



Jurnal Teologi Amreta

URL : <http://jurnal.sttsati.ac.id>

e-ISSN : 2599-3100

Edition : Volume 5, Nomor 2, Juli 2022

Page : 80-115

The New Covenant at Qumran

Andreas Hauw

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses what the community at Qumran thought about a new covenant. It covers three manuscripts (*Temple Scrolls* [11Q19], *The Rule of the Community* [1QS, 4Q255-264a, 5Q11, 5Q13] and *The Damascus Document* [4Q266-273, 5Q12, 6Q15]). Literary and historical-socio-political, as well as theological approaches will be used in the article. The phrase “new covenant” and covenant ideas presented in the manuscripts are investigated. The proper contexts of the three aforementioned manuscripts, and the phrase “new covenant” found in the OT only once (Jer.31:31), including their theological, political and social values are discussed. In addition, the emphasis on the concept of covenant in each manuscript and how it relates them to each other is explained. This paper concludes that the Qumran community reinterpreted the concept of covenant in a new way. Influenced by the theological, political and social issues of its time, the Qumran community understand that they are the eschatological community.

Keywords: Qumran, New Covenant, The Temple Scrolls, The Rule of the Community, The Damascus Document.

INTRODUCTION

Covenant is one of prominent terms in the Hebrew Scripture and Israel considered itself the covenant community of God. The concept of covenant,

however, differs from time to time. Our investigation here focuses on the concept of a new covenant at the Qumran Community. According to the documents excavated so far, which are numerous,¹ the Qumran Community's concepts of covenant are scattered in many different texts, such as 1Q28a, 1Q28b, 1QM, 1Q34, 1QH^a, 4Q501, 4Q504, 11Q19, 1QS, 4Q255-264a, 5Q11, 4Q266-273, 5Q12 and The Damascus Document (CD). I will concentrate my research only on the following texts: The Temple Scrolls (11Q19), The Rule of the Community (1QS, 4Q255-264a, 5Q11, 5Q13) and The Damascus Document (4Q266-273, 5Q12, 6Q15). Many issues concerning the concept of covenant at Qumran can be found in these particular texts.

In this paper I will address this specific question: what did the community at Qumran think about a new covenant? For sure, the Qumran community also used Hebrew Scripture, at least in some of their writings. Therefore why did they need a new covenant in addition to Hebrew Scripture? Did people at Qumran assume that there were new interpretations of the first covenant that could be found in the writings of the patriarchs and the prophets? I assume that we should investigate not only where the phrase "new covenant" can be discovered, but also all notions of the covenant found in the aforementioned three manuscripts. My assumption is based on the followings: (1) The phrase "new covenant" appears only four times in Qumran texts (CD vi.19, viii.21, xix.33-34 and xx.12); (2) we have

¹ Here I refer not only to documents discovered in 11 caves of Qumran but also to many documents beside them, for instance from Egypt and Syria. Hundreds of manuscripts discovered in the Dead Sea area include some OT manuscripts and their commentaries, Apocryphal Writings and Sectarian Writings. Here I will limit my research only to Sectarian Writings, especially to the texts that represent the concept of covenant.

to investigate the concept of covenant quite thoroughly and then see the notion of "new covenant" in its proper contexts, placed among the other explanations of covenant in other parts of the Qumran texts, especially CD; (3) In the Old Testament (OT) texts, there is only one occurrence of the phrase "new covenant", which appears in Jer. 31:31; (4) The Qumran community reinterpreted the concept of covenant in a new way, since it imbued it with the theological, political and social issues of its time.

METHOD

Literary, historical-socio-political, and theological approaches are significant methodology to be used in this paper. History, social-political contexts and theology of Qumran community, together with Hebrew Scripture, are presented in available texts. The Qumran's texts are literature that voices covenant concept of her community's experience. This literature contains artistry and form, in which the theological concept is reflected. How this methodology works is partly mentioned in the introduction. However, before we commence our inquiry, I shall introduce the Qumran Community in its historical framework. Then the concept of "covenant" would be interrogated in each manuscripts. In the last part of this article is the conclusion.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. The Qumran Community in its historical framework

This section will reveal to us the identity of the Qumran community in the context of Israel's history.² My explanation here is rather simple and not highly detailed.

1.1. Antiochus IV and his effect on the Jewish Community

The rise of the Qumran community cannot be separated from the Macedonian imperial domination over Palestine, particularly when Antiochus IV Epiphanes became the emperor of this region. The Romans accepted his successor Seleucus 4 Philopator in 175 BCE, since they were defeated by the Macedonians in Magnesia and were forced to sign an agreement at Apamea (188 BCE). During his time in power, Antiochus made every effort to do away with Judaism entirely, which caused the Jewish revolt later.

Almost at the same time, Jason led the Jewish community as high priest (175 BCE). After the end of Onias III's priesthood, Jason immediately obtained the permanent post of high priest from the king. Presumably he voluntarily offered the king an increase in taxes and an extra contribution of 150 talents of silver (2 Macc. 4:7-8). Soon afterwards in 171 BCE, Menelaus, one of his officers, betrayed him. Menelaus was sent to Antiochus IV where he gave more money than Jason

² Investigation of the history of the Qumran Community has been made by many scholars, however an elaborate survey has been prepared by Phillip R. Callaway. He started his study with archaeology, palaeography, Essenes theory, Damascus document, the pesharim, 4Qtestimonia and ended with the hodayat. His investigation concluded that the Qumran Community should be dated between the second century and early first century BC. He supposed that the chief of the community must have been a former high priest and that the community's enemy was the Pharisees. He emphasized that the conflict occurred because of different sectarian groups or disagreement within one particular group. See, *The History of the Qumran Community, JSPSS 3* (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1988).

and asked Antiochus to appoint him as high priest in Jerusalem. Menelaus did not come from the Zadokite line as Jason did but Antiochus IV did not pay much attention to the tradition of high priests in Israel. Finally, Menelaus was appointed as high priest in Jerusalem and Jason with his large number of followers fled to Transjordan (2 Macc. 4:26). Jason attempted to rebel but failed (2 Macc. 5:5-7); it is possible that the Seleucid troops helped Menelaus.

With Menelaus' help, Antiochus IV plundered the temple in about 168 BCE and made a decree on religion that aimed to mould Jewish worship in a more Hellenistic form, and therefore the Jews, especially in Judah, were persecuted. Dan. 11:31 and 12:11 reported about the "abomination of desolation" which refers to the second altar in the temple of Jerusalem, which had taken on the name Zeus Olympius in place of the "Lord of heaven". Further persecution is noted in 1 Macc. 1:47 and 2 Macc. 6:21 and 7:1, and as a part of it, the Judaeans were forced to sacrifice pigs. As we shall see afterwards, this persecution incited a revolt movement.

1.2. The Maccabean Revolt and the Hasidic Movement

Persecutions by Antiochus IV caused Mattathias of Modein to start a revolt, but it was primarily a peasant war against the rich upper class in Jerusalem. Religious considerations, however, seem to be one of the reasons for this revolt. Mattathias refused to obey the king and killed the king's representative and a Judaeans who offered sacrifice in accordance with the royal command. Soon

afterwards, he and his five sons fled to the hills, and later Judas (not the oldest son) led the revolt (166-167 BCE).

This movement won the sympathy of all the Jewish communities; one of them was a group called the Hasideans ("pious"). This group is one of the most important groups in helping us understand the Qumran community, and soon it was also involved in the revolt. The Hasideans are mentioned for the first time in 1 Macc. 2:42, and described as a group who "offered themselves willingly for the law". The Hasideans joined the Maccabees shortly after the beginning of the revolt. This might have been caused by the massacre of their fellow members on a Sabbath by Seleucid troops, since they refused to offer any resistance on that day (1 Macc. 2:33-38, *AJ XII*, 274). We may infer that religious freedom was actually the main cause of the group's joining the Maccabean revolt, so as long as the ruler guaranteed religious liberty, the Hasideans would not rebel against the regime. Moreover, before the revolt, the Hasideans had already existed as a kind of religious party rather than a social movement.³ Lastly, in terms of religious affairs, this group lived on the basis of the Torah with utter strictness; the Hasideans gave the Mosaic law a central place in their daily life.

1.3. The Hasidic Movement and the Qumran Community

From archaeological evidence and literary materials, it can be assumed that the Hasidean community lived at Khirbet Qumran from about 150/140 BCE to 68

³ V. Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (Philadelphia and Jerusalem: JPS, 1961), 187-89; cf. J.A. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees, AB* (New York: Doubleday, 1976), 122.

CE.⁴ From about 31 BCE, the settlement had been abandoned due to an earthquake⁵ and the community was finally destroyed by the Romans in 68 CE.

To identify the group further, we have to identify both "*the teacher of righteousness*" and his opponent, who was described as "the godless priest" or "*the man of lies*". We need also to locate "the land of Damascus", which was their place of living and is often mentioned in their texts.

Many answers have been proposed regarding the identity of the teacher of righteousness: Onias 3,⁶ one of the first Pharisaic masters,⁷ an anonymous High Priest who succeeded Alcimus in 160 BCE,⁸ the Pharisee Eleazar or the Essene prophet Judas,⁹ John the Baptist,¹⁰ even Jesus of Nazareth,¹¹ and so on. These proposals remain unconvincing. Likewise, scholars have suggested that the wicked priest might be Jonathan, Simon, Alexander Jannaeus, or Hyrcanus 2, who all were Hasmoneans of the Maccabeus family.¹² Previously, the consensus among scholars identified this figure as Jonathan, but later van der Woude offered a theory that suggested a number of other figures.¹³ Recent research on the historiographical

⁴ R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and The Dead Sea Scrolls*, London: British Academy, 1973, 5, 18; cf. F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (Sheffield: Academic, 1961), 57ff, 63; H. Jagersma, *A History of Israel: from Alexander the Great to Bar Kochba* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 75.

⁵ Jagersma, *History*, 75.

⁶ H.H. Rowley, *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1952), 67-68; cf. William S. LaSor, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Faith* (Chicago: Moody, 1956), 224-225. He based his overview on the explanation in CD i.5 which said "390 years" and i.10 "twenty years". He reckoned 390 years from the Exile (586 BCE) as the raising up of the "root" (of the Community) to be about 196 BCE, and the "twenty years" would put the Teacher of Righteousness at 176 BCE, which is close enough to be Onias 3.

⁷ Yose ben Yoezer, in G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspectives* (London: SCM, 1982), 160.

⁸ J. Murphy-O'Connor, Demetrius I and the Teacher of Righteousness, *RB* 83 (1976), 400-20.

⁹ W.H. Brownlee, The Historical Allusions of the Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash, *BASOR* 126 (1952), 18.

¹⁰ B.E. Thiering, *Redating the Teacher of Righteousness*, (Sidney, Theological Explorations) (1979).

¹¹ J.L. Teicher, Jesus in the Habakkuk Scroll, *JJS* 3 (1952), 53-55.

¹² Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspectives*, 2nd edition. London: SCM, 1982, 161; cf. W.H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*, Missoula 1979, 95-98, cf. also B.E. Thiering, Once More the Wicked Priest, *JBL* 97, (1978), 191-205.

¹³ A.S. van der Woude, Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary, *Essays in Honour of Yigael Yadin*, *JJS* 33, (1982), 349-60.

context by Wacholder suggested that the wicked priest represented the Pharisees and Sadducees.¹⁴

Nevertheless, we must still say that the real identities of both "the teacher of righteousness" and "the wicked priest" are unknown. One obvious feature of "the teacher of righteousness", however, is his immense influence in the community, but due to the lack of information it is hard to say whether he was a founder of community or not. The community came into being 390 years after the fall of Jerusalem in 586 BCE, and yet, 390 seems to be a symbolic number. The evidence from archaeology indicates that the settlement was built in around 140 BCE, so the figure of 390 shows that the community came into being some decades earlier. We will discuss the meaning of the "land of Damascus" later. Lastly, we may infer that the community regarded itself as the true Israel, as we will see later in their writings. The community attacked the policy of the high priest in Jerusalem and maybe also that of the Pharisees and Sadducees,¹⁵ and called themselves Judah or Jerusalem (CD.vi.5). Who then who were Qumran community?

Several hypotheses have been proposed. The Essene hypothesis by Sukenik,¹⁶ developed by Dupont-Sommer¹⁷ and Geza Vermes¹⁸, then followed by

¹⁴ Ben Zion Wacholder, "Historiography of Qumran: The Sons of Zadok and Their Enemies", *Qumran between the Old and New Testament, JSOTs* 290 (Sheffield: Academic, 1988), 347-77.

¹⁵ Jagersma, *History*, 78.

¹⁶ E.L. Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot I* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1948), 16-17.

¹⁷ Dupont-Sommer, A. *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (trans. G. Vermes) (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983), 349-68.

¹⁸ Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 4th edition (Sheffield: Academic, 1995), 20-40.

Milik¹⁹ and Cross,²⁰ suggests that the Qumran community is identified with the Essenes. The "Groningen hypothesis" by F. García Martínez, followed by A.S. van der Woude, and to some extent also by Ben Zion Wacholder and Gabrielle Boccaccini, considers the Qumran community a break-away group from the Essenes.²¹ The "revised and augmented" Essenes hypothesis by Hartmut Stegeman proposes that the Qumran community was the main Jewish Union in late Second Temple times and used its settlement as a study centre for all members, wherever they usually lived.²² The Sadducean hypothesis by L.H. Schiffman suggests that the Qumran community originated from a Sadducean sect.²³ One further important proposal is offered by Norman Golb. He mentions that the Qumran buildings were actually fortresses and thus apparently had no connection with the caves. The manuscripts found in the caves were not left by the residents of Qumran but by people who fled from Jerusalem. The purpose of this was to hide the manuscripts from the approaching Romans around the time of the First Jewish Revolt.²⁴

¹⁹ J.T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judae* (trans. J. Strugnell) (London: SCM, 2nd ed. 1963), 80-98.

²⁰ Cross, *Ancient*, 54-87.

²¹ F. García Martínez, 'Qumran Origins and Early History: A "Groningen Hypothesis"', *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1989), 113-36; cf. "The History of The Qumran Community in the Light of Recently Available Texts", *Qumran between the Old and New Testament, JSOTSS* 290 (1998, Sheffield), 194-216; F. García Martínez and A.S. van der Woude, 'A "Groningen" Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History', *RevQ* 14.56 (1990), 521-41; Wacholder, "Historiography", 347-77; Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essenes Hypothesis* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 1988).

²² H. Stegeman, "The Qumran Essenes: Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple", in J. Trebelle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (eds), *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (STDJ, 11.1; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 83-166.

²³ L.H. Schiffman, 'Miqsat Ma'se ha-Torah and the Temple Scroll', *RevQ* 14.56 (1990), 435-57; cf. 'The New Halakhiv Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Scroll Sect' in H. Shanks (ed.), *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Random, 1992), 35-49, also in *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1994), 83-95.

²⁴ Norman Golb, "The Problem of Origin and Identification of The Dead Sea Scrolls," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 124 (1980), 1-24; cf. "The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Perspective," *The American Scholar* 58 (1989), 177-207.

To judge in detail which hypothesis is right is not our present task. All the hypotheses mentioned above have weaknesses. The Essene hypothesis has three weaknesses, as J.C. VanderKam has suggested:²⁵ (1) regarding the difference between The Community Rule (1QS vi.13-23) and Josephus' report (*JW.* 2.137-139) about the entrance requirements for candidates; (2) the reports of Josephus (*JW.* 2.120, 160-161) and Pliny regarding marriage in the Qumran Community differs from 1QS. 1QS does not speak about marriage and offers no such legislation as that mentioned in Josephus' and Pliny's reports; (3) the name Essene never occurs in the Qumran texts. An objection also has been applied to the Sadducean hypothesis, since, for instance, the Qumran texts clearly express non-Sadducean theological points, even though this objection has already been refuted by Schiffmann.²⁶ Golb's hypothesis, also known as the "Jerusalem Origin" hypothesis has been rejected too. Golb's hypothesis can explain why different opinions occurred between the Qumran texts and Josephus' and Pliny's reports, but he cannot handle the evidence from Pliny in a convincing way, and he is not able to account satisfactorily for the buildings at Qumran.²⁷

Nevertheless, at this time, the Essene hypothesis with its developments is the most satisfactory theory we have. The following reasons favor this claim: indeed, the Qumran community is related to the Essene sect, since there are many similarities between them. Vermes gave three principal considerations:

²⁵ J.C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 87-92.

²⁶ See, "The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect," *Biblical Archaeologist* 53 (1990), 64-73.

²⁷ See, VanderKam, *Dead Sea*, 97.

firstly, there is no site other than Qumran to correspond to Pliny's report about settlements between Jericho and Engedi; secondly, chronologically speaking, the Essene activities as described by Josephus occurred between the rule of Jonathan Maccabeus (c.150 BCE) and the first Jewish war (66-70 CE), and the sectarian occupation of the Qumran site coincides perfectly with that period; thirdly, the similarities of common life, organization and customs are so fundamental as to render the identification of the two bodies extremely probable, as long as some obvious differences can be explained.²⁸

If it is true that the Qumran Community was related to the Essenes, what do we know about the relationship between the Essenes and the Hasidic movement? Some claimed that the Essenes had their historical roots in Babylon, that is to say, in the Jews who returned from the Babylonian exile. We cannot accept this since there is no evidence for the claim, merely an assumption. From the historical accounts above, we know that the Essenes started in Palestine with the rise of the Hasidic movement at the beginning of the second century BCE. Potentially, the Essenes were the survivors of the Hasidim and continued at Qumran.²⁹ In this light, we may infer that the Hasidean movement, which started at the beginning of the Maccabean revolt, formed the pioneers of the Qumran community and possibly also of various other sects at that time.

Now let us turn to our main topic, which is to investigate the new covenant concept in the Qumran texts. I shall demonstrate how the Qumran Texts reflect

²⁸ Vermes, *Dead Sea*, 1995, 21.

²⁹ Vermes, *Dead Sea*, xxix. VanderKam gave some explanation of how the Essenes themselves eventually escaped to the Qumran site, see, *Dead Sea*, 99-108.

the concept of covenant. First of all, the Damascus Document (CD, 4Q266-273, 5Q12, 6Q15) will be elaborated, then our inquiry will cover the Community Rule (1QS, 4Q255-264a, 5Q11, 5Q13), and eventually the Temple Scrolls (11Q).

2. The Covenant in the Damascus Document (CD)

The Damascus Document comprises CD, and some fragments such as 4Q266-273, 5Q12, 6Q15. Characteristically, the central theme of the Damascus Document is the covenant.³⁰ In this part, however, I shall concentrate solely on CD because CD has already covered most of the fragments 4Q266-273, 5Q12, particularly on the issue of the covenant. The concept of covenant in CD is almost the same as in 11QTemple, as we shall see later on. Probably, the different addressees caused differences in emphasis. 11QTemple addresses all Israel, whereas CD tends to address a particular group within Israel. Very obviously, CD addresses a narrower audience, which is "the remnant" (i.1-2, 5-8). It raises the question: "who is the remnant?" But we will not discuss this now, since it does not influence the concept of covenant that we are trying to describe. Instead, we may discover their identity later. Since the community named themselves as "the remnant", we may assume that the concept of covenant in CD is defined in accordance with a more particularistic self-understanding.

³⁰ P.R. Davies, "The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of "Damascus Document", *JSOT*, 25 (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1983), 50-53.

It was Ernst Lohmeyer who first researched the term covenant and concluded that the concept was beset with uncertainty and difficult to understand.³¹ Perhaps this was caused by the fact that CD is a text containing mixed legal and homiletic materials: the content of the text is divided into two parts: i.1-viii.21 and xix.1-xx.34 consist of exhortations in the form of a sermon, and ix.1-xvi.19 contain a collection of laws.³²

Compared with 11QTemple, CD makes more frequent use in the term *b^erît* (42 times)³³ which still carries the OT meaning. It obviously points to the close relationship with the covenant concept connected with the Israel patriarchs, i.4 (*the covenant of the forefathers*),³⁴ viii.17-18 (*covenant of the fathers*), xii.10 (*covenant of Abraham*), xix.30-31, cf. 4QD^{a/e} 12, Jer. 34:13, 31:32, Deut. 9:5 and 7:8 (*the father's covenant*).³⁵ CD, and the *Temple Scroll* as well, mention the close relationship with Israel's ancestors inasmuch as God has delivered them to the sword, i.4-7, because they had forsaken God. The origin of the covenant is referred to God and the validity of the covenant rests in him as well, viii.15 ("*God loved...kept the oath*", an allusion to Deut. 9.5 and 7.8) and in xix.27 (*he loves... keeps the oath*). In addition, phrases such as "my covenant", "His covenant", and "God's covenant" clearly indicate that the covenant is established by God and simultaneously valid³⁶ either with or without the human partner. The texts in iii.13

³¹ E.J. Christiansen, *The Covenant in Judaism & Paul: A Study of Ritual Boundaries as Identity Markers*. (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 107.

³² Further discuss, see Emil Schürer. *The History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ 3* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987).

³³ See the list made by Karl Georg Kuhn. "ברת" *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen, 1960), 37.

³⁴ It is a quotation from Lev. 26:45 which in context of the Sinai covenant.

³⁵ For completely reading, see Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*.

³⁶ Cf. Christiansen, *Covenant*, 109; the texts are iii.11, v.12, vii.5, xiii.14, xiv.2, xx.17, i.17, iii.13, viii.1, xix.3.

and iv.9 assume this view whereby preposition ל qualifies a relationship given by a superior to an inferior partner.³⁷ Conditions are set up to be fulfilled by the human partner since the covenant has the character of an act of suzerainty. Of note, the Sinaitic Covenant emphasizing law is implied in CD, leading one to identify "covenant" with "law."³⁸ Likewise, in the Temple Scroll the covenant is read as having law as its content. As a result, the characteristic of being established by God assumes eternal implications, and the tendency of dependence on human response is still obvious.

To some extent, the Sinaitic Covenant influenced the covenant in CD as evidenced by the phrase "covenant with all Israel" (iii.13, xv.8-9, xvi.1). Since the covenant is only available to those observing and keeping God's law, a narrowed down covenant is offered to a restricted membership based on ethics, in this case obedience to the law.³⁹ This is supported by CD's opening statement, "*Hear now, all who enter the Covenant, and I will unstop your ears concerning the ways of the wicked*" (i.1-2). All who enter the covenant are not marked only by circumcision, as in the Abrahamic Covenant, but are required to have a high level of knowledge of the Torah and to practice ethical behavior (xiii.11-13). CD and the Temple Scroll are not concerned with the rite of circumcision. The only ritual that must be performed after a candidate passes the examination on Torah

³⁷ Ibid., cf. M. Weinfeld, "קְרִית" *TDOT* 2 (ed. G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren; trans. John T. Willis) (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 253-79: "But with the remnant which held fast to the commandments of God He made His Covenant with Israel (לישראל) for ever" and iv.9 "...all who enter after them shall do according to that interpretation of the Law..."

³⁸ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 109; cf. Raymond F. Collins. "The Birth-Notion of the Cairo Damascus Covenant and its comparison with the New Testament", *EthL* 39 (1963), 555-94.

³⁹ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 109.

knowledge and behavior, is a swearing in (cf. xv.6, 9 and 12). A candidate may be either one who turns from corrupt ways or one who is born within the community (xv.5-6, cf. also x.6-7). We are not sure if there was a trial period, or of the treatment of those who were rejected as members, if a special liturgy existed for this rite, or if it was open to women. A member was excluded if he violated the laws of the covenant⁴⁰ or disobeyed God's law. But there was an opportunity for reconciliation, as stated above, since texts such as ii.4-5, iii.18, iv.6-10 and xx.34 mention God as the subject of the atoning act. Thus God himself is simultaneously seen as the initiator of the covenant, as well as the source of reconciliation (cf. also xv.7, xx.17). In contrast to this outlook, according to the texts cited above, people may turn from sin by choosing to enter the covenant (cf. also iv.9-10), in this case by offering sacrifices (ix.14, xi.17-23 and xvi.13; more discussion of this below). So, CD asserts that community membership is only for those that pledge to adhere to the covenant on the community's own terms ("*enter the covenant*"). Therefore this covenant is in effect not for the whole of Israel, but only for a particular group. In other words, the emphasis changes from an ethnically broad covenant, such as the Sinaitic Covenant, to a particularistic covenant in which human faithfulness is still demanded.

Let us now examine whether "covenant" has an eternal connotation in CD, and if so, how to explain it. If the condition of human obedience must be met to

⁴⁰ CD uses variety of terms such as "to transgress the covenant/ordinances", "to forsake the covenant /the commandments" or "to despise the covenant/the ordinances," cf. i.3, 20, iii.1, v.12, viii.9, 19, x.3, xv.3-4, xvi.12, xix.4-5, 32-33, xx.11-12, 29.

enter the covenant with God or enjoy a relationship with God, how does one validate this covenant?

As mentioned before, the establishment of a covenant by God guarantees its eternal, permanent characteristics. CD clearly states the eternal characteristic of the covenant in iii.4, "*Covenant forever*" and iii.13, "*But with the remnant which held fast to the commandments of God He made His Covenant with Israel forever.*" The use of "forever" shows the permanent aspect of this covenant. However, it is the remnant of Israel which will enjoy this eternal covenant. In other words, the covenant has limited validity and concerns only a part of Israel. The eternal nature of this covenant may be seen in God's action to remember (*zākar*) and renew it to the community (i.4, vi.2, xix.1, cf. 4Q501 2, 4Q504 v.9-11). The covenant is to be renewed annually in the third month. God remembers that "covenant" means "mercy" (i.5, viii.18, xix.31), that is the cancellation of punishment. Conversely, the "vengeance of the covenant" (i.17-18 and xix.13) for breaching the covenant is exile (cf. iii.5-12, v.20-vi.2) and desolation of the land (v.20-21, iii.10). A parallel is made between disobedience, deserving condemnation, and the exilic situation (ii.7-9). Because some still keep the law while exiled, then exile is not God's final punishment; a remnant, representing human faithfulness, is still preserved. The validity of the covenant is still maintained by this remnant since it has been chosen to do the covenant will of God (iii.10-14).

A remnant community in CD seems to consist not only of common people in Israel, but also a priestly group or Levitical tribe. The text in iv.1-10 represents a

covenant with this group in terms of atonement. Another text in ii.2-5 is an allusion to Mal. 2:7, which regards the guardianship of knowledge and Torah instruction as tasks of the priests.⁴¹ In these twofold tasks those in the priesthood are seen as the ones who keep the law. Thus, a broad ethnic covenant becomes a narrower priestly covenant, with the validity of the covenant dependent on human obedience.

CD describes the remnant as those chosen by their fellow Jews. They are living in "exile" due to their desire to keep the purity of God's law in their lives against this present age of wickedness (xx.17). Living in "Damascus" (vi.19) seems to have been done in order to maintain their holiness. This holiness is described as "*distinguish(ing) between clean and unclean...proclaim(ing) the difference between holy and profane...keep(ing) the Sabbath day...and the feasts and the Day of Fasting.*" All these things are conditions for "*the members of the New Covenant in the land of Damascus.*" It seems the covenant is interpreted as a priestly covenant (cf. Num. 25:6-13). Moreover, "the men of perfect holiness" in xx.2, 5 and 7 seems to refer to the members of the community who have special status within it.⁴² The goal of perfect holiness is the aim solely of those elite individuals. Thus only a few people actually preserve this holiness, as the community understands it.

⁴¹ Cf. Christiansen, *Covenant*, 112.

⁴² As Göran Forkman interprets, *The Limits of the Religious Community: Expulsion from the Religious Community within the Qumran sect, within Rabbinic Judaism and within Primitive Christianity* (Lund, 1972), 66; cf. Christiansen, *Covenant*, 120.

As I have already stated above, entry to the covenant has to be done by "enter(ing) the covenant" itself. In that term lies actually the meaning of the "new covenant" concept as cited in the previous paragraph. Coming to the "new covenant" is what humans belong to or enter into, ignoring God's role. Only the human being is carrying the role. What is new in the "new covenant" here, as supposed by the Qumran community?

Jaubert observes that the "new covenant" is never opposed to an "old covenant" or replaces it.⁴³ The "new covenant" must be seen from a broken covenant point of view. Consequently, its conditions and promises are related to those of the old covenant. Sanders understood that the newness in the "new covenant" takes place when a new revelation is given by God. In other words, new content has been revealed in the "new" covenant. This is based on the interpretation of "hidden things" (iii.14) as a new content in the new covenant.⁴⁴ Christiansen rejects Sanders' point of view; she interprets "hidden things" as a radicalized demand to introduce a new and different quality of covenantal relationship. This "radicalized demand" is created by new ways of interpreting the pre-existing covenant laws.⁴⁵ Thus she treats the "new covenant" in CD in terms of introducing new conditions for one and the same covenant.⁴⁶ Furthermore, she explains, the new covenant ensures that the eternal covenant law is kept. As the new covenant is applied, an eschatological aspect is realized because the "teacher

⁴³ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 113.

⁴⁴ *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 242.

⁴⁵ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 129.

⁴⁶ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 130.

of righteousness" will be coming, in fulfillment of the restoration of the law, and thus the forgiveness promised in the OT is realized. Yet the new covenant retains a contemporary aspect also. CD sees the new covenant as a present reality.⁴⁷ This is manifest through a different relationship to God because of forgiveness, and holiness required obedience both in the present and the future. Thus, the new covenant in CD points both to realized eschatology and to the community's self-identification.⁴⁸ Inevitably, human commitment is required to validate the covenant with God; adherence to the law is obligatory.

We already have a description of the new covenant which is, in fact, a demand for perfect holiness and entrance into the covenant. Now, why do they have to stay "in the land of Damascus"? What do they understand in terms of keeping the covenant? Probably, based on land promised in the OT as background, the Qumran community misunderstood it and gave it a new nuance that referred to a narrower option, that is a new locality as a place to practice God's law perfectly.

The phrase in ii.11, "a remnant might be left to the Land", probably refers to "the land of Damascus" cited in vi.19. Callaway suggests that this phrase has to be understood either in a literal-geographical or a metaphorical-symbolic way.⁴⁹ Those who interpret it literally propose that it refers to exile in Damascus or to a place of refuge outside the Qumran site as a place of refuge for the "Qumran

⁴⁷ Collins, "The Birth-Notion..." *EthL.* (1963), 582.

⁴⁸ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 130-31.

⁴⁹ Callaway, "History", 121-27.

community.”⁵⁰ Most scholars, however, interpret it as being metaphorical-symbolic, that is, a symbol of refuge instead of a real place for taking shelter in which the community may practice perfect holiness (cf. 1.7-8).

To sum up, CD is concerned with a particular group among Jewish people known as the “remnant.” This group seems to have been guided by an elite group of Jews and refers to a priest group, who attempted to practice perfect holiness. They needed a place that could be defined by its holiness in order to fulfill their faithfulness in obeying God’s law. Therefore, the validity of God’s covenant with Israel, according to their outlook, is available only by and through this select group. The new covenant that they were setting up demanded that they take up an identity of holiness. The requirement to fulfil God’s law perfectly makes this group more exclusive, but the calling to “enter the covenant” is a sure and effective means to return to God. “Covenant” is meant as a new covenant with God within their community.

3. The Covenant in the Community Rule (1QS)

⁵⁰ Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 17; cf. Christiansen, *Covenant*, 121.

The community rule⁵¹ comprises a variety of laws and seems to have been a handbook for the community. The most interesting aspects of this document are community practice and theology. According to Christiansen it lacks any historical information.⁵² The lack of any expression of continuity with the past in covenantal terms supports this assumption. Moreover, the term “new covenant” is not found in 1QS, but “covenant”, describing the relationship between the community and God, appears 32 times.⁵³

The terms “covenant of God” (x.10) and “His covenant” (v.18-20) were used in a dualistic scheme context, for example, good-evil or light-darkness, not in relation to the past established covenants in the OT. Those who belong to the covenant of God are in the light and vice versa. Christiansen suggests that this phenomenon is a “timeless principle” rather than a historical foundation.⁵⁴ Thus the covenant is only for those who love God, without any relationship to the prior covenants.

The idea of a covenant with ancestors —any covenant that God established with a patriarch— or God remembering a covenant as appears in 11QTemple and CD does not appear in 1QS. Moses is mentioned four times (i.3, v.8, viii.15 and 22), but only in reference to the obligatory aspect of the covenant.⁵⁵ The absence

⁵¹ There are three documents using this term, 1QS, 4QS^d and 4QS^c. The last two of these fragments will be mentioned if necessary. There is general agreement on a date for these manuscripts of around 100 BC; see Schürer, *History*, 383-84. Michael A. Knibb, “The Qumran Community” *Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of Jewish & Christian World 200 BC to AD200* vol. 2 (Cambridge: CUP, 1987), 77-78 proposes 1QS’ structure as the following: Statements of the aims of the community (i.1-15); Entry into the community (i.16-iii.12); The doctrinal teaching of the community (iii.13-4.26); Rules for structuring the life of the community (v.1-vii.25); The relationship with Israel and eschatological teachings (viii.1-ix.26a) and finally a Conclusion (ix.26b-xi.22).

⁵² Christiansen, *Covenant*, 146.

⁵³ Kuhn, “τρβ”, 36.

⁵⁴ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 147.

⁵⁵ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 148.

of any reference to covenants with patriarchs is probably because there is no awareness of belonging to Israel as a covenantal nation, nor, as Christiansen said, "of a common past, of a shared relationship, or fate, uniting present Israel with Israel of the past and future, be it in faithfulness."⁵⁶ Israel is mentioned several times without reference to any idea of a covenant, even in a historical context. When Israel is mentioned, it is used to support the present validity of God's law (cf. iii.24, iv.3). The validity of the law is also maintained by priestly services since the priests' interpretation of the law is the authority within the community (cf. v.20-22, ii.3, viii.11-16). The unique expression "their Covenant" (vi.18-20) is used in reference to that task of priestly interpretation. Since the pronoun refers to the priests, it articulates that the establishment of the covenant is done by priestly commitment. A priest, therefore, must study the law and encourage people to do the same (iv.2-5). The study of the law is for the restoration of the covenant relationship, since the validity of the covenant is now based on legal principles (ix.3-6). The emphasis is on the priests' tasks to "keep the covenant" and "seek His will" through the law, rather than cultic service as cited in v.9 and 1QSb iii.22. Therefore, the covenant validity is built on the principle of law, rather than on history.⁵⁷

Since 1QS is not concerned with Israel's past, the promises of a land and offspring (in terms of a nation and people) are absent and now shift to the

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 150-51.

individual promises of peace and long life (iv.6-8).⁵⁸ One nuance appearing in these blessings is a future context contained in the phrase “life without end.” It promises that eternal punishment for evil will come through Messiah and Aaron (ix.11, ii.12-22).

For now, we understand that the covenant relationship in 1QS is primarily addressed to the present community in reference to a dualistic scheme of light and darkness. However, the effects of the covenant will be apparent in the future. How are the future effects described?

The phrase “eternal covenant” appears four times, in iii.11, v.5, viii.9 and iv.22-23. The first three are in the context of atonement as a consequence of obedience, whereas the last relates to God’s final judgment. Election determines entrance into an eternal covenant, as evidenced when God chooses the community to be his everlasting possession (xi.7-9). Furthermore, the elect will form a council of the community of holiness and will be an eternal plantation. To be an elected person means being set apart for God in a community, while simultaneously being God’s eternal possession. On the other hand, to enter an eternal covenant demands a response from humans—they must accept the law and live accordingly. Entering this eternal covenant also means escape from judgment, present restoration, and an end to injustice (iv.22-23). Thus, entering an eternal covenant has present connotations yet with future fulfillment. Exclusivity is clearly seen both in the idea of election and in the eternal covenant. The most

⁵⁸ Complete text as follows: “And as for the visitation of all those who walk in this spirit, it shall be healing, great peace in a long life, and fruitfulness together with every everlasting blessing and eternal joy in life without end, a crown of glory and a garment of majesty in unending light.”

important idea, however, is not its exclusiveness but as Christiansen mentioned, "the idea that God's election is thought of as coinciding with the community as 'the elect.'" ⁵⁹ So it is apparent that some of Israel are chosen to live lives of obedience. To live in obedience is a fully human response or an act of conversion (cf. x.12 and ix.17). This is important since the validity of the eternal covenant is based on covenantal obedience because its establishment is in accordance with eternal precepts (viii.10).

I explained that the idea of an eternal covenant is set within the context of atonement and of God's final judgment. Atonement is very apparent in viii.5-10 where it is considered in relation to election. The community, as an elect people, functions to bring atonement for the land (cf. ix.4-5) and it seems only for their own group (cf. v.6-7). Thus an expiatory service and its effects move from the temple in Jerusalem to the elect community in "exile" in order to sustain holiness in a real and concrete way (cf. ix.6). The community performs ritual washings so as to receive justification (cf. ii.25-iii.12). Thus the atonement is applied to a narrower community (the Qumran community), and with it the eternal covenant exists. Furthermore, particular people play a role in the covenant relationship. Thereby a particular covenant relationship and the priestly covenant commitment take place.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 154.

⁶⁰ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 157-58 supports this statement by referring the metaphorical language such as "Everlasting Plantation", "House of Holiness for Israel", "Assembly of Supreme Holiness for Aaron", "tried wall", "precious corner-stone" and "a most holy Dwelling for Aaron", "House of Perfection", and "Truth in Israel."

As a result, the new covenant stresses obedience and holiness. The new covenant is never related to Israel's past history; it is only focused on the present and is centered on atonement for the sake of perfection in order to come into the realm of light. Thus the new covenant is built on a timeless legal principle.

4. The Covenant in the Temple Scrolls (11QT)

There is no scholarly consensus about the genre of 11QTemple.⁶¹ It is very obvious, however, that the temple, holiness and the land are the most important aspects.⁶² The text addresses the issue of the validity of the temple that becomes the center for all Israel. As I shall show later, the temple seems to function as a symbol of a covenant relationship between all Israel and its God, and it makes holiness its goal.⁶³ How does it work and how does it link to the concept of covenant?

The term *b^e rîṭ* appears in the very beginning of the text: "*Behold, I will make a covenant (b^e rîṭ)*" (ii.1).⁶⁴ God initiates a covenant with Israel in which he will expel foreign nations and ensure Israel does what he has said. In order to be holy before God (ii.9), Israel should not make a covenant with foreign nations (ii.5, 12). The covenant stands for a relationship with God ("*You shall not worship*

⁶¹ For a parallel between 11QTemple and 1 Macc. 10:34-35, I suggest 11QTemple was written about 150 BC. For further discussion see Michael Owen Wise. *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran 11*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 49 (Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1990). Regarding the genre proposals see Yigael Yadin. *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect* (New York: Random, 1985), 64-74 and see also an overview summary by Christiansen, *The Covenant*, 105.

⁶² Wise, *Critical Study*, 155-94.

⁶³ Cf. Christiansen, *Covenant*, 106; cf. Wise, *Critical Study*, 155-94.

⁶⁴ All translations and reconstruction of Qumran texts are based on Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*.

another god' ii.11), since it is established by Him in xxix.10.⁶⁵ The text points to a close relationship with the covenants established with Israel's patriarchs, an example of which is that with Jacob, and appears to echo Lev. 26:40-46. Thus, the covenant is valid both in the past, the present and the future, even though 11QT^a never mentions an "eternal covenant." Nevertheless, its eternal validity is implied in lix.17,⁶⁶ which contains a promise of a future, that is, an eternal kingdom of Israel and a king chosen by God, which is based on the Davidic Covenant. The covenant made with the patriarchs also functions as a term for belonging to a community. In addition, lv.17 and lix.8⁶⁷ use the term *b^erîti* ("my covenant") which assumes a setting up of an already existing relationship in past time. Thereby, the covenant of God, as we have already seen, is valid even without a human partner. The idea that God is the guarantor of the covenant relationship is so strong, though, since the covenant is based on Old Testament concepts that practically speaking tend to make law the leading principle.⁶⁸ The human partner in a covenant relationship is under specific obligations, such as holiness.

⁶⁵ "I will cause my glory to rest on it until the day of creation on which I shall create my sanctuary, establishing it for myself for all the time according to the covenant which I have made (*karat*) with Jacob in Bethel."

⁶⁶ "But if he walk after my rules and keep my commandments and do that which is correct and good before me, no heir to the throne of the kingdom of Israel shall be cut off from among his sons for ever."

⁶⁷ lv.17, "If among you, in one of your towns that I give you, there is found a man or woman who does that which is wrong in my eyes by transgressing my covenant (*b^erîti*), and goes and worships other gods..."

lix.8, "I will hide my face from them and they shall become food, plunder and prey. None shall save them because of their wickedness, because they have broken my covenant (*b^erîti*) and their soul has loathed my law until they have incurred every guilt. Afterwards they will return to me..."

⁶⁸ Benedikt Otzen, "Judaism in Antiquity: Political Development and Religious Currents from Alexander to Hadrian" (trans. Frederick H. Cryer), *Biblemiser* 7 (1990), 72.

In 5 or 6 instances⁶⁹ the use of "covenant" is presupposed by obligatory covenants in the OT. Hence, the covenant is directly identified with the law. Therefore, its validity is not only tied to God's promise but is also conditional upon the human partner keeping the law. Moreover, the use of the term "eternal" with ordinances/statutes,⁷⁰ instead of "eternal covenant" indicates that the emphasis to follow the law is a key principle for the relationship. As a result, the validity of the covenant with God is for those who keep the laws or commandments as stated in lix.17.⁷¹ The leading principle is law, not covenant. It brings a new nuance that the emphasis of covenant changes from being dependent on God to human response. Thus, "covenant" is almost synonymous with "statutes", and its validity is tied to human obedience.⁷²

Since the covenant relationship is related to its obligations, the adherence to the law, it expects a restoration of holiness. The goal is for all the people to achieve holiness and perfection. Holiness, both ideal and real, can only be reached in the "land" that God has promised. For the "land" is significant inasmuch as it is the place where God's law is valid, as stated on 11QTemple ii (set in the context of Ex. 34.10-16). Maintaining holiness becomes a condition of God's presence in the land as well as for retaining possession of the land (lx.16-17,

⁶⁹ Yadin claims that only 5 times the term *b'rit* is applied in 11QTemple, *Temple Scroll*, 483 (ii.4 –citing Ex. 34:12, xx.14 –covenant of salt-, xxix.10 –on festival laws on sacrifices-, lv.17 –on laws against idolatry- and lix.10 –as part of the laws on the royal authority-). Vermes adds one more in ii.1, thus making six times.

⁷⁰ For example 11QTemple xviii.8, xix.8, xxii.14, xxv.8, xxvii.4.

⁷¹ "But if he walk after my rules and keep my commandments and do that which is correct and good before me, no heir to the throne of the kingdom of Israel shall be cut off from among his sons for ever."

⁷² Christiansen, *Covenant*, 110.

which follows the view in Deuteronomy).⁷³ It assumes that the Temple scrolls are built on the OT demand for holiness. A lack of holiness is a breach of the covenant, stated by the terms "*broken my covenant*" (lix.8) and "*transgressing my covenant*" (lv.17), resulting in the hiding of God's face (ix.4-12) when God's punishment will take place. The punishment for disobeying God's law is devastation of the land (lix.2-13), instead of "eternal inheritance of the land" (li.15-16),⁷⁴ which is set in the context of Ex. 34:10-16. As a result, demands for holiness are extended to the whole of Israel. Examples of this nation-wide determinant are seen in Temple Scroll in xviii.16, xxii.12, xxxix.1, 12, etc.⁷⁵ God himself avoids giving out punishment by restoring the covenant through the act of atonement (lxiii.6, cf. Deut. 21:9). On the other hand, the people must offer sacrifices to fulfill the OT law (cf. Lev. 16:33, Num. 28:30). The cult serves the purpose of dealing with the people's sins and/or transgressions.

As we have already seen, the land functions as the place for keeping God's law and directly points to the whole of Israel attempting to maintain holiness. In this matter the temple holds the important function of helping to keep the law and holiness. God is present in the temple. People gather before the divine presence to offer sacrifices (xxi.6, xxxv.12-14, xlvi.7-10, xvi.15-18, xviii.7, xxvi.7, 9). At this point, the people are identified through the cult, centered on the temple

⁷³ "*When you enter the land which I give you, do not learn to practice the abominations of those nations. There shall be found among you none who makes his son or daughter pass through fire, ...*"

⁷⁴ "*Justice and justice alone shall you pursue that you may live and come to inherit the land that I give you to inherit for all days.*"

⁷⁵ They refer to "tribes of Israel", "children of Israel", and the like.

as a place of holiness.⁷⁶ We assume the existence of a temple large enough for the people to gather, and a situation in which cultic holiness applies to both land and people (xix.11-xxv.2, li.7-10). Since these two functions of the temple act as conditions of covenant validity, then the temple is symbolic of the covenant relationship. We can then infer that the covenant relationship depends on the people's obedience and is used as a broad category for ethnic Israel.

To sum up, 11QTemple understands the covenant to be for the people and takes obedience, observed by keeping law and therefore holiness, as a condition in order to maintain the covenant relationship. The emphasis of the covenant now changes from dependence on God to human response. Thereby the covenant in 11QTemple has conditional characteristics, emphasizing Israelite ethnicity, and is eternal as long as the law's demand is fulfilled. In short, the new covenant in the Temple Scroll is to provide a new law.

CONCLUDING REMARK

Basically, the three Qumran texts we have investigated, though they were not exclusive by nature, nevertheless became exclusive when theological, religious, social and political influences occurred. Human actions to restore the covenant are very clear either by cult or by entering the covenant, which is equated with becoming a member of the community, as in CD. This is a clear distinction between 11QT and CD.

⁷⁶ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 114.

The covenant in 1QS is narrowed down and is more rigorous in rules so as to fulfill the covenant obligations of purity. Entrance into this eternal covenant demands ritual and moral practices in order to maintain the required standard of holiness. The interrelatedness with historical Israel is evident in the phrase "covenant with the ancestors." Thus the idea that the covenant is available for all Israelites occurs, but eventually it is only for those who choose to enter the covenant and enjoy its benefits. The covenant relationship is based primarily on obedience and faithfulness. Thus, "the remnant" will enjoy an eternal covenant relationship with God. They will preserve holiness before God and as a result an ethnic covenant is replaced by a particularistic covenant.

The covenant in 11QTemple is for all the people of Israel and uses cult practices to restore the broken covenant relationship.

A scope as narrow as that of CD is apparent in 1QS since those who enter the covenant will be worthy of being mentioned in the covenant relationship with God. The main difference between them is the complete absence of past history in 1QS. No past covenants are considered in the present covenant. The human partner must choose to enter the covenant with God, and thus human response assumes an important role in this relationship. Obedience to the law and holiness become primary conditions of the covenant in which radicalized demands take place instead of believing that God established the covenant as in the OT. This has happened since the salvation history of Israel does not play any role in 1QS. Those who refuse to enter the covenant, as 1QS understands the matter, are

excluded from the community. Thus a "new" particular religious society was growing in 1QS by means of a priestly covenant. A pure community is demanded in preparation for judgment where they will have "everlasting blessing and eternal joy in life without end, a crown of glory and a garment of majesty in unending light" (1QS iv.7-8); (cf. Christiansen, *Covenant*, 184.) The eschatological aspect is becoming clear in 1QS.

We already have a summary of the understanding of the covenant in Qumran texts that we investigated, and now I shall show what is "new" in the covenant in the Qumran community from Old Testament point of view. I will start with the phrase "new covenant" which appears in CD and Jeremiah. Then I will continue with the concept of covenant as a whole.

Both see that the "new covenant" is needed in the context of a broken relationship; in the case of Jeremiah the LXX emphasized an invalid covenant. Both have the same purpose but a different motif. By using the phrase "new covenant", Jeremiah looks to a future new condition for a relationship with God, something created by God. He expects, in the context of exile, that God will deliver them from oppression. Thus the nationhood will be maintained in the exilic situation. One more important point is to ask God to change people's hearts, which refers to obedience. A new covenant will be established by God and built on God's forgiveness. This new covenant, therefore, is assumed to be unconditional, created by God and depending not on obedience and external

signs but pointing forward to a new and different relationship between God and his people.

CD considers a new condition based on one and the same covenant as that effective in the past. By applying a new condition, CD ensures that the eternal covenant law is still preserved and expects that *a realized eschatology* will take place both in the form of a "teacher of righteousness", who will restore the law, and of forgiveness. The present situation is also important for CD, since it expects forgiveness and holiness to create a different relationship with God. However, it requires obedience to the law, both now and then. Accordingly, the validity of the covenant depends on human commitment.

We already see different treatment of the phrase "new covenant" between Jeremiah and CD, so now let us turn to the "new" concept of covenant in CD compared with the Old Testament.

The understanding of the relationship with God changes from the Old Testament period up to the second temple period. In the Old Testament it is very obvious that the relationship with God is manifested in the history of the people as well as in the cult and in worship. CD views the relationship with God as beginning with entering the new covenant. 1QS defined its community by maintaining its holiness as a pure community. 1QTemple restricted the covenant relationship with God to particular people then alive, without relating to the past history of Israel.

Entering the covenant, which is synonymous with being a member of the community, becomes the symbol that the covenant relationship with God is taking place. Covenant markers in the Old Testament, such as circumcision, have never been in question.

The scope of the covenant in the Qumran community becomes narrow and particular. If in the OT the scope of the covenant is the nation, in other word the Israelites, now it is only for a particular subgroup within the nation.

Regarding the establishment and validity of the covenant, the OT is very clear in that, in every dimension, God is believed to be the initiator in establishing and also in validating the covenant. Humans will response to this initiative but in the Qumran community the covenant may be established by humans and its validity depends on human action. In the OT case, therefore, the eternal characterization of the covenant is certain but this does not happen in the Qumran texts.

The eschatological point of view as a result of the expectation of a covenant with God has a more prominent place in the Qumran community than in the OT. Arising from this idea, the Qumran community sees itself as the "remnant" which the OT prophesied.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brownlee, William H. "The Historical Allusions of the Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 126 (1952): 10-20.
- _____. *The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk*. Society of Biblical Literature 24. Georgia: Scholar, 1979.
- Callaway, Phillip, R. *The History of the Qumran Community*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 3. Sheffield: Sheffield, 1988.
- Christiansen, Ellen Juhl. *The Covenant in Judaism & Paul: A Study of Ritual Boundaries as Identity Markers*. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995.
- _____. "The Consciousness of belonging to God's covenant and what it entails according to the Damascus Document and the community rule." Pages 69-97 in *Qumran between the Old and New Testament* (ed. Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thomson). Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 290. Sheffield: Academic, 1998.
- Clements, R.E. *Abraham and David: Genesis 15 and its Meaning for Israelite Tradition*, Studies in Biblical Theology, Second Series 5. London: S.C.M., 1967.
- Collins, Raymond F. "The Birth-Notion of the Cairo Damascus Covenant and its comparison with the New Testament." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 39 (1963): 555-94.
- Cross, F.M. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. Third Edition. Sheffield: Academic, 1994.
- Davies, Philip R. *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of "Damascus Document"*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 25. Sheffield: Sheffield, 1983.
- de Vaux, Roland. *Archaeology and The Dead Sea Scrolls*, London: British Academy, 1973.
- Dupont-Sommer, A. *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (trans. G. Vermes). Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983.
- Botterweck, J., and J.H. Ringgren, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Translated by John T. Willis. 15 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980-2000.
- Golb, Norman. "The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Perspective." *The American Scholar* 58 (1989): 177-207.
- _____. "The Problem of Origin and Identification of The Dead Sea Scrolls." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 124 (1980): 1-24.
- Goldstein, J.A. *1 Maccabees*. Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1976.
- Guhrt, J. "Covenant, Guarantee, Mediator." Pages 365-372 in vol. 1 of *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. Edited by Colin Brown. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
- Jagersma, H. *A History of Israel: from Alexander the Great to Bar Kochba*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Josephus*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. LCL. Cambridge: HUP, 1926-1965.

- Knibb, Michael, A. *The Qumran Community*. Cambridge Commentaries on writings of Jewish & Christian world 200BC to AD200. vol. 2. Cambridge: CUP, 2012.
- Kuhn, Karl Georg. *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.
- LaSor, William Sanford. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Faith*. Chicago: Moody, 1962.
- Martinez, Florentino García and A.S. van der Woude. "A "Groningen" Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History." *Revue de Qumran* 14.4 (56) (1990):521-541.
- Martinez, Florentino García. "The History of the Qumran community in the light of recently available texts." Pages 194-216 in *Qumran between the Old and New Testament* (ed. Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thomson). Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 290. Sheffield: Academic, 1998.
- _____. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Qumran texts in English*. 2nd ed. Translated by Wilfred G.E. Watson. Leiden: Brill and Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Milik, J.T. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*. Translated by J. Strugnell. London: SCM, 1963.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. "Demetrius I and the Teacher of Righteousness." *Revue Biblique* 83 (1976): 400-420.
- Otzen, Benedikt. *Judaism in Antiquity: Political Development and Religious Currents from Alexander to Hadrian*. Biblical Seminar 7. Sheffield: Academic, 1990.
- Ringgren, Helmer. *The faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Crossroad, 1995.
- Sanders, E.P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- Schiffman, L.H. "Miqsat Ma'še ha-Torah and the Temple Scroll." *Revue de Qumran* 14.4 (56) (1990): 435-457.
- _____. "The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect." *Biblical Archaeologist* 53 (1990): 64-73.
- _____. *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Philadelphia: JPS, 1994.
- Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987.
- Stegemann, H. "The Qumran Essenes: Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple." Pages 83-166 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (eds. J. Treballe Barrera and VanderKam Montaner). Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. "The community of the renewed covenant: Between Judaism and Christianity." Pages 43-110 in *The Community of the renewed covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam). Notre Dame: Notre Dame, 1994.
- Tcherikover, V. *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999.
- VanderKam, James C. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

- _____. "Covenant." Pages 151-155 in vol. 1 of *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James VanderKam). Oxford: OUP, 2000.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. 4th ed. Sheffield: Academic, 1995.
- _____. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*. 2nd ed. London: SCM, 1982.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion, "Historiography of Qumran: The sons of Zadok and their enemies." Pages 345-377 in *Qumran between the Old and New Testament* (ed. Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thomson). Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 290. Sheffield: Academic, 1998.
- Weinfeld, M. "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90 (1970): 184-203.
- Wise, Michael Owen. *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran 11*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 49. Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1990.
- Woude, A.S. van der. "Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habbakkuk Commentary." Pages 349-360 in *Essays in Honour of Yigael Yadin*. *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33 (1982).
- Yadin, Yigael. *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect*. New York: Random, 1985.

Short biography of author:

Dr. Andreas Hauw, serves as a vice rector of SEABS (Sekolah Tinggi Teologi SAAT), Malang, East Java, Indonesia. He is an expert in Biblical studies, specializing in NT such as the Gospel of Mark etc. He can be reached via electronic mail: andreas.hauw@seabs.ac.id