Anabathmoi Jacobou* in the pseudo-Clementine homilies and the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*.⁵⁵ Based on these findings, Skarsaune concludes that Justin's

⁴⁸ Prigent, *Justin*, 319. I have also consulted E. J. Crowley's review in *CBQ* 27 (1965), 431-32; R. M. Grant's review in *JTS* 17 (1966), 167-70. See also Skarsaune, *Proof*, 3-5. Justin's *Syntagma* is now lost, but it seems to be mentioned in *1 Apol.* 26: *EEC*, 463. The treatise against Marcion mentioned in Irenaeus, *AH*, 4.6.2; *HE* 4.11.8 might be identical with this *Syntagma*: cf. *DECL*, 357.

⁴⁹ M. Slusser, 'Justin Scholarship: Trends and Trajectories', in Parvis and Foster, *Justin*, 15.
⁵⁰ *NovTSup* 56 (Leiden: Brill, 1987).

⁵¹ Skarsaune, *Proof*, 228-42. He reiterated his testimony hypothesis in his 'Jewish Christian Sources Used by Justin Martyr and Some Other Greek and Latin Fathers', in O. Skarsaune and R. Hvalvik (eds.), *Jewish Believers in Jesus* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007), 379-416.

⁵² Skarsaune, *Proof*, 425. Regarding the 'kerygma' source (the hypothetical testimony source named by Skarsaune), see *ibid.*, 234.

⁵³ Bousset, *Schulbetrieb*, 299. Cf. Skarsaune, *Proof*, 136.

⁵⁴ Skarsaune, *Proof*, 234-42. Cf. Rutherford, 'Altercatio', 138, 206 n. 9.

⁵⁵ Skarsaune, *Proof*, 252-55. Cf. Slusser, 'Scholarship', in Parvis and Foster, *Justin*, 16.

testimony sources originated from a Jewish Christian community in Palestine.⁵⁶ The parallels between Justin's OT texts and the Targumic sources are therefore used as the evidence of Justin's reliance on Jewish Christian testimony sources.⁵⁷

In many respects, my own study has benefitted greatly from the information contained in Skarsaune's work. No subsequent study has surpassed his thorough analysis of OT material in Justin. Nonetheless, Skarsaune's works have still left room for further investigations. Even though Skarsaune has attempted to cover nearly all the OT texts in Justin's works in order to suggest their possible origins, he admits that in one passage at least, he is unable to give any suggestion.⁵⁸ His study also focus on identifying the Jewish Christian testimony sources which Justin received from his predecessors, but he seems to be less attentive to Justin's reworking of the OT/source material.

In this respect, our supposition that Justin may have had access to the Targumic traditions provides more possibilities for his sources, and help us to understand his exegetical practices. The Targumic traditions are the mine of information for the Jewish exegetical traditions. With the subtle changes and expansions of the Hebrew texts, which often associate one biblical passage with others, the Targumists reveal covert messages in the Scriptural texts and their relevant

⁵⁶ Skarsaune, *Proof*, 245-47, 371-374. He admits that Justin's conversion may have taken place in Syrian-Antioch.

⁵⁷ Skarsaune, *Proof*, 29; idem., 'Sources', 383. He seems to propose the following profile of Justin: after his philosophical pilgrimage (*Dial.* 3-8), Justin first joined a Jewish Christian group in Palestine; he later moved to Ephesus and subsequently opened his school at Rome. In Skarsaune's view, it would be later that Justin became a 'main-line' theologian. Recent studies however give more options regarding the provenance of his sources. In his monograph, Carlton Paget suggests that we must be prepared to accept the existence of Jewish Christianities, not the single, monolithic Jewish Christianity that existed in Palestine: J. Carleton Paget, 'Jewish Christianity', in *The Early Roman Period*, CHJ 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999), 741. D. Boyarin even refuses to use the phrase 'Jewish Christianity': 'Rethinking Jewish Christianity: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category (to Which Is Appended a Correction of My *Border Lines*)', *JQR* 99 (2009), 7-36. Some scholars who continue using this category allow the possibility that Justin had contact with Jewish Christian groups, not only in Palestine, but also in Ephesus, and even in Rome: Wilson, *Related Strangers*, 258-84; J. Marcus, 'Jewish Christianity', in *Origins to Constantine*, Cambridge History of Christianity 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006), 98.

⁵⁸ *Dial.* 86: Skarsaune, *Proof*, 374.

applications to their audiences. What modern scholars commonly attribute to his reliance on certain testimony sources may rather be due to the fact that Justin himself knew such Jewish exegetical traditions and practices, and put them into use in his own works.

4. Directions for further study on Jewish influence on Justin's OT interpretation

Preceding studies concerning Jewish influence on Justin's use of the OT suggest that there is a need to examine not only the LXX texts, but also MT, and some recensions, such as those of 'Theodotion', and Aquila,⁵⁹ if we are to obtain greater awareness of Justin's source material. Attention should also be given to the extant Aramaic Targums, since they may have preserved readings and interpretations available in Justin's time.⁶⁰

A further study, moreover, may attempt to explain his exegetical practices, not by attributing them immediately to certain testimony traditions, but by attempting to understand Justin's own theological motives. This by no means rejects any of Justin's possible uses of certain testimony sources, but a further study should pay more attention to Justin's reworking of the source material, so that we may have a better understanding of Justin as an exegete.

D. Objectives

Following the directions indicated in the preceding studies surveyed above, this study seeks to attain two objectives. First it seeks to elucidate a neglected aspect of Justin's notion of the NC, which is rooted in the early liturgical tradition. Prior studies view Justin's NC primarily as a salvation-historical/dispensational concept, but his understanding of the NC may not be limited to this. This study will

⁵⁹ For the dates of θ' and α' , see ch. 4 'Jeremiah 30-31 (37-38)', pp. 123, n. 342.

⁶⁰ For the developments and the documentations of *Tgs* (*Jon*, *Ps-Jon*, *Neof*, *Onq*), see ch. 4 'Jeremiah 30-31 (37-38)', p. 128-29, n. 364; ch. 5 'Exodus 19-24', p. 173, nn. 478-80.

attempt to show that his notion of the NC is also related to his view of the Eucharist and Christian baptism.

Second, this study attempts to demonstrate that Justin's notion of the NC, especially his identification of the NC with Christ, has a Jewish background. The identification of the NC with Christ is not made very frequently, but it is not an isolated phenomenon in early Christian literature. To recognize it, this study attempts to locate this identification in the context of the ideas of the covenant and the interpretations of the NC text in the first- and second-century Christian literature. Following the observations of the Christian sources, this study seeks to establish that Justin's notion of the NC is not only shaped by early Christian traditions, but also by Jewish textual and exegetical traditions—some of which are later preserved in the Targumic sources.

E. Scope and methods

To attain the objectives set above, in line with the directions clarified with our review of the previous studies, this study first locates Justin's use of the NC of Jeremiah 31(38).31 in the context of the first- and second-century Christian literature.

Chapter 1 establishes the conditions prior to Justin, by examining early Christian quotations of or allusions to the NC of Jeremiah in the documents before the time of Justin; namely, some texts of the NT (the accounts of the Last Supper in the synoptic Gospels, the Pauline letters, and the Letter to the Hebrews), of the *Shepherd of Hermas*, of the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and a fragment of the *Kerygma Petri*.

Chapter 2 presents a preliminary overview of Justin's use of Jeremiah 31.31-32 and the term διαθήκη. It attempts to show that Justin's notion of the NC is rooted in the early Christian liturgical tradition as recorded in Luke 22 and 1 Corinthians 11, by analysing his use of Jeremiah 31.31-32 in the *Dialogue*. This analysis

suggests that Justin's frequent combinations of two or more Scriptural texts may reflect his theological intentions. The chapter also shows that the new Law/covenant is clearly identified with Christ in the *Dialogue*.

Chapter 3 investigates early fathers after the time of Justin. Using the method of word study, this chapter investigates early Christian use of διαθήκη/*testamentum* in Irenaeus, followed by the word studies on the same term in Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria. These word studies are complemented with the examinations of their references to Jeremiah 31(38).31-34.

Part two provides an analysis of three OT passages (Jer 30-31 [37-38]; Exod 19-24; Gen 17) in different traditions. These chapters are very important texts for the biblical idea(s) of the covenant, but the reason for the choice of Exodus 19-24 and Genesis 17 demands an explanation. Exodus 19-24 is chosen, because Justin's notion of the NC seems to be rooted in an early Christian liturgical tradition. For early practice of the Eucharist, Exodus 19-24, especially chapter 24 would have provided an important OT background. Exodus 19-24 is also relevant to our enquiry because it is the passage of the Sinai covenant, which is discussed in antithesis to the NC by Justin. Such a polarization may not necessarily follow the distance of the Scriptural traditions of the Sinai covenant from Justin's notion of the NC, but it may provide us some clues to help us better understand the NC in Justin. For a similar reason, this chapter includes an examination of Genesis 17—the most important biblical text for the Jewish practice of the covenant of circumcision; Justin's argument for Christian baptism is partly derived from this passage.

To clarify points of comparison, chapter 4-6 begins with a reading of MT. As a matter of course, MT represents a medieval Jewish tradition of the Hebrew Bible, which includes some elements that would have been unknown to the ancient

audience,⁶¹ but it may still serve as a basis upon which to recognise the Hebraizing readings in the recensions of the Greek Scriptures (the versions of Theodotion and Aquila) and Justin; it may also help us to recognise various elements attributed to the LXX translators as well as to the Targumists. The study of MT is followed by our examination of LXX, which would have been the most important OT source for Justin's interpretation. For the chapters on Jeremiah 30-31 (37-38) and Exodus 19-24, we include the recensions of 'Theodotion' and Aquila, and the Aramaic Targums in our scope.

In part three (chapter 7), we examine two Jewish sources in the Second Temple period: *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (LAB) and a Qumran text (4Q252), since exegetical traditions in these Jewish documents may be related to Justin's interpretation of the NC in Jeremiah 31.31-32 and his notion of the NC.⁶²

F. Some clarifications

Before we proceed to chapter 1, it is necessary to clarify some of the terms/phrases that I use in this study. It would also be desirable to note, at the beginning, the critical editions, the translations, and the indices that I have constantly used.⁶³

For the proper names of the Jewish and Christian documents and authors not listed in *The JBL Handbook of Style*,⁶⁴ this study normally adopts the spellings of

⁶¹ Cf. M. J. Mulder, 'The Transmission of the Biblical Text', idem., and H. Sysling (eds.), *Mikra* (Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1988), 87-113; E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 2nd edn. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 22-71.

⁶² Justin seems to have known a Midrashic tradition which is also found in LAB. 4Q252 includes a fragment in which an identification of 'covenant' with a messianic figure is found (4Q252). Philo of Alexandria will be discussed in 'Excursus', pp. 223-28.

⁶³ See also the list of *Abbreviations*, pp. 245-49.

⁶⁴ Edited by P. H. Alexander, et al. (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999).

*The Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion*⁶⁵ and *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*.⁶⁶

Regarding the titles of the Scriptures, I use the Old Testament to refer roughly to the books that are included in most MSS of the Septuagint (LXX).⁶⁷ When it is necessary to refer specifically to the Old Testament approved as the canonical Scripture among the orthodox Jews and some Christian traditions, I use the Hebrew Bible. In this study, the NT includes the NT writings of the Western Christian canon. In addition, this study considers the Palestinian Targum (PT) tradition to be better reflected in *Ps-Jon*, *Neof*, *Frg Tgs*, and *CG* than in *Onq*.

To indicate the chapter-verse numbers of the OT/Hebrew Bible and the NT, I normally conform to the number system adopted by NRSV. When it is necessary, the chapter-verse numbers are indicated according to the critical editions of MT (BHS), LXX, and the Aramaic Targums. Sometimes, lower-case letters may be added to verse numbers: in the Hebrew Bible, any clauses before *Atnah* are designated with ‘a’ while any coming after are marked with ‘b’. This division in the verses of the Hebrew Bible is normally carried on in the corresponding verse of LXX.

For the translation of Justin’s works, I have produced my own based on the editions of Marcovich; for the *Dialogue*. I have frequently consulted ETs by Williams,⁶⁸ Falls & Halton for the *Dialogue*,⁶⁹ and ET by Barnard for *1 and 2 Apologies*.⁷⁰ For keyword searches of early Jewish and early Christian documents

⁶⁵ Edited by R. J. Z. Werblowsky and G. Wigoder (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997). The transliterations of the guttural consonants (‘ , ‘) may be omitted.

⁶⁶ 3rd edn., edited by F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone (Oxford: Oxford UP), 1997.

⁶⁷ Technically, the original LXX version included the Greek translation of Torah/Pentateuch only, but I follow the conventional use of the name Septuagint (LXX).

⁶⁸ A. L. Williams (trans.), *Justin Martyr: The Dialogue with Trypho* (London: S.P.C.K., 1930).

⁶⁹ T. B. Falls (trans.), *St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho*, rev. T. P. Halton, ed. M. Slusser (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2003).

⁷⁰ L. W. Barnard (trans.), *St. Justin Martyr: The First and Second Apologies*, ACW 56 (New York: Paulist, 1997).

written in Greek, I have used the *TLG (Thesaurus Linguae Graecae)* digital library.⁷¹

For the text of the Hebrew Bible, I use BHS.⁷² For the texts of LXX, I use the Göttingen edition.⁷³ For the Greek NT, I draw on the 27th edition of Nestle-Aland.⁷⁴ For the translations of the OT/Hebrew Bible and the NT, I quote from NRSV, although I sometimes produce my own. Translations of LXX, ‘Theodotion’, and Aquila are mine unless otherwise noted.⁷⁵ For the critical edition of the Aramaic Targums, I consult the edition by Clarke, Aufrecht, Hurd and Spitzer for *Ps-Jon*,⁷⁶ the edition by Díez Macho for *Neof*,⁷⁷ the edition by Sperber for *Onq, Jon*, and *Tgs* of the Writings.⁷⁸ For the translations of the Aramaic Targums, I quote from the Aramaic Bible series.⁷⁹

Finally, a few remarks on style and punctuation are in order. For the quotations from the primary sources, I normally retained the punctuations and the parentheses/brackets in the critical editions/translations. Yet I have often added my own emphases. The Italics in the quotations of LXX, α' , θ' , and the *Tgs* indicate the texts that are different from MT. The texts of the original languages and the chapter-verse numbers of the Scriptures may be inserted in parentheses to the quotations; in Justin’s texts, the Roman numerals inserted in parentheses indicate the verse numbers of the Scriptural texts quoted by Justin. In the

⁷¹ [Http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/inst/fontsel](http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/inst/fontsel), accessed May 2006 through June 2011.

⁷² K. Ellinger and W. Rudolph (eds.), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, 4th edn. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1990).

⁷³ Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum, Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931-).

⁷⁴ K. Aland, et al. (eds.), *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th edn. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Biblegesellschaft, 1993). For the key word(s) search of the Scriptures, I have used the Bible database soft ware (*BibleWorks 6; Accordance 5.6.1*) based on BHS, Rahlfs’s LXX, and NA²⁷.

⁷⁵ For ET of LXX, I have frequently consulted L. Brenton (trans.), *The English Translation of the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament* (London, 1851).

⁷⁶ E. G. Clarke, et al. (eds.), *Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance* (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav Publishing House, 1984).

⁷⁷ A. Díez Macho (ed.), *Neofiti 1: Targum Palestinense MS de la Bibliotheca Vaticana*, 5 vols (Madrid-Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968-1978).

⁷⁸ A. Sperber (ed.), *The Bible in Aramaic*, 4 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1959-1968).

⁷⁹ M. McNamara, et al. (eds.), *The Aramaic Bible*, 19 vols. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987-2004).

Aramaic texts, square brackets may be used to show orthographic variations. The square brackets with an asterisk (i.e. [*...]) in quotations from the primary sources indicates my insertions for the sake of clarification.⁸⁰

⁸⁰ For style, this study normally conforms to R. M. Ritter (ed.), *Oxford Style Manual* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003).

PART ONE

EARLY CHRISTIAN NOTIONS OF THE NEW COVENANT

The first three chapters attempt to locate Justin's use of Jeremiah 31.31-32 and his notion of the NC in the context of the first- and second-century Christian literature.

Chapter 1 considers the use of the NC text of Jeremiah 31(38).31-34 before the time of Justin, which is attested in some of the NT texts (the accounts of the Last Supper, 2 Corinthians 3, and Hebrews 8 and 10), the *Shepherd of Hermas*, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and the *Kerygma Petri*. Chapter 2 provides preliminary observations of Justin's use of Jeremiah 31.31-32 and his usage of διαθήκη, in order to gain an understanding of Justin's perception of the NC. In chapter 3, the investigation turns to the usage of διαθήκη/*testamentum* and the use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-34 among early fathers after the time of Justin.

Through the discussions of part 1, we seek to explain how Justin's notion of the NC is shaped by early Christian traditions, and to recognize Justin's interpretation of the NC of Jeremiah against the background of the second-century Christian literature.

Chapter I

Jeremiah's new covenant before the time of Justin:

The NT, the Apostolic Fathers, and the *Kerygma Petri*

A. Introduction

The purpose of the present chapter is to examine antecedent Christian traditions that may have shaped Justin Martyr's interpretation of the NC in Jeremiah 31(38).31-32.⁸¹

Justin demonstrates a significant dependence on some of the NT writings in composing his treatises.⁸² Contact with the synoptic Gospels is evident,⁸³ as well

⁸¹ Justin Martyr is estimated to have been born c. 100 CE and died a martyr c. 165 CE; modern scholars accept three treatises (*1 & 2 Apols.*, *Dial.*) as Justin's authentic works: Barnard, *Justin*, 14-26; *ODCC*, 920-21; *DECL*, 356-57; *EEC*, 462-63. *1 Apol.* seems to have been written somewhere between 150 and 155 CE, and the composition of *2 Apol.* seems to have followed shortly. For *1 Apol.*, R. M. Grant proposes a slightly later date (155-157 CE): *Greek Apologists of the Second Century* (London: SCM, 1988), 52-53. The date of *Dial.* is estimated to have been sometime between 155 and 161 CE: Barnard, *Justin*, 23-24; idem., *1 & 2 Apol.*, 11-12. Some scholars estimate the date of *Dial.* to be c. 150-55 CE during his stay in Palestine: Falls & Halton, *Dial.*, xii.

⁸² For the text-critical issues (e.g. dates, names, text types of MSS), I have consulted K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 2nd edn. trans. E. F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989); B. M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 3rd edn. (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992). The abbreviations adopted in the critical apparatus of NA²⁷ may be used in this study, but clarifications are given if necessary. For Justin's dependence on the NT and other early Christian sources, see Barnard, *Justin*, 53-66; E. Osborn, *Justin Martyr* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1973), 120-38; É. Massaux and A. J. Bellinzoni, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus*, book 3; *the Apologists and the Didache*, trans. N. J. Belval and S. Hecht, *New Gospel Studies* 5/3 (Macon, GA: Mercer UP, 1993 [the French edn. is published in 1986]), 10-109; Skarsaune, *Proof*, 92-113; idem., 'Justin and His Bible', in Parvis and Foster, *Justin*, 53-76.

⁸³ Among the Synoptic Gospels, Justin most often uses Matt: Skarsaune, *Proof*, 100; Massaux and Bellinzoni, *Influence*, 10-45, 49-89. Justin seems to mention Mark (a memoir of the apostle Peter) in *Dial.* 106.3, although Massaux identifies no literary influence of Mark in Justin: Massaux and Bellinzoni, *Influence*, 90. Justin seems to have used the third Gospel in his description of the baptism of Christ in *Dial.* 88.4: B. D. Ehrman, 'The Use and Significance of Patristic Evidence for Textual Criticism', in *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 250 n. 9. Scholarly opinions are divided on Justin's use of the Johannine traditions (the Gospel of John). Skarsaune surmises a contact with the source(s) of John's OT material and Justin's testimony source(s): *Proof*, 105-06. Some commentators of John may emphasise that no significant trace of the fourth Gospel is found in early Christian literature before Irenaeus (cf. R. Brown, *The Gospel According to John [I-XII]*, AB [New York: Doubleday, 1966], LXXXI; J. F. McHugh, *A Critical and Exegetical*

as some of the Pauline writings, and other epistles, notably the Letter to the Hebrews.⁸⁴ For this reason, it is necessary to examine the use of the NC text of Jeremiah 31.31-34 among these NT books.

Justin might have been in conversation with other early Christian documents, which are now included in the corpus of the Apostolic Fathers.⁸⁵ In addition, a fragment of the *Kerygma Petri* (KP), which includes a quotation of Jeremiah 31.31-32, is also important for consideration.⁸⁶ In the sections that follow, these documents will be discussed in the order mentioned above.

Commentary on John 1-4, ICC [London: T&T Clark, 2009], 1-3), but G. H. Stanton ('The Fourfold Gospels', *NTS* 43 [1997], 330) and C. E. Hill ('Was John's Gospel among Justin's Apostolic Memoirs?', in Parvis and Foster, *Justin*, 88-94) acknowledge Justin's contact with the Gospel of John. Likewise, the opinions are divided on Justin's use of the four canonical Gospels in the codex form. Stanton thinks it likely ('Fourfold Gospels', 317-46), whereas L. Hurtado has a reservation on this: *The First Christian Artefacts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), cited in Skarsaune, 'Justin and His Bible', 54, 180 n. 8. Justin may have known extra-canonical Gospels and/or oral traditions. He could have paved the way for the harmonized Gospel (*Diatessaron*) later produced by Tatian; Osborn and Grant even claim that Justin already used one: Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, 125-31; Grant, *Greek Apologists*, 58. However, the plural form of 'memoir' (τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν: *Dial.* 103.8) suggests Justin's use of the plural Gospels: Stanton, 'Fourfold Gospels', 330-32.

⁸⁴ In this study, the Pauline epistles include Rom, Gal, 1 & 2 Cor, 1 Thess, Phil, Philem. Besides Rom and Gal, Justin may also have used 1 Cor, Phil, 1 Thess: Skarsaune, 'Justin and His Bible', 74, 187 n. 95. Among the letters attributed to Paul, Justin used Eph, and he may have known 2 Thess and Col (Skarsaune, *Proof*, 92-99); the authenticity of these letters is now questioned: L. T. Johnson, *The Writings of the New Testament: An Interpretation*, rev. edn. (London: SCM, 1999), 271; D. G. Horrell, *An Introduction to the Study of Paul* (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 126-28. Among the Catholic Epistles, Justin seems to have known Heb; besides, Justin may have known 1 Pet, James, and 1 John. Justin knew Rev; he may also have known Acts: Skarsaune, *Proof*, 104-07; idem., 'Justin and His Bible', 75. It is difficult to judge to what degree Justin considered these writings authoritative as to bind his interpretations of the OT texts. Interestingly, some of the OT texts in Justin are quoted from NT writings: Skarsaune, *Proof*, 92-113. At the same time, Justin exercised freedom in interpreting the OT texts already used by the NT authors. For Justin's alteration of the Pauline arguments, see R. Werline, 'The Transformation of Pauline Arguments in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*', *HTR* 92 (1999), 79-93.

⁸⁵ In this study, the corpus of the Apostolic Fathers is the documents included in A. Lindemann and H. Paulsen (eds.), *Die Apostolischen Väter* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1992). For the texts and ET of the Apostolic Fathers, I have used Ehrman, *AF*.

⁸⁶ To our concern, Aristides of Athens is peripheral. His *Apology*, addressed to the emperor Hadrian, is estimated to have been written in 124-25 CE; it may have undergone a redaction in the mid 2nd century: B. Pouderon and M.-J. Pierre (eds. & trans.), *Aristide: Apologie*, SC 470 (Paris: Cerf, 2003), 37. The Armenian version of *Apology* was discovered in 1878; 11 years later, a complete Syriac translation was found in St. Catherine's Monastery on Mt Sinai: J.

B. New Testament documents

The phrase ‘new covenant’ (καινή διαθήκη) does not occur often in the NT.⁸⁷ It appears three times in the Letter to the Hebrews (8.8, 13; 9.15),⁸⁸ but rarely outside this letter. Allusions to Jeremiah 31.31 are also found in the Lukan and Pauline Eucharistic formulae (Luke 22.20 and 1 Cor 11.25) and in 2 Corinthians 3.6.⁸⁹

The purpose of this section is to make enough observations to compare the NT use of the NC in Jeremiah with Justin’s and to identify the elements that may have influenced his understanding of the NC. In order to achieve this goal, this section will first investigate the synoptic accounts of the Last Supper (Mark 14.22-24; Matt 26.26-28; Luke 22.15-20), followed by an examination of the Pauline use of the NC of Jeremiah in 1 Corinthians 11.23-26, 2 Corinthians 3.1-6. An examination will also be made of Romans 11.25-29. Finally, the NC of Jeremiah in the Letter to the Hebrews will be discussed in the last sub-division.

1. Synoptic accounts of the Last Supper

In the synoptic accounts of the Last Supper, the phrase NC is unique to Luke.⁹⁰ However, it is necessary to first examine the Markan and the Matthean accounts for two reasons: (1) they provide points of comparison with the accounts of the

Quasten, *Patrology* (Utrecht: Spectrum, 1950), 1:192. Aristides’ possible reference to LXX Jer 38.33-34 in *Apology XV* (Aristides, *Apologie*, 234-37), which may also be taken as allusion to other OT texts, is insignificant, since it does not provide an enough clue to recognize Aristides’ notion of the NC.

⁸⁷ It occurs in Luke 22.20; 1 Cor 11.25; 2 Cor 3.6; Heb 8.6; 9.15. For the NT use of διαθήκη, see J. Behm, ‘Διαθήκη D’, *TDNT* 2:129-34; H. Hegemann, ‘Διαθήκη’, *EDNT* 1:299-301; BDAG, 228-29; K. Backhaus, ‘Bund III’, *RGG*⁴ 1:1865-67. Except in Gal 3.15(-18) and Heb 9.16-17, where διαθήκη seems to mean ‘will/testament’, the NT usage of the term is significantly influenced by its occurrences in LXX: BDAG, 228; S. E. Porter, ‘The Concept of the Covenant in Paul’, in idem. and de Roo, *Concept*, 275-79.

⁸⁸ Heb 8.8 is a quotation of Jer 31(38).31.

⁸⁹ These NT occurrences of καινή διαθήκη are significant, when considered in light of traditions circulating in the Second Temple period. The phrase NC occurs only in the *Damascus Document* and the *Peshar on Habakkuk* (1QpHab). Cf. S. Lehne, *The New Covenant in Hebrews*, JSNTSup 44 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 35-61; T. R. Blanton, *Constructing a New Covenant*, WUNT² 233 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 71-75.

⁹⁰ The index of NA²⁷ lists Mark 14.24 and Matt 26.28 as the verses that refer to Jer 31(38).31.

Last Supper in Luke and 1 Corinthians as well as Justin's Eucharistic formula in *I Apology* 66;⁹¹ (2) Justin seems to have known both the Matthean account of the Last Supper and the liturgical tradition preserved in Luke.⁹²

a. Mark 14.22-24 and Matthew 26.26-28

The accounts of the Last Supper in the Gospels of Mark⁹³ and Matthew⁹⁴ can be discussed together since they have much in common. A relevant passage of the Markan account of the Last Supper is as follows:

(22) While they were eating, he took a loaf of bread, and after blessing it he broke it, gave it to them, and said, 'Take; this is my body.' (23) Then he took a cup, and after giving thanks he gave it to them, and all of them drank from it.

⁹¹ This study does not ask which account is the closest witness to the historical event or what are the original words spoken or the actions taken by Jesus in the Last Supper. The discussion is not structured according to the chronological order. The Markan text may retain earlier elements than those preserved in the Pauline and Lukan accounts: J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, trans. N. Perrin (London: SCM, 1966), 164. The Lukan and Pauline accounts may testify to elements older than those of Mark: cf. P. F. Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004), 1-2.

⁹² See the discussion in ch. 2 'Preliminary observations of Justin's notion of the new covenant', p. 64 with n. 185.

⁹³ According to Papias (*HE* 3.39.15), the second Gospel was written by Mark, the interpreter of Peter, who was likely identical with John Mark of Acts 12.12, 25; 15.37. Strictly speaking, Mark's association with Peter is not established and some scholars consider the author of the second Gospel to remain anonymous. The date of authorship is estimated to be 60-80 CE. The provenance of this Gospel is also uncertain. It might have been written in Rome, addressed to the audience in the city; some scholars suggest its Syrian origin. Cf. C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St Mark* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1959), 3-9; D. J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew*, SaPag 1 (Collegeville, MI: Liturgical Press, 1991), 8-10; M. D. Hooker, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St Mark* (London: A&C Black, 1991), 5-8; P. J. Achtemeier, 'Mark, Gospel of', *ABD* 4:542-45; U. Schnelle, *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings*, trans. M. E. Boring (London: SCM, 1998), 199-206; P. J. Achtemeier, J. B. Green, and M. M. Thompson, *Introducing the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 143-46; M. E. Boring, *Mark: A Commentary* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 14-21.

⁹⁴ Based on a testimony of Papias (*HE* 3.39.16), the author of this Gospel is traditionally identified with Matthew—one of the twelve disciples of Jesus, who was a tax collector in Galilee (Mark 2.13-14; Mat 9.9), but some scholars reject this identification. Since Matt would be dependent on Mark, it would be composed after c. 70 CE. The *terminus ad quem* is set by the letters of Ignatius (written c. 110-115 CE), who knew this Gospel. His witness may suggest a Syrian provenance. Cf. J. P. Meier, 'Matthew, Gospel of', *ABD* 4:622-27; Harrington, *Matthew*, 1-16; Schnelle, *History and Theology*, 199-206; U. Luz, *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*, trans. J. E. Courch (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 45-60.

(24) He said to them, ‘This is my blood of the covenant (τὸ αἶμά μου τῆς διαθήκης),⁹⁵ which is poured out for many. (25) 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 14.22-24)⁹⁶

The text below is a portion of the Matthean account:

(26) While they were eating, **Jesus** took a loaf of bread, and after blessing it he broke it, gave it to the **disciples**, and said, ‘Take, **eat**; this is my body.’

(27) Then he took a cup, and after giving thanks he gave it to them, **saying**, ‘**Drink from it, all of you**; (28) **for** this is my blood of the covenant,⁹⁷ which is poured out for many **for the forgiveness of sins** (εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν). I tell you, I will never again drink of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new **with you in my Father's** kingdom.’ (Matt 26.26-29)⁹⁸

Five observations from the passages above may be in order.

⁹⁵ A (Codex Alexandrinus), *f*^{1, 13} (the minuscule MSS groups 1 and 13), the Majority text, and ancient versions (Vulg. and some MSS of the Old Latin, all Syriac MSS, some Coptic MSS) testify to τὸ αἶμά μου τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης.

⁹⁶ The underlined texts indicate the readings absent in Matt 26.26-28.

⁹⁷ The variant reading τὸ αἶμά μου [τὸ] τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης is attested in A, C (Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus), D (Codex Bezae), W (Codex Freerianus), *f*^{1, 13} and the Majority text, ancient versions (most MSS of the Old Latin and Vulg., Syriac, Sahidic, and Boharic) and Irenaeus. The NA²⁷ reading has better supports including Papyri^{37, 45}, *κ* (Codex Sinaiticus), B (Codex Vaticanus).

⁹⁸ The bold texts indicate the texts unique to Matt. Matt is different from Mark in two respects. (1) In Mark, on the one hand, the word for the cup is given after the drinking of wine (Mark 14.23-24); in Matt, on the other hand, the word precedes the drinking. (2) The Matthean phrase ‘for the forgiveness of sins’ is absent in Mark; it alludes to the OT texts concerning the remissions of sins (such as Lev 4.20, 26, 35; 5.6, 10, 13; 19.22; Isa 55.7), and it is also similar to an element of the proclamation of Jesus and the earliest church (Matt 9.2; Mark 2.5; Acts 2.38; 5.31; 10.43). It is of course debatable how much degree the original speeches were retained in Acts: cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, AB 31 (New York: Double Day, 1998), 103-08; B. Witherington, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 46-49.

(1) Correspondences between Mark and Matthew indicate either their reliance on a common liturgical tradition, or Matthew's dependence on Mark.⁹⁹ If they are dependent on a common liturgical tradition, it would be likely transmitted separately from another tradition witnessed by Luke and Paul.

(2) Mark and Matthew depict the Last Supper as a Jewish Passover meal (Mark 14.12-17; Matt 26.17-20).¹⁰⁰ As such, they interpret the ancient event of the Passover (Exod 12) as a prefiguration of the sufferings of Jesus, which is symbolized in the Last Supper. Moreover, they may view the blood of the Paschal lamb as a type of the blood of Christ.

(3) In both Mark and Matthew, the Eucharistic element of bread is presented as the body of Christ. Whenever the Eucharistic formula is recited and the elements are partaken in these traditions, the phrase 'This is my body', together with his word for the cup, not only recalls Christ's death on the cross, but also his presence at the table as well as in the Eucharistic elements.

(4) The phrase 'blood of the covenant' in Mark 14.24 and Matthew 26.28 alludes to the blood used at the conclusion of the Sinai covenant in Exodus 24.8-11. At the people's consent, Moses sprinkled the blood of sacrificial animals over them. After this sprinkling, the representatives of Israel went up to the mountain to see the God of Israel, and to partake of the banquet in the divine presence. By using this phrase, Mark and Matthew associate the suffering of Christ commemorated in the Lord's Supper, with the conclusion of the Sinai covenant and the covenant meal in Exodus 24. Thus Mark and Matthew compare the series of the Exodus

⁹⁹ Most scholars accept the Markan priority of the Synoptic Gospels. For a summary of the discussions on the synoptic problem, see C. M. Tuckett, 'Synoptic Problem', *ABD* 6:264-68; Achtemeier, Green, and Thompson, *New Testament*, 69-73.

¹⁰⁰ For the defence of the Synoptic Last Supper as the Passover meal, see Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 15-88.

events that culminated at the conclusion of the Sinai covenant with the redemption achieved by the sufferings of Christ.¹⁰¹

(5) Jesus' vow of abstinence bears an eschatological overtone. The Markan and the Matthean accounts of the Last Supper envisage that the time of the eschatological banquet, which is prefigured in the Last/Lord's Supper, is yet to come.

To summarize: in the accounts of Mark and Matthew, the Last Supper is depicted as an addition to the Jewish Passover meal; just as the Jewish people practised the Passover to remember their ancestors' salvation from Egypt, Christians practised the Eucharist to recount the sacrificial death of Christ. The words for the bread suggest the presence of Christ, whereas the words for the cup reveal a typological correspondence between the blood of Christ with the redemptive merit and the blood used in the covenant conclusion at Sinai (Exod 24.8). The Eucharist is comparable with the covenant meal before the divine presence in Exodus 24.11. It also anticipates the future messianic banquet.

b. Luke 22.15-20

The words for the Eucharistic elements in the Lukan Eucharistic formula¹⁰² are similar to the Pauline version, and it seems likely that they are derived from a

¹⁰¹ The argument for the presence of Jer 31(38).31 in Mark and Matt (e.g. C. A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, WBC 34B [Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001], 392) is not convincing, since it does not explain why the authors, especially Matthew, would have not simply used the phrase NC if they indeed allude to Jer 31(38).31. The presence of Zech 9.11 is likely: cf. J. R. Donahue and D. J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Mark*, SaPag 2 (Collegeville, MI: Liturgical Press, 2002), 399.

¹⁰² Regarding the Gospel of Luke, most scholars accept the traditions from the 2nd century onward that testifies to Luke, the physician and companion of the apostle Paul (Phlm 24; Col 4.14), as the author of the third Gospel. Being dependent on Mark, Luke should be written after c. 70 CE. If Luke in his 30's was in company with Paul c. 50-60 CE, he may have written the third Gospel in his 70's; hence the *terminus ad quem* may be set c. 90 CE. The provenance is uncertain. Cf. I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1978), 33-34; L. T. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, SaPag 3 (Collegeville, MI: Liturgical Press, 1991), 2-3; F. Bovon, *Luke 1* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 8-10.

common source;¹⁰³ the Lukan formula seems to reflect a liturgical tradition transmitted separately from the Markan and Matthean formulae.

Before examining the Lukan account of the Last Supper, it is necessary to deal with one textual problem, since it is related to the presence of the phrase NC in this account. Codex Bezae and some MSS of the Old Latin testify to the shorter reading, which omits the text after the line ‘This is my body’. The phrase ‘new covenant’ appears in the text omitted in these Western texts.¹⁰⁴ If the shorter reading was the original,¹⁰⁵ it may not be appropriate to discuss the Lukan account of the Last Supper as the text that alludes to Jeremiah 31(38).31. In view of the strong textual supports, however, the longer text is likely original.¹⁰⁶ In the quotation below, the text omitted in the shorter reading is included in brackets:

(15) He said to them, ‘I have eagerly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer; (16) for I tell you, I will not eat it until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God.’ (17) Then he took a cup, and after giving thanks he said, ‘Take this and divide it among yourselves; (18) for I tell you that from now on I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes.’ (19) Then he took a loaf of bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and

¹⁰³ This tradition might have originated from Antioch: Bradshaw, *Origins*, 3.

¹⁰⁴ The shorter reading is attested only in D (Codex Bezae) and the Old Latin; Syr^c (the Old Syriac version) lacks v. 20.

¹⁰⁵ Westcott and Hort retained the longer reading in double brackets, suggesting it as an interpolation: B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort (eds.), *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (London: Macmillan, 1956 [the 1st edn. published 1885]), 177, 583.

¹⁰⁶ The text of NA²⁷ is supported by Papyrus⁷⁵, 8, B, and L. Cf. H. Chadwick, ‘The Shorter Text of Luke XXII. 15-20’, *HTR* 50 (1957), 249-58; Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 139-59; Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 148-50. Regarding the shorter reading, B. S. Billings attempts to show the environment of the scribe of Codex Bezae that might have necessitated to produce it: ‘The Disputed Words in the Lukan Institution Narrative (Luke 22.19b-20): A Sociological Answer to a Textual Problem’, *JBL* 125 (2006), 522-25. Jeremias gives an explanation of the way in which the shorter reading of the Western text was brought into the Syriac versions by Tatian: *Eucharistic Words*, 146-48. K. Petzer disclaims the argument for the shorter reading based on the style of Luke 22.19b-20: ‘Style and Text in the Lucan Narrative of the Institution of the Lord’s Supper (Luke 22.19b-20)’, *NTS* 37 (1991), 113-29. Ehrman and Bradshaw consider this issue not to be entirely settled yet: B. D. Ehrman, ‘The Cup, the Bread and the Salvific Effect of Jesus’ Death in Luke-Acts’, in *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 576-91; Bradshaw, *Origins*, 3-5.

gave it to them, saying, ‘This is my body[, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me (εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν).’ (20) And he did the same with the cup after supper, saying, ‘This cup that is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood].’ (Luke 22.15-20)¹⁰⁷

The Lukan account is in agreement with the Markan and Matthean accounts in two respects: (1) the Last Supper is also held as the Passover meal; (2) Jesus declares that the bread is his body, while his words for the cup include ‘covenant’ and ‘blood’ offered to establish the divine covenant; hence the Lukan account presents these elements as identified with Christ’s body and blood. These agreements seem to indicate that the synoptic accounts of the Last Supper are rooted in a common liturgical tradition.

At a certain stage, however, a tradition used in the Lukan account seems to have been further developed from the tradition retained in Mark and Matthew. This tradition may also be employed by the apostle Paul in 1 Corinthians 11, since the Lukan formula concurs with the Pauline formula in at least two respects. (1) The phrase ‘do this in remembrance of me’ occurs both in the Lukan and Pauline accounts (1 Cor 11.24-25); hence these two accounts clearly prompt their audience to repeat this practice regularly.¹⁰⁸ (2) The more important common feature in the Lukan and Pauline formulae is the presence of Jeremiah 31(38).31. The phrase ‘the new covenant in/with my blood’ (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη . . . ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι) clearly alludes to Jeremiah 31(38).31, highlighting the belief that the blood of Christ, symbolized by the Eucharistic element, fulfilled the prophecy of Jeremiah. Thus the tradition retained in the Lukan and the Pauline accounts

¹⁰⁷ The underlined texts indicate those absent in 1 Cor 11 regarding the words for the bread and the cup (Luke 22.19-20).

¹⁰⁸ J. Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, WBC 35C (Dallas: Word Books, 1993), 1042. This phrase is also used by Justin (*1 Apol.* 66.3; *Dial.* 41.1; 70.4).

indicate that the covenant established by the blood of Christ is the NC predicted by Jeremiah.¹⁰⁹

Moreover, the phrase ‘new covenant in/with my blood’ could be viewed as a conflation of Exodus 24.8 and Jeremiah 31(38).31. In the Lukan and Pauline tradition, however, Exodus 24.8 seems to be made obscure due to the introduction of the phrase NC. Rather, the phrase ‘in my blood’ may be related to Leviticus 17.14, where the abstinence from the blood is commanded since the blood represents the life itself. Hence the partaking of the blood of Christ might be viewed as equal to the partaking of the life of Christ.¹¹⁰

To summarize: the Lukan Last Supper account seems to reflect another liturgical tradition which is also used in 1 Corinthians 11. While it shows similarities with the Markan and Matthean accounts in its association of the Last Supper with the Passover meal and in the words for the elements, the tradition retained in Luke is characterized with its phrase ‘in remembrance of me’ and its reference to the NC in Jeremiah. In the liturgical tradition witnessed by Luke and Paul, the partaking of the blood of Christ might be equated with the receiving his life.

2. Pauline epistles

Recent studies of the Pauline epistles emphasise the Jewishness of Paul’s theology and its continuity with Jewish heritage.¹¹¹ The following observation is

¹⁰⁹ R. F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, SaPag 7 (Collegeville, MI: Liturgical Press, 1999), 433.

¹¹⁰ J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV)*, AB 28B (New York: Double Day, 1985), 1402. The Lukan account differs from the Pauline account in two respects. (1) Jesus’ vow of abstinence, which comes after the words for and the partaking of the bread and the cup in 1 Cor as in Mark and Matt, comes before the words for the bread and the cup; in Luke, moreover, Jesus vows his abstinence from the Passover meal (Luke 22.16, 18). (2) With this shift, the Lukan text may be divided in two parts: the first part (22.15-18) belongs to the Passover meal; the second part (22.19-20) is the institution of the Lord’s Supper: cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 801.

¹¹¹ Horrell, *Introduction*, 89. A significant shift is marked by E. P. Sanders’ *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (London: SCM, 1977). In this study, the Lutheran/Protestant understanding of the ‘justification by faith’ comes under scrutiny. Sanders argues that Paul’s soteriology should be described as ‘covenantal nomism’, which was almost ubiquitous in Jewish religious thoughts in the Second Temple period. Welcoming Sander’s reappraisal of

made in connection with the view that emphasises the continuity between the Jewish traditions and Pauline theology.¹¹²

a. 1 Corinthians 11.23-26

The Pauline Eucharistic formula in 1 Corinthians¹¹³ appears in the context in which the apostle deals with disorder in the communal meal at Corinth (1 Cor 11.23-26). He reiterated the liturgical tradition, which would have been repeatedly recited during his first stay in the church:

(23) For I received from the Lord what I also handed on to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took a loaf of bread, (24) and when he had given thanks, he broke it and said, ‘This is my body that is for you. Do this in remembrance of me.’ (25) In the same way he took the cup also, after supper, saying, ‘This cup is the new covenant in my blood (τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι). Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me (εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν). (26) For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes.’ (1 Cor 11.23-26)

The Pauline account of the Lord’s Supper contains some elements that are similar to the tradition of the Markan and Matthean accounts. For example, the order of

Pauline theology, J. Dunn still expresses discontent to Sanders’ position. Dunn’s ‘New Perspective’ on Pauline theology seeks to understand Paul’s teachings as more Jewish. In his essay ‘Two Covenants or One?’, Dunn argues that in spite of his use of the phrase NC Paul did not recognise the two covenants in dichotomy, but rather he supported only one covenant: ‘Two Covenants or One?: The Interdependence of Jewish and Christian Identity’, in H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, and P. Schäfer (eds.), *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 97-122; Dunn, *Partings*, 339-65. According to Dunn, Paul interpreted the NC not as the replacement of the Sinai covenant, but as its renewal: *ibid.*, 360.

¹¹² For the better understanding of the Pauline notion of the covenant, it is necessary to examine such a term as δικαιοσύνη or ἐπαγγελία: cf. Porter, ‘Covenant in Paul’, 269-58. Such an undertaking is however beyond the scope of this study.

¹¹³ Based on the account of Acts 18.11-17, Paul’s first visit to Corinth is estimated to have taken place between 49 and 52 CE. As Paul’s journey recorded in Acts 18.18-19.22 roughly corresponds to the account of 1 Cor 16, this epistle seems to be composed 53-54 CE: C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London: A&C Black, 1968), 4-5; Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 23-24. J. Fitzmyer proposes a slightly later date of 56-57 CE: *1 Corinthians*, 42-48. The letter seems to be sent from Ephesus.

the words and the actions resembles that of the Matthean account. But the two common elements shared with the Lukan tradition stand out; the phrase ‘in remembrance of me’ and the presence of the NC in Jeremiah. As the apostle himself mentions in 1 Corinthians 11.23, his account of the Last Supper is derived from a tradition,¹¹⁴ which would also be known to Luke.

In summary, while the Pauline account of the Last Supper shows some resemblances with the Markan and Matthean accounts, it has two significant features also found in the Lukan account; (1) the phrase ‘in remembrance of me’ and (2) the presence of the NC in Jeremiah. They seem to indicate Paul’s dependence on the liturgical tradition known to Luke.

b. 2 Corinthians 3.1-6

In addition to the institution of the Lord’s Supper in 1 Corinthians, Paul uses *καινή διαθήκη* only once in 2 Corinthians 3.6,¹¹⁵ where the NC is used in a way distinct from that of 1 Corinthians 11.¹¹⁶ It appears in Paul’s defence of his apostleship in 2 Corinthians 2.14-3.18 to deal with the accusation raised by his opponents in the church of Corinth, who are called the ‘super-apostles’ (2 Cor 11.5; 12.11). They tried to discredit Paul’s apostleship by claiming that he carried

¹¹⁴ Paul’s claim may be understood as a statement that he guarantees the authenticity of the formula, which might be written in a style often used by Jewish teachers: Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 101, 187-88; I. H. Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord’s Supper* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1980), 32.

¹¹⁵ 2 Cor is estimated to be written c. 50-60 CE: H. D. Betz, ‘Corinthians, Second Epistle to the’, *ABD* 1:1151-52. The majority of scholars assume that the epistle is a compilation of Pauline letters/fragments, although there is no scholarly consensus on the partition(s) of this epistle: J. Lambrecht, *Second Corinthians*, SaPag 8 (Collegeville, MI: Liturgical Press, 1999), 7-9. V. P. Furnish suspects that ‘the painful letter’ (2 Cor 2.4) is recorded in 2 Cor 10-13, which is written slightly earlier than 2 Cor 1-9 (*II Corinthians*, AB 32A [New York: Doubleday, 1984], 30-48), while R. P. Martin argues that chs 10-13 were added after the composition of chs 1-9: *2 Corinthians*, WBC 40 (Waco: Word Books, 1986), xxxviii-xlvi. Some scholars go even further to assume that this epistle was a composite document, in which several Pauline writings were compiled by an editor: Blanton, *New Covenant*, 107-09. For the debate on the partition theories, see H. D. Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 3-27. Ever since the partition theory was first proposed, however, there has been a constant voice of arguments supporting the literary unity of 2 Cor: *ibid.*, 27-35.

¹¹⁶ It is arguable that the ministry of the NC in 2 Cor 3 encompasses the role of conducting the Sacraments, yet the roles performed by the ‘ministers of a new covenant’ in 2 Cor 3 seem to cover broader areas.

no letter of recommendation (2 Cor 3.1). The following passage (2 Cor 3.1-6) is Paul's reply to the criticism:¹¹⁷

(1) Are we beginning to commend ourselves again? Surely we do not need, as some do, letters of recommendation to you or from you, do we? (2) You yourselves are our letter (ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἡμῶν ὑμεῖς ἐστε), written on our¹¹⁸ hearts (ἐγγεγραμμένη ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν), to be known and read by all; (3) and you show that you are a letter of Christ, prepared by us, written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God, not on tablets of stone but on tablets of human hearts. (4) Such is the confidence that we have through Christ toward God. (5) Not that we are competent of ourselves to claim anything as coming from us; our competence is from God, (6) who has made us competent to be ministers of a *new covenant* (διακόνους καινῆς διαθήκης), not of letter but of spirit (οὐ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος); for the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life.¹¹⁹

Paul could defend himself by indicating that no letter of recommendation is required to the founder of a new congregation. Instead, he appeals to the presence of the vibrant congregation at Corinth. The 'letter' (ἐπιστολή), he argues, is also

¹¹⁷ This division of the text (2 Cor 3.1-6) is justifiable. For our purpose, the unit is sufficient to understand the Pauline interpretation of Jer 31(38).31-33, since the phrase 'written on our hearts' in 2 Cor 3.2 may allude to Jer 31(38).33, and the phrase NC occurs in 2 Cor 3.6. The presence of Jer 31(38).33 in 2 Cor 3.2 is supported by Richard and Hays: E. Richard, 'Polemics, Old Testament, and Theology: A Study of II Cor. 3:1-4:6', *RB* 88 (1981), 344-49; R. B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1989), 128.

¹¹⁸ This reading is defended as the *lectio difficilior* by S. J. Hafemann, *Suffering and the Spirit*, WUNT² 19 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986), 184-88; his argument is supported by Hays, *Echoes*, 127, 217 n. 18. With the strong textual support of Paul's statement in 2 Cor 7.3, the reading is adopted in the UBS edition: Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 509.

¹¹⁹ Emphasis mine. In the subsequent verses, Paul uses a rabbinic device of exegesis (*qal wa-homer*); in this method, the discussion moves from the lesser to the greater. As is mentioned by Matera, a thing mentioned in the 'lesser' half may not be denigrated as it might appear; the point is that what is true to the lesser is even more so to the greater. It should be noted that Paul's remarks on the old covenant (2 Cor 3.11) appears in such a rhetorical context: F. J. Matera, *II Corinthians: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003), 85-86. Hays also points out that the dichotomy must be understood in the polemical situation: *Echoes*, 126.

written on the hearts of Paul and his co-workers. He then urges his readers to judge his credentials not with the ‘letter’ written with ink, but the ‘letter’ written with the Spirit. It is in this polemic that Paul uses the phrase ‘ministers of a new covenant’.

To understand his use of the NC, attention must be given to Paul’s use of three OT texts present in 2 Corinthians 3: Exodus 24.12,¹²⁰ Jeremiah 31.31-33 and Ezekiel 36.26-27.¹²¹ In Exodus 24, Paul detects a typological correspondence between Moses’ role played in the giving of the Decalogue inscribed on the stone tablets and the ministry of the apostle Paul who is guided by the Spirit.¹²² Paul also believed that the prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel were being fulfilled in the ministry in which he was involved. In the eschatological NC, according to Jeremiah, the Torah is written, not on stone tablets, but on human hearts. Using an exegetical device similar to *gezera shewā*, Paul weaves together the two prophetic texts, which are mediated with the common terms such as ‘heart’ and ‘new’, into his rhetoric of the *γράμμα/πνεῦμα* dichotomy. By introducing the phrase NC of Jeremiah and the terms used by Ezekiel, Paul seems to have identified another typological correspondence between the wicked Israelites accused by the prophets and Paul’s opponents at Corinth who disregarded the works of the Spirit.¹²³ Using these texts that indicate the typological correspondence, the apostle tries to show that his opponents’ demand of the letter of recommendation written with pen and ink is irrelevant to the ministry of the

¹²⁰ In Exod 24.12, Moses received the stone tablets on which the Decalogue is inscribed. These tablets were destroyed after the incident of the Golden calf (Exod 32). As the situation settled, God gave the second stone tablets to Moses (Exod 34.1, 4).

¹²¹ Matera also cites Ezek 11.19; 18.31, where the phrase ‘new spirit’ appears: Matera, *II Corinthians*, 78.

¹²² This typology is further elaborated in 2 Cor 3.7-18, in which Paul uses the story of Moses’ fading glory in Exod 34.34-35.

¹²³ Matera, *II Corinthians*, 80.

Spirit (2 Cor 3.7),¹²⁴ since the credentials of the ‘ministers of a new covenant’ should be judged by the ‘letter’ inscribed on human hearts by the Spirit.

In short, Paul uses the NC of Jeremiah in 2 Corinthians 3 in defence of his apostleship. By introducing the NC in Jeremiah, he attempts to show that the accusations made by his opponents are irrelevant to the ministry of the Spirit. He finds a typological correspondence between the ministry of the NC and the ministry by Moses at the conclusion of the old (Sinai) covenant. According to Paul, the former is characterized with the work of the Spirit; its credentials are confirmed with the letter of recommendation written on human hearts. Paul believes that it is more glorious than the latter. His rhetoric may not necessarily indicate his denigration of the Sinai covenant/Mosaic Law.

c. Romans 11.26-27

In the Letter to the Romans,¹²⁵ which would be intended as a systematic presentation of his Gospel, the phrase NC never occurs. For our concerns, however, an observation should be made on Romans 11.26-27, since one might suspect possible contact between these verses and Justin’s notion of the NC. The OT quotations in these verses include the term διαθήκη and the phrase ἐκ Σιών; they also appear in *Dialogue* 24.1, in which ‘another covenant’ is identified with Christ.¹²⁶

¹²⁴ A similar phrase ‘ministry of the Spirit’ in 2 Cor 3.7 is linked with the ‘ministers of a new covenant’. Paul may paraphrase ‘ministers of a new covenant’ with a phrase such as the ‘ministers of the new Spirit’. This link however does not necessarily mean that the NC and the Holy Spirit are equal in Paul’s view.

¹²⁵ Rom seems to be written shortly before Paul’s departure from Corinth for Jerusalem (Rom 15.25; Acts 20.2-3). Horrell estimate it to be written in 55-58 CE: *Introduction*, 48. According to C. E. B. Cranfield, Paul departed Greece in early Spring of either 56 or 57 CE: *The Epistle to the Romans*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975), 1:12-16. C. K. Barrett gives a slightly earlier date (55 CE): *The Epistle to the Romans* (London: A&C Black, 1971), 5. Few scholars would doubt its authenticity, but some scholars suspect that the original composition had lacked the last one chapter or two, and that it had been written for a general audience: J. A. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, AB 33 (New York: Double Day, 1993), 44-67.

¹²⁶ The Scripture index of NA²⁷ lists Rom 11.27 as a reference to Jer 31(38).33. In my view, the presence is not conspicuous.

As is demonstrated in Romans 9-11, the salvation of the Jews would have been Paul's central concern, even though he called himself the apostle to the Gentiles (Rom 11.13; Gal 2.8). In Romans 11, Paul argues that the temporal Jewish rejection of Christ does not follow God's total rejection of the nation. To explain why many Jews refuse Christ, Paul quotes the texts of Isaiah in Romans 11.26-27. The text below includes the verses adjacent to the Pauline quotations of the book of Isaiah:

(25) So that you may not claim to be wiser than you are, brothers and sisters, I want you to understand this mystery: a hardening has come upon part of Israel, until the full number of the Gentiles has come in. (26) And so all Israel will be saved; as it is written, '*Out of Zion will come the Deliverer* (ἥξει ἐκ Σιὼν ὁ ῥυόμενος); he will banish ungodliness from Jacob. (27) And this is my *covenant with them*', (Isa 59.20-21) '*when I take away their sins.*' (Isa 27.9a) (28) As regards the gospel they are enemies of God for your sake; but as regards election they are beloved, for the sake of their ancestors; (29) for the gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable.¹²⁷

In order to demonstrate that the rejection of some Jews is temporary and their transgressions will be forgiven at the future coming of the Messiah, Paul appeals to LXX Isaiah 59.20-21; 27.9a. The LXX texts of Isaiah below may be helpful to understand the Pauline use of these verses:

LXX Isa 59.20-21 (20) And the deliverer shall come *for the sake of Zion* (καὶ ἥξει ἕνεκεν¹²⁸ Σιὼν ὁ ῥυόμενος) and shall turn away

¹²⁷ Emphasis mine.

¹²⁸ The phrase ἐκ Σιὼν instead of ἕνεκεν Σιὼν is attested only in some minuscule MSS, the Bohairic version, and the patristic witnesses of Hilarius (Hilary of Poitiers; 4th century) and Jerome: J. Ziegler, *Isaias*, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum 14 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939), 343.

ungodliness from Jacob. (21) And this is my covenant
with them (καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη) . . .¹²⁹

LXX Isa 27.9a Therefore, the iniquity of Jacob shall be taken away; and
this is his blessing, when I shall have taken away his sin.

The common theme of Jacob's repentance and the forgiveness of his sins seems to have guided Paul to detect an intertextual link between Isaiah 59.20-21 and 27.9a. With these quotations of Isaiah 59.20-21; 27.9a, Paul expresses his hope that more Jews would recognise Christ as the deliverer coming out of Zion. In addition, the inclusion of covenant terminology seems to be related to Paul's conviction that the divine covenant given to the people of ancient Israel is irrevocable.

To the text of Isaiah 59.20, Paul has made one significant alteration. The preposition ἔνεκεν is replaced with ἐκ.¹³⁰ This alteration may indicate his interpretation that the Messiah will come again from the heavenly sanctuary.¹³¹ Or, Paul might have emphasised the equal standing of the Gentile Christians; that is, the Gentiles are not required to come to Zion in the eschatological pilgrimage, since the redeemer will come *out of* Zion.¹³² At any event, this phrase 'out of Zion' could be viewed as a parallel with Justin's phrase 'Law coming out of Zion' in *Dialogue* 24.1.

In summary, the apostle Paul anticipates a fulfilment of the prophecy in Isaiah 59.20-21; 27.9a about the future coming of Christ, and the salvation of Israel, since it promises that the transgressions of Jacob will be taken away. In view of

¹²⁹ Emphasis mine.

¹³⁰ C. E. B. Cranfield surmises the influence of the verses of Psa 14(13).7; 53.6(52.7); 110(109).2a: *The Epistle to the Romans*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979), 2:577. LXX Psa 109.2a has this text: 'The Lord shall send out your scepter/rod of power (ῥάβδον δυνάμεώς σου) out of Zion (ἐκ Σιών). . . '.

¹³¹ Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:578.

¹³² Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 682.

its obscurity in Romans, the NC of Jeremiah is marginal to the Pauline concept of the covenant in Romans 11.26-27.

3. *The Letter to the Hebrews*

The Letter to the Hebrews¹³³ is the only NT book that directly quotes Jeremiah 31(38).31-34 (in full in Heb 8.8-12; Jer 31[38].33-34 in Heb 10.16).¹³⁴

Hebrews 8.8-12 quotes Jeremiah 31(38).31-34 to prove that the first covenant (Sinai covenant) was not faultless (Heb 8.7, 13). The quotation of Jeremiah 31(38).31-34 is likely taken from LXX, although it includes variant readings and/or alterations by the author:

(7) For if that first covenant had been faultless, there would have been no need to look for a second one. (8) God finds fault with them when he says: ‘The days are surely coming, says the Lord (λέγει κύριος), when I will establish (συντελέσω) a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; (9) not like the covenant that I made (ἐποίησα) with their ancestors, on the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; for they did not continue in my covenant, and so I had no concern for them, says the Lord. (10) This is the covenant that I will make with the house of

¹³³ The author of Heb is unknown; the questions of the provenance and the recipients are unsettled: B. Lindars, *The Theology of the Letter to the Hebrews* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991), 15-19; L. T. Johnson, *Hebrews: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 32-38, 40-44; H. W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 1-6, 9-13. The author may have been a Hellenistic Jewish Christian, and the intended audience may have been a Hellenistic Jewish Christian community, some members of which were in danger of returning to Judaism: Lindars, *Hebrews*, 4, 21-25; A. T. Lincoln, *Hebrews: A Guide* (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 57. The author might have addressed this epistle to a Gentile Christian community whose members became versed in the OT; S. G. Wilson suggests a group of the Gentile Judaizers before 70 CE for the recipients: *Related Strangers*, 126. Heb is usually estimated to be written c. 60-90 CE: Lindars, *Hebrews*, 19-21; H. W. Attridge, ‘Hebrews, Epistle to the’, *ABD* 3:97; C. R. Koester, *Hebrews*, AB 36 (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 50-54. L. T. Johnson thinks that Heb was written as early as 45 CE: *Hebrews*, 38. The *terminus ad quem* of Heb may be established with *1 Cl.*’s use of Heb; *1 Cl.* is often estimated to be composed c. 95 CE: Koester, *Hebrews*, 21-22. As Attridge suspects, the late date of *1 Cl.* (about 115 CE) is possible: *Hebrews*, 6-9.

¹³⁴ These two quotations of Jer 31(38).31-34 in Heb 8 and 10 may constitute an *inclusio* to form a literary unit: Lindars, *Hebrews*, 80; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 19.

Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will put my laws in their minds, and write them on their hearts, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. (11) And they shall not 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. (12) For I will be merciful toward their iniquities, and I will remember their sins no more.’ (Jer 31[38].31-34)¹³⁵ (13) In speaking of ‘a new covenant’, he has made the first one obsolete (πεπαλαίωκεν). And what is obsolete and growing old will soon disappear (τὸ δὲ παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ). (Heb 8.7-13)

In the author’s view, Jeremiah’s prophecy of the NC has been given because the first covenant was defective. In the first covenant, on the one hand, the Levitical priest must offer regularly and repeatedly the sacrifices which cannot cleanse human sins completely at a time (Heb 7.27).¹³⁶ In the NC, on the other hand, the once-for-all sacrifice offered by the perfect priest according to the order of Melchizedek (Psa 110.4; Heb 5.6; 7.17). As the NC is established, therefore, the sacrificial offerings prescribed in the Sinai covenant become obsolete.

The main point of the author’s argument in Hebrews 8 is reaffirmed in Hebrews 10. After the contrast between the sacrifice offered at the earthly tabernacle in the old covenant and the true, heavenly worship established by Christ in Hebrews 9.1-10.15, the author makes another direct citation from Jeremiah 31.33-34:

¹³⁵ The author seems to have made the following alterations. (1) Throughout this quotation, Heb has the phrase, λέγει κύριος, instead of φησὶν κύριος in LXX. (2) Heb 8.8 has the verb συντελέσω instead of διατίθημι in LXX, and Heb 8.9 has ἐποίησα instead. But in v. 10, the verb διατίθημι is retained. The change of the verb διατίθημι to συντελέσω in Heb 8.8 indicates the author’s intention to emphasise the finality of the NC. The author might have used συντελέω with his familiarity with the term’s frequent use in ritual and sacrificial contexts in Hellenistic documents: LSJ, 1726; or he might have been guided by the usage in LXX Jer 41(34).8, 15. (3) LXX’s datives (τῷ οἴκῳ) in v. 8 are changed to the phrase ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον in Heb. But in Heb 8.10, the dative is preserved. (4) Heb omits δώσω in LXX Jer 38.33. (5) Γράψω in LXX Jer 38.33 is changed to ἐπιγράψω in Heb 8.10 perhaps for an emphasis. (6) The LXX phrase, ἀπὸ μικροῦ αὐτῶν καὶ ἕως μεγάλου αὐτῶν, in Jer 38.34 is contracted to ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου αὐτῶν in Heb 8.11.

¹³⁶ Koester, *Hebrews*, 389.

(16) ‘This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, says the Lord: I will put my laws in their hearts, and I will write them on their minds,’ (Jer 31.33) (17) he also adds, ‘I will remember their sins and their lawless deeds no more.’ (Jer 31.34; Heb 10.16-17)

The author introduces this quotation to establish his conviction that by the single offering, Christ ‘has perfected for all time those who are sanctified’ (Heb 10.14) to remove human sins. The statement ‘I will remember their sins and lawlessness no more’ is given because Jeremiah predicted, according to the author of Hebrews, that after the NC is established, sacrificial offerings prescribed in the Sinai covenant will no longer be necessary. Thus Hebrews concludes this section by saying, ‘Where there is forgiveness of these, there is no longer any offering for sin’ (Heb 10.18). As such, the NC of Jeremiah is set in contrast primarily with the cultic system practised by the Levitical priests according to the Torah. This old order now becomes obsolete because the once-for-all sacrifice has been offered by the perfect priest according to the order of Melchizedek.

In short, the author of Hebrews primarily views the NC as the new cultic order established by the once-for-all sacrifice offered by Christ.¹³⁷ The author seems to be the first Christian writer who explicitly argued that the old covenant would become obsolete after the establishment of the new. Christ is described as the ‘mediator of the new/better covenant’ (Heb 8.6; 9.15; 12.24); thus he is not identified with the NC in Hebrews.¹³⁸

¹³⁷ The frequent association of the covenant with the blood of Christ (Heb 9.20; 10.29; 12.24; 13.20) seems to be related to the practice of the Eucharist in Christian communities of the author and the recipients.

¹³⁸ Christ is never clearly identified with the NC in the NT books.

C. The Apostolic Fathers

In the corpus of the Apostolic Fathers, the term διαθήκη/*testamentum* does not occur very frequently;¹³⁹ καινὴ διαθήκη/*novum testamentum* never occurs in the Apostolic Fathers. With regard to Jeremiah 31(38).31-34, the Scripture indices of the Apostolic Fathers do not list these references.¹⁴⁰ However, an allusion to Jeremiah 31(38).33 is detectable in both the *Shepherd of Hermas* (*Sim.* 8.3) and the *Epistle of Barnabas* (4.6). An observation of these passages is thus warranted.

1. The Shepherd of Hermas

The eighth parable of the *Shepherd of Hermas*¹⁴¹ is an allegory of a great willow tree, under which is gathered the people called by God (*Sim.* 8.1.1). In addition, a tall angel stands with a sickle in his hand, who cut some of the branches from the willow and give them to the people of God. Surprisingly, the tree is not damaged even after being pruned by the angel (8.1.2-3). Each branch is given to an

¹³⁹ Although an early tradition of the Eucharistic prayer is preserved in *Did.* 9-10, it makes no mention of the covenant. Διαθήκη most often appears in *Barn.* Otherwise, the term occurs only twice in *1 Cl.* 15.4 and 35.7. In both cases, the term is used in the citations from Psalms (Psa 78.36-37; 50.16-23). These proof texts are used in the context of accusation against the Israelites' unfaithfulness to the Mosaic covenant. Ignatius of Antioch, who makes references to the Eucharistic rite (e.g. *Ign. Eph.* 20.2; *Rom.* 7.3), describes the Eucharistic elements in a mystical way; for him, they are identical with the flesh of Christ (*Smyrn.* 7.1). He believes that by eating and drinking them, one can experience mystical union with Christ's body and blood (*Phil.* 4). Curiously enough, he never uses διαθήκη. Cf. H. Kraft, *Clavis Patrum Apostolicorum* (München: Kösel Verlag, 1963), 102.

¹⁴⁰ K. Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers*, LCL 25 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1913), 2:391; Holmes, *AF*, 604; R. M. Grant (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers*, 6 vols. (New York: Thomas Nelson, 1965), 2:101-04, 133-35; 3:179-88; 6:161-64; Lindemann and Paulsen, *Apostolischen Väter*, 557-72; C. Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 269-72; Ehrman, *AF*, 2:478.

¹⁴¹ *Herm.* is a story of visionary experience told by a certain freedman named Hermas, a resident of Rome. He might be the author, but because of its composite structure, some scholars assume multiple authors. Scarce clues make it difficult to narrow down the date of authorship. Based on the reference to Clement of Rome in *Vis.* 2.4.3, the *terminus a quo* may be set at the beginning of the 2nd century CE. The *terminus ad quem* may be set by Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria's knowledge of this document, but its descriptions of the (Roman) church are fitted to the situation in the 1st half of the 2nd century: Osiek, *Shepherd*, 18-19; Ehrman, *AF*, 2:162-73; J. Verheyden, 'The Shepherd of Hermas', in P. Foster (ed.), *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers* (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 63-71. Justin could have had access to *Herm.*, as he settled in Rome. Cf. H. Musurillo, *The Acts of Justin and Companions* (Recensions A and B), in *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 42-53; Barnard, *Justin*, 12-13.

individual only to be returned to the angel (8.1.5). While many of branches are returned fresh and green, some are returned either withered or bitten by bugs. Those who return fresh branches are immediately sent to a tower, whereas the remainder of the branches are planted in order to see if they are able to sprout and bear fruit (8.2). In *Similitude* 8.3, the spiritual meaning of this enigmatic vision is explained by the shepherd:

(2) ‘Listen,’ he said, ‘this great tree (δένδρον) that overshadows plains and mountains and the entire earth is the law of God that has been given to the whole world. And this law is the Son of God who is proclaimed to the ends of the earth. The people under its shadow are those who have heard the proclamation and believed it. (3) But the great and glorious angel is Michael, who has authority over this people and guides it. For he is *the one who gives the law in the hearts of those who believe*. And so he watches over those to whom he has given the law, to see if they have kept it. (4) But you see the sticks that each of them has. The sticks are the law. Thus you see many of the sticks that have become useless. You will realize that these are all those who have not kept the law; and you will see where each one of them dwells.’ (*Sim.* 8.3.2-4)¹⁴²

This parable consists of several OT texts as well as Jewish and Christian traditions. The trope of the willow may be taken from Isaiah 44.1-5, in which it appears as a simile for redeemed Israel. The willow tree is also used as the metaphor of the Law, which seems to be rooted in a Jewish tradition.¹⁴³ In the Jewish tradition, this law would have been the Mosaic Law, but in *Shepherd*, the willow refers to the commandments that have been given through Christ by his Father.¹⁴⁴ The ‘sickle’ held by Michael indicates that this vision is about a

¹⁴² My Italics.

¹⁴³ N. Brox, *Der Hirt des Hermas* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 361.

¹⁴⁴ Besides 6 occurrences in parable 8, ‘law (νόμος)’ appears five times in *Herm.* (no Latin section in *Herm.* uses ‘lex’). Four of them are in *Sim.* 50, in which they refer to ‘the law of the divine city ordained by the Lord’: it is more like the law of an ancient city state. The last

judgment scene.¹⁴⁵ Bearing spiritual fruits is the sign of true Christian faith. In view of these tropes and imageries, the author seems to suggest that those who prove their faith with fruit on the branches receive their share of blessing.¹⁴⁶ Michael is said to put the law of God in their hearts, a likely allusion to Jeremiah 31(38).33, who then watches over them.

To summarize, the symbolic willow tree in *Similitude* 8.3 is identified with the Law of God; this imagery is likely rooted in a Jewish tradition, and reworked by the author, so that it may further be identified with the Son of God. The symbolic vision of the willow tree includes an allusion to Jeremiah 31.33, but it makes no reference to the NC.

2. The Epistle of Barnabas

In the *Epistle of Barnabas*,¹⁴⁷ the term διαθήκη appears frequently in the sections that discuss the true heirs of the divine covenant.¹⁴⁸ In *Barnabas* 4.6-8, for

one is found in *Sim.* 59.3, in which it is used as the law that Christ has received from his Father. This seems to be the meaning of 'law' in the eighth parable.

¹⁴⁵ 'Sickle' (δρέπανον) is used in apocalyptic visions in such verses as LXX Zech 5 and Rev 14.
¹⁴⁶ Similar motives may be found in a number of NT passages: Mark 4; Matt 3.8; 7.17-19; 12.33; 13; Luke 3.8, 9; 6.43, 44; 13.9; John 15; Gal 5.22; Eph 5.9; Phil 1.11; Heb 12.11; Jam 3.18.
¹⁴⁷ The author of *Barn.* is unknown; it is universally acknowledged that the epistle was not written by Barnabas, the companion of the apostle Paul (Acts 11.25-30; 12.25-15.19). Scholarly opinions are divided on the issue whether the author was a Jew or a Gentile: W. Horbury, 'Jewish-Christian Relations', 134-35. *Barn.* was written after the destruction of the Second Temple, and it is likely to have been written before the Bar Kokhba revolt, since it makes no mention of it. The date of composition may be roughly estimated between 70-130 CE. Since *Barn.* is quoted by Clement of Alexandria, the provenance is often identified with Alexandria, but it could be written in Syro-Palestine or Asia-Minor. Cf. J. Carleton Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background*, WUNT² 64 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 30-42, 252-53; R. Hvalvik, *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant: The Purpose of the Epistle of Barnabas and Jewish-Christian Competition in the Second Century*, WUNT² 82 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 17-23, 35-42, 43-53; Horbury, 'Jewish-Christian Relations', 131-133; Ehrman, *AF*, 2:3-11; J. Carleton Paget, 'The Epistle of Barnabas', in Foster, *Apostolic Fathers*, 72-80. Scholarly opinion seems also to be divided on the contacts between *Barn.* and Justin; Carleton Paget is sceptical of Justin's contact with this document: *Barnabas*, 240-41. See also Skarsaune, *Proof*, 310. It is beyond the scope of this study to engage fully with the debate on the possible contacts between *Barn.* and Justin.

¹⁴⁸ 11 times (*Barn.* 4.6, 7, 8; 6.19; 9.6, 9; 13.1, 6; 14.1, 5[x2]) among 14 occurrences: cf. Kraft, *Clavis Patrum*, 102. The covenants that appears in *Barn.* 14.2, 3 are the Sinai covenant written on the tablets; in *Barn.* 14.7, the term appears in the quotation of Isa 42.6.

example, the writer argues that his opponents¹⁴⁹ have lost their share in the covenant by claiming that both Jews and Christians are the true heirs; in his view, the covenant belongs only to Christians:

(6) And so you should understand. And yet again, I am asking you this as one who is from among you and who loves each and every one of you more than my own soul: watch yourselves now and do not become like some people by piling up your sins, saying that the covenant is [both theirs and ours. (7) For it is ours].¹⁵⁰ But they permanently lost it, in this way, when Moses had just received it. For the Scripture says, ‘Moses was on the mountain fasting for forty days and forty nights, and he received the covenant from the Lord’s own hand.’ (Exod 31.18; 34.28) (8) But when they turned back to idols they lost it. For the Lord says this: ‘Moses, Moses, go down quickly, because your people, whom you led from the land of Egypt, has broken the law.’ (Exod 32.7) Moses understood and cast the two tablets from his hands. And their covenant was smashed—that the covenant of his beloved, Jesus, might be sealed in our heart, in the hope by faith in him. (*Barn.* 4:6-8)

The line ‘the covenant of the beloved Jesus might be sealed in our heart’ may suggest a reference to Jeremiah 31.33. *Barnabas*’ use of this verse may be comparable to 2 Corinthians 3, although *Barnabas* uses it in a way different from Paul. In the Pauline letter, the ‘letter (of recommendation)’ written on human hearts by the Spirit is set in contrast to the Law inscribed on the stone tablets and to the letter written with ink (2 Cor 3); with his rhetorical description of the ministry of the apostle, Paul would have no intention of denigrating Jews. *Barnabas*, likewise, mentions that the covenant of his beloved (new Law) is

¹⁴⁹ Carleton Paget regards them as those who claimed that the covenant belonged to both Jews and Christians: *Barnabas*, 123. More specifically, Hvalvik argues that the opponents are Judaizing Christians: *Struggle*, 175. Regarding the Jewish background of *Barn.* more highly, Horbury seems to include Jews in the author’s opponent: ‘Jewish-Christian Relations’, 130.

¹⁵⁰ The text in the brackets at the end of v. 6 and the beginning of v. 7 is reconstructed from the Latin text: Ehrman, *AF*, 2:22; Lindemann and Paulsen, *Apostolischen Väter*, 32. For MSS of *Barn.*, see Ehrman, *AF*, 2:9-10; Lindemann and Paulsen, *Apostolischen Väter*, 24-25.

written on human hearts, unlike the old Law written on the stone tablets. However, *Barnabas* further argues that the Law was smashed because of the idolatry committed by the ancestor of Jews immediately after the giving of the Torah. Using Jeremiah 31.33 in a way different from the apostle Paul, the author of *Barnabas* discusses that the Jewish people lost their claim as heirs immediately after they received the Torah; thus *Barnabas*' use of the verse shows an anti-Jewish sentiment.¹⁵¹

A similar argument is repeated in *Barnabas* 14.1-4. The ancestors of the Jews had accepted the covenant only to break it later, thus proving themselves unqualified as true heirs (14.1-4).¹⁵² The author asserts that the covenant was rather given to 'us', namely Christians, because the Lord Jesus suffered to redeem them, to make them the true heirs of the covenant:

(5) He [the Lord Jesus] was made manifest so that those people might be completely filled with sins, and that we might receive the covenant through the Lord Jesus, who inherited it (ἡμεῖς διὰ τοῦ κληρονομοῦντος διαθήκην κυρίου Ἰησοῦ λάβωμεν). He was prepared for this end, that when he became manifest, he might make a covenant with us by his word, after redeeming our hearts from darkness, hearts that were already paid out to death and given over to the lawlessness of deceit. (*Barn.* 14.5)

As the phrase 'to receive the covenant' implies, διαθήκη is used as a synonym of κληρονομία—a legacy imparted through Christ, the first heir. In the subsequent verse (*Barn.* 14.6-9), *Barnabas* quotes the book of Isaiah for further proof of his claim that Christians are the heirs of the covenant:

¹⁵¹ This anti-Jewish sentiment in *Barn.* should be understood against the backgrounds of the rivalry between Judaism and Christianity and the fear of Christian assimilation to Judaism in which the author and the recipients of the epistle would have been struggling: Horbury, 'Jewish-Christian Relationship', 135-40.

¹⁵² *Barn.* 4.6-8 and 14.1-4 is a doublet: in quoting the two passages of Exod 31.18 and 32.7, 19, the author seems to draw on a certain source, which might have been rooted in a Jewish tradition: Carleton Paget, *Barnabas*, 114-19.

(6) For it is written how the Father commanded him to prepare for himself a holy people after he redeemed us from darkness. (7) And so the prophet says, ‘I the Lord your God called you in righteousness; and I will grasp your hand and strengthen you. I have given you as a *covenant* to the people, as a light to the nations, to open the eyes of the blind, to bring out of their bondage those in shackles and out of prison those who sit in darkness.’ (Isa 42.6-7) And so we know the place from which we have been redeemed. (8) Again the prophet says, ‘See, I have set you as a light to the nations that you may bring salvation to the end of the earth; so says the Lord God who redeems you.’ (Isa 49.6-7) (9) Again the prophet says, ‘The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he anointed me to preach the good news of grace to the humble; he sent me to heal those whose hearts are crushed, to proclaim a release to the captives and renewed sight to the blind, to call out the acceptable year of the Lord and the day of recompense, to comfort all those who mourn.’ (Isa 61.1-2) (*Barn.* 14.6-9)¹⁵³

Verse 7 is a citation of Isaiah 42.6, which indicates that the servant of the Lord is predicted to become ‘a covenant to the people, a light to the nations.’ By the quotation of Isaiah 42.6, the author might have intended to show his identification of the covenant with Christ in oblique manner.¹⁵⁴ However, it should be mentioned that *Barnabas* does not explicitly identify Christ with the NC as Justin does.

In a broad sense, *Barnabas* could be placed in the lineage of the Letter of Hebrews, since both epistles may have the same purpose—to prevent their audience from returning/converting to Judaism.¹⁵⁵ However, their uses of διαθήκη apparently show a difference; the phrase NC, which Hebrews uses rather

¹⁵³ Italics are mine. The above OT citations are left to us without further comment by the author.

¹⁵⁴ Ferguson, ‘Justin’, 399.

¹⁵⁵ *Barn.* seems to cite Hebrews twice (Heb 10.25 in *Barn.* 4.10 and Heb 13.7 in *Barn.* 19.9): Kraft, *Barnabas*, 3:186-87.

frequently, does not occur in *Barnabas*.¹⁵⁶ Unlike the author of Hebrews, *Barnabas* may have emphasized, not the contrast between the old covenant and the new, but the oneness and continuity of the divine covenant.

D. The *Kerygma Petri* (KP)

The *Kerygma Petri* (KP)¹⁵⁷—a pseudonymous work attributed to the apostle Peter—may have been extant prior to the composition of Justin’s treatises, though only fragments are preserved in Clement of Alexandria and Origen. As the work is cited by the Alexandrian fathers, the place of authorship may be Alexandria.¹⁵⁸ This document is estimated to be composed in the first half of the second century. The *terminus ad quem* of KP is the middle of the second century CE.¹⁵⁹ Most scholars, however, prefer an earlier date based on its possible use by the author of *Barnabas*, the author of the *Shepherd of Hermas*, Aristides of Athens, and Justin.¹⁶⁰ Robert Grant argues for the date during the reign of Hadrian (117-138 CE);¹⁶¹ Michel Cambe concludes that the document may have been written before

¹⁵⁶ *Barn.* 2.6 uses the phrase ‘new law’ (ὁ καινὸς νόμος).

¹⁵⁷ For the texts of KP, I have consulted M. Cambe, *Kerygma Petri: Textus et commentarius*, CCSA 15 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 141-61; the translations are taken from Schneemelcher, *NTA*, 2:37-40. The fragment numbers are given according to Cambe, the numbers by Schneemelcher are inserted in parentheses.

¹⁵⁸ Schneemelcher, *NTA*, 2:34.

¹⁵⁹ Origen seems to attest its use by a Valentinian, Heracleon (*Commentary on the Gospel of John* 13.[17]102 [SC 222: 84-85]), who died in c. 180 (*ODCC*, 756); Cambe, *Kerygma Petri*, 175-79.

¹⁶⁰ Although he allows 80-140 CE, Dobschütz favours an earlier date. Because of its relationships with *Barn.*, *Herm.*, Aristides and Justin, he considers that KP represents a transition from the earliest Christianity to the apologetic literature: E. von Dobschütz, *Das Kerygma Petri*, TU 11 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1893), 65-67. J. N. Reagan thinks that KP could hardly be written in the 2nd century: *The Preaching of Peter: The Beginning of Christian Apologetic* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1923), 77-80. A. J. Malherbe, however, assigns KP to the first quarter of the 2nd century CE; he declines the 1st-century date, because he assumes that the author of KP had some knowledge of the later NT books, based on Reagan’s observations: ‘The Apologetic Theology of the *Preaching of Peter*’, *Restoration Quarterly* 13 (1970), 207.

¹⁶¹ Grant considers its content to be fitting to the situation of Christian churches under the Hadrian rule. R. M. Grant, *Greek Apologists of the Second Century* (London: SCM, 1988), 39, 211. In a similar vein, G. N. Stanton argues that being possibly used by Aristides, KP should have been written about the same time when Pliny sent his letter to Trajan, or shortly afterwards: ‘Aspects of Early Christian and Jewish Worship: Pliny and the Kerygma Petrou’,

the Jewish insurrection of 115-17 CE in Egypt. However, arguments based upon a historical context may not be fitting to the discussion of *KP*'s date, since it is preserved only in fragments. Regarding the literary relationships, we have only meager evidence to decide the date of *KP*, and the estimated date remains conjectural. *KP* may have been extant in the early second century CE, being accessible to Justin. It may have been composed at about the time when Justin was active in producing his works. In this case, the parallels between *KP* and Justin would be due to their access to common sources.

Among its fragments, *KP* fr. 5 deserves our attention, since it includes the quotation of Jeremiah 31(LXX 38):31-32:

Learn then, ye also, holily and righteously what we deliver to you and keep it, worshipping God through Christ in a new way. For we have found in the Scriptures, how the Lord says: 'Behold, I make with you a new covenant, not as I made (one) with your fathers in Mount Horeb' (Jer 31[38].31-32). A new one has he made with us. For what has reference to the Greeks and Jews is old. But we are Christians, who as a third race worship him in a new way. (*KP* fr. 5 [2.d])¹⁶²

With the quotation of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32, *KP* mentions the old and the new covenants, which are set in antithesis. The old covenant refers to the old ways of worship practiced by both the Greeks and the Jews, whereas the NC is closely associated with Christian worship. This notion of the covenant is similar to that of Hebrews. Moreover, the association of the NC with Christian worship may

in M. J. Wilkins and T. Paige (eds.), *Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Early Church* (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1992), 94.

¹⁶² Cambe, *Kerygma Petri*, 157; Schneemelcher, *NTA*, 2:39.

indicate that the author of *KP* interprets the NC of Jeremiah based on the early Christian liturgical tradition preserved in the Lukan and the Pauline accounts.¹⁶³

E. Concluding remarks

The earliest evidence for Christian use of the NC in Jeremiah is found in the liturgical tradition retained in Luke 22 and 1 Corinthians 11. In these passages, the NC refers to the Eucharistic element of wine, which is symbolically presented as the blood of Christ poured out for the remission of sins. Together with Jesus' word for the bread, the phrase 'the new covenant in/with my blood' may suggest the presence of Christ at the table and in the elements. This makes it possible to suggest that the phrase NC may function as a metonymy for the Eucharistic rite as a whole.

In Pauline theology, the NC in Jeremiah is not a central emphasis, given its absence in the Letter to the Romans. His use of the NC is limited to his account of the Last Supper, which seems to be taken from the tradition known to Luke, and to his polemic against his opponents in Corinth in 2 Corinthians 3. His unique interpretation of Jeremiah 31.31-33 in 2 Corinthians 3 would be invented by the apostle, and its validity would be coupled with the polemic with which he was engaged. Yet his intricate presentation of the rhetorical antithesis between the old covenant and the new may have been easily stretched, or even misinterpreted by subsequent generations, as if the apostle set the NC in antithesis to the old covenant.

In Hebrews, we may identify an early sign of the parting from Judaism as far as its notion of the covenant is concerned.¹⁶⁴ In this letter, the covenant is used mainly in the discussions of the superiority of the sacrifice of the NC, which is

¹⁶³ *KP*'s mention of the Greeks and the Jews may suggest that this document was produced in the Gentile Christian environment. Cambe argues that *KP* should be located on the trajectory between Acts and the works of Justin: *Kerygma Petri*, 382-83.

¹⁶⁴ Lehne, *New Covenant*, 124; Wilson, *Related Strangers*, 110.

used in contrast with the old covenant. The author argues that the one that became old was destined to fade away, so that his audience may not be tempted to return to the old sacrificial system.

Besides the NT authors, early Christian writers before Justin apparently pay less attention to Jeremiah 31:31-32 than to 31:33.¹⁶⁵ In *Shepherd*, the author alludes to Jeremiah 31:33 in *Similitude* 8.3.2-5, which focuses on the engraving of the law of Christ on the hearts of his believers. Likely drawing on an earlier source, *Barnabas* uses Jeremiah 31:33 together with the passages of Exodus, as the apostle Paul did in 2 Corinthians 3. Although the quotation of Jeremiah 31:31-32 in *KP* may be a notable exception, the NC of Jeremiah seems to be marginal before it is reintroduced into the centre of theological debates by Justin Martyr in his *Dialogue with Trypho*. Most notably, the authors of the NT and the Apostolic Fathers do not explicitly identify the NC in Jeremiah 31:31 with Christ.

Before we turn to Justin's use of the NC in Jeremiah, a remark should be given on the NC as a dispensational category. The observations in this chapter may prompt us to reconsider Ferguson's judgement that Justin's view of the dispensational division between the old covenant and the new is rooted in the Pauline and Lukan concept of the covenant.¹⁶⁶ As far as the use of the NC is concerned, the Pauline letters and the Gospel of Luke do not seem to use *καινή διαθήκη* primarily as a dispensational concept. The old and the new covenants in Hebrews 8:8-13 can be interpreted as the two periods in the salvation history,¹⁶⁷ although the author might have allowed the overlapping period of the two covenants. These uses of the NC in the NT, therefore, may indicate that few NT authors held the clear-cut

¹⁶⁵ W. Kinzig, 'Καινή Διαθήκη: The Title of the New Testament in the Second and Third Centuries', *JTS* 45 (1994), 522.

¹⁶⁶ Ferguson, 'Covenant', 139.

¹⁶⁷ Justin's idea of the covenant as the dispensational period (*Dial.* 51.3) seems to be related to the idea of the covenant in the Letter to the Hebrews. See the discussion in ch. 2 'Preliminary observations of Justin Martyr's notion of the new covenant', pp. 71-72.

dichotomy between the old and the new covenants as the salvation-historical concept.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁸ Cf. S. McKnight, 'Covenant and Spirit: The Origins of the New Covenant Hermeneutic', in G. N. Stanton, et al. (eds.), *Holy Spirit and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 42-45.

Chapter II

Preliminary observations of Justin Martyr's notion of the new covenant

A. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to make a preliminary observation on Justin's notion of the NC. To achieve this objective, it first discusses Justin's use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 in *Dialogue* 11-12 and 22. It then observes his usage of διαθήκη in the *Dialogue*. These discussions will be followed by a consideration of early Christian traditions that may have influenced Justin's interpretation of the NC in Jeremiah. These observations lay the foundation which will allow the exploration of early Christian and Jewish sources in the subsequent chapters.

Before turning to Justin's use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32, it may be pointed out that Justin might have returned the NC to a place of theological prominence,¹⁶⁹ after the author of Hebrews interpreted the Christ event in light of the NC in Jeremiah. During the first half of the second century CE, it was as though the significance of the NC in Jeremiah had been neglected, as far as the extant Christian documents are concerned. The phrase is absent in the descriptions of the Eucharist in the *Letters of Ignatius*. Even though *Barnabas* may have alluded to Jeremiah 31(38).33 (*Barn.* 4.8), the author avoids using the phrase NC. Why then did the idea of the NC become important for Justin? To answer this question, it is reasonable to consider the theological debates in which Justin was involved.

In the first place, Justin's idea of the NC should be understood against the background of second century Jewish-Christian relations. His *Dialogue* shows signs of deepening Christian antagonism against Judaism. Justin's language is at

¹⁶⁹ With the possible exception of the author of *KP*.

times relentless against Jews.¹⁷⁰ However, Justin's emphasis on the covenant and his identification of Christ with the NC may have been linked with the adjustment of the religious practices which took place in the aftermath of the Bar Kokhba revolt (133-135 CE).¹⁷¹ Justin describes the Eucharist as 'the pure sacrifice' (Mal 1.11; *Dial.* 41.2); he also claims that it is the only sacrifice now pleasing to God (*Dial.* 117.2).¹⁷² This argument may have resonated with certain Jews, considering the transformations that Judaism was then undergoing.¹⁷³

At the same time, Justin's emphasis on the NC seems also to have been stimulated by the Marcionite controversy. The extant works of Justin were written after Marcion's arrival at and possible excommunication from the Church of Rome, estimated to have occurred in 144 CE.¹⁷⁴ In *1 Apology* 26.5, Justin mentions the rapid growth of the Marcionite churches among the nations as a serious threat.¹⁷⁵ Marcion's religion may be interpreted as an extreme response to the situation created after the failures of the Jewish revolts,¹⁷⁶ since he seems to have attempted to invent a Christianity entirely free from the residue of Judaism.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁰ For example, Justin claims that the Mosaic Law was given only to the Jews, because of their hardheartedness: *Dial.* 46.5; 67.4.

¹⁷¹ *ODJR*, 100; *EEC*, 110. Justin wrote *Dial.* likely based on a real conversation with certain Jews, which took place during the Bar Kokhba revolt (*Dial.* 1.3; 9.3). See also 'INTRODUCTION', p. 16 n. 30. According to Eusebius, the dialogue was held in Ephesus (*HE* 4.18.6): Marcovich, 'Introduction', *Dial.*, 62-64. Eusebius' report is questioned by some scholars: Falls & Halton, *Dial.*, xii.

¹⁷² Barnard, *Justin*, 144.

¹⁷³ The failure of the revolt was a serious blow to the Jewish hope to rebuild the Temple. The Romans prohibited them to enter the city, and they even erected a temple of Jupiter Capitolinus on the Temple site: J. C. VanderKam, *An Introduction to Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 49. Most Jews would have chosen to adjust to this predicament by reorganizing their religious life, placing the Torah at its new centre: *ibid.* 45.

¹⁷⁴ *EEC*, 523. S. Moll cautiously avoid specifying the exact date of Marcion's break with the church of Rome: *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*, WUNT 250 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 31-46. For the date of Justin's extant works (*1 & 2 Apol.*, *Dial.*), see ch. 1 'Jeremiah's new covenant before the time of Justin', 23 n. 1.

¹⁷⁵ E. C. Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence* (London: SPCK, 1948), 3.

¹⁷⁶ Grant, *Greek Apologists*, 43.

¹⁷⁷ A characteristic element of Marcion's theology was his dualism. He assumed the existence of two Gods: the creator God in the OT and the God of goodness, who had been unknown before Christ (*Marc.* 1.6). The main factor that drove him to the complete rejection of the God of the OT seems to have been his extreme Paulinism, or his misunderstanding of Pauline theology.

Justin was one of the earliest theologians involved in the Marcionite controversy. Unfortunately it is no longer possible to reconstruct his argument against Marcion from his now-lost *Syntagma against Marcion*.¹⁷⁸ Yet similar arguments may be reproduced in his extant works, especially in the *Dialogue*.¹⁷⁹ In both treatises, he would have defended the place of the OT in Christian Scriptures, and he would also have argued that Christians were the true people of the covenant. The idea of the NC would have played a key role in his defences. Justin accepts the dichotomy between the old covenant and the new (*Dial.* 67.9), but he also demonstrates that the NC is predicted by the Prophets and the Psalmists. He may have thought the NC to be a persuasive phrase for proving that the salvation offered by Christ was the fulfilment of the OT prophecies.¹⁸⁰

B. Absence of διαθήκη in Apologies

Before turning to the examinations of Justin's use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 and his usage of διαθήκη in the *Dialogue*, moreover, it is necessary to mention the absence of the term in *1 & 2 Apologies*. Early Christian apologists would have assumed their primary audience consisted of pagan readers often hostile to Christian religion, and they would have been careful not to use terminology they might have found confusing. Especially for those unfamiliar with the OT, the use of the term διαθήκη might have contributed to such confusion.¹⁸¹

According to his conviction, he compiled his version of the NT canon, consisting of the revised Gospel of Luke and the *Apostolicon*—a collection of the Pauline letters. His rejection of Jewish elements led him to refuse even to see Christ as the Jewish Messiah (*Marc.* 1.24).

¹⁷⁸ *AH* 4.6.2; *HE*, 4.18.9; Ferguson, *EEC*², 648. This lost work might have been identical with his *Syntagma against All Heresies* (*1 Apol.* 26.8): cf. *DECL*, 357.

¹⁷⁹ Moll, *Arch-Heretic*, 147-48 with n. 64.

¹⁸⁰ In this respect, Ferguson is right to suggest that 'Covenant was an important concept where Christians wanted to maintain both a significant continuity and a significant discontinuity with their Jewish heritage': Ferguson, 'Justin', 401.

¹⁸¹ The apologists are considered to have systematically avoided Christian jargon: G. J. M. Bartelink, 'Einige Bemerkungen über die Meidung heidnischer oder christlicher Termini in dem frühchristlichen Sprachgebrauch', *VC* 19 (1965), 193-209, cited in N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, trans. W. G. E. Watson (Brill: Leiden, 2000), 345. Διαθήκη often means will/testament in *koiné* Greek: see ch. 4 'Jeremiah 30-31 (37-38)', p. 115 n. 316.

However, it is still puzzling that Justin excludes διαθήκη from the description of the Eucharist in *1 Apology* 66:

For, the Apostles in the memoirs composed by the Apostles, which are called Gospels, thus handed down what was commanded to them: ‘**Jesus** took bread (τὸν Ἰησοῦν λαβόντα ἄρτον), <and> after giving thanks, he said: “Do this for my memorial (Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου)”, “this is my body”; and likewise He took the chalice, and after having given thanks, He said: “This is my blood”; and gave it to them alone.’ (*1 Apol.* 66.3)¹⁸²

On this Eucharistic formula, two remarks are in order. (1) The phrase ‘Jesus took bread’ is similar to that in Matthew 26.26 (λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον).¹⁸³ (2) The line ‘Do this for my memorial’ in the above quotation indicates Justin’s reliance on the liturgical tradition recorded in Luke 22.19.¹⁸⁴ Thus Justin seems to have composed this Eucharistic formula based on both Matthew 26.26-29 and the liturgical tradition retained in Luke (or Luke 22.15-20).¹⁸⁵

In spite of his knowledge of the liturgical tradition retained in Luke and/or the Lukan account of the Last Supper, however, Justin’s Eucharistic formula does not include the phrase NC; in fact it avoids using διαθήκη. This absence could be interpreted as Justin’s rejection of the application of the NC of Jeremiah to the Eucharistic element in the liturgical tradition. Yet it is too early to decide that Justin ignored this use of the NC of Jeremiah 31(38).31 in the liturgical tradition. In the following discussions, we will further examine the possible influence of the liturgical tradition over Justin’s use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 in the *Dialogue*.

¹⁸² My emphases.

¹⁸³ Among the Synoptic Last Supper accounts, it is only in Matt that the subject of the verb λαμβάνω is clarified as ‘Jesus’: cf. Mark 14.22; Luke 22.19. In 1 Cor 11.24, the verb λαμβάνω is indicative, whereas in Matt 26.26, it is in the participial form.

¹⁸⁴ And in 1 Cor 11.24-25.

¹⁸⁵ Jeremias argues that Justin’s Eucharistic formula was taken from the Lukan account: *Eucharistic Words*, 139. Justin might have used a harmonized text of Matthew and Luke: L. Misiarczyk, ‘Apologetic Harmony as a Source of Liturgy: The Eucharistic Institution Words in Justin Martyr’s *1 Apology* 66.3-6’, SP 40 (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 55-61.

C. Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 in the *Dialogue*

1. Dialogue 11-12

Justin quotes from Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 in *Dialogue* 11.3 and 22.6.¹⁸⁶ Justin uses the first quotation in *Dialogue* 11 to reply to Trypho's claim that one is never accepted by God, unless one observes God's commandments, the Sabbath, the feasts, and especially circumcision, as prescribed in Genesis 17.14 (*Dial.* 10). Responding to this remark of Trypho, Justin bases his argument on the OT prophecy of the NC. His first statement is that Christians believe the same God as Jews, 'who led your forefathers out of the land of Egypt' (LXX Psa 135.11; LXX Jer 38.32) 'with a strong hand and outstretched arm' (Deut 5.15; LXX Psa 135.12). This description is a conflation of phrases from two or three passages in LXX. He then adds another point: Christians hold out their hopes neither through Moses nor the observance of the Law (*Dial.* 11.1). The reason that Christians no longer keep the old Law is because it is only for the Jews. Justin argues that the new law/trustworthy covenant is now established, and the old covenant has become obsolete as the author of Hebrews says (Heb 8.13). As proof, Justin quotes Isaiah 51.4-5 together with LXX Jeremiah 38.31-32:

- (2) . . . For the Law [*promulgated] at Horeb is already obsolete, and belongs to you only, whereas the <new [*Law]> is simply for all men; and a Law set in opposition to a Law has abrogated the one before the other, and likewise a covenant which has come into existence afterwards established the earlier one. An everlasting and final law, *Christ himself*, and the trustworthy covenant was given to us, after which [*there shall be] no law, or commandment, or precept.
- (3) Have you not read these words of Isaiah: 'Listen to me, listen to me, my people, and the kings, give heed to me, for a Law will go out from me,¹⁸⁷ and my justice for a light of the nations. My righteousness swiftly comes near,

¹⁸⁶ For the quotation of Jer 31(38).31-32 in *Dial.* 67.9, see the discussion below in pp. 78-80.

¹⁸⁷ Justin may have identified the place from which the Law goes out with the Jerusalem Temple, since it was the holy site where the Lord revealed his divine presence.

and my salvation will come out, and nations will set their hope on my arm' (Isa 51.4-5)? And by Jeremiah, He speaks about this new covenant in this way: 'Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, and I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, not that I made with their fathers on the day that I took hold of their hand to lead them out from the land of Egypt' (Jer 31[38].31-32). (*Dial.* 11.2-3)¹⁸⁸

These two OT passages (Isa 51.4-5; Jer 31[38].31-32) are regarded as referring to the same event, namely, the emergence of the new Law/covenant. Justin considers the NC in Jeremiah to be identical with the Law going out from the Lord in Isaiah 51, which Justin identifies with Christ. This identification of Christ with the new Law and the NC is repeated in the next verse (*Dial.* 11.4):

If therefore God predicted the new covenant as about to be established, and this [*covenant] 'for a light of the nations' (Isa 51.4), then we see and are convinced that, by the name of the crucified Jesus Christ, <men> from the idolatries and other wrong-doing have turned to God, enduring to keep the confession and to practise the piety even to death, and that from their works and the power that accompanies them, everyone can understand that *this one* is the new Law, the 'new covenant', and the expectation of all the nations who anticipate the blessings from God. (*Dial.* 11.4)¹⁸⁹

In the next verse, Justin argues that Christians are now the 'true, spiritual people of Israel', because they have been led to God through the crucified Christ.

Justin's use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 in *Dialogue* 11 is also linked with his quotation of Isaiah 55.3-5 in *Dialogue* 12:

¹⁸⁸ Emphases mine.

¹⁸⁹ Emphases mine.

And further I said and presented the fact that Isaiah also proclaimed [*it¹⁹⁰] in other passages: (iii) ‘Listen to my words, so that your soul shall live; I will make with you an eternal covenant, which is the confirmation of the pious deeds of David. (iv) Behold, I have given him as a witness to the nations. . . . (v) Nations, who do not know you, shall call upon you; peoples, who do not know you, shall flee to you, because of your God, the holy one of Israel, for he glorified you’ (Isa 55.3-5). (*Dial.* 12.1)

Justin believes that the NC in Jeremiah is also predicted in Isaiah 55.3-5, where the prophet described it as the ‘eternal covenant’. Thus three OT passages—Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 and Isaiah 51.4-5; 55.3-5—constitute a cluster of the OT prophecies, all of which predict the establishment of the new Law/covenant.

The above observations on the use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 in *Dialogue* 11-12 allows us to make three remarks. (1) Justin understands that the (new) Law in Isaiah 51.4-5, the NC in Jeremiah 31(38).31, and the eternal covenant in Isaiah 55.1-3 all predict the same Law/covenant established by the coming of Christ. (2) Based on these prophetic texts, Justin identifies Christ with the new Law and the NC. (3) Justin does not include Jeremiah 31(38).33-34 in his citation; the absence of verses 33-34 suggests that the theme of the inscription of the Law on human heart(s) was peripheral to Justin’s notion of the NC.

2. *Dialogue* 22

The second quotation from Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 appears in *Dialogue* 22.6. In *Dialogue* 22, Justin first claims that the cultic instructions of the Sinai covenant were given only to the ancestors of the Jews, because of their inclination toward idolatry. To demonstrate that the sacrificial offerings prescribed in the Mosaic Law are no longer necessary, Justin quotes the four OT prophetic texts (Amos

¹⁹⁰ That is, Christ as the NC.

5.18-6.7;¹⁹¹ Jer 7.21-22; 31[38].31-32; Psa 50[49].1-23) based on a common *leitmotif* of God's dismissal of the sacrifices of the old covenant.

The use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 in *Dialogue* 22.6 must be understood in light of this *leitmotif*. By being conflated with Jeremiah 7.21-22, the presence of Jeremiah 31(38).31 is in fact made obscure. A collation of the texts of LXX and *Dialogue* 22.6 below might be helpful to show how Justin's use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 influenced the alterations he imposed on the text of Jeremiah 7.22:

- LXX Jer 7.21-22 (21) τάδε λέγει κύριος (a) Τὰ ὀλοκαυτώματα ὑμῶν συναγάγετε μετὰ τῶν θυσιῶν ὑμῶν καὶ φάγετε κρέα. (22) ὅτι οὐκ ἐλάλησα (b) πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν καὶ οὐκ ἐνετειλάμην αὐτοῖς ἐν (c) ἡμέρᾳ, ἣ ἀνήγαγον αὐτοὺς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου (d) περὶ ὀλοκαυτωμάτων καὶ θυσίας:
- LXX Jer 38.32 οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην, ἣν διεθέμην τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ (e) ἐπιλαβομένου μου τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν ἐξαγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, . . .
- Dial.* 22.6 Καὶ πάλιν διὰ Ἰερεμίου· (a') Συναγάγετε τὰ κρέα ὑμῶν καὶ τὰς θυσιάς ὑμῶν καὶ φάγετε· ὅτι οὐτε (d') περὶ θυσιῶν ἢ σπονδῶν (b') ἐνετειλάμην τοῖς πατέρασιν ὑμῶν, (c') ἢ ἡμέρᾳ (e') ἐπελαβόμην τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν ἐξαγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου.
- ET of *Dial.* 22.6 And again by Jeremiah: 'Gather your meat and your sacrifices and eat: because I commanded to your fathers neither concerning the sacrifices nor the libations;' (Jer 7.21-22) 'on that day, I laid hold of their hand to lead them out from the land of Egypt' (Jer 31[38].32a).

¹⁹¹ In Amos 5.18-6.7, the prophet warned that the Lord would not accept the sacrifices offered by the people of Israel.

Justin's texts of Jeremiah 7.21-22 and Jeremiah 31(38).32 show some differences from those of the LXX; among them, the replacement of (d) *περὶ ὀλοκαυτωμάτων καὶ θυσίας* in Jeremiah 7.22 to (d') *περὶ θυσιῶν ἢ σπονδῶν* is noteworthy. The word 'whole-burnt offerings' (ὀλοκαυτωμάτων) in Jeremiah 7.22 is replaced by 'libations' (σπονδῶν) to form a word pair with 'sacrifices' (θυσιῶν), which Justin rearranges to place before the verb *ἐντειλάμην*.

These changes might be rooted in a testimony source, in which its (Jewish) compiler might have emphasized the importance of the 'libations' offered in connection with the 'sacrifices' in Jewish religious practices.¹⁹² Yet Justin may also be responsible of these changes; if this is the case, they hint his knowledge of the interpretive tradition that applies the phrase NC of Jeremiah 31(38).31 to the Eucharistic elements. The insertion of 'libations' might be intended to create a word-pair ('sacrifice' and 'libation') which alludes indirectly to the NC of Jeremiah 31(38).31; using this expression, Justin might make an oblique reference to the elements of the Eucharist.¹⁹³ Moreover, he might have added the quotation from Jeremiah 31(38).32 in order to indicate the purpose of this change.¹⁹⁴

The reference to the people of the divine covenant in the subsequent quotation from LXX Psalm 49.1-23 in *Dialogue* 22.7-10 may strengthen this explanation. Although this Psalm is quoted in Justin's argument against Jewish sacrifices, he seems to interpret this psalm as the prophecy predicting that Christians would become the righteous people. In LXX Psalm 49.5,¹⁹⁵ he seems to find a proof of

¹⁹² I owe this point to an instruction given by Prof. W. Horbury at the oral examination.

¹⁹³ Or, if this word pair was rooted in a certain (Jewish) *testimonia*, Justin would have recognized its implication for the Christian liturgical practice.

¹⁹⁴ Regarding the conflated OT quotation in *Dial.* 22.6, Prigent does not seem to recognise Jer 31(38).31: *Justin*, 261. Likewise, Skarsaune mentions only Jer 7.21-22; 31.32 as the OT verses cited in *Dial.* 22.6: *Proof*, 111, 450. According to Skarsaune, Justin's texts of Jer in *Dial.* 22.6 are taken from the 'kerygma source', which is a tract circulated within a school milieu of a Jewish Christian circle in Syro-Palestine: Skarsaune, *Proof*, 234, 246, 295-97, 425-28. P. Bobichon seems to recognize the presence of Jer 31(38).31 in *Dial.* 22.6: *Justin Martyr: Dialogue avec Tryphon; Édition critique*, 2 vols. (Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2003), 2:646.

¹⁹⁵ 'Collect to Him his pious men, those who conclude His covenant upon sacrifices' (*Dial.* 22.7).

his belief that the people of the covenant are Christians who conclude the covenant with God by means of the spiritual sacrifice of the Eucharist. While Justin uses Amos 5-6 to argue that the sacrifices of the old covenant are no longer necessary, Justin seems to interpret the term ‘sacrifices’ in LXX Psalm 49.5 as a reference to the crucifixion of Christ as well as the Eucharist. God’s dismissal of the sacrificial offerings of the Mosaic Law, which is the *leitmotif* throughout the quotations in *Dialogue* 22, therefore, might be related to Justin’s hidden agenda of proclaiming that the Eucharist is the true, spiritual sacrifice pleasing and acceptable to God.¹⁹⁶

Moreover, if the textual changes in the conflated quotation of Jeremiah 7.21-22 and 31(38).31-32 are made by Justin, this conflation of these OT texts might demonstrate that Justin’s exegetical method is related to his theological view; with an intricate alteration of the text of Jeremiah 7.21-22 and 31(38).31-32, he may covertly express his view that the Eucharistic elements are identical with the NC. This finding may suggest that the combinations and alterations, which scholars often attribute to his reliance on testimony sources, may rather provide clues for understanding Justin’s exegetical methods of the OT; by changing words and phrases, Justin may associate a certain biblical text with other Scriptural verses.¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁶ The use of the word-pair ‘sacrifice’ and ‘libation’ is not always associated with Justin’s interpretation of Jer 31(38).31 in *Dial.* The same word-pair is also found in *Dial.* 92.2; 118.2. In *Dial.* 92.2, it appears in a list of the requirements in the Mosaic Law; in this case, ‘sacrifices and libations’ (θυσίων καὶ σπονδῶν) apparently refer only to the sacrificial offerings required in the Sinai covenant. However, the word-pair seems to be used in a discussion relating to the Eucharist in *Dial.* 118.2. Although the ‘sacrifice of blood or libation’ in *Dial.* 118.2 refers to the sacrificial offerings prescribed in the Mosaic Law, it is used in contrast with the offerings that should be given under the NC—namely ‘spiritual praises and thanksgivings’ (πνευματικούς αἶνους καὶ εὐχαριστίας). Justin would include the Eucharistic rite in this category.

¹⁹⁷ After the observation of this textual phenomenon, one may still argue for Justin’s use of a certain testimony source regarding his use of Jer 31(38).31-32 in *Dial.* 22. Even if Justin did make use of a certain source, he did so in a way that suggests a strategic use of particular alterations and combinations of the OT texts, knowing the purposes of these alterations and combinations made by the author/compiler of the source.

To summarize, the modified phrase ‘sacrifice or libation’ within the combined quotation of Jeremiah 7.21-22 and 31(38).31-32 in *Dialogue* 22.6 might indirectly refer to the Eucharistic elements. This may constitute a case for Justin’s knowledge and acceptance of the liturgical tradition that applies the NC in Jeremiah 31(38).31 to the Eucharistic element. It may also provide evidence for Justin’s subtle exegetical methods, revealing his own theological interpretations.

D. Justin’s usage of διαθήκη

The above examinations of Justin’s use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 should be complemented with an observation of Justin’s usage of διαθήκη in the *Dialogue*.¹⁹⁸ A main purpose of this word study is to provide data to compare Justin’s usage of the term with those of early fathers after the time of Justin (Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria),¹⁹⁹ and to show that the identification of the NC with Christ is the peculiar feature in Justin’s use of διαθήκη.

Justin’s idea of διαθήκη is shaped mainly by his interpretation of the Prophets and the Psalms from a Christian perspective, as is indicated by the fact that διαθήκη often appears in quotations from and allusions to the Prophetic and Psalmic texts.²⁰⁰ Among the covenant themes in the Prophets and the Psalms, Justin focuses on the NC of Jeremiah.²⁰¹ He understands that the ‘eternal covenant’ in Isaiah 55 is identical with the NC in Jeremiah 31(38).31; but when referring to the covenant established by Christ, Justin prefers the phrase NC, which appears in the *Dialogue* more often than the phrase ‘eternal covenant’.²⁰²

¹⁹⁸ Cf. *Appendix* 1, pp. 239.

¹⁹⁹ Ch. 3 includes the word studies of διαθήκη/*testamentum* on Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria.

²⁰⁰ For example, *Dial.* 11.3 (Jer 31[38].31-32); *Dial.* 14.4 (Isa 55.3-5); *Dial.* 22.7 (Psa 50[49].5); *Dial.* 26.2; 65.4 (Isa 42.6); *Dial.* 122.3 (Isa 42.6).

²⁰¹ *Dial.* 11.2-4; 24.1-2; 34.1; 43.1; 118.3; 122.5.

²⁰² The phrase διαθήκη αἰώνιος appears in *Dial.* 12.1; 14.4 (Isa 55.3); *Dial.* 118.3, whereas the phrase καινή διαθήκη occurs more often in *Dial.* 11.3, 4; 34.1; 43.1; 51.3; 67.9; 118.3; 122.5.

Justin sets the NC in antithesis to the old covenant (*Dial.* 67.9-10). In his view, the old covenant²⁰³ primarily means the Mosaic Law/Sinai covenant.²⁰⁴ He understands the old covenant mainly as the customs and cultic practices prescribed in the Mosaic Law (*Dial.* 52.3; 67.5). According to him, the old covenant was intended only for the Jews because of the hardness of their hearts (*Dial.* 43.1; 46.5; 67.4).

Based on Justin's antithetical use of the old covenant and the NC, one can interpret the NC in *Dialogue* 51.3 as referring to the new dispensation inaugurated by the coming of Christ in the salvation history:

He [*i.e. Christ] mentioned that there would be no longer a prophet in your race, and that <it was necessary> to recognise the fact that the new covenant, which had long since been proclaimed by God as about to be established, was already present; that is to say, he himself was the Christ, [*as it is said] as follows: 'The Law and the Prophets are until John the Baptist: since then, the kingdom of the heavens suffers violence and violent men take it by force. And if you choose to accept, he is Elijah who was about to come. Let anyone with ears listen!' (Luke 16.16a; Matt 11.12-15) (*Dial.* 51.3)

In this verse, the NC indicates the dispensational/salvation-historical concept. By quoting Luke 16.16 and Matthew 11.12-15, Justin seems to have argued that John the Baptist belonged to the period of the 'Law and Prophets', which was terminated by the coming of Christ.²⁰⁵ At the same time, the above quotation does not disprove our view that the NC in Justin is mainly used in terms of the Eucharistic rite; this argument for the presence of the NC in *Dialogue* 51.3 may also testify to the view that his notion of the NC is indebted to the liturgical tradition.

²⁰³ In the extant works of Justin, the phrase *παλαιὰ διαθήκη* occurs only in *Dial.* 67.9.

²⁰⁴ *Dial.* 10.4; 22.9 (Psa 50[49].16); *Dial.* 74.4 (Deut 31.16-18); *Dial.* 67.9.

²⁰⁵ Set in contrast to the Law and Prophets, the NC in *Dial.* 51 may also be taken as referring to the Gospel of Christ.

In Justin's view, the NC is equal to the new Law, the coming of which was predicted by the OT prophets. The explicit identification of the (new) Law predicted in Isaiah 51.4 with the NC of Jeremiah seems to be peculiar to Justin's usage of the NC.²⁰⁶ Yet the most distinctive element in Justin's notion of the NC is his identification of Christ with the NC. This identification is first explicated in *Dialogue* 11.2, and is repeated throughout this treatise.²⁰⁷ In view of Justin's description of the Eucharistic rite as the incarnation of the Logos (*I Apol.* 66.2), Justin's identification of the NC/new Law with Christ seems to be tied to his conviction that the elements of the Eucharist are the embodiment of Christ.

This identification of the NC with Christ seems to be also relevant to the Sacrament of Christian baptism, as it is discussed in contrast with Jewish circumcision in *Dialogue* 24.1-2. In this passage, Justin argues that Jewish circumcision is now superseded with another Law/covenant:

(1) . . . But in order that now I may not seem to digress to other subjects, consider <what> I cry aloud, that the 'blood of that circumcision' (LXX Exod 4.25-26) has been abolished, and we have believed in the blood of the Saviour: now, 'another covenant', and 'another Law has come out from Zion' (Isa 2.3), (2) [*namely] Jesus Christ.²⁰⁸ He circumcises all those who will, just as it was proclaimed from old, with 'stone knives' (Josh 5:2), in order that there might be a righteous nation, a people keeping faith, taking hold of the truth, and maintaining peace. (*Dial.* 24.1-2)

In the above quotation, 'another covenant' is no doubt deemed identical with the NC, so that it can be taken as an allusion to Jeremiah 31(38).31. This covenant, in Justin's view, is also identical with the Law that comes out from Zion (Isa 2.3/Mic 4.2). In *Dialogue* 24, Justin seems to reiterate the association of the NC with

²⁰⁶ I have found no explicit identification of the (new) Law with the (new) covenant in the Apostolic Fathers.

²⁰⁷ *Dial.* 11.2-4; 24.1-2; 43.1; 118.3, 122.5-6. In *Dial.* 122.5, the NC is even identified with the new people of Israel, namely Christians.

²⁰⁸ The reading adopted by Falls & Halton, *Dial.* 38.

the theme of the ‘going out of the (new) Law’ from the Lord (Isa 51.4-5) in *Dialogue* 11, although this time, he uses Isaiah 2.3/Micah 4.2 instead.²⁰⁹ In the above passage, most notably, Justin identifies a correspondence between circumcision and Christian baptism, as he mentions that ‘Christ circumcises all those who will’; thus ‘another covenant’ may also refer to Christian baptism in *Dialogue* 24.

Justin therefore expands the semantic field of the NC in the liturgical tradition by taking this phrase as a metonymy, so that the NC may refer to the Eucharistic rite, and even to the Sacrament of Christian baptism, which would normally be followed by the Eucharist in early Christianity. That is to say, this identification is related to his high view of the Sacraments.

To summarize, Justin’s notion of the NC is anchored in the OT usage of διαθήκη in the Prophets and the Psalmists. In his view, the NC stands in antithesis with the old covenant which primarily means the Mosaic Law/Sinai covenant. The NC in *Dialogue* 51.3 bears a dispensational implication. At the same time, a prominent feature in Justin’s use of the phrase is his identification of the NC with the new Law and Christ. This identification seems to be related to his knowledge of the liturgical tradition preserved in Luke and 1 Corinthians as well as his interpretation of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 (*Dial.* 11).

E. Early Christian influence on Justin’s notion of the new covenant

1. Influence of NT documents

In the previous chapter, we have identified three strands of the NT use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-34: (1) the liturgical tradition preserved by Paul and Luke; (2)

²⁰⁹ Justin would find the ‘Law going out from the Lord’ (Isa 51.4) as identical with the ‘Law coming out from Zion’ (Isa 2.3), since the Temple stood on Mount Zion—the place where the Lord revealed himself.

the Pauline defence of his Apostleship in 2 Corinthians 3; and (3) the direct quotations in Hebrews 8.8-12 and 10.16-17.

Among these strands of early Christian traditions, the influence of the liturgical tradition preserved by Paul and Luke seems to be an important source for Justin's notion of the NC.²¹⁰ The combined quotation of Jeremiah 7.21-22 and 31(38).31-32 in *Dialogue* 22.6 shows his acknowledgement of the liturgical tradition that refers to the Eucharistic element of wine using the phrase NC. In *Dialogue* 24.1, the NC is further extended to refer to another Sacrament of Christian baptism.

Hebrews would be another source of Justin's notion of the NC. As is pointed out by Backhaus,²¹¹ Justin discusses the NC in contrast with the old covenant (*Dial.* 67.9-10) in the same manner as Hebrews 8.8-13; like the author of Hebrews, Justin argues that the old covenant became obsolete after the establishment of the new (Heb 8.13; *Dial.* 11.2). Moreover, Justin would agree with Hebrews in understanding the NC primarily as the new cultic order inaugurated by Christ's ordinance given at the Last Supper, and sealed by his sacrificial death on the cross.

In the above discussions, we have identified no significant contact with the Pauline use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-33 in 2 Corinthians 3. In Paul's argument, the theme of the Law inscribed on human heart(s) in Jeremiah 31(38).33 plays an important role.²¹² As is indicated with the absence of verses 33-34 in the *Dialogue*, Justin is not attentive to this theme. Moreover, the letter/Spirit dichotomy as in 2 Corinthians 3 is not attested in Justin.²¹³

In addition, Justin's combinations of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 with other OT texts (i.e. with Isa 51.4-5 and 55.1-3 in *Dial.* 11-12; with Amos 5.18-6.7, Jer 7.21-22,

²¹⁰ As in the liturgical traditions preserved in the Synoptic Gospels, for example, Justin identifies a typological correspondence between the Passover lamb and Christ in *Dial.* 40.1.

²¹¹ Backhaus, *Bund*, 320.

²¹² Justin does not use Jer 31(38).33-34 in *Dial.*: Marcovich, 'Indices', *Dial.*, 325.

²¹³ In *Dial.* 55.3, Justin argues that God has hidden from Jews the ability of discerning the divine words; this argument may echo 2 Cor 3.14. Otherwise, no reference to 2 Cor 3 is listed in Marcovich, 'Indices', *I & 2 Apols.*, 173; idem., 'Indices', *Dial.*, 330.

and LXX Psa 49.1-23 in *Dial.* 22; with Isa 2.3/Mic 4.1 in *Dial.* 24) do not seem to be witnessed in the NT documents.²¹⁴ One might suspect a Pauline influence on Justin's combination of 'another covenant' with the 'Law coming out of Zion' in *Dialogue* 24. Justin's theme of the coming of the new Law/NC from Zion might be related to Romans 11.26-27.²¹⁵ At least in one important point, however, Justin's use of Isaiah 2.3/Micah 4.2 is different from the Pauline phrase 'Out of Zion will come the Deliverer'; while Paul expects the 'coming of the Deliverer' to take place in the future coming of Christ, Justin saw its fulfilment in the Christ event and the spreading of the Christian liturgy.²¹⁶ This difference may demand a further explanation on Justin's use of Isaiah 2.3/Micah 4.2 in connection with Jeremiah 31(38).31 in *Dialogue* 24.²¹⁷

In sum, Justin's notion of the NC seems to be indebted to the liturgical tradition retained in 1 Corinthians 11 and Luke 22. It is also influenced by the Letter to the Hebrews. The Pauline influence on Justin's use of the NC text is not conspicuous; the use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-33 in 2 Corinthians 3 is quite remote from Justin's notion of the NC. In addition, Justin did not rely on the NT documents in combining Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 with other OT texts in *Dialogue* 11-12, 22, and 24.

2. Justin and the Apostolic Fathers

It seems unlikely that Justin's notion of the NC was indebted to the Apostolic Fathers. As we saw in chapter 1, Jeremiah 31(38).33 seems to be present in *Simili*

²¹⁴ Regarding the combinations of these OT texts, Justin of course might have relied on certain Christian sources which are now lost, or Jewish sources.

²¹⁵ Cf. the discussion in ch. 1 'Jeremiah's new covenant before the time of Justin', pp. 36-38.

²¹⁶ Backhaus argues that Justin was influenced by Heb 12.22-24 in terms of his association of 'another covenant' with Isa 2.3/Mic 4.2: *Bund*, 320. The passage from Heb alludes to the partaking of the Eucharistic rite, by saying that unlike the terror experienced by the people of Israel at Mount Sinai, Christians come to Mount Zion/the heavenly Jerusalem. However, it is unlikely that Heb 12.22-24 is reflected in Justin's association of the NC with the Law coming out of Zion in *Dial.* 24.1-2, since Justin seems to emphasise the fact that the new Law/NC comes/goes *out of* Zion.

²¹⁷ The issue is further discussed in ch. 4 'Jeremiah 30-31 (37-38)', pp. 136-38.

8.3.3, where the author identifies the Law with Christ mediated with the symbolic (willow) tree. This symbol could be viewed as a precedence of Justin's identification of the (new) Law with Christ. As we will discuss in chapter 4 (Jeremiah 30-31 [37-38]), Justin uses 'tree' (ξύλον) as a symbol of the Cross, the Sacraments, and Christ. Thus the symbolic use of the (willow) tree in *Shepherd* may stand as a parallel with Justin's 'tree'. However, it is uncertain whether Justin knew *Shepherd*'s symbolic use of 'willow' (ἰτέα).²¹⁸ Unlike the tree (δένδρον) in *Similitude* 8.3.3, moreover, Justin does not use the term δένδρον as a messianic symbol.²¹⁹ Thus the symbolic use of the trees in *Shepherd* does not necessarily suggest Justin's dependence on this document; it rather seems to indicate that both the author of *Shepherd* and Justin relied on Jewish tradition.

The possible allusion to Jeremiah 31(38).33 in *Barnabas* 4.8 might be more pertinent to our concern. If *Barnabas* 4.8 includes an allusion to the NC text of Jeremiah, the author seems to have considered the term 'Law' written on 'human heart' (Jer 31[38].33) to be interchangeable with the 'covenant of Jesus' (*Barn.* 4.8). Together with the use of the phrase 'new Law' in *Barnabas* 2.6, this witness may testify to the fact that *Barnabas* regards the new Law as identical with the covenant of Jesus.²²⁰ His use of Isaiah 42.6-7 might even indicate *Barnabas*' identification of the (new) covenant with Christ.

Nevertheless, two differences in the covenant ideas between *Barnabas* and Justin make it difficult to suppose direct contacts between them. First, *Barnabas*, unlike Justin, does not use the phrase the NC; the author seems to emphasize the oneness of the divine covenant. Second, in using the NC text of Jeremiah, *Barnabas*

²¹⁸ In Justin's extant works, the term occurs once in *Dial.* 86.5, where Justin mentions that the people of Israel found seventy willow trees and twelve springs after they crossed the river Jordan. Justin might have mentioned the willow as the symbol of the Law, but it seems unlikely that he relied on *Herm.* in this regard.

²¹⁹ In Justin, δένδρον appears in *I Apol.* 16.13; 24.1; 43.8: in *I Apol.* 16.13, it appears in the quotation of Matt 7.19 (the tree bearing no good fruits); in *I Apol.* 24.1 and 43.8, the term is used to describe pagan deities. The term does not occur in *Dial.*

²²⁰ Moreover, it is noteworthy that *Barn.*, like Justin, would also understand the Law/covenant in terms of the cultic practices: Horbury, 'Jewish-Christian Relations', 144.

focuses on the sealing of the new Law on human heart in Jeremiah 31(38).33—the verse absent in Justin. In spite of some striking similarities, therefore, the case for *Barnabas*' influence on Justin's notion on the NC is not very strong.

In short, it seems unlikely that *Shepherd* and *Barnabas* have influenced Justin's interpretation of the NC text of Jeremiah and his notion of the NC. Their similarities rather seem to show the influence of Jewish exegetical traditions on *Shepherd*, *Barnabas*, and Justin.

3. Justin's possible contact with KP

Although no explicit identification of the NC with Christ is found in the NT and the Apostolic Fathers, it would be too hasty to conclude that no early Christian documents have contributed to the formulation of this element in Justin's notion of the NC. In this regard, *KP* frs. 1 and 5 deserve our attention. Our purpose here is to examine whether *KP* or its source(s) influenced Justin's notion of the NC and his use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32.²²¹

a. *KP* fr. 5 and *Dialogue* 67.9

Justin's text of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 in *Dialogue* 67.9 has one element in common with the text preserved in *KP* fr. 5.²²² In both texts, the phrase ἐν ᾧ

²²¹ Scholars acknowledge parallels between *KP* and Justin. C. Andresen has suggested that Justin knew the apologetic tradition contained in *KP*: *Logos und Nomos: Die Polemik des Kelsos wider das Christentum* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1955), 326. Admitting the possibility that *KP* could be the precursor of Justin, W. Rordorf is cautious not to emphasise its influence over Justin's theology; except for Justin's salvation-historical framework of exegesis, according to Rordorf, Justin owed little to *KP*: 'Christus als Logos und Nomos: Das Kerygma Petrou in seinem Verhältnis zu Justin', in A. M. Ritter (ed.), *Kerygma und Logos: Beiträge zu den geistesgeschichtlichen Beziehungen zwischen Antike und Christentum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 424-431. Skarsaune seems to be not entirely content with Rordorf's conclusion: *Proof*, 229 n. 1. He argues for the existence of the 'kerygma source'—a common source used by both Justin and the author of *KP*: *Proof*, 234, 246, 425.

²²² The quotation of Jer 31(38).31-32 similar to *KP* fr. 5 is introduced in reply to Trypho's argument that Jesus was chosen as Christ only because of his perfect observance of the Law (*Dial.* 67.2). Justin uses the NC text to establish his claim that the old covenant was given because of the hardness of heart of the ancestors of Jews, and it is temporally as predicted by the prophets (*Dial.* 67.8). He then mentions that the old covenant was given with 'fear and trembling' (67.9); this remark alludes to Exod 20.18-20 and Heb 12.18-21.

Χωρήβ appears in the quotations of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32. In fact, this phrase also appears in Irenaeus' *Adversus Haeresius* 4.9.1. The chart below collates these four texts:

Synopsis: LXX Jer 38.31-32

LXX Jer 38.31-32	KP fr.5	Dial. 67.9	AH 4.9.1
<p>Ἰδοὺ ἡμέραι ἔρχονται, φησὶν κύριος, καὶ διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰουδα διαθήκην καινὴν,</p> <p>οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην, ἣν διεθέμην τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν ἐξαγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου</p>	<p>Ἰδοὺ</p> <p>διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν</p> <p>καινὴν διαθήκην,</p> <p>οὐχ ὥς διεθέμην τοῖς πατράσιν ὑμῶν</p> <p>ἐν ὄρει Χωρήβ.</p>	<p>καινὴν διαθήκην διαθήσεσθαι ὁ θεὸς ἐπήγγελλται παρὰ τὴν</p> <p>ἐν ὄρει Χωρήβ</p>	<p>Ecce</p> <p>disponam, inquit,</p> <p>testamentum novum,</p> <p>non quemadmodum disposui patribus vestris</p> <p>in monte Choreb</p>

The quotation in *KP* fr. 5 is not a reproduction of LXX Jeremiah 38.31-32. The author of *KP* may have either written simply from his memory, or he may have relied on an external source containing a non-LXX text.²²³ *KP*'s text is copied by Irenaeus in *Adversus Haeresius* 4.9.1. In comparison with Irenaeus' contact with *KP* or its source, it is more difficult to decide whether Justin used *KP*'s text of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32, since the text in *Dialogue* 67.9 is not identical with one preserved in *KP* fr. 5. However, the presence of the *KP* text in Irenaeus, which indicates the wide circulation of *KP* or its source, may strengthen the case for Justin's access to the same text. It is possible that Justin relied on *KP* or its source regarding his use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 in *Dialogue* 67.9.

²²³ Skarsaune, *Proof*, 72-73. The author of *KP* or its source may have combined a shortened LXX Jer 38.31-32 with ἐν ὄρει Χωρήβ alluding to Deut 5.2-4, as Cambe points out: *Kerygma Petri*, 156.

KP and Justin might have agreed on two points in terms of their use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32. Firstly, both seem to have avoided verses 33-34 in their quotations of the NC text of Jeremiah. Secondly, as Stephen Wilson argues, *KP* might have recognised the NC in Jeremiah as predicting the Eucharist,²²⁴ as Justin did. This point might be confirmed by the comment of Clement of Alexandria appended to the quotation of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 taken from *KP* fr. 5 (*Str.* 6.[5]41.4-5); Clement points out that Christians now worship God in a new way (*Str.* 6.[5]41.6). Clement's association of Christian worship with the NC in Jeremiah might have been rooted in *KP*'s view of the NC as the prophecy of the Eucharist. If this is the case, both *KP* and Justin belonged to Christian circles which adopted the liturgical tradition preserved by Paul and Luke.

In view of the fragmentary nature of the *KP* text preserved by Clement, however, it is difficult to make a judgement on how *KP* or its source influenced Justin's use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32. *KP*'s text of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 is not very helpful for identifying the origin of Justin's use of the NC.

b. Identification of Law with the Lord in *KP* fr. 1

For our concerns, *KP* fr. 1 is more important, since in this fragment, *KP* identifies Law with the Lord. According to Clement of Alexandria, the author of *KP* called the Lord/saviour 'Law and Word' (*KP* fr. 1a-c):

1. (a) In the 'Preaching of Peter' we find the Lord called *Law and Word* (νόμον καὶ λόγον). (*KP* fr. 1a; *Str.* 1.[29]182.3)

(b) In the 'Preaching' Peter called the Lord *Law and Word*. (*KP* fr. 1b; *Str.* 2.[15]68.2.)

²²⁴ Wilson, *Related Strangers*, 93.

(c) The Lord himself is called *Law and Word*, as Peter says in the ‘Preaching’ and the prophet: ‘For out of Zion will the Law go forth and the Word from Jerusalem’ (Isa 2.3/Mic 4.2). (*KP* fr. 1c; *Ecl.* 58)²²⁵

Unfortunately, *KP* fr. 1 preserves only the phrase ‘Law and Word’. This tantalizingly small amount of information still allows us to make a few observations.

(a) In *Stromata* 1.(29), Clement cites ‘Law and Word’ in *KP* as a support to his argument that the Lord is the Lawgiver. This phrase appears toward the end of a series of citations he identifies in Plato’s works (*Politics* [*Statesman*] and *Laws*) as well as in Proverbs 6.23 and Genesis 17.4 (*Str.* 1.[29]182.2). Clement primarily uses the phrase taken from *KP* to prove that the Lord is the ultimate giver of the Law, a role which encompasses the natural law, the ideal, universal law of human societies, and the divine Law manifested in the Pentateuch.

(b) The phrase ‘Law and Word’ appears again in *Stromata* 2.(15) in a commentary to Psalm 1.2, in which Clement repeats that the author of *KP* described the Lord as ‘Law and Word’. Based on this *KP* fragment, Clement describes the Lord as the lawgiver (νομοθέτης).

(c) *Eclogae* 58 has a citation of *KP*: the phrase ‘Law and Word’ is cited in Clement’s commentary on LXX Psalm 18. He suggests that the Law established by Christ fulfilled LXX Psalm 18.8. In this case, Clement adds Isaiah 2.3/Micah 4.2,²²⁶ which Clement may associate with *KP*’s appellation of Christ with ‘Law and Word’.

These appellations of the Lord as ‘Law and Word’ in *KP* are noteworthy. If Justin knew *KP* or its source, this appellation might have assisted Justin’s identification of the new Law with Christ.

²²⁵ Cf. Cambe, *KP*, 151. ET is quoted from Schneemelcher, *NTA*, 2:37-38.

²²⁶ Cambe regards the quotation of Isa 2.3/Mic 4.2 as inserted by Clement: *KP*, 151.

However, it must be pointed out that we do not know whether the author of *KP* treated the NC in Jeremiah which appears in *KP* fr. 5 as equal to the Law in fr. 1, since the two fragments appear in two different contexts where Clement discusses different theological issues. On the one hand, Clement cites *KP*'s appellation of Law as the Lord (fr. 1) in his discussion of the universal Law. On the other hand, he comments on the new way of worship after the quotation of *KP* fr. 5. Apparently, Clement does not regard the 'Law' in *KP* fr. 1 as identical with the NC in fr. 5. It is therefore uncertain whether the author of *KP* or its source made the same identification of the (new) covenant with the Lord (Christ) as Justin did.

To sum up: Justin Martyr may have known either *KP* or a certain tradition behind it. In *KP*, the Lord was called 'Law and Word'. This appellation is similar to Justin's identification of the new Law with Christ; in this respect, one may suppose *KP*'s influence on Justin. However, *KP* does not articulate the NC to be identical with Christ, as Justin does. The possible influence of *KP* does not definitely explain what assisted Justin to identify the NC with Christ.

F. Concluding remarks

After the failure of the Bar Kokhba revolt, Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 might have become again an important OT text among some Christians who refuse Marcion's radical secession from the Jewish tradition. Justin Martyr might have been one of those theologians to recover this prophetic text.

Justin interprets the NC text of Jeremiah in light of other OT prophetic texts. He quotes Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 together with Isaiah 51.4-5; 55.1-3 in *Dialogue* 11-12, and he also seems to make a conflated quotation of Jeremiah 7.21-22 and Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 in *Dialogue* 22.6. These juxtapositions and conflations of the OT prophetic texts may be composed by Justin himself.

His interpretation of the NC in Jeremiah seems to be influenced by early Christian traditions. With the conflated quotation of Jeremiah 7.21-22; 31(38).31-32 in *Dialogue* 22.6, Justin seems to make a subtle reference to the Eucharist; this quotation may indicate his knowledge of the Eucharistic formula preserved in Luke 22.17-20 and 1 Corinthians 11.23-26. This exegetical practice may not only confirm the fact that Justin knew the liturgical tradition which refers to the Eucharistic elements with the NC, but it may also show that Justin's combinations and alterations of these OT texts reflect his theological interpretations.

In addition, the Letter to the Hebrews would be an important source of Justin's notion of the NC. Just as Hebrews 8.13, Justin argues that the old covenant became obsolete after the establishment of the NC (*Dial.* 11.2). The idea of the covenants in Hebrews, which view the biblical covenants primarily as cultic practices, is also similar to Justin.

Finally, the above observation suggests that Justin's identification of the new Law/covenant with Christ is a distinctive element in his notion of the NC. As far as the extant Christian documents are concerned, Justin might be the first Christian author who explicitly identified the NC with Christ. The identification of the new Law with Christ might have been preceded with *KP* fr. 1 or the tradition behind it. However, the above examination of *KP* suggests that Justin's identification of the NC with Christ demands a further explanation regarding its origin. For his interpretation of the NC in Jeremiah, Justin may have had access to certain traditions unknown to other early Christians. To identify such traditions, therefore, it seems to be beneficial to explore Jewish textual and exegetical traditions.

Before turning to the Jewish traditions, however, it is necessary to look at the usages of διαθήκη in early fathers after the time of Justin, in order to understand Justin's notion of the NC against the background of the second-century Christian literature after the Bar Kokhba revolt.

Chapter III

The new covenant in early Fathers after the time of Justin

A. Introduction

This chapter will explore usages of διαθήκη/*testamentum* in Christian fathers after the time of Justin—Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria. The idea of the NC was not central to the extant theological treatises written by Tatian,²²⁷ Athenagoras,²²⁸ Theophilus of Antioch,²²⁹ and Melito of Sardis:²³⁰ their extant works make no explicit citation of Jeremiah 31(38).31-34, and they rarely use the term διαθήκη. It is in the works of Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria that διαθήκη/*testamentum* appears rather frequently. This chapter focuses on their usages of the term and their uses of the NC text and their use of the NC text.

²²⁷ Tatian, one of Justin's pupils (*ODCC*, 1590), wrote *Oratio ad Graecos* in c. 165-172: M. Marcovich (ed.), *Tatiani: Oratio ad Graecos*, PTS 43 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995), 3. *Oratio* does not cite Jer 31(38).31-34, nor does it employ the term διαθήκη: *ibid.*, 83-84, 100.

²²⁸ Athenagoras of Athens' *Legatio pro Christianis*, written c. 177 (M. Marcovich [ed.], *Athenagoras: Legatio pro Christianis*, PTS 31 [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990], 1), includes no occurrence of διαθήκη (*ibid.*, 130) and no citation of or allusion to Jer 31(38).31-34: *ibid.*, 117-18; B. Pouderon (ed. & trans.), *Athenagoras: Supplique au sujet des Chrétiens et sur la Résurrection des morts*, SC 379 (Paris: Cerf, 1992), 347-48. *De resurrectione*, the other extant treatise by Athenagoras, is a philosophical defence of the resurrection of the dead. The date of composition is unknown; it may be written shortly after the composition of *Legatio*: *ibid.*, 30. It contains no reference to Jer 31(38): *ibid.*, 345-48.

²²⁹ Theophilus' *Ad Autolycum*, written shortly after 180 (*EEC*, 831), is a defence of Christianity addressed to his pagan friend Autolycus. No citation of Jer 31(38).31-34 is attested in this document: M. Marcovich (ed.), *Theophili Antiocheni: Ad Autolycum*, PTS 44 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995), 87, 143. Διαθήκη occurs once in *Ad Autolycum* 3.2.2, where he discusses the precepts embraced by a pagan deity (Orpheus): *ibid.*, 100.

²³⁰ Only fragments of Melito's works were known to modern scholars until the discovery of *Peri Pascha* in the 1930s: S. G. Hall (ed. & trans.), *Melito of Sardis: On Pascha and Fragments* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979), xvii. It is estimated to have been written c. 160-170: *ibid.*, xii. No citation from Jer 31(38).31-34 is listed in the index: *ibid.*, 97-99. *Fragments* 3.14 includes the phrase τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία with the list of the canonical OT books; Hall argues that this is the earliest Christian use of the term 'Old Covenant' for the OT, and 'the earliest surviving Christian list of Old Testament books': *Melito*, xxx. His argument is questionable, since the fragment is taken from a quotation of Eusebius: *HE* 4.26.13-14. Melito would have used 'Law and Prophets' to refer to the OT Scriptures: *Pasch.* 72; 104; *Fragments* 3.13; 15.

The usage of διαθήκη/*testamentum* of each author is examined below using a consistent method. After the occurrences are identified in the extant works of each theologian,²³¹ they are put together in a classification.²³² Based on this classification, a summary of the word study is given to each theologian. This word study is complemented with the examination of the use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-34.²³³ A summary of these two investigations (the word study of διαθήκη/*testamentum* and the examination of the use of Jeremiah 31[38].31-34) is provided in the last sub-section for each author.

B. Irenaeus

Eusebius reports that Irenaeus (c. 130-c. 200)²³⁴ was respected as one who was ‘devoted to the covenant of Christ’ (*HE* 5.4.2). Irenaeus was certainly a staunch defender of the apostolic doctrines demonstrated in the canonical Gospels and the apostolic letters, which would eventually be titled as ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη. Irenaeus, of course, does not use καινὴ διαθήκη as the title of the NT. But in his extant works—*Epideixis*²³⁵ and *Adversus Haereses*,²³⁶ the NC often refers to the

²³¹ For Irenaeus, I have used the indices of A. Rousseau and L. Doutreleau (eds. & trans.), *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les hérésies*, book 1, part1, SC 263 (Paris: Cerf, 1979), 380; book 2, part 1, SC 293 (Paris: Cerf, 1982), 391; book 3, part 1, SC 210 (Paris: Cerf, 1974), 436. Since books 4 and 5 of *AH* (SC 100; 153) and *Epideixis* lack the indices, I have identified the occurrences with ETs (*ANF* 1:309-567; P. Smyth [trans.], *Irenaeus: Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*, ACW 16 [New York: Paulist, 1952]). For Tertullian, I have used G. Claesson (ed.), *Index Tertullianus*, 3 vols. (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1974-1975). For Clement of Alexandria, I have used *TLG*.

²³² The classifications of διαθήκη/*testamentum* in Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria are provided in *Appendix 2-4*, pp. 240-44.

²³³ For the Scripture index searches, I have used *BiPa* 1. For a citation of Jer 31.33-34, *BiPa* 1:166 lists ch. 35 in the *Octavius* by Minucius Felix, but the presence of the verses are not conspicuous: G. W. Glarke (trans.), *The Octavius of Marcus Minucius Felix* (New York: Newman Press, 1974), 117-18.

²³⁴ *EEC*, 413; *ODCC*, 851.

²³⁵ Irenaeus’ *Epideixis* was written in the 180s or the 190s: Smyth, *Irenaeus: Proof*, 6. In this study, I have used ET of *Epideixis* by J. P. Smyth.

²³⁶ The precise date of *AH* cannot be determined; *AH* 1-3 may have been written before 188 CE or 189 CE: D. J. Unger and J. J. Dillon (trans.), *Irenaeus of Lyons: Against the Heresies*, book 1, ACW 55 (New York: Newman, 1992), 3-6. In this study, I have also consulted ET of *AH* in *ANF* 1:309-567.

Gospel/teachings of Christ. This reference may be seen as an embryonic stage of the appellation of the canonical NT writings.

1. Διαθήκη/testamentum

Irenaeus' view of the covenant (διαθήκη/*testamentum*), which we recognize from his extant works, seems to have been shaped in his engagement with the polemics against Christian heresies, such as Gnosticism. As a Christian polemist, for example, Irenaeus defends the authority of the two covenants, by arguing that the Mosaic Law and the Gospel of Christ originate ultimately from a common author (AH 4.32.1-2). Thus his use of the term is often influenced by the polemics in which he was involved.

Although Irenaeus considers the two covenants (the old covenant and the new) to be most important, he recognises other biblical covenants in the OT, the descriptions of which are not always consistent. While he calls the Sinai covenant the 'first covenant' (AH 3.12.15), he also argues that there are four divine covenants (with Adam, with Noah, with Moses, and of Christ), just as there are four Gospels (AH 3.11.8).²³⁷ According to Irenaeus, these covenants show a progress toward the perfection of the NC (AH 4.9.3). In other places Irenaeus mentions the covenant with Abraham, arguing that the blessings for all the nations through Abraham and his descendants are fulfilled in the NC (3.10.2;²³⁸ 3.12.3).

It is in *Adversus Haereses* 4 that Irenaeus discusses at length on the NC. While acknowledging a typological correspondence between the Sinai covenant and the NC (AH 4.8.3),²³⁹ he also argues that Christ has established the new way of salvation. In *Adversus Haereses* 4.16.2-3, Irenaeus explains that the Sinai covenant was designed particularly for the people of Israel delivered from slavery

²³⁷ This is one of the reasons why Irenaeus accepts the four canonical Gospels: von Campenhausen, *Formation*, 197-98.

²³⁸ In AH 3.10.3, Irenaeus rightly acknowledges the covenant to Abraham as the oath sworn by God.

²³⁹ That is, the correspondence between the priests in the Sinai covenant and the disciples of Christ in the NC.

in Egypt; to strengthen this argument, he points out that the Lord did not establish this covenant with the righteous fathers (Patriarchs) because the Decalogue were engraved on their hearts. Likewise, Christians, who are not confined to literal interpretations of the Law, now meet the requirements of the old covenant with the help of the Holy Spirit. Thus Christians are no longer required to keep the regulations of the old covenant like slaves, since they have been fulfilled by Christ's redemptive acts (4.34.2). For Irenaeus, what characterizes the NC is a type of spiritual liberty—deliverance from the slavish observance of the Mosaic Law as well as salvation from idolatry (*AH* 4.16.5; 4.33.14; *Epideix.* 96). Irenaeus' idea of spiritual liberty seems to have been shaped under the influence of the Pauline texts (Gal 4; 2 Cor 3).²⁴⁰

2. *Jeremiah 31(38).31-34*

The NC text of Jeremiah is quoted once in *Epideixis*, and twice in *Adversus Haereses* (*AH* 4.9.1; 4.33.14). These quotations generally concur with the above overview of Irenaeus' usage of διαθήκη/*testamentum*.

(1) *Epideixis* 90: The quotation of Jeremiah 31(38).31-34²⁴¹ is located in a series of OT proof texts in chapters 86-90, which shows Irenaeus' belief that the Christian message proclaimed by the apostles had already been predicted in the OT. The quotation is followed by his comment that the promises predicted in

²⁴⁰ Gal 4.24 includes δύο διαθήκαι: one is the covenant of the slave woman (Hagar) associated with Mount Sinai and Jerusalem in the time of Paul, while the other is the covenant of the free woman (Sarah) associated with Jerusalem above. Irenaeus seems to take the two covenants of Gal 4.24 as the Mosaic Law (old covenant) and the Gospel (NC), so that he could argue that the people of the NC are free, released from the bondage of the old covenant. Irenaeus may also combine his interpretation of Gal 4.24 with the letter/Spirit dichotomy of 2 Cor 3. Irenaeus seems to know the liturgical tradition that describe the Eucharistic element as the NC (*AH* 4.17.5; 5.33.1); he would consider the observance of the Sacrament to be a part of the NC/teachings of Christ.

In the Eucharistic formula based on Matt 26.27-29, Irenaeus might have used the phrase NC (*AH* 5.33.1), although it might have been attributed to MS of Matt used by Irenaeus, or to the translator of the Latin edition.

²⁴¹ The quotation seems to have been taken from Heb 8:8-12.

these OT prophecies²⁴² ‘were to be inherited by the calling from the Gentiles, in whom the new testament is opened’.²⁴³ Using the NC text of Jeremiah, Irenaeus argues that the Gentile Christians who have received the NC are now the people of God.²⁴⁴ Irenaeus even makes the bold statement that Christians no longer need the Ten Commandments, since they have no desire for killing, adultery, and covetousness (*Epideix.* 95). This passage confirms the above observation that Irenaeus’ view of the NC is characterized by a type of spiritual liberty.

(2) *Adversus Haereses* 4.9.1: In chapter 9, Irenaeus first introduces the verse Matthew 13.52,²⁴⁵ to which he applies an allegorical interpretation. According to Irenaeus, the ‘householder’, who represents the Lord, gives the old treasure, which is the Mosaic Law, to his inexperienced servants, while he also provides other kinds of assets suitable for the righteous. The new treasure taken out by the ‘householder’ is interpreted as the NC, which in this context refers to the ‘manner of life according to the Gospel.’ To prove this interpretation, Irenaeus quotes three OT passages: Psalm 96(95).1, Isaiah 42.10, 12, and Jeremiah 31(38).31-32. Psalm 96 and Isaiah 42.10-13 have two similar features: they both mention the praises to God of Israel by all the nations, and also predict the coming of the Lord himself with power and authority. Irenaeus interprets the singing of the new hymn in Psalm 96(95).1 as the proclamation of the Gospel. The citation from Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 comes after that of Isaiah 42. Considerably abbreviated, it is likely quoted from *KP* or its source.²⁴⁶ Irenaeus concludes this section with his statement that the same householder, namely the Lord Jesus Christ, has established the NC in order to restore freedom for Christians.

²⁴² Psa 18.5; Isa 2.3; 10.23; 43.18-21; 50.8-9; 52.7; 63.9; 65.15-16; Jer 31(38).31-34.

²⁴³ Smyth, *Irenaeus: Proof*, 103.

²⁴⁴ As predicted in Hos 2.23-24 (LXX 2.25) and 1.10 (LXX 2.1), which Irenaeus quotes from Rom 9.25-26: Smyth, *Irenaeus: Proof*, 104, 212.

²⁴⁵ ‘Therefore every scribe who has been trained for the kingdom of heaven is like the master of a household who brings out of his treasure what is new and what is old’ (Matt 13.52): *ANF*, 1:472.

²⁴⁶ See the discussion on *KP* in ch. 2 ‘Preliminary observations of Justin’s notion of the new covenant’, pp. 78-80.

(3) *Adversus Haereses* 4.33.14: The other quotation of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 in *AH* occurs in Irenaeus' argument that the OT prophets predicted the works of Christ (*AH* 4.33.10); Irenaeus then lists a series of OT prophecies including Jeremiah 31(38).31-32, which he thinks have been fulfilled in the first coming of Christ (*AH* 4.33.11-14). Here again, Irenaeus seems to use *KP*'s text of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32. To this quotation, Irenaeus appends his comment that the prophet predicted the 'liberty of the new covenant' (*novi testamenti libertas*) in *Adversus Haereses* 4.33.14. The use of the phrase indicates that Irenaeus' idea of spiritual liberty is central to his idea of the NC.

In sum: Irenaeus uses Jeremiah 31(38).31-34 to show the common origin of the two covenants and their contrast. The old covenant and the new both originate from the same God. In his view, however, the NC predicted by the OT prophets is distinct from the old, since the new Law is engraved on the hearts of those who received the NC. Thus, Irenaeus focuses on Jeremiah 31(38).33, and he considers the NC to be characterized by the spiritual liberty.²⁴⁷

3. Summary

Irenaeus' use of the NC text of Jeremiah may show a contrast with Justin' use. Unlike Justin's idea of the NC which is based on his reading of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32, Irenaeus focuses on Jeremiah 31(38).33, likely influenced by the Pauline traditions (2 Cor 3; Gal 4). Irenaeus would believe that the prophecy of the NC is fulfilled not only in the practice of the Eucharist, but also by the engraving of the Gospel/teachings of Christ on Christian's hearts. As a result, the NC in Irenaeus seems to become an idiomatic expression of the Gospel of Christ. Irenaeus further argues that even the Ten Commandments are not necessary for a Christian, because he is 'the spiritual disciple' (*Epideix.* 95). This idea of the spiritual liberty in the NC is absent in Justin, while the identification of Christ with the NC is foreign to Irenaeus.

²⁴⁷ This emphasis may have been influenced by Pauline texts (Gal 4; 2 Cor 3).

C. Tertullian

Before discussing the idea of the covenant held by this North-African theologian, a brief remark should be made on his involvement in a sectarian movement in the later stage of his life time.²⁴⁸ Most of Tertullian's extant works were written from the end of the second century and into the early third century.²⁴⁹ Tertullian's later writings are regarded as the products of his Montanist period, many of which may bear marks of his involvement with the movement of the 'new prophecy'. Even though his orthodoxy might be questioned, however, there is no denying his influence on early Christian thought, and the result of the examinations below still contribute to our purpose here, which seeks to understand Tertullian's view of the NC.²⁵⁰

1. Testamentum

Tertullian uses *testamentum*²⁵¹ primarily in its Roman legal sense, as his use of it in *Adversus Marcionem* 4.1.1 illustrates; in this verse, *testamentum* is interchangeable with *instrumentum* (legal document). In this respect, J. H. Waszink's remark is suggestive:

I wonder whether enough attention has been paid to Tertullian's frequent references to the *testimonium Sacrae Scripturae* (or *sacrae paraturae* or

²⁴⁸ Tertullian was born in c. 155-160 and died c. 225: *EEC*, 1107; *ODCC*, 1591.

²⁴⁹ This study accepts Barnes' chronology of Tertullian's works, with a consideration of Rankin's note: T. D. Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 55; D. Rankin, *Tertullian and the Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), xiv-xvii.

²⁵⁰ Judged from his attachment to this charismatic religion expressed in his own writings and from the remarks by Jerome and Augustine, it has been assumed that as he became highly involved with the Montanists, Tertullian eventually cut his ties to the main-line church. Challenging this view, the study by D. Rankin discusses that Tertullian probably remained in the main-line church throughout his lifetime. Rankin lists the sections mentioning the church of Carthage in Tertullian's later works, which show no definite sign of schism. He also adduces Cyprian's admiration of Tertullian: in spite of his criticism against the Montanists of his day, Cyprian called Tertullian his 'Master': *ibid.*, 27-38, 43.

²⁵¹ Cf. Claesson, *Index*, 1632. In Tertullian, *foedus* appears three times in the two meanings: (1) a treaty between two parties (*Apol.* 9.9; 26.3) and (2) a bond of (Christian) community (*Apol.* 39.1): Claesson, *Index*, 618.

utriusque Testamenti). In this phrase the word *testimonium* is not just a metaphor, for the courtroom is never far from his mind: Tertullian is the plaintiff, the heretic in question (or the pagan opponent or, in the last stage of his life, the official Church) is the defendant, and Holy Scripture is the chief witness.²⁵²

Waszink rightly points out the influence of classic rhetorical training on Tertullian's exegesis. In order to settle theological disputes with his opponents, Tertullian uses the divine *testamentum* for the decisive evidence. Such a use of *testamentum* indicates that his view of the term is influenced by its legal sense.

In Tertullian, (*vetus*) *testamentum* often means the Mosaic Law/Sinai covenant,²⁵³ the initiator of which was Moses (*Marc.* 4.22.3). With *vetus testamentum*, he introduces the citation from the Pentateuch (*Marc.* 2.27.5). It may also include the Psalms, since the phrase *prophetica vox veteris testamenti* in *De exhortatione castitatis* 10.4 introduces citations from both Leviticus 11.44 and from Psalm 18.25-26. When used in a broad sense, therefore, *vetus testamentum* may refer to the books of the OT.²⁵⁴

Just as *vetus testamentum* for Tertullian is primarily the Mosaic Law/Sinai covenant, *novum testamentum* often means the Gospel of Christ.²⁵⁵ In *Adversus Marcionem* 4.40.4, Tertullian argues that this 'testament' is sealed by the blood of Christ (Luke 20.22).²⁵⁶ At the same time, Tertullian argues that the 'new testament' has been unsealed by the apostles (*Res.* 39.1). He even treats the

²⁵² J. H. Waszink, 'Tertullian's Principles and Methods of Exegesis', in W. R. Schoedel and R. L. Wilken (eds.) *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition* (Paris: Editions Beauchesne, 1979), 19.

²⁵³ *Res.* 39.1; *Marc.* 4.1.6 (Jer 31[38].32), 4.22.3; 5.5.10; 5.11.5; *Ieiun.* 11.1; 14.1; *Pud.* 11.3.

²⁵⁴ *Vetus testamentum* may encompass the OT books rejected by Marcion (*Marc.* 4.6.1; 5.5.10). Tertullian also uses the phrase 'the law and the prophets' (*Marc.* 4.6.1; 4.22.11; *Prax.* 31.1).

²⁵⁵ *Praescr.* 30.9; *Marc.* 5.11.5; *Prax.* 31.1; *Pud.* 6.5; 12.10.

²⁵⁶ In this case the testament may also refer to the Eucharist. The new testament is also described as 'new law' and 'spiritual circumcision and sacrifice' (*Iud.* 6.1-2). The phrase is juxtaposed with 'new prayer' (*Orat.* 1.1), so that it may imply the new way of worship. Like Justin, therefore, the observance of the Sacraments and the liturgical practices would also constitute an important part in his notion of the NC.

writings of the apostle on the equal terms with the Gospels (*Prax.* 15.1); thus the ‘new testament’ in Tertullian might indicate the NT Scriptures.

In addition, Tertullian, unlike Justin, is influenced by the Pauline use of the NC text in 2 Corinthians 3. In *Adversus Marcionem* 5.11.4, he comments on the ‘new testament’ in 2 Corinthians 3, where the apostle Paul expresses his conviction that he was called to be the minister of this testament; then Tertullian interprets the ‘new testament’ as the Gospel proclaimed in the power of the Holy Spirit to make people alive. His association of the Holy Spirit with the NC may suggest that Tertullian’s idea of the NC is influenced by the Pauline text.

2. *Jeremiah 31(38).31-34*

Tertullian quotes Jeremiah 31(38).31-34 twice in *Adversus Iudaeos* (3.7; 6.2) and in *Adversus Marcionem* (1.20.4; 4.1.6) respectively.

(1) *Adversus Iudaeos* 3.7: In *Adversus Iudaeos* 2, Tertullian discusses the primordial law given prior to the Sinai covenant. In his argument that the covenant with the patriarchs and the Mosaic Law are temporary, he introduces the idea of the pre-existence of the *lex primordialis* or *lex naturalis* (*Iud.* 2.4, 7). He insists that prior to the Sinai covenant the unwritten law, which was ‘the womb of all the precepts of God’ (2.4), had been given to Adam and Eve, the progenitors of all the nations: it was revised first for the patriarchs, and next for the people redeemed out of slavery in Egypt (2.9). Tertullian then proceeds to argue that the temporary nature of circumcision was verified in the OT stories before the giving of the Sinai covenant, because people like Noah, Enoch and Melchizedek are deemed righteous even without circumcision (2.13-14).

The first citation of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 appears in this context as proof of the annulment of carnal circumcision (*Iud.* 3.7). Based on the NC text from Jeremiah, Tertullian argues that Gentile Christians are the people of God without circumcision. In the next verse (*Iud.* 3.8), he proceeds to introduce the theme of

the coming out of the new Law in Isaiah 2.2-4. Tertullian's use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 and Isaiah 2.2-4 in his argument for the annulment of circumcision echoes *Dialogue* 24. However, Tertullian seems to interpret it in a way different from Justin. Tertullian uses Isaiah 2.2-4 as a proof of the renewal of the testament which brings the inheritance of the divine kingdom to all Christians (*Iud.* 3.8-9). Moreover, his interpretation of the 'mount of the Lord' in Isaiah 2.3 is distinctive. The prophet most likely intended to refer to the city of Jerusalem, or more specifically the Temple mount. Tertullian takes it as a metaphor referring to Christ.

(2) *Adversus Iudaeos* 6.2: The second appearance of Jeremiah 31(38).32 in *Adversus Iudaeos* 6.2 makes a literary unit with the first appearance in 3.7. In chapters 3-6, Tertullian discusses the cessation of the old law and the coming of the new. In the concluding section of this unit, Tertullian affirms that if Christ had already come, the new Law must have come into effect (6.3-7.1).

(3) *Adversus Marcionem* 1.20.4: The first three books of *Adversus Marcionem* are Tertullian's objections against Marcion's *Antitheses* (*Marc.* 2.29; 3.1). The first book mainly consists of Tertullian's refutation of Marcion's dualism (*Marc.* 1.2). Marcion insisted that he rescued the original teaching of Christ by emphasizing the Pauline theology.²⁵⁷ Tertullian uses Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 to refute this Marcionite contention.

The first citation of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 appears in a series of OT citations (Isa 43.18-19; Jer 4.3-4; Hos 2.11; Isa 1.14), which are introduced with the Pauline text 'old things have passed away' (2 Cor 5.17). By placing these OT passages immediately after this Pauline text, Tertullian demonstrates that Paul's teaching in 1 Corinthians 5.17 is in accordance with the OT prophecies, which Marcion thought were the Creator's books. This flow of argument may also indicate Tertullian's conviction that both the Pauline letters and the OT prophets are the

²⁵⁷ Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 1:48-51.

authoritative Scriptures. At the same time, Tertullian interprets these Pauline and Prophetic texts as proofs of the fact that circumcision and observance of the Jewish calendar are now revoked. This argument of Tertullian may have been derived from Justin's interpretation of the NC in *Dialogue* 11.

(4) *Adversus Marcionem* 4.1.6:²⁵⁸ The use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 in *Adversus Marcionem* 4.1.6 is similar to one in *Adversus Marcionem* 1.20.4.²⁵⁹ As in book 1, Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 is juxtaposed with Isaiah 43 and Jeremiah 4.3-4. Here again, Tertullian cites Isaiah 43.18-19 and 1 Corinthians 5.17 together with Jeremiah 31(38).31-32. As in *Adversus Marcionem* 1.20, Tertullian uses the NC text to argue that some precepts of the old covenant were temporary.

In sum: Tertullian's use of the NC text of Jeremiah shows similarities with Justin's. Using Jeremiah 31(38).31-32, Tertullian argues that the commandments of the old covenant—especially those pertaining to cultic practices—were revoked by the establishment of the new. Like Justin, he quotes only from verses 31-32; moreover, he may have borrowed a cluster of the OT proof texts which includes Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 from Justin's *Dialogue*. Likely drawing on Justin's identification of the new Law with the NC in *Dialogue* 24, Tertullian uses the 'new testament' interchangeably with the 'new law',²⁶⁰ although Tertullian does not identify the NC with Christ.

3. Summary

Tertullian's usage of *testamentum* is rooted in the legal sense of the term in Roman society. For Tertullian, *testamentum* is the divine evidence which provides him with the proof texts that he uses to settle theological disputes. The 'old testament' mainly means the Mosaic Law, although it may be extended to

²⁵⁸ Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 2:256-59.

²⁵⁹ In the verses adjacent to *Marc.* 4.1.6, Isa 2.3; 51.4 appears in *Marc.* 4.1.4-5 and Isa 55.3 in *Marc.* 4.1.7; the occurrence of these OT verses in the same context may indicate the influence of Justin's OT texts in *Dial.* 11 and 24.

²⁶⁰ Cf. *Iud.* 6.1-2, 9.18; *Marc.* 3.14.3; 4.9.3.

include the Prophets and the Writings. The ‘new testament’ primarily means the Gospel/teachings of Christ. One might be tempted to assume that ‘two testaments’ in Tertullian refer to the two part Christian Scriptures, but it seems unlikely that he uses the term as the title of the Scriptures.

Our observation may suggest that Tertullian’s use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 was indebted to Justin Martyr’s. Accepting the synonymous use of law and testament, however, Tertullian diverges from Justin’s notion in that he identifies Christ, not with the Law/covenant, but with Mount Zion (*Iud.* 3.8).

D. Clement of Alexandria

Clement of Alexandria (c. 150-c. 215)²⁶¹ regards Greek philosophy highly. He would consider that its role for the Greeks was similar to the Torah for the Jews.²⁶² His high regard for philosophy seems to have significantly influenced his usage of διαθήκη and interpretation of Jeremiah 31(38).31-34.

1. Διαθήκη

Διαθήκη in Clement primarily means the divine revelations, which mainly consist of the teachings for the true knowledge of God.²⁶³ Clement considers this knowledge to encompass both contemplative knowledge of God and practical

²⁶¹ EEC, 179-80; ODCC, 367. Clement of Alexandria left three major works (*Protreptikos*, *Paedagogus*, and *Stromateis*), two short treatises (*Quis Dives Salvetur?* and *Eclogae Propheticae*), an excerpt from a work of a Gnostic writer (*Excerpta ex scriptis Theodoto*), and some fragments. The first book of *Str.* was written at certain point in the reign of S. Severus (193-211 CE; *Str.* 1.[21]144.1-5): R. E. Heine, ‘The Alexandrians’, in F. Young, L. Ayres, and A. Louth (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 118. Most titles would have been completed during his years in Alexandria, before he left the city in 202/203: J. E. L. Oulton and H. Chadwick (eds.), *Alexandrian Christianity*, LCC 2 (London: SCM, 1954), 17. B. Altaner and A. Stuiber, *Patrologie* (Freiburg: Herder, 1966), 190-91. The possible dates for the major works are suggested by A. Méhat (*Étude sur les 'Stromates' de Clément d'Alexandrie*, *Patristica Sorbonensia* 7 [Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1966], 54): *Prot.*, c. 195; *Paed.*, c. 197; *Str.*, book 1, c. 198, book 2-5, c. 199-201; *Str.*, book 6-7 and *Div.*, c. 203; *Ecl.*, c. 204.

²⁶² Oulton and Chadwick, *Alexandrian Christianity*, 21.

²⁶³ Clement uses διαθήκη once in the common Greek sense in the context where he compares the secular legal practices of validating will/testament with the coming of Christ that expounded the OT promises (*Str.* 5.[8]55.4).

knowledge for the life of piety; he believes that true knowledge must be practical in order to guide people to righteous conducts (*Str.* 2.[10]²⁶⁴47.4). Knowledge of God and commandments for honourable living go hand in hand in Clement's thought (*Str.* 4.[16]99.2). He argues that unless knowledge and righteous conduct are both present, salvation is not effective (*Str.* 6.[15]122.4).

The root meaning of Clement's idea of the covenant seems to be derived from his view of natural theology. Clement not only applies the term *διαθήκη* to direct revelation, but also to indirect revelation. Greek philosophy is included in the 'different covenants' (*Str.* 6.[5]42.1-2), since it is an indirect form of revelation (*Str.* 1.[5]28.2; 6[8]67.1).²⁶⁵

Clement acknowledges that there are different appearances of the same covenant throughout different generations (*Str.* 6.[13]106.3; 7.[17]107.5). He knows at least four ancient covenants established with OT figures: Adam, Noah, Abraham, and Moses (*Ecl.* 51.1). Among such diverse appearances, the old covenant and the new are the two most important forms—both are given by the only God (*Str.* 2.[6]28.6; 6.[5]42.1).

Like other Christian polemicists, Clement testifies to the unity of the two covenants. He believes that the NC is prophesied in the OT Scriptures.²⁶⁶ His use of the phrase 'the old and the new testament' seems to be related to the fact that he accepts the harmony of the OT, the Gospel and the apostolic doctrines as the 'ecclesiastical rule' (*Str.* 6.[15]125.2). Clement believes that the first coming of Christ fulfilled the old covenant (*Str.* 4.[21] 134.2-4) in order to establish the NC for the new people (*Paed.* 1.[7]59.1; *Prot.* [10]94.1).

²⁶⁴ In this study, a number in parentheses or block parentheses in reference to a section of Clement's work indicates a chapter (a sub-division of 'book').

²⁶⁵ Clement mentions the covenant with the angels before or at the creation, which is the natural order of heavenly bodies (*Ecl.* 51.1). In *Str.* 6.(16)133.3, the covenant of heavenly bodies is called 'the physical Decalogue of heaven.'

²⁶⁶ *Str.* 1.(21)125.5; 6.(5)41.5, (6)44.2.

Παλαιὰ διαθήκη in Clement means the Sinai covenant/Mosaic Law.²⁶⁷ This covenant was also called the ‘first covenant’, designed for the Jews (*Paed.* 1.[6]33.4). Just as the phrase ‘old covenant’ refers to the Sinai covenant and its commandments, καινὴ διαθήκη in Clement often means the teachings of Christ; as the Decalogue was the essence of the Sinai covenant, the Sermon on the Mount is the quintessential expression of the NC (*Str.* 3.[11]71.3). Christ’s ethic is so excellent that even some of the apostolic teachings remain at the level of the (old) covenant (*Str.* 3.[12]82.4).

At the same time, Clement would be one of the earliest writers who used διαθήκη/αι to refer to the OT Scriptures; with the term, he also seems to refer to the NT in the formative stage. As Carleton Paget points out, Clement of Alexandria is the first Christian author who used παλαιὰ διαθήκη to refer to ‘a *body of writings* distinguished from the collection of books known as the New Testament.’²⁶⁸ The canonical NT Scriptures for Clement may still be a matter for discussion, but it is likely that by the phrase the ‘old and new/two testaments,’ he virtually refers to the two-part Christian Bible, which would include the OT Scriptures as well as the Gospels and several apostolic writings.²⁶⁹

Finally, an observation should be made on Clement’s interpretation of Genesis 17.4, in which he identifies the covenant with the creator God (*Str.* 1.[29]182.2). He explains this identification in this way:

Moses clearly means the Lord when he speaks of a covenant, saying, ‘Look. I am my covenant at your side.’ (Gen 17.4a) He had said ‘covenant’ earlier,

²⁶⁷ *Paed.* 1.(7)59.1; *Str.* 4.(16)100.1-2 (2 Cor 3.14); *Str.* 7.(14)88.2; *Ecl.* 43.1.

²⁶⁸ J. Carleton Paget, ‘The Christian Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Alexandrian Tradition’, in M. Saebø, et al. (eds.), *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*. vol. 1; *From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (until 1300)*, part 1, *Antiquity* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 485.

²⁶⁹ *Str.* 1.(5)28.2, (9)44.3; 5.(1)3.3, (13)85.1.

It is relatively in a few cases where Clement clearly discusses the NC in connection with the Eucharist. The NC in Clement may refer to the new way of worship (*Str.* 6.[5]41.4-7) and particularly the Eucharist (*Div.* 3.6).

adding that he should not search for it in writing. The covenant is the originator of the universe, who establishes its orderly disposition, and is called God because of its good order. (*Str.* 1.[29]182.2)²⁷⁰

Clement identifies the covenant in Genesis 17.4a with God, since Clement regards him as the ‘originator’ (αἴτιος) of the universe.²⁷¹ Clement understands that the giver of the covenant/order to the universe may be described as identical with the covenant.²⁷²

This identification of the covenant with the ‘originator’ is strikingly similar to Justin Martyr’s equation of Christ as the NC,²⁷³ since in Clement’s understanding, the term would have included not only God the Father, but also Christ.²⁷⁴ Thus in Clement’s use of διαθήκη, we find the identification of the NC with Christ as we have seen in Justin.

2. Jeremiah 31(38).31-34

In Clement, Jeremiah 31(38).31-34 occurs once in *Protreptikos* and twice in book 6 of *Stromateis*. In *Protreptikos* (11)114.5 and *Stromateis* 6.(6)52.4, on the one hand, Clement only quotes Jeremiah 31(38).33-34; with these verses, Clement argues that both the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount are inscribed innately on human hearts. In *Stromateis* 6.(5)41.4-5, on the other hand, Clement quotes Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 from *KP*.

(1) *Protreptikos* (11) 114.5: In *Protreptikos* (10)106-08, Clement exhorts his readers to accept God, describing Him as the lawgiver for the people of the

²⁷⁰ ET is quoted from Ferguson, *Stromateis* 1-3, 155-56.

²⁷¹ Αἴτιος is also identified with the Logos/Christ in *Prot.* (1)7.1. Cf. *PGL*, 54.

²⁷² Philo of Alexandria also recognises this identification of the covenant with God: see ‘Excursus’, p. 225.

²⁷³ Von Otto cites *Str.* 1.(29)182 as a parallel with Justin’s identification of the NC with Christ in *Dial.* 11: J. C. T. von Otto, *Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Saeculi Secundi*, vol. 2; *Iustinus Philosophus et Martyr: Opera quae feruntur omnia II, Dialogus cum Tryphone*, (Wiesbaden: Martin Sändig, 1877), 42-43.

²⁷⁴ In his commentaries to *KP* fr. 1, Clement mentions the Lord as the Lawgiver; likewise in *Dial.* 12.2, Justin discusses that the Lawgiver (i.e. Christ) has come.

kingdom of heaven, and explaining what the divine laws are. Clement considers that these commandments are intrinsically engraved on human hearts. He seems to suggest that the Scriptures have articulated these universal moral principles. Yet he still invites his audience to ‘put away oblivion of the truth’ in order to recover what has been obscured (*Prot.* [11]114.1).²⁷⁵ Jeremiah 31(38).33-34 is introduced after this invitation. Although Clement thinks that the divine laws have been inscribed on human hearts, he still encourages his audience to receive the ‘laws of life,’ because God promises to grant the true knowledge and the remission of sins to those who respond. Clement seems to believe that the redemptive work of Christ has made it possible to recognise the divine laws as prophesied in Jeremiah 31(38).33.

(2) *Stromateis* 6.(6)52.4: An allusion to Jeremiah 31(38).33-34 appears in Clement’s polemic against Valentinus who would have rejected the OT Scriptures. After he argues that Greek philosophy prepared the Greeks for the Gospel just as the OT Scriptures (the Law and the Prophets) did for the Jews (*Str.* 6.[6]44), Clement starts his discussion against a Gnostic interpretation of Jeremiah 31(38).33-34. Clement’s allusion to verses 33-34 (νόμος ὁ γραπτὸς ἐν καρδίᾳ) seems to have been taken from Valentinus’ text of the *Intercourse of Friends*. Clement argues that Valentinus’ use of Jeremiah 31(38).33-34 ignores the point intended by the prophet. Clement also points out that Valentinus views the Law engraved on human hearts merely as the innate moral conscience given to all human beings, while the prophet views the engraving of the law in the hearts of the divine people as an eschatological event. Thus Clement accuses Valentinus of distorting the truth by suggesting that it is ‘common knowledge’ (*Str.* 6.[6]53.1). Unlike Valentinus, Clement believes that the truth is kept under a veil unless one accepts Christ to be released from the bondage of oblivion.

²⁷⁵ The Greek text reads ἀφέλωμεν τὴν λήθην τῆς ἀληθείας; C. Mondésert (ed.), *Clément d’Alexandrie: Le Protrepétique*, SC 2 (Paris: Cerf, 1949), 182. Clement’s use of the term λήθη may echo the Greek mythological theme of the River of Forgetfulness mentioned in Plato’s *Republic* 621.

In view of his criticism of the Valentinian interpretation, together with the discussion in *Protreptikos* (11)114.5, it is clear that Clement's interpretation of Jeremiah 31(38).33-34 is set forth as an alternative to a Gnostic interpretation. Clement seems to propose a middle path between a Gnostic interpretation of the Law engraved on human heart(s) and a Christian interpretation of those who reject entirely the Greek philosophical knowledge.

(3) *Stromateis* 6.(5)41.5: The verses from Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 appear in a discussion on the obsolescence of the Greek ways of worship. In *Stromateis* 6.(5)41.5, Clement uses the verses to support his view of the Greeks' knowledge of God; the NC text here is quoted from *KP*.²⁷⁶ Using the quotation of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32, the author of *KP* seems to argue that the Greeks must observe the new way of worship, just as the Jews must give up their traditional ways of worship. Likely accepting this argument, Clement adds his comment that the Greeks still worshiped with some—if not perfect—knowledge of God.

In sum: Clement of Alexandria interprets the NC text under the influence of Greek thought. He acknowledges that the Greeks may have obtained the knowledge of God in their pursuit of philosophy. Clement quotes Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 from *KP*; perhaps in agreement with *KP*, he views the NC in Jeremiah as the new way of worship. Clement includes the Greek ways of worship in the category of the old covenant. At the same time, he rejects Valentinian interpretation of the 'law engraved on human heart' in Jeremiah 31(38).33 merely as innate human conscience, by arguing that the truth remains obscure unless one is released from oblivion by accepting Christ.

3. Summary

Clement of Alexandria, like other early fathers, often follows his predecessors and established ecclesiastical traditions. For example, the influence of the liturgical

²⁷⁶ See also the discussion in ch. 1 'Jeremiah's NC before the time of Justin', pp. 56-58.

tradition retained in the Pauline and Lukan writings might be recognised in his use of the NC text quoted from *KP*. Accepting the consensus perhaps reached after the Marcionite controversies, Clement acknowledges the harmony between the old covenant and the new as an ‘ecclesiastical rule.’

The above discussion also reveals that Clement’s idea of the covenant and his interpretation of Jeremiah 31(38).31-34 are rooted in his intellectual backgrounds. Among the three theologians being discussed in this chapter, Clement has the highest regard for Greek literature. Clement understands *διαθήκη* as the divine revelation(s) that lead one to the true knowledge of God. In its broader sense, even the Greek philosophy and worship may be described as the ‘covenants’. In his discussion of *διαθήκη*, moreover, he makes the distinction between direct and indirect revelation. By including Greek philosophy in the category of the ‘different covenants’, he expresses his conviction that philosophical knowledge is a form of indirect revelation.

To the question of the identification of the NC with Christ, Clement’s covenant idea includes a parallel with Justin’s use of the term, possibly because both knew *KP*’s identification of ‘Law and Word’ with the Lord. More importantly, Clement identifies the covenant of Genesis 17.4a with the creator God; this might suggest that Justin’s identification of the NC with Christ was also partly rooted in Gen 17.4a, even though Justin does not use the exact text in his extant works.²⁷⁷

E. Concluding remarks

From the above word studies of *διαθήκη/testamentum* and our examination of the use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-34, it is clear that Justin’s identification of the NC with Christ was, as Clement’s example shows, not an isolated phenomenon in the second-century Christian literature. The identification of the covenant with God in Genesis 17.4, together with Philo’s interpretation of the text in *De mutatione*

²⁷⁷ See ch. 6 ‘Genesis 17’, p. 209.

nominum 57-58,²⁷⁸ would have been known among some Christians. Justin's identification of the NC with Christ needs to be seen in this background.

Yet there seems to be still differences between Clement and Justin regarding their identification of the NC with Christ. Justin's identification is clearly associated with Jeremiah 31.31-32 (*Dial.* 11), whereas Clement does not seem to make this identification where he quotes the NC text of Jeremiah. In his extant works, moreover, Justin does not clearly identify the covenant of Genesis 17.4a with the creator God/Christ as Clement does. Hence Justin's identification of the NC with Christ may be rather closely related to the NC text of Jeremiah and its context; the clues to understand Justin's identification may be found in the textual and exegetical traditions of Jeremiah 30-31, which we will investigate in the next chapter.

²⁷⁸ See the discussion in 'Excursus: Philo of Alexandria', p. 225.

PART TWO

THREE PASSAGES OF THE OT/ HEBREW BIBLE IN DIFFERENT TRADITIONS

Part I has examined the early Christian interpretations of the NC text of Jeremiah (Jer 31.31-34) and the usage of διαθήκη/*testamentum* in first- and second-century Christian literature.

As discussed in chapter 1, the phrase NC was, in the earliest Christianity, first used to refer to the Eucharistic element of wine in a liturgical tradition as recorded in the Pauline and the Lukan accounts of the Lord's Supper. The phrase then appeared in 2 Corinthians 3, where the apostle Paul defended his apostleship using the phrase 'ministers of the new covenant'. He argued that their ministry, characterized with the works of the Spirit, was more glorious than the ministry of the old covenant. In the Letter to the Hebrews, the NC text of Jeremiah played a prominent role. The author of Hebrews, who was likely influenced by the use of the NC in the liturgical tradition, further developed the notion of the NC. In fact, he seems to have been the first Christian author who clearly argued that the old covenant was destined to become obsolete after the establishment of the NC (Heb 8.13).

With the possible exception of *KP*, it might have been in the writing of Justin Martyr that the NC text of Jeremiah became again an important OT text after the Letter to the Hebrews. Regarding Justin's use of the NC text of Jeremiah, chapter 2 has observed three points. (1) Although Justin did not use the phrase NC in his Eucharistic account in *I Apology* 65-66, his combined quotations of Jeremiah 7.21-22 and 31(38).31-32 in *Dialogue* 22.6 might indicate that his notion of the NC was rooted in the liturgical tradition preserved in the Pauline and Lukan Eucharistic formulae; the NC in Justin might have referred to the Eucharistic rite.

(2) In *Dialogue* 11-12, Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 and Isaiah 51.4-5 and 55.1-3 formed the first cluster of the OT quotations in this treatise. This combination had not been attested before Justin's works; hence, Justin was likely responsible for composing this cluster of the OT texts. (3) One of the distinctive features in Justin's notion of the NC was his identification of the NC of Jeremiah 31.31 with Christ; Justin seems to have been one of the first Christian writers who clearly made this identification.

The third point is further examined in chapter 3 which explored the usage of the term διαθήκη/*testamentum* and the use of the NC text of Jeremiah after the time of Justin Martyr. The result of our investigation indicates that the identification of the NC with Christ was not inherited by Irenaeus and Tertullian, but it was shared by Clement of Alexandria.

The witness of Clement may elucidate Justin's sources of his notion of the NC. It might have been *KP*'s identification of the Law with the Lord that assisted both Justin and Clement to make the same identification. Both Justin and Clement might also have been influenced by Genesis 17.4a.

However, there is still a room for a further investigation on Justin's sources of his notion of the NC in view of his knowledge of the Jewish traditions. Justin's identification seems to be closely related to his interpretation of the NC text of Jeremiah; hence, further clues to understand Justin's identification may be found in the passage, its context, and the Scriptural texts related to the NC text. Thus it may still worthwhile seeking possible sources of Justin's identification of the NC with Christ in the OT Scriptural traditions current among Jewish and Christian circles in Justin's time.

Based upon these findings, we raise the following questions in part two. First, why did Justin combine Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 with Isaiah 51.4-5 and 55.1-3? Certainly, the terms νόμος and διαθήκη are present in all three OT texts. But are there any other clues to the understanding of Justin's combination? Second, are

there any other sources on which Justin relied on in terms of the formation of his notion of the NC, especially his identification of the NC with Christ?

To answer these questions, part two will explore three OT passages (Jer 30-31 [37-38], Exod 19-24, and Gen 17) in different traditions (MT, LXX, the versions of 'Theodotion' and of Aquila, and the Aramaic Targums). Among these passages, the most important one is of course Jeremiah 30-31 (37-38), which will be discussed in chapter 4. But this study extends its scope also to Exodus 19-24, since this passage provides an important background of early Christian practice of the Eucharist; in the liturgical tradition attested in Mark and Matthew, the establishment of the Sinai covenant is associated with the Last Supper by the use of the phrase 'blood of the covenant' which alludes to Exodus 24.8-11. The narrative of the Sinai covenant (Exod 19-24) will be examined in chapter 5. The last chapter of part two (chapter 6) will turn to Genesis 17, the passage on the covenant of circumcision. The inclusion of Genesis 17 may shed light of Justin's view on Christian baptism, which Justin recognised as the NC together with the Eucharist.

Chapter IV

Jeremiah 30-31 (37-38)

A. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is mainly twofold: (1) to explore Jeremiah 30-31(37-38) in different textual traditions; (2) to examine the influence of the passage on Justin Martyr's use of Jeremiah 31.31-32. Accordingly, this chapter first provides an outline of Jeremiah 30-31 (MT) before the examination of the passage in LXX (Jer 37-38);²⁷⁹ it then turns to the passages of 'Theodotion', Aquila, and *Tg* Jeremiah. On the basis of the findings in these textual and exegetical traditions, this chapter analyzes their influence on Justin; its scope is extended to an examination of Justin's use of the Jewish metaphors of 'tree' and 'water'—the key terms to describe the renewed Israelites in Jeremiah 30-31 (37-38).²⁸⁰

B. Two texts of Jeremiah

Before turning to the examination of Jeremiah 30-31 (MT), it is necessary to deal with the two texts of Jeremiah.²⁸¹ A study which compares LXX Jeremiah with MT must address this issue. The Hebrew text of Jeremiah used by the translators of LXX Jeremiah was shorter than that of MT by one seventh.²⁸² The existence of

²⁷⁹ The examination of LXX Jer 37-38 is preceded by a brief discussion on the LXX translation of ברית as διαθήκη.

²⁸⁰ The translators seems to have known these Jewish metaphors, since they seem to be reflected in the LXX translation of 'watered garden' (Jer 31.12 [MT]) as 'fruitful tree' (LXX Jer 38.12).

²⁸¹ That is, the textual tradition of MT and the *Vorlage* of LXX Jer.

²⁸² B. Becking, 'Jeremiah's Book of Consolation: A Textual Comparison Notes on the Masoretic Texts and the Old Greek Version of Jeremiah XXX-XXXI', *VT* 44 (1994), 145.

In this study, the plural is always used to refer to the translator(s) of LXX Jer. This does not imply my wholehearted agreement with H. St. J. Thackeray on the issue, although his theory seems to be still a viable solution. From his observation of the vocabulary of LXX Jer, Thackeray inferred that there were two (or three) translators of the book: one translated up to somewhere in the latter part of ch. 29, and the other did the rest (or possibly ch. 52 was done by another hand): *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins* (London: Oxford UP, 1921), 32. His theory comes under the scrutiny of E. Tov, who argues that the book was first translated by one person and later revised by another: *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch*, HSM 8 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976).

a shorter Hebrew version as the *Vorlage* of LXX Jeremiah has been suggested by A. Scholz.²⁸³ Since the discovery of the Jeremiah fragments in the Qumran scrolls (e.g. 4QJer^b),²⁸⁴ the view first articulated by Scholz has become a widely accepted position; that is, when the translation of Jeremiah was undertaken, two Hebrew versions of the book were in circulation.²⁸⁵ It has been further developed by J. Gerald Janzen who asserts that the *Vorlage* of LXX Jeremiah is earlier than MT; the priority should therefore be given to the *Vorlage* of LXX for text critical evidence.²⁸⁶ Scholarly opinion however remains divided on this issue. Sven Soderlund still argues that the better texts should be decided case-by-case,²⁸⁷ while G. Fischer regards MT more highly than the *Vorlage* of LXX Jeremiah 1-20.²⁸⁸ A position called the ‘editorial theory’ has been proposed originally by J. G. Eichhorn,²⁸⁹ and revived by A. van Selms; he argues that Jeremiah and Baruch left two different editions of the Book of Jeremiah.²⁹⁰

²⁸³ *Der masoretische Text und die LXX-Übersetzung des Buches Jeremias* (Ratisbon, 1875), cited in A. W. Streane, *The Double Text of Jeremiah (Massoretic and Alexandrian) Compared* (Cambridge: Deighton Bell, 1896), 6.

²⁸⁴ The fragments of 4QJer^b correspond to the length and the verse order of parallel sections of LXX Jer: E. Tov, ‘Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah’, in P.-M. Bogaert (ed.), *Le Livre de Jérémie: Le prophète et son milieu, les oracles et leur transmission* (Leuven: Leuven UP, 1981), 190-91, 264; M. Abegg, et al. (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* (New York: Harper San Francisco, 1999), 382.

²⁸⁵ E. Tov, *The Text-critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem: Simor, 1981), 52, 191, 264; L. Greenspoon, ‘Hebrew into Greek: Interpretation in, by, and of the Septuagint’, in A. Hauser and D. Watson (eds.), *A History of Biblical Interpretation*, vol. 1: *The Ancient Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 82.

²⁸⁶ J. G. Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*, HSM 6 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1973), 127-28. Janzen’s ‘expansion theory’ is supported by Tov, ‘Some Aspects’, 145-67. The ‘expansion theory’ is gaining more supports including P. Piovanelli, ‘JrB 33,14-26 ou la continuité des institutions à l’époque Maccabéenne’, in A. Curtis and T. Römer (eds.), *The Book of Jeremiah and Its Reception* (Leuven: Leuven UP, 1997), 255-76; S. Olofsson, ‘Qumran and LXX’, in F. Cryer and T. Thompson (eds.), *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*, JSOTSup 290 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 235; L. C. Allen, *Jeremiah: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008), 7-8.

²⁸⁷ S. Soderlund, *The Greek Text of Jeremiah: A Revised Hypothesis*, JSOTSup 47 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 248.

²⁸⁸ G. Fischer, ‘Zum Text des Jeremiabuches’, *Bib* 78 (1997), 305-28, cited in J. R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1-20*, AB 21A (New York: Doubleday, 1999), 62.

²⁸⁹ In vol. 3 of *Einleitung in das alte Testament*, 3rd edn. (Reutlingen, 1803).

²⁹⁰ A. van Selms, ‘Telescoped Discussion as a Literary Device in Jeremiah’, *VT* 26 (1976), 99-112; Soderlund, *Greek Text*, 11-13. B. Becking gives a positive appraisal to van Selms’

It is beyond the scope of this study to engage in the debate concerning the two texts of Jeremiah, since its purpose is not to establish the *Urtext* of the Book of Jeremiah. My study will approach the two texts as separate traditions, because its goal is to examine the differences between Jeremiah 30-31 (MT) and LXX Jeremiah 37-38 and the influence of each tradition upon Justin Martyr. The reception history of LXX prompts us to treat them as such. The LXX texts would have been accepted, transmitted and interpreted in their own right by some early Jewish authors such as Philo of Alexandria, and by early Christian theologians,²⁹¹ since the story of the LXX translation in the *Letter of Aristeas* was well known to them²⁹² and the fact that the LXX texts were often preferred by NT writers would have been recognised by most of early Christian fathers.

As the first text to be examined, my study chooses MT mainly because of a methodological reason. Although the *Vorlage* of LXX Jeremiah would be at times significantly different from MT Jeremiah, the text preserved in MT might still be able to shed light on the different readings in LXX Jeremiah. The

theory: 'Abbreviation, Expansion or Two Traditions: The Text of Jeremiah 30-31' in *Between Fear and Freedom: Essays on the Interpretation of Jeremiah 30-31* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 14.

²⁹¹ The recensors of LXX might have attempted to recover the better LXX texts. (1) Origen intended to reconstruct the 'original LXX texts' perhaps by consulting the Hebrew text, although it resulted in a mixture of two traditions: Swete, *Introduction*, 68; S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 111-13. (2) Lucian of Antioch, a putative recensor of the Lucianic recension, might have revised the LXX text possibly with a current Hebrew tradition as well as with Origen's recension and Symmachus. Lucian seems to have incorporated earlier Greek translations: the Lucianic recension of LXX Samuel-Kings might include the translation of the Hebrew *Vorlage* similar to one attested in the Qumran documents (4QSam^a); it has also been pointed out that the Greek OT text from Samuel to Maccabees used by Josephus faithfully reproduces that of the Lucianic recension: Jellicoe, *Septuagint*, 157-69; O. Munnich, 'Le texte de la Septante', in M. Harl, et al. (eds.), *La Bible grecque des Septante: Du Judaïsme hellénistique au Christianisme ancien* (Paris: Cerf, 1988), 169-71; Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint*, 232-36. (3) Jerome testifies to another recensor, Hesychius, who might have revised LXX c. 300, but there seems to be no scholarly consensus regarding which manuscripts represent this recension: Swete, *Introduction*, 78-80.

²⁹² *Ibid.*, 12-13.

examination of the Hebrew text can provide a foundation for a better understanding of the LXX text.²⁹³

C. Jeremiah 30-31 (MT)

The choice of Jeremiah 30-31(37-38)—the Book of the Covenant (BC) in Jeremiah²⁹⁴—as an immediate context for the NC text is justified, because the two chapters forms a unit.²⁹⁵ The passage may be outlined as follows.

The introductory section (Jer 30.1-3) serves as an assurance for the people of Israel and Judah that they will return to the Land given to their fathers. The first oracle describes God's judgment on all the nations side-by-side with his restoration of the Davidic dynasty (30.4-31.22). The coming days would not only be a time of distress, but also the time of salvation for Jacob (30.5-7). The people of Israel would return to the Land to live in peace, a Davidic king should be enthroned again, and God's presence would be restored in Israel. God would bring judgment on all the nations among which he scattered the people of Israel and Judah (30.8-11). The prophet/redactor inserts a brief explanation for the cause of Israel's suffering: their wound was incurable in any other way (30.12-15). In the coming days, however, God would destroy the nations that oppressed and

²⁹³ In addition to MT and LXX, this chapter also attempts to identify points of contact between the other traditions (θ' , α' , *Tg Jer*) and Justin. For the examinations of θ' and α' , I have compared them with both MT and LXX; for the examination of *Tg Jer*, I have mainly compared it with MT.

²⁹⁴ This study follows J. R. Lundbom's appellation—the 'Book of the Covenant' for Jer 30-31 (37-38): *Jeremiah 21-36*, AB 21B (New York: Doubleday, 2004), 368. Regarding the date of the BC in Jeremiah, W. L. Holladay infers that most verses in ch. 30 were composed in Jeremiah's early career (615-609 BCE), while the NC text (Jer 31[38].31-34) was written in 587 BCE: *Jeremiah 1* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1986), 2, 9. Lundbom admits that some sections might have been composed earlier, although he suggests that the first compilation of the Book of Restoration was done shortly after 586 BCE: *Jeremiah 21-36*, 370, 376. R. P. Carroll identifies a number of editorial elements in the BC of Jeremiah, and is cautious of attributing it to Jeremiah's authorship: *Jeremiah: A Commentary* (London: SCM, 1986), 569. W. McKane seeks to elucidate the redaction process beyond LXX and the texts of Jer recovered from Qumran, assuming that MT Jer represents the last editorial stage: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986), 1:1-lv. ²⁹⁵ Cf. B. Becking, 'Cola, Canticles and Subcantos: The Macrostructure of Jeremiah 30-31', in *Between Fear and Freedom: Essays on the Interpretation of Jeremiah 30-31* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 50-52.

plundered Israel. The people would return to Zion to rebuild the city; the thanksgiving would come out from them (ויצא מהם תודה). Zion's population would grow and a ruler from their midst should be established (30.16-21). They would be God's people, and he would be their God (30.22). Another description of God's judgment concludes chapter 30 (30.23-24).

In Jeremiah 31.1, there is a covenant formula²⁹⁶ followed by a series of restoration promises. Since Israel found favour with God in the wilderness even after the incident of the Golden Calf, the 'survivors of the sword' would find rest, since God assured Israel of his steadfast love. When the remnant of Israel returned, they would rejoice with circle-dance and with tambourines (Jer 31.4; cf. Exod 15.20). In the coming days, the guards in the hill-country of Ephraim would exhort the people of Israel to go up to Zion (Jer 31.2-6). The remnant of Israel would return not only from the land of the north but also from the corners of the earth to the 'streams of water' (נְחָלֵי מַיִם) (31.7-9). Those who returned to Zion should enjoy agricultural affluence, and their life would become like a 'watered garden' (כִּגְן רוּחַ), so that they would no longer languish (31.10-14). In Jeremiah 31.15, Rachel's lament for the loss of her children interrupts a series of promises, but in the next verse, she was encouraged not to mourn any longer, because her children should return to their Land. Upon hearing Ephraim's vow of repentance, the Lord would show his compassion, just as a mother loves her children (31.15-20). The first oracle (30.3-31.22) concludes with an invitation: the people were invited to return to their God and their cities, because he would create a new thing on earth (31.21-22).

While Jeremiah 30.4-31.22 mainly focuses on Northern Israel, 31.23-40 is concerned with the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the cities of Judah, predicted along with the restoration of the entire nation of Israel. The first section predicted the rebuilding and re-habitation of the cities of Judah (31.23-26). In the second

²⁹⁶ That is, the formula of 'I will be the God of all the families of Israel, and they shall be my people' or the like. In the BC of Jeremiah, it first appears in Jer 30(37).22.

section, God promised to sow not only the house of Israel and Judah, but also the seed of man (Adam) and animal, which might allude to the covenant with Noah (Jer 31.27-30). The third section—the hub of this literary unit (31.23-40)—is the NC text (31.31-34). In the coming days, the Lord would make a new covenant with Israel; unlike the Sinai covenant, in which the Law was inscribed on stone tablets, the divine law would be inscribed on the inner-part (קרב) and heart (לב) of the people of Israel, and their transgressions would no longer be remembered (31.31-34).²⁹⁷ In the fourth section, God's steadfast love for Israel is compared with the order of heavenly bodies (31.35-37). The second oracle ends with a description of the rebuilding of Jerusalem in the fifth section (31.38-40).

From the examination of Jeremiah 30-31, we recognise that the BC in Jeremiah includes references to other covenants in the Hebrew Bible. These oracles are primarily about the restoration of the Davidic kingdom (Jer 30.9), and therefore provide an overall theme of the BC in Jeremiah, which is the future fulfilment of the Davidic covenant.²⁹⁸ God's sowing of man/Adam and of animal might be an allusion to the covenant with Noah (Jer 31.27), although a universalistic perspective is not conspicuous here. The use of the verb 'to multiply' (*hip'il* of רבה: Jer 30.19)²⁹⁹ and the inheritance of and re-settlement in the Land (Jer 30.3)

²⁹⁷ It is a matter for debate whether the NC is a renewal of the previous covenant(s) or the establishment of something entirely new. Some elements in the BC of Jeremiah may suggest that the NC will be entirely different from the previous covenants: cf. B. P. Robinson, 'Jeremiah's New Covenant: Jer 31,31-34', *SJOT* 15 (2001), 187-89. Assuming a common source for the prophetic traditions about the new/eternal covenants (Jer 31.31-34; 32.37-41; Ezek 37.16-28; 34.25-31; Bar 2.29-35) and the giving of new heart (Ezek 36.22-35, Zach 7.7-8.17), P. Buis rather argues that the use of the phrase NC does not contradict the prophets' belief in the eternal validity of the Sinai covenant: 'La nouvelle alliance', *VT* 18 (1968), 1-5. J. Swetnam also asserts that the newness of the NC is not to be found its content, but in the manner in which the Torah is made available to the people of Israel: 'Why Was Jeremiah's New Covenant New?', in D. Lys (ed.), *Studies on Prophecy*, VTSup 26 (Leiden: Brill, 1974), 112-15. A similar view is also held by R. Rendtorff, *The Covenant Formula: An Exegetical and Theological Investigation*, trans. M. Kohl (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 73.

²⁹⁸ In my study, the Davidic covenant means the divine promise for the glory of the nation of Israel given to David (2 Sam 7.11-16//1 Chr 17.10-15): the eternal Davidic kingdom is promised in Psa 89(88).3-4, whereas the eternal divine presence in the Temple built by the son of David is assured in Psa 132(131).8-17. Cf. Jaubert, *Alliance*, 32-36.

²⁹⁹ The *hip'il* verb רבה is often used in the covenant/promise to the fathers: e.g. Gen 15.1; 16.10; 26.4, 24; 48.4; Lev 26.9; Deut 7.13; 30.5.

may suggest the presence of the covenant with Abraham/the patriarchs. The reference to the priestly covenant is not explicit in the BC in Jeremiah, but it might be alluded to in Jeremiah 30.21.³⁰⁰ The Mosaic covenant is contrasted with the NC: in the future, the Law will be written on human heart(s), so that no one will teach the Law to another since all Israelites will know it (Jer 31.31-34). This NC is also called the 'eternal covenant' in Jeremiah 32.40.³⁰¹ In Jeremiah 30-31 (MT) therefore the NC is seen as the fulfilment of the covenants with Noah, Abraham, Levi and David, and as the renewal of the Mosaic covenant. Among these covenants, the Davidic covenant is conspicuous.³⁰²

Moreover, the establishment of the NC is expected to take place after the judgment of all the nations among whom God scattered the people of Israel (Jer 30.11), just as the Sinai covenant was given after the destruction of Pharaoh's army in the Red Sea (Jer 31.4). Hence, the MT tradition expects the realization of the NC in the future (Jer 31.17).³⁰³

D. LXX translation of ברית

Before turning to LXX Jeremiah 37-38, it is necessary to deal with the LXX translation of ברית as διαθήκη; it is indispensable for a study on the LXX interpretation of the NC in Jeremiah to discuss this issue. Numerous efforts have been made to elucidate ברית in the Hebrew Bible and to define the theological

³⁰⁰ The *nip'al* verb נִגַּשׁ (to draw near) is also used in Exod 24.2, where only Moses is allowed to come near to the Lord. Just as Moses, this future ruler of Israel is expected to have access to the Lord: Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21-36*, 408.

³⁰¹ Hence the five covenant themes (or six, if the covenant with Noah is distinguished from the eternal covenant) recognised by Jaubert (*Alliance*, 27-66) are to a greater or lesser extent present in the BC of Jeremiah.

³⁰² While the prophet/redactor only alludes the covenants with Noah and Abraham, and hints the priestly covenant, he clearly predicts the coming of the Davidic messiah.

³⁰³ Accordingly, some Midrashic documents interpret the NC in Jer 31 as a future event: *Midrash Qohelet* 2.1 (A. Cohen [trans.], *Ecclesiastes*, Midrash Rabbah 8: [London: Soncino, 1951], 51); *Midrash Shir ha-Shirim* 1.2 (M. Simon [trans.], *Song of Songs*, Midrash Rabbah 9 [London: Soncino, 1951], 25-26).

concept(s) of the OT covenant(s).³⁰⁴ This section attempts to give a brief overview of the discussions on the meaning(s) of ברית in the Hebrew Bible and the significance of the LXX translation of this word.³⁰⁵

In *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, the lexical meanings of ברית are defined as follows: (1) ‘agreement’ or ‘covenant’ between persons; (2) ‘covenant’ with animals (Hos 2.20; Ezek 34.25), stones (Job 5.23), or death (Isa 28.15, 18); and (3) ‘covenant’ between God and mankind.³⁰⁶ To these definitions, the *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* adds ‘obligation’.³⁰⁷ However, a peculiar usage, which *HALOT* would group in the second category, is illuminating. In Job 31.1, Job makes a ‘covenant’ with his eyes not to gaze on a maiden. In this case, ברית should be translated as ‘oath’ or ‘vow’. This meaning is relevant also to God’s oaths/vows to Abraham (Gen 15) and Phinehas (Num 25).³⁰⁸

The Hebrew Bible uses some analogies to describe the covenant relationship between God and Israel. It employs analogies with family relationships, such as a

³⁰⁴ This issue has been a focus of the modern study of the religion of ancient Israel and OT theology since J. Wellhausen: D. J. McCarthy, *Old Testament Covenant: A Survey of Current Opinions* (Richmond: John Knox, 1972), 1-2; E. W. Nicholson, *God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 3-7.

³⁰⁵ It is beyond the scope of this study to discuss fully the philology of ברית, its development as a theological concept(s) throughout the history of ancient Israel, and the diverse views on the covenant(s) within the Hebrew Bible.

³⁰⁶ Cf. *HALOT*, 157-59. The etymology of ברית is uncertain: E. Klein, *A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the Hebrew Language for Readers of English* (London: Collier Macmillan, 1987), 85.

³⁰⁷ *DCH* 2:264.

³⁰⁸ A. Schenker identifies the origin of the OT idea of the covenant in vows taken under oath: ‘L’origine de l’idée d’une alliance entre Dieu et Israël dans l’ancien Testament’, *RB* 95 (1988), 184-94. M. Haran also argues that the divine oaths are given unilaterally in the covenants to Abraham, Phinehas, and David; nevertheless, it is almost inevitable that the parties who have received such oaths would respond to God with certain positive actions as expressions of their loyalty: ‘The Berit “Covenant”: Its Nature and Ceremonial Background’, in M. Cogan, et al. (eds.), *Tehillah le-Moshe* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 205-06. The involvement of oath in the treaties of the Ancient Near East is discussed by H. Tadmor, who points out that oaths for covenants/treaties may be sworn by either party: ‘Treaty and Oath in the Ancient Near East: A Historic Approach’, in G. Tucker and D. Knight (eds.) *Humanizing America’s Iconic Book* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982), 127-52.

marriage analogy,³⁰⁹ and a father-son analogy.³¹⁰ Some covenant passages seem to be written in formats resembling the Ancient Near Eastern suzerainty treaties; hence the suzerain-vassal relationship serves as a model.³¹¹

Treaties and covenants in the Ancient Near East often involved symbolic actions, sacrificial rites, curses, and oaths said by either or both parties.³¹² These practices account for the association between ברית and the cultic practices/ceremonial acts in the Hebrew Bible.³¹³ In the Hebrew Bible, the presence of YHWH is one of the most significant elements in the narratives of the divine covenants/oaths to Israel.³¹⁴ A typical example is found in the narrative of Exodus 19-24. It describes the overwhelming presence of YHWH at Mount Sinai, the access to which is restricted to the specially-selected representatives.

Next, we turn to the issue of the LXX translation of ברית. The LXX translators almost always translate the Hebrew ברית as διαθήκη.³¹⁵ In non-biblical

³⁰⁹ McCarthy, *Covenant*, 32-33. M. Weinfeld notes the similarity between the covenant formulae in the Hebrew Bible and the marriage contract formula known to us from the Ancient Near East: 'Berit - Covenant vs Obligation', *Bib* 56 (1975), 125.

³¹⁰ In Hos and Deut: D. J. McCarthy, 'Notes on the Love of God in Deuteronomy and the Father-Son Relationship between Yahweh and Israel', *CBQ* 27 (1965), 144-47; idem., *Covenant*, 33. Hos also includes the marriage analogy: Nicholson, *God and His People*, 187-88.

³¹¹ The similarity between the narrative structure of some OT covenants (e.g. the Sinai covenant in Exod and the covenant at Shechem in Josh 24) and the format of the Hittite suzerain-vassal treaties has been demonstrated by G. E. Mendenhall in *Law and Covenant in Israel and Ancient Near East* (Pittsburgh: Biblical Colloquium, 1955); idem., 'Covenant', *IBD* 1:714-23. However, Mendenhall's theory has been challenged by D. J. McCarthy, who argues instead that biblical covenants should be compared with diverse treaty forms in the Ancient Near East including the Assyrian treaties: *Treaty and Covenant: A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and the O.T.*, new edn., AnBib 21 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981 [first published in 1963]); Nicholson, *God and His People*, 56-68.

³¹² Tadmor, 'Treaty', 132-36.

³¹³ Gen 15, 31; Exod 24; Josh 24: McCarthy, *Covenant*, 30-31. The phrase 'to cut the covenant' (כרת ברית) in the Hebrew Bible was most likely related to such a ceremonial background of ברית: Haran, 'Berit "Covenant"', 208.

³¹⁴ E. J. Christiansen, *The Covenant in Judaism and Paul: A Study of Ritual Boundaries as Identity Markers*, AGJU 27 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 30.

³¹⁵ J. Behm, 'Διαθήκη', *TDNT* 2:106; E. Kutsch, 'Bund', *TRE* 7:397. ברית is translated as στυθήκη only in LXX 4 Kgdms 17.15 of Codex Alexandrinus (Hatch & Redpath, 1316; H. B. Swete, [ed.], *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint*, I: *Genesis-4 Kings* [Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1909], 1:780) and as ὁρκωμοσία (swearing, oath) only in 1 Esd 9.93. In LXX 3 Kgdms 11.11, ברית is translated as ἐντολή; otherwise, it is always translated as διαθήκη: Jaubert, *Alliance*, 311 with n. 2; T. Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the*

Hellenistic texts, διαθήκη commonly means disposition by testator. As a legal document, a διαθήκη involved a beneficiary, although it would normally have been declared unilaterally.³¹⁶

Then, why did the LXX translators consistently translate ברית as διαθήκη? The classic answer to this question has been given by Johannes Behm. He explains that the LXX translators chose the term because of their reflection on the divine covenants with Abraham, David, and the people of Israel. The translators rendered ברית with the Greek term for ‘disposition’ or ‘testament’, which is a legal transaction that can be decided and written unilaterally, because such a rendition is more relevant to the covenants established with one who has ultimate authority over the chosen people. Apparently, Behm assumes that the Hebrew ברית primarily means ‘agreement’ or ‘treaty’, which is bilateral in nature.³¹⁷

This view however is challenged by Ernest Kutsch, who questions the validity of the German translation *Bund* for ברית. Kutsch argues that the Hebrew word should be properly translated to *Bestimmung* or *Verpflichtung*. ברית can mean *Bund* only in a secular treaty which imposes obligations upon the vassal-side. Based on this argument, he asserts that the LXX translators have found in διαθήκη a ‘suitable reproduction of ברית’.³¹⁸

Septuagint (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 238. Other than LXX 4 Kgdms 17.15 in Codex Alexandrinus, Wis 12.21 seems to be the only verse where συσθήκη indicates the divine covenant in LXX. There are a few cases where the LXX translators adopt διαθήκη for Hebrew words other than ברית. In LXX Dan 9.13, διαθήκη is used as an equivalent of תורה, whereas in LXX Deut 9.5, the word (דבר) of God is translated with διαθήκη. In Greek Sirach, it is used as an equivalent of both ברית and חק: Jaubert, *Alliance*, 313.

³¹⁶ Hence, it means ‘last will/testament’: A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, trans. L. R. M. Strachan (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1927), 337; J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan (eds.), *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1929), 148-49; S. R. Llewelyn and R. A. Kearsley, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1980-81*, vol. 6 (North Ryde, N.S.W.: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1992), 38. It also means a general sense of ‘ordinance’ or ‘disposition’; only in Aristophanes, *Aves*, 439, it means ‘agreement’ or ‘treaty’: Behm, ‘Διαθήκη’, *TDNT* 2:124-25; Jaubert, *Alliance*, 311.

³¹⁷ Behm, ‘Διαθήκη’, *TDNT* 2:127. A similar view is also expressed by Jaubert: *Alliance*, 312.

³¹⁸ E. Kutsch, *Verheissung und Gesetz: Untersuchungen zum sogenannten “Bund” im Alten Testament* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1973), 30; idem., ‘Bund’, *TRE* 7:398, 401-04. Cf. J.

Nonetheless, Kutsch's study did not settle the debate. In subsequent studies, more attention has been given to the immediate context of the LXX translators. In the introduction to the first volume of *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, Marguerite Harl briefly discusses this issue. She supposes that the translation of ברית as διαθήκη was already a common practice among the Greek-speaking Jews in Alexandria, before the LXX translators of Genesis adopted it. The Hellenistic Jews, she suggests, would have used the term διαθήκη because it conveyed an idea of a guarantee of a promise for the future.³¹⁹ Adrian Schenker has offered another explanation. Drawing upon the legal documents in Ptolemaic Egypt, he argues that the LXX translators identified a common trait between the legal practices concerning inheritance and the divine covenants, especially those with Abraham in Genesis 15 and 17. The Lord, the ultimate proprietor of the earth, gave the Land as a gift to the chosen.³²⁰ The LXX translators seem to have thought that this meaning of διαθήκη (testament, legacy) could better describe the biblical covenants in Genesis 15 and 17, and perhaps in other passages, as they would have discerned that ברית refers to God's promise sworn by oath to grant divine blessings.

Although a semantic shift caused by the LXX translators' choice³²¹ of διαθήκη might not be as decisive as it might once have been thought, it is still undeniable that this Greek word narrowed the semantic field of the Hebrew ברית. With the stereotypical rendition of ברית as διαθήκη in LXX,³²² however, a Greek speaking audience would not only have sensed its clumsiness in some passages, but some may also have recognised that the meaning of διαθήκη in some passages was being extended beyond its conventional sense to include 'covenant', 'treaty' or

Barr, 'Some Semantic Notes on the Covenant', in H. Donner, et al. (eds.) *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 35.

³¹⁹ M. Harl, *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, vol. 1: *La Genèse* (Paris: Cerf, 1986), 55.

³²⁰ A. Schenker, 'Διαθήκη pour ברית: L'option de traduction de la LXX à la double lumière du droit successoral de l'Égypte Ptolémaïque et du livre de la Genèse', in J. Auwers and W. Andre (eds.), *Lectures et relectures de la Bible* (Louvain: Louvain UP, 1999), 125-31.

³²¹ Or by the choice of Alexandrian Jews in the 2nd/3rd century BCE.

³²² E. Tov, 'Three Dimensions of LXX Words', *RB* 83 (1976), 540-42.

‘agreement’.³²³ Nevertheless, this would have had its limits; fundamentally *διαθήκη* meant ‘ordinance’, ‘disposition’, or ‘testament’ in the Hellenistic world. It is unlikely that *διαθήκη* functioned in LXX exactly in the same way as *ברית* did in the Hebrew Bible.

The LXX translation of *ברית* as *διαθήκη* was inherited by early Christians. The NT writers unanimously adopted the LXX translation of *ברית*, as did the Apostolic Fathers.³²⁴ Jewish recensors—Aquila and Symmachus—preferred *συνθήκη* (agreement, contract), which they would consider as the better equivalent of *ברית* that was more commonly used.³²⁵

To summarize briefly, the Hebrew *ברית* bears more implications than the English translation ‘covenant’ can mean; it seems often to be better understood when translated as ‘oath/vow’. In ancient Israel, the establishments of covenants would often have involved solemn declarations of oath; thus *ברית* may have both unilateral and bilateral aspects. In the Hebrew Bible, the divine covenants were quite often given with the signs of the divine presence. The LXX translators chose *διαθήκη* for the equivalent of *ברית* with their good understanding of the Hebrew term, although the meanings of *ברית* might not have been fully reproduced in the LXX translations. Christian traditions retained the LXX rendition, whereas Jewish recensions chose *συνθήκη* for the equivalent of *ברית*.

E. LXX Jeremiah 37-38

Ideally, the examination here should be limited to those elements that reflect only the Alexandrian translators’ interpretations of the BC in Jeremiah. Due to the lack of the full text of the *Vorlage* of LXX Jeremiah, one cannot completely distinguish the translation values that belong to LXX Jeremiah from the

³²³ Lust, Eynikel & Hauspie (137) give two definitions (treaty and covenant), while Muraoka defines *διαθήκη* as (1) compact, treaty, mutual agreement, and (2) ‘covenant’ between God and Israel: *GELS*, 150-51.

³²⁴ *Συνθήκη* is not an entry word in BDAG; Kraft, *Clavis Patrum*.

³²⁵ Harl, *Genèse*, 55.

theological ideas intrinsic to the *Vorlage*. Nevertheless, our examination of LXX Jeremiah 37-38 would still be sufficient to reach our goals, since it is possible to include the elements attributed to the *Vorlage* in the theological traditions among the Alexandrian Jews in the third or second century BCE,³²⁶ even if the Hebrew edition was composed or compiled elsewhere.³²⁷

Concerning the BC in Jeremiah, A. W. Streane, J. Gerald Janzen, Emanuel Tov and Bob Becking have collated MT and LXX Jeremiah.³²⁸ Among them, Becking addresses the theological interpretations of the BC in Jeremiah by the Alexandrian translators, although he is cautious about emphasizing the theological interpretations unique to LXX Jeremiah.³²⁹ These preceding studies accord with the scholarly view that LXX Jeremiah is a relatively literal translation, in comparison with the freer translation of such a book as LXX Job.³³⁰

Certainly, LXX Jeremiah 37-38 often faithfully reproduces the Hebrew text. For example, the covenant themes in Jeremiah 30-31 (MT) mostly remain intact in LXX Jeremiah. Like in MT, LXX Jeremiah 37.9 retains the theme of the

³²⁶ To avoid intricacy, the references to the author/redactor of the *Vorlage* are often omitted when the translators of LXX Jer are mentioned, unless it is necessary to distinguish the author/redactor from the translators. Based on the prologue of Sirach, Swete estimates the Greek translations of the prophetic books to have been completed before 132 BCE: *Introduction*, 24. See also Schürer, *History*, 3-1:476-77; Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 137.

³²⁷ The discovery of 4QJer^b indicates that the provenance of the original Hebrew edition of LXX Jer may not be identified with Egypt: Tov, *Text-critical Use*, 259-60.

³²⁸ The main purpose of Streane's study is to propose emendations to the Hebrew text based on LXX Jer: Streane, *Double Text*, 207-19. Janzen (*Studies*) focuses on 'zero variants' (i.e. the MT texts not attested in LXX Jer), yet he does not necessarily give explanations for all these incidences. Tov's collation in *Text-critical Use* is limited to MT Jer 30(37).16, 24, 31(38).7, 8, 12, 20, 22, 25. Drawing on Janzen, Tov and others, Becking further analyzes the differences in the BC of Jeremiah: 'Jeremiah's Book of Consolation: A Textual Comparison Notes on the Masoretic Texts and the Old Greek Version of Jeremiah XXX-XXXI', *VT* 44 (1994), 145-69; the revised edition of this article is 'Abbreviation, Expansion or Two Traditions: The Text of Jeremiah 30-31' in *Between Fear and Freedom* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 11-48.

³²⁹ Becking argues that LXX Jer makes a 'stronger' reference to 'creation' (31.12, 22) and 'exodus' (31.8) than MT; he considers that these elements reflect a part of the salvation historical framework held by Alexandrian Jews. In addition, he makes two further points: LXX Jer or its *Vorlage* seems to avoid blasphemous speech about God, and the BC of Jeremiah in LXX shows more internal coherence: Becking, 'Book of Consolation', 168. These points are reiterated in idem., 'Abbreviation', 47.

³³⁰ Tov, *Text-critical Use*, 51; Greenspoon, 'Hebrew into Greek', 82.

fulfilment of the Davidic covenant. One can say that this theme, together with the fulfilment of the covenant to the Fathers (LXX Jer 37.3), is the *leitmotif* in both Jeremiah 30-31 (MT) and LXX Jeremiah 37-38. The covenant with Noah is also alluded to in LXX Jeremiah 38.27 as in MT.

Nevertheless, it is not impossible to detect the translators' perspective reflected in the subtle expansions and slight alterations from the Hebrew meanings. In the first place, their applications of the oracles to historical events are at times more specific. They interpret LXX Jeremiah 37-38 as the prophecies that have partly been fulfilled in the return from the Babylonian Exile and in the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the Temple. This tendency may be detectable in the differences in Jeremiah 30(37).18:

Jer 30.18 (MT) (b) . . . Behold, I restore the fortunes (שב שבות) of the tents of Jacob and I am compassionate (ארחם) to his dwelling place; (c) and a city shall be built upon its mound (על-תלה), and a citadel (ארמון) shall dwell upon its right place.³³¹

LXX Jer 37.18 (b) . . . Behold, I will return the *settlement* of Jacob, and will have pity upon *his captivity*; (c) and the city shall be built upon its *height* (ὕψος), and the *temple* (ναός) shall settle according to its judgment.

The translators have slightly altered a word pair in the Hebrew text; a 'mound' (תל) and a 'citadel' (ארמון) in MT are rendered as the 'height' (ὕψος)³³² and the 'Temple' (ναός) in LXX Jeremiah.³³³ The word ὕψος—an equivalent of the

³³¹ ET of Jer 30-31 (MT) is mine unless otherwise noted.

³³² Some MSS and the Arabic version testify to τεῖχος (wall) instead of ὕψος; Ziegler, *Ieremias*, 353.

³³³ The reading of ναός has a textual problem. A variant reading λαός has stronger supports: J. Ziegler, (ed.), *Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae*, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum 15 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), 353. Ναός is considered the original because it can be an equivalent to the Hebrew ארמון and λαός can be derived from ναός through either scribal error or revision.

Hebrew word *תל* (mound of ruins) in this verse³³⁴—is also used in LXX Jeremiah 28.53 (MT 51.53) as a translation of the word *מרום* that refers to the stronghold of Babylon. The translators likely preferred the term *ὑψος* which might have been relevant to describe the rebuilt city. This translation of the word-pair (‘height’ and ‘temple’) may reveal the translators’ view that the prophecy in this verse has been realized in the reconstruction of the Temple and the rebuilding of Jerusalem.

A reference to the Levites in LXX Jeremiah 30.19 may also be grouped in this tendency of specification; or it may be better described as a shift of emphasis:

Jer 30.19 (MT) And from them,³³⁵ a thanksgiving (*תודה*) shall go out, and a sound of dancers; I will make them many, and they shall not be few, and I will make them honoured,³³⁶ and they shall not be insignificant.

LXX Jer 37.19 And there shall go forth from them *singers* (*ᾄδοντες*), even the sound of dancers; and I will multiply them, and they shall not at all be diminished.

In MT, on the one hand, it is ‘dancers’ who will sing praise/thanksgiving. In LXX Jeremiah, on the other hand, the singers are the Levites: in LXX, the word *ᾄδοντες* is mainly used in 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, where it refers to the Levitical singers trained for the Temple services.³³⁷ LXX Jeremiah’s emphasis on the role of the Levites in the Temple rituals are reflected also in LXX Jeremiah 38.14; replacing the word *דשן* with *οἶων Λευί*, the translators seem to express their conviction that only the Levites can perform the priestly roles.

³³⁴ Lust, Eynikel & Hauspie, 640–41.

³³⁵ That is, from ‘the tents of Jacob and his dwelling places’ (Jer 30.18).

³³⁶ The *hip ‘il* verb of *כבד* literally means ‘to make heavy’, but it may also means ‘to be made numerous’: *HALOT*, 456.

³³⁷ 1 Chr 15.27; 2 Chr 23.13; 29.28; Ezra 2.41, 65, 70; 7.7; 10.24; Neh 7.1, 44, 67, 73; 10.29, 40; 11.22; 12.28, 29, 42, 45, 46; 13.10.

The LXX tendency of specification/shift of emphasis seems to be related to the LXX emphasis on the post-exilic vitalization of the Torah observance, because in the translators' perspective, it was the important event that testifies to the partial fulfilment of the NC prophecy. This point can be detected in the reference to the Passover in LXX Jeremiah 38.8, where the translators find a fulfilled element of the oracle in the post-exilic practice of the feast:

Jer 31.8 (MT) Behold, I bring them from the land of the north, and I will gather them from the corners of the earth; among them, blind and lame persons, those who are pregnant³³⁸ and those who are in labour together; (in) the great congregation, they shall return.

LXX Jer 38.8 Behold, I bring them from the north, and will gather them from the farthest part of the earth *to the feast of the Passover*: [...] and *you shall beget* a great multitude, and they shall return here.

Jeremiah 31.8 (MT) is a description of a return journey from exile: even slow walkers—the disabled and the pregnant—shall join this journey. LXX Jeremiah, however, describes population growth after the Babylonian Exile, and the celebration of the Passover feast. In this case, the focus is shifted from the return journey to the life after the return from the Exile, particularly mentioning the Passover feast.

This tendency towards specific applications of the oracles to the post exilic Jewish life—especially to the vitalization of the Torah observance—is related to another feature of the BC of Jeremiah in LXX. As the translators highlight the sections that have been fulfilled, they seem to identify antecedent realizations of the eschatological events in the passage. This tendency is observed in the LXX

³³⁸ This text is missing in LXX.

translation of the phrase ‘watered garden’ in Jeremiah 31.12 (i.e. the soul/life of the remnant of Israel will become like a ‘watered garden’ [כגן רוה], which alludes to the Garden of Eden).³³⁹ Because the LXX translators recognise the ‘(stream of) water’ in Jeremiah 31.9 (MT) as symbolizing the Law, and interpret the ‘watered garden’ in MT as a righteous person (or people) who is nurtured by the Law (= water), they seem to change it to ‘fruitful tree’ (ξύλον ἑγκαρπον).³⁴⁰ This phrase echoes the ‘tree of life’ in Genesis 2.9 as well as the ‘tree planted by the streams of water’ in Psalm 1.3. With this change from the ‘watered garden’ to the ‘fruitful tree’, the translators describe the life devoted to the learning and observance of the Torah in a different metaphor, which would symbolize the ideal life of the restored Israel. This alteration reveals the translators’ view of the Torah observance as a precursor/earthly entity of the life promised in the eschatological/heavenly reality.

To summarize, LXX Jeremiah 37-38 may exhibit a tendency towards a specific interpretation of the oracles, which seems to be related to the translators’ view that the oracles have been partly fulfilled in the return from the Babylonian Exile to the Land and in the vitalization of the Torah observance among the returned people.³⁴¹ They also regard the fulfilled elements as the antecedents of the full realization of the prophecies. The LXX translation of ‘watered garden’ as the ‘fruitful tree’ (Jer 31[38].12) may reveal the translators’ knowledge of Jewish metaphors of ‘tree’ and ‘water’; that is, the former is the righteous people

³³⁹ The phrase ‘watered garden’ is also used in Isa 58.11. A similar phrase ‘like gardens beside a river’ (כגנת עלי נהר) appears in Num 24.6, which is also a description of the people of Israel in Balaam’s blessing. This simile in Num 24 depicts Israel as a ‘new creation’. Cf. G. Vermes, ‘The Story of Balaam: The Scriptural Origin of Haggadah’, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*, 2nd edn. (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 157-58. Vermes also points out that the water in the next verse (Num 24.7) is interpreted as a messianic figure in the ancient versions except for Vulg.: *ibid.*, 159-60.

³⁴⁰ This LXX text might testify to the Hebrew reading current at the time of the LXX translation. Similar metaphors of the Torah are found in Sir 24.23-27, where the Mosaic Law/Sinai Covenant is compared with the four rivers that flow from the Garden of Eden: M. Maher, ‘Some Aspects of Torah in Judaism’, *Irish Theological Quarterly* 38 (1971), 322-23.

³⁴¹ This point should not be overemphasised because a similar perspective might be more or less reflected in proto-MT as well.

nurtured by the latter (= the Torah). With their subtle techniques, the translators may indicate that the Torah observance of the Israelites is an earthly embodiment of the heavenly/eschatological reality.

F. 'Theodotion' and Aquila

1. Barthélemy's *Les devanciers d'Aquila*

Prior to the compositions of Justin's extant works, the version of so-called 'Theodotion' and the version of Aquila would have been extant.³⁴² An earlier date of the Theodotionic recension is now widely accepted after the debates incurred by Dominique Barthélemy's *Les devanciers d'Aquila*.³⁴³ In the field of the textual history of LXX and its recensions, Barthélemy's study has been one of the most influential and provocative works since its publication in 1963. His study has challenged conventional theories of the textual history of LXX including the recensions of 'Theodotion' and Aquila. Before examining the BC of Jeremiah in

³⁴² According to Irenaeus, Theodotion was a Jewish proselyte (AH 3.21.1), while Jerome calls him an Ebionite (*De viris illustribus* 54). It is uncertain whether the recension attributed to Theodotion in the *Hexapla* were indeed made by him alone. Barthélemy identifies 'Theodotion' as one of the revisors of such recensions as the *καίτε* recension, so that he dates the recension(s) of 'Theodotion' to the first half of the 1st century CE: *Les devanciers*, 144-67. Most scholars today seem to take one of the following three positions: (1) some scholars accept Barthélemy's conclusion that there was no Theodotion in the second century, but only the *καίτε* revisor(s) of the first century; (2) some may take a concessive approach by assuming that a pre-Christian *καίτε* recension originated in the first century and went through the second-century stage before it was accepted as the recension of 'Theodotion' by Origen; (3) others may adhere to a proto-Theodotion instead of recognizing the *καίτε* group. Cf. Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint*, 148-53; J. M. Dines, *The Septuagint* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 84-86.

Aquila was certainly a Jewish proselyte (y. *Meg.* 1.11), who lived under the reign of Hadrian (117-138 CE). According to Epiphanius, his recension was made about 128-129 CE, but Swete suspects that it could hardly be completed before c. 140 CE: Swete, *Introduction*, 32; Dines, *Septuagint*, 87.

The versions of θ' and α' are mainly reconstructed from the evidence included in the *Hexapla apparatus* of the Göttingen edition; they are indicated with the following signs; α' = Aquila, θ' = Theodotion, π' ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$) = All early Greek versions including 'Theodotion' and Aquila, $\omicron\iota\ \gamma'$ (the three) = Aquila, 'Theodotion' and Symmachus: Ziegler, *Ieremias*, 141, 350-65.

³⁴³ VTSup 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1963).

‘Theodotion’ and Aquila, it is necessary to consider Barthélemy’s arguments³⁴⁴ and some of the scholarly responses.

Les devanciers d’Aquila consists of three parts. In the first part, Barthélemy attempts to establish a relationship between a tradition of Rabbinic exegesis in Palestine and a group of Jewish recensions which is commonly referred to as the *καίγε* recension. After a comparison of the hermeneutical methods of Rabbi Aqiva and Yishmael ben Elisha, he points out that Aquila’s translation follows Rabbi Aqiva’s methods mainly in two respects: the rendering of *אֵל* by *καίγε* and the literal translation of *אֵל*. While Aquila’s method fully complies with the translation techniques of Rabbi Aqiva, some other Hebraizing Greek versions ignore the particle *אֵל*. With these criteria—the consistent rendering of *אֵל* by *καίγε*, and the ignoring of the particle *אֵל*—Barthélemy believes that one can identify the texts that should be included in the *καίγε* group.³⁴⁵ He further argues that this group laid a foundation for the version of Aquila, which acted out consistently Rabbi Aqiva’s methods.³⁴⁶

In the second part, Barthélemy deals with the texts which he thinks represent some of the most distinctive members of the *καίγε* group. He first tries to show that the manuscripts grouped in the ‘Lucianic recension’ of the *βγ* section (2 Sam 11.2-1 Kings 2.11) are in fact the original text of LXX, whereas the text group of this section represented by Codex Vaticanus should be included in the *καίγε* recension.³⁴⁷ Due to the paucity of evidence, moreover, he even questions the

³⁴⁴ For the summary of Barthélemy’s *Les devanciers d’Aquila*, I have consulted the following review articles by S. Jellicoe, in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 84 (1964), 178-82; by R. A. Kraft, in *Gnomon* 37 (1965), 474-83; by G. Vermes, in *JSS* 11 (1966), 261-64.

³⁴⁵ Besides the use of *καίγε*, Barthélemy also mentions other characteristics which he thinks show the influence of the school of Rabbi Yishmael: *Devanciers*, 48-80; Munnich, ‘Texte’, 160.

³⁴⁶ Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 3-88; G. Dorival, ‘L’achèvement de la Septante dans le Judaïsme: De la faveur au rejet’, in M. Harl, et al. (eds.) *La Bible grecque des Septante* (Paris: Cerf, 1988), 95.

³⁴⁷ Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 91.

designation of the ‘Lucianic recension’ used in the textual criticism of LXX.³⁴⁸ After the examination of the βγ sections of LXX Kings in Theodotion, Barthélemy concludes that the recension by so-called Theodotion³⁴⁹ constitutes an important witness to the καίγε group. Barthélemy also argues that this Theodotionic recension precedes Aquila.³⁵⁰

In the final part, Barthélemy turns to the investigation of the Minor Prophets Scroll discovered from Naḥal Ḥevel (8ḤevXIIgr). He argues that this Greek translation is the earliest attempt to revise LXX in line with proto-MT and it belongs to the καίγε group. He further points out that this recension is used by Justin and is identical to that of Quinta in the *Hexapla*. Barthélemy further claims that it has provided the Greek basis for the recensions of Aquila and Symmachus.³⁵¹

Some of Barthélemy’s arguments have not been convincing enough to gain wide scholarly support. For example, Lester Grabbe criticises Barthélemy’s claim that Aquila’s translation reflects the exegetical methods of Rabbi Aqiva.³⁵² Although his proposal for the proto-Lucianic text of the βγ section of Kings as LXX has

³⁴⁸ Ibid., 126-27. But Barthélemy neglects a witness of Jerome: Jellicoe’s review in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 84, 179.

³⁴⁹ Barthélemy identifies Theodotion with Yonatan ben Uzziel: *Devanciers*, 148-57.

³⁵⁰ Ibid., 91-148.

³⁵¹ He also points out that the text may be used by the translator of the Coptic version, and the copyist(s) of the Washington Codex: Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 163-270.

³⁵² L. L. Grabbe, ‘Aquila’s Translation and Rabbinic Exegesis’, *JJS* 33 (1982), 527-36; Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint*, 110. Barthélemy further claims that Aquila and Symmachus may not have revised LXX, but produced their recensions based on the καίγε text(s): *Devanciers*, 246-53, 261-65. This claim is supported by K. G. O’Connell, *The Theodotionic Revision of the Book of Exodus: A Contribution to the Study of the Early History of the Transmission of the Old Testament in Greek*, HSM 3 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1972). In some books, however, Aquila is not familiar with the καίγε recension: B. Lindars, ‘Introduction’, in idem. and G. Brooke (eds.) *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 3. L. Grabbe adheres to the traditional view on Aquila and Symmachus as original translators: ‘The Translation Technique of the Greek Minor Versions: Translations or Revisions?’, in Brooke and Lindars, *Septuagint*, 505-17.

stimulated further studies, moreover, his rejection of the ‘Lucianic recension’³⁵³ as a text group has not been well received.³⁵⁴

Nevertheless, Barthélemy’s work has made a significant contribution to our knowledge of the textual history of LXX. It is now generally agreed that before Aquila, a Jewish recensor/school of recensors had already made the revision(s) of the LXX text (the *καίγε* recension), many of which may have been attributed later to Theodotion.³⁵⁵ Hence the conventional view of the three Greek recensions in the columns of the *Hexapla* is now questioned: Origen would have determined the columnar order in the *Hexapla* on the basis of their relative closeness to the Hebrew text, instead of being arranged according to their chronological order.³⁵⁶

2. Book of the Covenant in θ' and α' Jeremiah

In accordance with the scholarly consensus, the discussion on the Theodotionic text of Jeremiah 30-31 should precede that of Aquila. As far as the BC in Jeremiah is concerned, however, textual evidence of ‘Theodotion’ is too fragmentary to reconstruct its significant features. A few remarks are sufficient. The version of ‘Theodotion’ tends to recover the proto-MT readings against LXX Jeremiah, although ‘Theodotion’ seems to preserve LXX Jeremiah’s reading more often than Aquila.³⁵⁷ The text of ‘Theodotion’ is well preserved in Jeremiah 33.14-26, where he translates ברית as διαθήκη (θ' Jer 33.20-21, 25).³⁵⁸

³⁵³ Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 127.

³⁵⁴ S. P. Brock, ‘Lucian *redivivus*: Some Reflections on Barthélemy’s *Les devanciers d’Aquila*’, in SE 5/TU 103 (Berlin: Akademie-verlag, 1968), 176-81; E. Tov, ‘Lucian and Proto-Lucian: Toward a New Solution of the Problem’, *RB* 79 (1972) 101-13; Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint*, 234.

³⁵⁵ E. Tov proposes to call this text group as the *καίγε*-Theodotion group: ‘Transliterations of Hebrew Words in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament: A Further Characteristic of the *Kaige*-Th. Revision?’, *Textus* 8 (1973), 85.

³⁵⁶ G. J. Norton, ‘Cautionary Reflections on a Re-Edition of Fragments of Hexaplaric Material’, in idem. and S. Pisano (eds.), *Tradition of the Text* (Fribourg, Switzerland: Universitätsverlag, 1991), 154.

³⁵⁷ For example, the ‘children of Levi’ (Jer 31.14); ‘create the new salvation’ (Jer 31.22).

³⁵⁸ Swete, *Introduction*, 44-46.

As expected, the version of Aquila follows the readings of proto-MT for the most part in the sections where the texts of LXX Jeremiah are different. His literalism is conspicuous in his translation of the idiomatic phrase כרת ברית as κόπτω συνθήκην (α' Jer 31.31).

However, there are some cases where Aquila preserves both readings of the MT tradition and LXX. An example is found in his retention of the verb μεγαλυνῶ in Jeremiah 31.14:

MT . . . and I will give them gladness from/without sorrow (מיגונם).³⁵⁹
And I will drench the soul of the priests with fat . . . (31.13-14)

LXX . . . and I will make them rejoice. I will **extol/make great and** drench the soul of the priests, . . . (38.13-14)

α' . . . and I will cheer them up away from their sorrow. I will **extol/make great and** drench the soul of the priests, . . .³⁶⁰

The LXX reading μεγαλυνῶ may be based on a different reading of MT's מיגונם at the end of Jeremiah 31.13. Aquila translates the Hebrew word מיגונם as ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης αὐτῶν, while he also adopts the LXX reading μεγαλυνῶ, which echoes Genesis 12.1. By retaining the LXX reading, he approves of the LXX's reference to the promise to Abraham in this context.

In addition, it is noteworthy that Aquila's version includes a text that can be interpreted as the prophecy of the Eucharist; in the version of Aquila, it seems to be 'thanksgiving' (εὐχαριστία) that comes out from Jerusalem (α' Jer 31.19):

And a thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία)³⁶¹ shall come out of them, and a sound of dancers: and I will make them many, and they shall not be made humbled.

³⁵⁹ The preposition מן here may be taken as a privative marker in the sense of 'without', 'free from': Waltke & O'Connor, 214. Allen translates מיגונם משמחתים as 'to turn their grief into gladness': *Jeremiah*, 341.

³⁶⁰ The emphases in the Scriptural texts in this section are mine.

As we will discuss below, this reading seems to have played an important role in Justin's use of Jeremiah 31.31-32 in *Dialogue* 11-12 and 24.³⁶² It might be questionable whether Justin has relied on the version of Aquila, since he criticizes some Jews who have removed the LXX passages that could be used in favour of Christian interpretations (*Dial.* 71.2), and he would have regarded Aquila as one of them.³⁶³ Even though Justin might not have used the version of Aquila, he likely knew of this reading through the *καίγε* recension or its type.

In short, Aquila's possible rendition of *הנה* as *εὐχαριστία* in Jeremiah 31.19 is important to our concern. This rendition may have been rooted in an early Jewish recension which Aquila was able to use. As we will discuss below, this reading seems to be related to Justin's use of Jeremiah 31.31-32.

G. Tg Jeremiah 30-31

Targum Jonathan to the Prophets (Jon) most likely originated in the synagogue service in Palestine.³⁶⁴ The Targumist's main concern was to encourage the

³⁶¹ This reading of Aquila (*ἐξομολόγησις* sive *εὐχαριστία*) is reconstructed from the Syro-Hexaplaric recension. Except for Aquila, the apparatus of the Göttingen edition gives no witness for this reading: Ziegler, *Ieremias*, 353.

³⁶² See my discussion in pp. 136-38 below.

³⁶³ Justin's accusation of Jewish falsification of LXX may not be taken at face value, since it may have been borrowed from the Samaritan criticism of Jewish 'falsification' of the Torah. I owe this point to Prof. C. T. R. Hayward.

³⁶⁴ The author, date and provenance of *Jon* to the Prophets are uncertain. Traditionally, the Targum to the Prophets has been attributed to Jonathan ben Uzziel, the most prominent disciple of Hillel in the 1st century CE. P. Churgin rejects this traditional view, since the only witness in the Babylonian Talmud (*b. Meg.* 3a) seems to be fictitious, and the parallel passage in the Jerusalem Talmud (*y. Meg.* 1.9) is completely silent about this tradition. He also rejects the solution that the Targum was the work of R. Joseph, the 4th century Amora, since Joseph himself quotes from *Jon: Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1927), 9-10, 13-15. B. Chilton is reluctant to acknowledge possible involvement of these Rabbis in the formation of this Targumic tradition: *The Glory of Israel*, JSOTSup 23 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 2-3. *Jon* had undergone revisions before it assumed its present form in perhaps the 4th century CE; minor revisions could have been made before the date of the earliest extant codex: M. McNamara, *Targum and Testament, Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible* (Shannon: Irish UP, 1972), 206-07; C. T. R. Hayward, *The Targum of Jeremiah*, ArBib 12 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 34-35. S. H. Levey infers that the *terminus ad quem* of *Jon* is no earlier than the Arab conquest of Babylonia ('The Date of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets', VT 21 [1971], 186-96), but his argument is disproved by Chilton, *Glory*, 6-7. C. T. R. Hayward argues for earlier dates of significant exegetical traditions in Tg Jer, which may be traced back

Jewish community to observe the Torah and to worship the Lord even under adverse circumstances.

As we have discussed the LXX translation of ברית to διαθήκη prior to the examination of LXX Jeremiah 37-38, it is desirable to mention the Targumic rendition of ברית here. In the extant Aramaic Targums, including *Jon*, the Hebrew word ברית seems to be translated rather consistently as קימא.³⁶⁵ The word is derived from the verbal root קים, the *pe'al* form of which means 'to stand', 'to rise', or 'to exist'. J. Levy has assigned four definitions derived from this root: (1) *Gesetz, Gottesgesetz*;³⁶⁶ (2) *Bund, Bündniss, Vertrag*; (3) *Schwur, Eid*; (4) *Gelübde, Gelöbniss*.³⁶⁷ The reason why the Targumists chose this translation is convincingly explained by C. T. R. Hayward; he points out that the choice is related to the Hebrew expression ברית הקים (to establish the covenant), which expresses the idea that ברית is an object established and confirmed by God. With this Hebrew expression, the Targumists would have noticed that

the Aramaic language has the same root, with the additional meaning of 'to swear' in the *pa'el*. Now the object of swearing is naturally an oath, which in Aramaic is *qym*'; and . . . both in the Torah itself and in later writings the covenant is viewed as an oath. At a certain stage in the development of ideas about the covenant, the word *qym*' was ripe for use, and would have been

to the 1st century BCE, or even earlier: 'Some Notes on Scribes and Priests in the Targum of the Prophets', *JJS* 36 (1985), 210-21; Hayward, *Jeremiah*, 35-38. Based on his linguistic observation, E. M. Cook criticises the Palestinian origin of *Jon*, but it seems uncertain whether his proposal of the Syrian, or the upper Mesopotamian origin gains a wider scholarly support: 'A New Perspective on the Language of Onqelos and Jonathan', in D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara (eds.), *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context*, (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1994). In the five phases of the development of Aramaic laid out by J. A. Fitzmyer ('The Phases of the Aramaic Language', in *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* [Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979], 60-63, 72-74), W. F. Smelik includes the PT in Late Aramaic (c. 200- c. 700 CE): *The Targum of Judges*, *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 36 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 10-11.

³⁶⁵ קימא is employed consistently in *Neof*, which invariably regards the divine covenant to the Patriarchs as an oath sworn by God: Hayward, *Divine Name*, 41, 58.

³⁶⁶ Often as the equivalent of the Hebrew חוק *ibid.*, 58, 67.

³⁶⁷ Levy, *CWT*, 2:358-59.

popular at the time when the notion of the covenant oath was commonly held in Judaism.

Thus the choice of קימא can be explained by the Hebrew expression הקים ברית as well as the Targumist's understanding of the covenant-oath in the Torah and the later writings.³⁶⁸

Next, our discussion will turn to *Tg* Jeremiah 30-31. The BC in *Tg* Jeremiah is a relatively straightforward rendering of the Hebrew text preserved in MT. Overall, it presents a coherent translation of the BC in Jeremiah.³⁶⁹ In this passage, the Targumist emphasises the following points: (1) God's mercy to Israel is unfailing; (2) the return from the Exile to the Land coincided with the people's return to the Torah as well as to the worship of the Lord; (3) the oracles in this passage include the messianic prophecy which is yet to be fulfilled.

(1) The Targumist focuses on God's unfailing mercy on Israel in the BC of Jeremiah (*Tg* Jer 30.11; 31.2, 9, 32). Although he admits that the Lord inflicted the Exile on Israel as a divine punishment, he also highlights God's merciful dealings with Israel, for the Lord did not completely destroy Israel—he disciplined the people 'in clement judgment' (*Tg* Jer 30.11):

MT For I am with you, says the Lord, to deliver you; for I will cause destruction to all the nations, among which I have scattered you; Indeed, I will not cause destruction to you; but I will discipline you according to justice (למשפט) and I will not leave you unpunished.

Tg Because my *Memra* is at your assistance, says the Lord, to *redeem* you; for I will make a complete end of all the nations whither I have scattered you; but with you I will not make a complete end. And I will

³⁶⁸ Hayward, *Divine Name*, 58-62.

³⁶⁹ P. Churgin (*Jonathan*, 135) finds a later interpolation in *Tg* Jer 31.15, but as Hayward points out, the insertion of Nebzaradan's sending of Jeremiah from Ramah is simply an oblique reference to *Tg* Jer 40.1, and it does not necessarily indicate a later interpolation: *Jeremiah*, 133 n. 13.

bring sufferings upon you to teach you, but in clement judgment (בדין (חסוד); and I will certainly not *destroy you*.

It is not a coincidence that *Memra* appears in this verse where the Targumist emphasises God's justice and mercy, since in the Aramaic Targums, *Memra* is closely associated with these divine attributes.³⁷⁰

(2) The Targumist marks the Exile as the occasion for Israel to repent their sins and to return to their God. For the Targumist, the return to the Lord is virtually identical with the return to the Torah and the right worship. This identification is seen in *Tg* Jeremiah 31.18-19:

MT (18) Indeed, I have heard Ephraim's bemoaning: 'You have disciplined us and I took the discipline; like a calf that has not been instructed; bring me back, that I may return, for you are the Lord, my God. (19) Because after my returning, I have repented, and after I have been made known, I have slapped [*my] upper thigh, I was thoroughly ashamed, and also disgraced, for I bore the scorn of my youth'.

Tg (18) *The house of Israel is heard and revealed before me, for they weep and lament because they are exiled, saying: You have brought sufferings upon us, but we were not instructed, like a calf which has not been instructed. Now restore us to your worship, and we shall return; for you are the Lord our God. (19) For when we return to the Law he shows mercy upon us, and when it was revealed to us we struck our thighs: we were ashamed, and indeed we humbled*

³⁷⁰ *Memra* appears 6 times in Jer 30-31. All of its appearances are associated with either God's mercy to Israel, or his judgment on it, or both (30.11, 31.2, 9, 28, 37). Cf. Hayward, *Divine Name*, 45-50, 53.

*ourselves: for we receive the shame of our sins which are from of old.*³⁷¹

The phrase ‘after my returning’ in MT occurs in a vow of repentance and fidelity to the Lord, which is supposed to be said by the repentant Israelites. This MT phrase indicates the Israelites’ return from the Exile; it may also imply that their return from the Exile must coincide with their return to the Lord. The Targumist further interprets this as the return to the Torah as well as to the worship of the Lord; hence, the Targumist views the return to the Lord as equal to the return to the Torah as well as to the right worship.³⁷²

In the Targumist’s view, moreover, the return of Israel should also have coincided with the rebuilding of the Temple on mount Zion (*Tg Jer* 31.12). The returned Israelites were expected to participate in the worship in the rebuilt Temple, because God would restore his presence among his people. The Targumist’s translation of Jeremiah 30.19 indicates this point:

MT And from them, a thanksgiving (תודה) shall go forth, and the sound of dancers; I will make them many, and they shall not be few, and I will make them honoured, and they shall not be insignificant.

Tg And *those who bring up* thank-offerings (תודתא) shall *be many* in them; and the sound of those who *praise*; and I will increase them, and they shall not diminish; and I will *strengthen* them, and they shall not be *weak*.³⁷³

Unlike MT, the ‘thank-offerings’ in the Targum did not ‘go forth’, but ‘many’ of them should be brought up to the Temple. With these alterations, the Targumist

³⁷¹ The underlines are mine.

³⁷² This identification of the returning to the Lord with the returning to the Torah and worship is also found in *Tg Jer* 8.5.

³⁷³ Emphasis mine.

encourages his audience to participate in the right worship, just as the restored Israelites would bring offerings to the rebuilt Temple.³⁷⁴

(3) In addition, the Targumist anticipates that the ‘Anointed (משיחא), the son of David’ should be raised from among the people of Israel (*Tg Jer* 30.9). The term משיחא appears also in 30.21:

MT His prince shall be one of his own, his ruler shall come from his midst; I will bring him near, and he shall approach me, for who is he who would risk his heart/life to approach me? says the Lord.

Tg And *their king* shall be *anointed* from *them*, and *their Anointed One* shall *be revealed* from *among them*; and I will bring *them* near, and *they shall assemble* to my worship. For who is he whose heart *delights* to draw near to *my worship*, says the Lord?

Here the Targumist maintains the priestly character of this future messianic king. It may indicate merely a Targumist’s expectation that the messianic King will delight in the worship of the Lord. Given the Targumist’s retention of Jeremiah 33.21-22, in which the covenant with David is juxtaposed with one with the Levites, it is likely that with his alterations, the Targumist describes the priestly character of the messianic king.³⁷⁵

In sum, we may point out two parallels between Justin and *Tg Jeremiah* 30-31. First, the Targumist, like Justin (e.g. *Dial.* 118.2),³⁷⁶ acknowledges the priestly character of the messiah (*Tg Jer* 30:21). Second, the Targumist often identifies Israel’s return to the Lord with its return to the worship; likewise, Justin identifies

³⁷⁴ The Targumist may have suppressed the theme of ‘coming out of תורה’, knowing that Christians, like Justin, took advantage of the proto-MT reading of this verse. For Justin’s recognition of this term, see the discussion below, pp. 136-38.

³⁷⁵ Two passages in the Targum to the Prophets (*Tg* 1 Sam 2.35; *Tg* Zech 6.13) also testify to the pairing of the messiah and the priest: Chilton, *Glory*, 23-24.

³⁷⁶ And like the author of Hebrews.

Christ with the NC, namely the Eucharist, which would be the core of the Christian liturgical practice.

G. Influence of Jeremiah 30-31 (37-38) on Justin Martyr

This section will show that the BC in Jeremiah—the context of the NC of Jeremiah—has influenced Justin’s exegesis of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32.

There are at least two elements in the BC of Jeremiah which have influenced Justin’s use of the NC text of Jeremiah in *Dialogue* 11-12.³⁷⁷ In these chapters, Justin combines Jeremiah 31.31-32 with Isaiah 51.4-5 and 55.3-5. ET of *Dialogue* 11.2-12.1 is helpful to examine his exegetical practices on these Scriptural passages:

- (2) . . . For the Law [*promulgated] at Horeb is already obsolete, and belongs to you only, whereas the <new [*Law]> is simply for all men; and a Law set in opposition to a Law has abrogated the one before the other; and likewise a covenant which has come into existence afterwards established the earlier one. An everlasting and final law, Christ himself, and the trustworthy covenant was given to us, after which [*there shall be] no law, or commandment, or precept.
- (3) Have you not read these words of Isaiah: ‘Listen to me, listen to me, my people, and the kings, give heed to me, for a Law will go out from me, and my justice for a light of the nations. My righteousness swiftly comes near, and my salvation will come out, and nations will set their hope on my arm’ (Isa 51.4-5)? And by Jeremiah, He speaks about this new covenant: ‘Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, and I will make a new covenant with the

³⁷⁷ *Dial.* 11-12 are important in the structure of *Dial.*, since they are located immediately after Trypho’s claim that one cannot belong to the people of the covenant unless one observes the requirements of the Sinai covenant (*Dial.* 10). In Justin’s initial reply, he quotes Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 together with Isaiah 51.4-5 and 55.3-5 (*Dial.* 11-12). With these Scriptural quotations, Justin seems to provide a direction of his subsequent arguments, and to determine the underlying theme of the entire dialogue that Justin was supposed to have engaged with Trypho with other Jews. Thus Justin would have chosen the OT texts in these chapters carefully.

house of Israel and the house of Judah, not that I made with their fathers on the day that I took hold of their hand to lead them out from the land of Egypt' (Jer 31[38].31-32). (4) If therefore God predicted the 'new covenant' as about to be established, and this [*covenant] 'for a light of the nations', then we see and are convinced that, by the name of the crucified Jesus Christ, <men> from the idolatries and other wrong-doing have turned to God, enduring to keep the confession and to practise the piety even to death, and that from their works and the power that accompanies them, everyone can understand that this one is the new law, the 'new covenant' and the expectation of all the nations who anticipate the blessings from God. (5) For we are the true, spiritual Israel, and the race of Judah, Jacob, Isaac and Abraham, who, when he was still 'uncircumcised', was approved by God, 'because of his faith' (Rom 4.9), and who was called the 'father of many nations' (Gen 17.4b), [*and we are] those who are brought near to God by this crucified Christ; this will be made clear to us in the course of discussions. (*Dial.* 11.2-5)

(1) And further I said and presented the fact that Isaiah also proclaimed [*it³⁷⁸] in other passages: (iii) 'Listen to my words, so that your soul shall live; I will make with you an eternal covenant, which is the confirmation of the pious deeds of David. (iv) Behold, I have given him as a witness to the nations. . . . (v) Nations, who do not know you, shall call upon you; peoples, who do not know you, shall flee to you, because of your God, the holy one of Israel, for he glorified you' (Isa 55.3-5). (*Dial.* 12.1)

First, we examine Justin's combination of Jeremiah 31.31-32 with Isaiah 55.3-5. Admittedly, these two passages are connected with the common term (διαθήκη). Yet there is another element that would have been recognised by Justin. As is discussed in the section on Jeremiah 30-31 (MT), the fulfilment of the covenant to David is the most conspicuous among the several OT covenant themes present in

³⁷⁸ That is, Christ as the NC.

the BC in Jeremiah. The prophecy on the Davidic covenant is, in fact, a distinct element in Isaiah 55.3-5, since the passage predicts that the ‘eternal covenant’ will be established as ‘the confirmation of the pious deeds of David’ (Isa 55.3). This common theme would have also guided the composition of this combination.

Second, we turn to the juxtaposition of Jeremiah 31.31-32 with Isaiah 51.4-5 in *Dialogue* 11. Besides the occurrences of the synonymous terms of ‘law’ and ‘covenant’, these texts have again another common element. Isaiah 51.4-5 has the phrase ‘a teaching will go out from me’ (תורה מאתי תצא),³⁷⁹ whereas the BC of Jeremiah—the context of the NC text—has ‘Out of them shall come thanksgiving’ (ויצא מהם תודה: Jer 30.19 [MT]).³⁸⁰ These two texts seem to be combined based on the common theme of the ‘coming/going out of תורה/תודה’.

Justin could have relied on an earlier (testimony) source to make this combination. However, there are two reasons from which we may deduce Justin as the inventor of this combination (Jer 31.31-32 + Isa 51.4-5). Firstly, this combination is not attested in early Christian writings before the time of Justin. Secondly, Justin was one of the few Christian authors who had access to the *καίγε* recension. Justin’s access to this Jewish recension makes it likely that he knew the proto-MT reading of Jeremiah 30.19 which is attested in the version of Aquila: ‘And a praise/thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία) shall come out of them, and a sound of dancers . . .’ (α’ Jer 30.19a). This proto-MT reading may also have been retained in a certain (Jewish) recension before the version of Aquila, and it would not be impossible for Justin to have access to this reading either through Aquila or a recension before Aquila.³⁸¹ Justin would have embraced this reading rooted in proto-MT, since as we have seen in chapter 2, the NC in Justin may refer to the Sacrament of

³⁷⁹ LXX Isa 51.4 has νόμος παρ’ ἐμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται.

³⁸⁰ LXX Jer 37.19 has καὶ ἐξελεύσονται ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ᾠδόντες. According to my key word search in the Hebrew Bible, the phrase ‘Torah comes/goes out’ (יצא תורה) appears only in Isa 2.3/Mic 4.2 and Isa 51.4, and the phrase ‘thanksgiving comes out (יצא תודה)’ only in Jer 30.19. For the equivalent of יצא in these three verses, the LXX translators always choose ἐξέρχεται.

³⁸¹ Or possibly from proto-MT.

the Eucharist (εὐχαριστία).³⁸² The presence of the phrase ‘coming out of the Eucharist (εὐχαριστία)’ in Aquila or a certain (Jewish) version therefore would have guided Justin to associate Jeremiah 31.31-32 with Isaiah 51.4-5.³⁸³

The theme of the ‘coming/going out of תורה/תורה’ is again present in *Dialogue* 24, where Justin combines Isaiah 2.3/Micah 4.2 with the phrase ‘another covenant’ which alludes to Jeremiah 31(38).31. The texts of LXX Isaiah 2.3b and *Dialogue* 24.1 are as follows:

LXX Isa 2.3b . . . for out of Zion will go forth the law (ἐκ γὰρ Σιών ἐξελεύσεται νόμος), and the word of the Lord out of Jerusalem.

Dial. 24.1-2 (1) . . . But in order that I may not seem to digress to other subjects, consider <what> I cry aloud, that the ‘blood of that circumcision’ (LXX Exod 4:25-26) has been abolished, and we have believed in the blood of the saviour: now, ‘another covenant’, and ‘another Law has come out from Zion’ (Isa 2:3), (2) [*namely] Jesus Christ. . . .

This combination of Isaiah 2.3/Micah 4.2 with the phrase ‘another covenant’ is likely composed again by Justin himself, based on the common element of the ‘going/coming out of the Law/thanksgiving’ in Isaiah 2.3 and the BC of Jeremiah.³⁸⁴ The presence of this common theme in Jeremiah 30-31 is significant

³⁸² Regarding Justin’s knowledge of the liturgical tradition retained in Luke and 1 Corinthians and his recognition of the NC as the Sacrament of the Eucharist, see the discussion in ch. 2 ‘Preliminary observations of Justin’s notion of the new covenant’, 59-62.

³⁸³ He would also be able to recognise that the pronunciation of the Hebrew term for εὐχαριστία is similar to that of Torah.

³⁸⁴ Justin’s combinations of the ‘going/coming out of the Law’ in Isa 2.3/Mic 4.2 with the NC in *Dial.* must be balanced with his quotation of LXX Psalms 109.2 in *1 Apol.* 45.5: ‘Then the line “He will send forth to you the powerful rod (ῥάβδον δυνάμεως) from Jerusalem” (LXX Psalms 109.2) is the prediction of the mighty Word (τοῦ λόγου τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ), which his apostles coming out (ἐξελθόντες) from Jerusalem proclaimed everywhere, . . .’ (*1 Apol.* 45.5). Justin may also identify the theme of the ‘going/coming out of the new Law from Zion’ in LXX Psalms 109.2. Regarding the above quotation of LXX Psalms 109.2, Justin clearly identifies the ‘rod’ with the ‘Word’ (λόγος), which might also be paraphrased as the new Law/covenant. According to Justin, LXX Psalms 109.2’s ‘rod’ sent from Jerusalem is identical with the event

to our concern, since this common motif would have provided Justin³⁸⁵ with a clue to associate the NC of Jeremiah with the Law coming/going out of Zion/the Lord in Isaiah 2.3/51.4 and a Scriptural support to his identification of the new Law with the NC.

In sum, it seems likely that Justin combined Jeremiah 31.31-32 with Isaiah 51.4-5 and 55.1-3 in *Dialogue* 11-12, based on his observation of these verses of Isaiah and the BC in Jeremiah.³⁸⁶ Given the fact that an important clue to joining Isaiah 2.3 and 51.4-5 to Jeremiah 31.31-32 is found, not in LXX Jeremiah, but in a Jewish recension and in proto-MT, it seems to be reasonable to deduce that Justin's identification of the NC with the 'new Law coming out (of Zion)' (Isa 2.3; 51.4-5) is partly based on his reading of the BC in Jeremiah with a Jewish recension (a *καίγε* type/'Theodotion', or Aquila). By this juxtaposition, he attempts to show that the new/eternal covenant predicted by the ancient prophets is now established by the coming of Christ, who is the Davidic messiah. Justin also hints that the prophecies are fulfilled also in the Christian practice of the Eucharist.

I. Justin's use of the metaphors of 'tree' and 'water'

As we have seen in the analysis of LXX Jeremiah 37-38, the LXX translation of 'watered garden' (כגן רוה) as 'fruitful tree' (ξύλον ἔγκαρπον) in LXX Jeremiah 38.12 involves Jewish metaphors of '(stream of) water' as the Torah (Jer

predicted in Isaiah and Jeremiah, that is, the coming/going out of the new Law/covenant from Zion/the Lord. In this case, however, Justin takes the 'rod/Word' primarily as the teachings of Christ that the apostles preached. Justin's use of LXX Psa 109.2 in *I Apol.* 45 therefore demonstrates that Justin's notion of the new Law/covenant might be extended to included the teachings (Gospel) of Christ, even though the phrase new Law/covenant is absent in this passage. In other words, the 'Word' (λόγος) in Justin can mean the teachings (Gospel) of Christ proclaimed by the apostles.

³⁸⁵ Or the author of Justin's source.

³⁸⁶ Although our observation does not exclude the possibility of his access to certain secondary source(s).

31[38].9) and the ‘(fruitful) tree’ as the (renewed) Israelite(s).³⁸⁷ With this translation, the LXX translators seem to have depicted the restored Israelites in an impressive way—instead of using the metaphor of the ‘watered garden’ in the Hebrew text, they described them with the tree imagery of the righteous ones/people who live according to the Torah (Psa 1.3). With this translation, they seem to have emphasised that after the return from the Exile the life of the Israelites (= tree) was characterized with their renewed commitment to the Torah (= water). Thus their use of these metaphors would be closely related to their view of the NC.

In Justin’s extant works, he does not clearly cite LXX Jeremiah 38.12; thus it is not appropriate to treat this verse as the text that influenced Justin’s interpretation of the NC of Jeremiah. The following discussions will show, however, that Justin knew these Jewish metaphors of ‘tree’ and ‘water’. In some cases, Justin uses these metaphors in similar ways as the LXX translators do in LXX Jeremiah 38.12; the ‘tree(s)’ indicates the true Israel, while the ‘water’ means the (new) Law. At the same time, Justin’s use of these metaphors also reveals similarities with Jewish textual/exegetical traditions later preserved in the Pentateuch Targums. An investigation of these metaphors in Justin will further elucidate his interpretation of the NC and its sources.

This section is dedicated to the investigation of Justin’s use of the metaphors of ‘tree’ and ‘water’. First, it discusses Justin’s use of the ‘tree’ (ξύλον) to demonstrate his eclectic approach to the Scriptural exegesis; it will show that his use of the ‘tree’ reflects both Jewish and Christian exegetical traditions.³⁸⁸

³⁸⁷ This metaphor of ‘tree’ is also found in Tg of Psa 1.3: D. M. Stec, *The Targum of Psalms*, ArBib 16 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2004), 29. The author of the *Letter to Diognetus* adopts this Jewish metaphor; he argues that those who accept λόγος shall become like the ‘delightful garden’ (LXX Gen 3.24) and they shall ‘raise in themselves a thriving tree bearing all kinds of fruits’ (πάγκαρπον ξύλον εὐθαλοῦν ἀνατεῖλαντες ἐν ἑαυτοῖς; *Diogn.* 12.1).

³⁸⁸ Justin’s use of ξύλον has been discussed by G. Q. Reijnders, M. Fédou & J. Paramelle, and M. Derrett. Reijnders’ study of early Christian use of ξύλον/*lignum*, which covers the NT writings and early Christian literature through Tertullian, pays little attention to Jewish influence over Justin’s use of the metaphors (ξύλον): *The Terminology of the Holy Cross in Early Christian*

Second, it turns to the brief discussion on Justin's use of the 'water' (ὕδωρ). Finally, it argues that Justin learned these metaphors originated from a Midrashic tradition through his contact with the PT tradition in its oral stage.

1. Justin's use of the metaphor of 'tree'

a. 'Tree' as true Israel

Justin recognises the Jewish metaphor of 'tree' as Israel, which is reflected in the LXX translation of the 'watered garden' as the 'fruitful tree' in LXX Jeremiah 38.12. Justin's similar use of this metaphor of 'tree' is found in the quotation from LXX Isaiah 55.3-13, which is introduced after Justin's first discussion of Christian baptism in *Dialogue* 14.³⁸⁹ To give an illustration of Christian baptism, Justin introduces a lengthy quotation from Isaiah 55.3-13:

(4) And they [*the words] are said by Isaiah in this way: (iii) 'Hear me, so that your soul will live: and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, the holy, trustworthy [*blessings] of David. (iv) Behold, I have given it/him for a witness to the nations, a ruler and commander to the nations. (v) Nations, who do not know you, will call upon you, and peoples, who do not know you, will flee to you for refuge for the sake of your God, the holy one of Israel, for he has glorified you. (5) (vi) Seek God, and when you find him, call upon him: whenever he would draw near to you, (vii) let the ungodly leave his ways and [*let] the lawless one [*leave] his plans, and let him return to the Lord, and he will find mercy, for God will greatly forgive your sins. (viii) For my plans are not as your plans, nor my ways as yours: (ix) but as far as the heaven

Literature: As Based upon Old Testament Typology (Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1965), 33-47, 99-102. Although they recognise the Jewish origin of Justin's use of the 'tree', Fédou & Paramelle do not go further to seek its sources; they rather suggest that this metaphor in *Dial.* 86 indicates Justin's reliance on a testimony source: 'La vision de la croix dans l'œuvre de Saint Justin « Philosophe et Martyr »', *Recherches Augustiniennes* 19 (1984), 37-43. Derrett explores both Jewish and Christian documents, but his study deals exclusively with the insertion of ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου to LXX Psalms 95.10 (*Dial.* 73): 'Ο ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΕΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΕΝ ΑΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΞΥΛΟΥ', *VC* 43 (1989), 378-92.

³⁸⁹ Justin raises this theme in *Dial.* 14.1.

is distant from the earth, so far is my way distant from yours, and your thoughts from my intention. (6) (x) For as snow or rain comes down from the heaven, and it will not return, until it may saturate the earth, bring forth, cause to bud, and give seed to the sower and bread for food, (xi) so will my word be; whatever will go forth from my mouth, it will not return, until all things that I desired are accomplished, and [*until] I make my commandments prosperous. (7) (xii) For you will go forth in gladness, and will be taught in joy: for the mountains and hills will leap in joy to welcome you, and all the trees (ξύλα) of the field applaud (ἐπικροτήσῃ)³⁹⁰ with their branches. (xiii) And instead of the thorny bush, a cypress will come up, and instead of the fleabane, a myrtle will come up: and the Lord will be for a name, for an everlasting sign, and he will not fail' (Isa 55.3-13). (*Dial.* 14.4-7)

Although Justin does not provide his commentary to the above quotation of Isaiah 55.3-17, one can decipher Justin's interpretation of this prophetic text on the ground that Justin quotes this passage as a proof text for Christian baptism. Justin understands that in Isaiah 55.6-7, the prophet invites his audience to turn from their evil practices and to return to the Lord. Justin's interpretation would be that these verses are a prophetic description of repentance as a prerequisite for Christian baptism, namely the NC. Justin understands that the divine plan to establish this everlasting covenant (Christian baptism) should be, in a sense, beyond human comprehension, just as the heavens are far distant from the earth (Isa 55.8-9). Moreover, Justin interprets this prophetic statement as indicating that the supersession of the covenant of circumcision (old covenant) should be surprising and even inconceivable to some. The wonder of the everlasting covenant is described with the metaphors of 'snow' and 'rain', both of which are related to 'water'—the metaphor of the Torah and the word of God.³⁹¹ The word of God will not return until it accomplishes what God intended to achieve, just as

³⁹⁰ Literally, it means 'to rattle'.

³⁹¹ And the symbol of Christian baptism.

snow or rain saturates the earth. As the divine word goes forth to the nations, further, the trees (ξύλα) of the field will praise God. The last line of the quotation is enigmatic, but Justin seems to understand it as predicting a promise of the divine presence among the ‘trees’—those who praise God. Justin, therefore, seems to interpret the ‘trees’ in Isaiah 55.12 as a prophetic reference to the new people of the divine covenant, just as the LXX translators used the term ‘fruitful tree’ in LXX Jeremiah 38.12 as a symbol of the renewed Israelites.

In short, Justin’s quotation of Isaiah 55.3-13 in *Dialogue* 14 as a proof text of Christian baptism may show his knowledge of Jewish metaphor of the ‘tree(s)’ as the righteous ones/people who live according to the word of God (Torah).

b. Pauline use of ‘tree’

The metaphor of ‘tree’ in Justin not only refers to the true Israel (Christians), but also alludes to the Cross. In this respect, Justin’s use of ‘tree’ is influenced by the Pauline use of the ‘tree’ in Deuteronomy 21.23 (Gal 3.13). In view of the significance of Christ’s death on the cross, it would be quite natural for early Christians to find the prophetic implication in the appearance of tree (ξύλον) in the OT Scriptures and to associate it with the crucifixion. The ‘tree’ in Galatians 3.13 would have been one of the earliest examples.³⁹² In Galatians 3.13, the apostle Paul quotes a line from Deuteronomy 21.23a:

LXX Deut 21.23a . . . for every one who is hanged on a tree (πᾶς κρεμᾶμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου) is cursed of God; . . .

Gal 3.13 Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us—for it is written, ‘Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree (πᾶς ὁ κρεμᾶμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου)’ . . .

³⁹² The ‘tree’ in Deut 21.23 is associated with the crucifixion of Christ in other early Christian writings as well: cf. Pol. *Phil.* 8.1; *Barn.* 5.13; 8.1, 5. Possibly influenced by this Pauline use of ξύλον, *Barn.* associates the ‘tree’ in Deut 21.23 with the ‘tree’ in Psa 1.3 (*Barn.* 11.6).

The Pauline text is slightly different from LXX; it inserts a definite article before κρεμάμενος. Justin makes the same insertion in his quotation of Deuteronomy 21.23 (*Dial.* 96.1), which may suggest his dependence on the Pauline text and exegesis.³⁹³

The Pauline use of the ‘tree’ in Deuteronomy 21.23 seems to be developed further by Justin in *Dialogue* 96.1. In chapter 96, Justin discusses one paradox: those who are now cursing Christians are in fact testifying to the fact that persecuted Christians are the true lovers and worshippers of God (*Dial.* 96.1-2):

(1) And for what is said in the Law, ‘Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree (πᾶς ὁ κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου)’ (Deut 21.23; Gal 3.13), strengthens our hope which is depend on the crucified Christ, not because God has cursed this crucified one, but because God foretold what would be done by you and all others like you, as you did not know that he is the ‘one who existed before [*the creation of] all’ (Psa 110[109].3), the ‘eternal priest of God’ (Psa 110[109].4), the king, and Christ. (2) And this has taken place before [*your] eyes so that you can see: for in your synagogues, you curse all those who are called Christian because of Him, <just as> also the other nations, who put the curse into effect, are killing those who merely acknowledge that they are Christians. . . . (*Dial.* 96.1-2)

Justin is in agreement with the apostle Paul’s view that Christ became one who was cursed, in order to redeem the human beings (Deut 21.23a; Gal 3.13; *Dial.*

³⁹³ The source of Justin’s quotation is discussed by Sibinga, who suggests three options: (1) Justin relies on Paul’s quotation of Deut 21.23, but changed the interpretation; (2) Paul and Justin used a common testimony source; (3) Justin’s source relies on Paul’s text of Deut 21.23: *Text*, 94-99. Stylianopoulos prefers the first option, because prior to the quotation of Deut 21.23 in *Dial.* 96, Deut 27.26 appears in *Dial.* 95.1, another OT text quoted also in Gal 3.10: *Mosaic Law*, 105-08. Skarsaune also admits that Justin used Gal 3.13: *Proof*, 99. In order to explain the differences between Paul and Justin regarding the interpretation of Deut 21.23, Skarsaune surmises that Justin also consulted a non-Pauline testimony source: *ibid.*, 216-20.

95.2).³⁹⁴ Justin also believes that this text of Deuteronomy finds its fulfilments, not only in the crucifixion of Christ, but also in the curse said in the Synagogue and the persecution against Christians that was taking place in Justin's day. Justin may shift his focus rather to the latter in this context.³⁹⁵ Although Justin depends on the Pauline use of Deuteronomy 21.23, therefore, he retains his freedom to interpret the same OT text in the new context, interpreting it as a prophecy to the events in his days.

To sum up, Justin's use of 'tree' is also rooted in early Christian tradition of the tree as the symbol of the crucifixion of Christ. Justin has obtained this tradition from Galatians 3.13, but he has further developed the Pauline use of this symbol.

c. Fusion of the Pauline metaphor and the Midrashic traditions

Justin has developed further the symbolic term of ξύλον under the influence of Jewish and Midrashic traditions. Into the Christian symbol of ξύλον as the Cross, Justin incorporates the imagery of 'horns of unicorn' in Deuteronomy 33.17. In *Dialogue* 91.2, he interprets the horns (κέρατα) of a unicorn (μονόκερως) in Deuteronomy 33.17—the animal which has a messianic overtone in LXX—as a prophetic reference to the cross.³⁹⁶ His identification of these horns with the two beams of the cross indicates that ξύλον (beam) not only refers to the crucifixion of

³⁹⁴ Justin refuses the idea that the crucifixion of Christ indicated God's rejection of Jesus; Justin would not admit that the curse of God was inflicted upon Christ: *Dial.* 94.5; 111.2.

³⁹⁵ Skarsaune, *Proof*, 220.

³⁹⁶ G. B. Caird regards the original Hebrew word ראם as 'aurochs', which was an ancient wild ox with 'two tremendous curving horns'. In terms of the LXX translation to μονόκερως (unicorn), he supposes that the translators 'did not know the identity of ראם and erroneously identified it with the Indian rhinoceros (known to the Greeks at least since the time of Ctesias)': 'Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint. II', *JTS* 20 (1969), 22-23. Concerning the LXX translation of μονόκερως (a Greek mythical animal) for the equivalent of ראם (e.g. Num 24.8; Deut 33.17; LXX Ps 28.6), J. L. W. Schaper argues that they have chosen it as the metaphor to refer to the divine power as well as the messiah: 'The Unicorn in the Messianic Imagery of the Greek Bible', *JTS* 45 (1994), 117-36. These two interpretations are reflected in *Tgs: Onq*, on the one hand, interprets the 'horns' in Deut 33.17 as the messiah; in the PT (*Neof. Ps-Jon*), on the other hand, the 'horns' in Deut 33.17 symbolize the power and strength given to the members of the tribe of Joseph to prevail over the nations. Justin's interpretation might be influenced by the tradition preserved in the PT, since he seems to have known that μονόκερως is a messianic symbol, which also represents the divine power.

Christ, but also to the divine mysterious power, since in the OT a horn (קֶרֶן; κέρας) is often a symbol of power and might.³⁹⁷

Moreover, Justin locates this identification of the horns with the beams of the cross (*Dial.* 91.2) intentionally in the series of references he makes to the battle with Amalec (Exod 17.11-12; *Dial.* 91.3) and the brazen serpent (Num 21.9; *Dial.* 91.4).³⁹⁸ This combination of Exodus 17.11-12 and Numbers 21.9 in *Dialogue* 91³⁹⁹ indicates Justin's contact with a Midrashic tradition. About this combination of these OT texts, T. W. Manson has pointed out that the collocation of Exodus 17.11-12 and Numbers 21.9 is also attested in the Rabbinic sources:⁴⁰⁰ in *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Shim'on bar Yoh'ai*, Rabbi Eliezer says that Moses' raising of his hands and the brazen serpent should be interpreted as the words of the Torah that strengthens Israel.⁴⁰¹ In the Midrashic interpretation, the two OT references—Moses' raising of his hands and the brazen serpent—are interpreted

³⁹⁷ B. Kedar-Kopfstein, 'Qeren', *TDOT* 13:173. In the Greek literature, κέρας is also used to depict the strength and might of the gods: W. Foerster, 'Κέρας', *TDNT* 3:669.

³⁹⁸ It is noteworthy that Justin seems to be the first Christian writer who introduced a messianic interpretation of κέρας in Deut 33.17: Reijners, *Terminology*, 99-100.

³⁹⁹ In *Dial.* 97.1, Justin mentions a typological correspondence between Moses' raising of his both hands in the form of the cross during the battle (Exod 17.11-12) and Christ's remaining on the cross/tree (ξύλον) until evening. Although it is only in *Dial.* 97.1 where ξύλον is clearly associated with Moses' raising of his hands, the reference to this event is in fact recurrent in *Dial.* 90.4; 91.3; 93.5; 111.1; 112.2. Moses' raising of his hands in Exod 17.11-12 as a type of the cross also appears in *Dial.* 91 in juxtaposition with the brazen serpent (Num 21.9), which is another recurrent story (*Dial.* 93.5; 94.1; 112.1; 131.4).

⁴⁰⁰ *m. Roš Haš.* 3.8; *Mekh. RI.* Amalek 1; *Mekh. RSbY.* Exod 17.11.

⁴⁰¹ T. W. Manson, 'The Argument from Prophecy', *JTS* 46 (1945), 131-32. Cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism: In the First Century of the Christian Era, the Age of the Tannaim*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1927), 2:206. In *Mekh. RI.* Amalek 1, the blood of the Passover lamb (Exod 12.23) is also associated with the battle with Amalek and the brazen serpent: J. Z. Lauterbach, *Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1933), 2:143-44. The final redaction of *Mekh. RI.* is estimated to have been in the second half of the 3rd century: H. L. Strack and G. Stemmerger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, trans. M. Bockmuehl (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 277-79. The paschal lamb is also juxtaposed with the battle with Amalek in *Dial.* 111.3-4: Rokéah, *Justin*, 36-37.

as the symbols of the power and strength given to the Israelites through the Torah.⁴⁰² This Jewish interpretation has also influenced Justin's use of ξύλον.

In sum, Justin's use of ξύλον as the symbol of the Cross is influenced further by the imagery of 'horns of unicorn' in Deuteronomy 33.17, and by the Midrashic traditions on Exodus 17.11-12 and Numbers 21.9 preserved in early Rabbinic sources. His use of the term displays a fusion of both Jewish and Christian exegetical traditions.

d. Further Jewish influence on Justin's 'Tree'

In Justin's use of 'tree' in *Dialogue* 86, there are traits of another Jewish influence. In this chapter, the 'tree' is considered not only to be (the source of) the miraculous power of the Cross, but also to be Christ himself (i.e. new Law). Justin brings out this interpretation in *Dialogue* 86.1:

And after saying this, I added: And learn that after he [*Christ] was crucified—regarding him, the Scriptures show that he shall come again in glory—he possessed a symbol of the 'tree of life', which is said to have been planted in Paradise, and [*learn] <concerning> what <has happened and> is about to happen to all the righteous ones. Moses was sent with a rod for the redemption of the people, and when he took hold of it with his hand in front of the people, he divided the sea; <and> with this [*rod], he saw water gushing forth from the rock: and by throwing a wood (ξύλον) into the water in Marah, which was bitter, he made it sweet. (*Dial.* 86.1)

⁴⁰² Since the collocation of the battle with Amalek and the brazen serpent is also found in *Barn.* 12, the tradition that combines the two passages is known among some early Christian groups. Justin might have learned this tradition from a Christian source (Skarsaune, *Proof*, 218), but it is also likely that he has acquired the knowledge from a Jewish source. M. Hirshman reluctantly admits Justin's possible knowledge of the tradition later preserved in the Rabbinic sources: 'Polemic Literary Units in the Classical Midrashim and Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*', *JQR* 83 (1993), 377. Rokéah rejects any relation between *Mekh.RI.* Amalek 1 and *Dial.: Justin*, 35-42.

In this verse, Justin argues that after the crucifixion, Christ became the one who possessed the symbol of the mysterious power of resurrection (the tree of life)—the source of the eternal life. According to Justin’s interpretation, this mysterious ‘tree’ was once held by Moses; using this ‘tree (of life)’, he changed the bitter water sweet at Marah (Exod 15.23-25).

Justin’s association of the ‘tree (of life)’ with OT symbols is elaborated further in the subsequent verses (*Dial.* 86.2-6). He associates the ‘tree of life’ with ‘rod’ (ῥάβδος; Isa 11.1)⁴⁰³ and ‘sprout’ (βλαστός; Gen 49.9)⁴⁰⁴—the symbols identified with Christ. Justin argues that these OT symbols demonstrate the glory and power of Christ revealed before his first coming. These two symbolic terms (ῥάβδος and βλαστός) appears in *Dialogue* 86.4:

The rod (ῥάβδος) that brought a ‘sprout’ (βλαστός) to Aaron appointed him as the high priest. Isaiah prophesied that a ‘rod from the root of Jesse’ (ῥάβδον ἐκ ρίζης Ἰεσσαί; Isa 11.1) would become Christ. And David says that the righteous one is like the ‘tree planted by the channels of waters’, which ‘produces its fruit in due season, and his leaf shall not fall off (Psa 1.3). (*Dial.* 86.4)

In this passage, the ‘tree (of life)’ is further identified with the ‘rod’ held by Aaron; Justin believes that this ‘rod’ brought Aaron the ‘sprout’, which perhaps indicates the spiritual power/authority that made Aaron the high priest. The ‘tree (of life)’ is then identified with a ‘rod of the root of Jesse’ in Isaiah 11.1—a messianic king. It is further associated with the ‘tree’ (i.e., the righteous one) in Psalm 1.3. Thus Justin incorporates these messianic symbols (ῥάβδος and βλαστός) into the metaphor of ξύλον.

⁴⁰³ The equivalent in MT is קֶשֶׁת (rod, shoot). A similar symbolic use of ‘rod’ appears in *Numbers Rabbah* 18 and *Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer* 40(22c); cf. H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (München: Beck, 1926), 3:746; Skarsaune, *Proof*, 375. In *Dial.* 100.4, ῥάβδος is juxtaposed with ἀνατολή (sprout/East).

⁴⁰⁴ Besides this occurrence in *Dial.* 86.4, Justin uses βλαστός only in his quotation of Gen 49.9 (Israel’s testament to Judah) in *Dial.* 52.2, where it refers to Christ.

In the last part of this series of the OT citations in *Dialogue* 86, Justin inserts a legendary story on the construction of the house of the Torah; in verse 6, in which Justin mentions a story of Elisha's throwing of a 'piece of wood' into the River Jordan:

Elisha, by throwing a wood (ξύλον) into the River Jordan, brought up the iron [*head] of an axe (2 Kings 6.4-7); with this axe the sons of the prophets had gone to cut trees (ξύλα) to build the house, in which they purposed to recite and practise the Law and ordinance of God: as Christ redeemed us, who have been baptized from the gravest sins that we committed, because of the crucifixion on the tree (ξύλου), and because of water of cleansing, and He made us the house of prayer and worship. . . . (*Dial.* 86.6)

In the story perhaps based on 2 Kings 6.4-7, the sons of the prophets cut out the timbers with the axe, the iron head of which was miraculously recovered from the river bed by Elisha.⁴⁰⁵ With these timbers, they built the house for teaching and practicing the Torah. Justin finds a typological correspondence between the house of the Torah made of the 'trees' and the house of prayer and worship (i.e. the Christian church), where the new Law is observed. Thus the series of the OT material in *Dialogue* 86, which is selected and combined with the symbolic terms of the 'tree (of life)', the 'rod', and the 'sprout', is juxtaposed with the legendary story that mentions the construction of the house of the Law; Justin regards this house as a type of a Christian congregation; that is, the house of the new Law. In *Dialogue* 86, therefore, Justin indicates that the 'tree (of life)' is associated with the (new) Law.

This use of ξύλον in *Dialogue* 86 shows a resemblance with the Jewish metaphor of 'tree (of life)' as the Torah. Justin uses the 'tree of life' as the symbol of the resurrection based on his reading of other Scriptural passages, such as Proverbs

⁴⁰⁵ This story of Elisha may have been borrowed from an unknown extra biblical source.

3.16. But he seems to be also influenced by an exegetical tradition found in *Neof* of Genesis 3.22, 24:

(22) And the Lord God said: ‘Behold, the *first* Adam whom I have created is alone in the world as I am alone in the heavens on high. Eventually numerous nations are to arise from him, and from him shall arise one nation who will know to distinguish between good and evil. If he had observed the precept of the Law and fulfilled its commandment, there would be the life, and he would stand forever like the tree of life. And now, as he has not observed the precepts of the Law and has not fulfilled its commandment, behold we will banish him from the garden of Eden before he stretches out his hand and takes of the fruit of the tree of life and eats and lives forever.

(24) And he banished Adam; and he had made the Glory of his Shekinah dwell from the beginning (מלקדמין)⁴⁰⁶ to the east of the Garden of Eden, between the two cherubim. Two thousand years before he created the world⁴⁰⁷ he had created the Law; he had prepared the Garden of Eden for the just and Gehenna for the wicked. He had prepared the Garden of Eden for the just that they might eat and delight themselves from the fruits of the tree, because they had kept precepts of the Law in this world and fulfilled the commandments. For the wicked he prepared Gehenna, which is comparable to a sharp sword devouring with both edges. He prepared within it darts of fire and burning coals for the wicked, to be avenged of them in the world to come because they did not observe the precepts of the Law in this world. For the Law is a tree of life for everyone who toils in it and keeps the commandments: he/it is the life and endures like the tree of life in the world to

⁴⁰⁶ An equivalent of the Hebrew מקדם; קדם may refer to ‘prehistoric times’: HALOT, 1070. Regarding this phrase, I have adopted the translation of D. M. Golomb, *A Grammar of Targum Neofiti*, HSS 34 (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1985), 41.

⁴⁰⁷ The Aramaic text reads קדם על לא יברא עולם תרין אלפין דשנין (lit. the primeval time before he does not create the world two thousand years).

*come. The Law is good for all who labour in it in this world like the fruit of the tree of life.*⁴⁰⁸

The Targumist assumes that the Law preceded creation: if one would obey this Law, one should live forever; thus the Law is deemed as the source of the eternal life. Since Adam failed, he was rejected from his access to the ‘tree of life’, namely the Law, so that he should not live forever.⁴⁰⁹

This identification of the Law with the ‘tree of life’ in the PT tradition seems to have provided a reason for Justin’s association of the ‘tree of life’ with other OT metaphors in *Dialogue* 86: the ‘tree (of life)’ is associated with ‘rod’ and ‘sprout’—the symbols of the messianic figure (Christ), who is also the new Law.⁴¹⁰

e. ‘Tree’ as Eucharistic element

We have observed so far that Justin knew a Jewish metaphor of ‘tree’ that refers to the righteous people who live according to the Torah—a tradition reflected in LXX Jeremiah 38.12. The ‘tree’ in Justin also refers to the Cross, as in Galatians 3.13, and its mysterious power. Justin has further developed the early Christian metaphor of ‘tree’ under the influence of the Midrashic exegesis on Exodus 17.11-12 and Numbers 21.9, as well as a Jewish metaphor of the ‘tree of life’ as the Torah.

Justin incorporates another element into his metaphor of ‘tree’ from a textual tradition preserved in LXX Jeremiah. Justin’s metaphoric use of ξύλον is found also in the quotation of LXX Jeremiah 11.19 in *Dialogue* 72.2. He seems to

⁴⁰⁸ My translation; I have consulted ET in M. J. McNamara, *Targum Neofiti I: Genesis*, ArBib 1A (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1992), 63-64. For the date of *Neof*, see ch. 5 ‘Exodus 19-24’, p. 173 n. 479.

⁴⁰⁹ *Frg Tg* (P) and *Ps-Jon* to Gen 3.22, 24 also testifies to the establishment of the Law before the creation, and to the identification of the ‘(fruit of the [*Frg Tg* (P) Gen 3.24]) tree of life’ with the Law.

⁴¹⁰ There is another resemblance between Justin’s use of the ‘tree (of life)’ in *Dial.* 86 and *Neof* of Gen 3.22-24; both seem to be dependent on the Midrashic tradition on the water of Marah. See the discussion below, pp. 156-59.

interpret this ‘tree’, which is associated with ‘bread’, as a symbol of the Eucharistic element. In the preceding chapter (*Dial.* 71), Justin blames the Jews who have rejected the Septuagint translation, and he also accuses some of them of deleting the passages that would have supported Christian arguments. In the next chapter, Justin gives LXX Jeremiah 11.19 as an example of such Jewish falsification:

Like an ‹innocent› lamb, I am brought to be killed, not knowing: against me, they crafted an argument, saying: ‘Come and let us throw a tree (ξύλον) into his bread, and let us destroy him from the land of the living, so that his name should no longer be remembered.’ (Jer 11.19; *Dial.* 72.2)

Although Justin makes no further comment on the phrase ‘throw a tree into his bread’, he would take it as another proof text of the presence of Christ in the Eucharistic element of bread. Justin’s quotation of LXX Jeremiah 11.19 indicates therefore that in Justin’s view, the mysterious power represented in the ‘tree (of life)’ in the OT and now revealed in the crucifixion of Christ is conveyed to Christians through their receiving and partaking of the Eucharistic element.

Simply put, LXX Jeremiah 11.19 provides Justin with a clue with which he associates the metaphor of ‘tree (of life)’ with the Eucharistic element of bread.

f. Sacraments as channels of mysterious power

In Justin’s view, moreover, ξύλον not only refers to the Eucharistic element, but the Sacrament of baptism as well. Such a use of ξύλον is found in *Dialogue* 138—a chapter in the concluding section of the *Dialogue*:

(2) For Christ, who is the first born of all the creatures, has also become again the head of another race, to which new birth is given by Him, by *water, faith* and *tree* (ξύλον), which held the mystery (μυστήριον) of the cross, just as Noah was saved, being carried by the tree (ξύλω) in waters together with his family. Therefore, when the prophet says, ‘In the time of Noah, I saved you’

(Isa 54.9), <as> I mentioned before, he is addressing to the people who was similarly faithful to God, and who had these symbols, in the like manner. And Moses, having the rod in his hand, led your people to cross the sea. (3) But you suppose that He addressed only to your people, or to the earth. But because the whole earth was in deluge, as the Scripture says, and ‘the water was lifted up fifteen cubits above all mountains’ (Gen 7.20), it is evident that God has spoken, not to the earth, but to the people who obeyed Him; for this people, He also prepared the restful haven in Jerusalem, as has been proven by all the symbols at the time of the deluge. And I said: by *water, faith and tree* (ξύλου), those who prepared themselves beforehand and repented of their sins will escape the judgment of God which is about to come. (*Dial.* 138.2-3)⁴¹¹

By the phrase ‘water, faith, and tree’ in the above quotation, Justin refers to the Sacrament of baptism.⁴¹² The additional phrase ‘which holds the mystery of the cross’ underpins the point.⁴¹³ Moreover, Justin mentions two OT types of baptism in this context: the deluge of Noah and Israel’s crossing of the Red Sea. In both of these events, ‘water’ and ‘tree’ were involved. Noah and his family were protected from the water in the ark made of wood, whereas Moses raised the ‘rod’ to divide the water of the sea to open up the path for the people of Israel. Likewise, the new people of Israel are saved by ‘water, faith, and tree’, that is, baptism. Justin implies that just as the divine power was present in the tree/rod in the time of Noah and Moses, the tree/cross of Christ conveys the same power; those who believe in Christ receive this power through baptism.

In summary, Justin uses ξύλον as follows. Like the LXX translators of Jeremiah, Justin knew the Jewish metaphor of the ‘tree’ that represents the (renewed/true) Israelites. The ‘tree’ in *Dialogue* 96.1, which is a symbol of the crucifixion of

⁴¹¹ My Italics.

⁴¹² Πίστις may mean baptism: *PGL*, 1084.

⁴¹³ Justin might not use μυστήριον as an idiomatic term to refer to a Sacrament: cf. G. Bornkam, ‘Μυστήριον’, *TDNT* 4:824-28; *PGL*, 891-93. Nonetheless, our interpretation of the phrase ‘water, faith and tree’ as the Sacrament of baptism and the Eucharist sits well on Justin’s description.

Christ,⁴¹⁴ shows the trace of the Pauline interpretation of Deuteronomy 21.23 in Galatians 3.13. Justin's use of this metaphor is also influenced by the Midrashic tradition on Exodus 17.11-12 and Numbers 21.9. Knowing the Jewish symbol of 'tree (of life)' as the Torah likely through the PT tradition, moreover, he uses it for the metaphor of the new Law/covenant, namely Christ. Hence Justin juxtaposes ξύλον with other Christological symbols such as 'rod' and 'sprout' (*Dial.* 86).⁴¹⁵ Just as the 'tree (of life)' can refer to the Torah, its power, and those who live according to the Torah in Jewish traditions, the 'tree (of life)' in Justin means Christ (i.e., the [new] Law), his crucifixion (*Dial.* 86.6) and his/its mysterious authority and power (*Dial.* 73.1-2).⁴¹⁶ Furthermore, Justin recognizes that LXX Jeremiah 11.19 associates the 'tree' with the Eucharistic element of 'bread' (*Dial.* 72.2); 'tree' also appears in his description of Christian baptism (*Dial.* 138.2-3). As such, this metaphor of the 'tree (of life)' plays an important part also in his theology of Sacraments and his notion of the NC.⁴¹⁷

2. Justin's use of the metaphor of 'water'

Just as he is indebted to Jewish interpretation of the 'tree (of life)', Justin's metaphoric use of 'water' is rooted also in a Jewish metaphor of 'water' as the Torah. As we have seen above in the section of LXX Jeremiah 37-38, this metaphor would be known by the translators of LXX Jeremiah 38. The 'water' as the metaphor of the Torah is also reflected in Sirach 24.23-34. It is also attested in *Tg* of Song of Songs 4.15.⁴¹⁸

⁴¹⁴ This tradition could also be instigated by a certain Christian who knew the Jewish metaphor of the 'tree (of life)'.

⁴¹⁵ This Christological symbol is enlisted again in *Dial.* 126 with other Christological symbols and titles, such as the 'Son of Man', 'Star', 'Wisdom', 'Dawn/Sprout', and even 'Israel'.

⁴¹⁶ It may also indicate those who partake of this power through the Sacraments: *Dial.* 138.2, 3.

⁴¹⁷ The link between the symbol of tree rooted in the Jewish tradition and the Eucharist is noticed by Derrett, 'ΚΥΠΙΟΣ', 384. However, he does not discuss a connection between this symbol and Justin's identification of Christ with the NC.

⁴¹⁸ A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, vol. 4: *The Hagiographa* (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 134; Maher, 'Some Aspects', 322-24. This metaphor of 'water' as the Torah might have been reflected in some NT texts, such as the 'living water' in John 4.10-15 and 7.38. Thus it is not impossible that Justin learned this metaphor also from a Christian source.

Regarding the metaphoric use of ‘water’, the Targumists’ interpretation of ‘water’ in Numbers 24.6-7 is noteworthy. The PT sources almost unanimously identify the ‘water’ in verse 6 with the Law, and the ‘water’ in verse 7 with the messiah.⁴¹⁹ The observations on these Targumic interpretations by Geza Vermes deserve quoting here:

It is clear from these texts that the versions as a whole interpret יזל as ‘to come forth’, ‘to arise’; מים as the Messiah; and מדליו (or rather מדליותיו) as ‘the children of Israel’. This disconcerting exegesis results from the following Midrashic associations. יזל מים recalls יזל צדק (Isa 45.8), where righteousness is symbolically expressed as water. . . . Also, צדק is associated with the Messiah from Jeremiah 33.15 and 23.5. אצמיה לדוד צמה צדק is translated in the Targum: אקים לדוד משיחא דצדקא. In short, water = righteousness = Messiah.⁴²⁰

Thus in the PT tradition, the metaphor of ‘water’ not only refers to the Torah, but to the messianic figure as well.

These two elements in the Jewish metaphor of ‘water’ are reflected in Justin’s use of ‘water’. Being a Christian writer, Justin refers to the Sacrament of baptism (= new Law/covenant) with the phrase ‘water of life’ (τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς ζωῆς: *Dial.* 14.1), which is likely borrowed from Jeremiah 2.13 (πηγὴν ὕδατος ζωῆς).⁴²¹ Justin uses this verse of Jeremiah in his polemic against the old covenant, namely Jewish circumcision (the ‘broken cisterns that cannot hold water’) in contrast to Christian baptism⁴²². In these polemics, the ‘water (of life)’, like the ‘tree (of life)’, also symbolizes the new Law/covenant (Sacrament) in Justin.

⁴¹⁹ *Ps-Jon* and *Neof* to Num 24.6-7; *Frg. Tg.* (V) Num 24.6-7: cf. Vermes, ‘Balaam’, 158-59. *Onq* interprets the ‘water’ in Num 24.7 as the ‘king who will be anointed from among his sons’, but it does not mention the Torah in v. 6 unlike the PT.

⁴²⁰ Vermes, ‘Balaam’, 159-60.

⁴²¹ The construction of τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς ζωῆς, which resembles that of the ‘tree of life’, also appears in Rev 7.17; 21.6.

⁴²² The ‘living fountain’ in *Dial.* 19.2; 140.1; the ‘water of life’ in *Dial.* 114.5.

Justin, however, does not confine the use of this metaphor only to refer to the Sacrament of baptism. Just as the ‘tree’, the ‘water’ in Justin may also refer to Christ. This identification is found in his commentary on Isaiah 35.1-7 in *Dialogue* 69, where Justin combines two or more biblical passages including Jeremiah 2.13. The ‘fountain of the living water’ in this passage means Christ:

(5) ‘ . . . Then the lame shall leap like a deer, and the tongue of the speechless shall speak plainly; for water has burst forth in the wilderness, and a [*river] valley in a thirsty land; and the waterless [*land] shall become a marsh, and there shall be the fountain of water in the waterless [*land]’ (Isa 35.6-7). (6) As a ‘fountain of the living water’ (πηγή ὕδατος ζῶντος: Jer 2.13; 17.13) from God ‘gushed forth in the wilderness’ (ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ . . . ἀνέβλυσεν)⁴²³ [*destitute] of the knowledge of God—that is, in the land of the Gentiles, this Christ gushed forth, who also came in the midst of your race, and healed those who are disabled in a limb, deaf and lame, from birth and after the flesh; he made [*them] leap, hear, and see by his Word. (*Dial.* 69.5-6)

In Justin’s view, the ‘fountain of water in the waterless [*land]’ in Isaiah 35.7 is a prophecy of the Messiah who came amongst the Gentiles; the ‘fountain of water’ may refer to Christ, whereas the ‘waterless land/wilderness’ may mean the land of the Gentiles. To strengthen this interpretation, Justin uses the phrase taken from Jeremiah 2.13 or 17.13; in these verses, the ‘fountain of the living water’ is equal to the Lord. The combination of these OT verses in *Dialogue* 69.5-6 is therefore better understood by interpreting the ‘water’ in these verses as Christ.

Simply put, Justin interprets the ‘water’ in the OT texts as Christ (i.e. new Law/covenant) in a way similar to the Midrashic/Targumic association of ‘water’ with the Torah as well as the Messiah.

⁴²³ Although the exact phrase and term are attested neither in LXX nor in (Jewish) Greek recensions, the line seems to allude to Exod 17.6 or Num 20.11.

3. Justin's source of the metaphors of 'tree' and 'water'

Justin uses both 'tree (of life)' and 'water' as the metaphors of the Sacraments and the new Law/covenant, which he identifies with Christ. His identification of the new Law/covenant with Christ seems to be rooted in Justin's high view of the Sacraments. The identification is also based on his interpretation of Jeremiah 30-31 (37-38). Yet his knowledge of these metaphors also helps him make this identification; they would play a significant role in shaping Justin's interpretation of the NC of Jeremiah.

Then from which source did Justin learn these metaphors? The above discussion in fact has already indicated some possible sources. Justin should have detected the symbolic use of these terms in the LXX translations; it would be possible for Justin to recognise the implications of the subtle changes made by the translators as in LXX Jeremiah 38.12. Justin might have discovered the mysterious power hidden in the 'tree' and the 'water' through the NT writings; the Pauline tradition has also contributed to Justin's metaphor of 'tree'.⁴²⁴ These Jewish exegetical traditions might have circulated among early Christians groups, from which Justin might have obtained his knowledge of these metaphors. He might have leaned them in the dialogues with other Jews including Rabbis. Yet this sub-section suggests another possible source.

In terms of the metaphors of 'tree' and 'water', it is noteworthy that there was a group of Jewish interpreters who advocated them as symbols of the Torah. Early proponents of the Jewish metaphors of 'water' and 'tree' as the Torah are identified with the *dôrshê rěshûmôt* (דרשי רשומות), an old Palestinian school that adopted the figurative interpretations to certain scriptural texts,⁴²⁵ although the metaphors of 'tree (of life)' and 'water' as the Torah might have been extant

⁴²⁴ Justin could have known the Johanine tradition on 'water' (e.g. John 4.10-15).

⁴²⁵ J. Z. Lauterbach, 'The Ancient Jewish Allegorists in Talmud and Midrash', *JQR* 1 (1911), 301, 305, 310-11; G. Bienaimé, *Moïse et le don de l'eau dans la tradition Juive ancienne: Targum et Midrash*, AnBib 98 (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1984), 16-19, 37-42.

before the *dôrshê rêshûmôt* and known among other groups and locations.⁴²⁶ The pair of the metaphors is ascribed to this school in respect to their interpretation of the water of Marah in Exodus 15.22-25.

With regard to the ‘water’ in Exodus 15.22, *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Shimon bar Yoḥai* to Exodus 15.22⁴²⁷ and *b. Baba Qamma* 82a⁴²⁸ are in agreement in identifying the *dôrshê rêshûmôt* as those who suggested the symbolic interpretation of ‘water’ as the Torah based on Isaiah 55.1.⁴²⁹ This tradition on ‘water’ seems to be reflected in *Ps-Jon* to Exodus 15.22:⁴³⁰

MT And Moses caused Israel to set out from the Sea of Reeds, and they went into the wilderness of Shur. They were three days in the wilderness, and they found no water.

Ps-Jon And Moses caused Israel to set out from the Sea of Reeds, and they went to the wilderness of *Haluzah*. They walked three days in the wilderness, *neglecting the commandments*, and they found no water.

The Targumist explains the reason why the Israelites failed to find the water for three days in the wilderness: it was because they were ‘neglecting the commandments’.⁴³¹ Thus this Targumic rendition reflects the metaphoric use of ‘water’ as the Torah in the Midrashic tradition on the water of Marah.

⁴²⁶ As may be indicated in 1QH 8.19-21.

⁴²⁷ J. N. Epstein (ed.), *Mekhilta d'rabbi Šim'on b. Jochai: Fragmenta in Geniza Cairensi* (Jerusalem: Sumptibus Mekize Nirdamim, 1955), 103. Strack and Stemberger estimate the date of *Mek. RSbY*. in the 4th century: *Introduction*, 283.

⁴²⁸ E. W. Kirzner (trans.), *The Babylonian Talmud: Seder Neziḳin; Baba Qamma* (London: Soncino, 1935), 466.

⁴²⁹ Bienaimé, *Moïse*, 16. This figurative interpretation of the ‘water’ is rejected by Rabbi Yehoshua ben Ḥananyah (active in the early second century); he claims that the word should be interpreted literally: *Mek. RSbY*. Exod 15.22 (Epstein, 102); Bienaimé, *Moïse*, 22.

⁴³⁰ For the date of *Ps-Jon*, see ch. 5 ‘Exodus 19-24’, p. 173 n. 478.

⁴³¹ M. J. McNamara and R. Hayward, *Targum Neofiti I: Exodus*, ArBib 2 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 206 n. 41. Cf. L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, vol. 3: *Bible Times and Characters from the Exodus to the Death of Moses*, trans. P. Radin (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1911), 38-40; idem., *The Legends of the Jews*, vol. 6: *Notes to Vols. 3 and 4* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1928), 14-15 nn. 82-84.

Concerning the ‘piece of wood’ in Exodus 15.25, *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Shimon bar Yoḥai* again includes the interpretation by the *dôrshê rěshûmôt*:

The *dôrshê rěshûmôt* say: He showed him the words of the Torah, which is considered equivalent to a tree, as it is said ‘She is a tree of life to them who lay hold on her’ (Prov 3.18).⁴³²

Based on Proverbs 3.18, this school of exegetes identify the ‘piece of wood’ with the ‘tree of life’, namely, the true wisdom, and the instructions of the Torah.⁴³³

The interpretations of the ‘piece of wood’ in *Neof* to Exodus 15.25 seem to be indebted to the tradition which was originated from or transmitted by the *dôrshê rěshûmôt*. According to *Neof* to Exodus 15.25, the Lord showed a ‘tree’ to Moses when he was praying:

MT And he cried out to the Lord, and the Lord showed (וַיִּרְהוֹ)⁴³⁴ a tree; he threw it into the water, and the water became sweet . . .

Neof And he *prayed before* the Lord, and the Lord showed him a tree, *and the Memra of the Lord took from it a word of the Law*, and he cast it into the midst of the water, and the waters were made sweet . . .

The Targumist’s insertion, ‘and the *Memra* of the Lord took from it a word of the Law’, is likely influenced by the haggadic tradition attributed to the *dôrshê rěshûmôt*.⁴³⁵

⁴³² My translation based on *Mek. RSbY*. Exod 15.25 (Epstein, 104). I have also consulted Lauterbach, ‘Jewish Allegorists’, 311; J. Bonsirven, *Exégèse rabbinique et exégèse paulinienne* (Paris: Beauchesne et ses fils, 1939), 237.

⁴³³ Bienaimé, *Moïse*, 38. This symbolic interpretation of the *dôrshê rěshûmôt* is likely mediated with the tradition that identifies the ‘tree of life’ in Gen 3.24 with the Torah attested in the PT: R. Le Déaut, *Targum du Pentateuque*, vol. 2: *Exode et Lévitique*, SC 256 (Paris: Cerf, 1979), 129; Bienaimé, *Moïse*, 42.

⁴³⁴ *Hip* ‘il of ירה may mean either ‘to teach’ or ‘to throw’: *HALOT*, 436.

⁴³⁵ For the discussion on this haggadic tradition in *LAB* 11.15, see ch. 7 ‘*Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* and 4Q252’, pp. 213-17.

Thus the Midrashic tradition of the water of Marah, which identifies ‘tree (of life)’ and ‘water’ with the Torah, was propagated by the *dôreshê rêshûmôt* (the school of Jewish interpreters), and transmitted through the Targumic traditions.

Justin seems to have known this Midrashic tradition of the water of Marah (Exod 15.22-25), since his use of Exodus 15.22-25 in *Dialogue* 86 shows similarities with this tradition.⁴³⁶ In *Dialogue* 86.1, like the Midrashic tradition, he identifies the piece of wood thrown into the water of Marah with the ‘tree of life’; this ‘tree of life’ is also equated with the messianic symbols of ‘rod’ and ‘sprout’ in the following verses, so that the ‘tree (of life)’ may be further identified with Christ who is the new Law/covenant. Moreover, the last verse of *Dialogue* 86 includes the legendary story on the building of the house of the Torah made of ‘tree’. The chapter also includes the metaphoric use of the ‘water(s)’ (Psa 1.3). These elements indicate that Justin collected these OT metaphors and imageries based on his knowledge of the Midrashic tradition on the water of Marah.⁴³⁷

In short, Justin’s association of the piece of wood in Exodus 15.25 with the ‘tree of life’, which is identified with Christ (the new Law), and his association of the ‘tree’ with the houses of the Torah and the new Law in *Dialogue* 86 seem to indicate that he knew the Midrashic tradition on the water of Marah; he might have learned this tradition from the PT tradition in its oral stage.

I. Concluding remarks

The findings of this chapter can be summarized in four points.

(1) The LXX translators and the Targumist would have interpreted the BC of Jeremiah in light of the contexts of their audiences and applied it to their situations. In the LXX translation of Jeremiah 30-31 (37-38), the LXX translators

⁴³⁶ For ET of *Dial.* 86, see above pp. 146-48; see also ch. 7 ‘*LAB* and 4Q252’, p. 215-16.

⁴³⁷ This explanation by no means excludes the possibility that Justin drew on other sources in collecting the OT metaphors and imageries of *Dial.* 86.

found its partial fulfilment of the NC prophecy in the vitalization of the Torah learning and observance in the post-exilic period, although they also envisage its full realization in the future. *Tg* Jeremiah 30-31 reflected Jewish adjustment to the life without the Temple. The Targumist identified the message relevant to his audience in the exhortation to return to the Torah; for him, it was identical with the faithful observance of the worship service held in Jewish synagogue. Justin's interpretation of the NC was not distant from such readings: he also acknowledged that the NC was partly fulfilled in the Christian liturgical practice; his ignorance of Jeremiah 31(38).33-34 might indicate that he expected the full realization of this prophecy in the future. In a way similar to the Targumist of Jeremiah, Justin would have thought that the observance of the new Law/covenant was virtually identical with the faithful participation in the Christian worship.

(2) Justin's choice of the OT texts juxtaposed with Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 in *Dialogue* 11-12 could be rooted in either Jewish or Christian sources, but this study would suggest another possibility; it might have been the result of his reading of the BC in Jeremiah both in LXX and a Greek recension.⁴³⁸ The juxtaposition of Isaiah 55.1-3, on the one hand, was based on his recognition of the fact that the fulfilment of the Davidic covenant is the *leitmotif* of both the BC in Jeremiah and Isaiah 55. The combination of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 with Isaiah 51.4-5, on the other hand, was due to the occurrence of the common theme of the 'going/coming out of תורה/תודה' in both texts; in Isaiah, it is תורה (Law) that goes/comes out, whereas in the BC of Jeremiah, it is תודה (thanksgiving) that comes out. A similar combination of Isaiah 2.3 and the phrase 'another covenant' is also made in *Dialogue* 24.1. In creating these combinations, Justin might have relied on a Jewish recension, which would have preserved the reading closer to proto-MT. Justin's identification of the new Law with the NC (*Dial.* 24.1) therefore might have been partly due to his knowledge of the reading preserved in a Jewish recension.

⁴³⁸ And possibly even in proto-MT.

(3) Justin knew the Jewish metaphors of ‘tree’ and ‘water’. Like the translators of LXX Jeremiah 38.12, Justin knew the Jewish tradition that identifies the ‘tree(s)’ with the righteous ones who live according to the Torah (i.e. Israel) (*Dial.* 14). More importantly, Justin’s use of the metaphor of ‘tree (of life)’ shows the elements derived from the early Christian tradition (Gal 3.13), the LXX texts, and the Midrashic traditions. Under their influence, Justin’s ‘tree’ signified not only the cross, and its mysterious power, but the new Law/covenant, namely Christ. Likewise, the ‘water’ in Justin referred to the Sacraments and Christ, since Justin also knew the Jewish metaphor of ‘water’ as the Torah and the Messiah. In Justin, moreover, these metaphors of ‘tree (of life)’ and ‘water’ were closely related to Christian baptism and the Eucharist. These Jewish metaphors would have functioned as catalysts for Justin’s identification of the new Law/covenant (i.e., the Sacraments) with Christ.

(4) Justin’s use of Jewish metaphors of ‘tree (of life)’ and ‘water’ as the Torah may indicate his knowledge of the Midrashic tradition on the water of Marah which would have been originated from or transmitted by the *dôrshê rêshûmôt*, and likely mediated through the PT tradition in its oral stage. Justin might have come across the expositions of these metaphors in a (Jewish-) Christian circle,⁴³⁹ or he might have learned them through his dialogues with other Jews.⁴⁴⁰ Yet we should not disregard the possibility that Justin learned them directly from the early PT tradition perhaps before his conversion.⁴⁴¹

⁴³⁹ Cf. Skarsaune, *Proof*, 373-74.

⁴⁴⁰ In this case, these metaphors may still be related to and have originated from the PT.

⁴⁴¹ Justin may have known the Samaritans’ method of sacrificing the Paschal lambs (*Dial.* 40.3): Williams, *Dial.*, 80. His knowledge of such a religious practice may indicate his associations with the Samaritans and possibly even with Jews before his conversion. In *Dial.* 14.2-3, he seems to refer to a Samaritan tradition, which is also preserved in *Ps-Jon* to Exodus 12.18: P. R. Weis, ‘Some Samaritanisms of Justin Martyr’, *JTS* 45 (1944), 201. Justin may have encountered the Midrashic exegesis on the water of Marah likely in oral traditions recited in the synagogue liturgy: concerning the recitation of the Scriptures in the synagogue, cf. R. Le Déaut, ‘The Current State of Targumic Studies’, *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 4 (1974), 8. The Targumic influence over Justin’s OT interpretations may be comparable with its influence over *Peshitta*. The translation of the Syriac version is estimated to have occurred in c. 150-

200 CE: M. P. Weitzman, *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament: An Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999), 258. The translator(s) of *Peshiṭta* had knowledge of both the Hebrew text and the Jewish exegetical traditions, some of which may be transmitted orally to be recorded later in the Targumic and Midrashic literature: *ibid.*, 129; P. B. Dirksen, 'The Old Testament *Peshitta*', in Mulder and Sysling, *Mikra*, 281-84. Although it is evident that the translator(s) of *Peshiṭta* and the Targumists relied on common sources, these sources were not in written form when they were used by the Syriac translator(s). In his discussion on the relation between the Syriac version and the Jewish Targums, Weitzman emphasises the fact that the translator(s) of *Peshiṭta* did not use a written form of the Targums: *Syriac Version*, 86-129.

Chapter V

Exodus 19-24

A. Introduction

The present chapter will examine Exodus 19-20 and 23.20-24.18 (Exod 19-24),⁴⁴² the passage that constitutes a background for early Christian ideas of the NC, particularly in the institution of the Lord's Supper.⁴⁴³ The investigation of this passage will provide further clues for understanding Justin's notion of the NC and his view of the Sacrament. This chapter will also explore Exodus 19-24 in the different traditions of the OT in a manner similar to that employed in the previous chapter. First, it will outline the passage in MT, before turning to LXX, the recensions of 'Theodotion' and Aquila, and the Aramaic Targums. The last section will examine the influence of the passage on Justin's view of the NC.

B. The Masoretic Text

In spite of the complexity of the source-critical and redaction-historical issues,⁴⁴⁴ and the apparent tensions within Exodus 19-24, it is still possible to recognise a certain degree of a narrative unity within the Sinai pericope (Exod 19-24).⁴⁴⁵ This narrative unit begins with God's demand for Israel's preparation before his descent to Mount Sinai and concludes with the ratification of the covenant. The

⁴⁴² In the present study, the Decalogue (Exod 20.1-17) is not examined in full measure. To avoid complexity, the text of Exod 19-20 and 23.20-24.18 examined in this chapter may be simply mentioned as Exod 19-24.

⁴⁴³ Matt 26.26-29; Mark 14.22-25; Luke 22.20; 1 Cor 11.25; Heb 9.18-21; 12.18-23.

⁴⁴⁴ The issues relating to the sources and the redaction history of Exod 19-24 (MT) are beyond the scope of this essay.

⁴⁴⁵ Cf. J. van Seters, ' "Comparing Scripture with Scripture": Some Observations on the Sinai Pericope of Exodus 19-24', in G. Tucker, et al. (eds.), *Canon, Theology, and Old Testament Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 111-30; W. H. C. Propp, *Exodus 19-40*, AB 2B (New York: Double Day, 2006), 101-309; G. C. Chirichigno, 'The Narrative Structure of Exod 19-24', *Bib* 68 (1987), 457-79. Y. Avishul identifies a chiastic structure of Exod 19-24: 'The Narrative of the Revelation at Sinai (Ex 19-24)', in G. Galil and M. Weinfeld (eds.), *Studies in Historical Geography and Biblical Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 197-214.

covenant in this passage epitomises the covenant-oath in the Hebrew Bible which involves the theophany, the divine promise, the stipulations, and the rituals.

Exodus 19 provides an account of Israel's preparations for receiving the Decalogue (Exod 20.1-17) and the statutes and ordinances (book of the covenant: Exod 20.22-23.19) at Mount Sinai. After a report of Israel's arrival to the wilderness of Sinai (Exod 19.1-2), the introductory passage explains why Israel came to this location. God was now willing to conclude his covenant with the people whom he had brought out from Egypt; he declared them as his 'possession' (סגלה) and to make them the 'kingdom of priests' (ממלכת כהנים)⁴⁴⁶ and the 'holy nation' (19.3-6). Upon the Israelites' acceptance (Exod 19.7-8), the Lord told Moses that he would come in a dense cloud, so that the people could hear his speech (19.9). The Lord also declared that the people should be cleansed for the third day when the Lord would descend onto the mountain (19.10-11). He instructed Moses then to set a boundary around the mountain (19.12-13); thus Mount Sinai was turned into a sanctuary.⁴⁴⁷ Then Moses returned to the people with these instructions (19.14-15). On the third day, extraordinary phenomena occurred at the mountain—great sound/thunder (קול), lightening, and a thick cloud. After the people came out of the camp, the Lord descended with fire upon Mount Sinai. He then summoned Moses to the mountain for a conversation (19.16-19). He told Moses to instruct the people not to break through the boundary to see him. He also ordered Moses to consecrate the priests, lest his wrath should break out against them. After fulfilling these demands, Moses and Aaron approached the mountain (Exod 19.20-25). The stage is thus set for the giving of the Decalogue (Exod 20.1-17).

⁴⁴⁶ The phrase may also be translated as 'a kingdom, priests'.

⁴⁴⁷ This consecration is comparable with that of the tabernacle site: N. M. Sarna, *Exodus* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1991), 105.

When the Lord delivered the Ten Words, the people of Israel trembled with intense fear since the people witnessed (כל־העם ראים)⁴⁴⁸ the signs of the divine presence as revealed in the thunder and lightning flashing over the mountain, the blare of the horn, and the smoke of the mountain (Exod 20.18). Their fear was so great that they asked Moses not to let the Lord speak directly to them, lest they die (20.19). Moses explained that the Lord incurred the great fear among the Israelites, so that they should not sin (20.20).

After receiving the Decalogue, Moses approached the cloud to receive the book of the covenant. The first stipulation prescribed how to build the altar in the place where the Lord would reveal his ‘name’, namely his divine presence (Exod 20.22-26). In the last section of the statutes and ordinances, the Lord promised to send an angel (מלאך) who would precede the Israelites, as they entered the Land promised to their ancestors. God ordered the people to obey this angel since he would bear the name of the Lord (Exod 23.20-33).

In Exodus 24, the Sinai covenant was ratified by Moses who stood as the mediator. The Lord summoned Moses and Aaron, Aaron’s sons and the seventy elders to approach the mountain; only Moses was allowed to come closer to the Lord (Exod 24.1-2). When Moses delivered the ordinances to the people, they pledged in one voice to keep all of them (24.3). After the book of the covenant was recorded,⁴⁴⁹ an altar was built for a ritual to ratify the covenant. At the ratification, young Israelite men offered whole-burnt offerings and slaughtered oxen for sacrifices. Moses sprinkled half of the oxen blood over the altar. After the Israelites pledged to observe the commandments, Moses dashed the remainder upon the people (24.4-7). He then declared the conclusion of the covenant by saying: ‘Behold, the blood of the covenant, which the Lord concludes with you, concerning all these words.’ (24.8) After this blood ritual, Moses, Aaron, Aaron’s

⁴⁴⁸ The verb ראה governs even the thunder and the blare of horn; for the verb of these auditory objects, Sam supplies שמע: S. Fraade, ‘Hearing and Seeing at Sinai: Interpretive Trajectories’, in G. Brooke, et al. (eds.), *The Significance of Sinai* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 250-52.

⁴⁴⁹ B. S. Childs, *Exodus* (London: SCM, 1974), 505.

sons, and the seventy elders went up to the mountain to see the God of Israel. In the presence of God, they had a ceremonial meal (24.9-11).

After the covenant ratification, the Lord summoned Moses again to the mountain to give him the tablets of the commandments. This time, Moses was accompanied by Joshua. As Moses went up to the mountain, the glory of the Lord settled upon it. The cloud covered the mountain for six days (Exod 24.16).⁴⁵⁰ The glory of the Lord was revealed also in 'a consuming fire' (24.17). On the seventh day, the Lord called Moses again from the cloud and kept him for forty days and forty nights (24.12-18).

This is an outline of Exodus 19-20 and 23.20-24.18. For the subsequent discussions, two remarks are added. First, the Sinai pericope is characterized by the descriptions of the theophany, which is one of the most important themes in Exodus.⁴⁵¹ The extraordinary phenomena that accompanied the theophany caused the great fear and trembling among the people of Israel. Second, although this passage accounts for the extraordinary events that took place during the giving of the Decalogue and the book of the covenant, it also establishes a liturgical pattern for the people of the covenant.⁴⁵²

C. The Septuagint

LXX Exodus 19-24 gives a relatively straightforward rendition of MT.⁴⁵³ Some of the differences may be explained either as variant readings in the *Vorlage*,⁴⁵⁴ or

⁴⁵⁰ The cloud indicates a literary relation with the dedication of the Temple: 1 Kings 8.10-11//2 Chr 5.13-14.

⁴⁵¹ W. Johnstone, *Exodus* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 47. Exod is concluded with the dwelling of God's glory at the completed tabernacle (Exod 40.34-38).

⁴⁵² For example, the narrative includes the marking of the mountain as the holy site, the consecration of the priests (the intermediary figures to convey the divine ordinances to the people), the sacrificial offerings, the ritual meal, and the signs of the divine presence.

⁴⁵³ The date of the LXX Pentateuch is estimated in the 3rd century BCE: Schürer, *History*, 3-1:476; G. Dorival, 'Les origines de la Septante: La traduction en Grec des cinq livres de la Torah', in M. Harl, et al. (eds.), *La Bible Grecque des Septante* (Paris: Cerf, 1988), 56-58; E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 2nd edn. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 136.

as the translator's choice of certain Greek words, which often differ slightly from their Hebrew counterparts.⁴⁵⁵ The translators added some insertions and alterations as editorial corrections to make the narrative coherent.⁴⁵⁶ Yet it is still possible to detect theological features of the LXX translation.

In the Sinai pericope, the LXX translators maintain an attitude which can be described as theological hesitation.⁴⁵⁷ One can identify this tendency in their descriptions of human contacts with God. LXX's first divergence from MT in Exodus 19-24 is related to this tendency. In LXX Exodus 19.3, the translators insert τὸ ὄρος (And Moses went up into *the mountain of God*) which is not attested in MT. Whatever the translators' intention may be,⁴⁵⁸ they avoid describing the direct contact between God and Moses. Consequently, LXX puts a subtle emphasis on the place where God is to reveal his presence.

In other words, this tendency of theological hesitation is related to the translator's emphasis on the holy site. An example of this emphasis is found in LXX Exodus 19.12, which includes a difference from MT; the LXX phrase 'touching any part of it (mountain)' for 'to touch its edge' (MT) may imply that human access to the holy place is more strictly controlled in LXX than in MT.⁴⁵⁹

The LXX tendency to limit human access to the divine presence seems to be linked with LXX's view of the privileged status of the intermediary priestly

⁴⁵⁴ For example, LXX Exod 19.18 has the text 'all *the people were greatly amazed*' (ἐξέστη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς σφόδρα), where MT has 'the whole mountain trembled violently'. This difference is likely caused by a variant reading in the *Vorlage*, since some Heb MSS also read 'people': Childs, *Exodus*, 343.

⁴⁵⁵ By translating הָאָרֶץ as λαὸς περιούσιος, LXX seems to emphasise the privileged status given to Israel: A. Le Boulluec and P. Sandevour, *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, vol. 2: *L'Exode*, (Paris: Cerf, 1989), 199.

⁴⁵⁶ The translators use certain phrases consistently throughout the passage: J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 296.

⁴⁵⁷ Le Boulluec and Sandevour use the phrase *scrupule théologique* to describe the translators' attitude indicated in the insertion of τὸν τόπον, οὗ εἰστήκει ἐκεῖ in Exod 24.10: *Exode*, 246.

⁴⁵⁸ Because the next line has 'God called him [*i.e. Moses] from the mountain', this insertion may show the translators' intention to make the narrative internally more coherent: Wevers, *Notes on Exodus*, 293.

⁴⁵⁹ This difference could be due to translators' efforts to improve the narrative: *ibid.*, 299.

figures.⁴⁶⁰ Concerning this emphasis on the privilege of the priests, the translation of ממלכת כהנים in Exodus 19.5-6a deserves attention:

MT (5) And now, if you indeed will listen to my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my possession from all the nations, for all the earth belongs to me. (6) And you shall be to me a kingdom of priests (ממלכת כהנים) and a holy nation.⁴⁶¹

LXX (5) And now if you indeed listen to my voice, and keep my covenant, you shall be to me *the special people* (λαὸς περιούσιος) from all the nations, for the whole earth belongs to me. (6) And you shall become *a royal priesthood* (βασιλείον ιεράτευμα)⁴⁶² and a holy nation.

In the phrase ‘royal priesthood’, the translators convert the noun ממלכה to the adjective βασιλείος and translated כהנים as ιεράτευμα (priesthood)⁴⁶³ instead of ιερεῖς.⁴⁶⁴ They likely made the former alteration under the influence of the psalms that praise YHWH as the king of Israel in order to emphasise that the Jewish people worship their God as their true king.⁴⁶⁵ Both MT and LXX consider that the band of the priests plays an indispensable role in the fulfilment of the divine promise in Exodus 19.5-6. Nevertheless, it is still possible to say

⁴⁶⁰ In MT Exod 24.1-2, on the one hand, these priestly, representative figures (Moses, Aaron, his sons, and the elders) are allowed to worship from afar and only Moses is able to approach the Lord. In LXX, on the other hand, they all worship ‘before the Lord’, and Moses is allowed to come even closer.

⁴⁶¹ ET of Exod 19-24 (MT) is mine unless otherwise noted.

⁴⁶² LXX Exod 19.6 (βασιλείον ιεράτευμα) also allows two renditions: ‘the royal priesthood’ or ‘a kingdom, the priesthood’.

⁴⁶³ The term ιεράτευμα seems to appear only here in the LXX Pentateuch; or possibly in LXX Exod 23.22: Hatch & Redpath, 679.

⁴⁶⁴ A reference to Exod 19.6 in 2 Macc 2.17 indicates that the word is taken as a noun by the author; Philo also interprets it as a noun (*Sobr.* 66; *Abr.* 56): Le Boulluec and Sandevor, *Exode*, 200.

⁴⁶⁵ For example, Psa 10 (9); 24 (23); 29 (28); 47 (46); 93 (92); 95-99 (94-98). The former alteration could reflect the situation of the Alexandrian Jewish community under the Ptolemaic dynasty in the 3rd century BCE; the translators could have tried to avoid using ‘kingdom’ to tone down its political implication: cf. C. G. den Hertog, ‘Die griechische Übersetzung von Exodus 19:6 als Selbstzeugnis des frühhellenistischen Judentums’, in R. Roukema (ed.), *The Interpretation of Exodus* (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 185-88.

that with the phrase βασιλειον ιεράτευμα, the LXX translators shift an emphasis from ‘kingdom’ to ‘priesthood’.⁴⁶⁶

Furthermore, Exodus 24.9-11—the climactic section of Exodus 19-24—emphasises the role of the priestly, representative figures in the liturgical practice. In these verses, LXX shows significant divergences from MT:

MT (9) And Moses, Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy elders of Israel went up. (10) And they saw the God of Israel, and under his feet, like a work of brick of sapphire stone, and like the heaven itself in purity. (11) And against the chiefs of the sons of Israel (אֲצִילֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל), He did not send his hand; and they beheld (וַיַּחֲזֹוּ) God, and they ate, and drank.

LXX (9) And Moses went up, and Aaron, and Nadab and Abiud, and seventy of *the council* of Israel. (10) and they saw *the place* (τὸν τόπον) *where* God of Israel *stood* (οὗ εἰστήκει ἐκεῖ), and *the things* under his feet were like the work of brick of sapphire stone, and just as *an appearance/form of firmament of the* heaven in purity. (11) And of the *chosen* of Israel, *no soul has perished*,⁴⁶⁷ and they were *seen/appeared in the place* (ὥφθησαν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ) of God, and they were eating and drinking.

⁴⁶⁶ The exact meaning of βασιλειον ιεράτευμα is still open to question. The LXX phrase may indicate that the priesthood of kingly stock was an ideal for the Jewish people in this period: Wevers, *Notes on Exodus*, 295. A. Van der Kooij, however, interprets βασιλειον ιεράτευμα as ‘the priesthood with royal status’ referring to the governing body of the Jewish nation; hence he deduces that with the juxtaposition with the ‘holy nation’ the translators describe the Jewish people as the nation governed by the body of the priests: ‘A Kingdom of Priests: Comment on Exodus 19:6’, in R. Roukema (ed.), *The Interpretation of Exodus* (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 173-75.

⁴⁶⁷ Regarding this phrase, I have consulted the French translation of Le Boulluec and Sandevour: *Exode*, 247.

In the above text, two differences from MT in Exodus 24.11 indicate the LXX translators' emphasis on the role played by the priestly class at the covenant conclusion.

(1) LXX translates לְצִיָּא (chief) as ἐπιλέκτος (chosen; of choice quality).⁴⁶⁸ In the above passage, the word may be used in coordination with the phrase λαὸς περιούσιος in Exodus 19.5: when the people of Israel were chosen from among the nations, these representative, priestly figures were chosen even from among the 'special people' (λαὸς περιούσιος).⁴⁶⁹ Hence the band of the priests is described as a doubly privileged class.

(2) Moses and his entourage 'were seen/appeared in the place' (ὤφθησαν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ) of God, instead of seeing God. This LXX translation seems to be related to the translator's recognition of the liturgical implication of Exodus 19-24. In the LXX Pentateuch, the passive of ὁράω often refers to the theophany or the appearance of an angel.⁴⁷⁰ When the verb refers to the 'appearance' of the Israelites, it most likely means their appearance before the divine presence.⁴⁷¹ The translators intentionally use the passive of ὁράω which is suitable for the theophany and the worship. They describe the seeing of God by the priestly figures in Exodus 24.10-11 in the language that they may recall from worship. Moreover, the insertion of ἐν τῷ τόπῳ indicates that the translators recognise the hidden theme of the Sinai pericope to be the Jerusalem Temple.⁴⁷² The translators' attachment to the Temple is also confirmed with another insertion of 'the place' in

⁴⁶⁸ Muraoka, *GELS*, 276.

⁴⁶⁹ With the choice of λαὸς περιούσιος for הַלְלוּ, the translators seem to emphasise the privilege of the people of Israel.

⁴⁷⁰ To the patriarchs (Abraham [Gen 12.7; 16.13; 17.1; 18.1; 22.14]; Isaac [Gen 26.2, 24]; Jacob [Gen 31.13; 35.1; 35.9; 48.3]; all the three patriarchs [Exod 6.3]); to Moses (Exod 3.2; 33.23); to the people of Israel (Lev 9.6, 23; Num 14.10; 16.19; 20.6); to objects, such as the 'lid of the ark of the covenant' (Lev 16.2), the tent of the meeting (Num 14.10; 16.19, 42; 20.6).

⁴⁷¹ Exod 34.20, 23, 24; Deut 16.16; 31.11.

⁴⁷² Cf. C. T. R. Hayward, 'Understandings of the Temple Service in the Septuagint Pentateuch', in J. Day (ed.), *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 386-88.

Exodus 24.11.⁴⁷³ Thus the enhanced role of the priests in LXX Exodus 19-24 is related to the translators' recognition of the Sinai event as setting a pattern of worship, and its implication of the Temple worship.

Finally, attention should be given to the text likely used by early Christians such as Justin. Those who have a high regard for the liturgy and the Sacraments would not fail to notice a significant insertion into Exodus 23.25:

MT And you shall serve the Lord your God, and he will bless your bread,
 and your water, and I will take away disease from your midst.

LXX And you shall serve the Lord your God, and *I* will bless your bread
 and your wine and your water, and I will take away disease from you.

Whatever reason for the insertion may be, this LXX text is most likely related to the practice of the Eucharist in Justin's community.⁴⁷⁴

To summarize, LXX Exodus 19-24 shows the translators' theological hesitation to describe the transcendent God and human contact with him. It tends to limit the access to the presence of God more strictly to those chosen Israelites, such as the priests, who are privileged to have the celestial experience as described in Exodus 24. The translation of ὁφθησαν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ in Exodus 24.11 reveals that the translators recognised the theme of the worship at the Jerusalem Temple in Exodus 19-24. The passage also includes the terms (bread, wine and water) that would have influenced an early Christian practice of the Eucharist.

⁴⁷³ C. T. R. Hayward points out that with this insertion, the LXX translators present the Temple as the place where God reveals his divine presence; the phrase (καὶ ὁφθησαν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ) in Exod 24.11 'unmistakably recalls the words of Exod 23.12; 34.23, that every Israelite male shall be seen or appear (ὁφθήσεται) before the Lord, to which Deut 16.16 adds the words 'in the place which the Lord your God shall choose' (C. T. R. Hayward, 'The Giving of the Torah: Targumic Perspectives', in G. Brooke, et al. [eds.], *The Significance of Sinai* [Leiden: Brill, 2008], 274); that is, the Temple.

⁴⁷⁴ Cf. the discussion below, p. 190-91.

D. 'Theodotion' and Aquila

The Greek texts of Exodus 19-24 in 'Theodotion' and Aquila are often assimilated to proto-MT.⁴⁷⁵ For example, the pronominal suffixes attested in MT but not in LXX are often retained (α' & θ' Exod 19.18; 23.27). The Hebrew phrase such as 'from before you' (מִפְנֵיךָ) is preserved literally in the phrase ἀπὸ προσώπου σου (α' & θ' Exod 23.29). Just as MT, both 'Theodotion' and Aquila put Joshua in a position subordinate to Moses (ὁ λειτουργὸς αὐτοῦ; α' & θ' Exod 24.13), whereas LXX describes Joshua as 'the attendant' (παρεστηκώς).

The version of Aquila, however, does not always adhere to the literal translation of the Hebrew text; it shows some elements that may reflect a situation of Jews in the second century. Likely being aware of the anachronism of 'priests' (הַכֹּהֲנִים) in Exodus 19.22, Aquila translates it as οἱ πρεσβύτεροι.⁴⁷⁶ With this revision, Aquila makes the text more relevant to his audience.

Concerning the translation of the phrase 'kingdom of priests/kingdom, priests' (Exod 19.6), 'Theodotion' translates it as βασιλεία ἱερεῖς as two words, whereas in Aquila as βασιλεία ἱερέων. The Theodotonic reading (βασιλεία ἱερεῖς) is also attested in the book of Revelation (1.6; 5.10).⁴⁷⁷ Thus these recensions witness the two different readings of Exodus 19.6 that existed side by side in the first and second century CE.

In sum: the versions of 'Theodotion' and Aquila tend to assimilate the LXX readings to those of proto-MT, although Aquila's revision from 'priests' to 'elders' in Exodus 19.24 suggests that his version is not always the literal translation of

⁴⁷⁵ For α' and θ', I have consulted the *Hexapla apparatus* of J. W. Wevers and U. Quast (eds.), *Exodus*, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum 2, part 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991) and Field, 1:113-23.

⁴⁷⁶ No evidence is available to judge whether Aquila made the same revision in α' Exod 19.24.

⁴⁷⁷ And in *Peshitta* Exod. McNamara points out that the reading of θ' Exod 19.6 and the references to Exod 19.6 in Rev 1.5; 5.10 are similar to the Targumic translations of the phrase 'kingdom of priests/kingdom, priests': *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966), 227-30.

proto-MT. These recensions bear witness to the two different readings of ממלכת כהנים in Exodus 19.6 extant in the first and second century CE.

E. Aramaic Targums

This section will investigate the Targumic sources, which were in their oral stages during the time of Justin. It will first examine some sections of Exodus 19-24 with attention to common features of the three extant Targums to the Pentateuch (*Targum Psuedo-Jonathan* [*Ps-Jon*],⁴⁷⁸ *Targum Neofiti I* [*Neof*],⁴⁷⁹ and *Targum Onqelos* [*Onq*]⁴⁸⁰), before turning to an examination of the unique renditions of *Ps-Jon* and *Neof*.

1. Common features

In general, the Targumic sources tend to avoid using anthropomorphism and describing direct human contact with God. This tendency is comparable to the theological hesitation observed in LXX Exodus 19-24. Yet the tendency is more prevalent within the Aramaic Targums. Their translations of Exodus 20.24 (*Onq* 20.21) provide an example of this tendency. The line ‘I will come to you’ in

⁴⁷⁸ P. Alexander estimates the final redaction of *Ps-Jon* in the 7th century: ‘Targum, Targumim’, *ABD* 6:322, whereas M. Maher rejects a date before the eighth century: *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*, ArBib 1B (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 11-12. M. Taradach sets a *terminus ad quem* for *Ps-Jon* before the date of *Pirquei de-Rabbi Eliezer* (832 CE): *Le Midrash*, *Le Monde de la Bible* 22 (Genève: Labor et Fides, 1991), 71-72. U. Gleßmer observes that out of their caution, scholars tend to give the priority to a later date: *Einleitung in die Targume zum Pentateuch* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 191.

⁴⁷⁹ Alexander surmises that the codex in its present form may already have taken its shape in the 3rd or 4th century CE: ‘Targum’, *ABD* 6:323. Z. Safrai considers *Neof* as no earlier than the 4th century CE: ‘The Targums as Part of Rabbinic Literature’, in *The Literature of the Sages*, 2nd part: *Midrash and Targum, Liturgy, Poetry, Mysticism, Contracts, Inscriptions, Ancient Science and Languages of Rabbinic Literature*, CRINT 3A (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2006), 269-70. Gleßmer admits that the date of *Neof* is still an open question: *Einleitung*, 114.

⁴⁸⁰ *Onq*, the official Targum of Babylonia, preserves western features, even though its last redaction took place in the east: Alexander, ‘Targum’, *ABD* 6:321-22; B. Grossfeld, *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis*, ArBib 6 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 10-11, 30-32. Proto-*Onqelos* may have been compiled toward the end of the 1st century or the beginning of the 2nd century CE: Gleßmer, *Einleitung*, 93. Taradach estimates that the date of the Babylonian redaction took place in the first half of the 3rd century: Taradach, *Midrash*, 65-67. A later date is proposed by Z. Safrai, who thinks that the redaction took place at the same time as the Babylonian Talmud, or sometime afterwards: Safrai, ‘Targums’, 265.

Exodus 20.24 (MT) is translated in two ways: (1) *Ps-Jon* and *Onq* paraphrase it as ‘I will send my blessings’; (2) *Neof* replaces אָבוֹא with the *hitpe’el* verb אֶתְגַּלִּי, adding the phrase ‘in (my) *Memra*’. Although their methods are different, the three Targums all avoid describing the direct human contacts with God in Exodus 20.24 (*Onq* 20.21).

The same verse (Exodus 20.24 [*Onq* 20.21]) shows another significant common feature. The three Targumic sources are in agreement in their identification of the place where the divine name is remembered along with the place where God reveals his divine presence; it is also the place where the Jewish people are allowed to worship him. This association of the divine name with the divine presence indicates the Targumists’ concern for the Jerusalem Temple.

In Exodus 20.24 (*Onq* 20.21), the three Targums express their concern for the Temple in two different ways. One is when *Neof* inserts קִבִּיעַ between מִדְבָּח and אֶרֶעָא to assimilate the ‘altar of earth’ (Hb. מִזְבֵּחַ אֲדָמָה) to Jacob’s ladder (סֵלֶם קִבֵּעַ) in *Neof* of Gen 28.12):

MT You shall make the altar of earth for me (מִזְבֵּחַ אֲדָמָה תַעֲשֶׂה־לִּי) . . .

Neof An altar you *shall build fixed upon* the earth to my Name (מִדְבָּח (קִבִּיעַ אֶרֶעָא תִבְנוֹן לִשְׁמִי) . . .

With this assimilation, *Neof* emphasises that the earthly worship practised at the site is linked with the heavenly reality.⁴⁸¹

The other is when *Ps-Jon* and *Onq* include the rendition which is absent in *Neof*: they translate ‘in every place where I cause my name to be remembered’ in MT as ‘in every place where I will cause my *Shekinah* to dwell’:

MT . . . in every place where I cause my name to be remembered . . .

⁴⁸¹ McNamara and Hayward, *Neofiti: Exodus*, 89.

Ps-Jon . . . in every place where I will cause my *Shekinah to dwell* (בכל (אתרא דאשרי שכינתי), and where you will worship before me. . .

Onq . . . wherever I shall *rest My Divine Presence* (בכל אתר דאשרי (שכינתי) . . .

Adequately recognizing the implication of the text in proto-MT, both *Ps-Jon* and *Onq* render the text as the prophetic reference to the Jerusalem Temple where the Lord reveals his presence. *Ps-Jon* is more thoroughgoing in this respect, since it mentions that the Jewish people would worship the Lord at this site before his presence. Thus in the three Targums, the place where the divine name is remembered is interpreted as the site where the divine presence is revealed.

In Exodus 19.5-6, more common features of the three Targums are identified:

MT (5) And now, if you shall really listen to my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my possession (והייתם לי סגלה) from all the nations, for all the earth belongs to me. (6) And you shall be to me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation.

Ps-Jon (5) And now, if you really *listen* to my *Memra* and keep my covenant, you shall be *more beloved before me* (ותהון קדמי חביבין) than all the peoples *who are upon the face of the earth*. (6) And you will be *before me kings adorned with the crown* (מלכין קטרי) (כלילא), *ministering priests* (וכהנין משמשין), and a holy people.

Neof (5) And now, if you hearken to the voice of my *Memra* and observe my covenant, you shall be to my name a *beloved people* (לעם חביבין), *as a special possession* (היך סגלה) from all the nations, because all the earth *is mine*. (6) And you shall be to *my name kings and priests* (מלכין וכהנין) and a holy nation.

Onq (5) So now, if you really *listen to My Memra* and will observe My covenant, then you will be *more beloved before Me* (ותהון קדמי

(חביבין) than all the nations, for the entire earth is Mine. (6) And you will be to Me *kings*, priests (כהנין מלכין קדמי), and a holy nation; . . .

In Exodus 19.5, the Targumic sources agree in three places. First, ‘(the voice of) my *Memra*’ is used in a word pair of ‘my covenant’; the choice of *Memra* in Exodus 19.5 in the three Targums constitutes a strong case for Hayward’s argument for the connection between the covenant-oath and *Memra*.⁴⁸² Second, סגלה in MT is translated with the word ‘beloved’ (חביב); this rendition is based on a Midrashic tradition.⁴⁸³ Third, all the Targumic sources translate the phrase מלכת כהנים into two separate words מלכין and כהנין. These Targumic translations of Exodus 19:6, like the Theodotionic text, reflect an early textual tradition.⁴⁸⁴ The Targumic readings emphasises both holiness and dignity of an individual Jew, by describing each member of the Jewish people as ‘king’ and ‘priest’ in a figurative sense, even though these sources would maintain the corporate character of the Jewish people as the holy nation.

The last passage to be examined is Exodus 24.9-11, which includes again several common features:

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| (24.9) MT | And Moses went up, Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy elders of Israel. |
| <i>Ps-Jon</i> | Then Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and the seventy of the elders of Israel went up. ⁴⁸⁵ |

⁴⁸² God’s covenant with the Patriarchs and Israel is the divine oath sworn by him/his name. In the Targumic language, it can be described as the covenant-oath sworn by his *Memra* or in the name of his *Memra*: Hayward, *Divine Name*, 57, 67.

⁴⁸³ Cf. *Mek. RI*. Exod 19.5 (Lauterbach, 2:204); *Mek. RSbY*. Exod 19.5 (Epstein, 139): McNamara and Hayward, *Neofiti: Exodus*, 80 n. 5.

⁴⁸⁴ This translation is similar to that of θ' in that both separate the phrase into two words, although θ' retains the meaning of מלכת with βασιλεία.

⁴⁸⁵ *Onq* has nearly the same text as that of *Ps-Jon*.

- Neof* And Moses and Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu and seventy of *wise men* of Israel went up.
- (10) MT And they saw God of Israel, and under his feet, [**there was something*] like the pavement of sapphire stone, and like the heaven itself in purity.
- Ps-Jon* *Nadab and Abihu lifted up their eyes and saw the glory of the God of Israel; under the footstool of his feet that was placed under his throne (there was) the likeness of a work of sapphire stone, recalling the slavery with which the Egyptians had enslaved the children of Israel with clay and bricks. As the women treaded the clay with their men, there was a delicately reared maiden there who was pregnant. She lost the embryo, and it was tread on with the clay. Gabriel came down and made a brick out of it, and bringing it up to the heavens on high, he placed it as a platform under the footstool of the Lord of the world. Its splendour was like (that of) a work in precious stone and like the glorious beauty of the heavens when they are clear of clouds.*
- Neof* And they saw *the Glory of the Shekinah of the Lord*; and under the *footstool* of his feet there (was) like brick-work of sapphire, as *a vision* of the heavens, *when they are pure from cloud*.
- Onq* and they perceived *the Glory of the God of Israel* and beneath *the throne of His Glory* *⟨was something⟩* like the work of a *precious stone and in appearance like the sky* for purity.
- (11) MT And to the chiefs of the sons of Israel, he did not send his hand; and they beheld God, and they ate, and drank.
- Ps-Jon* But, *at that time*, he did not send his *plague* against the *handsome young men Nadab and Abihu*. But *it was reserved*

for them until the eighth day of ordination, when it would afflict them. And they saw the Glory of the Shekinah of the Lord, and they rejoiced in their offerings that had been accepted with favour, as if they ate and drank (הי כאכלין והי (כשתיין).

Neof And he did not stretch out his hand to the young men of the children of Israel; and they saw the *Glory of the Shekinah of the Lord*, and they rejoiced over their sacrifices which were received, as if they ate and drank (היך אכלין והיך שתיין).

Onq Yet to the leaders of the Israelites were not injured, even though they perceived the *Glory of the Lord*; and they rejoiced in their sacrifices which were accepted as though they were eating and drinking (כאילו אכלין ושתיין).

In the above texts, two agreements among the Targumic traditions are noteworthy. First, the Targumists of *Ps-Jon*, and *Neof*, *Onq* clearly associate the sacrifices offered in verse 5 with the dining in verse 11. Second, the Targumic sources agree with respect to the insertion of ‘as if’ (כאילו/היך/הי כ) before ‘they ate and drank’ (verse 11), which indicates that Moses and the others ate and drank like angels; hence they all depict it as a celestial dining.⁴⁸⁶ Therefore, by associating the sacrifices in Exodus 24.5-8 with the celestial dining in Exodus 24.11, the three Targums emphasise the heavenly aspect of the sacrifices and the ritual dining depicted in Exodus 24.

The above quoted passages of the Targumic sources show also important common features of the Targumic designations of God (i.e. *Memra* and *Glory* [of the *Shekinah*]). In spite of some differences, the Targumic sources of Exodus 19-24 are in agreement by recognizing the basic theological implications resulting from

⁴⁸⁶ Grossfeld, *Ongeles to Exodus*, 73 n. 12; McNamara, *Neofiti: Numbers*, ArBib 4 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 105 n. 8.

using these designations. In this respect, Exodus 19.5-6 and 24.10-11 are important. In these two key passages, all three Targums concur in their use of *Memra* (Exod 19.5-6) and Glory (of the *Shekinah* [*Neof*]) of the Lord (Exod 24.10-11). It is particularly noteworthy that ‘(the voice of) my *Memra*’ is used in parallel with ‘my covenant’. This parallelism is understandable because the covenant-oath in the Torah/Pentateuch is quite often given with the clear indication of the divine presence. These agreements found in three Targumic sources suggest that the Targumists applied these designations of the divine presence based on their recognition of the theological implications of these terms.

In sum, the three Targumic sources duly recognise the significance of the theophany and its liturgical implication in Exodus 19-24. As they describe the divine presence, they show the tendency to avoid anthropomorphism and human contact with God. In so doing, they often use the designations of God and his divine presence, such as *Memra*, Glory (of the *Shekinah*), and *Shekinah*. The Targumic sources express their concerns for the Jerusalem Temple in their interpretation of Exodus 20.24 (*Onq* 20.21). They translate ‘the kingdom of priests/the kingdom, priests’ (Exod 19.6) as ‘kings and priests’, which may emphasise the holiness and dignity of each member of the Jewish people. They all associate the sacrifices in Exodus 24.8 with the dining in 24.11, where they depict it as a celestial event and the participants as receiving an angelic status.

2. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan

Although *Ps-Jon* often preserves the texts attested in *Onq*,⁴⁸⁷ it also includes a significant number of renditions witnessed by other PT sources.⁴⁸⁸

⁴⁸⁷ For example, ‘... you really listen to my *Memra*’ in Exod 19.5; ‘prepare them’ in Exod 19.10; ‘(the Lord) kill (some) of them’ in Exod 19.22, 24; ‘his *Memra* is in my name’ in 23.21; the line ‘your food and your drink’ in *Onq* of Exod 23.25 is similar to ‘food that you eat, and your drink’ in *Ps-Jon* of Exod 23.25; 24.1; ‘first born of the sons of Israel’ in Exod 24.5; ‘This is the blood of the covenant’ in Exod 24.8.

⁴⁸⁸ For instance, Israel’s flight on the ‘cloud(s)’ and God’s bringing of Israel ‘to the instruction of the Law’ in Exod 19.4; ‘arrows of fire’ in Exod 19.13; ‘from the mountain, come/draw near

Ps-Jon of Exodus 19-24 also includes unique haggadaic texts which are not attested in other PT sources. Besides the lengthy expansions of Exodus 24.10-11 quoted above, the description of God's descent to Mount Sinai is quite remarkable: the mountain is uprooted and lifted up in the air, while the heaven was bent down to the mountain (Exod 19.17). The blast of the horn even revived the dead (Exod 20.18). In *Ps-Jon*, the giving of the Sinai covenant is thus depicted most extraordinarily. The expansions unique to *Ps-Jon* are often linked to exegetical traditions preserved in Midrashic and Rabbinic sources.⁴⁸⁹

Above all, *Ps-Jon*'s concern for the Jerusalem Temple is reflected in its unique insertion to Exodus 23.20:

MT Behold, I send an angel before you, to guard you on the way, and bring you to the place where I have prepared.

Ps-Jon Behold, I am *dispatching* an angel before you to guard you on the way and to bring you into the (dwelling) place *of my Shekinah* which I have prepared.

In *Ps-Jon*, the angel will protect the people as they enter into the Land of the promise, and he will also lead them 'to the place of my *Shekinah*', which refers to

and receive the ten words' in Exod 19.25; 'the Gory of the *Shekinah* of the Lord' in Exod 20.21; the prohibition of raising/passing iron over the altar in 20.25; the particular mention of the 'priests' who serve at the altar in Exod 20.26; the clearance of cloud in the heavenly vision of Exod 24.10 (cf. McNamara and Hayward, *Neofiti: Exodus*, 104 n. 7). In *Ps-Jon* and *Neof*, 'sacrifices of holy things' in Exod 20.24 are associated with those in 24.5. The PT sources give the first two commandments of the Decalogue (Exod 20.2-3) in a spectacular fashion; among them, *Ps-Jon* provides the most elaborate account. In one case, *Ps-Jon* shows a feature of both *Onq* and other PT sources; just as *Onq*, *Ps-Jon* translates סבין as זקנים in Exod 19.7; 24.1, 9, but it also renders the same Hebrew term as חכימא in Exod 24.14 as in other PT sources.

⁴⁸⁹ For example, *Ps-Jon*'s interpretation of 'work of bricks' as a harsh reminder of the slavery in Egypt (Exod 24.10) is likely related to the interpretation preserved in y. *Sukk.* 4, 4(5) (M. Schwab, *Le Talmud de Jérusalem*, vol. 4: *Traités Soucca, Rosch Ha-Schana, Taanith, Meghilla Haghiga, Mo'ed Qaton* [Paris: G.-P. Maisonneuve, 1932], 34); Maher, *Ps-Jon: Exodus*, 232 n. 16.

the Jerusalem Temple. The Targumist views the Temple as the focal point of the Land,⁴⁹⁰ and the Temple service as the ultimate purpose of the Israel's redemption.

This Targumic concern for the Temple is, in fact, coupled with the emphasis on the instruction of the Torah in *beth ha-Midrash*. As C. T. R. Hayward argues, the PT of Exodus 19 and 24 associates the theophany and the giving of the Torah at Sinai with the Synagogue worship and the instruction of the Torah at *beth ha-Midrash*.⁴⁹¹ The identification of the Sinai event with the instruction of the Torah given in *beth ha-Midrash* is indicated in Exodus 19.4, where *Ps-Jon* and the other PT sources unanimously paraphrase the text וַאֲבָא אֲתִכֶּם אֵלַי as 'I brought you *close to the instruction of my Law*'.⁴⁹² Hence *Ps-Jon*, with other PT traditions, views the synagogue worship and the study of the Torah at *beth ha-Midrash* as almost equal to the service of the Temple.⁴⁹³

To summarize briefly, *Ps-Jon* of Exodus 19-24 preserves the elaborate Targumic expansions which may have characterized the ancient PT tradition. These expansions are often related to the exegetical traditions recorded in the Midrashic and the Rabbinic sources. Its attachment to the Temple is evident in the passage, although it also reflects the transformation of the Jewish religion which took place to adjust to the situation after the destruction of the Temple.

3. Targum Neofiti 1

The Targumist of *Neof* maintains a relatively discrete attitude as a translator.

Neof preserves the constructions of the Hebrew phrases more often than *Onq*.⁴⁹⁴

⁴⁹⁰ *Ps-Jon* not only views the Temple as the centre of the Land, but also regards it as the microcosm of the universe: C. T. R. Hayward, 'Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and the Bread of the Presence', in P. V. M. Flesher (ed.), *Targum and Scripture: Studies in Aramaic Translations and Interpretation in Memory of Ernest G. Clarke* (Brill: Leiden, 2002), 122.

⁴⁹¹ The association of the Sinai event with the Synagogue worship (prayer) is prevalent in *Neof*. See the discussion in the next section.

⁴⁹² *Neof*, CG (F), *Frg Tgs* (J, P, V). Cf. C. T. R. Hayward, 'The Giving of the Torah: Targumic Perspectives', in G. J. Brooke, et al., *Significance of Sinai*, 275-77.

⁴⁹³ Hayward, 'Giving', 284.

⁴⁹⁴ For example, the 'young men of the sons of Israel' in Exod 24.5 (*Neof*); 'Behold the blood of the covenant' without insertion of 'this is' in *Neof* of Exod 24.8; the Hebrew phrase 'to listen

The expansions are less frequent and shorter than those in *Ps-Jon*, although in some passages they are as elaborate as those in *Ps-Jon*.⁴⁹⁵

In a number of cases, *Neof* preserves readings different from *Onq*, but attested in other PT sources (CG [F] and *Frg Tg* [J, P, V]). The phrase ‘in prayer’ (בצלי) is a typical example, which is not attested in *Onq* of Exod 19-24.⁴⁹⁶ On the use of this phrase and others such as ‘perfect/complete heart’ (*Neof* of Exod 19.8),⁴⁹⁷

Hayward gives an insightful comment:

Underlying these expressions are thoughts of the undivided loyalty to God and purposeful concentration of the mind in devotion characteristic of the *hasid* as he recites the daily *Amidah* (כדי שיכנונו לבם) according to *m. Ber.* 5.1), and a proper understanding of the words of the *Shema* ‘that one should love the Lord with an undivided heart’ (*Sifre to Deuteronomy* 32; *b. Ber.* 61b), and thus take upon oneself the yoke of the kingdom of heaven, a most appropriate sentiment given the divine command of Exod 19.6 that Israel become ממלכת כהנים.⁴⁹⁸

Thus *Neof* properly uses the language that describes the prayer at synagogue as the fulfilment of the divine promise given in Exodus 19.6.⁴⁹⁹

In a few cases, *Neof* preserves unique readings, not attested in other PT sources. One example is found in Exodus 23.21:⁵⁰⁰

to the voice (of the Lord)’ in Exod 19.5 and 23.22 is translated as the ‘voice of *Memra* (of the Lord)’ (*Neof*).

⁴⁹⁵ For example, Exod 20.1-17 (*Neof*).

⁴⁹⁶ In Exod 19.8, *Neof* inserts בצלי to describe the manner in which Moses brings back the words of the people to the Lord. The phrase בצלי is added in *Neof* of Exod 20.24. Moreover, ‘you shall bow down’ in Exod 24.1 (MT) is rendered as ‘you shall pray’ in *Neof*.

⁴⁹⁷ And ‘with a united heart’ (*Ps-Jon* of Exod 19.2).

⁴⁹⁸ Hayward, ‘Giving’, 277-78.

⁴⁹⁹ The phrase ‘Glory of the *Shekinah* (of the Lord)’, which does not occur in *Onq* of Exod 19-24, is another typical PT phrase found in *Neof*. This phrase is used in the descriptions of God’s descent (*Neof* of Exod 19.18, 20; 20.20; 24.16) and human contact with God (*Neof* of Exod 19.17; 24.10-11, 13).

MT Be attentive to him, and listen to his voice; do not rebel against him, for he will not pardon your transgressions, for my name is in him.

Neof Pay attention before him and listen to (his) voice, and do not rebel against *his words, for my holy name is invoked upon him*, for he will not *forgive or* pardon your sins, for my *holy name is invoked upon him*.

Neof gives a distinct explanation of the reason why the people are instructed to obey the words of the guardian angel sent before them. It is because God's 'holy name will be invoked upon him'. Since the invocation of the holy name of course can be made only in the Jerusalem Temple in ancient Israel, *Neof* associate the guardian angel with the high priest who invokes the divine name in the Temple.

In short, *Neof* of Exodus 19-24 applies a typical PT phrase, 'in prayer', more often than other PT sources. With this phrase, *Neof* expresses its belief that Jewish devotion to the God of Israel in the worship within the synagogue is a fulfilment of the divine promise of Exodus 19.5-6. Nonetheless, it retains an ancient tradition associated with the Temple.

F. Exodus 19-24 in Justin Martyr

Justin frequently cites the book of Exodus in the *Dialogue* especially from its early chapters (2-17), because they are replete with texts suitable for the proofs of his arguments.⁵⁰¹ For Justin, the angel who appeared to Moses in the burning bush (Exod 3.2-4) was Christ before his first coming (e.g. *Dial.* 59.1). Justin not only detects a type of Christ's crucifixion in the paschal lamb (Exod 12.7; *Dial.* 40.1), but he describes Christ as the Passover as well (*Dial.* 111.3). Justin also

⁵⁰⁰ See also Exod 19.11 (*Neof*): '... because on that day *the Glory of the Shekinah of the Lord will be revealed*'; in this verse, CG (F, U), *Frg Tg* (P, V) have 'the *Memra* of the Lord will be revealed'.

⁵⁰¹ Cf. Marcovich, 'Indices', *Dial.*, 320.

believes that the manna which the people of Israel ate in the wilderness was the bread of the angels (Exod 16; LXX Psa 78.25; *Dial.* 57.2). As we have seen in the previous chapter, Moses' rod (e.g. Exod 14.16; 17.9) represented the divine power, which is identical to the tree of life and Christ (*Dial.* 86).

By contrast, Justin cites less frequently from Exodus 19-24. Marcovich lists only a few citations from these chapters.⁵⁰² Among Justin's citations of Exodus 19-24 enlisted in Marcovich's index, this section first examines Justin's citation of Exodus 23.20-21 in *Dialogue* 75 and, second, his interpretation of the 'glory' that the people could not see (Exod 19.21; 24.17) in *Dialogue* 127-128. These citations indicate that among several themes involved in Exodus 19-24, the pre-existent Christ in the passage is one of Justin's concerns. This section seeks further references to the passage, by examining Justin's use of the terms relating to Exodus 19-24: namely, (3) 'king' and 'priest' (Exod 19.6); (4) 'bread, wine, and water' (LXX Exod 23.25), and (5) 'blood' (Exod 24.8). The examinations of these terms will further reveal the elements that shaped Justin's notion of the NC and the Sacraments as well as some of his exegetical practices.

1. Exodus 23.20-21 in Dialogue 75

In *Dialogue* 75, Justin argues that the book of Exodus tells us the name of God in a mysterious way. In the passage below, Justin quotes Exodus 23.20-21 to point out that Joshua, like Israel, is another name of the divine figure/angel:

(1) And in the book of Exodus, it was reported by Moses likewise⁵⁰³ in a mysterious manner and we have noticed that the name of God himself, which

⁵⁰² See also *BiPa* 1:95-99. In *Dial.* 67, Justin discusses that the old covenant involved the overwhelming phenomena (Exod 19.16; 20.18-19), because of the hardheartedness of the ancestors of the Jewish people. Unless the ancestors had experienced fear, Justin claims, they would not have obeyed the commandments. A possible influence of Heb 12.18-22 may be detected in Justin's view of the superiority of the NC which is given without any provocation of fear: *Dial.*, p. 186 (app. crit.).

⁵⁰³ Because of the lacuna between *Dial.* 74 and 75, it is unclear what Justin compares with Moses' report here.

He says was not revealed to Abraham or to Jacob, was Joshua/Jesus.⁵⁰⁴ And it is said as follows: And the Lord said to Moses, ‘Speak to this people’ (Exod 20.22), ‘Behold, I send my angel before you in order that he may guard you in the way, so that he may lead you into the land which I have prepared for you. Pay attention to him and listen to him, and do not disobey him, for he will not give way to you, for my name is upon him.’ (Exod 23.20-21) (2) Then who led your fathers into the Land? Now consider well that the one who was given this name was previously called Hosea (Num 13.16). For if you consider this, you will also recognize that the name of the one <who> said to Moses, ‘For my name is upon him’, was Joshua/Jesus. For he was also called Israel, he likewise renamed Jacob with this name. (*Dial.* 75.1-2)

The point Justin makes here is that the name of the angel, who led the Israelites into the land of Canaan, testifies to the pre-existent Christ, since in Exodus 23.20-21, the Lord told Moses that he would place his name upon this successor. The leader who succeeded Moses was of course Joshua. His given name was Hosea (הוֹשֵׁעַ; Ἀὐτῆς), but when he was sent to the land of Canaan for the reconnaissance mission, Moses gave him the new name Joshua (יְהוֹשֻׁעַ; Ἰησοῦς; Num 13.16). Then before the assault against the city of Jericho, the celestial figure appeared to Joshua in the form of the prince-warrior (Josh 5.13-15; *Dial.* 61.1; 62.4-5). Justin argues that this figure was in fact Christ. He finds an analogy between the name change of Joshua and that of Jacob to Israel. Justin explains that Joshua is another name of the same celestial being that Jacob encountered in Genesis 32.23-31,⁵⁰⁵ and that Moses was able to give this name to his successor with his prophetic knowledge. Justin therefore argues that the name change of Joshua testifies to the pre-existence of Christ, and constitutes a Scriptural proof of the incarnation of Christ.

⁵⁰⁴ Based on God’s word to Moses that he has not told his name to Abraham, nor to Isaiah, nor to Jacob (Exod 6.3), Justin deduces that Joshua is the name unknown to the Patriarchs, since another name ‘Israel’ was given to Jacob.

⁵⁰⁵ For Israel’s name change in Justin, see Hayward, *Interpretations*, 336-42.

Regarding Justin's interpretation of Exodus 23.20-21, a Targumic tradition deserves consideration for Justin's possible source. In *Jon* to the Former Prophets, the prince-warrior in Joshua 5.14 is described as 'an angel sent from before the Lord'.⁵⁰⁶ With this phrase, the Targumist associates the prince-warrior with the angel predicted in Exodus 23.20-21. Justin likely used this interpretive tradition for his argument.⁵⁰⁷

Simply put, Justin's use of Exodus 23.20-21 in *Dialogue* 75 shows his possible contact with the interpretive tradition attested in *Tg* of Joshua which associates the angel in Exodus 23.20 with the celestial figure in Joshua 5.14.

2. Exodus 19.21; 24.17 in Dialogue 127-128

In *Dialogue* 127 and 128, Justin mentions the glory of the Lord that appeared on Mount Sinai (Exod 24.17)—the glory that the people were unable to see (Exod 19.21). In Justin's view, this glory revealed on Mount Sinai provides more proofs of his argument for Christ's pre-existence.

In Exodus 19.21, the Lord sent Moses to tell the people of Israel neither to draw near to the signs of the divine presence nor to gaze at his glory, lest they die.

Then the glory of the Lord appeared as the burning fire before the people in Exodus 24.17. According to Justin, this glory was a form of pre-existent Christ, since it is impossible for the ineffable Father to take such a form on the earth.

This idea is explicated in *Dialogue* 127:

⁵⁰⁶ *Jon* of Josh 5.14. MT has 'a commander (שר) of the army of the Lord'.

⁵⁰⁷ D. C. Trakatellis suggests that Justin may have been influenced by Philo, who identifies the Logos with the guardian angel of Exod 23.20 (*Agr.* 51; *Migr.* 174): *The Pre-Existence of Christ in Justin Martyr* (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1976), 81-82 nn. 77, 80. However, the Philonic texts may not fully account for Justin's interpretation of the angel who appeared before Joshua (Josh 5.13-15). O. Skarsaune is sceptical about Philo's influence on Justin's interpretations of the theophany in the OT: *Proof*, 409-24; 'Judaism and Hellenism in Justin Martyr, Elucidated from His Portrait of Socrates', in H. Cancik, et al. (eds.), *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 585-611. Trakatellis also surmises Justin's knowledge of *Barn.* 12 or the tradition behind it; however, it does not account for Justin's association of the name change of Joshua with the angel sent before the people of Israel.

(2) For the ineffable Father and Lord of all neither comes to any place, nor walks, nor sleeps, nor arises, but remains in the place wherever \langle he may be \rangle , seeing acutely and hearing acutely not with eyes, nor ears, but with power beyond descriptions. ‘He sees everything and knows everything’,⁵⁰⁸ and no one of us escapes his notice: he \langle is \rangle not moved; he cannot be contained in any place, even in the whole universe; he indeed existed even before the universe came into being. (3) How therefore could this one either converse with anyone, or be seen by anyone, or appear in the smallest part of the earth, when the people were not able to see the *glory* of the one sent from Him [**i.e.* the Father] at Sinai (Exod 19.21; 24.17), and when Moses was unable to enter in the tent which he made, \langle when \rangle it was filled with the glory from God (Exod 40.35 [LXX 40.29]), and when the priest could not remain standing before the Temple, as Solomon brought the ark into the building in Jerusalem, which Solomon himself built. (*Dial.* 127.2-3)⁵⁰⁹

Justin describes the glory that appeared on the top of Mount Sinai as the glory of the ‘one sent from the Father’. Consequently, Justin assumes that on the mountain, Moses was conversing, not with the Father, but with Christ. In the subsequent verses (*Dial.* 127.4-5), he further argues that this is the best way to understand OT theophany accounts, because the ineffable God would never have allowed himself to be seen or to be heard by human beings.

In the next chapter (*Dial.* 128), Justin proceeds to discuss particularly the term ‘glory’ in Exodus 24.17; he considers this term to be another Christological title:

(1) . . . Then I repeated all [**the passages*] that were previously written [**in the Dialogue*] from the book of Exodus, both about the vision of the one who was at ‘the bush’ and about the renaming of Joshua, and I said further: (2) And do not think, O gentlemen, that I am over-wordy to say these things, but

⁵⁰⁸ A citation of *Odyss.* 11.109: *Dial.*, p. 290 (app. crit.). A similar description of God is also found in Job 28.23-24.

⁵⁰⁹ My Italics.

it is because I know that there are even some who wish to anticipate these things, and to say that the power (δύναμιν) which appeared from the Father of all to Moses, or to Abraham, or to Jacob was called ‘Angel’⁵¹⁰ when he came to people, since the messages from the Father is conveyed to the human beings; [*and He is called] ‘Glory’ (δόξα), since He appears sometimes in an appearance that is not containable [*by space], and sometimes a ‘Man’ (ἄνδρα) and a ‘Human being’ (ἄνθρωπον), since He appeared in the fashion of such forms as the Father wills; and they call ⟨Him⟩ ‘Logos’, since he brings instructions (ὁμιλίας) from the Father to the people. (*Dial.* 128.1-2)

The term δόξα in the above quotation again may allude to Exodus 24.17. It is noteworthy that Justin mentions δόξα as one of the Christological titles.⁵¹¹ He uses these titles to describe different forms of Christ’s appearance. In Justin’s view, the substance of these forms is δύναμις (the divine power).⁵¹² The reason why Justin considers δόξα as another messianic title is because δόξα belongs to the category of form, rather than substance. Thus his use of the term is based on his philosophical reflection.⁵¹³ At the same time, it may echo the Targumic use of the ‘Glory’ to describe the divine presence. Justin likely discerns an analogy between the Jewish description of the divine presence and the Greek concept of δύναμις.⁵¹⁴

⁵¹⁰ Gen 19.1; Exod 23.20.

⁵¹¹ ‘The Son of God’, ‘Angel’, ‘Glory’, ‘Man’, and ‘Word’. A similar juxtaposition of Christological titles (‘Son’, ‘Wisdom’, ‘Angel’, ‘God’, ‘Lord’, and ‘Word’) is also found in *Dial.* 61.

⁵¹² Justin’s δύναμις here may be influenced by the Greek concept as a ‘cosmic principle’: W. Grundmann, Δύναμαι/δύναμις, *TDNT* 2:286-88.

⁵¹³ Justin’s use of δόξα reflects the LXX use of the word (particularly Isaiah: e.g. Isa 42.6 [*Dial.* 65]; LXX Isa 35.2 [*Dial.* 69.5]; LXX Isa 40.5 [*Dial.* 50.3]) which is often an equivalent of כבוד: G. Kittel, Δόξα, *TDNT* 2:233-53. The Hebrew word כבוד may also mean ‘substance, quantity, power’. In its extended meaning, it may refer to glorified objects, such as the throne, the temple, and a crown: M. Weinfeld, *Kābôd*, *TDOT* 7:22-38. Justin may have found an affinity between the biblical concept of ‘glory’ and the Greek idea of ‘power’.

⁵¹⁴ A remark should also be given to Justin’s use of the term ‘Logos’ in *Dial.* 128.2, where Christ is called ‘Logos’ because he conveys the divine instructions (ὁμιλίας). Justin uses ὁμιλία in different meanings: word, utterance (*Dial.* 128.2); discussion (*Dial.* 68.8); discourse of exposition, sermon (*Dial.* 85.5). Cf. *PGL*, 951-52. Based on this use of ‘Logos’ in *Dial.*

In summary, the ‘Glory’ which appeared at the giving of the Sinai covenant and which the people were unable to see (Exod 24.17), in Justin’s view, was a form of the pre-existing Christ. For Justin, ‘Glory’ is another Christological title, just as ‘Son of God’, ‘Angel’, ‘Man’, and ‘Logos’.

3. King and priest (Exod 19.6)

The phrase ‘kingdom of priests’/‘kingdom, priests’ (ממלכת כהנים) in Exodus 19.6 is translated in Greek either as βασιλείον ιεράτευμα (LXX),⁵¹⁵ or as βασιλεία ιερεῖς (θ’), or as βασιλεία ιερεῶν (α’). The Targumic sources are in agreement in translating the phrase in two words—‘kings’ and ‘priests’.⁵¹⁶

Justin uses none of these exact phrases, although he makes an oblique reference to Exodus 19.6 with Daniel 7.27. For Justin, the establishment of the ‘eternal kingdom’ (Dan 7.27) is primarily the matter for the future second coming of Christ (e.g. *Dial.* 32.1). In Justin’s thought, however, the eternal kingdom is not entirely distinguishable from the ‘kingdom of heavens’, since the two phrases occur in the same chapter (*Dial.* 140.2-4). This phrase, borrowed likely from Matthew 8.11, describes the establishment of Christ’s spiritual kingdom over the universe.⁵¹⁷ As an apologist, Justin would prefer to use this phrase ‘kingdom of heavens’ to avoid any misgiving by suggesting that Christ has established the earthly eternal kingdom after his resurrection. Nonetheless, the use of these phrases may not entirely exclude the possibility that the kingdom of heavens in Justin has something to do with the events that take place on earth.

Moreover, Justin’s juxtaposition of ‘king’ and ‘priest’ for the messianic titles⁵¹⁸ resembles the Targumic translations of the Hebrew phrase as ‘kings’ and ‘priests’

128.2, we may surmise that Justin’s concept of the Logos would have been also associated with the divine instruction given in the worship.

⁵¹⁵ The term ιεράτευμα is not used in Justin’s extant works; neither does he use the phrase ἕθνος ἅγιον.

⁵¹⁶ *Onq, Neof, Ps-Jon*, CG (F), *Frg Tg* (J, P, V).

⁵¹⁷ For example, *I Apol.* 11.1-2; *Dial.* 76.

⁵¹⁸ *Dial.* 34.2; 36.1; 86.3; 96.1; 113.5; 118.2.

in Exodus 19.6. He would assume that the divine promise of the royal priesthood (LXX Exod 19.6) is fulfilled with the fact that Christ has become the ‘eternal king’ (*Dial.* 36.1) and ‘eternal priest’ (*Dial.* 96.1).⁵¹⁹ Thus Justin views these key concepts of the covenant in Exodus 19-24 converging in Christ.

In sum: Justin makes an oblique reference to Exodus 19.6 with the phrase ‘eternal kingdom’ (Dan 7.27) and ‘kingdom of heaven’ (Matt 8.11). Justin’s juxtapositions of ‘king’ and ‘priest’, which are in a sense similar to the Targumic interpretations of מַמְלַכְת כְּהֻנִּים, may echo his reference to Exodus 19.6. By referring to the verse, Justin notes that Christ has established the eternal/heavenly kingdom as promised in Exodus 19.6.

4. Bread, wine and water (LXX Exod 23.25)

In the above discussion on LXX Exodus 19-24, we have observed that the three terms—bread, wine and water—juxtaposed in LXX Exodus 23.25 are unique to the LXX text, and are not attested in MT. These three terms also appear in Justin’s descriptions of the Eucharist in *First Apology*:

Then after the convener has given thanks and all the people have agreed, those who are called by us deacons give to each of those present a portion of the blessed (εὐχαριστηθέντος) *bread, wine, and water*, and bring to those absent. (*1 Apol.* 65.5)

And as we said before, after we have finished the prayer, *bread, wine and water* are brought forth, and the convener gives prayer and thanksgiving to the best of his ability . . . (*1 Apol.* 67.5)⁵²⁰

It is likely that Justin takes LXX Exodus 23.25 as a prophecy of the Eucharist and a Scriptural basis for distributing the three elements in the Eucharistic rite.⁵²¹

⁵¹⁹ Justin identifies a typological correspondence between Melchizedek and Christ: Psa 110(109).4; *Dial.* 113.5.

⁵²⁰ My emphases.

Moreover, Justin's recognition of the three elements in LXX Exodus 23.25 would have guided him to identify another prophetic reference to the Eucharist in Isaiah 33.15-16, which will be discussed in the next subsection.

In short, Justin identifies in LXX Exodus 23.25 the prophetic reference to the Eucharistic elements of 'bread, wine, and water'; the practice of the Eucharist in Justin's community would be influenced by LXX Exodus 23.25.⁵²²

5. Justin's use of 'blood'

Together with 'tree' and 'water', 'blood' (αἷμα; αἷμα) is another key term for Justin's notion of the NC. He regards the blood of the paschal lamb or the 'blood of the Passover' (τὸ αἷμα τοῦ πάσχα) as the type of the crucifixion of Christ (*Dial.* 40.1; 111.3). Moreover, Justin extends the meaning of this symbolic term, which he associates with the Christian baptism and the Eucharist. Thus his use of 'blood' is not so distant from that of the 'blood of the covenant' in Exodus 24.8, which constitutes an important OT background of the institution of the Lord's Supper. This subsection first examines Justin's use of 'blood' in his discussions of baptism, before turning to 'blood' connected with the Eucharist.

There are two passages in which Justin uses 'blood' in close association with Christian baptism (*Dial.* 13 and 24). In *Dialogue* 13.1, Justin mentioned the 'blood and death of Christ' through which Christians are purified by faith:

For it was certainly not to a bath that Isaiah sent you to wash away murder there and all other sins, which not even all the water of the ocean would be sufficient to cleanse, but, as is probable, this was of old that bath of salvation, which he mentioned for those who repent and for those who are no longer

⁵²¹ It is uncertain whether water and wine are delivered in the same cup or not: *1 Apol.* 65.3. L. W. Barnard supposes that two separate cups are used for water and mixture of water and wine: Barnard, *Justin*, 178.

⁵²² This point gives us another reason to reject A. von Harnack's claim that in Justin's day, only bread and water were distributed as the Eucharistic elements: 'Brod und Wasser: Die eucharistischen Elemente bei Justin', in *TU 7*, part 2 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1891), 117-44, cited in Barnard, *Justin*, 177-79.

cleansed with ‘blood of goats’ (Isa 1.11; 34.6) and of sheep, or with the ashes of heifer (Num 19.9), or with the offerings of flour, but [*for those who are cleansed] by the faith through the blood and the death of Christ, who died for this cause, . . . (*Dial.* 13.1)

Immediately after this remark on ‘the blood and the death of Christ’, Justin makes a lengthy quotation of Isaiah’s prophecy of the Suffering Servant (Isa 52.10-54.6); Justin cites this text as the prophecy of Christ’s first coming in the humblest form and as the prediction of the blood of Christ which would be shed on the Cross for the cleansing of human sins (*Dial.* 13.2-9). Then in *Dialogue* 14, Justin quotes Isaiah 55.3-13 as a proof text of Christian baptism. In a concluding remark about the quotation of Isaiah 55.3-13, he mentions that these prophecies of Isaiah predicted Christ’s first coming. The narrative of *Dialogue* 13-14 seems to be structured as follows:

- | | | |
|----|--|---------------------|
| A | Justin’s first remark | |
| | on Isaiah’s prophecy of Christian baptism: | <i>Dial.</i> 13.1 |
| b | Quotation of Isa 52.10-54.6 | |
| | (Prophecy of Christ’s first coming in disgrace): | <i>Dial.</i> 13.2-9 |
| A’ | Justin’s second remark | |
| | on Isaiah’s prophecy of Christian baptism: | <i>Dial.</i> 14.1-3 |
| a | Quotation of Isa 55.3-13 | |
| | (Prophecy of Christian baptism): | <i>Dial.</i> 14.4-7 |
| B | Justin’s conclusive remark | |
| | on Isaiah’s prophecy of Christ first coming: | <i>Dial.</i> 14.8 |

By arranging the quotations and his remarks in this structure, Justin indicates his theological view of baptism as the mysterious identification with the death of Christ—the culmination of the humblest life in his first coming.⁵²³ Early

⁵²³ The apostle Paul may have made a similar identification in Rom 6, where he describes Christian baptism as the ‘baptism into Christ’s death’ (Rom 6.3).

Christian belief that the blood of Christ cleanses human sins would facilitate Justin's identification of Christ's crucifixion with the Sacrament of baptism. His view of the blood of Christ, of course, would likely be rooted in the NT writings,⁵²⁴ but Justin seems to be more articulate in describing baptism as the cleansing of sins with the blood of Christ.

The blood of Christ is more clearly associated with baptism in *Dialogue* 24.1-2.⁵²⁵ In these verses, 'another covenant' refers to baptism; Justin compares it with the circumcision of the Israelites conducted by Joshua with 'stone knives' before their entry into the land of Canaan (Josh 5.1-8). Justin believes that this circumcision was a type of Christian baptism. More importantly, Justin's phrase 'blood of that circumcision' in *Dialogue* 24.1 alludes to LXX Exodus 4.25-26,⁵²⁶ the text of which is significantly different from MT:

MT (24) And it happened on the way, in a lodging place, that the Lord met him, and he sought to kill him. (25) And Zipporah took a flint and cut off her son's foreskin, and touched his feet, and said, 'Truly you are a bridegroom of blood to me!' (26) And He let him alone; it was then she said, 'A bridegroom of blood by circumcision'.

LXX (24) And it happened on the way, in *the* lodging place, that *the angel of God* met him and sought to kill him. (25) And Zipporah took a stone to circumcise the foreskin of her son, and *fell at* his feet, and said, '*the blood of the circumcision of my son staunched* (ἔστη⁵²⁷ τὸ αἷμα τῆς περιτομῆς τοῦ παιδίου μου)'. (26) And the angel *departed* him, *because* she said '*the blood of the circumcision of my son staunched*'.

⁵²⁴ Cf. Rom 3.25; Heb 9.14; 10.11-22; 13.12; 1 Pet 1.2, 19; 1 John 1.7; Rev 1.5.

⁵²⁵ For ET of *Dial.* 24.1-2, see ch. 2 'Preliminary observations of Justin's notion of the new covenant', p. 73.

⁵²⁶ In LXX, the phrase 'blood of the circumcision' (τὸ αἷμα τῆς περιτομῆς) appears only in Exod 4.25-26: Hatch & Redpath, 1128.

⁵²⁷ Ἰστημι in this verse may mean 'staunch': Lust, Eynikel & Hauspie, 290.

With the phrase ‘blood of the circumcision’, the translators seem to associate this incident in Exodus 4.24-26 with the blood of the Paschal Lamb (Exod 12) as well as to the ratification of the covenant with blood (Exod 24), because these events more clearly indicate the soteriological virtue of the sacrificial blood.

Moreover, the LXX phrase ‘blood of the circumcision’ reflects a Jewish interpretation of the passage, a history of which is skilfully delineated by Geza Vermes in his article first published in the 1950s.⁵²⁸ The LXX text of Exodus 4.24-26 in fact preserves an ancient Palestinian interpretation. This interpretation is also retained in the Targumic traditions, which use the same phrase ‘blood of (the) circumcision’.⁵²⁹ This ancient interpretation emphasised the ‘blood’ shed by the cutting of the foreskin, to which the sacrificial and soteriological significance are attached. In the second century, however, most likely after the ban of circumcision by the Romans following the Bar Kokhba revolt, a shift took place concerning the interpretation of Exodus 4.24-26. Subsequently, the Rabbis started to explain the reason for Moses’ life being spared in a different manner. Instead of the blood, they argued that what saved Moses’ life was circumcision.

To return to the phrase ‘blood of that circumcision’ in *Dialogue* 24, Justin very likely cites the phrase from LXX Exodus 4.24-26. This citation indicates his consent with the translators’ interpretation in terms of their view that the blood of the covenant has the mysterious power of salvation. In this respect, Justin is an heir to the ancient Palestinian interpretation of Exodus 4.24-26. Justin’s use of the phrase, however, also reflects the situations after the crucifixion of Christ and the Bar Kokhba revolt, for Justin argues that the soteriological virtue of the blood of circumcision is superseded by Christian baptism which symbolizes the blood of Christ.

⁵²⁸ G. Vermes, ‘Circumcision and Exodus IV 24-26: Prelude to the Theology of baptism’, in *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*, 2nd edn. (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 178-92; first published in *NTS* 4 (1957-58), 308-319.

⁵²⁹ Yet there are some differences among the Targumic sources; e.g. it is only in *Ps-Jon* that the reason why the angel attacked Moses is because he failed to circumcise one of his sons: M. Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodus*, ArBib 2 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 172-73.

Justin uses the term ‘blood’, not only in reference to baptism, but in his discussion of the Eucharist as well. *Dialogue* 70 provides us with an important text to understand his use of the term in respect to his view of the Sacrament. In this chapter, Justin continues to engage with his defence of Christ’s virgin birth and incarnation, which he started discussing in chapter 67. In *Dialogue* 69, Justin introduces a mythological story and a pagan practice of Mithraism to support his argument. Justin claims that prior to the proclamations of the Gospel, the devil has distorted the OT prophetic texts concerning the virgin birth and incarnation of Christ to be converted to such a story as the birth of Dionysus and to be spread among the Greeks, so that they may be hampered from understanding the real meaning of the prophecies (*Dial.* 69.2). Then in *Dialogue* 70, he adds the communal meal in Mithraism for another example of the demonic distortion of the prophetic text; the text which Justin thinks was distorted by the demons in this case is Isaiah 33.13-19, which is quoted in *Dialogue* 70.2-3:

(2) . . . (xiii) Hear, those who are from afar, what I have done: those who come near shall know my strength. (xiv) The lawless in Zion have departed; trembling will seize the impious. Who will announce you the eternal place? (xv) He who walks in righteousness, speaks about righteous conduct, hates lawlessness and injustice, keeps his hands away from bribes, shutting his ears in order that he should not hear the unrighteous judgment of *blood* (κρίσιν ἄδικον αἵματος), and shutting his eyes in order that he should not see an unrighteous thing. (3) (xvi) He will dwell in a high cave of a strong rock. *Bread* will be given to him, and his *water* will be sure. (xvii) You will see a king with glory, and your eyes will see <a land> from afar. (xviii) Your soul will meditate on the fear of the Lord. Where is the scribe (ὁ γραμματικός)?⁵³⁰ Where are the counsellors? Where is he who counts those who are nourished, (xix) a small and a large people? For with him, they did not take counsel, nor did they understand the depth of his voices, so that they did not hear: a

⁵³⁰ LXX has the plural (οἱ γραμματικοί); α’ supports the singular form (ὁ γραμματεύς).

despised people, and there is no understanding in him who hears. (Isa 33.13-19) (*Dial.* 70.2-3)⁵³¹

In the above quotation of Isaiah 33.13-19, the ‘blood’ appears in verse 15. Justin interprets the ‘unrighteous judgment of blood’ as a prophetic reference to the accusation (i.e. unrighteous judgment) against the Christian doctrine on Christ’s crucifixion. At the same time, the ‘blood’ can be taken as interchangeable with the new Law/covenant (Sacrament). Hence Justin seems to interpret the one who does not hear the unrighteous judgment of ‘blood’ in Isaiah 33.15 as a prophetic description of the one who refuses the accusation against the new Law/covenant in Justin’s day. In other words, one who does not take heed to the false accusation against the ‘blood’ of Christ, in Justin’s view, is the one who accepts the new Law/covenant, namely a Christian.

In this lengthy quotation from Isaiah 33, Justin also identifies the prophetic description of the Eucharist in the appearance of the terms ‘bread’ and ‘water’ in Isaiah 33.16; Justin sees them stand in connection with the ‘blood’ in Isaiah 33.15. Thus he identifies the Eucharistic elements in ‘bread’, ‘water’, ‘blood (wine)’ in Isaiah 33.15-16. His interpretation of Isaiah 33.16-17 is explicated in the subsequent verses:

Therefore, it is evident that <he [* i.e. Isaiah] predicts> also in this prophecy concerning the ‘bread’, which our Christ ‘handed down’ (παρέδωκεν) to us ‘to do in remembrance’ (ποιεῖν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν) of his incarnation for those who believes in him, for whom he became liable to suffering, and concerning the ‘cup’, he ‘handed down to us as we give thanks (εὐχαριστοῦντας) to do in remembrance of his blood’ (1 Cor 11.24; Luke 22.19). And this prophecy makes it clear that we will see this king with glory. (*Dial.* 70.4)

⁵³¹ Emphases mine.

According to Justin's interpretation, the Prophet predicted in Isaiah 33.17 that the partakers of the Eucharist, namely Christians, would see the king (Christ) with glory. Justin expects this 'seeing of the king with glory' to take place in the second coming of Christ. His interpretation of Isaiah 33.16-17 as the prophecy of the Eucharist most likely indicates that he also identifies a typological correspondence between the covenant meal in Exodus 24.10-11 and the Eucharist. Justin would argue that those who participate in the Eucharist can see the king with glory at Christ's second coming, just as Moses and the other representatives saw God at the covenant ratification and the ritual dining. Although Justin remains silent about the seeing of the king at the Table of the Eucharist, this silence does not necessarily suggest that the establishment of the kingdom of heavens and the hope of the future coming of the king have nothing to do with the earthly practice of the Eucharist in Justin's view.

To summarize, the 'blood' is another important term to understand Justin's notion of the NC. His use of the term reflects an early Palestinian tradition on Exodus 4.24-26 preserved in LXX, which perceives the soteriological virtue of the blood (of circumcision). The term can refer to the crucifixion of Christ, baptism and the Eucharist. Based on the soteriological significance of blood, Justin finds a prophecy of the Eucharist in Isaiah 33.15-17, which includes the terms 'bread', 'water', and 'blood'. This prophetic text is associated with the theme of the 'seeing of the king', which alludes to the covenant meal before the divine presence in Exodus 24.11.

G. Concluding remarks

As the above observations of MT, LXX, and the Aramaic Targums have shown, the narrative of Exodus 19-24 is an important text which includes the theophany, the quintessential covenant conclusion and the pattern of the worship for ancient Israel. The textual traditions examined above (MT, LXX, *Tgs*) agree in their

recognition of the liturgical implication of the narrative. They also associate the event with the worship in the Jerusalem Temple.

The above analysis has identified three more references to LXX Exodus 19-24 in Justin's works: (1) 'bread, water, and wine' in LXX Exodus 23.25 are related to the Eucharistic elements described in *First Apology* 65.3; 67.5; (2) his juxtaposition of 'king' and 'priest' as Christ's messianic titles may refer indirectly to Exodus 19.5; (3) his commentary to Isaiah 33.16-17 in *Dialogue* 70.4 may also allude to Exodus 24.10-11. Moreover, Justin seems to be indebted to a Targumic interpretation preserved in *Jon* to the Former Prophets (Joshua 5.14) regarding his association of the angel in Exodus 23.20-21 with Joshua 5.13-15. Besides these references to Exodus 19-24, Justin's phrase 'blood of that circumcision' (*Dial.* 24.1) is most likely taken from LXX Exodus 4.24-25. Above all, Justin would acknowledge that the narrative of the establishment of the Sinai covenant set out the pattern of worship, just as he knows that the NC has something to do with the liturgy.

In spite of these additional references, the initial observation of Justin's use of Exodus remains the same; he does not make so many direct and explicit references to Exodus 19-24. Unlike the authors of 1 Peter (2.9) and Revelation (1.6), Justin does not appeal directly to Exodus 19.5-6 in the *Dialogue*, even though his concern for the verses may be expressed in oblique manners, by using the phrase 'eternal kingdom' taken from Daniel 7.27. His allusion to Exodus 24.10 in fact appears in his comment to the direct quotation of Isaiah 33.16-17. To refer to the Sinai events, therefore, he often appeals to the OT Prophets.⁵³²

This seems to be, in part, because the passage would be one of the solid proofs for the Jews defending their privileged status among the nations. This status was,

⁵³² G. Stanton points out that Trypho values the Torah, whereas Justin often uses the Prophets: 'Other Early Christian Writings: "Didache", Ignatius, "Barnabas", Justin Martyr', in J. Barclay, et al. (eds.), *Early Christian Thought in Its Jewish Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996), 186.

they believed, secured by their faithful observance of the Torah. Even before the rise of Rabbinic Judaism, the Jewish pursuit of holiness would be at the core of their ethnic identity. Such a conscience is no doubt related to the divine promise in Exodus 19.5-6.⁵³³ By keeping themselves as a ‘holy nation’, they maintained their identity as the people of the divine covenant. From their point of view, Christians’ claim on the new Israel would appear to be a very weak and futile argument, because Christians made such a claim without observing circumcision, the Sabbath, the feasts, and the dietary laws.

To put this issue into a more immediate context, Justin’s tendency to avoid direct quotations from or explicit allusions to Exodus 19-24 may be better understood in relation to the emerging Rabbinic Judaism, which reorganized the Jewish religious life around the Torah after the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple. Now some customs that the Jews used to conduct only in the Temple were practised more widely in Jewish synagogues.⁵³⁴ As we have seen, the Targumic traditions interpret Exodus 19-24 from a perspective that equates the synagogue service with the Temple worship. His choice of the Scriptural passages may also be related to the growing tendency to emphasise the authoritative status and the eternal nature of the Torah of Moses on the side of Rabbinic Judaism.⁵³⁵ Hence, his less frequent use of Exodus 19-24 neither shows his indifference to the passage, nor indicates his total ignorance of Jewish exegetical traditions of the passage that may have strengthened Jewish arguments against Christian claims. His choice of the texts from the Prophets referring to the Sinai events should be understood in such a development on the side of the Jewish religious life.

⁵³³ The Qumranian pursuit of sanctity represents an acute form of a tendency which would have existed in the Second Temple period: cf. Jaubert, *Alliance*, 145.

⁵³⁴ Cf. I. Gafni, ‘The Historical Background’, in S. Safrai and P. J. Tomson (eds.), *The Literature of the Sages*, CRNIT 3 (Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1987), 14-15.

⁵³⁵ The emphasis of the authority of Moses in Midrashic and Rabbinic sources may be related to, or reaction against, early Christian view(s) of the Sinai covenant: S. Fraade, ‘Moses and the Commandments: Can Hermeneutics, History, and Rhetoric Be Disentangled?’, in H. Najman and J. Newman (eds.), *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 417-20.

Often quoting the texts of the Prophets,⁵³⁶ he draws on the arguments concerning the passages that testify to Christ's pre-existence. He emphasises that Christ would take the form of an angel, who appeared on the several occasions in the OT with the sign of fire. For Justin, the 'blood of the covenant' is one of the most important signs of the divine power and presence. He believes that Christians are cleansed of their sins by the blood of Christ and spiritually nurtured by partaking of the element of the Eucharist. Justin's claim that Christians are now the true people of the divine covenant is dependent on Christ's presence among them through baptism and the Eucharist.⁵³⁷ In the narrative of the Sinai covenant, therefore, Justin focuses on the elements and phenomena to which most Jews in his days might have been less attentive. Even though Justin's focus is different from that of Jews in his day, Exodus 19-24 is still an indispensable OT text for understanding Justin's notion of the NC.

⁵³⁶ The reason why Justin interpreted the texts of the Mosaic Torah in light of the Prophets is explained in *Dial.* 68.6, where Justin points out that the Prophets expounded the meanings of the words spoken mysteriously.

⁵³⁷ And also in the word (teachings) of God given in the worship.

Chapter VI

Genesis 17

A. Introduction

The last OT passage to be examined is Genesis 17, which accounts for the origin of circumcision. As we have observed in the previous chapter, Justin views Christian baptism in close connection with the Eucharist, and he considers it as the NC that has replaced Jewish circumcision (*Dial.* 24.1-2). A comparison of Genesis 17 in different traditions may shed light on Justin's view of baptism, which constitutes an indispensable part of his concept of the NC. This chapter first outlines the passage in MT, before examining LXX.⁵³⁸ The last section discusses Justin's use of Genesis 17, and his polemic against circumcision in defence of Christian baptism.

B. The Masoretic Text

Genesis 17 stands about in the middle of the Abraham cycle (Gen 11.27-25.18).⁵³⁹ After the first covenant-oath was given to Abraham in chapter 15, he obtained his

⁵³⁸ The extant textual witnesses of α' and θ' Gen 17 are too scarce to dedicate one section: cf. J. Wevers (ed.), *Genesis*, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 176-82; Field, 33-34.

Regarding Gen 17 in *Tgs*, a few remarks would be sufficient here. In this passage, the three Targums (*Ps-Jon*, *Neof*, and *Onq*) view the Jewish synagogue as the fulfilment of the promise to Abraham (*Ps-Jon* and *Onq* of Gen 17.16; *Neof* of Gen 17.4-5); they also find the use of *Memra* as the divine designation (Gen 17.11) appropriate to describe God's mercy to Abraham shown at his giving of the second covenant in Gen 17. The unique readings of *Ps-Jon* (e.g. Gen 17.10) show its concern for the proper practice of circumcision. *Neof*, on the other hand, emphasises God's unfailing commitment to his covenant-oath first given to Abraham and confirmed to the patriarchs; this covenant-oath remains intact for those who worship in Jewish synagogues (e.g. the translation of the MT phrase 'father of the multitude of nations' as the 'assembly of congregation of just nations' in *Neof* of Gen 17.4-5 recurs in the promises to Isaac [Gen 28.3] and to Jacob [Gen 35.11]).

⁵³⁹ Most commentators who apply the source-critical and the redaction-historical analyses consider that Gen 17 belongs primarily to the Priestly document/tradition (the latest stratum of material used in the compilation of the Torah/Pentateuch): H. Gunkel, *Genesis*, trans. M. Biddle (Macon, GA: Mercer UP, 1997), 259 (first published 1901; ET based on 9th German repr. 1972); J. Skinner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1910), 289; S. R. Driver, *The Book of Genesis* (London: Methuen & Co., 1911),

son Ishmael, not by his wife Sarah, but by her maidservant Hagar (Gen 16).⁵⁴⁰

Ishmael was in fact not the son of the promise who should be blessed as Abraham's heir.

When Abraham turned 99 years old, the Lord appeared to give him the covenant of circumcision. Informing Abraham that his name is 'God Almighty' (אל שדי),⁵⁴¹ the Lord first encouraged Abraham to walk in his presence, and to be perfect/blameless (תמים).⁵⁴² Then the Lord declared that he would make his covenant with him and with his offspring, so that Abraham's descendants might prosper. When the Lord revealed his divine presence, Abraham fell to the ground before God (Gen 17.1-3). The Lord further promised that Abraham would become the father of many nations, and that from him many kings would come. Moreover, the Lord gave him a new name which was more suitable for a father of many nations (Gen 17.5). The Lord also pledged to maintain this eternal covenant, so that he would be with Abraham and with his descendants forever: the land of Canaan should also be eternally secured to Abraham's descendants (Gen 17.4-8).

In terms of God's promise of being with Abraham and his descendants, a closer attention should be given to Genesis 17.4. The following is the text preserved in MT:

I, behold, my covenant [*is] with you;

אני הנה בריתי אתך

184; G. von Rad, *Genesis*, rev. edn., trans. J. H. Marks (London: SCM, 1976), 197 (ET based on 9th German edn. 1972); E. A. Speiser, *Genesis*, AB 1 (New York: Double Day, 1964), 122; R. Davidson, *Genesis 12-50* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979), 54. The divisions of the chapter do justice to its narrative structure: C. Westermann, *Genesis 12-36*, trans. J. Scullion (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1985), 255.

⁵⁴⁰ To avoid complexity, this study consistently uses 'Abraham' and 'Sarah' before and after their name changes.

⁵⁴¹ The etymology remains obscure: *ibid.*, 257-58; G. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, WBC 2 (Dallas, TX: Word, 1994), 19, 28; Ruppert, *Genesis*, 343.

⁵⁴² Like Noah (Gen 6.9): Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 28.

and you will become a father of a multitude of וְהָיִיתָ לְאָב הַמֶּוֹן גּוֹיִם:
nations.⁵⁴³

Modern translations take אֲנִי as in *casus pendens*, translating it as ‘for my part/as for me’,⁵⁴⁴ since אֲנִי may be correlated with אֶתְּךָ in verse 9; אֲנִי introduces the obligation of God, whereas אֶתְּךָ in verse 9 is used to explain the obligation of Abraham.⁵⁴⁵ The personal pronoun אֲנִי can also be taken as standing in apposition with בְּרִיתִי; the text also means that the fact that the covenant is established with Abraham is virtually the same as God himself is always with Abraham.⁵⁴⁶

The Lord then demanded Abraham to make a commitment. As a sign of the covenant (Gen 17.11), the Lord required Abraham to circumcise the foreskin of every male in his household, including all slaves born in his house and bought from foreigners: this practice of circumcision itself is also referred as the covenant (Gen 17.10).⁵⁴⁷ A newborn son must be circumcised on the eighth day after his birth (17.9-13a). This ritual was to be observed by the descendants of Abraham throughout their generations (17.9, 12). A male without circumcision must be cut off from the people of the covenant (Gen 17.14).

The Lord also gave his promise to Sarah that she would become the mother of the nations (Gen 17.15-16). Yet Abraham was doubtful, so that he beseeched the Lord to bless Ishmael instead. Declining this request, the Lord gave his last word to confirm that he would establish this eternal covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and

⁵⁴³ ET of Gen 17 (MT) is mine.

⁵⁴⁴ Joüon-Muraoka, 543, 586. Accordingly, NRSV translates: ‘As for me, this is my covenant with you: You shall be the ancestor of a multitude of nations.’ See also N. Sarna, *Genesis* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 124; Waltke & O’Connor, 677; Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 14.

⁵⁴⁵ Ibid., 15 n. 4a.

⁵⁴⁶ LXX and *Neof* retain the Hebrew construction.

⁵⁴⁷ Regarding the description of circumcision as ‘covenant’, LXX retains the Hebrew construction. Wevers considers this use of ‘covenant’ as a metonymy: J. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 233.

the descendants of Isaac (17.17-21). Then Abraham responded by doing exactly what he was told to do (17.22-27).

Two initial observations may be added to this outline. Firstly, the Lord demanded that Abraham show his commitment in Genesis 17.⁵⁴⁸ With the commitment made on the side of Abraham, the account of Genesis 17 may be seen as the ratification of the covenant: it was a defining moment for the covenant relationship between God and Abraham, as Abraham and Sarah's name change indicates. Secondly, the giving of the covenant of circumcision is depicted as a seminal event for the later creation of the people of Israel who will inherit the Land. The covenant of circumcision in Genesis 17, which is God's merciful confirmation of both his pledges to Abraham's heir/descendants and the land promised as his/their inheritance, therefore, provides the foundation for the concept of the 'covenant with the fathers' in early Judaism and early Christianity.

C. The Septuagint

LXX Genesis 17 is different from MT in four verses (Gen 17.1, 14, 16, and 23); among them, verse 14 deserves attention. For Genesis 17.14, LXX Genesis includes the phrase 'on the eighth day', which is not attested in MT, but found in Sam:

MT	And as for an uncircumcised male who does not circumcise the flesh of his foreskin, his soul shall be cut out (ונכרתה) from his people; he has broken my covenant.
LXX	And uncircumcised male, who will not be circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin <i>on the eighth day</i> (τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ὀγδόῃ), his soul <i>shall be put to death</i> (ἐξολεθρευθήσεται) out of his race, <i>because</i> (ὅτι) he broke my covenant.

⁵⁴⁸ In Gen 15, the Lord had already given his assurance by sending 'a smoking fire pot and a flaming torch' to pass between the pieces of animals (Gen 15.17).

Sam And as for an uncircumcised male who does not circumcise the
flesh of his foreskin *on the eighth day* (ביום השמיני), his soul
shall be cut out from his people; he has broken my covenant.

Wevers thinks that the phrase ‘on the eighth day’ in Sam and LXX was added based on the same phrase that occurs in the preceding verse.⁵⁴⁹ This LXX reading of the circumcision ‘on the eighth day’ is adopted by Justin in his argument against Jewish circumcision, which will be discussed below.

In short, LXX preserves the phrase ‘on the eighth day’ in Genesis 17.14, in which Justin finds a significant implication for Christian baptism.

D. Genesis 17 in Justin Martyr

Justin would be aware of the fact that the Scriptural evidence in Genesis 17 as in Exodus 19-24 is apparently in favour of the Jewish practice. In *Dialogue* 10.3, Trypho questions Justin’s belief that Gentile Christians should receive God’s favour without circumcision, without observing the Sabbath, the feasts, and other precepts of the Law, by quoting Genesis 17.14—the text which articulates the rejection of the uncircumcised from the covenant:⁵⁵⁰ it is noteworthy that Trypho integrates the covenant of circumcision into the ordinances given in the Sinai covenant. In a sense, the arguments Justin makes throughout the *Dialogue* can be viewed as his reply to Trypho’s criticism.⁵⁵¹ Justin does not refer to Genesis 17 often,⁵⁵² but with a few references to Genesis 17.4b and 14, he certainly deals with the issue initially raised by Trypho. First this section examines Justin’s use

⁵⁴⁹ Wevers, *Notes on Genesis*, 236.

⁵⁵⁰ Trypho mentions that this rule is applied also to strangers and purchased slaves. As such, Trypho is depicted as a Jew who held a strict view on circumcision of the proselytes. Some Jews held more liberal views: cf. N. J. McEleney, ‘Conversion, Circumcision, and the Law’, *NTS* 20 (1974), 319-41.

⁵⁵¹ The issue of circumcision seems to be Justin’s concern throughout *Dial.* In the final appeal in the *Dialogue* (137-41), Justin invites Trypho and his friends to receive ‘circumcision of the hardness of heart’ (i.e. Christian baptism), because Jewish circumcision was given merely as a sign, not as a work of righteousness (*Dial.* 137.1).

⁵⁵² Justin discusses the name change of Abraham and Sarah based on the Greek text (*Dial.* 113.2).

of the phrase ‘father of many nations’ derived from Genesis 17.4b, before turning to Justin’s use of Genesis 17.14.

1. Father of many nations (Gen 17.4b)

The ‘father of many nations’ (πατὴρ πολλῶν ἐθνῶν), the phrase that alludes to Genesis 17.4b, occurs in *Dialogue* 11.5 and 119.4-6. In these passages, Justin argues that Gentile Christians are the true Israel, the people of the NC. ET of *Dialogue* 11.5 is as follows:

(5) For we are the true, spiritual Israel, and the race of Judah, Jacob, Isaac and Abraham, who, when he was still ‘uncircumcised’, was approved and blessed by God ‘because of his faith’ (Rom 4.9), and who was called the ‘father of many nations’ (Gen 17.4b), [* and we are] those who are brought near to God by this crucified Christ; this will be made clear to us in the course of discussions. (*Dial.* 11.5)

In the preceding verse, Justin repeats the key phrases of the quotations (‘light of nations’ in LXX Isa 51.4-5; ‘new covenant’ in Jer 31.31-32), which are introduced as the proofs of his argument that the Mosaic Law is no longer binding, because the everlasting and final Law is now given (*Dial.* 11.3). As the NC (i.e. the light to the peoples) is made manifest by the crucified Christ, Justin argues, people from many nations are turning to God from idolatry. They are the true Israel without circumcision, since they put their faith in Christ, just as Abraham was blessed ‘because of his faith’ before receiving the circumcision.⁵⁵³ The phrase ‘father of many nations’ (πατὴρ πλήθους ἐθνῶν), borrowed from Genesis 17.4b, is introduced in this argument to demonstrate that Gentile Christians are the true Israel. In light of this new development in salvation history, Justin believes, the phrase bears a prophetic meaning, predicting that the Gentile believers would be accepted by God.

⁵⁵³ This argument of Abraham’s justification before circumcision echoes Rom 4.9-10.

This phrase ‘father of many nations’ appears again in *Dialogue* 119.4. In this passage, Justin further expounds his interpretation of Genesis 17. Justin argues that Christians are now the ‘holy people, redeemed by the Lord’, as prophesied in Isaiah 62.12. They are the nations that God promised to come out from Abraham:

(3) . . . But we are not merely a people, but also a holy people, as we have already proven: ‘And they will call it a holy people, having being redeemed by the Lord’ (Isa 62.12). (4) Therefore, we are not a despicable people, or a barbarous tribe, or a sort of nation as the Carians or the Phrygians; but ‘God has also chosen us’ (Deut 14.2) and ‘has been made manifest to those who did not seek him. “Behold, I am God”, he says, “to the nation, who did not call upon My name” ’ (Isa 65.1). For this is that nation, which God gave to Abraham in ancient days; and God promised to ‘make him a father of many nations’ (Gen 17.4b), . . . (*Dial.* 119.3-4)

By pointing out in *Dialogue* 119.4 that Abraham was promised to become ‘father of many nations’, not of just one particular nation, Justin emphasises the universality of the true people of the divine covenant. He continues to argue that just as Abraham according to God’s voice left the land where he had lived in Genesis 12, Christians are the people who put their trust in the words of God, leaving the pagan religions behind. They are thus duly called the children of Israel, and it is they who will inherit the Holy Land (*Dial.* 119.5).

In sum, the phrase ‘father of many nations’ in Genesis 17.4 provides Justin a proof of his belief that the Gentile Christians are the true Israel, since Abraham should become father of, not just one, but many nations.⁵⁵⁴

⁵⁵⁴ It is noteworthy that both references to ‘father of many nations’ in *Dial.* 11 and 119 coincide with allusions to the Pauline epistles (Rom 4.9; Gal 3.7). They may indicate that Justin’s polemic against circumcision was influenced by the Pauline argument.

2. Justin's polemics against circumcision

This section discusses Justin's polemic against circumcision in defence of Christian baptism, which includes his interpretation of Genesis 17.14. He finds it particularly important that God commanded Abraham to practise circumcision 'on the eighth day' in LXX Genesis 17.14, since it was on that day when Christ rose from the dead.

Justin of course knows that circumcision originated with Abraham (e.g. *Dial.* 16.2). He concedes that Jesus himself received circumcision, and observed the precepts of the Mosaic Law (*Dial.* 67.5-6). Nevertheless, he holds a very negative view of Jewish circumcision. Far from acknowledging it as the 'sign of the eternal covenant', he describes it as the 'useless baptism' (*Dial.* 19.2). Justin argues that like other precepts of the Mosaic Law, circumcision was ordered only to the Jews because of the hardness of their heart (e.g. *Dial.* 18.2).

To prove that circumcision is no longer required of all, Justin appeals to the uncircumcised righteous people who lived before Abraham, such as Adam, Abel, Enoch and Noah (*Dial.* 19.3-4). Relying on the LXX text, moreover, he puts forth his interpretation of Genesis 17.14, which he might have learned from the 'old man':

(3) . . . Therefore, O Trypho, <I said,> to you and to those who wish to become proselytes, I proclaim the divine word, which I have heard from that [*old] man. Understand that the elements (τὰ στοιχεῖα) do not idle, nor do they observe the Sabbath. Remain as you have been born: for if there was no need of circumcision before the time of Abraham, or of the Sabbath observance, feasts and offerings before Moses, in the same way the observances of these are no longer necessary, after [*the coming of] the son of God, Jesus Christ, who was born, according to the will of God, by Virgin Mary, from the descendants of Abraham. (4) And for 'Abraham himself, when he was uncircumcised, by the faith of his trust in God, was justified and blessed', as

the Scripture indicates: ‘he received the circumcision for a sign’ (Rom 4.11), but not for righteousness, as both the Scriptures and the facts compel us to acknowledge. Thus it was rightly said concerning that [*Jewish] people, ‘that soul shall be destroyed from his race, unless he is circumcised . . . on the eighth day’ (LXX Gen 17.14). (*Dial.* 23.3-4)

In these verses, Justin attempts to prove that circumcision is not mandatory for all, because the righteous men in the primeval era were uncircumcised.⁵⁵⁵ He also applies a Pauline argument against circumcision; Abraham was considered to be righteous, not because of his circumcision, but because of his faith. He then makes a quotation of Genesis 17.14 from LXX which includes ‘on the eighth day’. With this quotation, Justin emphasises that God has ordered the ‘circumcision on the eighth day’, that is, the ‘circumcision’ practised on the day after the Sabbath; according to Justin, therefore, Genesis 17.14 is not a warning against those who do not receive Jewish circumcision, but rather a warning against those who refuse the ‘circumcision on the eighth day’, namely Christian baptism.

To sum up, Justin holds a negative view of Jewish circumcision: it was given because of the hardheartedness of the people. As the NC is established, he believes, one cannot be accepted by God without receiving the true, eighth-day circumcision (Gen 17.14), which is Christian baptism.

E. Concluding remarks

Genesis 17 includes an element which could have been used by Justin to forge his identification of the NC with Christ, that is, the speech of the divine figure who addressed to Abraham in Genesis 17.4a: ‘I, behold, my covenant [*is] with you’.

⁵⁵⁵ It seems to be the ‘old man’ (*Dial.* 3.1) who told Justin that the righteous men in the primeval era were uncircumcised. Interestingly, he may also be the source of Justin’s knowledge of the Pauline argument that Abraham was deemed righteous before receiving circumcision. Regarding circumcision, a view similar to Justin is also expressed by Irenaeus, *Epideix.*, 24: M. Harl, *La Bible d’Alexandrie*, vol. 1: *La Genèse* (Paris: Cerf, 1986), 169. A rebuttal to such an argument may be found in *b. Sanh.* 58b: Williams, *Dial.*, 47-48 n. 4.

But this element is absent in Justin.⁵⁵⁶ He rather focuses on two phrases in this chapter: the ‘father of many nations’ (Gen 17.4b) and circumcision ‘on the eighth day’ (LXX Gen 17.14). The latter phrase is not retained in MT, but in LXX and in Sam. In Justin’s view, the promise to Abraham that he would become the father of many nations testifies to Justin’s belief that the Gentiles Christians are the people of the covenant and true Israel. Justin also believes that the hidden meaning of the circumcision ‘on the eighth day’ (LXX Gen 17.14) is now revealed in the resurrection of Christ and in the practice of Christian baptism.

⁵⁵⁶ Justin might have recognized this identification of the covenant with the Lord in Gen 17.4a, since he uses the latter half of the verse.

PART III

JEWISH SOURCES IN THE SECOND TEMPLE PERIOD

The above examinations of Jeremiah 30-31 (37-38), Exodus 19-24, and Genesis 17 in the different traditions (MT, LXX, θ' , α' , *Tgs*) have demonstrated that Justin defended his notion of the NC by using the textual and exegetical traditions of the Hebrew Bible/OT that include LXX, Greek recensions, and oral stages of the Targumic traditions.

Among the findings, Justin's use of the Jewish metaphors of 'tree (of life)' and 'water' as the Torah is particularly important to understanding Justin's identification of Christ with the NC. Just as these symbols are interpreted as referring to the Torah in the Jewish traditions, the 'tree (of life)' and the 'water' represent the new Law and NC in Justin. The 'tree (of life)' in Justin is associated with the Eucharistic element of bread based on Jeremiah 11.19 (*Dial.* 72.2), and together with the 'blood/wine', the 'water' is also the element of the Eucharist in Justin's view. His use of these metaphors seems to be derived from the Midrashic tradition of the water of Marah; in this tradition, the 'tree' thrown by Moses is equal to the tree of life, and this tree, together with the 'water' turned sweet, refers to the Torah.

Admittedly, Justin's source for his knowledge of the Jewish metaphors of the Torah, may not be limited to LXX, Greek recensions, and an oral stage of the Targumic traditions. The Midrashic tradition of the water of Marah is in fact also attested in *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (LAB) 11.15. Thus it is necessary to compare this section with Justin's use of the water of Marah, before deciding which source Justin used for this Midrashic tradition.

In addition, the next chapter investigates a fragment of Qumran commentary on Genesis (4Q252 V), since it includes the text which identifies a messianic symbol

of ‘ruler’s staff’ with the ‘covenant of kingship’, which alludes to the Davidic covenant. In Justin, a similar metaphor of ‘rod/sceptre’ stands in juxtaposition with the ‘tree of life’ and is used as the Christological symbol (*Dial.* 86). The comparison between 4Q252 V and *Dialogue* 86 may shed further light on Justin’s identification of the NC with Christ.⁵⁵⁷

⁵⁵⁷ Philo of Alexandria will be discussed in Excursus.

Chapter VII

Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum and 4Q252 V

A. Introduction

This chapter examines Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (*LAB*)⁵⁵⁸ for another possible source of Justin's knowledge of the Midrashic tradition on the water of Marah. It will ask whether Justin learned this Midrashic tradition from *LAB* or not.

It also examines Qumran Commentary on Genesis A (4Q252) V, since this document identifies a messianic symbol—the 'ruler's staff' (מִזְבֵּחַ)—with the 'covenant of kingship'. Although it is unlikely that this identification of a messianic symbol with a covenant influenced Justin's notion of the NC, this precedent strengthens the argument that his identification of the NC with Christ is rooted in Jewish traditions.

B. *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*

Before examining the parallels between *LAB* and Justin, it is necessary to mention the transmission of this document. The original Hebrew text of *LAB*⁵⁵⁹ is estimated to have been written in first-century Palestine.⁵⁶⁰ The complete text of

⁵⁵⁸ In this study, I have used ET by D. J. Harrington (*OTP* 2:297-377), which is based on his edition: *Pseudo-Philon, Les Antiquités Bibliques*, vol. 1: *Introduction et texte critiques*, SC 229 (Paris: Cerf, 1976). I have also consulted ET and the Latin text provided by H. Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation*, AGJU 31 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 1:89-194.

⁵⁵⁹ For the original language of *LAB*, cf. L. Cohn, 'An Apocryphal Work Ascribed to Philo of Alexandria', *JQR* O.S. 10 (1898), 277-332; D. J. Harrington, 'The Original Language of Pseudo-Philo's "Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum"', *HTR* 63 (1970), 503-14.

⁵⁶⁰ P.-M. Bogaert proposes a date before the Jewish revolt (C. Perrot and P.-M. Bogaert, eds., *Pseudo-Philon, Les Antiquités Bibliques*, vol. 2: *Introduction littéraire, commentaire et index*, SC 230 [Paris: Cerf, 1976], 74), but scholarly opinions seem to be divided on the question whether it was written before or after 70 CE: G. W. E. Nickelsburg, 'The Bible Rewritten and Expanded', in M. E. Stone, *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, CRINT 2 (Assen:

LAB is preserved only in a Latin edition, which is a translation from the Greek text. Howard Jacobson estimates that the translation from Hebrew to Greek may have taken place before the third century CE.⁵⁶¹ Some second-century Christian writers, therefore, could have read the Greek version.⁵⁶²

It is debatable whether or not Justin had access to this document. A possible contact between *LAB* and Justin's *Dialogue* is suggested by Jacobson, who points out that *LAB* 17 associates the rods of almond thrown by Jacob into the water-troughs (Gen 30.37-38) with the rod of Aaron, which was kept safe in the Ark of the Covenant together with the stone tablets (Num 17.23 [LXX 17.8]). These references to the rods of Jacob and Aaron also coincide in *Dialogue* 86.2-4.⁵⁶³ However, my observation of *LAB* 17 and *Dialogue* 86 suggests otherwise. First the text of *LAB* 17 should be quoted here to clarify the difference:

(1) And then the identity of the priestly family was revealed by the selection of one tribe. And it was told to Moses, '*Take for the twelve tribes one rod apiece and put them in the tent of meeting. And then to whomever my glory shall have spoken, the rod of that one will flower and I will take away the murmuring from my people.*' (2) Moses did so, and he *deposited the twelve rods. And the rod of Aaron sprouted and flowered and yielded seed of almonds.* (3) Now that which happened then was like what Israel did while he was in Mesopotamia with Laban the Syrian when *he took almond rods and put them at the cisterns of water (in congregationem aquarum); and the flocks came to drink and were divided according to the peeled rods, and they brought forth white and speckled and many-coloured kids.* (4) So the assembly of the people was like the flock of sheep. And as the flocks brought

Van Gorcum, 1984), 109-10; Schürer, *History*, 3-1:328-29. H. Jacobson, on the other hand, argues for the Hadrian period (*Commentary on LAB*, 1:209).

⁵⁶¹ Jacobson, *Commentary on LAB*, 1:277.

⁵⁶² A possible allusion to *LAB* 9.16 is attested in Clement of Alexandria, *Str.* 1.23, 153; Schürer, *History*, 3 (part 1):329.

⁵⁶³ Jacobson, *Commentary on LAB*, 1:573.

forth according to the almond rods, so the priesthood was established through almond rods.

This episode which describes the establishment of the priestly order is located right after Korah's rebellion recorded in *LAB* 16. *LAB* 17 associates Aaron's rod with Jacob's because both rods are made from almond trees. *LAB* finds a mysterious power hidden in the rods made from almond trees. According to *LAB*, it was this mysterious power hidden in the rods of almond that established the priesthood among the people of Israel.

Jacobson considers that the same combination of Jacob's rods with Aaron's rod appears also in the series of OT references in *Dialogue* 86.2-4:

(2) By casting the rods (ῥάβδους) into the water-troughs, Jacob succeeded in his uncle's sheep conceiving, in order that he might obtain offspring from them (Gen 30.37-38): the same Jacob boasts that he 'has crossed the river with his staff/rod (ἐν ῥάβδῳ αὐτοῦ)' (Gen 32.11). He also said that a 'ladder' had appeared to him, and the Scripture has indicated that God was stationed on it (Gen 28.12-13): and we have already proven from the Scriptures that this was not the Father. And when Jacob poured olive oil over a stone in the same place, God, who appeared to Jacob, gave him a testimony, so that he anointed a pillar of stone for God who appeared to Jacob. (Gen 28.18; 31.13) (3) And likewise we have demonstrated that Christ was proclaimed symbolically as 'stone' in many Scriptural passages: and likewise we have demonstrated that every form of 'anointing', either of olive oil, or of oil of myrrh, or all forms of anointing of mixture of oil/perfume, referred to Him, as the Word says: 'therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness more than your fellows.' (LXX Psa 44.8) For all the kings and the persons anointed by Him have privilege of being called kings and the anointed ones: in the same way that He also received from the Father [*the titles of] 'king', 'Christ', 'priest', and 'angel', and all other <names> of this kind which he has or had.

(4) The rod (ῥάβδος) that brought a ‘sprout’ (βλαστός) to Aaron appointed him as the high priest. Isaiah prophesied that a ‘rod from the root of Jesse’ (ῥάβδον ἐκ ῥίζης Ἰεσσαί; Isa 11.1) would become Christ. And David says that the righteous one is like the ‘tree planted by the channels of waters’, which ‘produces its fruit in due season, and his leaf shall not fall off (Psa 1.3). (*Dial.* 86.2-4)

In fact, Justin’s reference to Jacob’s throwing of rods into the water-troughs is associated with Moses casting of wood into the water of Mara: Justin focuses on the fact that in either case, a rod or a piece of wood thrown into water bears mysterious power. Aaron’s rod, on the other hand, is quoted rather in association with the messianic prophecy of the sprout of Jesse in Isaiah 11.1, and this association is clearly related to Justin’s claim that Christ is the priestly king predicted by the OT prophets. Justin does not mention that Aaron’s rod and Jacob’s rods were made from an almond tree, which is the key element in this association according to Pseudo-Philo. Thus it seems to be by coincidence that Jacob’s rod (Gen 30.37-38) and Aaron’s rod (Num 17.23) appear both in *LAB* 17 and *Dialogue* 86.

A significant parallel, however, is found in *LAB* 11.15, where Pseudo-Philo provides a Midrashic interpretation of the water of Mara:

And all the people stood far off, but Moses drew near the cloud, knowing that God was there. And then God told him his statutes and his judgments, and he detained him forty days and forty nights. There he commanded him many things and showed him the tree of life, from which he cut off and took and threw into Marah, and the water of Marah became sweet. And it followed them in the wilderness forty years and went up to the mountain with them and went down into the plains. . . .’

The first sentence in *LAB* 11.15 is identical to Exodus 20.21.⁵⁶⁴ Moreover, after the giving of the Torah, Moses went up again to the mountain to receive further instructions from God. However, the divine ordinances and stipulations in Exodus 20.22-23.33 are almost entirely omitted in *LAB*. Instead, Pseudo-Philo inserts a legendary account of the water of Marah. God showed Moses the ‘tree of life’ at Mount Sinai, and Moses cut off its piece and threw it into the water of Marah to make the water sweet. This water followed the people of Israel for forty years throughout their journey in the wilderness. This insertion indicates Pseudo-Philo’s knowledge of the early Midrashic tradition on the water of Marah.

The presence of the Midrashic tradition on the water of Marah in *LAB* 11.15 raises the possibility of Justin’s reliance on the document. Justin’s knowledge of the Jewish symbols of the Torah could be related to that of *LAB*. In view of the facts that the tradition on the water of Marah is the only parallel between *LAB* and Justin,⁵⁶⁵ and that Justin have more contacts with the textual/exegetical traditions preserved in the Targumic sources, however, it seems more likely that both Pseudo-Philo and Justin have learned the Midrashic tradition, which originated from the *dôrshê rêshûmôt*, from the earlier, oral stage(s) of Jewish exegetical tradition attested in the PT.⁵⁶⁶

In short, the Midrashic tradition on the water of Marah seems to be the only parallel between *LAB* and Justin. Justin could have learned this tradition through *LAB*, but it seems more likely that he learned it orally.

⁵⁶⁴ *LAB* 11.14 is a retelling of Exod 20.18-20.

⁵⁶⁵ If Justin was able to use *LAB* as a written source, he would have used it more frequently.

⁵⁶⁶ Or orally through his dialogues/contacts with Jews. The author of *LAB* may also have learned the Midrashic tradition through the PT tradition. The parallels between *Tgs* and *LAB* are listed in L. H. Feldman, ‘Prolegomonon’, in *The Biblical Antiquity of Philo* (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1971), LXVI-LXVIII. For the *dôrshê rêshûmôt*, see L. Ginzberg, ‘Allegorical Interpretation’, in I. Singer, et al. (eds.) *The Jewish Encyclopedia* (London: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1901-05), 1:403-11; Lauterbach, ‘Ancient Jewish Allegorists’, 301, 305, 310-11; Bienaimé, *Moïse*, 16-19.

C. 'Ruler's staff' in 4Q252

The purpose of examining a Qumran text (4Q252 V) in this section is to identify more Jewish elements in Justin's exegetical methods in terms of his interpretation of the NC. One might question the necessity of this section, since it seems unlikely that his notion of the NC was influenced by the documents preserved and regarded by the Qumran community.⁵⁶⁷ But it is unsound to exclude the Qumran texts *a priori*, because it is unrealistic to assume that various strands of Second Temple Judaism, including Essenism, had suddenly disappeared after the failures of the Jewish revolts.⁵⁶⁸ It is also misleading to think that the Rabbinic orthodoxy soon took control of every corner of the Diaspora-Jewish communities after securing its bridgehead.⁵⁶⁹ The Jewish interpretive traditions recovered from the

⁵⁶⁷ According to a widely accepted view, the inhabitants at the site of Qumran were a group of the Essenes. The habitation of the Essenes has been estimated to have begun in the 2nd century BCE (161-35 BCE), but more scholars now prefer a later date (c. 100 BCE) for the beginning of the settlement (e.g. H. Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 56; M. O. Wise, 'Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and the *Floruit* of His Movement', *JBL* 122 [2003]: 53-87). Their settlement seems to have been terminated in 68 CE. For a survey of the occupation phases of Qumran, see J. Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 47-72. For the discussions on the origin and history of the Qumran sectarians, cf. G. Vermes, 'The Essenes and History', *JJS* 32 (1981), 18-31; Stegemann, *Library of Qumran*, 139-62; J. C. VanderKam, 'Identity and History of the Community', in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 487-533. The Essene hypothesis is recently reaffirmed by VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 2nd edn. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 97-126, and by J. J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 10, 155-56. Some scholars prefer alternative explanations. The advocates of the 'Groningen hypothesis' regard the Qumran community as a break-away group of the Essenes: F. García Martínez, 'The History of the Qumran Community in the Light of Recently Available Texts', in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 194-216. In a similar vein, G. Boccaccini considers the Qumran community to be a group separated from the mainstream body of the Essenes, which he describes as 'Enochic Judaism': *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998). L. H. Schiffman identifies the origin of the Qumran sectarians with a faction of the Sadducean priests that opposed the usurpation of the high priesthood by the Hasmoneans: *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 65-95. S. Talmon, however, argues that the Qumran community is a group which is never witnessed by any ancient authors; hence it should be named the 'community of the renewed covenant': 'The Community of the Renewed Covenant: Between Judaism and Christianity', in *Community of the Renewed Covenant* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 3-24.

⁵⁶⁸ M. Goodman, 'Sadducees and Essenes after 70 CE', *Judaism in the Roman World*, AGJU 66 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 153-62.

⁵⁶⁹ Even in 2nd-century Palestine, the 'traditional' view that assumes the domination of the Rabbis is no longer tenable: S. J. D. Cohen, 'The Rabbi in Second-century Jewish Society'

Qumran literature may have continued to have been transmitted, or at least their echoes may have lingered on among some sectors of Jewish groups in the second century. Thus it is not entirely out of context to examine the Qumran texts in order to understand Justin's OT exegeses.

Commentary on Genesis A (4Q252)⁵⁷⁰ includes the identification of a messianic symbol from Genesis 49.10 with the 'covenant of kingship'. The following is the text of 4Q252 V.1-5 that includes this identification:

A ruler (שליט)⁵⁷¹ shall [not] depart from the tribe of Judah . . . (Gen 49.10). Whenever Israel rules, there shall [not] fail to be a descendant of David upon the throne (Jer 33.17). For the ruler's staff (המחקה)⁵⁷² is the Covenant of kingship (ברית המלכות),⁵⁷³ [and the clans] of Israel are the divisions, until the Messiah of Righteousness comes, the Branch (צמח) of David (Jer 33.15). For to him and to his seed is granted the Covenant of kingship over his people for everlasting generations which he is to keep . . . the Law with the men of the community, for . . .⁵⁷⁴

Although this text is damaged, it may still allow us to make three observations.

CHJ 3:975. Thus it is difficult to judge to what degree Rabbinic Judaism had influenced Justin's opponents (who could have been fictitious figures). Goodenough has acknowledged both Palestinian and Hellenistic Jewish elements in the discussions of Trypho: *Theology of Justin Martyr* (Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1968 [1st published 1923]), 95.

⁵⁷⁰ CDSSE, 494. For the text and translation of 4Q252 V, I have also consulted; J. M. Allegro, 'Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature', *JBL* 75 (1956), 174-87; G. J. Brooke, et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4, XVII: Parabiblical Texts*, part 3, DJD 22 (Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 205-06; DSSR 2:110-11; J. L. Trafton, 'Commentary on Genesis A (4Q252 = 4QCommGenn A = 4QPBless)', PTSDSSP 6B, 203-19. The palaeographical evidence indicates that the document was written/copied in the second half of the 1st century BCE. This document seems to rely on several different sources which may predate the Qumran community and it seems to be composed/compiled by an author/redactor who belonged to the Qumran community: CDSSE, 492; G. J. Brooke, '4QCommentary on Genesis A', DJD 22, 190; Trafton, 'Commentary on Genesis', 204.

⁵⁷¹ I have adopted this reading in accordance with Allegro, 'Further Messianic References', 174; Trafton, 'Commentary on Genesis', 217.

⁵⁷² The term מחקה seems to be taken from Gen 49.10.

⁵⁷³ For the translation of מלכות, some scholars prefer 'kingdom' to 'kingship': e.g. M. G. Abegg, 'The Covenant of the Qumran Sectarials', in Porter and de Roo, *Concept*, 83; C. A. Evans, 'Covenant in the Qumran Literature', in Porter and de Roo, *Concept*, 77.

⁵⁷⁴ The Italics indicate scriptural quotations.

(1) The quotation of Genesis 49.10 in 4Q252 V adopts the term ‘ruler’ (שליט). This is similar to the LXX reading of ἄρχων (LXX Gen 49.10) rather than שבט (sceptre/tribe) in MT. If 4Q252 V had proto-MT as its source text, the author/redactor of this commentary interpreted ‘sceptre’ as a messianic symbol as the LXX translators did.⁵⁷⁵ This messianic reading of Genesis 49.10 in 4Q252 V would be related to the term ‘ruler’s staff’ which may have stood as the word-pair of שבט in the same verse (Gen 49.10 [MT]). The term מחקק—a synonym of שבט—can mean either ‘ruler’, or ‘ruler’s staff’.⁵⁷⁶ Hence, the statement ‘the ruler’s staff is the covenant of the kingship’ may also be translated as ‘the *ruler* is the covenant of the kingship.’⁵⁷⁷ As such, the messianic figure is identified with the ‘covenant’ here. In 4Q252, therefore, we have a precedent for Justin’s identification of a messianic figure with a biblical covenant.

(2) In this identification of the ruler/ruler’s staff with the covenant of kingship, the author/redactor of 4Q252 V makes an additional remark: ‘to him and to his seed is granted the Covenant of kingship’. Thus the messianic symbol(s) of Genesis 49.10 seems to be interpreted as referring to a Davidic messiah, who would be the ultimate recipient of the covenant-oath originally given to the ancient Davidic dynasty (2 Sam 7.12-16), and confirmed in Jeremiah’s prophecy (Jer 33.15-18). Phrased differently, the messianic king predicted in Genesis 49.10 would receive the authority/power promised in the covenant of the kingship.

(3) In the above passage, at least three scriptural passages are conflated: Genesis 49.10, 2 Samuel 7.12-16, and Jeremiah 33.15-17. This conflation is mediated with the messianic symbols of ‘ruler’s staff’ (מחקק), and ‘branch’ (צמח).

⁵⁷⁵ G. Vermes, ‘Lion-Damascus-Meḥokeḳ-Man’, in *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*, 2nd edn. (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 50-54. The author/redactor of 4Q252 V could have known both readings of proto-MT and (the *Vorlage* of) LXX, or he might have used a certain textual tradition slightly different from both proto-MT and (the *Vorlage* of) LXX. Gen 49.10 is not attested in the biblical MSS discovered from the Qumran caves: *DSSB*, 22.

⁵⁷⁶ The word is the *po‘el* participle of the verb חקק; the *po‘el* of חקק also means ‘to order/decide’: *HALOT*, 347. In CD VI. 7, המחקק refers to the ‘interpreter of the Law’: cf. Allegro, ‘Further Messianic References’, 174 n. 6.

⁵⁷⁷ My emphasis.

These findings may provide circumstantial evidence to the view that Justin had contact with Jewish exegetical traditions and practised Jewish exegetical methods. The biblical texts in 4Q252 V (Gen 49.10; 2 Sam 7.12-16; Jer 33.15) are conflated based on the messianic symbol of the ‘ruler’s staff’⁵⁷⁸ (Gen 49.10) and the ‘branch of David’ (Jer 23.5; 33.15). Similar juxtapositions of the messianic symbols that combine several OT texts are also found in Justin (*Dial.* 86.1-4).

More importantly, the Qumran commentary on Genesis 49.10 in 4Q252 V sheds light on Justin’s identification of Christ with the NC. By means of the statement that the ruler/ruler’s staff is the covenant of kingship, the commentator expressed his view that the divine promise had been given to a future messianic ruler. Justin’s identification of the NC with Christ (*Dial.* 24.1; 43.1; 188.3) is better understood against the background of Semitic language(s) and Jewish exegetical practices, since the dual meanings of מַחֲקֶק (ruler/ruler’s staff) may provide an explanation to Justin’s identification of ῥάβδος with the messianic king (Christ). Furthermore, just as the messianic symbol of ‘ruler’s staff’, which may also mean ‘ruler’ (the messianic figure), stands in apposition with the term ברית in 4Q252 V, the messianic symbols such as ῥάβδος in Justin refers to Christ, who is identical with the NC. Regarding their use of the messianic symbols, therefore, there are parallels between 4Q252 and *Dialogue* 86.

In sum, the conflation of the biblical texts with the messianic symbols in 4Q252 V provides additional support to the view that Justin’s exegetical methods are rooted in Jewish traditions. The commentator of 4Q252 and Justin both combine some OT texts that include the messianic symbols. Moreover, the messianic figure/symbol (ruler/ruler’s staff) is identified with the ‘covenant of kingship’ in 4Q252 V, whereas Justin recognises the rod/scepter as the Christological symbol that may be equated with the tree (of life), the new Law/covenant, and Christ.

⁵⁷⁸ And perhaps of ‘sceptre’.

D. Concluding remarks

In view of the fact that the Midrashic tradition on the water of Marah is the only parallel between *LAB* and Justin, it is unlikely that Justin relied on *LAB*. The presence of the Midrashic tradition in *LAB* indicates its wide circulation among the first and second century Jewish groups. Justin likely came across this tradition through the PT tradition in its oral stage.

The comparison between 4Q252 V and Justin has shown that the use of the messianic symbols in this Qumran commentary is similar to Justin's use of the Christological symbols, and that the identification of the 'ruler/ruler's staff' with the covenant of kingship in 4Q252 V strengthens the view that Justin's identification of the NC with Christ is partly rooted in Jewish traditions.

In addition, the above discussion demonstrates that the issues discussed in the study of the Qumran texts may elucidate exegetical phenomena attested in Justin's writings. The impact of the discoveries of the Qumran texts on the study of the second-century Christianity may not provide the same significant effects that it has brought to the NT studies, but the comparative studies between these texts and early Christian fathers including Justin Martyr remain important when considering the parallels between the Second Temple Judaism and early Christianity, since the ways of Judaism and Christianity still run close together.

Excursus: Philo of Alexandria

Scholars have been discussing Justin's contacts with the works of Philo of Alexandria.⁵⁷⁹ On this issue, David Runia has submitted a proposal to explain the similarities between Philo and Justin in his essay in 1995:

I am convinced that no passage in Justin's extant works can be adduced to prove direct use of Philo. One particular theme, however, is most intriguing, namely the interpretation of the divine theophanies in the Old Testament. Justin's Christological interpretations are uncannily similar to Philo, yet differ at crucial points.⁵⁸⁰ Generally this is explained through Justin's use of other Hellenistic Jewish literature now lost. I would suggest an alternative hypothesis which I cannot prove. Justin studied Philo's works while still in Palestine (or possibly Syria). Later he moved to Rome where he no longer had access to the original texts, and so when he wrote the Dialogue with Trypho years later he had to rely on his memory and introduced modifications. This reconstruction would explain the similarities and the differences, but as I just said, cannot be proven.⁵⁸¹

Thus Runia was inclined to allow Justin's contacts with Philo, even though Runia admitted that in writing his theological treatises, Justin had not used Philo's works. In his recent contribution to *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*, however, Runia seems to have withdrawn this hypothesis:

There can be no doubt that there are affinities between Philo and Justin in the imagery and titles that the latter uses for the Logos, in the emphasis on the

⁵⁷⁹ Cf. Skarsaune, *Proof*, 409-24; D. Rokéah, *Justin*, 22-28. Philo of Alexandria was born c. 20-10 BCE and died c. 50 CE: P. Borgen, 'Philo of Alexandria', *ABD* 5:333; *EJ²*, 16:59-64; D. R. Schwartz, 'Philo, His Family, and His Times', in A. Kamesar (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Philo* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 10. The translations of Philo's works are taken from the editions of Loeb Classical Library (*Philo* I-X [LCL, vols. 226, 226, 247, 261, 279, 285, 320, 341, 363, 379]; *Philo* (*Sup*) I-II [LCL, vols. 380, 401]).

⁵⁸⁰ Here, Runia cites Skarsaune, *Proof*, 410ff.

⁵⁸¹ D. T. Runia, 'Witness or Participant? Philo and the Neoplatonist Tradition', in *Philo and the Church Fathers* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 195. Cf. Idem, 'Reference to Philo from Josephus up to 1000 AD', in *Philo and Church Fathers*, 230-39.

cosmic significance of the Logos, and in the importance accorded to divine theophanies in the interpretation of the Old Testament. Recent scholars incline to the view that these affinities are due to Justin's acquaintance with Hellenistic Judaism rather than with Philo himself.⁵⁸²

His vacillation between the two appraisals seems to be due to the fact that the evidence is not decisive enough to establish Justin's contact with Philo, even though their use of theological terms and biblical interpretations often show striking similarities. According to Skarsaune, such similarities should rather be attributed to their dependence on common Hellenistic Jewish sources, since they differ in crucial points. As discussed in the previous chapters, however, the similarities between Philo and Justin may also be explained by supposing their reliance on Palestinian Jewish traditions. This supposition may find support in Philo's exegesis of the water of Marah in *De migratione Abrahami* 36-37. Before turning to this passage, however, it is necessary first to look at Philo's use of the term διαθήκη.⁵⁸³

Διαθήκη in Philo primarily means 'will' or 'testament'—the warrant of inheritance/gifts.⁵⁸⁴ Having evolved from this root meaning, his concept goes beyond the conventional semantic field. Hence διαθήκη is paraphrased with the divine word (λόγος) in *De somniis* 237.⁵⁸⁵ This Philonic paraphrase can be explained as a ramification of the root meaning of διαθήκη; the association may

⁵⁸² D. T. Runia, 'Philo and the Early Christian Fathers', in Kamesar, *Cambridge Companion*, 214. In the footnote to this remark, Runia cites Skarsaune, *Proof*, 433f.

⁵⁸³ For the word index search of Philo's works, I have consulted P. Borgen, K. Fuglseth, and P. Skarsten, eds., *The Philo Index* (Leiden: Brill, 2000). N. G. Cohen has recently done an exhaustive study on Philo's use of the Prophets. She identifies no reference to Jer 31.31-34 in Philo; *Philo's Scriptures* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 87-96.

⁵⁸⁴ Cf. *Spec.* II.16; Jaubert, *Alliance*, 414, 418; L. L. Grabbe, 'Did All Jews Think Alike? 'Covenant' in Philo and Josephus in the Context of Second Temple Judaic Religion', in Porter and de Roo, *Concept*, 251-57. For an analysis of Philo's concept of διαθήκη, see Jaubert, *Alliance*, 414-37.

⁵⁸⁵ In *Somm.* 223, Philo describes the divine covenant as being 'filled with the bounty of God'; it is also paraphrased with 'law' (νόμος) and 'principle' (λόγος). In the Greek and Hellenistic world, λόγος is almost identical with νόμος which prescribes human conducts: H. Kleinknecht, 'Λέγω B', *TDNT* 4:81.

indicate that the divine word in Philo's thought is comparable with promises written in a testament.

Germane to my interest in Justin's identification of the NC with Christ, it is necessary to mention Philo's explication of Genesis 17.4 in *De mutatione nominum* 57-58, where he interprets διαθήκη as identical with God:

The frame of mind which shrank from Him and fell spontaneously won God's high approval by thus acknowledging of the Existent that it is He alone Who stands and that all below Him are subject to change and mutation of every kind. He addresses him with an insistence which is also a call to partnership. 'And I,' He says, '—see, My covenant is with thee' (Gen 17.4a). The meaning suggested is to this purport—there are very many kinds of covenant, assuring bounties and gifts to the worthy, but the highest form of covenant is 'I myself.' He shews and points to Himself, as far as He can be shewn Who is above all shewing, by the words 'And I,' and adds, 'behold my covenant,' the beginning and the fountain of all bounties is 'I myself.'⁵⁸⁶

In Genesis 17.4, God revealed Himself to Abraham by saying, 'And I, see, My covenant is with thee'. This enigmatic statement attracts Philo's attention. In his commentary on this statement, Philo paraphrases 'my covenant' with 'the beginning and the fountain of all bounties'. In Philo's exegesis of Genesis 17.4a, he views God as the highest form of διαθήκη and πηγή. This Philonic interpretation of διαθήκη in Genesis 17 could be taken as a parallel to the Justinian equation of the NC with Christ. Nonetheless, it is unlikely that this Philonic interpretation of διαθήκη in Genesis 17.4a is Justin's source, because in his extant works, Justin does not quote from or allude to Genesis 17.4a.⁵⁸⁷

⁵⁸⁶ *Mut.* 57-58 (*Philo* V [LCL 275], 170-73). Another remark on Gen 17.4 is also given in *QG*, III. 42, where the line 'And I, behold, My covenant is with thee' is interpreted as setting forth the archetypal form of covenant: *Philo* (Sup) I (LCL 380), 231-33.

⁵⁸⁷ The verse is not listed in Marcovich, 'Indices', *I & 2 Apols.*, 171; 'Indices', *Dial.*, 319. Gen 17.4b-5 might be present in *Dial.* 119.4 as listed in *BiPa* 1:80, but Gen 17.4a is absent. This

Turning now to an issue of common Palestinian Jewish traditions of Philo and Justin, there is an example of this found in Philo's exegeses of the water of Marah in *De migratione Abrahami* 36-37:

Now the thing shewn is the thing worthy to be seen, contemplated, loved, the perfect good, whose nature it is to change all that is bitter in the soul and make it sweet, fairest seasoning of all spices, turning into salutary nourishment even foods that do not nourish. So we read 'The Lord shewed him a tree, and he cast it into the water' (Exod 15.25), that is into the flabby, flaccid mind teeming with bitterness, that its savagery might be sweetened away. This tree offers not nourishment only but immortality also, for we are told that the Tree of Life has been planted in the midst of the Garden (Gen 2.9), even Goodness with the particular virtues and the doings which accord with them to be its bodyguard. For it is Virtue that has obtained as its own the centra and most honourable place in the soul.⁵⁸⁸

In the above section, Philo identifies the wood thrown into the bitter water of Mara with the 'Tree of Life'. The referent of the 'Tree of Life' may become clear in light of the other occurrences of the phrase. In *Legum allegoriae*, the 'Tree of Life' is interpreted as the symbols of 'wisdom' (σοφίας; *Leg.*, III. 52) or of 'the soul virtue' (τὴν ἀρετὴν τῇ ψυχῇ; *Leg.*, III. 107).⁵⁸⁹ Thus a careful reader of Philo could deduce from these passages that the 'Tree of Life' in *De migratione Abrahami* 36-37 symbolizes wisdom, in which the Torah/Law would be included. But it is unlikely that Justin was able to use Philo's works extensively in composing his theological treatises. In view of the fact that Christ as the new Law is a covert, but important agenda in *Dialogue* 86, the Midrashic tradition of the water of Marah preserved in the PT traditions, which clearly associates the

Philonic interpretation of Gen 17.4a may have influenced Clement of Alexandria: see ch. 3 'The new covenant in early Fathers after the time of Justin', p. 97-98.

⁵⁸⁸ *Migr.* 36-37 (*Philo* IV [LCL 261], 152-53).

⁵⁸⁹ *Philo* I (LCL 226), 334-35; 372-73. In *Plant.* 44, the tree of life in the Garden of Eden is compared with the immortal spirit within the man created after the divine image.

tree of life with the Torah, better explain Justin's use of the OT quotations including the water of Marah in *Dialogue* 86.

It is more likely that both Philo and Justin knew the Midrashic tradition of the water of Marah which originated from Palestine. The original form of this tradition is better preserved in *Mekhilta' de-Rabbi Shim'on bar Yoh'ai*,⁵⁹⁰ the PT tradition,⁵⁹¹ and *LAB* 11.15: in these texts, the 'Tree of Life' is clearly identified with the Torah. In Philo, the semantic field covered by the symbolic phrase 'Tree of Life' is expounded to include 'wisdom' and 'soul virtue', whereas in Justin, it is shifted to refer to Christ as the new Law/covenant.

In sum, it is unlikely that Justin relied on Philonic works to express his notion of the NC—Justin's identification of the NC with Christ mediated with his appreciation of the plant/garden metaphors and the messianic symbols in the OT, which he believes prefigure Christ, the new Law/covenant, and the Sacraments. Philo's concept of διαθήκη is primarily derived from the root meaning of the Greek term. His identification of διαθήκη with God could be seen as a parallel to Justin, but the critical verse (Genesis 17.4a) to which Philo applies this interpretation is not used in Justin's extant works. As the above observations of Philo's interpretation of the water of Marah have shown, Philo is dependent on Jewish exegetical traditions which were concurrent both in Palestine and Alexandria.⁵⁹² My observations may suggest that in some cases, the similarities

⁵⁹⁰ *Mek. RSbY*. Exod 15.22 (Epstein, 102).

⁵⁹¹ *Ps-Jon* of Exod 15.22 and *Neof* of Exod 15.25.

⁵⁹² As Jaubert rightly points out, it is unrealistic to assume that Philo was totally separated from Palestinian Jewish traditions in the 1st century CE: Jaubert, *Alliance*, 376. P. Borgen also makes a similar observation; 'it is impossible to distinguish sharply between "normative Judaism" and "Hellenistic Judaism"': *Bread from Heaven*, NovTSup 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 3. S. Sandmel prefers a different explanation of the parallels between Philo and the Rabbinic source; he argues that they developed their interpretations of the Scriptures independently: *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 127-34. Another observation by P. Borgen, which concludes his survey of Philonic research since World War II, may deserve quoting here: 'Since no sharp distinction can be drawn between Palestinian Judaism and Hellenistic Judaism, it is a subordinate question to ask whether Philo was dependant on Palestinian traditions or the Palestinian Jews drew on Alexandrian traditions, as exemplified in Philo's writings. The main question is then to uncover traditions

between Philo and Justin can be explained with their common knowledge of the Jewish traditions, which are not necessarily limited to the 'Hellenistic' Jewish sources, current in the first and second centuries.

current in Judaism at that time and examine the various usages, emphases and applications within this common context': 'Philo of Alexandria: A Critical and Synthetical Survey of Research since World War II', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.21.1 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984), 98-154, cited in P. Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria*, NovTSup 86 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 12.

CONCLUSION

This study has raised the two sets of questions: (1) How Justin's notion of the NC is defined? How does Justin interpret the NC—the phrase rooted in Jeremiah 31.31? Was his idea a salvation-historical concept as pointed out by Ferguson and Backhaus? Or is there a neglected aspect in his idea? (2) What shaped Justin's notion of the NC, particularly his identification of the NC with Christ? Which Christian sources influenced his interpretation of the NC? Did he have access to Jewish exegetical and textual traditions to support his interpretation of the NC text of Jeremiah? The first set of questions is concerned with the definition of Justin's notion of the NC, whereas the second seeks to identify its sources.

A. Results

To answer these questions, part one (chapters 1-3) of this study located Justin's use of the NC text of Jeremiah and his notion of the NC in the context of the first- and second-century Christian literature. Subsequently, parts two (chapters 4-5) and three (chapter 7) argued that Justin's understanding of the NC of Jeremiah was partly rooted in Jewish textual and exegetical traditions.

Chapter one demonstrated that the phrase NC which alludes to Jeremiah 31(38).31 was first used to refer to the Eucharistic element of wine in certain Christian communities; its liturgical tradition was preserved in 1 Corinthians 11 and Luke 22. Jeremiah 31(38).31-34 was also used by Paul in his defence of his apostleship (2 Cor 3). In the Letter to the Hebrews, the NC was primarily deemed as the new cultic order established by Christ—the eternal high priest. It was in this Letter that the concept of the NC made a significant turn; the author argued that since the NC was established, the old covenant became obsolete (Heb 8.13). After its appearance in Hebrews, the NC text of Jeremiah became relatively

obscure in the first half of the second-century.⁵⁹³ In this period, *KP* might have been one of the few documents which quoted the NC text of Jeremiah; its use may testify to the fact that early Christians used the phrase NC mainly as a liturgical term.

Chapter two provided a preliminary observation of Justin's use of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 and his usage of διαθήκη. This study confirmed the observations made by the preceding studies on Justin's idea of the covenant: with the phrase NC, Justin Martyr referred to the dispensational period (*Dial.* 51.3); concurring with the author of Hebrews, Justin asserted that the old covenant was obsolete, since it had been intended only for the Jews (*Dial.* 11.2). At the same time, Justin's interpretation of the NC of Jeremiah was also influenced by the liturgical tradition which refers to the Eucharistic element as the NC; his notion of the NC was shaped by his recognition of the liturgical tradition and his high regard of the liturgy and the Sacraments. Although the phrase NC was absent in Justin's Eucharistic formula (*1 Apol.* 66), his conflated quotation of Jeremiah 7.21-22 and 31(38).31-32 in *Dialogue* 22.6 might have attested to his recognition and acceptance of the liturgical tradition which described the Eucharistic element of wine with the phrase NC; this conflated quotation might also have indicated that Justin applied subtle techniques to bring out his interpretation of certain OT texts. In *Dialogue* 24.1-2, Justin argued that the '(blood of that) circumcision' was replaced by the new Law/covenant; the meaning of the NC in Justin was thus extended to the spiritual circumcision, that is, Christian baptism. Moreover, Justin viewed the NC of Jeremiah as equal to the new Law going/coming out from the Lord/Zion in Isaiah 51.4/2.3 (*Dial.* 11; 24.1-2). Most notably, Justin identified the new Law/covenant with Christ. This identification might have been partly rooted in *KP*'s appositional use of the terms 'Law' and 'Logos' for its

⁵⁹³ In the corpus of the Apostolic Fathers, two allusions to Jer 31(38).33 were found in *Sim.* 8.3 and *Barn.* 4.

appellation of the Lord, but the early Christian sources prior to Justin, including *KP*, did not fully answer the question of why Justin identified the NC with Christ.

As discussed in chapter three, the identification of the NC with Christ did not occur so frequently in the extant second-century Christian works, but it was not an isolated phenomenon. Clement of Alexandria would have made the same identification of the NC with Christ, since he identified the covenant in Genesis 17.4a with the creator God (*Str.* 1.[29]182.2). However, there were differences between Justin and Clement; Justin did not clearly cite Genesis 17.4a in the extant works, and his identification was rather closely related to the NC text of Jeremiah.

In part two, this study investigated the three OT passages (Jer 30-31 [37-38]; Exod 19-24; Gen 17) in the OT textual and exegetical traditions (MT, LXX, α' , θ' , *Tgs*), some of which would have circulated mainly among the Jewish communities.

The investigation of the different traditions/versions of Jeremiah 30-31 (37-38) in chapter four revealed that Justin's combination of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 with Isaiah 51.4-5 and 55.3-5 was likely based on his reading of the BC in Jeremiah (Jeremiah 30-31 [37-38])—the context of the NC text of Jeremiah. Justin knew that the NC of Jeremiah should be coincident with the coming of the Davidic king, which was predicted both in the BC of Jeremiah and Isaiah 55, while Justin recognised the common element between Jeremiah 30-31 (37-38) and Isaiah 51.4-5—namely, the theme of the coming/going out of תורה/תורה (Jer 31.19; *Dial.* 11-12). Justin spotted this theme also in Isaiah 2.3/Micah 4.2 (*Dial.* 24.1). This common theme provided Justin with the Scriptural support for his identification of the new Law with the NC (Eucharist). This may also indicate that he had access to Jeremiah 30-31 (37-38) in a certain Jewish recension (a *καίτε* type/ 'Theodotion', or Aquila).

Moreover, Justin would have recognised the Jewish metaphors of 'tree' and 'water' in Jeremiah 31(38). The LXX translation of the 'watered garden' as the

‘fruitful tree’ in Jeremiah 31(38).12 involved these metaphors; the translators interpreted the ‘waters’ in Jeremiah 31(38).9 as the Torah, whereas they used the phrase ‘fruitful tree’ in verse 12 as the symbol of the renewed Israelites. Justin would have recognised the LXX translation of the ‘watered garden’ as the ‘fruitful tree’, since he also seems to have interpreted the metaphor of ‘tree’ as describing the new Israel (Isaiah 55.12; *Dial.* 14).

More importantly, Justin knew the Jewish metaphors of the ‘tree (of life)’ and the ‘water’ as the Torah, which would have been current among the Jews in Justin’s time. As his remark on the water of Marah and his use of the metaphor of the ‘tree of life’ in *Dialogue* 86 indicated, Justin appropriated the Midrashic tradition on the water of Marah for his argument. This tradition would have originated from or been propagated by the *dôreshê rêshûmôt* and later transmitted through the PT tradition. Justin seems to have learned this tradition from the PT tradition in its oral stage.

Justin incorporated these metaphors of the ‘tree (of life)’ and ‘water’ into other Jewish and Christian traditions, and he likely used them to refer to the Eucharistic elements. With respect to the metaphor of the ‘tree (of life)’, Justin conjoined the Jewish metaphor with the Pauline use of the ‘tree’ of Deuteronomy 21.23 as a prophetic description of the crucifixion. LXX Jeremiah 11.19, which coupled ‘tree’ with ‘bread’, also provided another support for Justin to connect this metaphor with the Eucharist (*Dial.* 72.2); this prophetic text of Jeremiah (LXX Jer 11.19) linked the ‘tree’—the symbol of the Law and the crucifixion of Christ—with the ‘bread’, namely the body of Christ. For Justin, therefore, the ‘tree’ not only symbolized the sacrificial death of Christ on the cross, but it also represented the Eucharistic element as well as Christ. Regarding the metaphor of ‘water’, Justin easily associated it with Christian baptism since the water was the essential element in this Sacrament. In Justin’s community, moreover, the water was not only the symbol of baptism, but also one of the three Eucharistic elements (*1 Apol.*

65.5; 67.5).⁵⁹⁴ Thus Justin may have developed and transformed the Midrashic tradition on the water of Marah (Jewish metaphors of the Torah) into the Christian symbols of the Sacraments.

Chapter five investigated Exodus 19-24 and Justin's use of the passage. As the phrase 'blood of the covenant' in the Last Supper accounts indicated, the narrative about the conclusion of the Sinai covenant was essential to understand the early Christian view of the Eucharist including Justin's. In Jewish textual and exegetical traditions (MT, LXX, *Tgs*), Exodus 19-24 was recognised as the description of the model of worship and the prefiguration of the Temple service. In the PT traditions, in particular, the Targumists saw the fulfilment of the divine promise to become a holy nation in the synagogue service and the Torah learning in *Beth ha-Midrash*. Since the passage provided strong supports to Jewish adherence to the Torah, Justin did not appeal very often to the passage. Instead, he quoted the passages of the Prophets, namely Daniel 7.27 and Isaiah 33.15-17; the former was related to Exodus 19.5-6 and the latter alluded to the covenant meal in Exodus 24.8-11. These oblique references indicated that Justin was not ignorant of the Sinai covenant and its significance for the Christian faith and practices. Justin's citation of Isaiah 33.16-17 was particularly important for our concern, since in this prophetic text he identified the three Eucharistic elements (bread, water, and blood [wine]) which were predicted in LXX Exodus 23.25. He interpreted Isaiah 33.16-17 both as an oblique reference to the Sinai event and as a prophecy of the Eucharistic rite. Thus Justin's interpretation of Exodus 24 was not entirely detached from the *leitmotif* of the passage in the Jewish textual and exegetical traditions; Justin would have recognised that the establishment of the Sinai covenant was closely related to the establishment of the right pattern of the worship for the people of the covenant.

⁵⁹⁴ His identification of 'water' with Christ was also similar to the identification of 'water' in Num 24.6-7 with the messiah in the Targumic sources.

Our investigation of Justin's use of Exodus 19-24 yielded three additional points. (1) Although Justin did not directly quote from the 'blood of the covenant' in Exodus 24.8, the 'blood' was another key term for Justin's notion of the NC. Just as 'tree/bread' and 'water', it symbolized the crucifixion of Christ, the Eucharist, and Christian baptism. As his quotation of the phrase 'blood of that circumcision' from LXX Exodus 4.25-26 indicates, Justin's view of the soteriological virtue of 'blood' would have been rooted in a Palestinian Jewish tradition. (2) In Justin's view, moreover, the Sinai event is relevant for Christians, because it testifies to the pre-existence of Christ; according to Justin, it was Christ who spoke to Moses and Aaron from the pillar of cloud at Mount Sinai (Exod 19.21; 24.17: *Dial.* 127-128). (3) The name of the successor of Moses is another proof of the pre-existent Christ. Hosea was changed to Joshua, because he met Jesus in the form of the celestial figure (Josh 5.14). Justin may have learned the tradition that associates the angel sent before Israel (Exod 23.20) with the celestial figure in Joshua 5.14 from a Targumic tradition (cf. *Jon* of Josh 5.14). Thus in the presence of Christ, Justin found a continuity between the old covenant and the new.

Genesis 17—the passage discussed in chapter six—provided additional support to Jewish observance of the old covenant. Justin quoted from this chapter two phrases: the 'fathers of many nations' in Genesis 17.4b (*Dial.* 11.5; 119.4-6), and the 'circumcision on the eighth day' in LXX Genesis 17.14 (*Dial.* 23.4; 41.4). The former was used in his argument that the promise to Abraham was fulfilled in the Gentile conversion to Christianity, and the latter provided a support to Justin's negative view of Jewish circumcision; in his view, it was superseded by the 'circumcision on the eighth day', which he believed was a prophetic reference to Christian baptism.

The investigations of part two thus revealed the fact that Justin's interpretation of the NC text of Jeremiah and his notion of the NC was shaped by the Jewish textual and exegetical traditions that would be conveyed through LXX, a Jewish recension (or recensions), and the Targumic traditions in their oral stages.

Part three (Chapter seven) further examined the two Jewish documents of the Second Temple period (*LAB* and 4Q252). The Midrashic tradition on the water of Marah was also witnessed in *LAB* 11.15. In view of the fact that the water of Marah was the only parallel between Justin and *LAB*, however, it is unlikely that Justin learned it from this document. Chapter 7 also discussed the fragment of Qumran Commentary on Genesis since this document included an antecedent of Justin's identification of the NC with Christ. In 4Q252 V, the 'ruler/ruler's staff' was identified with the 'covenant of kingship'. A similar use of the 'sceptre/rod' was also found in *Dialogue* 86. This antecedent strengthened our view that Justin's identification of the NC with Christ was rooted in the Jewish thought and traditions.⁵⁹⁵

A summary of these findings may clarify our answers to the initial questions. (1) This study confirmed that Justin's idea of the covenant included the dispensational/salvation-historical concept; the idea of the two dispensational periods (i.e. the old covenant and the new) seems to be rooted in the covenant idea in the Letter to the Hebrews. However, Justin's notion of the NC was shaped not only by the Letter to the Hebrews, but also by the early liturgical tradition attested in Paul and Luke. Based on his belief that the Eucharistic elements were the embodiment of the divine Word, Justin identified the new Law/covenant (Sacraments) with Christ. In Justin, the phrase NC was further extended to refer to Christian baptism. (2) Justin's notion of the NC, especially his identification of the NC with Christ, can be explained better by assuming that Justin's interpretation of the NC of Jeremiah and the related OT texts were rooted in Jewish textual and exegetical traditions. Among such traditions, the key OT texts for Justin's interpretation of Jeremiah 31(38).31-32 and his notion of the NC were the Hebraizing reading of Jeremiah 31.19 (MT) in a Jewish recension, the

⁵⁹⁵ As we have discussed in Excursus, Philo's identification of the covenant with the Lord in *Mut.* 57-58 would not be directly related to Justin's identification of the NC with Christ, since Philo makes this identification based on his interpretation of Gen 17.4a; in Justin, this verse apparently plays no part in his notion of the NC.

Midrashic tradition on the water of Marah transmitted through the PT tradition, and the prophetic reference to the three Eucharistic elements in LXX Exodus 23.25 and Isaiah 33.15-17. In other words, Justin's recognition of the theme of the coming/going out of תורה/תורה in Jeremiah 31.19 (MT), Isaiah 2.3 and 51.4 assisted him to equate the new Law in Isaiah with the NC of Jeremiah, while the Jewish metaphor of the 'tree' and 'water' as the Torah⁵⁹⁶ would have guided Justin to identify the new Law/covenant (Sacrament) with Christ, the Messiah.

B. Implications

These results reveal at least three implications. Firstly, the present study has demonstrated that Justin's interpretation of the NC of Jeremiah and his use of the related OT texts are indebted to preceding textual and exegetical traditions both Jewish and Christian. For the better understanding of Justin's exegesis and his views of the key theological concepts derived from the OT, therefore, it is often very helpful to extend our scope to the parallels even in Jewish sources.⁵⁹⁷

Secondly, the findings of this study have shown that Justin's use of Jeremiah 31.31-32 and his OT citations in *Dialogue* 86 were closely related to his identification of the new Law/covenant as Christ. As far as his uses of the NC text and the OT material in *Dialogue* 86 are concerned, the alterations and combinations of the OT texts seem to have been mainly the results of Justin's reworking of the OT/source material, which would have been current among both in Jewish and Christian circles. Viewed from the perspective of the testimony hypothesis, Justin's source material would have included Jewish influence even in its upper layer. Moreover, these findings might suggest that Justin at times directly used the textual and exegetical traditions of the Hebrew Bible/OT (Jewish

⁵⁹⁶ Together with LXX Jeremiah 11.19's association of 'tree' with 'bread', and the appearance of 'bread, water, and wine' in LXX Exodus 23.25.

⁵⁹⁷ For example, this study has shown that the identification of the 'ruler's staff' with the 'covenant' in 4Q252 may shed light on Justin's identification of the NC with Christ.

recensions and the Targumic traditions) other than LXX, even though he highly respected the LXX translations.

Thirdly, Justin's exegetical methods can be understood as ramifications of the Jewish exegetical traditions in the Second Temple period and beyond. He combined some OT texts based on the common elements found in those texts; such common elements were often the key theological terms such as the messianic symbols and the metaphors of the Torah. Moreover, his subtle technique of combining the OT texts, methods similar to those found in Jewish sources,⁵⁹⁸ also indicates that he was enough acquainted with Jewish traditions to imitate their exegetical practices in his works. Justin would have learned some Jewish traditions through Christian sources. However, this study has also attempted to show that Justin's interpretation of the OT included traits of his learning them directly from the contemporary Jewish sources. Thus our findings suggest that even in the middle of the second century, Christianity remained in contact with Judaism; the partings of the two religions would have been rather a lengthy and intricate process.

C. For further enquiries

The present study focused on Justin Martyr's use of Jeremiah 31.31-32 and his notion of the NC. With this narrowly scoped research, one can hardly make a contribution which may change the landscape of the study on Justin Martyr's use of the OT. In many respects, this study owes greatly to the findings and suggestions made by the pioneers and predecessors. Nevertheless, it could still make a few suggestions to facilitate further enquiries into this area of the Justin Martyr scholarship.

Firstly, the Scripture index search of Jeremiah 31(38).31-34 and the word study of *Διαθήκη/testamentum* in the second-century Christian fathers undertaken in this

⁵⁹⁸ And in some early Christian documents as well.

study should be refined by the investigations of the reception history of related OT texts and theological terms. For the better understanding of the early Christian concepts of the ‘covenant’, it will be beneficial to widen the scope to include other OT texts, such as Isaiah 2.3/Micah 4.2 and Psalm 110(109), and the word studies of the key Scriptural terms, such as νόμος and σοφία.

Secondly, this study has focused on Justin’s dependence on Jewish textual and exegetical traditions, but it does not of course claim that the influence of early Christian documents is less significant. Perhaps the comparison between the Pauline texts and Justin will be promising. Justin’s interpretations of some OT texts discussed in this study occasionally show similarities with the Pauline uses of the OT.

Finally, this study has attempted to demonstrate that Justin had a cultivated understanding of the OT covenant—an important term for the theology/-ies of the OT Scriptures. The divine covenant in the OT is the oath/promise given to the people of the covenant often with the clear sign of the divine presence. Accordingly, it was in the presence of Christ that Justin found one important continuous element between the old covenant and the new. In his view, this pre-existent Logos conversed with Moses at Sinai. Hence the presence of the divine Logos in the Eucharistic rite was one of the most important proofs of his argument that Christians were the new Israel. This study concerned on a small segment of Justin’s knowledge of the OT Scriptures and his exegetical practices. Further enquiries into Justin’s interpretation of the OT should help us to better understand why the Jewish Scriptures were indispensable for his faith and practices.

Appendix:

Classifications of the usage of διαθήκη/*testamentum*

This appendix is the results of my word studies of the term διαθήκη/*testamentum* in Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullianus, and Clement of Alexandria, presented in the form of the classifications of the meanings/referents of the term.⁵⁹⁹

1. Classification of διαθήκη in Justin Martyr

- I. Covenant with the Patriarchs: *Dial.* 126.2 (Exod 6.2-4)⁶⁰⁰
- II. Sinai covenant/Mosaic Law⁶⁰¹
 - A. Covenant that is still binding in Trypho's view: *Dial.* 10.4
 - B. Covenant given with fear and trembling: *Dial.* 67.9
- III. Covenant for Gentile Christians predicted in the OT
 - A. 'Everlasting covenant' identical with the new⁶⁰²
 - B. Covenant established by sacrifice: *Dial.* 22.7 (Psa 50[49].5)
 - C. Covenant for the Gentiles (not for the proselytes)⁶⁰³
 - D. Covenant which Jews failed to recognize: *Dial.* 123.4
- IV. New Covenant (Jer 31[38].31)
 - A. NC in antithesis to the old/Sinai covenant: *Dial.* 67.9-10
 - B. New dispensation: *Dial.* 51.3
 - C. NC identical with new Law: *Dial.* 34.1
 - D. NC identical with new Law and Christ⁶⁰⁴

⁵⁹⁹ For the indices used for these word studies, see ch. 3 'Jeremiah's new covenant in early Fathers after the time of Justin', p. 76 n. 5.

⁶⁰⁰ The OT verses in parentheses indicate that the term διαθήκη appears in the OT quotations.

⁶⁰¹ *Dial.* 22.9 (Psa 50[49].16).

⁶⁰² *Dial.* 14.4 (Isa 55.3-5); *Dial.* 118.3.

⁶⁰³ *Dial.* 26.2, 65.4 (Isa 42.6); *Dial.* 122.3 (Isa 42.6); *Dial.* 123.1

⁶⁰⁴ *Dial.* 11.2-4; 24.1-2; 43.1; 118.3; 122.5.

2. Classification of διαθήκη/testamentum in Irenaeus

- I. Covenant between Ialdabaoth and Abraham in Gnostic myth: *AH* 1.30.10
- II. Old covenants
 - A. Covenant of circumcision made with Abraham (Gen 17)⁶⁰⁵
 - B. Promise to Abraham in Gen 12, 15, and 17 (fulfilled by Christ)⁶⁰⁶
 - C. First covenant—the Sinai covenant⁶⁰⁷
 - D. Ark of the covenant: *AH* 1.18.4; 2.24.3
- III. Several covenants
 - A. Four covenants (covenants with Adam, Noah, Moses, and Gospel): *AH* 3.11.8
 - 1. Covenant with Noah: *Epideix.* 22
 - 2. Covenant with Abraham: *Epideix.* 24
 - 3. Sinai covenant (Psa 132.12): *Epideix.* 64
 - 4. New covenant (Jer 31.31): *Epideix.* 90, 91
 - B. By the same author: *AH* 1.10.3; 3.12.12
- IV. Covenant of Christ (NC)⁶⁰⁸
 - A. New covenant prophesied by the prophets⁶⁰⁹
 - B. Gospel⁶¹⁰
 - 1. Book of the canonical Gospel: *AH* 5.34.1
 - C. Characterized with Liberty: *AH* 3.12.14; 4.16.5; 4.33.14
 - D. ‘Citizens of the new covenant’: *AH* 3.12.5
 - E. Cup of the Eucharistic rite: *AH* 4.17.5; *AH.* 5.33.1
- VI. Old covenant and new in contrast: two covenants before Christ and after
 - A. Two covenants in concord: *AH* 4.12.3; 4.15.2
 - B. Two covenants from one God: *AH* 4.9.3; 4.32.1; 4.32.2
 - C. New covenant foretold by the law: *AH* 4.34.2

⁶⁰⁵ *AH* 3.12.10-11; 4.16.1; 4.25.1.

⁶⁰⁶ *AH* 3.10.2 (Luke 1.72-75); *AH* 3.12.3 (Acts 3.25).

⁶⁰⁷ *AH* 3.12.15; 4.8.3 (Deut 33.9); *AH* 4.11.3; 4.16.2 (Deut 5.2); *AH* 4.16.3.

⁶⁰⁸ *AH* 3.17.2.

⁶⁰⁹ *AH* 4.9.3; 4.17.1; 4.34.3; 4.34.4 (Isa 2.3-4).

⁶¹⁰ *AH* 3.10.5; 3.12.11; 4.8.3; 4.28.2; 5.9.4; *Epideix.* 8.

3. Classification of *testamentum* in Tertullian

- I. Testament/will in a secular legal sense: *Apol.* 15.1; *Marc.* 5.4.1-2
- II. Divine revelation/testament: *Marc.* 5.4.8
 - A. Divine word: *Marc.* 3.14.3; *Pud.* 18.6 (Ps 50 [49].16-18)
- III. Divine revelation/testament before Christ: *Cast.* 10.4
 - A. Old testament:
 - 1. Old testament to Abraham sealed with circumcision: *Monog.* 6.2
 - 2. Mosaic Law, Sinai Covenant:⁶¹¹
 - 3. 'Ark of covenant': *Iud.* 4.8; *Marc.* 4.12.3; 4.13.4; *Cor.* 9.1
 - 4. Entire Old Testament scriptures rejected by Marcion: *Marc.* 4.6.1; 5.5.10
 - B. Prophecy of the new/eternal testament⁶¹²
 - 1. Prophecy of new laws/testaments (plural): *Marc.* 4.1.8
 - 2. 'Covenant' predicted in Daniel: *Iud.* 8.6 (Dan 9.27)
- IV. Divine revelation/testament after Christ
 - A. Gospel of Christ:⁶¹³
 - 1. Testament sealed with the blood of Christ: *Marc.* 4.40.4 (Luke 22.20)
 - 2. New Testament unsealed by the apostles: *Res.* 39.1
 - B. Testament of the apostles: *Praescr.* 37.5
 - 1. Divine word spiritually engraved in human hearts: *Marc.* 5.11.4 (2 Cor 3.6)
 - 2. Testament making the gentiles into the heirs of the promise (Eph 2)⁶¹⁴
 - C. Gospels and Apostles (NT Scriptures): *Prax.* 15.1
 - D. Sacraments: *Marc.* 4.40.4 (Luke 22.20)
 - 1. New law, spiritual circumcision and sacrifice: *Iud.* 6.1-2
- V. Two testaments
 - A. Ancient law and new law: *Iud.* 9.18
 - B. Law and Gospel: *Marc.* 3.14.3

⁶¹¹ *Res.* 39.1; *Marc.* 4.1.6 (Jer 31.32); 4.22.3; 5.5.10; 5.11.5; *Ieiun.* 11.1; 14.1; *Pud.* 11.3

⁶¹² *Marc.* 4.1.6 (Jer 31.31; Isa 55.3); 4.9.3; 4.14.2 (Psa 45.1)

⁶¹³ *Iud.* 7.1; *Orat.* 1.1; *Praescr.* 30.9; *Marc.* 5.11.5; *Prax.* 31.1; *Pud.* 6.5, 12.10.

⁶¹⁴ *Marc.* 5.11.13; 5.17.12-13.

- C. The old testament and the new: *Marc* 4.6.1; 5.4.8; *Prax.* 20.2
- D. Either testament/each of the two testaments: *Monog.* 6.3; *Pud.* 1.5

4. Classification of διαθήκη in Clement of Alexandria

- I. Covenant with an implication of covenantal relationship between God and the heirs
 - A. Excluding those who participate in idolatry: *Prot.* (2)23.2 (Eph 2.12)
 - B. Covenant made with many nations: *Str.* 1.(21)125.5 (Dan 9.27)
- II. Will/Testament in legal sense: *Str.* 5.(8)55.4
- III. One divine covenant with different appearances
 - A. One, eternal covenant
 - 1. Everlasting covenant with eternal blessing: *Prot.* (10)94.1
 - 2. Only covenant of salvation conceived as different through different generations⁶¹⁵
 - 3. 'Our covenant' leading Jews and Christians to live in righteousness⁶¹⁶
 - B. Different covenants including Greek philosophy: *Str.* 6.(5)42.2; (8)64.4
 - C. Two covenants (Law and Gospel) by one God
 - 1. Reveal one God: *Str.* 2.(6)28.6
 - 2. Given by the same God: *Str.* 6.(5)42.1
- IV. Divine revelations/oracles/teachings:⁶¹⁷
 - A. Old covenants; covenants before the Advent of Christ
 - 1. Covenant before/by the time of Moses
 - a. Covenant of the angels; natural order: *Ecl.* 51.1
 - b. Covenant for Abraham, in the quotation from Gen 17.2: *Paed.* 1.(7)56.3
 - c. Four ancient covenants with Adam, Noah, Abraham, and Moses⁶¹⁸
 - 2. Sinai Covenant, Mosaic Law, Torah⁶¹⁹
 - a. 'First covenant' for the Jews: *Paed.* 1.(6)33.4

⁶¹⁵ *Str.* 6.(13)106.3; 7.(17)107.5.

⁶¹⁶ *Str.* 2.(10)47.3.

⁶¹⁷ *Str.* 7.(12)69.5.

⁶¹⁸ *Str.* 5.(6)34.4-5; *Ecl.* 51.1.

⁶¹⁹ *Paed.* 1.(9)86.1 (LXX Psalms 77.8, 10); *Str.* 4.(6)32.5 (LXX Psalms 77.36-37); *Str.* 6.(8)63.2-3, *Ecl.* 43.1.

- b. 'Old covenant' for the old people: *Paed.* 1. (7)59.1
 - c. In contrast with the moral teachings in the Gospel: *Str.* 3.(12)82.4
 - d. Torah for the Jews, like philosophy for the Greeks⁶²⁰
 - e. Ten Commandments: *Str.* 7.(14)88.2
 - 3. Revelations before the coming of Christ
 - a. 'Oracle of the old economy': *Str.* 5.(8)55.3-4
 - b. Fulfilled and expounded in the coming of Christ⁶²¹
 - c. Beneficial to the apostles and to the Gentile Christians: *Ecl.* 59.1
 - d. Old economy before the Paraclete is active in the Church: *Exc.* (1)24.2
 - B. New covenant/Gospel of Christ: *Str.* 2.(10)47.3; *Str.* 4.(21)130.4; 4.(23)149.5
 - 1. New covenant prophesied in OT⁶²²
 - a. Written in the 'old letter': *Paed.* 1.(7)59.2
 - 2. New teaching(s) given by Christ⁶²³
 - a. Giving of new covenant identical with coming of the Word⁶²⁴
 - b. Directing the new people of covenant: *Paed.* 1.(5)20.2
 - c. A command in the sermon on the mount: *Str.* 3.(11)71.3
 - d. Its ethical standard higher is than the Law: *Str.* 3.(18)108.2
 - e. At the cost of His ultimate sacrifice: *Div.* 37.4
 - 3. New worship: *Str.* 6.(5)41.4-7
 - a. Eucharist: *Div.* 3.6
 - C. Spiritual blessing promised to the faithful
 - 1. 'The covenant of Israel' as an inheritance to the Gentile Christians⁶²⁵
- V. Direct and Indirect Revelations
- A. Greek philosophy (indirect revelation) as a covenant for Greeks⁶²⁶
 - B. Direct revelation in contrast with Greek philosophy: *Str.* 1.(5)28.2
 - C. Christian Bible (in metaphorical sense)
 - 1. Old Testament before Christ
 - a. Teachings of Proverb: *Str.* 3.(6)54.4

⁶²⁰ *Str.* 4.(16)100.1-2 (2 Cor 3.14).

⁶²¹ *Str.* 4.(21)130.4; 4.(21)134.2-4.

⁶²² *Str.* 1.(21)125.5 (Dan 9.27); 6.(6)44.2 (Isa 49.7-9); 6.(5)41.5 (Jer 31.31-34)

⁶²³ *Str.* 3.(18)108.2; 4.(23)149.5; 6.(15)125.3.

⁶²⁴ *Paed.* 1.(7)59.1-2.

⁶²⁵ *Str.* 2.(6)29.1, 2.

⁶²⁶ *Str.* 6.(8)67.1.

- b. Revelations in the old economy/OT⁶²⁷
 - c. Oracles given to the old people under the old economy: *Str.* 5.(10)62.2
- 2. Old and new testaments⁶²⁸
 - a. Identical with the Scriptures: *Str.* 5.(13)85.1
 - b. Containing teachings leading to true knowledge: *Str.* 6.(15)120.3
 - c. Record of examples to be followed: *Str.* 6.(17)161.5
 - d. Harmony of the two testaments as the ecclesiastical rule: *Str.* 6.(15)125.2-3

IV. God himself as Covenant

- A. Originator of the universe based on LXX Gen 17.4: *Str.* 1.(29)182.2

⁶²⁷ *Str.* 4.(21)134.2-4; 5.(10)61.1.

⁶²⁸ *Str.* 1.(5)28.2, (9)44.3; 5.(1)3.3, (6)38.5, (16)133.5; 7.(6)34.2, (16)100.5.

Abbreviations

A. Works of Justin Martyr

For the texts of Justin's *Dial.* and *1 & 2 Apol.*, I have consistently used Marcovich's editions. I have often consulted the other abbreviated titles.

<i>Dial.</i>	<i>Dialogue with Trypho: Iustini Martyris, Dialogus cum Tryphone</i> , ed. M. Marcovich (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997)
A	Codex A: <i>Parisinus</i> gr. 450 (dated 1363 CE)
a	Codex a: <i>Musei Britannici</i> Loan 36/13 (dated 1541 CE)
<i>1 & 2 Apol.</i>	<i>First and Second Apologies: Iustini Martyris, Apologiae pro Christianis</i> , ed. M. Marcovich (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994)
Barnard, <i>1 & 2 Apol.</i>	St. Justin Martyr, <i>The First and Second Apologies</i> , trans. L. W. Barnard, ACW 56 (New York: Paulist, 1997)
Falls & Halton, <i>Dial.</i>	St. Justin Martyr, <i>Dialogue with Trypho</i> , trans. T. B. Falls, rev. T. P. Halton, ed. M. Slusser (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2003)
Marcovich, 'Indices', <i>Dial.</i>	<i>Dialogue with Trypho: Iustini Martyris, Dialogus cum Tryphone</i> , ed. M. Marcovich (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997), 319-39
Marcovich, 'Indices', <i>1 & 2 Apol.</i>	<i>First and Second Apologies: Iustini Martyris, Apologiae pro Christianis</i> , ed. M. Marcovich (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), 171-211
Williams, <i>Dial.</i>	Justin Martyr, <i>The Dialogue with Trypho</i> . trans. A. L. Williams (London: S.P.C.K., 1930)

B. Bible and versions

For the texts of the Hebrew Bible, its versions, and the NT, I have used the titles below. ET of the Hebrew Bible and the NT Scriptures are taken from NRSV, unless otherwise noted.

BHS	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> , 4th edn. eds. K. Ellinger and W. Rudolph (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1990)
CG	Cairo Geniza Palestinian Targum Manuscript: M. L. Klein (ed.), <i>Genizah Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch</i> , 2 vols. (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1986)
CG (F)	MS Heb. e 43, folio 61-64, Oxford Bodleian Library: <i>ibid.</i> , 1: 260-271
CG (U)	MS 608 (ENA 656), folio 1, Jewish Theological Seminary (Exod 19.7-14): <i>ibid.</i> , 1:258-259
Field	F. Field (ed.), <i>Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt; Sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta</i> , 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1875)
Frg Tg	The <i>Fragmentary Targum</i>
Frg Tg (J)	MS 605 (ENA 2587), folios 6-7, Jewish Theological Seminary (Exod 19.1-8): <i>The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch According to their Extant Sources</i> , vol. 1. ed.

	M. L. Klein (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980), 237-238
	MS 605 (ENA 2587), folios 30, Jewish Theological Seminary (Exod 20.2-3, 7-9): <i>Genizah Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch</i> , 2 vols. ed. M. L. Klein (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1986), 1:276-277
Frg Tg (P)	Hébr. 110, Paris-Bibliothèque nationale: <i>The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch According to their Extant Sources</i> , vol. 1. ed. M. L. Klein (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980), 43-125
Frg Tg (V)	Ebr. 440, Vatican Library: <i>ibid.</i> , 126-235
Jon	<i>Jonathan to the Prophets: The Bible in Aramaic</i> , vol. 2-3: <i>The Former Prophets-The Latter Prophets According to Targum Jonathan</i> . ed. A. Sperber (Leiden: Brill, 1959-1962)
LXX	The Septuagint: <i>Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum</i> , Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931-)
MT	The Masoretic Text of the Hebrew Bible
NA ²⁷	Nestle-Aland, <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> , 27th edn. eds. K. Aland, et al. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Biblegesellschaft, 1993)
Neof	<i>Neofiti 1: Targum Palestinense MS de la Bibliotheca Vaticana</i> , 5 vols. ed. A. Díez Macho (Madrid-Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968-1978)
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
Onq	<i>Onkelos: The Bible in Aramaic</i> , vol. 1: <i>The Pentateuch According to Targum Onkelos</i> , ed. A. Sperber (Leiden: Brill, 1959)
Ps-Jon	<i>Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance</i> , eds. E. G. Clarke, W. E. Aufrecht, J. C. Hurd, and F. Spitzer (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav Publishing House, 1984)
PT	The Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch
Rahlfs, LXX	A. Rahlfs, ed., <i>Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graece</i> , 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935 [repr. 1979])
Sam	The Samaritan Pentateuch: <i>Der Hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner</i> , ed. A. F. von Gall (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1918)
Tg	The Aramaic Targum
Vulg.	The Vulgate: R. Weber, et al. (eds.), <i>Biblia Sacra, iuxta Vulgatam Versionem</i> , 3rd edn. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983)
α´	The Version of Aquila
θ´	The Version of Theodotion
σ´	The Version of Symmachus
8HevXIIgr	<i>The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahar Hever (8HevXIIgr)</i> , ed. E. Tov, DJD 8 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990)

C. Works of Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria

For early Christian authors after the time of Justin, I have used the following editions.

Irenaeus	Irenaeus of Lyon
----------	------------------

<i>AH</i>	<i>Adversus haereses</i> : A. Rousseau, and L. Doutreleau (eds. & trans.), <i>Irénée de Lyon: Contre les hérésies</i> , book 1, SC 263, 264 (Paris: Cerf, 1979); book 2, SC 293, 294 (Paris: Cerf, 1982); book 3, SC 210, 211 (Paris: Cerf, 1974). A. Rousseau, B. Hemmerdinger, L. Doutreleau, and C. Mercier (eds. & trans.), <i>Irénée de Lyon: Contre Les Hérésies</i> , book 4, SC 100 (Paris: Cerf, 1965); A. Rousseau, B. Hemmerdinger, and L. Doutreleau, (eds. & trans.), <i>Irénée de Lyon: Contre Les Hérésies</i> , book 5, SC 152, 153 (Paris: Cerf, 1969)
<i>Epideix.</i>	<i>Epideixis tou apostolikou kerygmatos (The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching)</i>
Tertullian	Tertullian, <i>Opera</i> , part 1: <i>Opera Catholica, Adversus Marcionem</i> ; <i>Opera</i> , pars 2: <i>Opera Montanistica</i> , CCSL 1 and 2 (Turnholti: Brepols Editores Pontificii, 1954)
<i>Adv. Valent.</i>	<i>Adversus Valentinianos</i>
<i>An.</i>	<i>De anima</i>
<i>Apol.</i>	<i>Apologeticum</i>
<i>Cast.</i>	<i>De exhortatione castitatis</i>
<i>Iud.</i>	<i>Adversus Iudaeus</i> : H. Tränkle (ed.), <i>Q. S. F. Tertulliani, Adversus Iudaeos: Mit Einleitung und kritischem Kommentar</i> (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1964)
<i>Ieiun.</i>	<i>De ieiunio aduersus psychicos</i>
<i>Marc.</i>	<i>Adversus Marcionem</i> : E. Evans (ed. & trans.), <i>Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem</i> , 2 vols. Oxford Early Christian Texts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972)
<i>Mong.</i>	<i>De monogamia</i>
<i>Orat.</i>	<i>De oratione</i>
<i>Pat.</i>	<i>De patientia</i>
<i>Praescr.</i>	<i>De praescriptione haereticorum</i>
<i>Prax.</i>	<i>Adversus Praxean</i>
<i>Pud.</i>	<i>De pudicitia</i>
<i>Res.</i>	<i>De resurrectione mortuorum</i>
<i>Scorp.</i>	<i>Scorpiace</i>
<i>Val.</i>	<i>Adversus Valentinianos</i>
Clement of Alexandria	
<i>Ecl.</i>	<i>Eclogae ex scripturis prophetis</i> : O. Stählin (ed.), GCS 17 (Berlin: Akademie, 1909), 135-55
<i>Exc.</i>	<i>Excerpta ex scriptis Theodoti</i> : F. Sagnard (ed.), SC 23 (Paris: Cerf, 1948)
<i>Paed.</i>	<i>Paedagogus</i> : M. Harl (ed.), SC 70 (Paris: Cerf, 1960)
<i>Prot.</i>	<i>Protreptikos</i> : C. Mondésert (ed.), SC 2 (Paris: Cerf, 1949)
<i>Div.</i>	<i>Quis dives salvetur</i> : O. Stählin (ed.), GCS 17 (Berlin: Akademie, 1909), 157-191
<i>Str.</i>	<i>Stromateis</i> : for book 1, M. Caster (ed.), SC 30; for book 2, C. Mondésert (ed.), SC 38; for book 3, O. Stählin (ed.), GCS 15:195-247; for book 4, C. Mondésert (ed.), SC 463; for book 5, P. Voulet (ed.), SC 278; for book 6, P. Descourtieux (ed.), SC 446; A. Le Boulluec (ed.), SC 428; for book 8, O. Stählin (ed.), GCS 17:80-102

D. Non-Biblical primary sources⁶²⁹

For non-biblical primary sources, I have used the following editions and translations. For some of the abbreviated titles below, the bibliographical data should be supplied in the footnotes.

ANF	<i>Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325</i> . 10 vols. eds. A. C. Coxe, J. Donaldson, and A. Roberts (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994)
Arakh.	<i>Arakhin</i>
Arist. Apol.	Aristides of Athens, <i>Apology</i> : Pouderon, Bernard, and Marie-Joseph Pierre (eds. & trans.), <i>Aristides: Apologie</i> , SC 470 (Paris: Cerf, 2003)
b.	The Talmud Bavli
Barn.	<i>The Epistle of Barnabas</i>
Ber.	<i>Berakhot</i>
CD	The Cairo Damascus Document: C. Rabin (ed.), <i>The Zadokite Documents</i> (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954)
CDSSE	G. Vermes, <i>The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English</i> , rev. edn. (London: Penguin, 2004)
Did.	<i>Didache (The Teachings of the Twelve Apostles)</i>
Diog.	<i>The Letter of Diognetus</i>
DSSB	<i>The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible</i> , eds. & trans. M. Abegg, P. Flint, and E. Ulrich (New York: Harper Collins, 1999)
DSSR	<i>The Dead Sea Scroll Reader</i> , 6 vols. eds. D. W. Parry and E. Tov (Leiden: Brill, 2004-2005)
Ehrman, AF	B. D. Ehrman (ed.) <i>The Apostolic Fathers</i> , 2 vols. LCL 24, 25 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003)
HE	Eusebius of Caesaria, <i>Historia Ecclesiastica</i> : Eusebius, <i>The Ecclesiastical History</i> . 2 vols. eds. & trans. K. Lake and J. E. L. Oulton, LCL 153; 265 (London: William Heinemann, 1932)
Herm.	<i>The Shepherd of Hermas</i>
Holmes, AF	<i>The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translation of their Writings</i> , 2nd edn. eds. & trans. J. B. Lightfoot and J. R. Harmer, rev. M. W. Holmes (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992)
Ign.	Ignatius of Antioch
Eph.	<i>To the Ephesians</i>
Phil.	<i>To the Philadelphians</i>
Rom.	<i>To the Romans</i>
Smyrn.	<i>To the Smyrneans</i>
Jub.	<i>The Book of Jubilees</i> , trans. J. C. VanderKam, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 511 (Louvain: Peeters, 1989)
KP	<i>The Kerygma Petri</i> : M. Cambe (ed.), <i>Kerygma Petri: Textus et commentarius</i> , CCSA 15 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003)
LAB	Pseudo-Philo, <i>Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum</i> : Daniel J. Harrington (ed.), <i>Pseudo-Philon, Les Antiquités Bibliques</i> , part 1: <i>Introduction et texte critiques</i> , SC 229 (Paris: Cerf, 1976)
m.	The Mishnah
Makk.	<i>Makkot</i>

⁶²⁹ Early Christian documents except for the works of Justin Martyr, Irenaeus of Lyon, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria; Jewish Sources in the Second Temple period; Rabbinic sources; the tractates of the Mishnah.

<i>Meg.</i>	<i>Megillah</i>
<i>Mek. RI.</i>	<i>Mekhilta' de-Rabbi Yishma'e'l</i> : J. Z. Lauterbach (ed.), <i>Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael</i> , 3 vols. (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1933-1935)
<i>Mek. RSbY.</i>	<i>Mekhilta' de-Rabbi Shim'on bar Yoh'ai</i> : J. N. Epstein and E. Z. Melamed (eds.), <i>Mekhilta d'Rabbi Šim'on b. Jochai</i> (Jerusalem: Sumptibus Mekize Nirdamim, 1955)
<i>Melito, Pasch.</i>	Melito of Sardis, <i>Peri Pascha</i> : H. S. George (ed. & trans.), <i>Melito of Sardis: On Pascha and Fragments</i> (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979), 1-61
<i>Philo</i>	<i>Philo</i> , I-X, eds. & trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, LCL 226, 227, 247, 261, 279, 285, 320, 341, 363, 379 (London: William Heinemann, 1929-1967)
<i>Abr.</i>	<i>De Abrahamo</i>
<i>Det.</i>	<i>Quod Deterius Potiori insidiari solet</i>
<i>Leg.</i>	<i>Legum allegoriae</i>
<i>Migr.</i>	<i>De migration Abrahami</i>
<i>Mos.</i>	<i>De vita Mosis</i>
<i>Mut.</i>	<i>De mutatione nominum</i>
<i>Plant.</i>	<i>De plantatione</i>
<i>QE</i>	<i>Questiones et solutiones in Exodum</i>
<i>Sobr.</i>	<i>De sobrietate</i>
<i>Somn.</i>	<i>De somniis</i>
<i>Spec.</i>	<i>De specialibus legibus</i>
<i>Philo (Sup)</i>	<i>Philo, Supplement, I-II</i> , ed. & trans. R. Marcus, LCL 380, 401 (London: William Heinemann, 1953)
<i>QG</i>	<i>Questiones et solutions in Genesin</i>
<i>Pol. Phil.</i>	Polycarp, <i>The Letter to the Philippians</i>
<i>Pss. Sol.</i>	<i>The Psalms of Solomon</i>
<i>Roš Haš.</i>	<i>Rosh HaShanah</i>
Schneemelcher, <i>NTA</i>	E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher (eds.), <i>New Testament Apocrypha</i> , rev. edn. 2 vols. trans. R. McL. Wilson (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1991-1992)
<i>Shabb.</i>	<i>Shabbat</i>
<i>Sim.</i>	<i>Simili (Parables) in the Shepherd of Hermas</i>
<i>Sukk.</i>	<i>Sukkah</i>
<i>t.</i>	The Tesefta
<i>Vis.</i>	<i>Visions in The Shepherd of Hermas</i>
<i>y.</i>	The Talmud Yerushalmi
<i>1 Cl.</i>	<i>First Letter of Clement</i>
1QH	1QHodayot (Thanksgiving Psalms)
4Q252	4QCommentary on Genesis A

E. Other abbreviations: reference Works; journals; series; others

AB	The Anchor Bible
ABD	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> , 6 vols. eds. D. N. Freedman, et al. (New York: Doubleday, 1992)
ACW	Ancient Christian Writers
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AnBib	Analecta Biblica

ArBib	The Aramaic Bible, 19 vols. eds. M. McNamara, K. J. Cathcart, and M. Maher (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987-2004)
BC	Book of the Covenant (in Jeremiah 30-31 [37-38])
BDAG	W. Bauer, F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich (eds.), <i>Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , 3rd edn. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1999)
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>BiPa</i>	<i>Biblia Patristica: Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique</i> (Paris: Centre d'analyse et de documentation Patristique, 1975-)
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i>
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CCSA	Corpus Christianorum, Series apocryphorum
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina
CHJ	The Cambridge History of Judaism, vols. 1- (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984-)
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
<i>DCH</i>	The <i>Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> , ed. D. J. A. Clines (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993-)
<i>DECL</i>	<i>Dictionary of Early Christian Literature</i> , eds. S. Döpp and W. Geerlings, trans. M. O'Connell (New York: Crossroad, 2000)
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951-)
<i>DLNTD</i>	<i>Dictionary of the Later New Testament and Its Developments</i> , eds. R. P. Martin and P. H. Davids (Leicester: IVP, 1997)
<i>EDNT</i>	Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament, 3 vols. eds. H. Balz and G. Schneider (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990-93 [the original German edition is published in 1978-80])
<i>EDSS</i>	<i>Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> , 2 vols. eds. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)
<i>EEC</i>	<i>Encyclopedia of the Early Church</i> , 2 vols. ed. A. Di Berardino, trans. A. Walford (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1992)
<i>EJ²</i>	<i>Encyclopaedia Judaica</i> , 2nd ed., 22 vols. eds. F. Skolnik and M. Berenbaum (New York: Thomson Gale, 2007)
FC	The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1947-)
Ferguson, <i>EEC²</i>	E. Ferguson (ed.), <i>Encyclopedia of Early Christianity</i> , 2nd edn. (New York: Garland, 1999)
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte
<i>HALOT</i>	L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner (eds.), <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> , Study Edition. 2 vols. rev. J. J. Stamm, trans. M. E. J. Richardson. (Leiden: Brill, 2001)
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
Hatch & Redpath	E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath (eds.), <i>A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament</i> , 2nd edn. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998)
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>IBD</i>	The <i>Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i> , 4 vols. eds. G. A. Buttrick, et al. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962)
ICC	The International Critical Commentary

Jastrow	M. Jastrow (ed.), <i>Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talum Babli and Yerushalami, and the Midrashic Literatur</i> , 2nd edn. (New York, 1903)
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
Joüon-Muraoka	P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, <i>A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew</i> , 2 vols., Subsidia Biblica 14 (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991)
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i> , New Series
<i>JQR O.S.</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i> , Old Series
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Studies of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
Kaufman, Sokoloff, & Cook	S. A. Kaufman, M. Sokoloff, and E. M. Cook (eds.), <i>A Key-Word-in-Context Concordance to Targum Neofiti: A Guide to the Complete Palestinian Aramaic Text of the Torah</i> (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993)
LCC	The Library of Christian Classics. 13 vols. eds. John Baillie, et al. (London: SCM Press, 1953-1969)
LCL	The Loeb Classical Library
Levy, CWT	J. Levy (ed.), <i>Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim und einen grossen Theil des rabbinischen Schriftthums</i> , 2 vols. (Leipzig: Baumgärtner, 1867)
LSJ	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. S. Jones (eds.), <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> , 9th edn. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940)
Lust, Eynikel & Hauspie	J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie (eds.), <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint</i> , rev. edn. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003)
Moulton & Milligan	Moulton, J. H., and G. Milligan (eds.), <i>Vocabulary of the Greek Testament</i> (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1929)
Muraoka, <i>GELS</i>	T. Muraoka (ed.), <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint</i> (Louvain: Peeters, 2009)
NC	New Covenant
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>ODCC</i>	The <i>Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church</i> , 3rd edn. eds. F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)
<i>ODJR</i>	The <i>Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion</i> , eds. R. J. Z. Werblowsky and G. Wigoder (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)
<i>OTP</i>	The <i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> , 2 vols. ed. J. H. Charlesworth (New York: Double Day, 1983-1985)
<i>PGL</i>	<i>A Patristic Greek Lexicon</i> , ed. G. W. H. Lampe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961)
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien
PTSDSSP	J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations</i> , vols. 1- Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project

	(Tübingen/Louisville: Mohr Siebeck/Westminster John Knox Press, 1994-)
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
SaPag	Sacra Pagina Series
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SC	Sources Chrétiennes (Paris: Cerf, 1943-)
Schürer, <i>History</i>	E. Schürer, G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Black, <i>The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135): A New English Version</i> , 3 vols. (London: T&T Clark, 1973-1987)
SE	Studia Evangelica
SJT	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
SJOT	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
Sokoloff, <i>DJPA</i>	M. Sokoloff (ed.), <i>A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period</i> , 2nd edn. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002)
SP	Studia Patristica
TDNT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . 10 vols. eds. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, trans. G. W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-76)
TDOT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> , 15 vols. eds. G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren, trans. D. E. Green (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974-2006)
TLG	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae</i> : http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/inst/fontsel , accessed May 2006 through June 2011
TRE	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i> , 36 vols. eds. H. R. Baltz, et al. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1977-2004)
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
UP	University Press
VC	<i>Vigiliae christianae</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
Waltke & O'Connor	B. K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, <i>An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax</i> (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990)
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
WUNT ²	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament (2. Reihe)

Bibliography

A. Editions and translations⁶³⁰

- Bobichon, Philippe (ed.), *Justin Martyr: Dialogue avec Tryphon; Édition critique*, 2 vols. (Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2003).
- Casey, Robert Pierce (ed.), *The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria*, Studies and Documents 1 (London: Christophers, 1934).
- Caster, Marcel (ed. & trans.), *Clément d'Alexandrie: Les Stromates: Stromate 1*, SC 30 (Paris: Cerf, 1951).
- Clarke, G. W. (trans.), *The Octavius of Marcus Minucius Felix* (New York: Newman Press, 1974).
- Cohen, A. (trans.), *Ecclesiastes*, Midrash Rabbah 8 (London: Soncino, 1951).
- Descourtieux, Patrick (ed. & trans.), *Clément d'Alexandrie, Les Stromates: Stromate 6*, SC 446 (Paris: Cerf, 1999).
- Evans, Ernest (trans.), *Tertullian's Treatise against Praxeas* (London: SPCK, 1948).
- (trans.), *Tertullian's Treatise on the Resurrection* (London: SPCK, 1960).
- Ferguson, John (trans.), *Clement of Alexandria: Stromateis, Book 1 to 3*, FC 85 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press 1991).
- Harl, Marguerite (ed. & trans.), *La chaîne Palestinienne sur le Psaume 118 (Origène, Eusèbe, Didyme, Apollinaire, Athanase, Théodoret)*, part 1, SC 189 (Paris: Cerf, 1972).
- (ed.), *Clément d'Alexandrie: Le Pédagogue Livre 1*, SC 70 (Paris: Cerf, 1960).
- Kirzner, E. W., *Baba Ḳamma*, in I. Epstein (ed.), *The Babylonian Talmud: Seder Neziḳin* (London: Soncino, 1935).
- Kraft, Robert A. *Barnabas and the Didache*, in Robert M. Grant, (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary*, vol. 3 (New York: Thomas Nelson, 1965).
- Le Boulluec, Alain (ed. & trans.), *Clément d'Alexandrie: Les Stromates: Stromate 7*, SC 428 (Paris: Cerf, 1997).
- Le Déaut, Roger, *Targum du Pentateuque*, part 2: *Exode et Lévitique*, SC 256 (Paris: Cerf, 1979).
- Lindemann, Andreas, and Henning Paulsen (eds.), *Die Apostolischen Väter: Griechisch Deutsch Parallelgusgabe auf der Grundlage der Ausgaben von Franz Xaver Funk, Karl Bihlmeyer und Molly Whittaker* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1992).
- Mondésert, Cl. (ed. & trans.), *Clément d'Alexandrie: Les Stromates: Stromate 2*, SC 38 (Paris: Cerf, 1954).

⁶³⁰ The titles listed here are the editions and translations used in this study; see also *Abbreviations* A-D, pp. 245-49.

- (ed. & trans.), *Clément d'Alexandrie: Les Stromates; Stromate 4*, SC 463 (Paris: Cerf, 2001).
- (ed. & trans.), *Clément d'Alexandrie: Le Protreptique*, SC 2 (Paris: Cerf, 1949).
- Marcovich, Miroslav (ed.), *Athenagoras: Legatio pro Christianis*, PTS 31 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990).
- *Tatiani: Oratio ad Graecos*, PTS 43 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995).
- *Theophili Antiocheni: Ad Autolycum*, PTS 44 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995).
- von Otto, J. C. T., *Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Saeculi Secundi*, vol. 2; *Iustinus Philosophus et Martyr: Opera quae feruntur omnia II, Dialogus cum Tryphone*, (Wiesbaden: Martin Sändig, 1877),
- Pouderon, Bernard (ed. & trans.), *Athenagoras: Supplique au sujet des Chrétiens et sur la Résurrection des morts*, SC 379 (Paris: Cerf, 1992).
- and Marie-Joseph Pierre (eds. & trans.), *Aristide: Apologie*, SC 470 (Paris: Cerf, 2003).
- Ryle, Herbert Edward, and Montague Rhodes James (eds.), *Psalms of the Pharisees, Commonly Called the Psalms of Solomon* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1891).
- Sagnard, F. (ed. & trans.), *Clément d'Alexandrie: Extraits de Théodote*, SC 23 (Paris: Cerf, 1948).
- Schwab, Moïse, *Le Talmud de Jérusalem*, vol. 4: *Traité Soucca, Rosch ha-Schana, Taanith, Meghilla Haghiga, Moëd Qaton* (Paris: G.-P. Maisonneuve, 1932).
- Simon, M. (trans.), *Song of Songs*, Midrash Rabbah 9 (London: Soncino, 1951).
- Smyth, Joseph P. (trans.), *Irenaeus of Lyons: Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*, ACW 16 (New York: Paulist, 1952).
- Sperber, Alexander, *The Bible in Aramaic*, 4 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1959-73).
- Stählin, Otto (ed.), *Clemens Alexandrinus 2: Stromata, buch 1-4*, GCS 15 (Berlin: Akademie, 1960).
- (ed.), *Clemens Alexandrinus 3: Stromata buch 7 und 8-Excerpta ex Theodoto-Eclogae Propheticae-Quis Dives Salvetur-Fragmente*, GCS 17 (Berlin: Akademie, 1909).
- Trafton, Joseph L., 'Commentary on Genesis a (4Q252 = 4QCommGenn A = 4QPBless)', in PTSDSSP 6B, 203-17.
- Unger, Dominic J., and John J. Dillon (trans.), *Irenaeus of Lyons: Against the Heresies*, ACW 55 (New York: Newman, 1992).
- Voulet, Pierre (ed. & trans.), *Clément d'Alexandrie: Les Stromates: Stromate 5*, part 1, SC 278 (Paris: Cerf, 1981).
- Westcott, Brooke Foss, and Fenton John Anthony Hort (eds.), *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (London: Macmillan, 1956).

Wevers, John Williams, and U. Quast (eds.), *Exodus*, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum 2, part 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991).

Ziegler, Joseph (ed.), *Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae*, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum 15 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957).

——— (ed.), *Isaias*, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum 15 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967).

B. Critical works cited

Abegg, Martin, 'The Covenant of the Qumran Sectarians', in Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. de Roo (eds.), *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*, JSJSup 71 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 81-97.

Achtemeier, Paul J., Article 'Mark, Gospel of', *ABD* 4:541-57

———, Joel B. Green, and Marianne Meye Thompson, *Introducing the New Testament: Its Literature and Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001).

Aland, Kurt, and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 2nd edn., trans. Erroll F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989).

Abbl, Martin C., 'And Scripture Cannot Be Broken': *The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*, NovTSup 46 (Leiden Brill, 1999).

Alexander, Philip S., 'Jewish Aramaic Translations of Hebrew Scriptures', in Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling (eds.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity* (Assen/Maastricht, Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1988), 217-57.

———, Article 'Targum, Targumim', *ABD* 6:320-331

Allegro, John M., 'Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature', *JBL* 75 (1956), 174-87.

Allen, Leslie C., *Jeremiah: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008).

Altaner, Berthold, and Alfred Stuiber, *Patrologie: Leben, Schriften und Lehre der Kirchenväter* (Freiburg: Herder, 1966).

Andresen, Carl, *Logos und Nomos: Die Polemik des Kelsos wider das Christentum* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1955).

Attridge, Harold W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989).

——— Article 'Hebrews, Epistle to the', *ABD* 3:97

Aune, David E., 'Justin Martyr's Use of the Old Testament', *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* 9 (1966), 179-97.

- Avishur, Yitzhak, 'The Narrative of the Revelation at Sinai (Ex 19-24)', in Gershon Galil and Moshe Weinfeld (eds.), *Studies in Historical Geography and Biblical Historiography: Presented to Zecharia Kallai* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 197-214.
- Backhaus, Knut, *Der neue Bund und das Werden der Kirche: Die Diatheke-Deutung des Hebräerbriefs im Rahmen der frühchristlichen Theologiegeschichte*. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen (Neue Folge) 29 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1996).
- Article 'Bund III', *RGG*⁴ 1:1865-67
- Barnard, Leslie W., *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought* (London: Cambridge UP, 1967).
- Barnes, Timothy David, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).
- Barr, James, 'Some Semantic Notes on the Covenant', in Herbert Donner, Robert Hanhart and Rudolf Smend (eds.), *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie: Festschrift für Walther Zimmerli zum 70. Geburtstag* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 23-38.
- Barrett, C. K., *The Epistle to the Romans*, Black's New Testament Commentaries (London: A&C Black, 1971).
- *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Black's New Testament Commentary (London: A&C Black, 1968).
- Barthélemy, Dominique, *Les devanciers d'Aquila: Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophète*, VTSup 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1963).
- 'Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante', *RB* 60 (1953), 18-29.
- Becking, Bob, 'Cola, Canticles and Subcantos: The Macrostructure of Jeremiah 30-31', in *Between Fear and Freedom: Essays on the Interpretation of Jeremiah 30-31* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 49-134.
- 'Abbreviation, Expansion or Two Traditions: The Text of Jeremiah 30-31', in *Between Fear and Freedom: Essays on the Interpretation of Jeremiah 30-31* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 11-48.
- 'Jeremiah's Book of Consolation: A Textual Comparison Notes on the Masoretic Texts and the Old Greek Version of Jeremiah XXX-XXXI', *VT* 44 (1994), 145-69.
- Behm, J., Article 'Διαθήκη', *TDNT* 2:106-134
- Betz, Hans Dieter, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985).
- Article 'Corinthians, Second Epistle to the', *ABD* 1:1151-52
- Bienaimé, Germain, *Moïse et le don de l'eau dans la tradition Juive ancienne: Targum et Midrash*, AnBib 98 (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1984).
- Billings, Bradley S., 'The Disputed Words in the Lukan Institution Narrative (Luke 22:19b-20): A Sociological Answer to a Textual Problem', *JBL* 125 (2006), 507-26.
- Blackman, E. C., *Marcion and His Influence* (London: SPCK, 1948).

- Blanton, Thomas R., *Constructing a New Covenant: Discursive Strategies in the Damascus Document and Second Corinthians*, WUNT² 233 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).
- Boccaccini, Gabriele, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Partings of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).
- Bonsirven, Joseph, *Exégèse rabbinique et exégèse paulinienne* (Paris: Beauchesne et ses fils, 1939).
- Borgen, Peder, *Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo*, NovTSup 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1981).
- *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time*, NovTSup 86 (Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- Article 'Philo of Alexandria', *ABD* 5:333-42
- Boring, M. Eugene, *Mark: A Commentary* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006).
- Bornkam, G., Article 'Μυστήριον', *TDNT* 4:802-827
- Bousset, W., *Jüdisch-Christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandrien und Rom: Literarische Untersuchungen zu Philo und Clemens von Alexandria, Justin und Irenäus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 1915.
- Bovon, François, *Luke 1*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002).
- Boyarín, Daniel, 'Rethinking Jewish Christianity: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category (to Which Is Appended a Correction of My *Border Lines*)', *JQR* 99 (2009), 7-36.
- Bradshaw, Paul F., *Eucharistic Origins* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004).
- Brock, S. P., 'Lucian *redivivus*: Some Reflections on Barthélemy's Les Devanciers D'aquila', in *Studia Evangelica* 5/TU 103 (Berlin: Akademie-verlag, 1968), 176-81.
- Brooks, E. C., 'The Translation Techniques of Rufinus of Aquileia (343-411)', in *SP* 17, part 1 (Oxford: Pergamon, 1982), 357-64
- Brooke, George J., Article 'Testimonia', *ABD* 6:391-92.
- Brooke, George J. Hindy Najman and Loren T. Stuckenbruck (eds.), *The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).
- Brown, Raymond, *The Gospel According to John (I-XII): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1966).
- Brox, Norbert., *Der Hirt des Hermas* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991).
- Buis, Pierre, 'La nouvelle alliance', *VT* 18 (1968), 1-15.
- Caird, G. B., 'Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint. II', *JTS* N.S. 20 (1969), 21-40.

- Campanhausen, Hans von, *The Formation of the Christian Bible*, trans. J. A. Baker (London: A&C Black, 1972).
- Carleton Paget, James N. B., 'The Christian Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Alexandrian Tradition', in Magne Saebø, Menahem Haran and Chris Brekelmans (eds.), *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, vol. 1; *From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (until 1300)*, part 1; *Antiquity* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 478-542.
- *The Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background*, WUNT² 64 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994).
- 'The Epistle of Barnabas', in Paul Foster (ed.), *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers* (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 72-80.
- 'Jewish Christianity', in William Horbury, W. D. Davies and John Sturdy (eds.), *The Early Roman Period*, CHJ 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999), 731-75.
- *Jews, Christians and Jewish Christians in Antiquity*, WUNT 251 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).
- Chadwick, Henry, 'Justin Martyr's Defence of Christianity', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 47 (1964), 275-97.
- 'The Shorter Text of Luke XXII. 15-20', *HTR* 50 (1957), 249-58.
- Childs, Brevard S., *Exodus: A Commentary* (London: SCM Press, 1974).
- Chilton, Bruce, *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum*, JSOT Supplement Series 23 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983).
- *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes*, ArBib 11 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987).
- Chirichigno, G. C., 'The Narrative Structure of Exod 19-24', *Biblica* 68 (1987), 457-79.
- Christiansen, Ellen Juhl, *The Covenant in Judaism and Paul: A Study of Ritual Boundaries as Identity Markers*, AGJU 27 (Leiden: Brill, 1995).
- Churgin, Pinkhos, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1927).
- Clarke, Ernest G., *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Deuteronomy*, ArBib 5B (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998).
- *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Numbers*, ArBib 4 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995).
- Cohen, Naomi G., *Philo's Scriptures: Citations from the Prophets and Writings, Evidence for a Haftarah Cycle in Second Temple Judaism*, JSJSup 123 (Leiden: Brill, 2007).
- Collins, John J., *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).
- Collins, Raymond F., *First Corinthians*, SaPag 7 (Collegeville, MI: The Liturgical Press, 1999).

- Cook, Edward M., 'A New Perspective on the Language of Onqelos and Jonathan', in D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara (eds.), *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 142-56.
- Cranfield, C. E. B., *The Epistle to the Romans*, 2 vol., ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975/1979).
- *The Gospel According to St Mark*, The Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1959).
- Daniélou, Jean, *The Development of Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea*, vol. 1; *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, trans. John A. Baker (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964).
- Davidson, Robert, *Genesis 12-50*, The Cambridge Bible Commentary (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979).
- Deissmann, Adolf, *Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World*, trans. Lionel R. M. Strachan (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1927).
- Derrett, J. Duncan M., 'Ο ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΕΒΑΣΙΑΕΥΣΕΝ ΑΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΞΥΛΟΥ', VC 43 (1989), 378-92.
- Díez Macho, Alejandro, 'The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum: Its Antiquity and Relationship with the Other Targums', in *Congress Volume (Oxford 1959)* (Leiden: Brill, 1960), 222-45.
- Dines, Jennifer M., *The Septuagint* (London: T&T Clark, 2004).
- Dirksen, Peter B., 'The Old Testament Peshitta', in Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling (eds.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1988), 255-97.
- Dobschütz, Ernst von, *Das Kerygma Petri*, TU 11 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1893).
- Dodd, C. H., *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet, 1952).
- Donahue, John R. and Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Mark*, SaPag 2 (Collegeville, MI: The Liturgical Press, 2002).
- Dorival, Gilles, 'L'achèvement de la Septante dans le Judaïsme. De la faveur au rejet', in Gilles Dorival, Marguerite Harl and Olivier Munnich (eds.), *La Bible grecque des Septante: Du Judaïsme hellénistique au Christianisme ancien* (Paris: Cerf, 1988), 83-125.
- 'Les origines de la Septante: La traduction en Grec des cinq livres de la Torah', in Gilles Dorival, Marguerite Harl and Olivier Munnich (eds.), *La Bible grecque des Septante: Du Judaïsme hellénistique au Christianisme ancien* (Paris: Cerf, 1988), 39-82.
- Driver, S. R., *The Book of Genesis* (London: Methuen & Co., 1911).
- Duncun, J. Ligon, 'The Covenant Idea in Ante-Nicene Theology', Ph.D. thesis (New College, University of Edinburgh, 1995).

- Dunn, James D. G., 'The New Perspective on Paul', in *Jesus, Paul and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (London: SPCK, 1990), 183-214; first published in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 65 (1983), 95-122.
- *The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity*, 2nd edn. (London: SCM Press, 2006).
- *Romans 9-16*. WBC 38B (Dallas: Word Books, 1988).
- 'Two Covenants or One?: The Interdependence of Jewish and Christian Identity', in Hubert Cancik, Hermann Lichtenberger and Peter Schäfer (eds.), *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 97-122.
- Ehrman, Bart D., 'The Cup, the Bread and the Salvific Effect of Jesus' Death in Luke-Acts', in *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 156-77.
- 'The Use and Significance of Patristic Evidence for Textual Criticism', in *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 247-66.
- Evans, Craig A., 'Covenant in the Qumran Literature', in Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. de Roo (eds.), *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*, JSJSup 71 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 55-80.
- *Mark 8:27-16:20*, WBC 34B (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001).
- Fédou, Michel, and Joseph Paramelle, 'La vision de la croix dans l'œuvre de Saint Justin « Philosophe et Martyr »', *Recherches Augustiniennes* 19 (1984), 29-110.
- Feldman, Louis H., 'Prolegomenon', in *The Biblical Antiquity of Philo* (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1971), IX-CLXIX.
- Ferguson, Everett, 'The Covenant Idea in the Second Century', in March W. Eugene, *Texts and Testaments* (San Antonio: Trinity University, 1980), 135-62.
- 'Justin Martyr on Jews, Christians and the Covenant', in Frédéric Manns, *Early Christianity in Context: Monuments and Documents* (Jerusalem: Franciscan, 1993), 395-405.
- Fernández Marcos, Natalio, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*, trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson (Leiden: Brill, 2000).
- Fischer, G., 'Zum Text des Jeremiabuches', *Biblica* 78 (1997), 305-28.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A., *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 31 (New York: Double Day, 1998).
- *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, AB 28B (New York: Double Day, 1985).
- 'The Phases of the Aramaic Language', in *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), 57-84.
- *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 33 (New York: Double Day, 1993).

- Foster, Paul (ed.), *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers* (London: T&T Clark, 2007).
- Foerster, W., Article 'Κέρας', *TDNT* 3:669-71
- Fraade, Steven D., 'Hearing and Seeing at Sinai: Interpretive Trajectories', in George J. Brooke, Hindy Najman and Loren T. Stuckenbruck (eds.), *The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 247-68.
- 'Moses and the Commandments: Can Hermeneutics, History, and Rhetoric Be Disentangled?', in Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman (eds.), *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 399-422.
- Frend, W. H. C., 'Old Testament in the Age of the Greek Apologists, AD 130-180', *SJT* 26 (1973), 129-50.
- Furnish, Victor Paul, *II Corinthians*, AB 32A (New York: Doubleday, 1984).
- Gafni, Isayah M., 'The Historical Background', in Shmuel Safrai and Peter J. Tomson (eds.), *The Literature of the Sages*, 1st part: *Oral Tora, Halakha, Mishna, Tosefta, Talmud*, CRINT 3A (Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1987), 1-34.
- García Martínez, Florentino, 'The History of the Qumran Community in the Light of Recently Available Texts', in Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thompson (eds.), *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 194-216.
- Ginzberg, Louis, *The Legends of the Jews*, vol. 3: *Bible Times and Characters from the Exodus to the Death of Moses*, trans. Paul Radin, (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1911); vol. 6: *Notes to Volumes 3 and 4* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1928).
- Gleßmer, Uwe, *Einleitung in die Targume zum Pentateuch*, Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 48 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995).
- Goodenough, Erwin R., *Theology of Justin Martyr: An investigation into the conceptions of early Christian literature and its Hellenistic and Judaistic influences* (Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1968 [first published in Jena, 1923]).
- Goodman, Martin, 'Sadducees and Essenes after 70 CE.', in Stanley E. Porter, Paul Joyce, and David E. Orton (eds.), *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 347-356.
- *Judaism in the Roman World: Collected Essays*, AGJU 66 (Leiden: Brill, 2007).
- Grabbe, Lester L., 'Aquila's Translation and Rabbinic Exegesis', *JJS* 33 (1982), 527-36.
- 'The Translation Technique of the Greek Minor Versions: Translations or Revisions?', in George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars (eds.), *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 505-17.

- Grant, Robert M., *Greek Apologists of the Second Century* (London: SCM, 1988).
- Greenspoon, Leonard, 'Hebrew into Greek: Interpretation in, by, and of the Septuagint', in Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson (eds.), *A History of Biblical Interpretation*, vol. 1; *The Ancient Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 80-113.
- Grossfeld, Bernard, *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis*, ArBib 6 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988).
- *The Targum Onqelos to Exodus*, ArBib 7 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988).
- *The Targum Onqelos to Leviticus and the Targum Onqelos to Numbers*, ArBib 8 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992).
- *The Targum Onqelos to Deuteronomy*, ArBib 9 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988).
- Grundmann, W., Article 'Δύναμαι/δύναμις', *TDNT* 2:284-317
- Gunkel, Hermann, *Genesis*, trans. Mark E. Biddle (GA: Mercer UP, 1997).
- Hafemann, Scott J., *Suffering and the Spirit*, WUNT² 19 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986).
- Haran, Menahem, 'The Berit 'Covenant': Its Nature and Ceremonial Background', in Mordechai Cogan, Barry L. Eichler and Jeffrey H. Tigay (eds.), *Tehillah le-Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 203-19.
- Harl, Marguerite, *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, vol. 1; *La Genèse* (Paris: Cerf, 1986).
- Harrington, Daniel J., *The Gospel of Matthew*, SaPag 1 (Collegeville, MI: Liturgical Press, 1991).
- 'The Original Language of Pseudo-Philo's "Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum"', *HTR* 63 (1970), 503-14.
- and Anthony J. Saldarini, *Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets*, ArBib 10 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987).
- Harris, Rendel, *Testimonies*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1916-20).
- Hatch, Edwin, *Essays in Biblical Greek* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889).
- Hays, Richard B., *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1989).
- Hayward, C. T. R., 'The Giving of the Torah: Targumic Perspectives', in George J. Brooke, Hindy Najman and Loren T. Stuckenbruck (eds.), *The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 269-85.
- *Interpretations of the Name Israel in Ancient Judaism & Some Early Christian Writings: From Victorious Athlete to Heavenly Champion* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005).
- *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 1996).
- 'Understandings of the Temple Service in the Septuagint Pentateuch', in John Day (ed.), *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 385-400.

- ‘Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and the Bread of the Presence’, in Paul V. M. Flesher (ed.), *Targum and Scripture: Studies in Aramaic Translations and Interpretation in Memory of Ernest G. Clarke* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 115-28.
- Hayward, Robert, *Divine Name and Presence: The Memra, Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies* (Totowa, NJ: Allanheld, Osmund & Co., 1981).
- ‘Some Notes on Scribes and Priests in the Targum of the Prophets’, *JJS* 36 (1985), 210-21.
- *The Targum of Jeremiah*, *ArBib* 12 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987).
- Hegermann, H. Article ‘Διαθήκη’, *EDNT* 1:299-301
- Heine, Ronald E., ‘The Alexandrians’, in Frances Young, Lewis Ayres and Andrew Louth (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004), 117-30.
- Hengel, Mengel, *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon*, trans. Mark E. Biddle (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001).
- Hertog, Cornelis G. den, ‘Die griechische Übersetzung von Exodus 19:6 als Selbstzeugnis des frühhellenistischen Judentums’, in Riemer Roukema (ed.), *The Interpretation of Exodus: Studies in Honour of Cornelis Houtman* (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 181-91.
- Hill, C. E., ‘Was John's Gospel among Justin's Apostolic Memoirs?’, in Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (eds.), *Justin Martyr and His World* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 88-94.
- Hirshman, Marc, ‘Polemic Literary Units in the Classical Midrashim and Justin Martyr’s *Dialogue with Trypho*’, *JQR* 83 (1993), 369-84.
- *A Rivalry of Genius: Jewish and Christian Biblical Interpretation in Late Antiquity* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996).
- Holladay, Willam L., *Jeremiah 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1-25*, *Hermeneia* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1986).
- Hooker, Morna D., *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St Mark*, *Black's New Testament Commentaries* (London: A&C Black, 1991).
- Horbury, William, ‘Jewish-Christian Relations in Barnabas and Justin Martyr’, in *Jews and Christians in Contact and Controversy* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 127-61.
- Horrell, David G., *An Introduction to the Study of Paul* (London: T&T Clark, 2006).
- Hvalvik, Reidar, *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant: The Purpose of the Epistle of Barnabas and Jewish-Christian Competition in the Second Century*, *WUNT*² 82 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996).
- Jacobson, Howard, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation*, 2 vols., *AGJU* 31 (Leiden: Brill, 1996).
- Janzen, J. Gerald, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*, *HSM* 6 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1973).

- Jaubert, Annie., *La notion d'alliance dans le Judaïsme aux abords de l'ère Chrétienne*, Patristica Sorbonensia 6 (Paris: Seuil, 1963).
- Jellicoe, Sidney, Review 'Les devanciers d'Aquila. By Dominique Barthélemy', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 84 (1964), 178-82.
- *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).
- Jeremias, Joachim, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, trans. Norman Perrin (London: SCM Press, 1966).
- Johnson, Luke Timothy, *The Gospel of Luke*, SaPag 3 (Collegeville, MI: The Liturgical Press, 1991).
- *Hebrews: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006).
- *The Writings of the New Testament: An Interpretation*, rev. edn. (London: SCM Press, 1999).
- Johnstone, William, *Exodus* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990).
- Kamesar, Adam (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Philo* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009).
- Katz, P., 'Justin's Old Testament Quotations and the Greek Dodekapropheton Scroll', in SP 1 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957), 343-353.
- Kedar-Kopfstein, B., Article 'Qeren', *TDOT* 13:167-74
- Kingsbury, Edwin C., 'The Theophany Topos and the Mountain of God', *JBL* 86 (1967), 205-10.
- Kinzig, Wolfram, 'Καὶνὴ Διαθήκη: The Title of the New Testament in the Second and Third Centuries', *JTS* N.S. 45 (1994), 519-44.
- Kittel, G., Article 'Δοκέω/δόξα', *TDNT* 2:232-55
- Kleinknecht, H., Article 'Ἀέγω B', *TDNT* 4:77-91.
- Koester, Craig R., *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 36 (New York: Doubleday, 2001).
- Kraft, Robert A., Review 'Dominique Barthélemy: *Les devanciers d'Aquila*', *Gnomon* 37 (1965), 474-83.
- Kutsch, E., Article 'Bund', *TRE* 7:397-410.
- Lambrecht, Jan, *Second Corinthians*, SaPag 8 (Collegeville, MI: The Liturgical Press, 1999).
- Lane, Willam L., *Hebrews 9-13*, WBC 47B (Dallas: Word Books, 1991).
- Lauterbach, Jacob Z., 'The Ancient Jewish Allegorists in Talmud and Midrash', *JQR*, N.S. 1 (1911), 291-333.
- Le Boulluec, Alain, and Pierre Sandevor, *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, vol. 2; *L'Exode* (Paris: Cerf, 1989).

- Le Déaut, Roger, 'The Current State of Targumic Studies', *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 4 (1974), 3-32.
- Lee, J. A. L., *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*, SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 14 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983).
- Lehne, Susanne, *The New Covenant in Hebrews*, JSNTSup 44 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990).
- Levey, Samson H., 'The Date of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets', *VT* 21 (1971), 186-96.
- Lewis, Jack P., *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1968).
- Lieber, Andrea, 'Jewish and Christian Heavenly Meal Traditions', in April D. DeConick (ed.), *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 313-339.
- Lincoln, Andrew T., *Hebrews: A Guide* (London: T&T Clark, 2006).
- Lindars, Barnabas, 'Introduction', in George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars (eds.), *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 1-7.
- *The Theology of the Letter to the Hebrews* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991).
- Llewelyn, S. R., and R. A. Kearsley, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1980-81*, vol. 6 (North Ryde, N.S.W.: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1992).
- Lundbom, Jack R., *Jeremiah 1-20*, AB 21A (New York: Doubleday, 1999).
- *Jeremiah 21-36*. AB 21B (New York: Doubleday, 2004).
- Luz, Ulrich, *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*, trans. James E. Courch, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007).
- Magness, Jodi, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).
- Maher, Michael, 'Some Aspects of Torah in Judaism', *Irish Theological Quarterly* 38 (1971), 310-25.
- *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*, ArBib 1B (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992).
- *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodus*, ArBib 2 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994).
- Malherbe, Abraham J., 'The Apologetic Theology of the *Preaching of Peter*', *Restoration Quarterly* 13 (1970), 205-23.
- Manson, T. W., 'The Argument from Prophecy', *JTS* 46 (1945), 129-36.

- Marcus, Joel, 'Jewish Christianity', in Margaret M. Mitchell and Frances M. Young (eds.), *Origins to Constantine*, The Cambridge History of Christianity 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006), 87-102.
- Marshall, I. Howard, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1978).
- *Last Supper and Lord's Supper* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1980).
- Martin, Ralph P., *2 Corinthians*, WBC 40 (Waco: Word Books, 1986).
- Massaux, Édouard, and Arthur J. Bellinzoni, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus*, book 3; *the Apologists and the Didache*, trans. Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht, New Gospel Studies 5/3 (Macon, GA: Mercer UP, 1993).
- Matera, Frank J., *II Corinthians: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003).
- McHugh, John F., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John 1-4*, ICC (London: T&T Clark, 2009).
- McIvor, J. Stanley, *The Targum of Chronicles*, ArBib 19 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994).
- McCarthy, Dennis J., 'Notes on the Love of God in Deuteronomy and the Father-Son Relationship between Yahweh and Israel', *CBQ* 27 (1965), 144-47.
- *Old Testament Covenant: A Survey of Current Opinions* (Richmond: John Knox, 1972).
- *Treaty and Covenant: A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and the O.T.* new edn., AnBib 21 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981).
- McEleney, Neil J., 'Conversion, Circumcision, and the Law', *NTS* 20 (1974), 319-41.
- McKane, William, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*, 2 vols. ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986/96).
- 'Old and New Covenant (Testament): A Terminological Enquiry', in Graeme A. Auld (ed.), *Understanding Poets and Prophets: Essays in Honour of George Wishart Anderson* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 227-35.
- McKnight, Scot, 'Covenant and Spirit: The Origins of the New Covenant Hermeneutic', in Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen C. Barton (eds.), *Holy Spirit and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 41-54.
- McNamara, Martin J., *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch*, AnBib 27 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966).
- *Targum and Testament, Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament* (Shannon: Irish UP, 1972).
- *Targum Neofiti I: Genesis*, ArBib 1A (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1992).
- *Targum Neofiti I: Deuteronomy*, ArBib 5A (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992).

- *Targum Neofiti I: Numbers*, ArBib 4 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995).
- and Robert Hayward., *Targum Neofiti I: Exodus*, ArBib 2 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994).
- Méhat, André, *Étude sur les 'Stromates' de Clément d'Alexandrie*, Patristica Sorbonensia 7 (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1966).
- Meier, John P., Article 'Matthew, Gospel of', *ABD* 4:622-41
- Metzger, Bruce M., *The Text of the New Testament*, 3rd edn. (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992).
- *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd edn. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/United Bible Society, 1994).
- Misiarczyk, Lesyek, 'Apologetic Harmony as a Source of Liturgy: The Eucharistic Institution Words in Justin Martyr's *1 Apology* 66.3-6', in *SP* 40 (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 55-61.
- Moll, Sebastian, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*, WUNT 250 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).
- Moore, George Foot, *Judaism: In the First Century of the Christian Era, the Age of the Tannaim*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1927).
- Munnich, Olivier, 'Le texte de la Septante', in Gilles Dorival, Marguerite Harl and Olivier Munnich (eds.), *La Bible grecque des Septante: Du Judaïsme hellénistique au Christianisme ancien* (Paris: Cerf, 1988), 129-200.
- Musurillo, Herbert, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs: Introduction, Texts and Translations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).
- Nicholson, Ernest W., *God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986).
- Nickelsburg, George W. E., 'The Bible Rewritten and Expanded', in Michael E. Stone, *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, CRINT 2 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 89-156.
- Nolland, John, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, WBC 35C (Dallas: Word Books, 1993).
- Norton, Gerald J., 'Cautionary Reflections on a Re-Edition of Fragments of Hexaplaric Material', in Stephen Pisano and Gerald J. Norton (eds.), *Tradition of the Text* (Fribourg, Switzerland: Universitätsverlag, 1991), 129-55.
- O'Connell, Kevin G., *The Theodotionic Revision of the Book of Exodus: A Contribution to the Study of the Early History of the Transmission of the Old Testament in Greek*, HSM 3 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1972).
- Osborn, Eric, *Justin Martyr* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1973).
- Osiek, C., *Shepherd of Hermas*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999).
- Oulton, John E. L., and Henry Chadwick (eds.), *Alexandrian Christianity*, LCC 2 (London: SCM Press, 1954).
- Parvis, Sara and Paul Foster (eds.), *Justin Martyr and His Worlds* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007).

- Perrot, Charles, and Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, *Pseudo-Philon: Les Antiquités Bibliques*, vol. 2: *Introduction littéraire, commentaire et index*, SC 230 (Paris: Cerf, 1976).
- Petzer, Kobus, 'Style and Text in the Lucan Narrative of the Institution of the Lord's Supper (Luke 22. 19b-20)', *NTS* 37 (1991), 113-29.
- Piovanelli, Pierluigi, 'Jrb 33,14-26 ou la continuité des institutions à l'époque Maccabéenne', in A. H. W. Curtis and T. Römer (eds.), *The Book of Jeremiah and Its Reception* (Leuven: Leuven UP, 1997), 255-76.
- Porter, Stanley E., 'The Concept of Covenant in Paul', in Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. de Roo (eds.), *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*, JSJSup 71 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 269-85.
- Porter, Stanley E., and Jacqueline C. R. de Roo (eds.), *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*, JSJSup 71 (Leiden: Brill, 2003).
- Prigent, Pierre, *Justin et l'Ancien Testament* (Paris: Gabalda, 1964).
- Propp, William H. C., *Exodus 19-40*, AB 2B (New York: Double Day, 2006).
- Quasten, Johannes, *Patrology*, vol 1: *The Beginnings of Patristic Literature* (Utrecht: Spectrum, 1950); vol 2: *The Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus* (Utrecht: Spectrum, 1953).
- Rahlfs, Alfred, 'Über Theodotion-Lesarten im Neuen Testament und Aquila-Lesarten bei Justin', *ZNW* 20 (1921), 182-99.
- Rankin, David, *Tertullian and the Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995).
- Reagan, Joseph N., *The Preaching of Peter: The Beginning of Christian Apologetic* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1923).
- Reijnders, G. Q., *The Terminology of the Holy Cross in Early Christian Literature: As Based upon Old Testament Typology* (Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1965).
- Rendtorff, Rolf, *The Covenant Formula: An Exegetical and Theological Investigation*. trans. Margaret Kohl (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998).
- Richard, Earl, 'Polemics, Old Testament, and Theology: A Study of II Cor. 3:1-4:6', *RB* 88 (1981), 340-67.
- Robertson, Edward, 'The Altar of Earth (Exodus XX, 24-26)', *JJS* 1 (1948), 12-21.
- Robinson, Bernard P., 'Jeremiah's New Covenant: Jer 31,31-34', *SJOT* 15 (2001), 181-204.
- Rokéah, David, *Justin Martyr and the Jews*, Jewish and Christian Perspectives 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2002).
- Rordorf, Willy, 'Christus als Logos und Nomos: Das Kerygma Petrou in seinem Verhältnis zu Justin', in Adolf Martin Ritter (ed.), *Kerygma und Logos: Beiträge zu den geistesgeschichtlichen Beziehungen zwischen antike und Christentum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 424-34.

- Runia, David T., *Philo and the Church Fathers: A Collection of Papers*, Supplement to VC 32 (Leiden: Brill, 1995).
- ‘Philo and the Early Christian Fathers’, in Adam Kamesar (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Philo* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 210-30.
- Rutherford, Will, ‘Altercatio Jasonis et Papisci as a Testimony Source for Justin's "Second God" Argument?’, in Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (eds.), *Justin Martyr and His Worlds* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 137-44.
- Safrai, Zeev, ‘The Targums as Part of Rabbinic Literature’, in Shmuel Safrai, Zeev Safrai, Joseph Schwartz and Peter J. Tomson (eds.), *The Literature of the Sages*, 2nd part: *Midrash and Targum, Liturgy, Poetry, Mysticism, Contracts, Inscriptions, Ancient Science and Languages of Rabbinic Literature*, CRINT 3A (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2006), 243-78.
- Sanders, E. P., *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (London: SCM Press, 1977).
- Sandmel, Samuel, *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1979).
- Sarna, Nahum M., *Exodus*, The JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1991).
- *Genesis*, The JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989).
- Schaper, J. L. W., ‘The Unicorn in the Messianic Imagery of the Greek Bible’, *JTS* N.S. 45 (1994), 117-36.
- Schenker, Adrian, ‘L'origine de l'idée d'une alliance entre Dieu et Israël dans l'Ancient Testament’, *RB* 95 (1988), 184-94.
- ‘Διαθηκη pour בְּרִית: l'option de traduction de la LXX à la double lumière du droit successoral de l'Égypte Ptolémaïque et du livre de la Genèse’, in Jean Marie Auwers and Wenin Andre (eds.), *Lectures et Relectures de la Bible* (Louvain: Louvain UP, 1999), 125-31.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H., *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1994).
- Schnelle, Udo, *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings*, trans. M. Eugene Boring (London: SCM Press, 1998).
- Schürer, Emil, Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar and Matthew Black, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, A New English Version*, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973-87).
- Schwartz, Daniel R. ‘Philo, His Family, and His Times’, in Adam Kamesar (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Philo* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 9-31.
- Selms, A. van, ‘Telescoped Discussion as a Literary Device in Jeremiah’, *VT* 26 (1976), 99-112.
- Seters, John van, ‘"Comparing Scripture with Scripture": Some Observations on the Sinai Pericope of Exodus 19-24’, in Gene M. Tucker, David L. Petersen and Robert R. Wilson

- (eds.), *Canon, Theology, and Old Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Brevard S. Childs* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 111-30.
- Shotwell, Willis A., *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr* (London: SPCK, 1965).
- Sibinga, Joost Smit, *The Old Testament Text of Justin Martyr 1: The Pentateuch* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963).
- Skarsaune, Oskar, 'Jewish Christian Sources Used by Justin Martyr and Some Other Greek and Latin Fathers', in Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik (eds.), *Jewish Believers in Jesus* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007), 379-416.
- 'Judaism and Hellenism in Justin Martyr, Elucidated from His Portrait of Socrates', in Hubert Cancik, Hermann Lichtenberger and Peter Schäfer (eds.), *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 585-611.
- 'Justin and His Bible', in Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (eds.), *Justin Martyr and His World* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 53-76.
- *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition*, NovTSup 56 (Leiden: Brill, 1987).
- Skinner, John, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1910).
- Slusser, Michael, 'Justin Scholarship: Trends and Trajectories', in Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (eds.), *Justin Martyr and His Worlds* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 13-21.
- Smelik, Willem F., *The Targum of Judges*, Oudtestamentische Studiën 36 (Leiden: Brill, 1995).
- Soderlund, Sven, *The Greek Text of Jeremiah: A Revised Hypothesis*, JSOTSup 47 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985).
- Speiser, E. A., *Genesis*, AB 1 (New York: Double Day, 1964).
- Stanton, Graham N., 'Aspects of Early Christian and Jewish Worship: Pliny and the Kerygma Petrou', in Michael J. Wilkins and Terence Paige (eds.), *Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Early Church* (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1992), 84-98.
- 'The Fourfold Gospels', *NTS* 43 (1997), 317-46.
- 'Other Early Christian Writings: 'Didache', Ignatius, 'Barnabas', Justin Martyr', in John M. G. Barclay and John Sweet (eds.), *Early Christian Thought in Its Jewish Context* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1996), 174-190.
- Stec, David M., *The Targum of Psalms*, ArBib 16 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2004).
- Stegemann, Hartmut, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).
- Strack, Hermann L., and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, vol. 3 (München: Beck, 1926).

- and G. Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. trans. Markus Bockmuehl (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991).
- Streane, A. W., *The Double Text of Jeremiah (Massoretic and Alexandrian) Compared* (Cambridge: Deighton Bell, 1896).
- Stylianopoulos, Theodore G., *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law* (Missoula, MT: Scholar's Press, 1975).
- Swete, Henry Barclay, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 2nd edn. (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1914).
- Swetnam, James, 'Why Was Jeremiah's New Covenant New?', in Daniel Lys (ed.), *Studies on Prophecy* (Leiden: Brill, 1974), 111-115.
- Tadmor, Hayim, 'Treaty and Oath in the Ancient Near East: A Historic Approach', in Gene M. Tucker and Douglas A. Knight (eds.), *Humanizing America's Iconic Book: Society of Biblical Literature Centennial Addresses 1980* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982), 127-52.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu, 'The Community of the Renewed Covenant : Between Judaism and Christianity', in Eugene Ulrich and James C. VanderKam (eds.), *Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 3-24.
- Taradach, Madeleine, *Le Midrash*, *Le Monde de la Bible* 22 (Genève: Labor et Fides, 1991).
- Thackeray, H. St. John, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins* (London: Oxford UP, 1921).
- Tov, Emanuel, 'Lucian and Proto-Lucian: Toward a New Solution of the Problem', *RB* 79 (1972), 101-13.
- *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of the LXX of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1:1-3:8*, HSM 8 (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1976).
- 'Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah', in by P.-M. Bogaert (ed.), *Le livre de Jérémie: Le prophète et son milieu, les oracles et leur transmission* (Leuven: Leuven UP, 1981), 145-67.
- *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, *Jerusalem Biblical Studies* 3 (Jerusalem: Simor, 1981).
- *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 2nd edn. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001).
- 'Three Dimensions of LXX Words', *RB* 83 (1976), 529-44.
- 'Transliterations of Hebrew Words in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament: A Further Characteristic of the Kaige-Th. Revision?', *Textus* 8 (1973), 78-92.
- Trakatellis, Demetrius C., *The Pre-Existence of Christ in Justin Martyr* (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1976).

- ‘Justin Martyr’s Trypho’, *HTR* 79 (1986): 287-97.
- Tränkle, Hermann (ed.) *Q. S. F. Tertulliani, Adversus Iudaeos: Mit Einleitung und kritischem Kommentar* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1964).
- Tuckett, C. M., Article ‘Synoptic Problem’, *ABD* 6:264-68
- Unnik, W. C. van, ‘Ἡ Κατὰ τὴν Διαθήκην - a Problem in the Early History of the Canon’, in *SP* 4, part 2 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961), 212-27.
- VanderKam, James C., *An Introduction to Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001).
- ‘Identity and History of the Community’, in Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 487-533.
- *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 2nd edn. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).
- Van der Kooij, Arie, ‘A Kingdom of Priests: Comment on Exodus 19:6’, in Riemer Roukema (ed.), *The Interpretation of Exodus: Studies in Honour of Cornelis Houtman* (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 171-79.
- Verheyden, Joseph, ‘The Shepherd of Hermas’, in Paul Foster (ed.), *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers* (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 63-71.
- Vermes, Geza, ‘Baptism and Jewish Exegesis: New Light from Ancient Sources’, *NTS* 4 (1957-1958), 308-19.
- ‘Circumcision and Exodus IV 24-26: Prelude to the Theology of Baptism’, in *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*, 2nd edn. (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 178-92.
- ‘The Essenes and History’, *JJS* 32 (1981), 18-31.
- ‘“He Is the Bread”: Targum Neofiti Exodus 16:15’, in *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 139-46.
- ‘Lion-Damascus-Meḥoḳeḳ-Man’, in *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*, 2nd edn. (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 40-66.
- Review ‘Dominique Barthélemy: Les Devanciers D’aquila’, *JSS* 11 (1966), 261-64.
- ‘The Story of Balaam: The Scriptural Origin of Haggadah’, in *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*, 2nd edn. (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 127-177.
- ‘"The Torah Is a Light"’, *VT* 8 (1958), 436-38.
- Von Rad, Gerhard, *Genesis: A Commentary, Revised Edition*. trans. John H. Marks (London: SCM Press, 1976).
- Waszink, Jan Hendrik, ‘Tertullian’s Principles and Methods of Exegesis’, in William R. Schoedel and Robert L. Wilken (eds.), *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition* (Paris: Editions Beauchesne, 1979), 17-31.
- Weinfeld, Moshe, ‘Berît - Covenant vs Obligation’, *Biblica* 56 (1975), 120-28.

——— Article ‘*kābôḡ*’, *TDOT* 7:22-38.

Werline, Rodney, ‘The Transformation of Pauline Arguments in Justin Martyr’s *Dialogue with Trypho*’, *HTR* 92 (1999), 79-93.

Weis, P. R., ‘Some Samaritanisms of Justin Martyr’, *JTS* 45 (1944), 199-205.

Weitzman, M. P., *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament: An Introduction*, University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 56 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999).

Wenham, Gordon J., *Genesis 16-50*, WBC 2 (Dallas, TX: Word, 1994).

Werline, Rodney, ‘The Transformation of Pauline Arguments in Justin Martyr’s *Dialogue with Trypho*’, *HTR* 92 (1999), 79-93.

Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 12-36: A Commentary*, vol. 2, trans. John J. Scullion (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1985).

Wevers, John William, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 30 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990).

——— *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 35 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993).

Wilson, Stephen G., *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians 70-170 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995).

Wise, Michael O., ‘Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and the *Floruit* of His Movement’, *JBL* 122 (2003), 53-87.

Witherington, Ben, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

C. Reference works

Borgen, P., K. Fuglseth, and P. Skarsten (eds.), *The Philo Index* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

Claesson, Gösta (ed.), *Index Tertullianus*, 3 vols. (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1974-1975).

Golomb, David M., *A Grammar of Targum Neofiti*, Harvard Semitic Studies 34 (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1985).

Institute for New Testament Textual Research and the Computer Centre of Münster University (eds.), *Computer Concordance to the Novum Testamentum Graece*, 2nd edn. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1985).

Kraft, Henricus (ed.), *Clavis Patrum Apostolicorum* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftlich Buchgesellschaft, 1963).

Muraoka, Takamitsu (ed.), *Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998).