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Abstract

Pauline scholarship often overlooks the fact that from the Levitical sacrificial perspective “sacrifice” and “curse” are diametrically opposed concepts. A sacrifice must be “holy and acceptable to God” (Rom 12:1). Arguably, Paul describes Jesus or his blood as a sacrifice to God (1Cor 5:7; Rom 3:25). In this light, how might we understand his assertion that Christ became a “curse” on the cross (Gal 3:13)? The “accursed” person who hangs on a tree is impure and defiled and thus totally unacceptable as a sacrifice to God (Deut 21:23; John 19:31). This research argues that the key concept that resolves such potential tensions in Paul’s statements is the “covenant”.

Both “sacrifice” and “curse” are covenantal concepts. Sacrificial activities are essential for maintaining the covenant between God and his people. When God’s people sin, sacrifice provides the means to attain forgiveness and to remain in the covenant. However, the covenant can be broken by grievous sins such as idolatry, which result in the loss of the sanctuary and the sacrificial means. Consequently, they would fall under the “curse” of the covenant. This covenantal perspective underlies Paul’s soteriology. This thesis demonstrates that in Paul’s understanding Christ’s death serves both ends: the termination of the Mosaic curse by becoming a curse, and the dedication of his life-blood for the maintenance of the renewed covenant. These two things are related yet not identical.

As test cases for this covenantal model, this research examines three Pauline texts. Galatians 3:13 describes the redemption of God’s people from the Mosaic covenantal curse. Deutero-Isaiah envisaged this event as a new “Exodus”, about which Paul talks in 1 Corinthians 5:7. Romans 3:25 illustrates the eschatological Yom Kippur for this new Exodus people consisting now of Jews and Gentiles, which sustains and sanctifies God’s renewed covenant people to the end.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1. Purpose statement

The purpose of the present dissertation is to explore the role of sacrifice in relation to the covenant within Paul’s soteriology. In this research, the notion of sacrifice itself will be carefully examined in the first century Jewish context. Hence, we shall use this term with the greatest circumspection, seeking to avoid both reductionistic and anachronistic approaches to this term. That is to say, sacrifice in this study denotes various acts involving in making offerings to God conducted in the sanctuary. These are prescribed in the book of Leviticus and other Pentateuchal books, and were practiced in the late Second Temple period.

While Pauline scholars almost unanimously agree that sacrificial elements are present in Paul’s soteriological statements, there is little consensus regarding the question of whether the sacrificial perspective is at the heart of his soteriology. In fact, there has been a long-standing scholarly tendency to regard sacrificial ideas as nonessential in Paul’s soteriology. For those scholars, Paul merely borrows some sacrificial terms from various traditions circulating around

---

1 In this dissertation, the term “sacrificial” is not used as a synonym for the term “cultic”. Since the Jewish idea of “sacrifice” denotes what is dedicated to God, I use this term with this specific bearing. The word “cult” can denote the act of worship in general. Hence, I use this term in a broader sense, which refers to a wide range of practices and ideas in Second Temple Judaism. Moreover, I distinguish the term “Levitical” from that of “Jewish”. While the former refers to the ideas found mainly in the book of Leviticus, the latter covers the notions conceived by Jews living in the late Second Temple period.

2 Concerning the biblical notion of sacrifice, Eberhart helpfully comments, ‘Even though the rituals and individual instructions for all of these types of sacrifice are different, the priestly texts employ one comprehensive term for all of them: לֵוִיָּהָב (Lev 1:2, 3, 10, 14; 2:1, 4, 7, 12; 3:1; 4:23, 28, 32; 5:11; 7:38; etc.; see also 17:4; Num 15:4). This term is a nominal derivative from the root לֵוִיָּה – “to draw near, to bring near”...It captures the dynamic movement of sacrificial material toward the sanctuary and ultimately toward God who, according to the priestly concepts, resides there’ (2011a, 23).

3 Hence, sacrifices signify not simply domesticated animals, but also cereals, flour, oil, frankincense, salt, unleavened cakes, and wine.

4 We have no interest in reconstructing the history and development of Jewish cultus. Rather, since our scope of the research lies in the first century CE, we focus on the sacrificial practices in the late Second Temple period.
the earliest churches, but these sacrificial categories ‘do not contain Paul’s characteristic view’.

E. P. Sanders, having stressed the centrality of atonement and forgiveness in Palestinian Judaism, still maintains that the Jewish notion of atonement is not at the centre of Paul’s soteriology. According to Sanders, when Paul uses sacrificial imagery in his soteriological statements, he merely repeats pre-Pauline traditions that understand Jesus’ death from the sacrificial perspective.

Nonetheless, the fact remains that Paul does adopt sacrificial terms in his letters (e.g., Rom 3:25). Moreover, there is a growing scholarly awareness of the “Jewishness” of Paul and his way of thinking. Given the enormous significance of the Temple and its cultus in the late Second Temple period, it is questionable to assume sacrificial elements as nonessential in Paul’s thought. Some prominent scholars thus reclaim the importance of the idea of sacrifice in Paul’s soteriology. Among these scholars, however, there is a tendency to pass over the diversity of the sacrificial terms or ideas Paul employs. For instance, they often confuse the scapegoat ritual with the blood-sacrificial rituals. In another instance, not a few scholars

---

5 Bultmann 1952, 296.
6 Concerning the English term “atonement”, McGrath states, ‘The term “theory of the atonement” has become commonplace in English-language theology as a term for “a way of understanding the work of Christ.” The term was used especially extensively in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. However, there is increasing evidence that this term is seen as cumbersome and unhelpful by many modern Christian writers, across the entire spectrum of theological viewpoints’ (2007 [1993], 330). Bearing this point in mind, I shall use the word “atone” or “atonement” as a technical term for signifying ΚΕΚΛΩΣΗ in Hebrew and its Greek equivalent ἐξολοθρεύω.
8 Frey states, ‘Pauline scholarship today can more easily acknowledge that Paul still acted and preached within a Jewish context. Paul’s Jewish identity as such is not a major problem any more’ (2014, 240).
9 Klawans argues, ‘Indeed, when we look a little deeper into Paul’s descriptions of sacrificial worship, we find that Paul affirms many of the fundamental theological tenets upon which ancient Jewish sacrificial worship is based’ (2006, 220).
10 E.g., Stuhlmacher 1989, 60; Dunn 1998, 212.
11 See our review of James Dunn below. The “blood-sacrificial ritual” signifies a ritual that involves blood manipulation in the sanctuary. The most typical ritual is the sin offering, in which blood assumes the central role. There are also the burnt offering, the peace (well-being) offering, and the guilt offering.
categorise the Passover sacrifice as a “sacrifice for sins” without providing a convincing argument. As will be discussed in the next chapter, however, the paschal lamb for the Passover feast is best categorised as a “thanksgiving offering”, which is not, by definition, a sacrifice for sins.

In recent decades, the tendency to minimise and reduce the variety of Paul’s sacrificial ideas has been challenged by an increasing interest in the diversity of the sacrificial concepts Paul utilises. Some scholars’ studies enhance our understanding of the complexity of sacrificial imagery in Paul’s salvific statements. There is, nonetheless, still room for further consideration in this regard. Stephen Finlan, aware of the diversity of Paul’s sacrificial concepts, claims that Paul considers that Jesus, through his death, fulfils each and every sacrificial activity of the Temple cult. Yet, this way of understanding poses a vexing problem. Roy E. Gane’s account of “sacrifice” explains the potential problem of Finlan’s account.

In Hebrew, the idea of “sacrifice” in general is conveyed by the noun qorban… The meaning of qorban is associated with that of the Hiphil verb from the same root qrb (lit., “cause to come near”), which can refer not only to preliminary conveyance of offering material to the ritual location (e.g., [Lev] 1:3), but also to formal ritual presentation to the Lord (e.g., [Lev] 1:5, 13). This formal presentation transfers something to the holy God for his utilization. So a qorban (“sacrifice, sacrificial offering”) makes something holy by giving it over to the holy domain of God.

Ancient Jews treated sacrificial animals with great care so as not to harm or afflict them. As Bradley McLean explains, ‘Sacrificial animals were killed quickly and efficiently by cutting

---

12 See the following scholarly review in this chapter.
13 Finlan 2004, 177-8.
14 Gane 2004, 78.
their throat with a sharp knife. A carelessly performed, and therefore painful, slaying would risk having the animal swallow its own blood, thereby jeopardising the worthiness of the animal for sacrifice’.\textsuperscript{15} Any sacrifice offered to God must be holy and spotless, and what is damaged or harmed is unfit for this purpose. It is unlikely that Paul was ignorant of such a basic Jewish idea of “sacrifice” (cf. Rom 12:1; Phil 4:18). This raises, among several other questions, the intriguing question of what Paul means by his statement in Galatians 3:13. Given that Jesus became a \textit{curse}, how then was it possible for him to be offered to God as a sacrifice? A person who is “accursed” would seem to be disqualified for a holy sacrifice to God. Finlan would respond to this that Paul thinks that Jesus simultaneously assumes the roles of both \textit{cursed} scapegoat and \textit{holy} sacrifice.\textsuperscript{16} However, it remains uncertain whether Paul in fact alludes to the scapegoat ritual in Galatians 3:13.\textsuperscript{17} It is also important to note that the scapegoat can be called a holy sacrifice to God (cf. Lev 16:5).\textsuperscript{18}

A more fundamental question concerns whether or not the cursedness of Christ can be compatible with the sacredness of sacrifice. While the flesh taken from the dead body of the sacrificial animal for sins, which is eaten by priests within the sanctuary, is “most holy” (Lev 6:29; cf. Lev 10:17),\textsuperscript{19} the corpse of the man hanging on a tree is impure and defiling (Deut 21:23). Hence, it is difficult to imagine that first century Jews could think that an accursed person who hangs on a tree could be eligible as a holy sacrifice (cf. John 19:31). If Paul thinks

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{15} McLean 1996, 48. E. P. Sanders also comments, ‘A deft stroke would sever the carotid arteries relatively painlessly, the blood would gush out, and the animal would soon lose consciousness’ (1992, 107).
\item \textsuperscript{16} Finlan claims, ‘He [Paul] is not looking to harmonize these [cultic] metaphors but to encapsulate the \textit{significance} of the death’ (2005, 51) [Finlan’s emphasis].
\item \textsuperscript{17} We shall consider this question in chapter 5.
\item \textsuperscript{18} See our discussion in chapter 2,3,3.5.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Concerning the flesh that is burned with fire outside the camp, see the detailed study of Kiuchi (1987, 130-42).
\end{itemize}
that Jesus was, at some point in time, dedicated to God as a holy sacrifice, does he consider that Jesus was, at the same moment, cursed by God or the law?

Having realised the intricacy of Paul’s sacrificial or cultic vocabulary, some scholars therefore suggest that there is no coherence in thought in Paul’s use of sacrificial ideas.20 This research attempts to show that Paul is indeed a thoughtful and consistent Jewish thinker, and his soteriological thinking is deeply rooted in Jewish sacrificial ideas. However, given the complexity of his soteriological thought, we need a broader framework in which Paul’s various ideas and thoughts can be satisfactorily connected. We posit the notion of the “covenant” as such a framework. To test our hypothesis, we shall examine some key passages from the Pauline corpus.21 For now, it is helpful to explain some essential points that will be fully developed and defended in the following chapters.

2. Key issues in this research

2.1 Thesis: Sacrifice, Curse, and the Covenant

In the first place, we postulate that Paul understands both sacrifice and curse as essential components of the covenant between God and his people. It is vital to stress that the purpose of the sacrificial system as a whole is to maintain the covenant relationship. When the covenant is

---

20 Fredriksen suggests, ‘Paul’s letters are shot through with the language of sanctuary, sacrifice, purity and holiness. Alas, much of it is confusing’ (2010, 247).
21 I limit the scope of this research to the epistles that are commonly regarded as genuinely Pauline (i.e., Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philemon). Unless otherwise stated, the biblical quotations are taken from New Revised Standard Version (NRSV). Concerning English quotations of the so-called Septuagintal texts (LXX), I shall use the translation of A New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS). In this thesis, the “Jewish” scriptures represent both Hebrew Vorlage texts and Old Greek texts, whereas the “Hebrew” scriptures signify Hebrew (and Aramaic) texts alone. We presuppose the fluidity of “scriptures” in the first century milieu, and pay attention to textual variance when necessary.
intact, the people of the covenant enjoy the divine presence in their midst (Exod 29:45), and the daily sacrificial offering ‘serves to maintain that presence among the community’. Moreover, if God’s people commit sins as an individual or as a group, they can be spared from God’s wrathful judgement through conducting sacrificial remedies in an appropriate manner. Once the covenant is broken, however, sacrifice becomes ineffective, and curse follows.

An example may help to illuminate this point. The infant Samuel was given the oracle concerning the doom of Eli’s house: “Therefore I swear to the house of Eli that the iniquity of Eli’s house shall not be expiated by sacrifice or offering forever” (1Sam 3:14). This oracle suggests not simply God’s rejection of Eli’s priesthood, but also the fracture of the covenant between God and his people. According to the book of Leviticus, the sins of priests bring guilt on the people as a whole (cf. Lev 4:3). Indeed, in the following narrative the fall of Eli’s house accompanied the subsequent loss of the sanctuary and the departure of God’s glory (1Sam 4:22; cf. Jer 7:12). As a result, God’s people lost the means to maintain the covenant. The same sequence was recapitulated on a much larger scale in the Babylonian exile (e.g., 2Kgs 24:3–4; Jer 7:14; 52:13; Lam 2:6; Ezek 11:22–25). The Jewish scriptures declare that the people under the broken covenant must endure suffering and punishment as the curse of the covenant (e.g.,

---

22 Klawans 2006, 70. Hence, Gese’s description of the sacrificial system is reductionist. He reduces the whole purpose of the sacrificial system to “atonement”, as he states: ‘The whole sacrificial system [in the post-exilic era] serves to atone and finds its meaning in the atoning function of sacrifice itself’ (1981, 103).

23 Klawans helpfully explains: ‘In the absence of grave sin, the regular and proper performance of sacrificial service attracts and maintains the dwelling of the divine presence in the sanctuary. Moral defilement–brought about by actions God finds utterly repugnant–threatens to undo this state of affairs. It stands to reason that in the presence of grave sin, sacrifice is no longer adequate to the task of attracting and maintaining the divine presence among the people of Israel’ (Ibid., 93).

24 Gese insists that, because the sin offering was instituted after the Babylonian exile, the sacrifice mentioned here could not be a sacrifice for sins (1981, 98). But the Jewish Bible clearly states that it was instituted before the Exodus event. Gese relies too much on his hypothetical reconstruction of the history of the Jewish cultus.
Lev 26:14–39; Deut 28:15–68; Jer 26:6; Lam 1:3; Dan 9:11). Since the sacrificial means are not designed to undo or mitigate the curse, the people of the broken covenant can only rely on God’s faithfulness to the covenant (cf. Lev 26:40–45; Dan 9:15–19). They hope, with humble hearts, that God remembers the covenant with their ancestors, and will restore the broken covenant at an appropriate time. In addition to this, we should take one more important factor into consideration for grasping this issue in the first century context. Around the time of the Maccabean crisis, there emerged the idea that the suffering of the faithful to the covenant could reverse the covenantal curse (cf. 2Macc 6:12–17; 7:32–38).

Another vital point to be explored is that Paul seems to consider that the covenant relationship between God and Jews has long been broken, as Berkley comments on Romans 2:23–24: ‘It is scriptural statements (cited and uncited) of Israel’s disobedience that lead Paul to the conclusion, and in the case of Isa 52:5 serve as his proof, that the Jews have broken the law to such an extent as to dishonor God. For Paul, that prophetic conclusion continues to be in effect for contemporary Jews’. In other words, Paul thinks that Jews in his own time have been kept under the covenantal curse (cf. Gal 3:10).

All these points are vital to unpack the complexity of Paul’s soteriology. From this covenantal vantage point, we hypothesise a holistic picture of Paul’s soteriology as follows: At the heart of Paul’s soteriology lies the theme of the covenant renewal foretold by Jeremiah and

---

25 Berkley 2000, 137. Gathercole also maintains, ‘the accusations in 2:21-22 of stealing, adultery, and sacrilege make little sense as a description of the “typical Jew”; rather, it is the presence of these sins in the nation to which Paul is referring. Finally, the description of exile in 2:24 points to a national experience: exile makes little sense on an individual level in the Jewish mindset’ (2002, 199) [Gathercole’s emphasis].

26 See especially Hays 1989, 45-6, 163-4. We shall discuss this point in depth in chapter 5.
other prophets (cf. Jer 31:31–37; Ezek 36:22–32; Isa 59:21), with the inclusion of Gentiles in it (Rom 15:7–13; cf. Isa 56:6). In order for this prophetic vision to be realised, however, Jesus must have dealt with the problem of the covenantal curse, caused by the fracture of the Mosaic covenant. Jesus, through himself becoming a curse on the cross, redeemed those Jews who trusted in him (Gal 3:13). This has opened up a way of the renewal of the covenant, to which Gentiles are now invited as equal partners with Jews (Gal 3:28; cf. Eph 2:11–22). Paul perceives this whole event as a new Exodus (1Cor 5:7), as both Jews and Gentiles need to be redeemed from the dominion of sin and death (Rom 6:20–23; 8:2). Having inaugurated the renewed covenant, Jesus himself became ἀραβάνθραν, where his life-blood was dedicated through his death and resurrection (cp. Rom 4:25; 5:9), for justifying and sanctifying, and maintaining the covenant people to the end. In this covenantal scheme, the idea that Christ became a curse is clearly distinguished from the idea that his life-blood was dedicated in the most holy place as the most holy sacrifice.

We shall demonstrate that this covenantal model provides a reasonable framework that enables us to grasp how seemingly incompatible concepts, such as “sacrifice” and “curse”, fit together in Paul’s soteriology.

2. 2 The scope of this research

To test the validity of the proposed covenantal model, we examine three passages from the

---

27 In agreement with, e.g., W. D. Davies 1980 [1948] 260-1; Hafemann 1995, 119-28. On 2 Corinthians 3:1-4:6, Sampley explains; ‘In two powerful ways, Paul interlaces the Jeremiah passage with the one about Moses. First there is the shared reference to covenant (Exod 34:27-28; Jer 31:32-33). Second, Paul makes an implicit contrast of Jeremiah’s “I will write it on their hearts” (Jer 31:33 NRSV) with the old covenant, whose statutes, according to the first passage and widely in Israel’s Scriptures, were written or cut into stone (implied, but not stated in Jeremiah 31)” (2000, 64).
Pauline corpus: 1 Corinthians 5:7, Romans 3:25, and Galatians 3:13. We have selected these passages because they seem to invoke the three Jewish themes of Passover, Yom Kippur, and the Isaianic suffering servant, respectively.²⁸ These themes, as will be shown, are critically important for the purpose of our study, since all of them are closely tied with the notion of the “covenant”.²⁹

Another important reason for choosing these three texts is that while both 1 Corinthians 5:7 and Romans 3:25 contain sacrificial imagery, Galatians 3:13 seems not use the language of sacrifice.³⁰ We attempt to show that Paul marshals both sacrificial and non-sacrificial terms in his accounts of the Christ event under the overarching theme of the “covenant”.

In this connection, in the course of our investigation, we must be aware of an important issue. One of the difficulties in the study of Paul’s soteriology arises from the elusiveness of the word “sin” in Paul’s writings. This term can signify either a human misconduct (e.g., 1Cor 6:18), or the enslaving power active over humanity (e.g., Rom 7:21–25).³¹ In the former case, humans are the subjects of sinful behaviours, whereas in the latter case humans could be regarded as the victims of the malevolent force called “sin”.³² J. Louis Martyn asserts that only the latter category is important to Paul: ‘Paul, when he is formulating his own view, consistently

---

²⁸ In this thesis, the term “suffering servant” refers to the figure depicted in Isaiah 52:13–53:12. We shall consider the relation of this passage with the rest of the so-called “servant poems” (Isa 42:1–9; 49:1–13; 50:4–11) in chapter 4. To be sure, the relationship between Galatians 3:13 and the Isaianic suffering servant is far from obvious. Indeed, one of the main tasks of this research is to demonstrate the relatedness between the two.
²⁹ I will explain this point in the next section.
³⁰ The latter point is disputed, especially as to a possible allusion to the scapegoat ritual. We shall discuss this issue in depth in chapter 5.
³¹ As Baker states, ‘Paul radicalizes this Jewish concept of sin. Once a person has transgressed, the option to obey or disobey ceases. Sin, so to speak, grows over a person’s head and traps him into bondage. In other words, sin commences as a seemingly corrigible transgression by the person but ends as a power over the person’ (1980, 215).
³² As Bultmann states, ‘this language stamps flesh and sin as powers to which man has fallen victim and against which he is powerless’ (1952, 245) [Bultmann’s emphasis].
speaks not of sins, but rather of Sin, identifying it as a power that holds human beings in a state of slavery. And he sees liberation rather than forgiveness as the fundamental remedy enacted by God.  

Martyn’s dichotomistic distinction of the two categories of sin in Paul’s thought is hardly convincing, however. While “sin” as a cosmic power is certainly significant in Paul’s soteriology, this does not justify the reduction of the importance of the former category of “sin” in his thought. It must be stressed that the “cosmic” category and the “sacrificial” category would not have been contradictory for some Jews and Paul alike. In a Jewish symbolic world in the late Second Temple era, sacrificial imagery often cohabited with cosmic or apocalyptic images. A quintessential case is the canonical book of Daniel. In 11Q Melchizedek, moreover, we can find a good example of the Yom Kippur imagery being associated with the theme of the cosmic battle against “anti-creational” characters such as Belial. We detect a similar combination in Paul’s discourse in the epistle to the Romans, namely, the Yom Kippur imagery (Rom 3:25) and the cosmic battle between the God of Israel and the enslaving power of sin (e.g., Rom 6:14; 8:3). Theologically speaking, it would have been possible for Paul to consider that humans are both responsible for and victimised by “sin”.

Another important point is, whereas God’s act of liberation, such as the Exodus event, can be offered to those who are outside the covenant, the Levitical idea of forgiveness of sins

33 Martyn 1997, 90.
34 We can find a good example of such a combination in the “Book of Watchers (chs. 1–36)” in 1 Enoch. In this narrative, the defeat of the “Giants” coincides with the purification of the earth and the atonement for sins (10:11–11:2).
35 See chapter 2.3.4.
36 On Romans 8:3, N. T. Wright writes, ‘God, says Paul, condemned sin. Paul does not, unlike some, say that God condemned Jesus…It is about sentence of death being passed on “sin” itself, sin as a force or power capable of deceiving human beings, taking up residence within them, and so causing their death (7.7–25)’ (2002, 578).
presupposes that those who are forgiven are within the Mosaic covenant. It is important to remember that the Exodus from Egypt preceded the ratification of the Sinai covenant. In other words, the Israelites were “outside” the covenant when being delivered from the yoke of Egypt. After the establishment of the covenant, the sacrificial system was instituted, which provided forgiveness of sins for the covenant people. If Paul is thinking according to this covenantal paradigm, his emphasis on the liberation from Sin prior to or coinciding with the institution of the new covenant does not suggest that he belittles the idea of forgiveness of sins. In fact, he is aware of the needs of forgiveness of sins for those who are “within” the new covenant (cf. 2Cor 2:7, 10). For these reasons, it is missing the point to ask which category of sin is at the heart of Paul’s soteriology.

Bearing this point in mind, we primarily pursue the significance of the former category of sin in relation to sacrifice and the covenant. While we must be careful to distinguish subtle differences in Paul’s usage of the term sin, the origin of the concept of sin as a cosmic power in Paul’s thought is outside the main scope of our research.37 For this reason, we shall not conduct a substantial survey on Romans 8:3. That is, whereas the phrase περὶ ἀμαρτίας in this verse denotes or at least connotes a sacrificial offering,38 this statement unmistakably involves the theme of the cosmic battle between the God of Israel and “sin” as the enslaving power.

For a similar reason, we do not include 2 Corinthians 5:21 in our main discussions. The statement in this verse involves latent ambiguity: τὸν μὴ γνώντα ἀμαρτίαν ύπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν (2Cor 5:21a). Some commentators interpret the former ἀμαρτίαν as “sin”, but the same...
word in the latter as “sin offering”.  F. F. Bruce defends this reading by indicating that the Hebrew word יָאָשׁ can signify both “sin” and “sin offering”. This rendering, however, attracts much criticism. If Paul had intended to say that “God made Jesus who knew no sin (ἁμαρτίαν) to be a sin offering (ἁμαρτίαν)”, he could have avoided such an ambiguous expression by choosing a more normal expression such as περὶ ἁμαρτίας (cf. Rom 8:3; Heb 5:3; 10:6, 8, 18, 26; 13:1) or θυσία ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίων (cf. Heb 5:1; 10:12). In fact, there is not a single instance elsewhere in New Testament writings where the absolute use of ἁμαρτία denotes the sin offering. In LXX, there are ample instances where ἁμαρτία signifies a “slaughtered animal offered to atone” (e.g., Exod 29:36; Lev 4:8, 20, 24, 25, 29, 33), but in these cases there is no ambiguity as to whether it stands for “sin” or “sin offering”. Hence, it is by no means certain whether ἁμαρτία in this specific case signifies a sacrifice at all. Rather, given that this word could be translated as “sin”, it seems that there is a conceptual similarity between the expression ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησε in 2 Corinthians 5:32 and the phrase ἐν ὑμοὶωματὶ σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας in Romans 8:3.

Hence, as was mentioned above, we focus on the three Pauline texts with special attention to the key terms in these passages, which explicitly or implicitly invoke the three Jewish themes

---

29 Plummer comments, ‘The authority of Augustine, who states the view repeatedly, especially in his anti-Pelagian treaties, has caused many to solve the difficulty of “made him to be ἁμαρτίαν” by supposing that ἁμαρτίαν, peccatum, here means “sin-offering”’ (1915, 187). Augustine states: ‘But I do not think that this passage in which Christ who did not know sin is said to have been made sin by God can be better interpreted than in the sense that Christ was made a sacrifice for sins and for this reason was called sin’. Answer to the Two Letters of the Pelagians III, 6. 16.


43 As Käsemann argues, ‘The remarkable mythical idea of a condemnation of sin in the flesh of the Crucified has its close parallel in the sentence in 2 Cor 5:21 and is not far from the statement in Col 2:14f’ (1980, 217).
of Passover, Yom Kippur, and the Isaianic suffering servant, respectively: πάσχα (1Cor 5:7), ἱλασθήσω and αἵμα (Rom 3:25), and κατάρα (Gal 3:13).

2. 3 Passover, Yom Kippur, and the Isaianic suffering servant

As mentioned above, the three passages to be examined (1Cor 5:7; Rom 3:25; Gal 3:13) appear to be closely related to the three themes of Passover, Yom Kippur, and the Isaianic servant. It is helpful to indicate how these themes are related to the covenant, and to one another.

Passover celebrates God’s faithfulness to his covenantal promises, which was manifested and confirmed in the Exodus event (cf. Exod 2:24). Yom Kippur is the most important day for the maintenance of the covenant between God and Israel. The Isaianic suffering servant redeems God’s covenant people from the covenantal curse, namely, the exile. In addition to their individual connectedness to the notion of the covenant, they are also mutually interrelated in important ways within a larger covenantal framework.

For instance, for first century Jews or Gentiles who were familiar with the Jewish scriptures, the word πάσχα would not have simply signified a sacrificial animal that was slaughtered and consumed during the Passover feast. Rather, as will be shown in the next chapter, due to the symbolic significance of this animal within the Exodus story, the reference to this word could have evoked the entire Exodus narrative. The Exodus story was critically important for Jews because it affirmed God’s faithfulness to his covenantal promises. Paul seems to exploit this evocative power of πάσχα to stress the fact that the Christ event

---

44 Umberto Eco explains this point well: ‘Meanings are common social beliefs, sometimes mutually contradictory and historically rooted, rather than undated and theoretically fixed constructs…the “common core of factual beliefs” are not beliefs “about referents” but the actual cultural definition that a society conventionally accepts for a given content unit’ (1976, 99).
accomplished the new Exodus,\textsuperscript{45} which manifests God’s everlasting faithfulness to his covenant people (cf. 1Cor 1:8–9, 10:13). Notably, too, the new Exodus theme is one of the most prominent theological motifs of Isaiah 40–55 (e.g., Isa 43:5–6; 51:10–11; 52:3–4). There, the vicarious suffering and death of the servant leads to the new Exodus for those who have been captive in the state of exile. We shall discuss in detail Paul’s contemplation of Jesus’ death against this Isaianic new Exodus backdrop. Hence, the image of the Passover feast can be meaningfully connected in Paul’s mind to the new Exodus envisioned by Deutero-Isaiah.\textsuperscript{46}

Likewise, the theme of Yom Kippur can be related to the Exodus motif. As will be seen, the new Exodus hope was closely intertwined with the expectation of the forgiveness of sins, because certain grave sins were generally thought to be the root cause of the exile, which Deuteronomy identifies as the curse of the covenant. For Jews in the late Second Temple period, Yom Kippur was the most important day in the annual calendar on which all the sins were forgiven and the whole congregation purified, which reconfirmed the covenant relationship between God and his people.\textsuperscript{47} Once again, forgiveness of the sins of God’s covenant people is one of the central themes in Isaiah 40–55 (cf. Isa 43:25; 44:22), which is accomplished through the suffering of the servant (Isa 53:4–6). Hence, it would not be surprising if Jews in the Second Temple period colligated the Exodus, Yom Kippur, and Isaianic motifs in their eschatological hope, as we can find such a case in 11Q Melchizedek.\textsuperscript{48} We contend that the same holds true

\textsuperscript{45} To my knowledge, W. D. Davies is the first scholar to strongly advocate the “New Exodus” understanding of Paul’s soteriology. See our review of his works in this chapter (2.3). In his study of Mark’s Gospel, Rikki Watts demonstrates the importance of the “Isaianic” New Exodus theme in the early Christian movement (1997).

\textsuperscript{46} Bauckham suggests that John the seer would have connected these two themes together: ‘He may well have connected this verse [Rev 5:6, 9] with the new exodus language of Deutero-Isaiah and seen the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53 as the Passover lamb of the new exodus’ (1993, 71).

\textsuperscript{47} See our discussion in chapter 2,3.

\textsuperscript{48} Cf. chapter 2,3,4.
for Paul’s soteriology.

Throughout this research, therefore, we shall demonstrate that the “covenant” is the hermeneutical key by which these three Jewish themes are organically and meaningfully connected.

2. 4 Outline of this research

As mentioned above, the present research is conducted through the examination of the three passages (1Cor 5:7; Rom 3:25; Gal 3:13) against the backdrops of the three Jewish themes of Passover, Yom Kippur, and the Isaianic suffering servant. The goal of this investigation is to demonstrate the validity of the covenantal model presented above.

In chapter 2, we shall explore the meanings for first century Jews of Passover and Yom Kippur. In the next chapter, we apply the outcomes of what we studied to 1 Corinthians 5:7 and Romans 3:25, respectively.

In chapter 4, we shall proceed to the study of Isaiah 53 conceptually as well as contextually. In the following chapter, we shall consider Galatians 3:13 in this Isaianic light.

In the final chapter, we shall conclude that the Passover, Yom Kippur, and Isaianic servant motifs can cohere in the covenantal framework. Prior to going into these tasks, we must review the history of research on our subject.
3. History of research on Paul’s use of sacrificial imagery

3.1 Introduction

Despite the enormous interest in Paul’s soteriology, scholars rarely write monographs on the history of research about the complexity of the cultic vocabulary in Paul’s soteriological statements. Nor can we here offer an encyclopaedic account of the various scholarly views expressed over many generations. Rather, we shall first critically review the overall trends of scholarly views on and attitudes to this issue, and then turn our attention to several key scholars who contribute significantly to the advancement of this area of research.

3.2 General trends

3.2.1 “Pre-Pauline tradition” hypothesis

We begin our survey with those scholars who consider that Paul depends almost exclusively on early Christian traditions whenever he appeals to sacrificial imagery. Although each scholar examined below holds a significantly different view on Paul’s theology in some critical aspects, they seem to share a similar assumption as to Paul’s usage of sacrificial terms or ideas. By examining these highly influential figures in the history of Pauline studies, we shall trace a general tendency in Pauline scholarship concerning our specific issue. Here, in order to highlight the complexity of Paul’s cultic vocabulary, we shall broaden the scope of research, paying attention to wider texts: Romans 3:25, Romans 8:3, 1 Corinthians 5:7, 2 Corinthians

49 The “cultic” vocabulary is not identical with the “sacrificial” vocabulary, as mentioned in the opening sentence. As will be discussed in due course, the term “curse” should not be regarded as a sacrificial term.
5:21, and Galatians 3:13, since each of them contains interesting issues.

(i) Rudolf Bultmann

Bultmann, a towering figure of New Testament studies in the twentieth century, maintains that at the heart of Paul’s soteriology is the Gnostic Redeemer myth. According to Bultmann, Judaism at the time of Jesus and Paul was a legalistic religion, on which Paul turned his back. Bultmann describes “Jewish legalism” as ‘a form of piety which regards the will of God as expressed in the written Law and in the Tradition which interprets it, a piety which endeavors to win God’s favor by the toil of minutely fulfilling the Law’s stipulation’. In Bultmann’s understanding, Jews took the purpose of cultic and ritual laws as God’s demand rather than God’s gracious provision to attain atonement and forgiveness. According to Bultmann, Jews observed sacrificial practices without knowing why. Hence, in Bultmann’s view, despite the fact that Paul adopts sacrificial motifs in such statements as that of Romans 3:25, these are peripheral in Paul’s soteriology. Paul merely borrows them from various traditions circulating around the earliest churches, but ‘Die für ihn charakteristische Anschauung ist darin jedenfalls nicht enthalten’. Under this assumption, Bultmann argues that many of Paul’s soteriological statements are predicated on two Jewish sacrificial notions: ‘die Auffassung des Todes Jesu als

---

50 Bultmann 1952, 298-303.
51 In Bultmann’s word, Paul accepted ‘God’s condemnation of his Jewish striving after righteousness by fulfilling the works of the Law’ (Ibid., 187).
52 Ibid., 11. Concerning Bultmann’s view on late Second Temple Judaism, see especially Bultmann 1956, 59-61.
53 Bultmann states, ‘But in general the temple cult with its sacrifices was carried out as an act of obedience–for was it not commanded in the Law?’ (Ibid., 17).
54 Bultmann 1970, 296. Since I find English translation unsatisfactory as to the sacrificial terms, I henceforth use Bultmann’s German original.
Sühnopfers’, and as ‘stellvertretenden Opfers’. The former idea, the sin offering, stands behind a number of statements, such as Romans 3:25, 1 Corinthians 15:3, and Galatians 1:4. The quintessential examples of the latter, the substitutionary offering, appear in 2 Corinthians 5:21 as well as Galatians 3:13. Bultmann states:

Es wäre verkehrt, den Hauptsatz so zu verstehen, daß Gott den (im ethischen Sinne) sündlosen Christus so behandelte, „als ob“ er ein Sünder wäre (was an sich nicht falsch wäre). Vielmehr soll der Satz die paradoxe Tatsache aussagen, daß Gott den (ethisch) sündlosen Christus zum Sünder (im forensischen Sinne) machte, – dadurch nämlich, daß er ihn am Kreuz als Verfluchten sterben ließ (vgl. Gl 3,13). Entsprechend sagt der Finalsatz, daß wir (durch ihn) zu Gerechten (im forensischen Sinne) werden sollen.

Bultmann’s comments betray his insensitivity toward the Jewish notion of sacrifice. Although he describes the “death” of Jesus as an offering for sins, such an idea contradicts the holy character of Jewish sacrifice. A sacrifice is dedicated to God, but death is detestable to God (e.g., Deut 21:22–23). Even though death is often a constitutive part of the ritual process through which what is dedicated to God (e.g., blood) can be obtained, death itself cannot be a sacrifice. How can one offer something detestable to God in order to propitiate or please him? With respect to his comment on Galatians 3:13, we can raise a similar question. If Christ was

---

55 Ibid., 295, 296.
56 Ibid., 295.
57 Ibid., 277-8.
58 As Gane explains: ‘It appears that the common denominator between various physical ritual impurities – corpse contamination, degeneration of skin by scaly skin disease, and loss of fluids from the reproductive organs – has to do with death. However, this is not death in general. Maccoby points out that life-threatening loss of blood from a wound was not ritually impure, as we would expect if all death were in view. By contrast, genital discharges that were not physically dangerous caused defilement (Lev. 15). So Maccoby convincingly narrows the death focus of physical ritual impurity to “an expression of the birth-death cycle that comprises mortality.” This impurity/mortality is diametrically opposed to holiness/life’ [Gane’s emphasis] (2004, 226-7). See also Maccoby 1999, 49; cf. 31-2, 48, 50, 207-8.
59 The comment of Klawans is helpful: ‘if death is defiling (and banned from the sacred) why does killing animals find a central place within the sacred? The answer to the riddle lies, in part, in the fact that the kind of death that occurs in the sanctuary is not a natural kind of death but a highly controlled one’ (2006, 58).
accursed on the cross, as Bultmann states, how was he at the same time able to be a holy sacrifice to God? Bultmann does not appear to give any thought to this.

Bultmann’s exegesis on 2 Corinthians 5:21 is also problematic. While Bultmann claims that this statement expresses the idea of substitutionary offering, he also asserts that Christ became a sinner in the forensic sense. Does God happily accept a sinner as a holy and acceptable offering to himself? Since Bultmann is convinced that Jewish sacrificial notions are of little importance in Paul’s soteriology, he seems uninterested in the problems mentioned above.

More fundamentally, if Judaism in Paul’s time had little to do with atonement and forgiveness, why was so much emphasis laid on atonement and forgiveness in the alleged pre-Pauline Christianity, which was more Jewish in nature? Ever since E. P. Sanders’ groundbreaking work in 1977, Bultmann’s reconstruction of late Second Temple Judaism has lost credibility.60

(ii) Ernst Käsemann

Käsemann, another prominent figure in German New Testament scholarship, claims that ‘long before Paul, theological reflection and the liturgical creeds emphasize the death of Jesus as saving event. The apostle picks up the various variations of this proclamation without giving preference to any one in particular. The idea of the sacrificial death is, if anything, pushed into the background’.61 Käsemann further insists that Paul ‘never definitely called Jesus’ death a

---

60 We shall return to Sanders’ view in due course.
61 Käsemann 1971a, 45.
sacrifice’, and argues, ‘according to I. Cor. 5.7, Jesus is the Paschal lamb slain for us. But in this context the point is not the sacred rite but its result: for Christians, Easter has begun. Even if one does not want to surrender the atonement aspect entirely, the decisive point, at all events, is the ending of our separation from God’.63

Käsemann rigorously attempts to reinforce Bultmann’s argument that Romans 3:24–26a originated in the early Christian liturgical tradition. Bultmann asserts that sacrificial terms, such as ἱλασθήριον and αἵμα, are characteristically un-Pauline.64 Käsemann further argues that there are many more “non-Pauline” terms and motifs in Romans 3:21–26 which are introduced to support the doctrine of justification.65 On Romans 3:25, Käsemann thus maintains:

Sie erklärt weiter die Häufung einer zum mindesten für Paulus nicht charakteristischen Terminologie: πάρεσις, προγεγονότα ἁμαρτήματα, προτίθεσθαι im Sinn von manifestieren, δικαιοσύνη als göttliche Eigenschaft in V.25, ἀπολύτρωσις, als Bezeichnung der bereits erfolgten Erlösung auch in der geprägten Formel 1. Kor. 1,30 und dem liturgischen Text Kol. 1,14 vorkommend, von den durch Bultmann genannten termini abgesehen.66

Käsemann’s emphasis of the liturgical character of Paul’s sacrificial language allows him to deprive any theological significance of the fact of Paul’s adoption of sacrificial motifs.67 His argument on Romans 3:24–26 has been severely criticised, however. Douglas Campbell notes that some of the alleged non-Pauline terms in Romans 3:25–26b are in fact used elsewhere in

62 Ibid., 43.
63 Ibid., 43.
64 Bultmann 1970, 49. We shall refute this view in chapter 3.
66 Käsemann1964, 96. However, Paul uses the words προτίθεσθαι and ἁμαρτήματα in Rom 1:13 (cf. Eph 1:9) and 1Cor 6:18, respectively.
67 See also Käsemann’s argument on Paul’s doctrine of “reconciliation”, which manifests his tendency to minimise Jewish sacrificial ideas in Paul’s thought. Cf. Käsemann 1971b, 51-2.
Paul’s letters, and *hapax legomena* in this passages are only Ἰλαστήριον, παρεσιν, and προγεγονότων.\(^{68}\) Campbell goes on to argue: ‘Bearing in mind that the smaller the section the more distorted the ratio, as small a section as 3.25a–26a still only yields a ratio of 3:17 [words], or 17.6%. This is not a particularly high ratio or percentage. Paul’s letters average a ratio of 17.4% peculiar vocabulary to total vocabulary, and in Romans the ratio is 26.3%.’\(^{69}\) This example suggests how shaky the grounds are, on which Käsemann’s argument is constructed. Rather, one may question whether Käsemann’s whole argument is predicated on his belief that Paul’s soteriology cannot be based on Jewish sacrificial ideas.

(iii) Martin Hengel

Hengel, together with Bultmann and Käsemann, argues that Paul borrowed some ‘pre-Pauline’ stereotyped formulations in his accounts of Jesus’ death, but that Paul ‘himself was no longer much concerned with this cultic vocabulary [Ἰλαστήριον in Romans 3:25]’.\(^{70}\) Hengel states, ‘This terminology [the group of words that has the Ἰλασ- root; cf. Heb 2:17; 1John 2:2; 4:10] was more directly related to the atoning sacrificial cult of the Temple than the very Greek-sounding formulae of Paul and –as I would suggest– the Hellenists’.\(^{71}\) Hengel construes the two sacrificial terms in the epistle to the Romans, Ἰλαστήριον and περὶ ἀμαρτίας (Rom 8:3), as referring to ‘a vicarious atoning sacrifice’.\(^{72}\) He further maintains that the second instance of ἀμαρτίαν in 2 Corinthians 5:21 also signifies the sin offering: ‘In II Cor. 5.21, also, the

\(^{68}\) Campbell 1992, 54. \(^{69}\) Ibid., 53. \(^{70}\) Hengel 1981, 45. \(^{71}\) Ibid., 51. \(^{72}\) Ibid., 45, 46.
statement that as the sinless one Christ was “made sin for us” by God…is to be understood to mean that Christ is offered on our behalf as the perfect sin offering’. Concerning the term πᾶσχα in 1 Corinthians 5:7, Hengel argues that Paul borrowed this term from another pre-Pauline tradition, ‘Another indication of this is the use of the metaphor of the sacrificial lamb without blemish for the crucified and exalted Jesus, which we find attested independently in I Pet 1.19; John 1.29, 35f. and Revelation, and which is also to be presupposed in I Cor. 5.7. Underlying this is probably the interpretation of Jesus as the passover lamb, a reference which goes back to the last meal of Jesus with his disciples’.75

As to the reason for Paul’s dependence on pre-Pauline traditions, Hengel suggests: ‘How can Paul–with relatively few exceptions–content himself with formulae and not explain in detail the atoning death of the Messiah “for us”? The reason is probably that the “that” in this formula was in no way controversial, even in Galatia and in the Roman church which was unknown to him’.76 According to Hengel, the various terms Paul employs, such as ἱλαστήριον, περὶ ἁμαρτίας, and ἁμαρτίαν, almost always signify the single notion of the “sacrifice for sins”. Unfortunately, Hengel’s analysis of Paul’s usage of sacrificial motifs sheds little light on the theological significance of the diversity and complexity of these motifs.

(v) Assessment of the preceding views

The three scholars mentioned above share the view that Paul’s sacrificial motifs are taken from

---

73 Ibid., 46. This rendering is, however, unconvincing for the reasons mentioned above.
74 ‘Paulus bezeichnet Christus als das „Paschaopfer“ oder „Paschalamm“. Anders als hier kann πᾶσχα auch das Paschafest bezeichnen’ (Artz-Grabner, Kritzer, Papathomas, and Winter 2006, 212). Among these options, it seems that “paschal lamb” is the most plausible. Cf. Exod 12:21 in LXX.
75 Hengel 1981, 46.
76 Ibid., 54.
the pre-Pauline traditions circulating in the earliest churches. They argue that Paul employs several liturgical traditions simply because these have been widely accepted among the earliest Christian movement. They also presuppose that sacrificial ideas do not lie in the centre of Paul’s soteriology. Given this assumption, it might be futile to attempt to find something unique or significant in Paul’s usage of sacrificial terms and ideas. The diversity of these terms may be explained by the variety of pre-Pauline traditions. The crucial weakness of this line of argument is, however, that while it may be true that Paul relies on earliest Christians’ shared understandings concerning Jesus’ death (cf. 1Cor 15:3; Gal 1:18–19), there is no evidence that the putative pre-Pauline liturgical formulae or confessions were popularly used by other early Christian thinkers and writers. For instance, Peter Stuhlmacher, as regards Romans 3:25–26, postulates that Paul herein uses the Yom Kippur creedal tradition that has been widely known among the churches (3:25–3:26a), and expands it by adding his own justification statement (3:26b). However, he fails to provide concrete proof of the assumption the alleged “Yom Kippur” creedal tradition had widely been used by the time of Paul. In fact, since there is no reliable source outside the Pauline corpus as to the alleged pre-Pauline liturgical traditions, the contents of these traditions reconstructed by these scholars inevitably become a matter of speculation. Nearly half a century ago, Reicke aptly pointed out the problem of the pre-Pauline hypothesis:

However, it is unrealistic to believe that exact separation of pre-Pauline and Pauline

---

77 It must be noted that Peter Stuhlmacher’s understanding of Paul’s soteriology shows a significant shift from the views of his predecessors, in particular that of Käsemann. Under the strong influence of Hartmut Gese (cf. 1981, 93-116), Stuhlmacher considers that sacrificial ideas are at the heart of Paul’s soteriology. Stuhlmacher, on the other hand, follows his predecessors’ assumption that Paul’s sacrificial language derives from the pre-Pauline traditions circulating among the earliest churches.  

elements in Paul’s epistle is possible. With the exception of clear quotations, no independent documents illustrate precisely which traditions Paul used, beyond a general assumption that preaching, prayers, prophecy, baptism, the Eucharist, catechism, and other church inspired him. Neither can anybody know exactly how much he changed this material. All reconstructions based upon analysis of his sayings will necessarily be a priori statements and depend on the scholar’s personal taste. Today the result is also endless disagreement about verses and half-verses, if not mere reproduction of what some renowned scholar has already written about their authenticity or non-authenticity.  

Paul may well have produced these statements through his own theological contemplation. Yet, even granting that Paul is largely dependent on the earliest liturgical traditions, this does not mean that he has some difficulties to accept the sacrificial ideas behind these traditions, nor is he ignorant of the significance of sacrificial motifs within Jewish contexts. Moreover, the pre-Pauline hypothesis is often predicated on an unwarranted assumption that Paul is fundamentally hostile to his contemporary Judaism, the view that we cannot endorse any more.

3. 2. 2 “Propitiation” or “Expiation”?

The three scholars reviewed above have exerted a considerable influence on Pauline studies. Nonetheless, they represent only one school of thought. Pauline scholarship is vast and diverse, and there are a number of scholars who put more weight on sacrificial ideas as the crucial element of Paul’s soteriology. Still, it would seem that these scholars pay inadequate attention to the variety and complexity of the cultic vocabulary in Paul’s soteriological statements. Rather, it is often the case that they concentrate on one particular question, the question of whether the

---

79 Reicke 1968, 41.
purpose of the sin offering is to *propitiate* God’s anger or to *expiate* (or “wipe out”) sins. Accordingly, some scholars tend to expend enormous energy on the exegesis of one term, ἰλαστήριον in Romans 3:25, which is translated as either a “propitiatory sacrifice” or a “place of atonement”. 80 In what follows, we shall examine two distinguished scholars from the English-speaking world, who take diametrically opposed views on “atonement”.

(i) Leon Morris

Morris maintains that a particular view on “blood” lies at the heart of Paul’s soteriology:

Now this verse [Leviticus 17:11] is patient of more than one interpretation…it could mean that what is ritually presented to God is the evidence that a death has taken place in accordance with His judgment on sin. For blood *in separation from the flesh* is not life but death…Such a survey shows clearly that the Hebrews understood ‘blood’ habitually in the sense ‘violent death’ (much as we do when we speak of ‘shedding of blood’), and in the sacrifices the most probable meaning is not ‘life’ but ‘life yielded up in death’. And this is surely Paul’s meaning.81

Morris asserts that the purpose of the blood sacrifice is to show the death of the victim as the evidence that God’s wrathful, righteous judgement is meted out on the sacrificial victim on behalf of the offerer. He goes on to state: ‘Such passages [1Thess 5:9–10; Rom 5:9] linking the death of Christ with salvation from wrath seem to indicate that Christ’s death represents a

80 E.g., Ridderbos 1977, 187.
81 Morris 1965, 219 [Morris’ italics]. Morris claims: ‘[I]t is clear that the commonest use of *dam* is to denote death by violence, and, in particular, that this use is found above twice as often as that to denote the blood of sacrifice [in the Hebrew Bible]. There is a difference also in distribution, for the blood of the sacrifice is often mentioned in Leviticus and Exodus…but rarely elsewhere, there being only twenty-five references to sacrificial blood in all the rest of the Old Testament. By contrast the use of blood to denote violent death is not specially located in any part of the Old Testament, and is found almost throughout. As far as it goes, then, the statistical evidence seems to indicate that the association most likely to be conjured up when the Hebrews heard the word “blood” used was that of violent death’ (1955, 109-10).
bearing of the divine wrath. Despite the hesitation of some, this must be accepted as the teaching of Paul’. In Morris’ view, the noun ἁλαστήριον in Romans 3:25 is the microcosm that condenses Paul’s salvific thought: ‘It seems clear that the word is understood to signify “means of propitiation” or “propitiatory thing”’. Morris persistently resists rendering this word as the “mercy seat”, and maintains: ‘In the first place the almost invariable habit of the translators of the Old Testament into Greek was to use the article, the only exception being in the first place where the word occurs, and there it is not alone, but in company with ἐπίθεμα [Exod 25:17 in LXX]’. He continues: ‘I do not see how the conclusion is to be avoided that, even on LXX premises, anarthrous ἁλαστήριον does not necessarily denote the mercy-seat. The word itself means “propitiatory”, and if the mercy-seat could be so designated, so also could one of the ledges on Ezekiel’s altar (or even Noah’s ark, according to Symmachus)’.

As regards 2 Corinthians 5:21, Morris writes: “Made sin” is not a very usual expression, but I should have thought that it is fairly plain that it means “treated as a sinner”, or “made to bear penalty of sin” or the like. Concerning Galatians 3:13, he claims: ‘Just as the previous passage [2Cor 5:21] we were examining spoke of God as making Christ “sin”, so this speaks of Christ becoming a “curse”…His meaning [in Gal 3:10] then is that men have not kept the law of God. Therefore they stand under a curse. But Christ became a curse for them. He bore the curse that they should have borne. He died their death.’ In the following, we shall examine the validity of Morris’ construction.

82 Ibid., 225.
83 Morris 1988, 182.
84 Ibid., 35.
85 Ibid., 36.
86 Morris 1965, 221.
87 Ibid., 222.
First of all, Morris’ understanding of sacrificial practices simply misses the mark. Although he asserts that ‘the statistical evidence seems to indicate that the association most likely to be conjured up when the Hebrews heard the word “blood” used was that of violent death’, his statistical methodology is faulty, as it includes a large number of biblical passages that are not in a sacrificial context. His theory that “blood in separation from the flesh is not life but death” contradicts the biblical injunction of blood-consumption (cf. Gen 9:4; Deut 12:23). Blood-consumption is prohibited because blood is the bearer of life rather than death, irrespective of its attachment to the flesh. Moreover, his particular view on the role of blood in the sin offering is in conflict with the biblical concern for the holiness of God. Death is the exact opposite of the holiness of God, and something that is directly associated with death (e.g., a corpse) poses a serious threat to the holiness of God. Given, therefore, that one of the crucial concerns of the sacrificial system is to safeguard the holiness of God from death (cf. Num 19:1–22), how can one present something that represents death (in Morris’s view, the “blood” of the victim) to God? In Morris’ construction, the aim of the blood sacrifice is reduced to the punishment for sins, which propitiates God’s wrath. However, even if the offender or his substitute is duly punished, this alone does not sufficiently deal with the problems caused by sins. From the biblical viewpoint, the peril of sins lies in the fact that sins generate corruptibility, pollution, and mortality, which would bring and spread death to God’s creation (cf. Gen 3:14–19; Lev 18:24–25; Rom 6:23).  

Next, although Morris’ entire argument relies fundamentally on the philologically

88 Morris 1955, 110.
89 E.g., Num 19:13.
90 We shall discuss this issue fully in chapter 2.3.3.3.
disputable rendering of the term ἱλασθήριον as a “means of propitiation”, Bailey criticises this rendering:

[I]t is commonly assumed that a ἱλασθήριον in the ancient world must have been something that could shed its blood, i.e. a sacrificial victim (‘sacrifice of atonement’, NIV; NRSV). This, too, fits the immediate context. But it is a false syllogism, since it assumes that the meaning of ἱλασθήριον can be determined by the meaning of “blood”, and is moreover supported by no external evidence: ἱλασθήριον never denotes an animal victim in any known source.91

Finlan further comments: ‘ἱλασθήριον is a LXX neologism signifying the place where the action of ἱλάσκομαι is done, just as θυσιασθήριον (altar) is the place where one can θύω or θυσιάζω (offer sacrifice) and φυγαδευτήριον is a place where one can φεύγω (flee; thus, a city of refuge). Most words ending –τήριον designate places’.92 Hence, we cannot exclude the possibility that ἱλασθήριον means a “place of atonement”. Moreover, although Morris contends that the anathorous usage of ἱλασθήριον in Romans 3:25 makes it difficult to render it as the “mercy seat”, this is gratuitous. As Finlan strongly argues:

To clarify: a predicate accusative is a predicate (complement) of a direct object. An example in English would be: I appointed him leader. “Him” is the direct object, and “leader” is its complement. More examples include: You made Israel a special people. He considered my remark agreement with his position. I made him a winner. Each of the direct objects here have [sic] predicate accusatives (in italics), and the latter can occur with or without the article in English. But in Greek, the rule is that predicate accusatives are anarthrous.93

92 Finlan 2004, 128 [Finlan’s emphasis].
93 Finlan 2004, 132.
In the light of their arguments, at least from the philological viewpoint, ιλαστήριον is more likely to be rendered as the “mercy seat”.

Morris maintains that Romans 3:25, 2 Corinthians 5:21, and Galatians 3:13 basically express the same idea, that is, Christ suffered the punishment as the substitute of sinners. This is, however, overly reductionistic, as our study will show.

(ii) James D. G. Dunn

James Dunn, one of the leading proponents of the so-called “New Perspective on Paul”, also emphasises the Jewish sacrificial character of Paul’s soteriology: ‘One of the most powerful images used by Paul to explicate the significance of Christ’s death is that of the cultic sacrifice, or more precisely the “sin offering” which could be offered up by individuals or groups in the Jerusalem temple (Leviticus 4) and the annual Day of Atonement sacrifices (Lev. 16.11–19)’. Dunn contends that the aim of Jewish sacrifices is neither propitiation nor appeasement of God’s wrath:

[As to exilaskomai and kipper], Hebrew usage contrasts markedly with common Greek usage on this precise point. Characteristically in Greek usage the human being is the active subject and God is the object: the human action propitiates God. But in Hebrew usage God is never the object of the verb (kipper). Properly speaking, in the Israelite cult, God is never “propitiated” or “appeased.” The object of the atoning act is rather the removal of sin – that is, either by purifying the person or object, or by wiping out the sin. Atonement is characteristically made “for” a person or “for sin”. And it can be said that it is God himself who expiates the sin (or for the sin).95

---

94 Dunn 1998, 212.
Dunn maintains that, behind almost all the salvific statements in Paul’s letters, there stands the concept of “sin offering”. As regards the question of how the sin offering achieves the removal of sin, Dunn advocates a distinctive theory: ‘The manner in which the sin-offering dealt with sin was by its death. The sacrificial animal, identified with the offerer in his sin, had to be destroyed in order to destroy the sin which it embodied. The sprinkling, smearing and pouring away of the sacrificial blood in the sight of God indicated that the life was wholly destroyed, and with it the sin of the sinner’. Dunn further argues that the purity of the sacrificial animal is conversely transferred to the offerer: ‘As the sin was transferred one way, bringing death to the sacrificial animal, so its purity and ongoing life were in effect transferred in reverse’. Dunn claims that 2 Corinthians 5:21 is the best example of this “exchange”: ‘The antithesis “sinless/made sin” makes it difficult to doubt that Paul had in mind the cult’s insistence on clean and unblemished animals for sacrifice. The allusion is not so much to the sin offering as such, but to the function of the sin offering—“made sin,” not peri hamartias (as in Rom. 8.3). A more specific allusion to the Day of Atonement’s scapegoat is likely (Lev. 16.21)’. Concerning 1 Corinthians 5:7, Dunn contends:

Paul explicitly states, “Christ, our paschal lamb, has been sacrificed.” This is rather striking, since the Passover lamb was not strictly speaking a sacrifice. However, the Passover is already associated with atonement in Ezek. 45.18–22. And this link was probably already forged in the double association of the Last Supper with the Passover and with Jesus’ “blood poured out (ekchunomenon) for many” (Mark 14.24 pars.). There the language is unavoidably sacrificial and signifies atonement…Paul’s language

---

96 Dunn 1991a, 46.
97 Dunn 1998, 222.
98 Ibid., 217.
here suggests that the same evolution of imagery was already well advanced in his theology.99

With regard to the epistle to the Romans, Dunn argues that the phrase περί ἁμαρτίας in 8:3 refers to the sin offering,100 and as to the controversial term ἵλαστήριον in 3:25, Dunn opines that it could mean either the “mercy seat (place of atonement)” or the atoning sacrifice, and further maintains: ‘Paul certainly has [the Day of Atonement ritual] in mind here’.101 In what follows, we shall evaluate Dunn’s arguments.

First, concerning Dunn’s understanding of the purpose of the sin offering, it is difficult to deny the element of appeasement in the sacrificial offering for sins, since it is the biblical idea that the sins of the people provoke God to wrath (e.g., Exod 32:11; Deut 9:7; 2 Chr 34:25). Moreover, as Paul repeatedly refers to the wrath of God in Romans (Rom 1:18; 2:5, 8; 3:5; 4:15; 5:9), it is hardly convincing to deny a connotation of the appeasement of God’s wrath in Paul’s statement of Romans 3:25.

Next, although Dunn writes that ‘the Passover lamb was not strictly speaking a sacrifice’, Exodus 12:27 clearly states: “it is the passover sacrifice [cf. Πάσχα in the Masoretic text (MT); Ὑσία in LXX] to the Lord, for he passed over the houses of the Israelites in Egypt, when he struck down the Egyptians but spared our houses” (cf. Deut 16:2). It seems, rather, that Dunn’s real question is whether the Passover lamb was considered as a sacrifice for sins in the time of Paul. Dunn quotes Ezekiel 45 as the evidence that the Passover was associated with a sacrifice for sins in the Second Temple era (cf. Ezek 45:21–22). In the Pentateuch, however, there is the

99 Ibid., 216-7.
100 Ibid., 216.
instruction to offer in the Passover feast the sacrifice for sins, which is clearly distinguishable from the sacrifice of the paschal lamb (Num 28:22). Thus, the instruction in Ezekiel 45:22 does not prove that the paschal lamb was conflated with the sin offering in the Second Temple period. Incidentally, it is not a lamb but a bull that is to be offered in this case.102

By referring to Mark 14:24, Dunn further attempts to defend his case that the paschal lamb was identified as a sacrifice for sins among the earliest churches. This point comes close to the mark. All the Gospels attest that the crucifixion of Jesus occurred around the time of the Passover feast, although there is a critical discrepancy concerning the exact moment of the execution between the Synoptic Gospels and John’s Gospel (cf. Matt 26:17–19; Mark 14:16; Luke 22:7–16; John 18:39; 19:14).103 In particular, in John’s Gospel, although it is hotly debated whether Jesus’ designation by John the Baptist in John 1:29 (the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world) could be interpreted as a paschal lamb,104 in light of an allusion to a paschal lamb in the description of Jesus’ crucifixion (John 19:36; cf. Exod 12:46; Num 9:12), it is arguably claimed that John the Evangelist ‘portrays the death of Jesus in terms of the pascal [sic] victim’.105 It might have been the case that early Christians contrived the distinctive idea, namely, the lamb of God as the sacrifice for sins.106 Therefore, while it is doubtful that

---

102 In the rabbinic literature, incidentally, there is evidence that the paschal lamb is viewed as an atoning sacrifice. In Sifre on Deuteronomy, it is thus written: ‘Since sacrificing is merely part of the entire matter, why was it singled out? To serve as a basis for analogical deduction: since sacrificing is characterized by being indispensable for expiation, anything else indispensable for expiation is also included’ (Sifre D. 129).

103 As to the chronological discrepancy between the Synoptic Gospels and John’s Gospel, see, e.g., Goudeever 1961, 224.

104 This is because ‘an expiatory function of the paschal lamb is highly controversial’ (Stökl Ben Ezra 2003, 177). We shall return to this issue in what follows.

105 Wheaton 2009, 64. Wheaton further argues that ‘the significance of the sacrifice of Jesus as the pascal victim lies…not in any atoning value intrinsic to the sacrifice itself but rather in its function as provision for the all-important pascal meal’ (Ibid. 59).

106 Cf. 1Pet 1:19; Rev 5:6-14. In this connection, Bauckham suggests that ‘it is likely that in Revelation 5:6, 9 John alludes not only to the Passover lamb, but also to Isaiah 53:7, where the Suffering Servant is
most first century Jews regarded the paschal lamb as a sacrifice for sins, Dunn may be correct in maintaining that some of early Christians developed the image of paschal lamb as a sacrifice for sins.  

What is more problematic in Dunn’s argument is his confusion of the blood-sacrificial offerings with the scapegoat. Dunn asserts that the destruction of the animal, to which the sins of the offerer are transferred, accomplishes the removal of sin. If this is true, however, how can we understand the case of the scapegoat, to which all the sins of Israel are to be transferred? Contrary to Dunn’s theory, the scapegoat must not be killed (at least within the Temple precinct), since its role is to be the vehicle that carries away the sins of all the people into the wilderness. Moreover, in Dunn’s construction, the purpose of the scapegoat ritual becomes contradictory, or at least redundant, in relation to that of the blood-sacrificial ritual conducted in the Temple. That is to say, if the sins of Israel can be destroyed by means of slaughtering the goat, for what reason must another goat carry away the sins of Israel into the wilderness, given that the sins have already been destroyed? Indeed, Dunn’s theory destroys the unity and rationale of the Yom Kippur rite. Dunn makes a common mistake of confusing the blood sacrifice with the non-blood scapegoat ritual.

---

107 We do not, however, consider that Paul, in 1 Corinthians 5:7, identifies the paschal lamb as a sacrifice for sins. We shall discuss this point in depth in chapter 3.

108 According to the Mishnah, the scapegoat was pushed from a cliff (m. Yoma 6.6). Even supposing that this report is true, it does not mean that Jews attempted to attain atonement through the death of the scapegoat. Rather, they would simply have eliminated the danger of its returning to the city of Jerusalem, which would jeopardise the removal of sins from the holy city. Cf. Milgrom 1991, 1045; m. Yoma 6.8.

109 See our discussion in chapter 2,3.3.5.

110 A similar mistake can be found in the works of other scholars. For instance, Schoeps states ‘When Paul answers this question with 2Cor. 5:21: God has made Christ to be sin and in Him has reconciled the world unto Himself (v.19) the expression cannot be understood otherwise than as an allusion to the laying of the hand on the animal (נ😂) prescribed in Ex. 29:10 (נ😂) as a result of which the sacrificial animal is laden with the sins of the sacrificer and is to become a “body of sin” through the transference of guilt’ (1961, 132 [my emphasis]). We shall consider the meaning of the laying of one hand on the...
3.2.3 Summary

In the previous sections, we reviewed the two prominent Pauline scholars who consider sacrificial ideas as critically important in Paul’s soteriology. They disagree, however, with each other with respect to the question of whether the concept of atonement signifies “propitiation” or “expiation”. This is unfortunate, since, as we shall see in the next chapter, the notion of “atonement” contains both propitiatory and expiatory elements.

Besides this point, their arguments often betray misconceptions, such as the confusion of the scapegoat with the blood sacrifice. What is more problematic is that both Morris and Dunn assert that atonement is directly achieved by the death of the sacrifice. It appears that their errors are rooted in a misunderstanding of sacrificial practices and their purposes. The same would hold true for the German scholars examined above. To be sure, those scholars selected above do not represent the entirety of Pauline scholarship. Nevertheless, given the considerable influence of each scholar, their views exhibit dominant tendencies in Pauline scholarship. This situation has, however, been dramatically improved by the works of the scholars who are sensitive and careful to distinguish the varying natures and purposes of sacrificial practices. We now turn to these scholars’ works.

animal in the next chapter. Stuhlmacher also writes ‘According to 2 Corinthians 5:21, God himself made his Son the sin offering for believers; that is, he identified the blameless Christ with the sinners, let him bear their iniquities, suffer death and gain eternal life vicariously for them’ (2001, 59, n.4). Stuhlmacher elsewhere maintains that Romans 3:25 and 2 Corinthians 5:21 express basically the same soteriological view (cf. 1989, 110), which betrays that he also confuses the blood sacrifice with the non-blood ritual of scapegoat.

111 We shall fully discuss this point in the next chapter.
3. 3 W. D. Davies

3. 3. 1 The “new Exodus” soteriology

Whilst somewhat dated, Davies’ monumental work, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, is still important.\(^{112}\) Davies contends that at the heart of Paul’s soteriology is the conviction that the Christ event is the new Exodus event: ‘he [Paul] obviously regards the great deliverance at the Exodus and its accompaniments as the prototype of the mighty act of God in Christ’.\(^{113}\) He argues that the idea of “redemption” in Paul’s letters (\[\text{E} \] \\[\text{P} \] ± \[\text{A} \] $\text{E}$ \[\text{I} \] $\text{S}$; Rom 3:24; 1Cor 1:30) should be understood against this Exodus backdrop:

Paul, then, in applying the term “redemption” to the work of Jesus Christ had a long tradition behind him [e.g., Exod 6:6; 15:13; Ps 77:15; Isa 41:14]. Just as Israel had been redeemed from Egypt, so the Christian community, the New Israel, had been redeemed, “rescued,” from bondage in the “Egypt” of sin. True, Paul does not use the term “redemption” frequently, but the idea of a New Exodus pervades his thought.\(^{114}\)

Davies further maintains that Paul considers the new Exodus as the covenant-making event: ‘The Pauline account of the Eucharist, as we saw, presents the Death of Jesus as the inauguration of a New Covenant, and in our treatment of Paul’s thought throughout the preceding chapters this concept has again and again emerged’.\(^{115}\) The Last Supper as the Passover event ‘should be regarded by him [Paul] as the inauguration of the New Covenant that was to be contrasted with the old, this New Covenant being ratified in the blood of Jesus, and it

---

\(^{112}\) The first edition was published in 1948.

\(^{113}\) Davies 1980 [1948], 105.

\(^{114}\) Davies 1967, 313-4.

\(^{115}\) Davies 1980 [1948], 260.
is this aspect of the Death of Jesus that appears in his account of the Eucharist as central to
Paul'.\textsuperscript{116} Davies stresses that at the centre of Paul’s understanding of Jesus’ death lies the
covenant-making that had given birth to the New Community.\textsuperscript{117}

In this connection, although Davies often uses the term “old Israel”,\textsuperscript{118} he upholds the
importance of the salvation-historical view in Paul’s thinking. Indeed, he himself raises a
question on this point: ‘Since those who believe in Jesus as the Messiah or those who are “in
Christ” now constitute “Israel”, the people of God, what was the relationship between them and
the Jews, Israel after the flesh, in their continuity and discontinuity?\textsuperscript{119} Davies emphatically
claims that Israel “after the flesh” still remains in God’s scope of salvation:

Paul is concerned to respect two things: the eschatological hope of the gospel and the
historical role of the Jewish people in the past and the preservation of that role in the
future, within the larger context of the epistle [to the Romans]. Both of these are tied up
with the faithfulness of God to his promise. This is far removed from anything that can
be called anti-Judaism, not to speak of anti-Semitism.\textsuperscript{120}

Davies further claims: ‘In interpreting Jesus as the Christ [i.e., the Messiah of Israel], Paul
placed him within the framework, indeed at the high point, of salvation-history, which in
varying degrees was the concern not simply of circles given to apocalyptic speculation but of all
significant currents in Judaism’.\textsuperscript{121} This is exactly the point that we attempt to defend as the
essence of Paul’s soteriology.

\textsuperscript{116} Ibid., 251.
\textsuperscript{117} Cf. Ibid., 253.
\textsuperscript{118} E.g., Davies 1977, 5; 1980 [1948] 252.
\textsuperscript{119} Davies 1977, 5.
\textsuperscript{120} Ibid., 29.
\textsuperscript{121} Ibid., 5 [my italics].
3. 3. 2 Sacrificial ideas in Paul’s soteriology

While Davies puts much emphasis on the significance of the Passover motif against the Exodus backdrop, he does not downplay the importance of the idea of the sacrifice for sins in Paul’s soteriology. He refutes the popular scholarly view that “the blood (of Christ)” in the Pauline vocabulary is merely a metonym for the death of Christ itself or the salvific effect of the death of Christ, and stresses the centrality of “blood” in Jewish sacrificial practices:

It is now pertinent to add that in all sacrificial activity it was the blood that was central...By outpouring of blood life was released, and in offering this to God the worshipper believed that the estrangement between him and the Deity was annulled, or that the defilement which separated them was cleansed...The sprinkling was the act of “atonement” and was thus reserved for the priest.

Davies contends that the word “blood” strongly carries such a sacrificial connotation in Romans 3:25 and 5:9 alike. Davies further argues that Paul, in Romans 3:25, alludes to the Yom Kippur sacrifice, and gives a favourable comment on Manson’s view that ἱλαστήριον here signifies a new “place of atonement”. Davies, however, does not further explore how the theme of Passover/Exodus might be related to that of Yom Kippur in Paul’s soteriological thought.

3. 3. 3 Isaiah 53 in Paul’s soteriology

Davies points out that the suffering servant in Isaiah 53 constitutes another crucial background
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122 Cf. Behm, “ἀἷμα, ἁμαρτεία,” TDNT 1:172-7. We shall discuss this point in depth in chapter 3.3.2.
123 Davies, ibid., 235-6.
124 Ibid., 230-6.
125 Ibid., 240. Davies, however, disagrees with Manson’s proposal that Romans 1-3 as a whole is structured on the ritual order of Yom Kippur (Ibid., 242). Cf. T. W. Manson 1945, 6-7.
for Paul’s soteriology, and suggests that ‘the assumption is at least possible that the conception of a Suffering Messiah was not unfamiliar to pre-Christian Judaism’. However, while Davies stresses the importance of the Exodus theme in Paul’s soteriology, he fails to mention that Isaiah 40–55 itself is deeply saturated with the new Exodus theme. The Isaianic suffering servant is depicted as the agent who brings about not only the new Exodus, but also the new creation, which might have greatly inspired Paul’s understanding of the Christ event.

Concerning a peculiar expression that Christ became sin or a curse, Davies comments: ‘We have been unable to find any material on the Rabbinic side to illuminate the concepts of Christ as a “curse” and as “sin”, and we must therefore here be content with seeing in these two concepts the strongest possible expression of Christ’s suffering on our behalf wrung out of Paul’s heart by the contemplation of Christ crucified’. Again, it is important to note that Isaiah 53 is an exceptional text within the entire Jewish scriptures that expresses the idea of “vicarious death” on behalf of the people. Moreover, as Davies stresses, the Exodus of the Adamic humanity from the power of sin is certainly important in Paul’s soteriology. Nonetheless, the new Exodus of the broken covenant people (i.e., Jews) from the curse of the law (i.e., exile) envisaged by Deutero-Isaiah might be equally significant in Paul’s thought. These two Exodus themes might have tightly been locked together in Paul’s covenantal and apocalyptic thinking. Therefore, it would be a worthwhile attempt to consider a potential Isaianic backdrop of the theme of Christ’s becoming a curse.
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126 Davies, ibid., 283. On this point, though, Hengel cautiously comments: ‘So far, then, we have no clear text from pre-Christian Judaism which speaks of the vicarious suffering of the Messiah in connection with Isa. 53’ (1981, 59).
127 Ibid., 284.
128 This point will be discussed in chapter 5.2.3.4.
129 We shall explore this point in chapter 5.
In sum, we have a high regard for Davies’ valuable contribution for stressing the importance of the Passover/Exodus event as the covenant-making event in Paul’s soteriology. He also sheds light on the centrality of “blood” in Jewish sacrificial practices and its significance in Paul’s atonement theology. However, there remain some issues to be explored, such as the relationship between the Exodus theme and Isaiah 53 in Paul’s soteriology, and the relationship between Passover/Exodus and Yom Kippur. The present study attempts to provide more detailed considerations on such issues.

3. 4 E. P. Sanders

3. 4. 1 Sacrifice within “covenantal nomism”

In his epoch-making study, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, E. P. Sanders has decisively changed the landscape of Pauline scholarship. Much has already been written on this revolutionary work, and it is well beyond the scope of our research to evaluate Sanders’ whole picture of Palestinian Judaism in Paul’s time. Here, we shall focus on his account of the Levitical sacrificial system and its significance for first century Jews. The edge of Sanders’ argument lies in the fact that he discusses the role of sacrificial practices within the framework of the “covenant”:

The ‘pattern’ or ‘structure’ of covenantal nomism is this: (1) God has chosen Israel and (2) given the law. The law implies both (3) God’s promise to maintain the election and (4) the requirement to obey. (5) God rewards obedience and punishes transgression. (6) The law provides for means of atonement, and atonement results in (7) maintenance or

130 Sanders 1977.
re-establishment of the covenantal relationship. (8) All those who are maintained in the covenant by obedience, atonement and God’s mercy belong to the group which will be saved. An important interpretation of the first and last points is that election and ultimately salvation are considered to be by God’s mercy rather than human achievement.131

The point is that, within the structure of covenantal nomism, the covenant and its law presuppose human frailty, and provide sacrifice beforehand as the means of remedy for those who breach the covenantal law. In fact, various remedial actions are stipulated, mainly in the book of Leviticus. This way of understanding the nature of the law within the covenantal framework potentially calls for a radical reappraisal of the traditional reading of Paul’s letters, not least Galatians and Romans. As an exemplary case, Galatians 3:10–14 is often construed on a tacit assumption as follows: Paul holds a particular belief that the fulfilment of the law is impossible, since the law demands absolute, perfect observance without margin for error. As Bultmann maintains, ‘A Jew would contradict Paul’s assertion that a man can be justified only on the basis of absolutely perfect keeping of the Law.’ 132 Bultmann also claims that no human can meet the absolute demand of the law: ‘existence under the Law, under the divine demand, is understood as the presupposition for the existence under grace. Only he who knows himself to be limited by God’s demand, who is awake to the fact that he never does and never can satisfy this demand, only this man can understand the preaching of the Gospel’.133 The crucial

131 Ibid., 422 [my emphasis]. Concerning point (8), Simon Gathercole demonstrates: ‘Final judgment on the basis of works permeates Jewish theology, Qumran included’ (2002, 111). Sanders would concede this point, as he states, ‘the basic distinction holds: getting in is purely a result of God’s grace; he must judge the deeds of those whom he has chosen, since to do otherwise would be capricious. Paul seems to share this view entirely’ (1983, 106). Cf. Rom 2:13.
132 Bultmann 1952, 263. See also Westerholm 2004, 375, n.66.
133 Bultmann 1964, 14 [Bultmann’s emphasis]. We shall fully criticise such a reading of Galatians in chapter 5.
weakness of Bultmann’s argument lies in the fact that the Mosaic law does not demand sinless perfectionism, as evidenced by its sacrificial provision. Paul’s statement, however, gives the impression that he ignores the Jewish idea of atonement and forgiveness. What exactly is Paul’s intention?

In this regard, Sanders’ view can be encapsulated in one sentence: ‘In short, this is what Paul finds wrong in Judaism: it is not Christianity’. Sanders also argue, ‘Paul in fact explicitly denies that the Jewish covenant can be effective for salvation, thus consciously denying the basis of Judaism’. How could Paul come to the conclusion that the Jewish covenant, and thus its sacrificial means, was ineffective for salvation? According to Sanders, Paul has come to believe that after the coming of Christ, all mankind are divided into the two groups: ‘those who believe and those who do not believe’, or those who are “in Christ” and those who are not. Because of the introduction of this absolutely new category, everything that belonged to the age before Christ becomes irrelevant to salvation. Even the Jewish covenant(s) cannot be the exception. The Jewish notion of atonement is thus not at the heart of Paul’s soteriology. Therefore, argues Sanders, when Paul adopts the sacrificial terms in his accounts of Jesus’ death, he merely repeats the pre-Pauline formulae without hesitation. Likewise, on Galatians 3:13, Sanders comments thus: ‘The argument sketched above makes the
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134 Sanders 1977, 552 [Sanders’ emphasis].
135 Ibid., 551 [Sanders’ emphasis].
136 Ibid., 509.
137 Ibid., 453-63.
138 Cf. ibid., 467. In a similar vein, Moo argues that Paul presupposes that the sacrificial provision in the Mosaic covenant becomes invalid after the cross (2013, 204-5). If this is the case, Paul would also have believed that the Mosaic covenant itself becomes obsolete (cf. Heb 8:13). As a corollary, the Mosaic curse loses its binding force as well, since sacrifice and curse are essential components of the Mosaic covenant. Hence, there is no ground for asserting that those who observe the Mosaic law shall be cursed.
139 Cf. ibid., 463.
substitutionary view of Christ’s death central. It is, I think, generally conceded that, while Paul repeats that view, it is not the one most characteristic of his thought. Thus Christ’s death as taking on the curse of the law is not likely to be the key understanding behind Paul’s view.  

Sanders’ assertion, however, contradicts what Paul strongly affirms in Romans 11:28–29: “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; for the gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable”. Although Paul harshly remarks on the Mosaic covenant and its law (cf. 2Cor 3:4–18; Gal 5:2–4), he nevertheless strenuously defends the irrevocability of the election and covenantal status of Jews. Nor does Paul state that Jews should not observe the Mosaic law (cf. Rom 14:1–23; 1Cor 9:20). Sanders’ argument does not do justice to the force of Paul’s statements. Given that Paul sees Jews’ election as irrevocable, however, there still remains the problem of why Paul seems to ignore the ideas of forgiveness and atonement in Judaism.

In this regard, James Scott provides a more convincing account. Scott argues that the Levitical sacrificial system is effective on the condition that the covenant is effective. However, once the covenant is broken, the sacrificial means cease to be in effect. In fact, the brokenness of the covenant inevitably entails the loss of the sanctuary, which makes impossible for the covenant people to offer sacrifices (cf. Ps 78:60; Isa 63:18; Lam 2:7). Hence, the sacrificial means are not capable of restoring the broken covenant, and the people under the broken covenant must be kept in a state of covenantal curse. In the time of Paul, the Temple and its cultus had long been restored, and most Jews who observed the sacrificial practices would have believed the effectiveness of their practices. Still, as will be discussed in due course, there is
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\[140\] Sanders 1983, 25.
evidence that not a few Jews felt that they were still under the covenantal curse, evidenced by their perennial subjugation to ungodly Gentile powers. Scott criticises Sanders’ view thus:

It is unfortunate that Sanders’s notion of covenantal nomism has so stressed continuity in the covenantal relationship between God and his people, and readily available atonement for sin by means of repentance, that texts on the exile which, like Daniel 9, emphasize prolonged discontinuity as punishment for sin, have gone practically unnoticed or have been labelled aberrant. There is in fact a number of other Old Testament and Jewish texts which tend to call into question Sanders’s business-as-usual concept of covenant nomism. The extensive penitential prayer tradition based on Dan. 9.4–19 and Deuteronomy 27–32 shows that the state of curse and exile was felt to continue throughout the Second Temple period and beyond.141

Sanders’ explanation of the role of sacrifice within the covenant is indeed helpful, but he seems not to take full account of the historical situation of the covenant people in the first century CE.142

3. 4. 2 Sanders’ participationist eschatology

Having reviewed Sanders’ argument for covenantal nomism in relation to Paul’s understanding of sacrifice, we now consider Sanders’ distinctive view of Paul’s soteriology. Sanders insists that Paul’s thought does not develop smoothly from the Jewish pattern of covenantal nomism, as he states: ‘the primary reason for which it is inadequate to depict Paul’s religion as a new covenantal nomism is that that term does not take account of his participationist transfer terms,
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111 Scott 1993b, 201-2. We shall fully evaluate Scott’s view in chapter 5.
112 Cf. N. T. Wright 2013a, 750. Incidentally, Sanders provides a more detailed description of sacrifices (1992, 103-118), but does not explore further the relationship between sacrifices and the covenant.
which are the most significant terms for understanding his soteriology’. Sanders claims that Paul’s soteriology is based on the so-called “participationist eschatology”, as he explains: ‘The basic insight was that the believer becomes one with Christ Jesus and that this effects a transfer of lordship and the beginning of a transformation which will be completed with the coming of the Lord’. Sanders thus rejects the “new Exodus” soteriology advocated by W. D. Davies.

It must be stressed, however, that the idea of the transfer of lordship is also crucial in the Exodus narrative. As Milgrom explains, ‘the legal aspect of redemption operates in the Exodus: God owns Israel because he is their [םע: “kinsman” or “redeemer”]. Freedom means solely a change of masters; henceforth, the Israelites are slaves of God’. Hence, the concept of “transfer” in Paul’s thought can comport with the Exodus context. Sanders maintains that “freedom” is one of the key features of Paul’s soteriological thought: ‘It agrees with the view that the death of Christ provides for a transfer of lordship that Paul can express the transfer in terms of liberation or freedom from bondage. One is free from the power of sin (or the law) and free to live for God’. Again, the celebration of “freedom” attained through the Exodus event was the keynote of the Passover feast the people observed in the late Second Temple period, as we shall see in the next chapter. Furthermore, the notion of “participation” was also characteristic of the Passover feast, through which first century Jews participated in the decisive salvific event in the past.

Admittedly, the theme of “transformation” is largely absent in the Exodus narrative. The
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143 Sanders 1977, 514.
144 Ibid., 549. See also 467-8.
145 Cf. Ibid., 511-5.
146 Milgrom 2001, 2226.
147 Sanders 1977, 468.
Israelites in the wilderness still remained a stiff-necked people (e.g., Deut 9:6). However, this is precisely the point of discontinuity between the Mosaic and renewed covenants. It is the “Spirit” that transforms God’s people from within, which was missing in the Mosaic covenant (cf. Isa 59:21; Rom 8:4). Indeed, the outpouring of the Spirit is one of the central features of the new Exodus in Jewish eschatological expectations.\(^\text{148}\) Hence, Sanders’ participatory soteriology does not necessarily contradict a new Exodus soteriology.

In sum, as stated above, Sanders’ argument on the relationship between the sacrificial system and the covenant is indeed illuminating. However, we do not concur with his assertion that neither the covenant nor the Exodus theme is essential in Paul’s soteriology.

4. 5 Michael Newton

3. 5. 1 The issue of “purity” in Paul’s theology

In his *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the letters of Paul*, published in 1985, Michael Newton brings the issue of “purity” into the study of Paul’s soteriology. His study anticipates the growing interest among scholars in the relationship between “sin” and “impurity” in the Second Temple era. Indeed, this has become a flourishing area of research in the interdisciplinary field of ancient Judeo-Christian studies.\(^\text{149}\) He closely examines the texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and maintains:

The Dead Sea Scrolls show without a doubt that an examination of the concept of purity

\(^{148}\) See our discussion in chapter 5.2.4.3.

cannot be carried out in the realm of the cult to the exclusion of a consideration of morality. The concern with purity that was manifested at Qumran covered both the cultic and the moral life to the extent that the two areas were intermingled and at times indistinguishable. If this is in fact the case then it is even wrong to speak of either ‘cultic’ or ‘moral’ purity as such.\textsuperscript{150}

Newton argues that the members of the sectarian communities believed that the infringement of the regulations of the community generated impurity that would defile the offender (cf. 1QS 5:13–14). Jonathan Klawans supports Newton’s view: ‘This tendency has become full-blown in the penal code of the Rule of the Community, with the result that all sorts of acts of deceit and arrogance have come to be understood as sources of defilement. And because the \textit{Rule of the Community} recognizes no distinction between ritual and moral impurity, these moral sins were considered to bring about ritual impurity’.\textsuperscript{151}

Newton further maintains that the sectarian communities also considered that, as a person who was in a state of impurity was regarded as a threat to the sanctity of the Temple (e.g., Lev 15:31; Num 19:13), so a person who contracted impurity due to a breach of the rule would be a threat to the sanctity of the “holy” community (e.g., 1QS 8. 20–24).\textsuperscript{152} In this regard, Newton points out both similarity and difference in Paul’s letters. Paul repeatedly calls Gentile

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{150} Newton 1985, 40. Cf. Klawans, \textit{op cit.}, 83.
\item \textsuperscript{151} Klawans, \textit{op cit.}, 83. As to the meanings of “ritual” and “moral” impurities, Klawans explains: “‘Ritual impurity’ refers here to the highly contagious but generally impermanent defilements also commonly known as ‘levitical.’ Ritual impurity results from primary or secondary contact with any one of a number of natural processes and substances, as described in Leviticus 11–15 and Numbers 19… The Bible, however, is concerned with another form of impurity, referred to here as ‘moral.’ Moral impurity results from committing certain acts so heinous as to be considered defiling. In the Holiness Code, sexual and cultic sins result in moral impurity. In Ezekiel, murder too defiles (33:25–26). Unlike contracting ritual impurity, the commission of these defiling acts is prohibited, and violations are punishable’ (1995, 289-90).
\item \textsuperscript{152} Cf. Newton 1985, 40-3. Gärtner explains this point: ‘Once the focus of holiness in Israel had ceased to be the temple [for the members of the sectarian community], it was necessary to provide a new focus. This focus was the community, which called itself “the Holy place” and “the Holy of holies” (1965, 15).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Christians “holy ones” (ἅγιος; e.g., Rom 1:7; 1Cor 1:2; 2Cor 1:1; Phil 1:1), and warns them not to contract impurity from Gentiles who commit sexual immoralities (cf. 1Cor 6:12–20; 1Thess 4:3–7). However, it is important to stress that Paul’s concern is solely directed to the issue of “moral” impurity.153 Paul is indifferent to the possibility of contracting the ritual impurity generated by unclean animals (cf. Rom 14:14, 20). On this point, there is a marked difference between Paul and the author(s) of the Rule of the Community, for whom ritual impurity is also to be avoided with the same seriousness. Notwithstanding this, Paul seems to share with the sectarian communities the conviction that they (either Christians or the members of the sectarian groups) are the holy ones, and that moral misconduct poses a threat to the holiness of the community. Newton explains: ‘1 Corinthians 5:9–13 continues with the theme of the purity of the Church…An act of immorality within the Church causes it to be polluted. So as to avoid the polluting effect of evil-doers within their ranks Paul calls on the Church “not to associate [συνανακτήγνωμι (sic)] with anyone who bears the name of brother if he is guilty of…” (1Cor. 5:11). This is clearly a call for purity’.154 From these observations, Newton provides an insightful argument as to Paul’s distinctive ecclesiology, namely, the Church as the Temple of God. Newton challenges the scholarly tendency to ‘see Paul’s use of the concept of the Temple as merely metaphorical’.155 He contends that Paul fully recognises the enormous significance for his Jewish contemporaries of the extant Temple in Jerusalem as the dwelling place of God.156 However, as the sectarian communities are convinced of their sanctity as “the House of

153 The distinction between “ritual” and “moral” impurities advocated by Klawans is gaining support from New Testament scholars. See, e.g., Bauckham 2005.
154 Ibid., 93.
155 Ibid., 58.
156 This point is further elaborated by Hogeerterp, who argues that while it is questionable that the rabbinic term Shekhinah was used in the pre-70 milieu, the association of God’s Spirit with the Temple was
Holiness consisting of Israel, a most holy assembly for Aaron\textsuperscript{137}, so Paul boldly claims that God’s presence now resides in the Christian community as the true Temple of God.\textsuperscript{158} Hence Paul regards himself as a priest who serves this new Temple, and also views Christian believers as both sacrificial offerings and priests.\textsuperscript{159}

3. 5. 2 Temple ecclesiology in Romans 3:24–25

Newton construes Romans 3:24–25 in the light of Paul’s Temple ecclesiology. He draws attention to an important yet neglected purpose of the sin offering, that is, the “purification of the Temple”.\textsuperscript{160} According to Newton, Paul imagines that the blood of Christ cleanses the Temple (i.e., the church), as the act of sprinkling the sacrificial blood on the mercy seat cleanses the Temple on Yom Kippur.\textsuperscript{161} Newton argues that, through his death, Jesus became ‘both a sacrificial offering and the place of offering’,\textsuperscript{162} and conducted the ultimate Yom Kippur offering so as to enable God’s permanent presence (i.e., the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit) among the forgiven, purified community, the church.\textsuperscript{163} Newton considers that Paul’s concern for maintaining holiness and purity in the Christian community reflects the Jewish

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{137} IQS 8:5–6. Translated by James H. Charlesworth.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{158} McKelvey’s account supports Newton’s contention: ‘More specifically, it should be noted that it is the body (σῶμα) which Paul says is God’s temple. Such a thought was foreign to the Greeks; and only in the case of Adam, the perfect man, was Philo willing to entertain the possibility. In this tradition it is the soul (ψυχή) or mind (νοῦς) which is the temple; the body is the prison of the soul’ (1969, 104). See also Gärtner 1965, 57-8; Hogeterp 2006, 295-8; Macaskill 2013, 154-9.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{159} Newton, \textit{op cit.}, 60-75.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{160} Ibid., 43-6. Newton follows the view of Milgrom, whose view we shall consider in the next chapter.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{161} Ibid., 76-7.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{162} Ibid., 75.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{163} Finlan criticizes Newton’s view, arguing that there is no Temple ecclesiology in the epistle to the Romans (2004, 145). However, Paul’s statement in Romans 12:5 (“so we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and individually we are members one of another”) is strongly reminiscent of 1 Corinthians 12:12, and Romans 6:4 is of 1 Corinthians 12:13. Such striking parallels suggest that Paul presupposes the Temple ecclesiology in Romans as well.}
\end{footnotes}
eagerness to maintain the holiness and purity of the Jerusalem Temple.\textsuperscript{164}

Newton’s study sheds important light on the relationship between Paul’s use of sacrificial imagery and his Temple ecclesiology. Another significant contribution of Newton’s work is the integration of the issue of purity into the study of Paul’s soteriology. Moreover, his construal of Romans 3:24–25 provides a helpful insight into Paul’s understanding of the atoning work of Christ. However, while his study casts fresh light on the neglected point of the sanctification of the Christian community in Romans 3:24–25, he draws little attention to the more prominent theme in Romans, the theme of the “wrath of God”. As our following study will show, the notion of “atonement” is not just about “purification”. We must pursue a more holistic understanding of “atonement” in this research.

3. 6 Hudson McLean

One of the most crucial developments in the study of Paul’s sacrificial motifs is the clarification of the fundamental difference between the blood-sacrificial ritual and the expulsion (or removal) ritual. McLean’s research published in 1996 as The Cursed Christ is a milestone in this area of study. As we shall see in the next chapter, the Yom Kippur rite mainly consists of two different rituals. In one ritual, the blood of the sacrifices plays a key role, but in the other, the blood plays no role. The former is the sin/purification offering, and the other is the scapegoat ritual.

McLean categorises the scapegoat as an apotropaeic ritual, which was widely practiced in

\textsuperscript{164} Newton, ibid., 79-114.
the Greco-Roman world. McLean asserts that the scapegoat cannot be referred to as a sacrifice, since it is sent not to God but to Azazel, which most probably signifies a demonic being. He maintains that Paul applies this “apotropaeic paradigm”, which would have been intelligible to both Jewish and Greco-Roman audiences, to Jesus’ death. McLean explains:

The apotropaeic victim functions in a substitutionary role by taking the place of the threatened community and assuming this burden. For example, the Athenian pharmakoi would take upon themselves the curse causing the plague or drought which threatened the citizens. Likewise, Christ is said to have died in substitution for all who are oppressed by the powers of the old order – sin and its curse – in order that those who relinquish all ties with this old order may be rescued from them.

One of the most significance contributions of McLean’s study is his critique of the longstanding scholarly tendency to confuse the blood-sacrificial ritual with the scapegoat ritual. However, whereas McLean puts much emphasis on Paul’s dependence on the idea of the expulsion ritual, he asserts that Paul never uses sacrificial concepts in his elucidation of Jesus’ death. On this point, he seems to go to the other extreme. We can enumerate five reasons that contradict McLean’s assertion.

First, it must be stated that the scapegoat, which McLean categorises as the best example of the apotropaeic ritual in the Jewish scriptures, can be called a sacrifice for sins. The
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166 Ibid., 73. However, the Passover sacrifices in the Exodus event, whose blood were used for an apotropaeic end, do not fit in with this paradigm.
167 Ibid., 79-81.
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scapegoat ritual is indeed unique within the sacrificial system as a whole. In the blood sacrifice, slaughtering an animal initiates the ritual, whereas the scapegoat should not be killed in the Temple court. The blood assumes no role in this ritual. On the scapegoat’s back, all the sins and iniquities of Israel are laid, and the scapegoat is sent alive to Azazel (cf. Lev 16:10, 21–22). Given this unique role of the scapegoat, not a few scholars argue that the scapegoat is not categorised as a sacrifice. Nevertheless, it could be called a sacrifice, as Leviticus 16:5 LXX reads: λῆμψαι δύο χιμάρους ἐξ αἰγών περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν. Since περὶ ἁμαρτίας is the technical term that signifies a sacrifice for sins, it is possible that first century Jewish readers regarded both goats (one for the Lord, the other for Azazel) as the sacrifices for sins. Since this point is worthy of further consideration, we shall return to it in our study of the Yom Kippur rite in the next chapter.

Second, and related to the last point, although McLean groups the scapegoat ritual and the other Mediterranean apotropaic rituals together, there are notable differences between the two. Although it is true that victims of the latter type of ritual, either animal or human, were often “cursed”, they were not called the bearers of sins or transgressions of the people (cp. Lev 16:21). Hence, it remains questionable whether the Greco-Roman audience could have detected a clear analogy between the pharmakos and Jesus who died for sins (cf. 1Cor 15:3). More important, the scapegoat ritual is not an independent ritual, as the Mediterranean apotropaic rituals are. Rather, it is a part of the complex Yom Kippur rite, and this rite as a
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172 Cf. Ibid., 84-100.
173 Although McLean uncritically relies on the view of Lewis Farnell who describes the Athenian pharmakos as an “abject sin-carrier” or “sin-bearer”, Farnell fails to provide solid evidence for this designation. Cf. Farnell 1907, 280.
whole should not simply be categorized as an apotropaic rite.\footnote{We shall discuss this point in depth in the next chapter.}

More problematic, however, is, third, the fact that McLean’s argument does not do justice to the force of Paul’s explicit statement in 1 Corinthians 5:7 (Christ our paschal lamb was \textit{sacrificed}). Admittedly, the verb \textit{θῶ} can simply mean “to slaughter”. Moreover, his analysis of the perception of the Passover sacrifice in the first century milieu would be correct: ‘at no stage in the evolution of the Passover was the paschal sacrifice ever understood to be atoning in nature, nor for that matter was the blood considered to have had a purgative significance’.\footnote{Ibid., 47.} Nevertheless, it remains true that the paschal lamb is a \textit{sacrifice} (cf. Exod 12:27), if not a sacrifice for sins.

Fourth, McLean asserts that Paul employs the term “Christ’s blood” as a synonym for Jesus’ death.\footnote{Ibid., 43.} However, in the sin offering, the most important element in the sacrifice is blood itself, which is not death but \textit{life}. Hence, when Paul uses the term \textit{αἵμα} in a sacrificial context, he may well be aware of this point.\footnote{We shall consider this issue in chapter 3.} If this is the case, it provides another piece of evidence that Paul utilises sacrificial ideas in his soteriological thought.

Finally, his claim that the anarthrous phrase \textit{περὶ ἀμαρτίας} never means “for a sin-offering” in LXX is gratuitous, as we can find an example of anarthrous usage in Leviticus 5:6 in LXX: \textit{θῆλυ ἀπὸ τῶν προβάτων, ἁμνάδα ἡ χίαιραν ἔξ αἰγων, περὶ ἀμαρτίας} (“a female from sheep, ewe lambs, or a young she-goat from goats, for the sin offering”).\footnote{My translation.} It should also be remembered that there are ample examples of such a usage in the epistle to the Hebrews (Heb 5:3; 10:6, 8, 18,
Thus, it is difficult to say that Paul never refers or alludes to the sin offering in his descriptions of Jesus’ death.

In sum, while Mclean’s clarification of the difference between the blood-sacrificial ritual and the scapegoat ritual greatly contributes to the advancement of Pauline studies, he fails to recognise the sacrificial ideas in Paul’s soteriology.

3. 7 Stephen Finlan

Stephen Finlan’s *The Background and Content of Paul’s Cultic Atonement Metaphors*, published in 2004, reflects the latest research developments in both Pauline studies and Jewish sacrificial practices. As to the scope of his study, Finlan states: ‘I will be concentrating on Paul’s use of sacrifice and scapegoat metaphors, but that does not mean that I think it possible to reduce his theology to these two themes. Paul’s is a great synthetic theology in which many themes are brought together’. Finlan aims to compensate for the weakness of McLean’s study, which completely ignores the blood-sacrificial elements in Paul’s soteriology.

As a preliminary to a study of Paul’s atonement thinking, Finlan explores the meaning of “atonement” in the Jewish sacrificial context. After stressing the peril of reducing this term to a single meaning, he turns to a perennial question among New Testament scholars: ‘NT scholars are particularly interested in the meaning of *kipper*, because this impinges on the meaning of NT sayings about the death of Jesus that utilize the ἱλάσκομαι word group. Scholars have debated whether ἱλάσκομαι has primarily the sense of propitiation (appeasing or
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181 Cf. Lang, “*kipper,*” *TDOT* 7:288-303.
conciliating God) or of *expiation* (removing or wiping away sin). Finlan rightly indicates that the word נפל in the Hebrew scriptures can mean a “payment” or “ransom” that conciliates the wrath of God:

Hartley minimizes propitiation. “Not God’s kindled wrath but his potential wrath is the direct focus of the expiating sacrifice,” and there is no need to propitiate a God who is not yet angry. But propitiation certainly is present if God’s anger will swiftly follow any letup in the regimen of ritual feeding. This is the agreement: God agrees to withhold his wrath if humans remember to keep up their offerings. Here sacrifice resembles a tribute payment to a demanding sovereign.

Finlan goes on to explain:

All monetary transactions are substitutionary in a pragmatic, not moral, sense. Hebrew sacrifice does not involve the animal substituting for one who has been justly convicted of sin. Rather, it is a payment; after all, foodstuffs have *value*. Various texts speak both of kippering and of making restitution plus one-fifth (Lev 5:24 [6:5 NRSV]; Num 5:7), or of paying double (Exod 22:7–9). נפל, then, has this connotation of payment, which does not negate its denotation, its primary meaning, of purging or cleansing.

His view that the sacrificial offering functions as a “payment” that appeases the wrath of God is of great significance for a proper understanding of sacrificial practices.

Having clarified the multiple denotations and connotations of “atonement” in the sacrificial context, Finlan proceeds to the exegeses of Paul’s salvific statements. He maintains that Paul exploits some images, such as the blood sacrifices and the scapegoat ritual, from the Yom
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182 Finlan 2004, 38.
183 Ibid., 38. See also Hartley 1992, 65. Hartley further maintains: ‘This interpretation, therefore, supports rendering נפל in the cultic texts as “expiate,” not “propitiate.”’ Ibid., 65.
184 Ibid., 43-4. See also Eberhart 2011b, 70.
Kippur rite in the epistle to the Romans, which can be found in the two phrases: ἱλαστήριον διὰ [τῆς] πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ αἷματι (Rom 3:25) and περὶ ἁμαρτίας (Rom 8:3). Concerning the former phrase, Finlan construes the word ἱλαστήριον as either a “place of atonement” or the “mercy seat”, and contends that the thrust of Paul’s argument in Romans 3:25 is to describe Jesus’ death as ‘a new Yom Kippur ritual’. On Romans 8:3, Finlan renders περὶ ἁμαρτίας as “for a sin-offering”, and he further explains: ‘In Romans 8:3 Paul joins sacrificial, judicial, and scapegoat metaphors: Christ was sent in the flesh as a sin offering (sacrificial) so that God could condemn sin (judicial) in the flesh (scapegoat). The specific focus on “the flesh” at the beginning and end of the verse suggests a scapegoat image, as does the idea of one creature taking something on for the whole community’. Concerning 2 Corinthians 5:21, Finlan writes:

At the heart of the scapegoat ritual is an exchange of conditions: the pure goat takes on the community’s sin, and the community takes on the goat’s purity. This interchange is at the heart of Paul’s soteriology…What happens in 2 Corinthians 5:21 is like what happens in a reversal ritual, not like what happens in a law court. This passage does not describe “justification” but change of status, a new “becoming.” Christ becomes sin, and people become the righteousness of God – a stunning reversal that has nothing to do with acquittal but everything to do with what happens when an animal or a person “becomes” sin and is banished by the community.
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185 Finlan 2004, 123-62; 2005, 39-41; 2007, 20-1. See especially an important philological study of Bailey, 1990. He argues that, from a linguistic point of view, ἱλαστήριον designated either a place of atonement (more specifically the “mercy seat”) in LXX or the votive offering in the pagan world, but was never used to signify a sacrificial animal in the first century CE. See also T. W. Manson 1945; Kraus 1991; Campbell 1992, 130-3; Schreiner 1998, 192-5.
186 Finlan 2005, 41.
187 Finlan 2004, 49. Also see. Bailey op. cit.,156.
188 Finlan 2007, 25 [Finlan’s italics].
189 Finlan 2005, 42-3 [Finlan’s italics].
With respect to Galatians 3:10–13, Finlan argues that Paul here uses cultic, economic, and judicial metaphors: ‘So the threefold metaphor in Galatians 3:10–13 is this: Christ takes away our curse by becoming a scapegoat, purchases the freedom of the captives of sin, and secures a favorable judicial result for human plaintiffs in the divine court’. 190

Finlan’s exhaustive and meticulous study is highly commendable. Finlan’s deep and broad knowledge of Jewish sacrificial practices and concepts is impressive. Nevertheless, his exposition is unsatisfactory on several points. First, Finlan does not fully explore the significance of the Exodus theme in Paul’s soteriology. 191 Although he describes Jesus’ death as “the new Passover lamb”, 192 he does not consider the possibility that this motif can be better comprehended within the Exodus story on which Paul might have constructed his exhortation. Concerning πάσχα in 1 Corinthians 5:7, he argues that it represents the apotropaic function (i.e., averting the wrath of God) of the Passover sacrifice. 193 This rendering is not entirely satisfactory, however. We shall discuss this point further in chapter 3.

Second, though Finlan claims that Paul sees that the “purity” of the scapegoat (i.e., an analogy of Christ’s righteousness) is transferred to believers, 194 this is far from convincing. Though it is true, as we shall see in the next chapter, that the scapegoat ritual contains the concept of “transfer”, it must be stated that the transfer occurring in this ritual was not reciprocal. Whereas the sins of Israel were to be transferred to and laid on the scapegoat, 195 there is no evidence that ancient Jews believed that either the “righteousness” or “purity” of the

190 Ibid., 45.
191 He only makes passing reference to this topic. E.g., Finlan 2004, 153, 170.
192 Ibid., 72.
194 Finlan 2005, 42-3.
scapegoat was reciprocally transferred to the people of Israel. Moreover, he does not address the question of how God’s righteousness, rather than Christ’s righteousness or purity, can be transferred to Christian believers.196

Third and most importantly, Finlan does not fully appreciate the importance of Isaiah 53 in Paul’s soteriology. He maintains, ‘Paul may get some of his ideas of heroic death from Isaiah, but his participationist notion cannot be found there’.197 On this point, he seems to attribute the “vicarious” idea found in Paul’s soteriology all to the scapegoat ritual. However, it must be remembered that Paul never explicitly likens Jesus to the scapegoat.198 Hence, it is necessary to seek the possibility that the idea of vicariousness in Paul’s thought is rooted in Isaiah 53.

Finally, Finlan states, ‘By variously describing Christ as the typological fulfillment of the OT cult, he [Paul] shows that Christ provides all the things the cult was thought to provide’.199 Finlan further maintains: ‘Paul’s treatment of the Jewish cult is thoroughly typologically: what matters is the fulfillment in Christ’.200 This “cultic fulfilment” theory is, however, not entirely convincing for two reasons. First, Finlan’s account does not properly explain why the fulfilment of these sacrificial activities results in the fulfilment of the Abrahamic promise of the outpouring of the Spirit (cf. Gal 3:14). Paul clearly sees a causal link between Jesus’ death and this blessing, but the sacrificial system does not provide an account of how this works. Second,
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197 Finlan 2004, 177.
198 Cf. chapter 5.1.2.
199 Ibid., 178 [Finlan’s italics].
200 Ibid., 185 [Finlan’s emphasis].
it is important to remember that the whole sacrificial system is designed to maintain the covenant relationship between God and his people. Once this relationship has been broken, the covenantal curses are unleashed. The existing sacrificial remedies have no power to terminate these curses. Thus, even if Jesus does typologically fulfil every sacrificial role through his death, one struggles to understand how, on a sacrificial level, that event would be sufficient to redeem the covenant people from the covenantal curse.  

4. Conclusion

4.1 Summary of the history of research

We have first reviewed the general tendencies of scholars as to their views on Paul’s use of sacrificial imagery in his soteriological statements. It is often the case that their accounts betray misunderstandings of various sacrificial practices and the ideas behind them. Therefore, it is not accidental that the breakthroughs in this area of research have been accomplished by those scholars who have astute insights into sacrificial practices and their meanings. These scholars shed light on several crucial aspects of Paul’s thought. Davies understands Paul’s soteriology in the New Exodus paradigm. He also stresses the importance of “blood” in Jewish sacrificial practices. Sanders makes a great contribution by expounding the relationship between sacrifice and the covenant. Newton demonstrates that a Temple ecclesiology and a corresponding concern for “purity” are crucial elements in Paul’s soteriology. McLean draws a clear distinction between blood-sacrificial rituals and the scapegoat ritual. Finlan expounds the
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201 We shall discuss this point fully in chapter 5.
diversity of Paul’s cultic terms and their theological backgrounds.

4. 2 The task to be addressed

Despite the considerable progress in understanding Paul’s use of sacrificial imagery, a vital issue remains to be explored. A number of scholars now argue that some kind of new Exodus framework provides Paul with a larger narrative conception of God’s redemptive work through Jesus. On the other hand, scholars like Finlan recognise the complexity and variety of cultic motifs and ideas in Paul’s soteriological statements. Nonetheless, there has been little attempt to understand these various motifs within such a larger narrative framework. It is important to note that some of Paul’s sacrificial motifs would have evoked more than simply Jewish sacrificial rituals, for example, the larger contexts of Jewish holy convocations, not least Passover and Yom Kippur. As we shall see in the next chapter, the Passover feast is inseparably connected to the story of Israel. At its core this feast is a commemoration and re-enactment of one of the decisive events in the story of Israel. Even in the case of Yom Kippur, strong ties are evident between this holy day and the future hope of Israel. Hence, if Paul’s sacrificial motifs evoke the images of these holy convocations, it is possible that these motifs are rooted in Paul’s understanding of the larger story of Israel. This point is critically important for our study, since the notion of the “covenant” is one of the crucial elements in the story of Israel. Therefore, it is vital to explore the significance of Passover and Yom Kippur in the first century milieu.

\[\text{Cf. N. T. Wright 1992, 260-2.}\]
Chapter 2: Passover and Yom Kippur for first century Jews

1. Passover and Yom Kippur

1.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, we reviewed a number of scholarly analyses of Paul’s usage of sacrificial imagery in his soteriological statements. Although they disagree on various points, most of them agree on one particular point: some terms in Paul’s statements are related to annual Jewish feasts or convocations, such as Passover and Yom Kippur. The most obvious example is the term πάσχα, which is clearly associated with the Passover feast and the feast of Unleavened Bread (cf. 1Cor 5:6–8). As regards Yom Kippur, Paul does not explicitly mention it in his letters. However, since ἱλαστήριον is a technical term that largely signifies the “mercy seat” in Greek versions of Jewish scriptures, for those who were familiar with the Pentateuch, the use of this word would have evoked the Yom Kippur imagery. Four out of five scholars whom we reviewed closely (Davies, Newton, McLean, and Finlan) acknowledge that the Yom Kippur motifs (either or both the blood-sacrificial ritual and/or scapegoat ritual) play an important role in Paul’s thought. Indeed, many other Pauline scholars point out that the Yom Kippur rite constitutes an important background to Paul’s soteriology. Hence, we have
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203 There are, of course, some exceptions, as Kraus explains, ‘Andererseits wird jedoch gern übersehen, daß ἱλαστήριον nicht nur die Übersetzung für Ἅγιος im Jerusalemer Tempel darstellt, sondern in der Ausgabe des Symmachus in Gen 6,16 die Arche gemeint ist, in Am 9,1 LXX ein Sühneort im Betheler Heiligtum und in Ey 43,14 (ter). 17.20 LXX die ναός, d.h. ein Teil des Altarkorpus des im Zentrum der neuen Tempelanlage stehenden Brandopferaltars’ (1991, 157).

reasonable grounds for assuming that Paul employs both Passover and Yom Kippur motifs in his accounts of Jesus’ death. In what follows, we shall explore how first century Jews perceived the meaning of Passover and Yom Kippur respectively, in order to gain insight into Paul’s use of these motifs.

1. 2 Methodological Remarks

It is important to clarify how our research is to be conducted. As regards the feast of Passover, we must first examine the main sources of knowledge of this feast for first century Jews. Stowers comments, ‘Paul and his readers may have understood the cult either through their own reading of the scriptural sources or through a knowledge of the temple cult as it operated in the first century or through a combination of scripture and current practice’. For first century Jews, these two mediums would have been inseparable, for a recitation of the holy scriptures was an essential part of the Passover feast (cf. Exod 12:26–27). Hence, we shall first examine how the scriptures themselves explain Passover, and then consult the writings from the first century CE, which give descriptions of the activities of the people during the Passover feast.

With regard to Yom Kippur, its dual character should be noted. While Yom Kippur was one of the annual Jewish holy convocations (cf. Lev 23:27; Num 29:7), it also constituted an essential part of the sacrificial system in the book of Leviticus (cf. Lev 16:2–34). The Jewish scriptures provide relatively little on this convocational aspect. Thus, in order to know how first century Jews observed the Yom Kippur convocation, we must rely mainly on the extra-biblical sources. It is beyond our purpose, though, to make a comprehensive survey of all the Second
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205 Stowers 1994, 208.
Temple sources that explicitly or implicitly refer to the Yom Kippur convocation, such as has recently been conducted by Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. Instead, we shall focus on some significant texts that provide insights into this convocation.

The Jewish scriptures give detailed accounts of Yom Kippur as a Temple rite, but there is almost no text from the first century CE that explains how this rite was conducted in the Temple. The observation of the entire procedure of the Yom Kippur rite was only available to a high priest, who alone entered the holy of holies (cf. Lev 16:17). Hence, it was through the book of Leviticus that first century Jews gained the whole picture. Therefore, the best way to explore how first century Jews understood the Yom Kippur rite is to consider how they read and understood Leviticus 16. Though the Mishnah contains much information about this rite, it may be problematic to use it as our primary source. It must be remembered that the Second Temple had been demolished long before the compilation of the Mishnah. E. P. Sanders thus warns, ‘The problem with using the Mishnah is that there is very seldom this sort of reference to pre-70 practice that allows us to make critical distinctions: not only are we often reading second-century discussions, we may be learning only second-century theory’. Nevertheless, the Mishnah is chronologically closer to the Second Temple period than the rest of the Tannaitic literature. Hence, while our primary source must be the scriptures, it would be beneficial to consult the Mishnah with reservations.
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207 Sanders 1992, 104.
2. Passover

2.1 The Passover event in the Exodus story

According to the Jewish scriptures, the origin of the Passover feast is found in the Exodus narrative. The Passover event is one of the climactic moments within the Exodus story, and the purpose of observing the Passover feast for subsequent generations is to commemorate this historic event (cf. Exod 12:26–27). Concerning the original Passover event, two points are important to our study of Paul’s texts, and thus deserve particular attention.

First, the Exodus event is predicated on God’s faithfulness to his covenantal promise to the patriarchs. According to the book of Exodus, God’s redemptive action was initiated by his remembrance of the covenant with the patriarchs (cf. Exod 2:24). More than four hundred years before the Exodus, God made a covenant with Abraham, and foretold him that his descendants would be enslaved and oppressed in the land of Egypt, and that God would rescue them from their predicament (cf. Gen 15:13–16). The Passover event is the fulfilment of God’s promise to Abraham (cf. Gen 15:14a; Exod 12:12).  

Second, it is vital to note that the slaughtering of lambs in this event had virtually no connection with the sin or guilt offering – sin was not forgiven, nor was purification effected. Not a single sin of Israel is mentioned in the Passover narrative. There was neither penitence nor confession of sins prior to the act of slaughter (cp. Ezra 9:3–5), and no declaration of forgiveness was pronounced to the congregation. Whereas God commanded all the Israelites to eat the meat of the slaughtered lambs (cf. Exod 12:8), this instruction is incongruous with the
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208 This point is relevant to our study of Galatians in chapter 5.
practice of the sin offering. In fact, there is not a single stipulation that permits the offerer/offender to eat the meat of the animal sacrificed for sin in the Jewish scriptures (cf. Lev 4:1–6:13, 6:14–7:7). Hence, it is justifiably claimed that lambs were not sacrificed for the atonement for sins in the Passover event. Instead, the blood of the paschal lambs served an apotropaic end, functioning as a “sign” that marked the Israelite households out to protect them from the plague that would strike the Egyptians (Exod 12:13). The Passover event was the time of the judgement on “all the gods of Egypt” (Exod 12:12).

2.2 The Passover feast in the first century CE

Next, in order to consider how first century Jews observed the Passover feast, we shall consult three sources: Philo, Josephus, and the Mishnah.

Philo provides a detailed account of the Passover feast in the first century CE. He states that in the time of the Passover feast all the Jews slaughtered lambs with their own hands (cf. Spec Law 2.145; QE 1.10). Philo’s report is corroborated by the Mishnah’s account, which states that the whole congregation of Israel slaughtered the paschal lambs in the Temple court, and the priests focused on the blood manipulation on this occasion (m. Pesahim 5.5–6). Philo stresses that this feast was celebrated in an exceedingly jubilant mood of thanksgiving (cf. Spec Law 2.146). According to Philo, each household took on the high dignity of the Temple, wherein the roasted meat of the paschal sacrifices was consumed: ‘On this day every dwelling-house is invested with the outward semblance and dignity of a temple’ (Spec Law
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209 As Gilders discusses, ‘The blood is identified as an apotropaic agent. It achieves an instrumental effect, warding off destruction, because Yahweh sees it’ (2004, 44).

210 This is important to our study of 1 Corinthians 5:7 in the next chapter.
This account implies that for at least some diaspora Jews the locus of the Passover feast did not lie in the act of slaughtering in the Temple, but in the Passover meal in each household.

Whilst the Passover feast was designed to re-enact the historic Passover event (cf. Exod 12:25–27), first century Jews did not imitate the act of putting the blood of the paschal lamb on the two doorposts and the lintel of the house (cf. Exod 12:7). According to the Mishnah, the priest dealt with the blood of the paschal sacrifices and tossed it on the base of the altar in the Temple (m. Pesahim 5.5–6). If this Mishnah’s account preserves the actual practice conducted in the Second Temple era, this implies that the apotropaeic element had been omitted from the Passover ritual. Moreover, it seems that the Passover sacrifice was clearly distinguished from the sin offering in the late Second Temple period. The Mishnah declares: ‘If on the Sabbath a man slaughtered a Passover-offering under some other name, he is thereby liable to a Sin-offering’ (m. Pesahim 6.4). In other words, whilst it was not permitted to make ordinal offerings, such as the sin offering, on the Sabbath, the Passover offering overrode the sabbatical regulations (cf. m. Pesahim 6.1–6). Since there would have been no necessity for rabbis to invent such an instruction, this Mishnaic account may well reflect the actual practice in the late Second Temple period. Notably this is yet another piece of evidence against
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211 Gray states, ‘later still, certainly by the first century A. D., the victim was still slain in the Temple enclosure, its blood and fat were conveyed to the altar, but the meal was eaten by small companies in the houses of Jerusalem’ (1925, 371). See also Routledge 2002, 208-22.

212 This point is also suggestive to our study of 1 Corinthians.

213 The significance of this type of blood manipulation (tossing it on the base of the altar; cf. Lev 3:2) is variously interpreted, such as a preventive measure against human consumption of the blood, or the symbolic action of returning the blood to its owner (i.e., God). See Gilders 2004, 86-96. Whatever significance it may have, it is important to note that this act is distinguishable from ‘the act of conveying the blood to the altar’ (Gilders, ibid., 107). Cf. Lev 4:4–7; 9:9.

214 Since they could no longer practice the Passover sacrifice in the Temple.
categorising the paschal lamb as a sacrifice for sins.

By the recitation of the scriptures during the Passover meal, Jews would have naturally recalled the collective memory of the Exodus event in Egypt. The feast of Unleavened Bread had virtually coalesced with the Passover feast in the first century CE (Exod 13:5–8, cf. Spec Law 2.158), and the purpose of this feast was also to commemorate the Exodus event (cf. Exod 13:7–8). Hence, the ultimate goal of the vernal feasts as a whole was to evoke gratitude for the Exodus event, the great deliverance from the state of slavery. Pesahim conveys the essence of the Passover feast for ancient Jews:

In every generation a man must so regard himself as if he came forth himself out of Egypt, for it is written, And thou shalt tell thy son in that day saying, It is because of that which the Lord did for me when I came forth out of Egypt. Therefore are we bound to give thanks, to praise, to glorify, to honour, to exalt, to extol, and to bless him who wrought all those wonders for our fathers and for us. He brought us out from bondage to freedom, from sorrow to gladness, and from mourning to a Festival-day, and from darkness to great light, and from servitude to redemption; so let us say before him the Hallelujah.215

Through participating in the Exodus event by observing this feast, Jews experienced God as the liberator. It would not be surprising, therefore, that commemorating the great deliverance in the past would have evoked a future hope, the hope that God would make a decisive move once again, and would accomplish a greater liberation from Israel’s enemies. In the Jewish scriptures, a prophetic vision for the future is often envisaged as a re-enactment of the Exodus event, as the following example shows:

215 m. Pesahim 10.5.
Micah 7:15–17: As the days when you came out of the land of Egypt, show us marvelous things. The nations shall see and be ashamed of all their might; they shall lay their hands on their mouths; their ears shall be deaf; they shall lick dust like a snake, like the crawling things of the earth; they shall come trembling out of their fortresses, they shall turn in dread to the Lord our God, and they shall stand in fear of you.

Indeed, all the major exilic and post-exilic prophets (Deutero-Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel) refer to the Exodus event as the basis of God’s future salvation (e.g., Isa 52:3–5; Jer 16:14–15; 31:31–33; Ezek 20:34–37). Thus, for those who felt oppressed by their enemies in the present time, observing the Passover feast would have had important political implications. In support of this view, there seems to be a significant correlation between the Passover feast and Jewish revolts. According to Josephus, a riotous instability almost always erupted during the time of the Passover feast. Josephus does not report any such insurrection during the autumnal convocations, while there was one instance at the time of Pentecost (cf. Ant. 20:105–112; J.W. 2:10–13, 42–54; 224–227, 280–284).

This fact is not without significance, since the autumnal feast of Booths would have attracted more pilgrims in comparison with the vernal feast of Passover in the late Second Temple period.216 The Gospels also attest that the Jewish ruling elites were afraid that during the time of Passover the people were liable to revolt (e.g., Matt 26:4; Mark 14:2). The cause of this phenomenon seems to lie in the distinctive nature of the Passover feast, which would have ignited the aspiration for “freedom”. As Horsley argues:
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216 As to the festival of Booths, Tigay explains, ‘It takes place when the bounty of the harvest is manifest and farmers have the leisure to remain at the sanctuary for all seven days of the festival, the longest stay of all the three pilgrimages…it is the festival that would attract the largest number of pilgrims to the chosen place’ (1996, 158).
Why are the Roman authorities and the Jewish high priests anxious about a “tumult” and “uprising” during the Passover festivals? The reason becomes clearer once we set the celebration of liberation in juxtaposition with the structural oppression of the imperial situation... The annual Passover celebration, however, was not simply “the sigh of the oppressed creature.” It was also “the protest against real distress.”

It is beyond our scope of research to consider to what extent such a rebellious sentiment had been shared among first century Jews. Nevertheless, the evidence suggests that, at least for some Jews, the Passover feast was the time for not only the celebration of the past, but also the anticipation of the great deliverance in the near future.

3. Yom Kippur

3.1 Introduction

Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement, is a composite of various elements. On this day, all Jews are to observe the most solemn convocation, in which they must deny themselves (Lev 16:29; 23:27; Num 29:7). On the same day, the high priest conducts a series of rituals in the Temple, which are unparalleled in complexity and seriousness within the Levitical sacrificial system. Hence, we must devote much more space to the study of Yom Kippur than to that of Passover conducted above. Our investigation of Yom Kippur consists of the three parts: 1) Yom Kippur as a holy convocation; 2) the complex rite carried out on Yom Kippur; and, 3) Yom Kippur in
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217 Horsley 1987, 34-5 [Horsley’s emphasis].
218 In this regard, N. T. Wright argues: ‘This brief list of movements of revolt in the years preceding the war gives, I think, sufficient indication of the mood of the country as a whole. It supports the fairly obvious conclusion: Josephus has thoroughly falsified his own suggestion that one single party, begun by Judas the Galilean, was responsible for the entire drift towards the war with Rome which broke out in AD 66. Revolution of one sort of another was in the air, and often present on the ground, both in Galilee and (particularly) in Jerusalem, throughout the period of Roman rule’ (1992, 176).
relation to Jewish eschatological hope.

3.2 Yom Kippur as a holy convocation

3.2.1 Yom Kippur as the day of mercy: Philo

Philo provides valuable information about Yom Kippur in the late Second Temple milieu. According to Philo, Yom Kippur was of critical importance to all Jews, including those who had little interest in religious activities: ‘On the tenth day is the fast, which is carefully observed not only by the zealous for purity and holiness, but also by those who never act religiously in the rest of their life’ (Spec Laws 1.186). Philo states that Moses declared Yom Kippur ‘a feast, the greatest of the feasts, in his native tongue a Sabbath of Sabbaths, or as the Greeks would say, a seven of sevens, a holier than the holy’ (Spec Laws 2.194; cf. Lev 23:32).\(^{219}\) One of the most notable characteristics of Yom Kippur in comparison with other holy convocations is that this was the only convocation for which all members of the covenant observed fasting for one day to afflict their souls (cf. Lev 16:29, 31; 23:29, 32; Num 29:7).\(^ {220}\) As regards the reason for abstaining from food, Philo stresses that what was behind fasting was sincere contrition for past sins:

\[\text{Because the holy-day is entirely devoted to prayers and supplications, and men from morn to eve employ their leisure in nothing else but offering petitions of humble entreaty in which they seek earnestly to propitiate God and ask for remission of their}\]

\(^{219}\) The sabbatical aspect of Yom Kippur seems to be related to the Jewish notion of “exile”, to which we shall return in due course.

\(^{220}\) In the Qumran community, Yom Kippur was called “the day of fasting” as well as “the appointed time, the rest of the day of Atonement”. See. 1Qp Hab 11.6–7.
sins, voluntary and involuntary, and entertain bright hopes looking not to their own merits but to the gracious nature of Him Who sets pardon before chastisement.\footnote{Philo, Spec Law 2.196.}

For pious Jews, who always sought God’s mercy through penitence and offerings of sacrifices, it was necessary to entreat God to forgive sins that they might have committed in ignorance. Even for those who did not lead a commendable life, Yom Kippur was an exceptionally important opportunity to make up for their laxity regarding the ancestral traditions: ‘The high dignity of this day has two aspects, one as a festival, the other as a time of purification and escape from sins, for which indemnity is granted by the bounties of the gracious God who has given to repentance the same honour as to innocence from sin’ (Spec Law 1.187). Yom Kippur was thus the most important day for both pious and uncommitted Jews, who were eager for the acquittal of all sins as well as for the covenantal blessings from God (cf. Moses 2.24).

3. 2. 2 Yom Kippur as the day of judgement: Festival Prayers

The Festival Prayers are the series of texts that refer to several Jewish festivals, though only Yom Kippur and the feast of the First Fruits are explicitly mentioned in the extant texts. They were most probably used for liturgical purposes. Whilst all the texts were found in Qumran caves, Falk argues that they probably originated outside the Qumran community, pointing out that ‘the liturgical calendar assumed in Festival Prayers begins in the autumn rather than the spring as otherwise attested at Qumran’.\footnote{Falk 1998, 157. Falk also indicates that the Festival Prayers do not exhibit any feature distinctive to the Qumran community.} If this is correct, the Festival Prayers can be ‘placed in the context of a broad stream of festival prayer tradition’.\footnote{Ibid., 207.} Although most of the
manuscripts are extremely fragmentary, we are fortunate to have relatively well-preserved texts that refer to Yom Kippur (1Q 34; 4Q 507–509). Among the texts found in the Qumran caves, we shall examine 4Q508 2, which seems to capture well the essence of Yom Kippur for Jews in the Second Temple era. As regards its content, Falk points out the fact that none of the texts of Festival Prayers is written in the second person in its concluding part. Falk then concludes, ‘The most likely conclusion is that 4Q508 2 comes from the middle of a prayer for the Day of Atonement’. 224

1. […] and you dwelt in our midst […]
2. […] Remember, O Lord, the appointed time of your mercies, and the time of repentance […]
3. […] and you have established it for us (as) an appointed time of fasting, a stature [sic.] fore[ver…]
4. […] and you know the hidden things and the revealed thing[s…]
5. […] you [k]now our form […]
6. […ou]r [rising] and our lying down you […] 225

Although the text is terse, it contains some key theological phrases that exhibit ancient Jewish views on Yom Kippur. The text confirms that Yom Kippur was a time of fasting as well as repentance. The author takes it for granted that God who dwells among his community knows every hidden deed of his people (cf. 4Q509 5-6 4). The theme of “revealing the hidden things” in line 4 is reminiscent of the ancient Jewish idea of God as the judge of the hidden things, as well as the early Christian conviction of the future judgement of Christ (cf. Sir 1:30; Pss. Sol. 9:3; Matt 6:4; Rom 2:16; 1 Cor 4:5; 14:25; 2 Cor 4:2). The judgemental tone is particularly

221 Ibid., 168.
prominent in the fragment of 4Q509 5–6 ii, as Falk comments, ‘Fragments 5–6 ii allude to the
curses of the covenant from the end of Deuteronomy, specifically citing God’s speech to Moses
in Deut 31:16’. The author of 4Q508 2 views Yom Kippur as the time of judgement of all the
hidden things, but it is indeed a merciful judgement toward those who repent. The
theological thrust of this text is remarkably similar to that of Philo.

3. 2. 3 Yom Kippur for all Jews

The study above confirms that both Diaspora and Palestinian Jews in the first century CE
recognised Yom Kippur as the day of “fasting” with prayers, through which all Jews expressed
penitence for every sin committed throughout the year. Moreover, Yom Kippur was perceived
as the day of judgement, on which all the hidden things were to be revealed. Both Philo and the
Festival Prayers clearly exhibit the Jewish attitude of humility and of sheer dependence on
God’s mercy at the time of Yom Kippur (cf. Spec. Law 2.196). It is uncertain, though, whether
they believed that even blasphemous, wanton sins, which result in the death penalty or “cutting
off” (e.g., Lev 18:29: 20:27; Num 15:30–1), could be forgiven on Yom Kippur. On this point,
the Mishnah declares that even the serious, deliberate sins that deserve the death penalty can be
forgiven (m. Shebuoth 1:6). Philo also states that both voluntary and involuntary sins are
forgiven (Spec. Law 2.196). On this issue, we have another witness from the first century,
namely, the author of the epistle to the Hebrews. He seems to consider that the scope of
forgiveness is limited to unintentional sins, as he writes, “not without taking the blood that he [a
high priest] offers for himself and for the sins committed unintentionally by the people” (Heb

226 Ibid., 166.
227 Cf. Ibid., 167; 4Q509 8.
9:7b). These attestations would seem to indicate that there was no concrete consensus on this point among first century Jews. At any rate, for the devoted Jews who dared not commit blasphemous sins, Yom Kippur must have been the special day on which all sins were graciously forgiven.\(^2\)

3. 3 The Temple rite on Yom Kippur

3. 3. 1 Introduction

Yom Kippur is not only a holy convocation for all Jews, but also a complex Temple rite observed by the high priest. The Yom Kippur rite consists of the two different types of ritual (the blood-sacrificial ritual and the scapegoat ritual), and has a twofold purpose (making atonement for both the sanctuary and the entire people). Although the Yom Kippur rite involves complex elements, it nevertheless seems to possess a logical coherence through which each ritual is organically connected to the other. Before proceeding to the examination of this complex rite, however, it is useful to consider the general meaning of blood-sacrificial rituals for first century Jews.

3. 3. 2 Purpose of the blood sacrifice (a): punishment for sin?

It is vital to explore in what ways first century Jews conceived the purpose(s) of the blood sacrifice for sins. This question is significantly relevant to the overall purpose of our study of Paul’s soteriology. In Christian theological traditions, it has often been assumed that Jewish

\(^{2}\) This point is suggestive to understand Paul’s statement in Galatians 3:10.
blood sacrifices prefigured Christ’s death.\textsuperscript{229} More specifically, it has been considered that Christ offered himself as the sacrifice for sins by suffering capital punishment from God in lieu of humanity as a whole (or for Christians only). As we saw in the previous chapter, Morris strongly insists that the purpose of the blood sacrifice in the sacrificial system is to execute capital punishment on the sacrificial animal as a substitute for the offerer, and he reconstructs Paul’s atonement theology on this basis. Schreiner provides the same line of interpretation as to the purpose of blood sacrifices:

[T]he fundamental reason for the sacrifices is atonement, so that sinners could be forgiven by the Holy One. \textit{The laying of hands on animals most likely means that the animal functions as a substitute for a person}. The sins of human beings are transferred, so to speak, to the animal. For many of us the sacrifice of animals remains abstract. But reflect on the violence of the activity: the blood, the entrails and the goriness of it all. The death of the animals shows that the penalty for sin is death. When we are told that the sacrifices are a soothing aroma, this image indicates that they satisfy God’s wrath, that they appease his anger.\textsuperscript{230}

Despite the popularity of such an interpretation, however, not a few scholars have raised dissenting voices. For example, Christian Eberhart argues:

[N]ouns and verbs [such as, הרב, הבן, and נֶשֶׁת] conveying the approach of the sanctuary permeate the regulations on sacrifice in Lev 1–7… [I]t may be mentioned that such terminological choices of the priestly communities and the ancient tradents of the Hebrew Bible texts do not convey any negative connotations. Instead, further Hebrew Bible texts indicate that specifically the burnt offering, the cereal offering, and the

\textsuperscript{229} Grudem maintains: ‘Scripture’s emphasis on the blood of Christ also shows the clear connection between Christ’s death and the many sacrifices in the Old Testament that involved the pouring out of the life blood of the sacrificial animal. These sacrifices all pointed forward to and prefigured the death of Christ’ (1994, 579).

\textsuperscript{230} Schreiner 2006, 82-3 [my italics].
sacrifice of well-being are often associated with a cheerful, merry, and celebratory atmosphere (1Sam 1:13–14; 2Chr 29:20–36). Furthermore, these terminological choices do not point to the act of slaughter at all. In animal sacrifice, slaughter occurs toward the beginning of the ritual; the ritual, however, continues after this activity, leading toward the act of burning all or a portion of the sacrificial material on the so-called altar of burnt offering (Lev 1:9, 13; 2:2, 11; 3:5, 11; 4:10, 31). Eberhart’s point that the essence of various sacrificial offerings prescribed in Leviticus 1–7 lies not in the act of slaughter but in the movement toward God’s presence considerably weakens the credibility of the view that the purpose of the blood sacrifice is to execute capital punishment.

Along similar lines, Roy Gane explains, ‘In an Israelite animal sacrifice the victim was slain so that its blood and body could be used, but slaughter itself was a relatively low point in terms of sanctity’. In the sin offering, what must be brought to the presence of God is the “blood” that is the life of the sacrificial animal, which accomplishes atonement (cf. Lev 17:11). From the biblical point of view, it is not death but life that attains atonement. Hence, insofar as we consider the meaning of the death of Christ from the Jewish sacrificial perspective, the particular view that Jesus’ death itself as capital punishment functions as a sacrifice to God is difficult to maintain.

It is also important to consider this issue from the viewpoint of first century Jews who had experienced the blood-sacrificial rituals firsthand. Kiuchi states: ‘as modern anthropologists and some biblical scholars have emphasized, it is unlikely that the ancient Israelites performed their ritual acts without being aware of their symbolic meaning; rather the meaning of the ritual acts

---

231 Eberhart 2011a, 23-4.
233 Cf. Hicks 1959, 12-3; Vaux 1964, 92-3; Gerstenberger 1996, 60; Moffitt 2011, 219.
are rarely spelled out because they were self-evident to them.\textsuperscript{234} Therefore, when we explore this issue from the first century perspective, it would hardly be true that the majority of Jews understood the purpose of the blood sacrifice as the implementation of capital punishment. Indeed, there are good reasons to conclude that they would have thought otherwise. We shall enumerate four reasons for this.

First, if the sacrificial animal is killed as the substitute for the offerer/offender for the punishment for sins, this implies that the Mosaic law \textit{originally} intends that any offender, who commits sin either inadvertently or intentionally, be put to death in order to attain an atoning effect from his death. Under this presupposition, the purpose of the blood sacrifice is viewed as a divine concession that allows the offerer to execute a sacrificial animal as an alternative for his own lethal punishment. Such an idea is, however, alien to the ideology of the Levitical sacrificial system. It must be indicated that the stipulations for the sin offering in Leviticus 4:1–35 are designed for an unintentional sin, as Milgrom explains, ‘Inadvertence is a key criterion in all expiatory sacrifice. A deliberate, brazen sinner is barred from the sanctuary (Num 15:30–31)’.\textsuperscript{235} If a devout first century Jew living in Jerusalem unintentionally commits a sin and becomes aware of it, he must slay a female goat as a sin offering (Lev 4:27–31). In this case, it is irrational to say that the goat is slain as the punishment on behalf of the offender, for there is no commandment that demands the death penalty for an unintentional sin (e.g., Exod 21:13; Num 35:10–15; Deut 19:1–10). Thus, a first century Jew who made a sacrifice to atone

\textsuperscript{234} Kiuchi 1987, 18. See also Douglas 1984 [1966]; 1999.

\textsuperscript{235} Milgrom 1991, 228. Hartley also indicates, ‘In many cultic passages, especially in Lev 4, the term \textit{inadvertently},’ is joined to \textit{sin}, in order to restrict it to offenses committed out of ignorance or human frailty (4:25; 5:25 [6:6]). In Num 15:22–31 a sin committed inadvertently is contrasted to one done with \textit{a high hand},’ i.e., a deliberate, defiant action’ (1992, 55).
for an unintentional sin probably did not imagine that the animal was killed as capital
punishment for his unwitting sin.

Moreover, a Jewish woman who bore a child was instructed to make a sin offering (Lev
12:6). In this case, did this woman think that an animal was vicariously killed for the sin of
bearing the child? Certainly not! Conversely, if a Jew defiantly commits a sin that deserves
the death penalty, he must be put to death. He has no recourse to any sacrificial remedy (e.g.,
Exod 21:12, 14–17; Lev 24:16–17). Again, any first century Jew who had committed such a
grievous sin with a “high hand” would scarcely have thought that he could escape capital
punishment by offering a sacrifice of any kind as his substitute. In the case of the convicted
murderer, the Jewish Bible strictly enjoins the Israelites to refrain from receiving any ransom
payment: “Moreover, you shall accept no ransom for the life of a murderer who is subject to the
death penalty; a murderer must be put to death” (Num 35:31). Although this injunction is
about inter-human relationship rather than the divine-human one, we can reasonably deduce that
neither will God receive any ransom payment (i.e., sacrifice) from a premeditated murderer.

Second, it is by no means certain whether first century Jews considered that the gesture of
laying one hand on the head of the sacrificial animal signified the transference of the sins of the
offerer to the animal. Gordon Wenham poses a question: ‘laying hands on and killing the animal
are features common to all the blood sacrifices in Leviticus. If these acts symbolized the transfer

236 We have evidence that, at least in the Tannaitic period, rabbis saw the sin offering offered by the new
238 A similar point is made by Brondos 2006, 20-1. However, as discussed above, some Jews might have
thought that even grievous sins would be forgiven in Yom Kippur.
239 As Levine explains, ‘One convicted of premeditated murder must pay with his life; ransom (Hebrew
köper) is not allowable’. Levine 2000, 559. See also Dozeman 1998, 266.
240 Concerning the idea of sacrifice as a ransom payment, see our review of Stephen Finlan in chapter 1.
of sin and substitution of the animal’s life for the worshipper’s in this sacrifice, it is reasonable to suppose that they had a similar significance in the other sacrifices. But then where is the special significance of the purification offering? It is important to remember that, in the case of the sacrifice for thanksgiving, an offerer made exactly the same gesture as in the case of the sin offering (Lev 3:1–17; 7:12–15). It is unlikely that a Jew who wished to express his gratitude to God offered an animal, which was thought to be contaminated with his own sins. Moreover, he would have felt strange eating the flesh of the sacrificial animal, which was an essential part of the thanksgiving offering (Lev 7:15), if this flesh were in fact contaminated with his own sins. It is doubtful, therefore, that those Jews who were familiar with various sacrificial practices would have thought that the gesture of laying a hand on the head of the sacrificial animal signified the transfer of the offerer’s sin to the sacrificial animal.

Third, with the exceptions for the outer sanctum offering (Lev 4:3–21; 6:30) and the Yom Kippur offering (Lev 16:27), the priests were instructed to eat the flesh of the sin offering (Lev 6:26). De Vaux explains:

---

241 G. Wenham 1979, 93-4. Wenham adopts the term the “purification offering” as the alternative for the “sin offering”. we shall discuss this point in the next chapter.

242 It is important to note that in Septuagintal texts of Leviticus, in the case of peace offerings, it is described that, unlike the MT, an offerer puts both hands on the sacrificial animal (cf. Lev 3:2, 8, 13). Hence, some first century Jews who could only read Greek texts might have thought that in the case of peace offerings they should put both hands on sacrificial animals.

243 Cf. Taylor 1937, 50-1. Philo interprets this gesture as the declaration of innocence. ‘so that as he lays his hands on the victim, he can boldly and with a pure conscience speak in this wise: “These hands have taken no gift to do injustice, nor shared in the proceeds of plunder or overreaching, nor been soiled with innocent blood” (Spec Laws 1.203-4).

244 The “outer sanctum” offering is a type of offering in which the blood manipulation is conducted in the holy place or the outer sanctum. Cf. Gane 2004, 99-101.

245 As a rationale for this exception, Gane indicates two possible reasons. First, in the case of Yom Kippur, the high priest not only served on behalf of an offender, but also offered the sacrifice for his own sins. Since he himself was the offerer, he ‘could not benefit from his own sacrifice’. Second, the sacrificial victims in Yom Kippur might have been considered to ‘absorb evils from the sanctuary’ (2004, 276-7).
The fact that the fat elements are burnt upon the altar and that the flesh of sacrifices for sins of individuals are eaten by priests “as a very holy thing” (Lev. vi. 22) (EVV.29) contradicts the theory which has it that the victim would be laden with the sin of the offerer and would undergo the penalty that was due to him. No, the victim does not become “sin”; it is pleasing to God, who in consideration for this offering removes the sin.  

The book of Leviticus explicitly says that a sacrifice for the sin offering is “most holy” (Lev 6:25), and its flesh is considered to possess contagious holiness (Lev 6:27). How could the flesh of the sin-laden animal have made holy whatever it touched?  

Therefore, unlike the case of the scapegoat ritual, the hand-pressing gesture in blood rituals does not signify the transference of sins from the offerer to the animal. Rather, as Gilders argues: ‘The hand-pressing indexes a relationship between offerer and animal. It is the one who offers the animal who presses his hand on its head’.  

It is important to note that the selection of a proper sacrificial animal involves a long process, as Klawans explains:

It is commonly pointed out that it is fitting for animals offered on the holy altar to be perfect and whole. It is equally important to recognize, however, that this stipulation does not only concern the animal: it requires the offerer to carefully examine the animal destined for sacrifice. These regulations, moreover, don’t only apply at the moment of sacrifice. Prudent shepherds will properly care for their flocks, watching for blemishes that have appeared, trying to prevent others from coming about, and perhaps even

---

246 Vaux 1964, 94. In this connection, concerning the question of the holiness of sacrificial blood, Kiuchi states that ‘the prescription that only the splashed part of the clothes must be washed [Lev 6:27] suggests that what is washed off is not uncleanness but holiness. For if it were uncleanness, this law might well have prescribed that all the clothes should be washed’ (1987, 136).

247 Contra D. P. Wright, who maintains, ‘The fact that the meat appears to pollute vessels in which it is cooked (6:21) and the blood appears to pollute clothing (v 20) shows that the edible portions are impure. The solution to the inconsistency of allowing the pure and holy priests to eat impure offerings is simply to view it as a concession’ (1987, 132). His explanation apparently contradicts Leviticus 6:29: “Every male among the priests shall eat of it; it is most holy”. See also Whybray 1978, 46.

controlling the breeding of those animals born with defects.249

The selection of an animal that is suitable for dedicating to God is the crucial responsibility of offerers. Therefore, it is no wonder that identifying ownership of a sacrificial animal constitutes an essential part of the process of sacrificing an animal.

Finally, in the case that an offerer could not afford to provide either a sheep or two birds for the sin offering, it was permitted to offer cereal as a sacrifice in lieu of a sacrificial animal (cf. Lev 5:5–10). Eberhart explains thus: ‘As this type of sacrifice consists of vegetal substances which are accompanied by oil, frankincense ([Lev 2] v.1), and salt ([Lev 2] v.13), it is clear that its ritual does not feature any act of slaughter’.250 This point further corroborates our case that death itself does not attain atonement for sins.

In the light of the points enumerated above, the assumption that first century Jews considered that the act of killing itself accomplished atonement for sins is quite dubious. It would have been common sense to many of them that it is not death but life that attains atonement. To be sure, Phinehas’ act of killing the Israelite man who worshipped the Baal of Peor functioned as atonement (cf. Num 25:13). Nevertheless, it is absurd to think that this idolatrous Israelite man was dedicated to God as a holy sacrifice. Rather, in this case, Phinehas performed the covenantal duty of cutting off the man who committed sins with a “high hand”. It was his zeal for the covenant that accomplished atonement for the Israelites. Hence, we cannot consult such a case when considering the meaning of the blood sacrifice for sins. In the case of an unsolved murder described in Deuteronomy 21:1–9, even supposing that the heifer is killed

---

249 Klawans 2006, 63.
as the substitute for an unknown criminal, this animal should not be regarded as a holy sacrifice.\(^\text{251}\) It must be remembered that, for those who deserve capital punishment (i.e., who commit blasphemous sins with a “high hand”), there is no atoning sacrifice for such sins. This fact apparently contradicts the theory that the offerer of the sacrifice can escape capital punishment by means of killing an animal. The sacrificial system is designed for those who wish to remain in the covenant. On the other hand, those who intentionally commit grievous sins are presumably regarded as abandoning the covenant. Therefore, they must be “cut off” from the covenant community. As to the purpose of the sin offering, Gane provides a more persuasive explanation:

The fact that expiatory sacrifices deal with lesser, noncapital offenses shows that the goal of these rituals is not remission of punishment on this level. Rather, there is a higher, more stringent standard: the demand of God’s life-giving holiness, from which the offerer is estranged. Ransom for life could be regarded as “a restoration of those who have fallen, a healing of the terminally ill”. In this sense kipper as ransom can also apply to sacrificial purification from ritual impurities, which is most likely based on the concept of death [as the opposite of God’s holiness], and also well-being offerings, which emphasize the positive end of process of restoration to a healthy relationship with God.\(^\text{252}\)

Gane’s account aptly explains why the sin offering must be offered even on such occasions as childbirth, where it is not a matter of sin. It seems that the purpose of the blood sacrifice is centred upon the concern of maintaining the holiness of God and his people.

We shall now turn to another theory that stresses a different aspect of the purpose of the

\(^{251}\) Gese is correct on this point (1981, 98).

\(^{252}\) Gane 2004, 305.
blood sacrifice.

3. 3. 3 Purpose of the blood sacrifice (b): purification from sin?

Among Old Testament scholars, the meaning and function of the sin offering have been a matter of controversy,\textsuperscript{253} and the term *sin offering* itself is questioned or even rejected by some influential scholars as a proper designation for this ritual. The sin offering is conducted on such occasions as childbirth, the completion of the Nazirite vow, and the purification of leprous houses (cf. Lev 12:1–8; Num 6:1–21; Lev 14:48–53). In these cases, this ritual is ‘prescribed for persons and objects who cannot have sinned’.\textsuperscript{254} Hence, Jacob Milgrom advocates an alternative rendering *purification offering* for this ritual, and a good number of scholars follow his lead.\textsuperscript{255} Milgrom further contends that the purpose of the sin (purification) offering is not to attain the forgiveness of sin committed by the offerer, because sin can be forgiven only through remorseful repentance. He insists that the sole aim of the sin offering is to cleanse the sanctuary:

If the bringer of the sacrifice is not affected, who then is being purified? The telling clue is the destination of the blood of the sacrifice. It is not smeared on the offerer; it is smeared, rather, on the altar. The act is described by the word *kippur*, “purge” (as in Yom Kippur: the Day of Purgation). In commanding that the blood be daubed on the horns of the altar, the text is indicating that the altar is contaminated and must be purified...Blood is the ritual cleanser that purges the altar of impurities inflicted on it by the offerer.\textsuperscript{256}

Such a proposal questions the conventional understanding of “atonement”, which is usually

\textsuperscript{253} Here, we are concerned with the blood-sacrificial offering.
\textsuperscript{254} Milgrom 1991, 253.
\textsuperscript{256} Milgrom 2004, 31.
associated with the forgiveness of sins. Milgrom argues that the Hebrew word מְשֻׁכָּה primarily signifies “purify (קִיפֶּר)”, though this word occasionally means “ransom (קֹפֶר)”, that is, an act of redemption from the wrath of God (e.g., Exod 30:12–16; 32:30–34; Num 25:13; 35:31–33). Milgrom insists that the former meaning of מְשֻׁכָּה is the essence of the Jewish concept of “atonement”, which is not about the purification of the sinner, but about that of the sanctuary. Since some New Testament scholars construct Paul’s atonement theology on the basis of Milgrom’s view, it is necessary to consider his argument further.

Milgrom’s construction is predicated on his distinctive view that ‘[a] sin committed anywhere will generate impurity that, becoming airborne, penetrates the sanctuary in proportion to its magnitude’. This way of understanding the relationship between sin and impurity garners increasing support from scholars who contend that a certain type of sin generates impurity, which does not spread through physical contact, but directly defiles the offender, the land, and the sanctuary. Frymer-Kensky succinctly summarises this view:

Pollution, the lack of purity, could affect individuals, the temple, the collectivity of Israel, and the land of Israel itself. Some forms of pollution could be eradicated by rituals; the performance of these purifications and expiations was a major function of the priesthood. The pollution caused by the performance of certain deeds, however, could not be eradicated by rituals; Israel believed that the person intentionally committing these acts would suffer catastrophic retribution. Wrongful acts could cause the pollution of the nation and the land of Israel, which could also not be “cured” by

---

257 Milgrom 1991, 1079-84.
260 Cf. Hoffmann 1905; Büchler 1928; Milgrom 1976a; Frymer-Kensky 1983; Klawans 2000; Hayes 2002; Bauckham 2005. The two forerunners of this view, Hoffmann and Büchler, regarded such a defiling force as symbolic or figurative. Moreover, a number of scholars remain unconvinced by the view that such impurity pollutes the land in a concrete sense. See e.g., Maccoby 1999, 193-208.
ritual. There was therefore an ultimate expectation of catastrophic results for the whole people, the “purging” of the land by destruction and exile.\textsuperscript{261}

There are ample biblical passages that support this view (e.g., Lev 18:24; 19:31; 20:3; Num 35:33; Ezek 36:17). A growing number of scholars adopt the term “moral impurity” to describe the type of impurity that cannot be eradicated by rituals.\textsuperscript{262} It is important to stress, however, that both of “ritual” and “moral” impurities would defile what must be kept holy, especially the Temple.\textsuperscript{263} As the most grievous consequence of the contamination of the Temple, Olyan explains, ‘Biblical sources understand pollution to be the ultimate threat to what is holy; its presence can even force Yhwh to abandon the place where he resides on earth’.\textsuperscript{264} From this perspective, Milgrom argues that the whole purpose of the Levitical sacrificial system is to maintain the purity and the sanctity of the Temple, which leads to his conclusion that the Jewish notion of “atonement” is basically synonymous with “purification”.

Milgrom’s argument casts an important light on an essential aspect of the Jewish sacrificial system. While paying due respect to his great contribution, we should nonetheless note that his argument relies too much on the blood sacrifices in the Yom Kippur rite, where the cleansing of the sanctuary is a primary goal.\textsuperscript{265} It is also important to note that, except for the Yom Kippur rite (cf. Lev 16:16) and the rituals for ordination (cf. Lev 8:15), there is no explicit statement that the sin offering is designed for cleansing the sanctuary.\textsuperscript{266} Rather, in most cases, the

\textsuperscript{261} Frymer-Kensky 1983, 399.
\textsuperscript{263} As we saw in the review of Newton in the previous chapter, the notions of sin and impurity were conflated in the mental map of the sectarian communities.
\textsuperscript{264} Olyan 2000, 39. See also Milgrom 2004, 32; Gane 2004, 408.
\textsuperscript{265} We shall return to this point in the next section.
\textsuperscript{266} Hence, Gane contends that ‘purification offerings throughout the year remove evils from their offerers rather than from the sanctuary and its sancta’ (2004, 104 [Gane’s emphasis]).
attention of the author of Leviticus is directed to the offerer who needs forgiveness for his sins, rather than to the sanctuary that must be cleansed from the defilement of sin and impurity. In fact, in the prescriptions of the sin offering for both the community and the individual, the instruction always ends with the phrase: “they/he/you shall be forgiven” (cf. Lev 4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:10, 13, 16, 18). Accordingly, it can be said that the focal point of the sin offering rests on the forgiveness of the offerer. If, as Milgrom contends, remorseful conscience suffices to effect forgiveness even before the sacrificial ritual, why is the forgiveness of sin declared after the sin offering (cf. Lev 5:6–7)? Jenson thus argues:

He [Milgrom] argues that only places, and not people, are purified. However, it [i.e., this type of ritual] is closely related to personal impurity in most of its occurrences, and the person is cleansed as a result of the priest performing atonement (Lev. 12.8; 14:19–20; 16:19, 30; Num. 8.6–7, 15, 21). While blood is not applied to the person requiring purification, there may have been practical reasons for this.267

Thus, Milgrom’s contention that remorseful repentance, without the ritual of blood sacrifice, suffices to attain forgiveness is not convincing.

This point inevitably reduces the force of his argument that the “atonement” attained through the sin offering almost exclusively signifies “purgation”. It must be remembered that the verb יָשָׁר denotes both “purify” and “ransom”, which implies that the sacrifice is offered not only to purify the offerer and/or the sanctuary, but also to redeem the offerer from the wrath of God through attaining the forgiveness of sins. As Hartley argues: ‘The blood rites then have a twofold function: to cleanse the sanctuary from the pollution of sin and to release the offerer

---

from the penalty of his sinning. דרש, “make expiation,” is the achievement of both these goals’. In this regard, Sklar conducts a comprehensive survey of the usages of both kopher and kipper in the Jewish scriptures, and then closely examines Leviticus 17:11. He concludes that it is a false dichotomy to choose either “purify” or “ransom” as the meaning of the word in question. Rather, since the blood of the sacrificial animal is believed to possess its life, ‘life-containing blood both ransoms and purifies’. Hence, we should avoid a reductionist approach to the Jewish notion of atonement. Eberhart’s comment captures the point: ‘The sacrificial cult mediates between these separate worlds [i.e., the divine and the human] and allows humans to appear before God. The term atonement is a very complex concept, but its outcome is such a mediated encounter that it might, under certain circumstances, imply the expiation of human sin and impurity’.270

In conclusion, in the first century milieu, it is most probable that the blood sacrifice for sins was considered to maintain the holiness and purity of God’s sanctuary, as well as to attain the forgiveness of sins that rescues the offerer from the divine judgement.

3. 3. 4 Purpose of the blood sacrifices for sins in the Yom Kippur rite

Having established the most plausible overall meaning of the blood sacrifice for first century Jews, we now proceed to the special case, the blood sacrifices for sins in the Yom Kippur rite. Fundamental to a proper understanding of the Yom Kippur blood ritual is the fact that the primary concern of this ritual is directed to the sanctuary rather than the people. As Leviticus

---

269 Sklar 2005, 182.
270 Eberhart 2011b, 69.
16:19 reads: “He [the high priest] shall sprinkle some of the blood on it with his finger seven times, and cleanse it and hallow it from the uncleannesses of the people of Israel”. It is important to note that it is not the people but the sanctuary that is cleansed from the uncleannesses of the people of Israel. The Yom Kippur blood ritual is a unique one, the purpose of which is explicitly accounted for as the purification of the sanctuary. As Gane explains, ‘Throughout the year, sacrifices at the Israelite sanctuary removed sins and severe physical ritual impurities from those who offered them there. All this contact with human faults and faultiness meant that the sanctuary itself needed periodic cleansing so that the Holy Lord could continue to reside there. If it became excessively polluted, he would abandon it (cf. Ezek. 9:3; 10:4, 18–19; 11:22–23)’. In order to comprehend Gane’s point, it is vital to pay attention to ancient Jewish perceptions of how the Temple could be defiled. For ancient Jews, the contamination of the Temple was caused not only through the direct contact or proximity of persons who were in a state of impurity, but also by their intentional sins. Josephus attests Jews’ concern over the defilement of the sanctuary that resulted from their sins. When Josephus was dispatched as an emissary of the Roman general Titus to persuade his compatriots to repent, he rebuked the Jews in the fortified city for their secret sins. His comment on this occasion reveals how first century Jews considered the relation between the people’s sins and the Temple:

But as for you, what have you done that is blessed by the lawgiver, what deed that he has cursed have you left undone? How much more impious are you than those who have been defeated in the past? Secret sin – I mean thefts, treacheries, adulteries – are

---

271 Another example is found in Lev 8:15.
272 Gane 2004, 270. Gane’s explanation involves the critique of Milgrom’s view on the purpose of ordinary sin offerings conducted through the year. Gane sees that the primary aim of the usual sin/purification offering is directed to the offerer rather than the sanctuary.
not beneath your disdain, while in rapine and murder you vie with each other in opening up new and unheard of paths of vice; aye and the temple has been the receptacle for all (ἐκδοχεῖον δὲ πάντων τὸ ἱερὸν γέγονεν), and native hands have polluted those divine precincts, which even Romans reverenced from afar, foregoing many customs of their own in deference of your law.273

Intriguingly, Josephus describes the Temple as “the receptacle” for the sins of the Jews, which implies that Josephus believes that the Temple somehow absorbs the sins of the covenant people. This is not surprising, since there are unambiguous biblical passages that explicitly state that serious sins defiled the sanctuary (e.g., Lev 20:2–3). With this understanding, Josephus insists that the uncleanness of the Temple was so repulsive to God that he might have abandoned the sanctuary defiled by the sins of his compatriots: ‘The same wonderful sign you had also experience of formerly, when the forementioned king of Babylon made war against us, and when he took the city and burnt the temple; while yet I believe that the Jews of that age were not so impious as you are. Wherefore I cannot but suppose that God is fled out of his sanctuary, and stands on the side of those against whom you fight’ (J.W. 5.411–412; cf. Ant. 20.165–166). Hence, there are good grounds for assuming that not a few first century Jews understood the primary purpose of the blood sacrifices in the Yom Kippur rite as the cleansing of the sanctuary.274 This point is corroborated by the observation of the actions of the high priest. By either sprinkling or applying directly the blood,275 the high priest is moving from the innermost sanctum (Lev 16:15) to the outer sanctum (v.16; cf. Exod 30:10), and toward the outer altar

---

274 It is the biblical idea that blood functions as a purifying agent. Leviticus 14:52–53 says: “Thus he [the priest] shall cleanse the house with blood of the bird, and with the fresh water…so he shall make atonement (הָעַטָה) for the house, and it shall be clean (וןַּדָּם)”. Cf. McCarthy 1969, 175.
standing in the courtyard (v.18). And finally, ‘the carcasses are incinerated outside the camp. So the entire inner-sanctum purification-offering complex progresses outward through four areas: inner sanctum→outer sanctum→outer altar→outside the camp’. This linear movement of the high priest in the Temple arena is highly suggestive, and would have provided ancient Jews with a visual image of how their sins and impurities that had been attached to the Temple were thoroughly dealt with through the blood-sacrificial ritual, as Gane aptly comments, ‘Anyone who has swept a room knows that you clean from the inside out’.277

However, there still remains a question. It is clearly articulated that the goal of the Yom Kippur rite is not only to cleanse the sanctuary thoroughly, but also to “make atonement for the people of Israel once in the year for all their sins” (Lev 16:34). There is no question that the scapegoat ritual contributes to this end (cf. Lev 16:22). But do the blood sacrifices for sins also contribute to the atonement for the sins of the people? Scholarly views are divided over this issue. Milgrom argues that ‘it is clear that the blood purges the impurities of the sanctuary and the scapegoat purges the sins of the people’.278 According to Milgrom, the blood ritual for sins

276 Gane 2005, 235 [Gane’s emphasis]; As to the purgation of the outer sanctum, Gane further explains: ‘Having cleansed the inner sanctum, the high priest was to purify the outer sanctum, which is referred to here as the “Tent of Meeting” (16:16b), that is, the rest of the tabernacle. At this point the text abbreviates by referring to the procedural pattern followed in the inner sanctum: “He is to do the same for the Tent of Meeting”. This must mean that the priest was to purge the area and its contents by applying the blood of the bull and of the goat once to a central object – in this case, the incense altar (cf. Ex. 30:10) – and seven times in front of that object’ (2004, 272). In this connection, Kiuchi further suggests, ‘It is remarkable that in vv. 28 and 26 the person who burned the hattat flesh outside the camp and the one who handled the Azazel goat are assumed to be unclean, and that the injunction to undergo purificatory rites is formulated in both verses in exactly the same words…This latter fact appears to suggest that the author intended to bring the symbolic meaning of the burning of the hattat to bear on what the Azazel goat does, i.e. bearing and removing the guilt’ (1987, 134-5).

277 Gane 2004, 280.

278 Milgrom 1991, 1043. In his support, Milgrom refers to the explanation in the Mishnah: ‘For uncleanness that befalls the Temple and its Hallowed Things through wantonness, atonement is made by the goat whose blood is sprinkled within [the Holy of Holies] and by the Day of Atonement; for all other transgressions spoken of in the Law, venial or grave, wanton or unwitting, conscious or unconscious, sins of omission or of commission, sins punishable by Extirpation or by death at the hands of the court, the scapegoat makes atonement’ (m. Shevu’ot 1.6).
and the scapegoat ritual in the Yom Kippur rite have completely different goals: one the cleansing of the Temple, the other the atonement for the sins of the people. His view is not, however, entirely convincing.

The Mishnah’s account of the blood sacrifices in Yom Kippur is highly suggestive in this regard: ‘R. Simeon says: As the blood of the goat that is sprinkled within [the Holy of Holies] makes atonement for the Israelites, so does the blood of the bullock make atonement for the priests; and as the confession of sin recited over the scapegoat makes atonement for the Israelites, so does the confession of sin recited over the bullock make atonement for the priests’ (m. Shevu’ot 1.7). Interestingly, according to the Mishnah, the high priest confessed his own sins before slaughtering the bull for the blood-sacrificial ritual, although there is no such an instruction in Leviticus 16 (cf. m. Yoma 3.8). Whilst we are not certain whether this Mishnah’s account accurately reflects the historical practice in the Second Temple era, this comment at least reveals that some rabbis attempted to understand the complex Yom Kippur rite holistically, and that they believed that the blood sacrificial ritual and the scapegoat ritual were inseparably linked with each other.

Moreover, along with the sin offering, the burnt offering was also conducted in the Yom Kippur rite, in order to make “atonement for himself and for his people” (Lev 16:24). In this connection, on the occasion of the inauguration of Aaron’s priesthood, he was instructed as follows: “Then Moses said to Aaron, ‘Draw near to the altar and sacrifice your sin offering and your burnt offering, and make atonement for yourself and your people; and sacrifice the offering of the people, and make atonement for them; as the Lord has commanded.’” (Lev 9:7). In this case, the combination of the sin offering and the burnt offering achieved atonement for
the priest and the people. It is thus not surprising if first century Jews considered the relationship between the sin offering and the burnt offering in the Yom Kippur rite in the same way.

Taken together these points would suggest that first century Jews did not explore the role and the function of the blood sacrifices for sins in isolation from other rituals such as the scapegoat ritual and the burnt offering. Rather, they would have thought that the blood sacrifices for sins contributed to the dual goal of the Yom Kippur rite as a whole, the cleansing of the Temple as well as the atonement for the sins of the people. We shall consider this point further in the following section.

3. 3. 5 Purpose of the scapegoat ritual in the Yom Kippur rite

The scapegoat ritual is a unique ritual within the Jewish sacrificial system. The blood of the animal plays no role in this ritual, and the animal is not presented to God but sent out to the mysterious “Azazel”. Only in this ritual does the high priest lay both hands on the head of the animal, whereas in the blood sacrifice the offerer lays a single hand on the head of the sacrifice.\(^{279}\) Leviticus 16:21 clearly states that the high priest not only confesses all the iniquities, all the transgressions, and all the sins of Israel, but also actually “puts” or “gives” (יִשָּׁלָם in the MT; ἐπιτίθησεν in LXX) them onto the goat. Judging by this vivid description, first century Jews most probably took this action as signifying the transference of all the sins of Israel from the representative of Israel (i.e., the high priest) to the scapegoat. In the light of the study of the purgation rites in the ancient Near Eastern world, Milgrom argues, ‘The fact that

\(^{279}\) As mentioned above, however, according to Old Greek texts, an offerer puts both hands on the animal in the case of the peace offering.
the text stresses that the hand-leaning rite is executed with both hands is the key to understanding the function of the Azazel goat. It is not a sacrifice, else the hand-leaning would have been performed with one hand…The two-handed ceremonial instead serves a transference function: to convey, by confession, the sins of Israel onto the head of the goat’. This reading is confirmed by the description of Leviticus 16:22 in LXX: Καὶ λήψεται ὁ χίμαρος ἑαυτῷ τὰς ἁδικίας αὐτῶν εἰς γῆν ἄβατον (“And the goat shall bear on itself their offences to an untrodden region”). Concerning the identity of Azazel, to whom the scapegoat is to be sent, Levine explains, ‘Azazel is most likely the name of a wilderness demon, a goat-demon, similar to the se‘irim, “goat-demons,” mentioned in 17:7 and once worshiped [sic] by Israelites’. The idea that the scapegoat is sent to a demonic entity makes some scholars think that the scapegoat is not a sacrifice. However, as mentioned in the previous chapter, Leviticus 16:5 designates both of the goats, one for the Lord and the other for Azazel, as the sin offering (in MT; περὶ ἁμαρτίας in LXX), which implies that the scapegoat is also viewed, at least in some sense, as a sacrifice for sins. Those scholars who maintain that the scapegoat is not a sacrifice largely consider that the blood ritual and the scapegoat ritual are independent from each other and serve different purposes. Hence, this issue ultimately hinges on the question of whether the scapegoat ritual is related or unrelated to the blood ritual within the Yom Kippur ritual scheme. Scholars advocate different theories about their relationship. According to Kiuchi, there are three scholarly approaches to this issue:

In the history of the interpretation of Lev 16 there are some exegetes who have

---

280 Milgrom 1991, 1041. See our discussion on the meaning of the one-handed ceremonies in 3.3.2.
281 Levine 1989, 251. We shall consider this point further in chapter 4.
282 See the comment of Milgrom just above.
attempted to resolve the problem, assuming the present text describing the two rites. There seem to be three possible approaches to the relationship of the two rites, assuming that the two rites are distinct: 1. The two rites deal with two kinds of sins entirely different from each other. 2. The two rites are functionally continuous in some sense. 3. The Azazel-goat ritual expresses, in a different form, the meaning of the purification rite in the sancta, which has already been completed, without adding anything essentially new. 283

Our concern is which option is most proximate to the view held by first century Jews. Although we have no direct evidence from the first century CE which could decide this issue, it seems that Leviticus 16 itself supports option 2. It is important to note that the word “forgive/forgiveness” is completely missing in Leviticus 16. Through the Yom Kippur rite, the people of Israel are, like the sanctuary, to be “cleansed” rather than to be “forgiven”. On this point, there seems to be an implicit yet substantial relatedness between the sanctuary and the people. Kiuchi thus comments: ‘on the day of Atonement it is assumed that all the Israelites need atonement; all the people stand before the Lord as guilty. Thus if the sancta are purified then, this should not be regarded as separate from the cultic status of the people; when the sancta are purified the people are also purified (cf. v.30)’. 284 It is vital to remember that uncleanness of the sanctuary was attributed to the impurities and sins of the people of Israel. 285 Hence, option 1 which maintains that the blood-sacrificial ritual and the scapegoat ritual deal with entirely different kinds of sins is not convincing. As regards option 3, we can find no exact correspondence between the blood-sacrificial ritual and the scapegoat ritual in their procedures, which makes it difficult to say that the latter is the symbolic repetition of the former. Indeed, if

283 Kiuchi 1987, 145.
284 Ibid., 157.
the blood sacrifices suffice to complete the atonement for sins, why should the sins of the people be transferred from the high priest to the scapegoat in a tangible manner? Therefore, option 2, which sees the relationship between the two rituals as being functionally continuous, remains most appropriate as the model for the relationship between the two rituals. Hence, we conclude that ‘the most likely view is that the two goats form one hattat’.

In sum, although we cannot be completely certain as to how the first century Jews viewed the role of the scapegoat in relation to the blood sacrifices in the Yom Kippur rite, they would have probably considered these two rituals to be organically connected and to serve the ultimate goal of Yom Kippur, ‘to make atonement for the people of Israel once in the year for all their sins’ (Lev 16:34).

3. 4 Yom Kippur and Jewish eschatological hope: Daniel 9 and 11Q Melchizedek

Since Yom Kippur is an unparalleled day in the national calendar of Israel, a day on which all the sins of Israel are to be erased, it can reasonably be assumed that this day would have fostered the national hope of Israel for the future. It is undeniable that many, not to say all, first century Jews saw the submission of their country to the pagan ‘rulers who claimed divinity and an empire that attributed its success to pagan gods’, as problematic. In the Jewish theological tradition, the cause of the subjugation of the holy people to the Gentile powers was not attributed to the powerlessness of their God, but was regarded as the covenantal curse and punishment for their own sins (cf. Judg 10:6–9; Isa 42:24–25). In this theological climate, the

---

286 Kiuchi, op cit., 148. D. P. Wright also argues, ‘If we understand that the sanctuary acquires impurity through the unholy acts of the people, then the bipartite purification rite on the Day of Atonement makes perfect sense. The blood rite removes the sins themselves – the cause of the impurity. The two evils belong naturally together, and consequently, the two parts of the rite belong together’ (1984, 19).

eschatological Jewish hope for the total defeat of the foreign powers harassing Israel was inevitably linked to the hope of the remission of their sins. In other words, the exaltation of Israel over the pagan powers would be realised only after their national sins were forgiven. I submit that the Yom Kippur imagery actually contributed to nurture this Jewish eschatological hope. In order to demonstrate this point, we shall examine Daniel 9 and 11Q Melchizedek. First, however, it is helpful to pay attention to the book of Micah. Here we can find a good example in which the hope of the forgiveness of sins is closely intertwined with the vision of the new Exodus. Since we shall find the same pattern in Daniel 9, the study of Micah serves as a preliminary to the main discussion.

As we saw above, in the midst of his agony and lamentation (Mic 7:1–6), the prophet nevertheless expresses the hope of the New Exodus (Mic 7:15–17), and then goes on to state the hope of the forgiveness of sins:

**Micah 7:18–20:** Who is a God like you, pardoning iniquity [ןָּלַע] and passing over the transgression of the remnant of your possession? He does not retain his anger forever, because he delights in showing clemency. You will again have compassion upon us; he will tread our iniquities under foot. You will cast all our sins into the depths of the seas. You will show faithfulness to Jacob and unswerving loyalty to Abraham, as you have sworn to our ancestors from the days of old.

Andersen and Freedman maintain that there is an allusion to the Exodus story, not least to the memories of God’s defeat of the Egyptian army in the sea, and God’s pardoning Israel’s sins after the golden calf incident:

---

The original question in Exodus 15 [“Who is like you, O Lord, among the gods?”; Exod 15:11] highlighted Yahweh’s incomparable power in quelling Pharaoh at the Sea of Reeds. The most memorable act of pardoning sin occurred at Sinai/Horeb. The phrase “carrying (away) iniquity” is the only item that Mic 7:18 has in common with the great revelation given [cf. Exod 34:7; 32(75)] then, so what we have here is only an indirect allusion. Even so, in view of the widespread evidence for this classic credo throughout the Hebrew Bible…there is enough common vocabulary between Exodus 34 and Mic 7:18–20 to support the inference that Micah had the tradition in mind and expected his listeners to recognize it.289

Here, we can see that the hope of the total remission of the sins of Israel is inseparably connected to the national memories of the Exodus story. More important, the future hope of Israel for the new Exodus as well as the total remission of sins is firmly predicated on God’s faithfulness to his covenantal promises made to Abraham and Jacob.

The combination of these themes, the forgiveness of sins, the Exodus, and God’s faithfulness to his patriarchal promises, appears most vividly in Daniel 9. Daniel affirms that “all Israel, those who are near and those who are far away”, are under the “curse” (ἡ κατάρα in LXX) of God due to their ancestral and communal sins (Dan 9:7, 11).290 The most horrible curse of the covenant is the exile (cf. Deut 28:36–37), under which Daniel and all Israel are placed. Daniel supplicates God to accomplish the act of deliverance, as he did for those who were enslaved in Egypt. Thus Daniel entreats: “And now, O Lord our God, who brought your people out of the land of Egypt with a mighty hand and made your name renowned even to this day – we have sinned, we have done wickedly”. He goes on to pray: “O Lord, hear; O Lord,

---

forgive; O Lord, listen and act and do not delay!” (Dan 9:15,19). Daniel’s prayer is predicated on God’s faithfulness to his covenant, which is in sharp contrast with Israel’s faithlessness to the covenant. Goldingay explains this point as follows:

A prominent motif in the prayer is that any breakdown in relationship between Yahweh and Israel is the responsibility of the latter, not the former. Yahweh is in the right, Israel is in the wrong.291… Yahweh is justified in the punitive action he has taken (compare the use of יָדֶּשׁ in Isa 5:16; 10:22). But the prayer goes on to refer to his יָדֶּשׁ (“right deeds,” v 16), concrete expression of יָדֶּשׁ, acts of faithfulness, commitment, mercy, and deliverance… At the beginning of the plea (v 15), Daniel specifically refers to the exodus, Yahweh’s paradigm יָדֶּשׁ… It is that reference to the exodus which leads into the generalization about Yahweh’s יָדֶּשׁ in the next verse.292

Daniel lays his hope of the new Exodus on God’s faithfulness and righteousness. Now Daniel expects and prays that the period of “exile” will shortly end after the lapse of seventy years, in accordance with the prophecy of Jeremiah (cf. Jer 25:11–12; 29:10–14; Dan 9:2).

Interestingly, Daniel’s prayer is interspersed with cultic images. As Vogal rightly indicates, the focal point of Daniel’s prayer is the restoration of God’s sanctuary (cf. Dan 9:17).293 Furthermore, Daniel’s fasting and confession of sins are strongly reminiscent of the practices observed during the period of Yom Kippur (cf. Lev 16:29, 31). The cultic image becomes more prominent in the oracle given to Daniel. It is even possible to find an allusion to Yom Kippur in this oracle. We shall then examine the oracle in question.

In response to Daniel’s prayer, the angel Gabriel is dispatched by God. The angel, however, informs Daniel of the fact that the actual end of the exile would extend far into the future,

---

292 Ibid., 243.
293 Vogal 2010, 49.
indeed for “seventy-sevenfold”. Gabriel declares:

**Daniel 9:24:** Seventy weeks are declared for your people and your holy city: to finish the transgression, to put an end to sin, and to atone for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal both vision and prophet, and to anoint a most holy place.

A number of scholars argue that the period of the seventy-weeks (seventy-sevens) in this oracle most probably alludes to the year of Jubilee (seven times seven years). It is important to remember that, at the beginning of the year of Jubilee, Yom Kippur must be observed (Lev 25:9). Hence, for those Jews who could have detected the allusion to the Jubilee in this text, the phrase “to atone for iniquity” in this oracle may well have evoked the notion of Yom Kippur. Indeed, we have evidence that supports this conclusion.

11Q Melchizedek (11Q13) provides information on the interpretation of the Danielic 70-weeks prophecy in the late Second Temple period. Fitzmyer argues that “the tenth Jubilee” mentioned in line 7 would probably ‘refer to the end of the 490 years, or “the seventy weeks of years” of Dan 9:24–27’, since each Jubilee cycle consists of 49 years (cf. Lev 25:8). If Fitzmyer’s argument is correct, this supports our suggestion that some Jews in the late Second Temple period associated the Danielic 70-week prophecy with the Yom Kippur rite, as the text shows:

**11Q13 7–8:** in the first week of the jubilee after [the] ni[ne] jubilees. And [the] d[ay of

---

294 Cf. Fishbane 1985, 482-3. A similar chronological perspective can be found in the Animal Apocalypse (*IEn. 85–90*), 11Q Melchizedek (II 6–8). For other examples, see Scott 2005, 82-103.

295 In Old Greek version of the scripture, the last phrase of verse 9:24 is rendered as “to gladden (ἐχαρεῖ) the holy of holies”. Grabbe indicates that it was probably due to a scribal error (i.e., misreading of מֵעַן (“anoint”) as מָצֵא (“rejoice”). Grabbe 1997, 598-9.


atonement is the end of the tenth jubilee, in which atonement is made for all the Sons of Light and the men of the lot of Melchizedek upon them according to all their works.  

11Q13 exhibits the exact eschatological pattern of the combination of the forgiveness of sins with the defeat of the enemies of God’s people (cf. 11Q13.13). Moreover, it is intriguing that in 11Q13 “the year of the Lord’s favour” mentioned in Isaiah 61:2 is identified with the eschatological Jubilee year brought about by Melchizedek (line 9). The author of 11Q13 also associates the messenger who proclaims the gospel in Isaiah 52:7 with the “anointed one” depicted in the 70-week prophecy:

11Q13 15–16: It (is) the day of [peace (about) which] God spoke [...] which [God] spoke [...] which [God] spoke [...] which [God] spoke [...] Isaiah the prophet who said, “[How] beautiful on the mountains are the feet of the messenger who announces peace, the messenger of good news who announces salvation, who says to Zion, ‘Your God reigns.’”

18: And “the messenger” is the anointed of the spirit about whom Daniel said, “[Until (the coming) of an anointed one, a leader, (there shall be) seven weeks.]”

The author of this passage further identified the “messenger” depicted in Isaiah 52:7 and the “anointed one” in Daniel 9:25 with the “anointed of the spirit” described in Isaiah 61:1 (line 19). The association of the Daniel’s 70-weeks prophecy with the Isaianic texts that refer to the servant of the Lord is not surprising. It is important to stress that Daniel’s prayer in

---

298 Translated by Roberts.
301 To be sure, Isaiah 61:1-3 is not part of the “servant poem”. However, J. J. Collins states, “The prophetic text itself [Isa 61:1-3] is usually assigned to Trito-Isaiah (Isaiah 56-66), but it is universally admitted to be very close to, if not indistinguishable from Deutero-Isaiah (Isaiah 40-55)” (1997, 225-6). The author of Luke/Acts clearly applied both Isaiah 61:1-3 and the fourth servant poem to Jesus (Luke 4:16-21; Acts 8:26-39).
9:4–19 is the plea for the termination of the period of the wrath of God, which signifies the end of the exile, as ‘the Exile was the great example of the wrath of God’.\(^{302}\) Because the central theme of Isaiah 40–55 and 61 also concerns ‘the return of the exiles from Babylon and the restoration of the community in Judah’,\(^ {303}\) it would have been natural for ancient Jewish exegetes to connect these prophetic oracles.\(^ {304}\) Scott succinctly depicts the essence of 11Q13 as follows: ‘Therefore, 11Q Melchizedek represents an eschatological text that interprets the restoration of Israel in Isa 61:1–3 within the framework of a sabbatical chronology that understands the 70 weeks of years in Daniel 9 in terms of jubilee years in Leviticus 25’.\(^ {305}\) In 11Q13, the imagery of Yom Kippur formed some of the essential building blocks for the manifestation of the Jewish eschatological hope.

4. Conclusion

4.1 Differences between Passover and Yom Kippur

It has been demonstrated that Passover and Yom Kippur would have had significantly different meanings for first century Jews. Falk’s comments on the Festival Prayers succinctly epitomise the general attitude of Jews toward Yom Kippur and Passover respectively, ‘The prayer for the Day of Atonement focuses on guilt, affliction, repentance, and mercy. The Passover prayer

\(^{302}\) A. T. Hanson 1957, 39 [Hanson’s italic]. See LXX of Daniel 8:19: “And he said to me, ‘Lo, I am telling you what will take place at the end of the wrath against the sons of the people, for yet will remain the appropriate time of consummation’”. “The wrath against the sons of the people” clearly refers to the “Exile” (cf. Dan 9:16).

\(^{303}\) J. J. Collins 1997b, 229.

\(^{304}\) On this point, Blenkinsopp aptly states: ‘In the third vision (Dan 9:1–27), Daniel’s confession of sin, spoken in the name of Israel past and present (9:1–19), is similar in form and language to the communal lament of Isa 63:7–64:11 (Eng. 12)’ (2006, 16).

\(^{305}\) Scott 2005, 96.
alludes to the Exodus, God’s miracles of deliverance, and the election of Israel’. Indeed, these two Jewish convocations differ significantly from each other, being nearly oppositional in their theological characters and in the ways in which they were practised.

We can enumerate three notable differences between Passover and Yom Kippur. First, according to Philo and Josephus, at the time of the Passover feast, a multitude of Jewish adult males around the world participated in the sacrificial ritual in the Temple. In the case of Yom Kippur, on the other hand, the high priest was almost the only player who conducted the complex rituals in the Temple. Second, it was the duty for ancient Jews to eat the meat of the paschal victims in the Passover feast (cf. Spec. Laws 2.148), whereas there was a solemn instruction to practise fasting with prayer during the time of Yom Kippur. In fact, neither the high priest nor any of the other priests ever ate the meat of the victims that were sacrificed to cleanse the sanctuary through their blood (cf. Lev 16:25, 27), though they did eat the meat of the animals offered as a regular sin offering (cf. Num 29:8–11). Third, whereas practising the Passover feast was, in a sense, a dramatic re-enactment of the Passover event commemorating their ancestors’ deliverance out of Egypt (cf. Ant. 17.213), the Yom Kippur rite could be viewed as a visualised demonstration of the banishing of all Israel’s sins and impurities from the covenantal sphere of God’s people. Hence, whereas the Passover feast was celebrated in a jubilant atmosphere appropriate for expressing gratitude to God, the fasting during Yom Kippur was to be observed in a mode of penitence appropriate for meditating on sins committed in the

---

308 According to the Mishnah, ‘If the Day of Atonement fell on a Sabbath the loaves were shared out at evening. If it fell on a Friday the he-goat of the Day of Atonement was consumed at evening’ (m. Menahoth 11.7)
309 Vaux indicates, ‘It is a religious “act”; one “performs”, [7733], the Passover [Exod 12:28]’ (1964, 3).
past and for imploring God to forgive these sins.\textsuperscript{310}

In the light of these marked differences, it is difficult to imagine that first century Jews would be likely to confuse the aim of Passover with that of Yom Kippur such that they might imagine that their sins were forgiven through slaughtering and eating the paschal lambs at the time of the Passover feast. Unlike the case of Yom Kippur, there is no record from the first century CE that Jews spent time on either penitence or fasting during the Passover feast, actions which were thought as prerequisites for the forgiveness of sins. Rather, the paschal lamb can best be categorised as a \textit{thanksgiving offering}, celebrating the deliverance out of Egypt, whereas, in the Exodus narrative, it seems to function as an \textit{apotropaeic sacrifice}, whose blood marked the Israelite households out to protect them from God’s judgement.

4. 2 The strong link between Passover and Yom Kippur

Despite the marked differences between them, however, we should not overlook the fact that both Passover and Yom Kippur reinforced in Jews the centrality of the covenant in their national life. By observing the Passover feast, Jews had constantly been reminded that their God was faithful to his covenant and its promises. His faithfulness to the covenant continued as a source of the national hope of deliverance throughout the late Second Temple period (e.g., Dan 9:15–19; Luke 1:54–55, 72). Likewise, through observing Yom Kippur in fasting and penitence, Jews had been assured of their covenant status as the people of the one creator God.

Moreover, the Jewish hope for the deliverance from the yoke of gentile powers was deeply

\textsuperscript{310} \textit{In Jubilees}, it is thus written: ‘And this day \textit{is} decreed so that they might mourn on account of their sins and on account of all their transgressions and on account of all their errors in order to purify themselves on this day, once a year’ (\textit{Jub.} 34.19).
linked with their aspiration for the forgiveness of sins (cp. Luke 1:71, 77), since their subjugation to foreign empires was often considered as the result of their covenantal breach (cf. 2Macc 6:12–17; 7:32–38). Hence, in Jewish theological imagination, Passover and Yom Kippur could have been intertwined with each other in their eschatological hope. We can find such an example in 11Q Melchizedek (11Q13), where the Exodus theme is inseparably connected with that of Yom Kippur. Within a covenantal framework, it is indeed likely that Passover and Yom Kippur were tightly bound together in the hearts of first century Jews.
Chapter 3: Passover and Yom Kippur motifs in Paul’s letters

1. Introduction

Having studied how first century Jews understood Passover and Yom Kippur respectively, we now consider how this might apply to Paul, concentrating on two texts: 1 Corinthians 5:7 and Romans 3:25. A number of commentators identify connections between πάσχα and the Passover feast in 1 Corinthians 5:7, and between Ἰλαστήριον and Yom Kippur in Romans 3:25. Nonetheless, in the light of our study in the previous chapter, there still remain some critical points to be explored.

As regards 1 Corinthians 5:7, scholars’ attention is often directed at one particular question: What sort of sacrificial idea lies behind the word πάσχα? For instance, some scholars argue over whether πάσχα can possibly signify a sacrifice for sins or not. Yet the question itself may be misguided, since Paul’s aim here is not to explain a definite salvific effect of Jesus’ death by comparing Jesus to a sacrificial animal. Rather, Paul introduces this term for the purpose of foreshadowing his further exhortations. Our following discussion will clarify this point.

Concerning Romans 3:25, while quite a few scholars argue over the meaning of Ἰλαστήριον in relation to the Yom Kippur sacrifice, it is rather surprising that they draw little attention to the significance of αἷμα in the same verse, despite the importance and centrality of “blood” in the Yom Kippur rite. In the Yom Kippur blood sacrifice, it is the life-blood that attains the redemption of God’s people from the wrath of God. We shall contend that Paul employs the

---

311 See our review of Dunn and McLean in chapter 1.
word αἷμα with a solid understanding of the role of “blood” in Jewish sacrificial practices.

2. Paul’s use of πάσχα in 1 Corinthians 5:7

2. 1 Introduction

In 1 Corinthians 5:7, Paul declares that Christ was slaughtered as our “paschal lamb (πάσχα)”. A close study of this statement gives us an important insight into the question of how Paul uses sacrificial imagery. Broadly speaking, scholars hold four exegetical opinions with regard to the meaning of πάσχα. That is to say, if Paul’s employment of this term reflects the normal Jewish perception of the role of the paschal lamb in either the original Passover event or the Passover feast, there must be two options: First, Jesus was sacrificed in order that his blood could be used for an apotropaeic end (i.e., warding off God’s wrathful judgement). Second, Jesus was sacrificed in order that his flesh could be eaten as the Passover meal. Moreover, these two options could overlap each other, since the paschal lamb assumed both roles in the original Passover event.

Another possibility is that the meaning with which Paul invests this word goes beyond the conventional Jewish understanding of πάσχα. In this case, there are another two exegetical options: First, Jesus was sacrificed as a sin offering. Second, Jesus was sacrificed in order that his blood could be used for the ratification of the new covenant. None of these four are, however, fully convincing.

The Greek verb δούλω can signify either “slaughter” or “sacrifice”. Both renderings seem to be possible in this context.

---

312 The Greek verb δούλω can signify either “slaughter” or “sacrifice”. Both renderings seem to be possible in this context.
2. 2 For averting the wrath of God?

Concerning the exact meaning of πάσχα in 1 Corinthians 5:7, some scholars consider that Paul has the original Passover story in mind, and that he identifies Jesus with the paschal lamb slaughtered immediately before the Israelites escaped from the land of Egypt. Finlan thus argues: ‘This [1Cor 5:7b] summons up the image of Christ’s blood averting the wrath of God just as the apotropaic blood on the doorposts caused the Angel of Death to “pass over” the Jews’. 313 This interpretation, however, poses some exegetical problems.

First, if Paul sees the blood of the paschal lamb as the means of averting the wrath of God, it is curious that in a context where he clearly does refer to the wrath of God he uses a very different image. It is important to note that, whilst Paul uses the word δραγή twelve times in the epistle to the Romans (Rom 1:18; twice in 2:5, 8; 3:5; 4:15; 5:9; twice in 9:22; 12:19; 13:4, 5), he never uses this term in his two letters to the Corinthians. Granting that Paul considers that the primary purpose of slaughtering the paschal lamb is to avoid the wrath of God, Romans 3:25 seems to be an ideal opportunity to use the Passover motif. However, in Romans 3:25, instead of using Paschal language, Paul speaks in terms of the Ιλαστῆριον. Paul’s choice of Ιλαστῆριον rather than πάσχα in Romans 3:25 considerably undermines the force of Finlan’s argument.

There is another reason why the apotropaic construal is not convincing. Whilst it is true that the people of Israel did put the blood of the paschal victims on the two doorposts and the lintel of their houses in the Passover event (cf. Exod 12:7), there is no record that ancient Jews repeated this practice in the annual Passover feast. 314 Moreover, the Passover sacrifice in the

---

314 See chapter 2.2.2.
feast should be viewed as a thanksgiving offering in the first century milieu. It is therefore unlikely that Jews in Paul’s time considered that sacrificing the paschal lambs in the feast functioned as an apotropaeic end of whatever kind. Hence, if Paul has the Passover feast rather than the original Passover event in mind (cf. 1Cor 5:8), his point here is not to explain the apotropaeic role of Jesus’ death. Moreover, the surrounding context strongly suggests that the thrust of Paul’s argument is not to expound how the Corinthians have avoided the wrath of God, but to warn them that their immoral way of life could incur God’s wrath on the whole community (cf. 1Cor 10:8), and thus to urge them to expel the immoral one from the holy community (cf. 1Cor 5:11–13).

For the reasons presented above, the interpretation that the usage of πάσχα intends to evoke the image of the apotropaeic blood is not sound.

2. 3 Preparation for the Passover meal?

As to the nature of the Lord’s Supper that Paul mentions in 1 Corinthians 11, Bruce Winter argues that Paul and his addressees understood it as a new Passover meal, on the grounds of the thematic connection of this passage with Paul’s use of Paschal language in chapters 5 and 10 (in particular, “the cup of blessing which we bless” in 10:16), both of which are situated in a Passover context. Winter’s interpretation is based on the supposition that Paul modelled the Lord’s Supper on the Last Supper celebrated by Jesus himself as a Passover meal. It is true that Paul’s account of the Last Supper exhibits the most conspicuous parallels to the Synoptic accounts, which strongly suggests that both Paul and the Synoptic writers utilised the same or a

---

315 Winter 2001, 150.
similar tradition. Thiselton endorses this view: ‘the issue of whether or not a Passover frame is presupposed as the framework of interpretation for last supper and the Lord’s Supper (and its tradition) has a decisive effect upon the exegesis of vv. 23b–25 [of 1 Corinthians 11]. In our view, the main factors customarily cited to establish a Passover framework remain utterly convincing’. What then would be an implication of this for our understanding of 5:7? As we have studied, the paschal lamb was, in the Passover feast, slain so as to be eaten at the Passover meal, as Pitre comments ‘in the Old Testament and ancient Jewish tradition, the sacrifice of the Passover lamb was not completed by its death. It was completed by eating the flesh of the lamb that had been slain’. From this point of view, Paul would have meant that Christ was sacrificed as the paschal lamb as a preparation for the Passover meal. Pitre goes on to argue:

In both of these statements [1Cor 5:7–8 and 1Cor 10:16], Paul is referring to the Lord’s Supper. In the first quotation, he not only identifies Jesus as the new “Passover lamb” who has been sacrificed. He also bases the celebration of the Eucharistic “feast” on Jesus’ identity as the lamb. Perhaps this is why, in the second quotation, Paul can affirm without hesitation that the Eucharist is a real communion in the body and blood of Jesus. For Paul, who sees the Lord’s Supper through Jewish eyes, it is nothing less than a new Passover.

Attractive as this view is, it would be an overstatement to say that Paul refers to the Lord’s Supper in 1 Corinthians 5:7.

It must be pointed out that the immediate context in which Paul develops his argument is

---

316 It is not in the scope of our research to compare Paul’s Eucharistic account with those of the Synoptic Gospels. In this regard, see the detailed discussions of Jeremias (1966, 138-203), Marshall (1980, 30-56), and Hengel (1981, 72-4).
317 Thiselton 2000, 874.
318 Pitre 2011, 74 [Pitre’s italics].
319 Ibid., 76. A similar case is made by Wheaton in his study of John’s Gospel (2009, 58-93).
not the Passover feast but the feast of Unleavened Bread. Although these two feasts virtually coalesced in the Second Temple era (Cf. Philo *Spec. Laws* 2.162), there was a clear distinction between the two. Whilst the Passover meal was celebrated only on the night after the paschal lamb was slaughtered, the unleavened bread was eaten for the subsequent seven days (cf. Exod 12:15; 13:6–7). Paul herein highlights the unleavened bread, rather than the Paschal flesh in the Passover meal. The question Paul raises here is whether this unleavened bread is made of the old yeast (malice and evil) or the new yeast (sincerity and truth). Thus, it is difficult to detect here an allusion to the Lord’s Supper, where the bread (i.e., the body of Christ; 1Cor 10:16; 11:23–24) is consumed. It seems, rather, that Paul’s point of emphasis lies elsewhere. In this regard, Sampley provides a helpful comment on Paul’s intention in mentioning the paschal lamb: ‘Paul’s view of Christ’s death in 5:7 fits his usual pattern of considering it a past, finished, defining event. He casts it here in Passover garb to sharpen his readers’ sense that the time for cleansing the house of yeast has passed. His rhetoric, therefore, creates a sense of urgency in dealing with the man who has his father’s wife’. Sampley’s proposal is insightful, and urges us to understand the reference to the paschal lamb within the chronological framework of the complex of the Passover/Unleavened Bread feasts. Hence, the reason why Paul refers to Christ as πάσχα is not to explain the soteriological value of the body of Christ, but to inform his addressees of the fact that the time for slaughtering the paschal lamb has already passed.

2. 4 Sacrifice for sins?

Historically, many Pauline scholars have interpreted 1 Corinthians 5:7 as referring, or at least

---

alluding to the sin offering.\textsuperscript{321} This interpretation is tempting since it seems to be consistent with Paul’s other statement in the same epistle that clearly indicates that Christ died for sins (cf. 1Cor 15:3).\textsuperscript{322} Moreover, as suggested above, it might have been the case that the image of the paschal lamb and the concept of the atonement for sins had been conflated in the very early stage of the Christian movement.\textsuperscript{323} Nonetheless, there are two problems with this reading.

First, as we discussed in depth in the previous chapter, it would have been common knowledge among first century Jews that the sacrifice for the Passover feast was not a sin offering. First century Jews who experienced firsthand both the paschal ritual in the Temple and an ordinary sin offering would likely recognize the marked difference between the two. For instance, in the case of the sin offering, an offerer who commits sins is prohibited from consuming the flesh of the sacrificial animal, whereas it is the duty of an offerer to eat the paschal meat. To count the fact that Paul was once extremely zealous for his ancestral traditions (Gal 1:14; Phil 3:5–6), it is unlikely that he was ignorant of such a difference. Hence, we cannot simply presuppose that Paul taught the Corinthian Christians to identify the paschal lamb with a sacrifice for sins.

Second, it is important to note that Paul exhorts his addressees to celebrate (ἐορτάζω) this event. Is it not rather strange, however, that Paul boldly encourages them to celebrate the sin offering, in the light of the fact that Jews in the first century would have observed the sin offering, not least Yom Kippur, in penitence? To be sure, we cannot exclude the possibility that Paul might have meant: “Let us celebrate the fact that our sins are forgiven because of the sin

\textsuperscript{321} E.g., Grosheide 1953, 126; Schoeps 1961, 133; Ridderbos 1977, 187-8; Marshall 1980, 77.
\textsuperscript{322} Although First Corinthians 15:3 does not necessarily mean that Christ died as the sin offering.
\textsuperscript{323} See our review of James Dunn in chapter 1.
offering of Jesus as the paschal lamb!” The real problem with this reading, however, is that it does not fit the immediate context well. Paul’s intention is not to urge them to celebrate the fact that their previously committed sins are forgiven through the sin offering of Christ, but to remind them of the danger that their ongoing sinning as holy ones (ἁγίας; cf. 1Cor 1:2) would have serious consequences (cf. 1Cor 5:9–13). Considering these various points, the view that Paul associates πᾶσχα with the sin offering is not very convincing.

2. 5 Ratification of the new covenant?

The fourth exegetical option is to view πᾶσχα as referring to the sacrifice that ratifies the new covenant in its blood. Hogeterp proposes, ‘1Cor 5:6–8 echoes the Christian celebration of Passover in remembrance of Jesus Christ whose sacrifice constitutes a new covenant (1Cor 11:25).’ The strength of this rendering rests on the fact that Paul clearly associates the blood of Christ with the institution of the new covenant. It is also important to remember that the Passover feast is often connected with the inauguration and renewal of the covenant in the Jewish scriptures (Cf. Exod 40:17; Num 9:1–5; Josh 5:1–12; 2 Kgs 23:1–23; 2 Chr 29:10; 30:1–27; 34:29–35:18).

Despite these advantages, it still suffers from some weaknesses. The theme of covenant-making does not emerge at all in Paul’s argument in chapter 5. While both the Passover event and the ratification of the Sinai covenant are climactic events within the Exodus story, they are distinguishable from each other. The observation of the Passover/Unleavened Bread feasts is not the celebration for the ratification of the Sinai covenant, but for the

---

324 Hogeterp 2006, 336.
commemoration of the Passover event. Incidentally, the sacrifice for the ratification of the Sinai
covenant was not a lamb but an ox (cf. Exod 24:5). Taking these points together, it is unlikely
that Paul expected that the reference to the paschal lamb in verse 5:7 would evoke the image of
the ratification of the covenant in the minds of his addressees. Hence, this rendering does not fit
the immediate context.

2. 6 Alternative view: \(\pi\dot{o}\sigma\chi\alpha\) as a signpost

Despite some attractiveness in each of the preceding cases, all the four options examined above
fall short of providing a decisive interpretation. Paul’s understanding of Jesus’ death is indeed
complex, which is associated with the elements of the redemption from God’s wrath, the
Eucharistic meal, the atonement for sins, and the ratification of the new covenant. Nonetheless,
none of them seems to play a central role in 1 Corinthians 5:7.

While there remains a possibility that Paul uses this term with a different connotation that
we have not detected, it seems more plausible that Paul does not intend a single, exclusively
sacrificial meaning when he uses the word \(\pi\dot{o}\sigma\chi\alpha\) here. Rather, this word functions as a signpost
that anticipates Paul’s further discussions. For those who experienced a series of Jewish feasts,
it was a given fact that the feast of Unleavened Bread was to be observed seamlessly in
conjunction with the Passover feast. Thus, the act of slaughtering \(\pi\dot{o}\sigma\chi\alpha\) functioned as a signal
that urged participants of the feast to move to the next stage of the complex feast of
Passover/Unleavened Bread.\(^{325}\)

\(^{325}\) In another instance, in his exhortation on the resurrection of the dead, Paul seems to connect Jesus’
resurrection with the feast of the Sheaf of the First Fruits (1Cor 15:20, 23; cf. Exod 23:16-19; Lev 23:9-14; Num 15:20-21). Philo regards this feast as a part of the spring feasts (Spec. Laws 2.162). Supposing
that Paul shares Philo’s understanding, then he places Jesus’ death (Passover) and resurrection (First
In a similar vein, the mention of πάσχα at this point prepares the way for Paul’s further exhortation in following chapters. Richard Hays states, ‘Paul assumes not only that his Corinthian readers will understand this symbolism [of the Passover] but also that they will identify metaphorically with Israel’.  

Paul exhorts his addressees to identify themselves with the people of a new Exodus, who are on the way to the promised inheritance. If Paul suggests that the Corinthian Christians have already participated in the new Passover event through observing the new Passover/Unleavened Bread feasts, they are now, in the light of the narrative sequence of the Exodus story, wandering in the wilderness. The particular perspective that sees the wilderness wandering of the ancient Israelites as the period of “testing” often appears in Second Temple literature, in both 4QPsalms Pesher (4QPs) and the epistle to the Hebrews. The wilderness story is presented as an aid to comprehending the significance of the present situation of the eschatological people of God. David Moffitt argues, ‘The period of the wilderness wandering can be used as an eschatological metaphor for the penultimate age. The “last days” can be described in terms of the testing during the time of wandering that sorted out those who would go into the land’. Paul herein seems to employ the same eschatological framework, and he exploits the symbolic significance of the paschal lamb for the Exodus story, so as to place his readers in the new Exodus story, where they themselves are to play an active role as the people of God.

Fruits) within the framework of the Jewish vernal festival cycle. Cf. Davies 1980 [1948], 106.

Hays 1997, 83.

As Jews in Paul’s time participated in the historic Passover event through observing the Passover/Unleavened Bread feasts. See chapter 2, 2. 2.


4QPsA 2:4-3:2; Heb 3:7-11.

Moffitt 2011, 90. See also J. J. Collins 1997a, 57.
In the light of these points, Paul’s intention in referring to \( \pi\acute{a}s\chi\acute{a} \) here does not seem to explicate the soteriological meaning of Jesus’ death by highlighting any sacrificial value of the paschal lamb. Rather, by associating his death with the Passover feast, Paul evokes the Exodus narrative, which reminds the addressees of the fact that they are in \( \tau\acute{a}\ \tau\acute{e}\lambda\gamma\tau\omega\nu\ \alpha\lambda\omega\nu\nu \) (the last days; 1Cor 10:11), which are, in Jewish apocalyptic thinking, characterised as the time of “purity” (cf. 1Cor 5:9–13; 6:11) as well as “testing” (cf. 1Cor 10:13) for God’s eschatological people.\(^{332}\) In order to drive this point home to the Corinthian Christians, Paul introduces two Jewish themes that follow the event of slaughtering \( \pi\acute{a}s\chi\acute{a} \): One is the feast of Unleavened Bread within the Jewish festival cycle, in which any old yeast, especially sexual impurity, must be eradicated. The other is the episode of the wandering in the wilderness within the Exodus narrative, in which people must persevere throughout their testings. Moreover, since the Exodus event itself was the confirmation of God’s faithfulness to his covenant, to recall this story would give a sense of assurance concerning God’s ongoing faithfulness to his covenant people in the time of testing (1Cor 10:13). In sum, a most appropriate way to understand the word \( \pi\acute{a}s\chi\acute{a} \) is to see it within the Exodus narrative, which has been celebrated in the Passover feast.\(^{333}\)

3. Paul’s use of sacrificial terms in Romans 3:25

3. 1 Introduction

Romans 3:25 is arguably the most controversial verse for the study of Paul’s usage of sacrificial imagery. A cluster of sacrificial terms, such as \( \acute{i}\lambda\alpha\acute{a}\tau\acute{t}\acute{h}\acute{r}i\acute{o}n, \ \alpha\acute{i}\mu\acute{a}, \ \acute{a}m\acute{a}\acute{r}\acute{t}\acute{h}\acute{m}\acute{a}, \) appears in this

---


\(^{333}\) I shall argue that this reading can be applicable to Galatians 4:1-11 in chapter 5.
condensed passage. Though scholarly debate on this verse often centres on defining the meaning of ἱλαστήριον (either “a sacrifice of atonement” or “a place of atonement”), it is not our primary concern to settle this weighty issue. Whichever rendering scholars may give, they generally agree on the point that Paul here has the blood sacrifice, most probably the Yom Kippur blood sacrifice, in mind. Instead, we will concentrate our attention on the function and meaning of αἷμα in the same verse.

Despite the centrality of blood in Jewish sacrificial practices, its significance in Paul’s soteriology has often been neglected or even denied. Not a few scholars view the “blood” of Christ as simply a metonym for Christ’s bloody death on the cross or the salvific effect of his violent death. Behm’s view is representative of this line of interpretation: ‘The interest of the NT is not in the material blood of Christ, but in His shed blood as the life violently taken from Him. Like the cross…“the blood of Christ” is simply another and even more graphic phrase for the death of Christ in its soteriological significance’. Penna endorses Behm’s opinion with respect to the Pauline letters: ‘insofar as it concerns the Pauline letters, I believe I must subscribe to it [Behm’s view]’. Penna goes on to argue:

While such a treatment [i.e., understanding the “blood” in the light of Old Testament sacrificial texts] has the value of placing the “blood of Christ” against the background of an undeniable sacrificial influence, it brings the risk of suggesting that the death of Jesus can be understood in Jewish terms, can be absorbed back into the Jewish cultic system, thus overemphasizing the element of blood in its physical and material aspect, and thus isolating it from the larger context of the death on the cross, and its

334 See our scholarly reviews in chapter 1.
335 There are some notable exceptions, however. For instance, Stowers denies any cultic allusion in this passage (1994, 209).
336 Behm, “αἷμα, αἵματευκροσία,” TDNT 1:172-7 [my italics].
337 Penna 1996, 2.40.
motivation.\textsuperscript{338}

Most Pauline scholars, however, explore the meaning of ἰλαστήριον against the Jewish sacrificial background. Although the exact meaning of ἰλαστήριον is contested among Pauline scholars, hardly any scholar denies a sacrificial connotation in this word. Given that ἰλαστήριον evokes a certain sacrificial image, it is extremely difficult to deny a sacrificial connotation in the term αἷμα, juxtaposed to this very word. Therefore, the argument that seeks to negate any sacrificial connotation in the word αἷμα is hardly convincing. The life-blood of the sacrificial animal assumes the central role in the sin offering, which both propitiates God’s wrath and purifies what must be kept holy.\textsuperscript{339} It is our contention that Paul uses the term αἷμα with this Jewish understanding of life-blood.

3.2 Meaning of αἷμα in Romans 5:9

Prior to considering the meaning of this term in Romans 3:25, it is helpful to study another usage of this word in Romans 5:9, since there is a noticeable parallelism between Romans 3:24–25 and verse 5:9:

\textbf{Romans 3:24–25:} δικαιούμενοι…ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἰλαστήριον διὰ [τὴς] πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἷματι…

\textbf{Romans 5:9:} …δικαιοδοθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἷματι αὐτοῦ…

As a number of commentators argue, it is appropriate to understand the statement in Romans

\textsuperscript{338} Ibid., 26.
\textsuperscript{339} Cf. Hicks 1959, 18.
5:9 as an abbreviation of the more detailed statement in Romans 3:24–25. Hence, the study of ἁμαρτία in Romans 5:9 is crucially important to the understanding of the same word in Romans 3:25.

Romans 5:9–10: Much more surely then, now that we have been justified by his blood (ἐν τῷ ἁμαρτίᾳ αὐτοῦ), will we be saved through him from the wrath of God. For if while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son (διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ νοῦ αὐτοῦ), much more surely, having been reconciled, will we be saved by his life.

The word ἁμαρτία in 5:9a is often construed as a synonym for the word δένοιτος in 5:10a. As Schreiner claims, ‘We should not distinguish between Christ’s death in verse 10 and his blood in verse 9…Both terms are sacrificial in character, stemming from Levitical terminology’. However, it must be remembered that Paul associates Jesus’ death not with justification but with reconciliation. Apart from the problem of simply equating “justification” with “reconciliation”, this way of reading contradicts the Levitical notion of sacrifice. As discussed in the previous chapter, the “blood” of the sacrificial animal must be brought near to the presence of God (i.e., to the various altars in the Temple) as a holy sacrifice (e.g., Lev 4:5, 7, 16). Since “death” is most detestable to God, anything that literally or symbolically carries death must be excluded from the presence of God. Gane’s account of Numbers 19 clarifies this
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342 We cannot simply equate “justification” with “reconciliation”. While these two notions would have closely been connected in Paul’s mind, there is a subtle yet substantial difference between them. Cranfield comments, ‘In the NT they [καταλλάσσειν and its cognates] are used with reference to the relation of God and men only in the Pauline epistles (cf. [Rom] 11.15; 2Cor 5.18-20), and there they express the quality of personal relationship which is integral to God’s justification of men but which the word “justification” does not as such necessarily suggest’ (1975, 267) [Cranfield’s emphasis].
343 As Philo states, ‘For the blood may truly be called a libation of the life-principle’ (Spec Laws 1.205).
Needless to say, the primary source of corpse contamination was the dead body, the dead body itself. Because the person was dead, the body could only convey ritual impurity to other persons or objects within the enclosed space where it was located or if someone touched it out in the open ([Lev] 19:14–16, 18). Even though ritual impurity contracted from a corpse by a live person was secondary, it was serious. This makes sense in light of the rationale underlying the ancient Israelite system of physical ritual impurities: Mortality involved in the birth-death cycle of human beings is opposed to divine holiness, which is characterized by life…What could represent mortality more than a corpse?344

By definition, it is impossible to bring “death” into the presence of God as a sacrifice, since death is incompatible with the holiness of God. As Moffitt argues, ‘In Levitical terms, to offer blood to God is not an act of offering death to God or of bringing death into God’s presence—a notion that would be abhorrent’.345 From the Levitical viewpoint, the blood of the sacrificial animal does not signify “death”.346 Hence, unless the Levitical sacrificial connotation of the term αἷμα is abandoned in Romans 5:9 as well as in 3:25, we cannot construe this word as a synonym for the word θάνατος.

It is also important to note that Paul clearly associates the resurrection of Jesus with justification of believers (Rom 4:25).347 While it is not easy to grasp in what sense the

346 How then should we consider the element of “death” in a blood-sacrificial ritual? Kiuchi suggests, ‘The eaten hattat conveys holiness within the sanctuary, whereas the burnt hattat probably conveys holiness within the sanctuary but defiles, like the Azazel goat, its handler outside the camp. In a deeper dimension it is the death which the sacrificial animal symbolizes that causes both the holiness and uncleanness contagions’ (1987, 142). In a slightly different way, I approach this problem as follows: insofar as death occurs in a controlled way in a holy domain (i.e., the sanctuary), it does not pose a problem. Outside the sanctuary, however, death becomes a threat to the sanctuary. Cf. Klawans 2006, 58.
347 Here, Paul adopts the term δικαίωσις.
The resurrection of Christ is connected to the justification of believers in Paul’s mind, it can at least be pointed out that the incorruptible, resurrected body of Christ seems to be more congruous with the requisite holiness of either “sacrifice” or the “mercy seat” (i.e., ἱερόν in Rom 3:25), than his mortal, “cursed” body on the cross. At any rate, the fact remains that Paul thinks that the justification of believers has been accomplished through the death and the resurrection of Christ. This point further weakens the force of the argument that the αἵματος which accomplished justification is simply a synonym for θάνατος.

Moreover, we have evidence that some of the Church Fathers interpreted the word αἵματος in this passage as a sacrificial term, as the statement of Origen shows:

Therefore, the divine declaration says, “And he will place the incense upon the fire in the sight of the Lord, and the smoke of the incense will cover the mercy seat which is upon the [ark of the] covenant and he will not die. And he will take from the blood of the calf and will sprinkle it with his finger upon the mercy seat.” Indeed, how the rite of atonement for men, which was done to God, should be celebrated was taught among the ancients. But you who came to Christ, the true high priest, who made atonement for you to God by his blood and reconciled you to the Father.

Here, Origen alludes to Romans 3:25 and 5:9–10. He clearly compares Christ’s blood to the life-blood of the sacrificial animals for the Yom Kippur rite. Origen thus understands the “blood” in Paul’s argument in a Jewish sacrificial context. Origen’s case clearly shows that our understanding that the blood of Christ is a sacrificial offering is not unprecedented in the period.

---

348 In this connection, Moffitt argues, in the epistle to the Hebrews, that the resurrected body of Christ itself, which conquers the mortality of the human fleshly body, functions as a pleasing sacrifice to God (2011, 230-56).

349 Origen, Homilies on Leviticus 1–16 9.10(1).
of the Church Fathers.  

Considering all these points together, it is problematic to equate ἁμα with θανατος in Romans 5:9–10. In Jewish blood sacrifice, the death of a sacrificial animal is a constitutive part of the ritual, as the life-blood can be obtained through its death. Nonetheless, death itself cannot be equated with blood, since blood is life. What is dedicated to God is not death but life. In this light, Paul’s statement of Romans 5:9 can be construed in this way: Paul does not say that Jesus’ death by itself is the sacrifice for atonement. Rather, what accomplishes justification is ἁμα, which signifies the holy, incorruptible life of Jesus the Messiah. His life-blood is presented to God through the death and the resurrection (cf. Rom 4:25). Prior to examining Romans 3:25 in this light, however, it is important to examine how the term ἁμα is used in 4 Maccabees.

3. 3 Meaning of ἁμα in 4 Maccabees

The date of 4 Maccabees remains a matter of debate, and scholarly views ‘range anywhere from circa 30 BC–AD135’.  

Whenever this text was written, however, due to its chronological proximity to the time of Paul, we must consider how the author considers ἁμα in relation to death.

In 4 Maccabees, “blood” and “death” initially seem to be used synonymously: καὶ διὰ τοῦ ἁματος τῶν εὐσεβῶν ἑκαίνων καὶ τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου τοῦ βανάτου αὐτῶν ἡ θεία πρόνοια τὸν Ἰσραὴλ προκακωθέντα διέσωσεν (4Macc 17:22). The author of 4 Maccabees appears to regard the

---

351 Williams, Jarvis 2010, 29.
352 There is, however, a textual variant in this passage, and Klauck argues that τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου βανάτου (the adjective usage of ἱλαστήριον) is a more plausible option than τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου τοῦ βανάτου (the substantive usage of ἱλαστήριον). See Klauck 1989, 753, n. 22.
deaths of the martyrs themselves as a propitiatory sacrifice to God.\textsuperscript{353} On the other hand, the same author also states: καθάρσιν αὐτῶν ποιήσας τὸ ἐμὸν αἷμα καὶ ἀντίψωρον αὐτῶν λαβὲ τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν (4Macc 6:29). Here, the author clearly states that what is dedicated to God is not the death of Eleazar, but his blood and life.\textsuperscript{354} As deSilva explains:

The movement of this passage clearly recalls some kind of ritual act whereby an alienated Deity is reconciled to the people. The spilling of blood and the offering of a sacrificial animal as an exchange-price for the lives of the worshipers, and as the means by which God’s wrath can be averted and favor restored, is fundamental to Israelite sacrifice. ἀντίψωρον specifically recalls LXX Lev 17:11, in which God says that he gave the blood of animals to the Israelites “to perform the rite of atonement for your lives at the altar; for, as life, it is blood that atones for a life (ἀντὶ τῆς ψυχῆς)”…Overlaid upon this background is the pattern of Deuteronomy 28–30, which has already been at work in the apostasy and chastisement of the nation mentioned in 4:15–21. Eleazar offers his obedience to the law to the point of death as a manifestation of that return to obedience that would invite God’s compassion upon the nation (Deut 30:1–3).\textsuperscript{355}

In the light of the statement of 6:29, it is not likely that the author believed that death itself functioned as a holy sacrifice to God. Rather, he would have thought that the deaths of the martyrs were, as in the case Eleazar (cf. 4Macc 17:13), part of the sacrificial process through which their lives were offered to God, as it reads: “and the tyrant was punished, and the homeland purified, they having become, as it were, a life-in-exchange (ἀντίψωρον) for the sin of the nation” (4Macc 17:21).\textsuperscript{356} This is not to suggest that the soteriology of 4 Maccabees is

\textsuperscript{353} Sam Williams maintains that 4 Maccabees is based on the notion of “effective death”. He argues, however, that this notion is not derived from the Jewish scriptures, but from the Hellenistic martyrdom ideology. Cf. Williams 1975, 183-97.

\textsuperscript{354} Jarvis Williams rightly detects the Jewish sacrificial idea in this statement, but he is wrong to describe “death” as an atoning sacrifice (2010, 46).

\textsuperscript{355} DeSilva 2006, 147.

\textsuperscript{356} Translated by deSilva.
solely based on the Jewish sacrificial ideas. The idea of the suffering of obedient Jews as the means of the termination of God’s wrath is indeed present, and such an idea is alien to Levitical sacrificial system.\textsuperscript{357} Still, when the author exploits the imagery of sacrificial practices, he is basically in line with the Jewish thought that what is offered to God is not death but life.

3. 4 Yom Kippur imagery in Romans 3:25

If the argument above is maintained, it can help to explain how “blood” in Romans 5:9 is not a metonym for the death of Christ \textit{per se}. Rather, the life-blood of Jesus is seen as a holy sacrifice to God. Given the thematic parallel between 5:9 and 3:25,\textsuperscript{358} \textit{αἵμα} in 3:25 should be interpreted in the same light. When we construe the phrase \textit{ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἷματι} as “by the sacrifice of his life-blood”, then, what would be the most plausible meaning of \textit{ἱλασθήριον}?

It is important to stress that, in Jewish thought, a sacrifice is not something that God himself sets forth for his people. Instead, a sacrifice is what is brought near to the presence of God. In the case of the blood sacrifice for sins, blood must be \textit{brought in an appropriate manner to the presence of God}, which accomplishes atonement. The sole eligible location for the dedication of a holy sacrifice is the sanctuary of God (cf. Deut 12:13–14). Within the Temple complex, moreover, the most solemn spot for the dedication of the blood sacrifice is the \textit{mercy seat (ἱλασθήριον)} in the sanctum sanctorum, on which the blood is to be sprinkled only on the occasion of Yom Kippur. It must be stressed, again, \textit{blood is the most important sacrifice} in the Yom Kippur rite, which is evinced by the fact that it is brought to the most holy place of the

\textsuperscript{357} We shall consider this point further in the next chapter.

\textsuperscript{358} As Käsemann states: ‘Sinngemäß müßte \textit{ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἷματι} zu \textit{ἱλασθήριον} gezogen werden, wie es 5,9 entspricht’ (1973, 900).
sanctuary.

Given the importance of both place and sacrifice, it is indeed likely that Paul specifies both the sacrifice itself (αἷμα) and the place where the sacrifice is offered (λαστήριον) in the Yom Kippur ritual. As Wilckens points out, ‘ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ αἷματι ἦν θυσία χωρὶς τὸν θυσίαν’ is not understandable; because the Hellenistic offerings have nothing to do with blood.359 Moreover, the idea that God himself proffers the mercy seat is not incongruous with a Jewish eschatological hope. It was common knowledge among first century Jews that the Ark of the Covenant had long since disappeared, most probably immediately before the destruction of the First Temple.360 Thus, Jews in the Second Temple period could not adhere closely to the procedure of the Yom Kippur rite due to the lack of one of the essential components, the mercy seat on the top of the Ark of the Covenant. Although Jews in the Second Temple era had no way of knowing where it was hidden, some of them believed that the Ark would be revealed at the eschatological moment that would coincide with the restoration of Israel, as 2 Maccabees 2:5–8 reads:

Jeremiah came and found a cave-dwelling, and he brought there the tent and the ark and the altar of incense; then he sealed up the entrance. Some of those who followed him came up intending to mark the way, but could not find it. When Jeremiah learned of it, he rebuked them and declared: ‘The place shall be unknown until God gathers his people together again and shows his mercy. Then the Lord will disclose these things, and the glory of the Lord and the cloud appear, as they were shown in the case of Moses,

359 Wilckens 1978, 192. In this connection, Gese explains the significance of “blood” in Jewish cultus: ‘Blood ceremonies are known from the field of history of religion. The drinking of blood, or smearing the body with blood is done in order to gain strength, to take into oneself particular powers. But there is a fundamental distinction between this type of blood practice and the use of blood in Israel, where blood is treated with the greatest respect’ (1981, 107).

360 Cf. Jer 3:16; *War*. 1.152; 5.219. On this topic, see especially Nir 2003, 43-77.
and as Solomon asked that the place should be specially consecrated.\textsuperscript{361}

As Schoeps suggests,\textsuperscript{362} Paul may well utilise the hope of the manifestation of the lost Ark of the Covenant by God himself. Moreover, as discussed above, there is evidence that the “seventy-weeks” prophecy in Daniel 9 was read in the eschatological hope of the eschatological Yom Kippur in the late Second Temple period.\textsuperscript{363} Strikingly, the themes of “atonement” and “justification” are juxtaposed in this oracle:

**Daniel 9:24 (in OG):** …συντελεσθήναι τὴν ἀμαρτίαν καὶ τὰς ἁδικίας σπανίσαι καὶ ἀπαλεῖψαι τὰς ἁδικίας καὶ δικαιοθῆναι τὸ ὑπάρχον καὶ δοθῆναι δικαιοσύνη αἰώνιον…

**Daniel 9:24 (Theodotion):** …τοῦ συντελεσθῆναι ἀμαρτίαν καὶ τοῦ σφραγίσαι ἀμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ ἐξιλάσσονται ἁδικίας καὶ τοῦ ἄγαγεν δικαιοσύνην αἰώνιον…

Although there is no explicit evidence that this Danielic oracle is the crucial background of Paul’s statement (cf. 1Thess 5:1; Dan 2:21; 2Thess 2:4; Dan 7:25; 10:36–39),\textsuperscript{364} provided the popularity of this oracle among first century Jews,\textsuperscript{365} it is not unlikely that Paul has this Danielic oracle in mind.

\textsuperscript{361} 2 Baruch 6:8 also states: “And he [the angel] said to the earth with a loud voice: Earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the mighty God, and receive the things [which includes the mercy seat] which I commit to you, and guard them until the last times, so that you may restore them when you are ordered, so that strangers may not get possession of them”. Translated by F. J. Klijn. See also 2Bar. 80:2; 4Bar. 3:6–14.

\textsuperscript{362} Schoeps argues, ‘We may suppose that the atoning sacrifice of the second temple still in operation at the time of Paul—it was, of course, still celebrated in spite of the missing ark of the covenant and the kapporeth—stood at the very heart of Pauline thought as the soteriological problem: how can another procure atonement for my sins?’ (1961, 131).

\textsuperscript{363} See chapter 2,4,2.

\textsuperscript{364} Beckwith states, ‘In First Thessalonians 5:1-8, Paul takes up Jesus’ teaching about his second coming. He says that his theme is “the times and the seasons” (verse 1), a phrase from Daniel 2:21, and then proceeds directly to echo the teaching in Jesus’ eschatological discourse’ (2005, 137). See also an important argument for the Pauline authorship of 2 Thessalonians by Ben Witherington (2006, 12-3), though it is outside the scope of this research to discuss this issue.

\textsuperscript{365} Beckwith, ibid., 142-3; N. T. Wright argues that this is the oracle to which Josephus cryptically alludes (\textit{J.W.} 6.312-15; cf. \textit{Ant.} 10.276; \textit{J. W.} 4.388; 6.109), which instigated Jews to fight against the Roman Empire (1992, 312-3). See also Grabbe 1997, 604-9.
In the light of the enormous significance of the Yom Kippur imagery for both the national life of Jews in general and Jewish apocalyptic imaginations in particular, Paul most probably evokes the image of Yom Kippur blood sacrifice by referring to the combination of the place of atonement (ἱλαστήριον) with the sacrifice itself (αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτί). The idea that Jesus is portrayed as both the most holy place in the sanctuary as well as the most holy sacrifice would not have been contradictory in Paul’s mind, since he can depict Christian believers as both God’s sanctuary as well as a holy sacrifice (cf. Rom 12:1; 1Cor 6:19).

4. Conclusion

We have conducted the survey of how Paul uses the Passover and Yom Kippur motifs in 1 Corinthians and Romans, respectively. What we find is that the sacrificial terms Paul uses are intimately and organically integrated in his arguments in both epistles.

In the case of 1 Corinthians, the word πάσχα functions as a signpost that indicates where his discourse is heading. For instance, the feast of Unleavened Bread was observed immediately after sacrificing paschal lambs. Hence, Paul’s mention of πάσχα anticipates his exhortation from verse 5:8 onwards. Furthermore, this word ushers the Corinthian believers into a symbolic Exodus world, where they are wandering in the symbolic space of wilderness en route to a promised heritage.

As regards Romans, the sacrificial terms in verse 3:25 are closely related to the argument Paul is mounting up to this point, not least to the leitmotif of ἐργὴ θεοῦ. Paul’s discourse is firmly rooted in the Jewish sacrificial idea that the sacrificial blood redeems sinners from the wrath of God. Paul does not simply borrow the word αἵμα from pre-Pauline traditions without
noticing the centrality of blood in Jewish sacrificial practices. On the contrary, precisely because he recognises the significance of blood in the sin offering in general and in the Yom Kippur blood sacrifice in particular, he stresses that it is the life-blood of Christ Jesus that has established the justification of believers and will redeem them from the eschatological wrath of God (Rom 3:25, 5:9–10).

Paul deploys both Passover and Yom Kippur motifs in crucial points in his discourses, either in an introductory point (1 Corinthians 5:7) or in a climactic part (Romans 3:25), whereby he creates a dramatic effect that bolsters his overall arguments. This evidence suggests that Paul has used these images in ways that align well with the Jewish “covenantal” background and context. The Passover is feast is the celebration of God’s faithfulness to the covenant, and Yom Kippur is the day when the covenant relationship between God and his people is firmly cemented. Paul has a good knowledge of what Jewish festivals and Jewish sacrificial practices signify respectively, and that he does not confuse them. In other words, Paul does not force randomly assembled Jewish motifs into his preconceived Christological understanding, thus potentially distorting their original meanings.366 Rather, these Jewish feasts and sacrificial practices seem to help Paul to explore the multifaceted significance of the Christ event.

---

366 Campbell claims that ‘salvation-historical approaches still place their crucial determinative emphasis on the analysis of Paul’s Jewish background, rather than on the analysis of what Paul’s Christian experience is...Christ is interpreted in broader canonical categories, but is still interpreted rather than interpreting’ (2005, 36-8) [Campbell’s italics]. However, it is not necessary to to be one-way (i.e., Christ interpreting the Old Testament), as Bauckham states, ‘Precisely at the points where they appreciate most fully the new identity of God in Jesus, they are engaged in exegesis, in the process of bringing the texts of the Hebrew Scriptures and the history of Jesus into mutually interpretative interplay’ (2008, 53) [my emphasis].
Chapter 4: The Isaianic Suffering Servant

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this chapter

In the previous chapters we studied first century Jewish perceptions of Passover and Yom Kippur, and then applied the insights from these studies to the Pauline texts that contain the sacrificial terms, πάσχα, αἵμα, and ἱλαστήριον. In this chapter, we proceed to the study of the third Jewish theme that stands behind Paul’s soteriology, namely, the Isaianic suffering servant. This study will be a necessary preparation for the next chapter in which we shall examine the Isaianic influence on one specific Pauline text, namely, Galatians 3:13.

1.2 Significance of Isaiah 53 in Paul’s soteriology

1.2.1 Martin Hengel’s arguments

As regards Paul’s perception of the suffering servant in Isaiah 53 (more precisely, Isaiah 52:13–53:12, which is normally called the “fourth servant poem”), Martin Hengel’s arguments that Paul alludes to the fourth servant poem in Romans 4:25, and that Paul received the early Christian tradition in which Jesus’ death was understood in the light of the fourth

---

367 There is no evidence that ancient readers had an idea of the “servant poems” as distinct units within the text of Isaiah. Cf. Jeremias, “παῖς ὄφω,” TDNT 5:682; Hays 1998, 209. Bearing this point in mind, however, we shall use the term “servant poems” henceforth for convenience sake. Concerning the scope of the servant poems, we shall use the broadest definition, as referring to Isa 42:1–9; 49:1–13; 50:4–11; 52:13–53:12.
servant poem (cf. 1Cor 15:3), would seem to remain irrefutable. Indeed, the majority of Pauline scholars now agree that Paul accepts the early Christian conviction that Jesus is the suffering servant of Isaiah 53.

Hengel maintains that ‘it should no longer be doubted that Isa. 53 had an influence on the origin and shaping of the earliest kerygma’. Hengel further claims that this Isaianic kerygma particularly affects and shapes Paul’s understanding of Jesus’ death, and contends that Romans 4:25 most probably depends on Isaiah 53:12:

**Romans 4:25a:** παραδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν…

**Isaiah 53:12:** …διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν παραδόθη.

Hengel notes that, in most of the undisputed and disputed Pauline texts, the preposition ὑπέρ is used in the “for us” formula (cf. Gal 1:4; 2:20; Eph 5:25; 1Tim 2:6; Titus 2:14), and that Romans 4:25 is the exceptional case that employs the preposition διά, which coincides with the case of Isaiah 53:12 in Old Greek texts (OG). Another piece of evidence indicating Paul’s dependence on Isaiah 53:12 is his choice of the verb παραδιδομι. It is noticeable that both Paul and the four Gospel writers use this verb as the technical term for Jesus’ being handed over (cf. Rom 8:32; 1Cor 11:23; Gal 2:20; e.g. Matt 20:18; Mark 9:31; Luke 9:44; John 19:16), which implies that their choice of this verb is based on the same source, namely, Isaiah 53:12 in OG.

---

369 Morna Hooker, who once questioned whether Paul identified Jesus with the suffering servant, now states, ‘To the question that has been put to me, “Did the use of Isaiah 53 to interpret his mission begin with Jesus?” I remain convinced that the answer is “No.” To the question “Where, then, did it begin?” I am far more ready than I was forty years ago to suggest that it may well have been with Paul’ (1998, 103) [Hooker’s emphasis].
370 Ibid., 59 [Hengel’s emphasis].
371 In the case of Galatians 1:4, there is a textual variant that attests the use of παραδιδομι.
372 Ibid., 35-6. See also Shum 2002, 189; Hooker 1998, 101-3. Henceforth, we adopt the term “OG” (Old Greek) rather than “LXX”. We shall return to this point soon in this chapter.
In addition to this, Paul *quotes*, nearly verbatim, from the fourth servant poem, and identifies Jesus with the servant of the Lord (Rom 15:21; cf. Isa 52:15 in OG).³⁷³

Hengel further argues that behind the tradition preserved in 1 Corinthians 15:3b, which Paul admits that he also received, there stands the earliest church’s identification of Jesus with the suffering servant in Isaiah 53. Hengel points out the fact that Isaiah 53 is the only text among the Jewish scriptures that expresses the idea of “vicarious death” that atones for the sins of the whole people: ‘As a rule, the possibility of such representation [i.e., a representative death for the guilt of others] is rejected out of hand, since “a person may die only for his own sins” [Deut 24:16]. Moses’ request to God to forgive the sins of his people or to be able to die for them is expressly rejected by God himself: “I blot out from my book only those who have sinned against me”’.³⁷⁴ From this theological point of view, it seems reasonable to conclude that the pre-Pauline tradition in 1 Corinthians 15:3b identifies Jesus with the suffering servant in Isaiah 53. This point strongly suggests that even before Paul wrote his epistles, the identification of Jesus with the Isaianic servant had already been accepted among many early Christians.

Hengel thus stresses the enormous importance of Isaiah 53 on the New Testament as a whole: ‘at any rate, there are ten literal quotations [in the NT] from the fifteen verses of Isa.

³⁷³ Dunn’s assertion that Paul identifies the “him” in the quoted text of Isaiah with himself is gratuitous (1988, 865-6). Nowhere does Paul claim that he only goes to places where people have never heard of him (i.e., Paul). On the contrary, Paul was willing to proclaim the gospel where people already knew him (cf. Gal 1:21–24). Wagner and Schreiner rightly argue this point. Cf. Wagner 1998, 195-202; 2002, 329-36; Schreiner 1998, 770-1. See also Rom 10:16; Isa 53:1.

³⁷⁴ Ibid., 8. As Hengel acknowledges, 2 Maccabees 7:37–38 exhibits a similar idea (Ibid., 60). However, it is uncertain whether Paul or other early Christians could have resorted to the authority of this book with the formulaic expression *κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς*. F. F. Bruce claims: ‘While the New Testament writers all used the Septuagint, to a greater or lesser degree, none of them tell us precisely what the limits of its contents were. The “scriptures” to which they appealed covered substantially the same range as the Hebrew Bible’ (1988, 50). It is also important to note that the seven brothers in 2 Maccabees 7 do not regard their deaths as being entirely “vicarious”, since they, unlike the suffering servant in Isaiah 53, acknowledge that they suffer owing to their own sins (cp. 2Macc 7:32 with Isa 53:9).
52.13–53.12, and thirty-two allusions to it. As far as I can see, this is one of the best results for any Old Testament text to be found in the New Testament. Hence, when early Christians resorted to the authority of the “scriptures” in defence of the vicarious death of Jesus, the only appropriate text must have been Isaiah 53.

This is not to suggest that the earliest Christians understood the meaning of Jesus’ death only through the lens of Isaiah 53. On the contrary, there is overwhelming evidence that they reflected on his death through other passages, in particular through the Psalms (e.g., Mark 15:34; Ps 22:1; John 19:24; Ps 22:18). Moreover, they would have struggled to grasp the meaning of his death in relation to the overarching narrative of the Jewish scriptures (cf. Luke 24:25–32, 44–46; Acts 17:2–3, 11). Nevertheless, it must be stressed that even supposing that early Christians understood Psalm 22 as referring to the “vicarious” death of Jesus (cf. Matt 27:35, 39, 43, 46), they could have done this only because they read this text in the light of Isaiah 53 (cf. Matt 26:28), but not vice versa. Psalm 22 does not talk about the “vicarious” suffering on behalf of the people, but Isaiah 53 does. In sum, in the light of the exceptional theological view expressed in Isaiah 53, Hengel’s view that Isaiah 53 is one of the central backdrops of Paul’s soteriology is compelling.

1. 2. 2 Isaiah 53 within its literary context

Solid evidence suggests that Isaiah 49–55 as a whole, not simply Isaiah 53, is significantly important for Paul. Richard Hays points out, ‘Allusions are more difficult to quantify precisely, but the list in Nestle-Aland can serve as a rough indicator: out of fifty allusions to Isaiah in the

---

375 Ibid., 60.
seven-letter corpus, twenty-one of them point to Isaiah 49–55. \(^{376}\) To count Paul’s special interest in and familiarity with Isaiah 49–55, and given that Paul identifies Jesus with the servant of Isaiah 53, there are good grounds for assuming that Paul understands the significance of Isaiah 53 within its broader context.

Indeed, intertextual study between the book of Isaiah and the Pauline corpus is becoming a flourishing area of research in Pauline scholarship, and some important studies have been published in recent years.\(^{377}\) These studies convincingly demonstrate that Paul quotes a passage from the book of Isaiah in view of the broader context surrounding this passage. Concerning Paul’s understanding of Isaiah 52:12–53:12, Shum comments thus:

In view of the explicit citations from Isa. 53:1 and 52:15 respectively in Rom. 10:16 and 15:21, there is no doubt that Paul had good knowledge of the Suffering Servant Song when composing Romans. Also, the explicit uses of Isa. 52:5 and 52:7 respectively in Rom. 2:24 and 10:15 indicate Paul’s knowledge of the larger context of the Song, which at least indirectly suggests that Paul may well have been familiar with the Song too.\(^{378}\)

Moreover, some scholars convincingly show that Paul applies the second servant poem (Isaiah 49:1–13) to himself.\(^{379}\) In the light of the strong thematic unity between the second and the

---

\(^{376}\) Hays 1998, 205. Hickling also indicates, ‘Paul, however, seems to have had a particular predilection for Isaiah: in his case, some 26% of the Old Testament quotations are from that book – or rather, they are taken from a very small number of chapters in it…First, a number of passages in Isa. 40–55 seems to have attracted his attention…Within this section of the book, the part of the text most used is 49–51…A second group of quotations within Isa. 40–55 follows almost immediately on the first, and falls within chapters 52–55’ (1978, 215-6).

\(^{377}\) The Isaianic influence on the Pauline corpus as a whole, as conducted by Wilk (1998), is outside the scope of our research. Concerning the epistle to the Romans, see Wagner 2002 and Shum 2002. As regards Galatians, see Harmon 2010.

\(^{378}\) Shum 2002, 196-7 [Shum’s emphasis]. See also Haacker 2003, 100-1.

\(^{379}\) See Beale 1989, 562; Webb 1993, 128-133; and esp., Lim 2009, 133-4. Paul has a particular interest in the second servant poem. Lim enumerates a number of quotations of and allusions to Isaiah’s second
fourth servant poems (e.g., Isa 49:3; 52:13; 53:1), this point strongly suggests the possibility that Paul finds some continuity between Jesus’ mission and his own vocation on the basis of a holistic reading of Isaiah 49–55. Hence, the assumption that Paul takes a keen interest not simply in Isaiah 53, but also in Isaiah 49–55 as a whole, will be the basis of our research in this chapter.

1. 3 Textual issues

Concerning the textual problems involved in this study, we must be mindful of some complicated issues. It is no exaggeration to say that the Greek version of Isaiah itself forms a major area of research in biblical scholarship. The problem lies in the fact that, while there are not a few variants within Old Greek manuscripts, considerable differences are observable between Greek versions of Isaiah and Masoretic text (MT). Concerning the latter, scholarly

_________

servant poem in 2 Corinthians and in other undisputed Pauline epistles (2Cor 3:6,14,18; 4:4,6; 5:18-19; 6:1,2,4-10; Rom 11:13,25; 15:16; 1Cor 9:15; 15:10,58; Gal 1:15,16; 2:2,8-9; 4:11; Phil 2:16; 1Thess 2:1; 3:5). Ibíd., 131-2. For a more comprehensive list, see K. O. Sanders 1991, 62, n. 51. Gignilliat, however, opposes the view that Paul applies the second servant poem to himself: ‘the typological significance of the Servant is a weight too great to be placed on the shoulders of Paul. Someone greater than Paul is needed to carry the significance and it has been argued that this person is Jesus Christ’ (2007, 108-9). Against Gignilliat’s view, Lambrecht argues that we should not underestimate Paul’s emphatic usage of L. in this verse. As the time when the Corinthians received (δείξασατι) was in the past, so the time when Jesus laboured as the servant was in the past. And now is the time when Paul is co-working (cf. συνεργεύοντες) with God, which is highlighted by the contrast of Paul’s verbatim quotation from OG Isaiah 49:8 with his subsequent modification of this verse with the double νῦν. See Lambrecht 1989, 384.

This point is well explained by Harmon (2010, 117-219). E. P. Sanders helpfully comments, ‘It is the long-held Jewish expectation that, in the final days, Gentiles would come to worship the God of Israel…This is the second half of a standard Jewish expectation about the end: God would first restore Israel, and then Gentiles would come in…Paul saw himself as the agent of this, the second half of the divine plan. His job description was this: Apostle to the Gentiles in the Messianic Era’ (1991, 3-4).

Cf. Wagner 2013, 29, n.146.

As to this term, McLay explains, ‘[T]he text that is being used may represent a LXX reading, that is, it is part of the scriptural tradition that originated in the Greek Jewish community, but it does not necessarily represent the original reading for that book that can be critically reconstructed using textual criticism. For this reason, most specialists now reserve the term Old Greek (OG) to designate a text that in the judgement of the scholar represents the original translation of a book’ (2003, 6).

Concerning the Qumran texts, Sapp comments, ‘The Qumran textual variants in Isaiah 53 compared to the MT are minor’ (1998, 172). In this connection, the Aramaic text of Isaiah exhibits far more
opinion divides as to whether these differences should be attributed to the translator’s free renderings, or to the existence of unknown Hebrew texts that the translator might have rendered faithfully.\textsuperscript{384} Troxel points out another factor: ‘some renderings in LXX-Isaiah seem best explained as reflecting a Hebrew variant, while others are amenable to observation of the translator’s perplexity or his overall conception of the meaning of the verse or passage’.\textsuperscript{385}

Besides these points, we face a challenge of a different kind. While it is extremely difficult to ascertain which version of text(s) Paul normally uses in his personal reflection on the book of Isaiah and in writing his epistles, it is equally difficult to know in what manner Paul quotes from or alludes to the texts of Isaiah. One of the most fundamental questions is, as McLay puts it: ‘Did they [the NT writers] quote from memory or copy from a manuscript?’\textsuperscript{386} On this point, Wagner maintains, ‘\textit{Ancient interpreters relied heavily on memory even in conjunction with the use of written texts.} Paul in particular was raised in a culture that deeply valued an intimate acquaintance with Israel’s scriptures. In such an environment, the memorization of larger portions of scripture was probably the norm’.\textsuperscript{387} We can no longer take it for granted that Paul always uses the ‘septuagintal’ text of Isaiah.\textsuperscript{388} He might have utilised the Hebrew Isaianic texts

---

\textsuperscript{382} Troxel 2008, 80.
\textsuperscript{383} McLay 2003, 15.
\textsuperscript{384} Wagner 2002, 21 [Wagner’s emphasis].
\textsuperscript{385} Lim challenges Stanley’s view: ‘All modern investigators are agreed in viewing the Greek Septuagint as the primary Vorlage for Paul’s citations from the Jewish Scriptures’ (Stanley 1992, 67). Lim shows that, in some instances, Paul’s scriptural citations seem to reflect the texts of the DSS rather than those of
in his memory, and translated them into Greek when necessary. Although space does not permit us fully to engage in these problems, we must pay close attention to variants within Greek texts of Isaiah, as well as to the difference between Greek and Hebrew texts.

2. Meaning of the “suffering” of the servant

2.1 Introduction

In order to explore the significance of Isaiah 53 for Paul’s soteriology, it is useful, as a preliminary step, to consider what sort of soteriological conception would have emerged from the text of Isaiah 53 in the eyes of first century readers. In this regard, a number of scholars argue that Deutero-Isaiah adopts some sacrificial images to illuminate the suffering of the servant. For instance, Blenkinsopp suggests that Isaiah 53 alludes to ‘plural cultic images, such as a guilt (or sin) offering, a sacrificial animal, and a scapegoat’. Allen further maintains that the sacrificial ideas are the crucial theological backdrop to the suffering of the servant:

The Servant’s voluntary sacrifice of himself in behalf of the people by taking their sins and receiving their punishment is clear. The upshot of Isaiah 53 is threefold: 1) Isaiah clearly states that God ordained the Servant’s suffering, 2) the Servant is not suffering for his own sins, and 3) the Servant substitutes himself for the people and suffers for them. There should be no doubt that substitutionary atonement is taught in Isaiah 53.  

---

MT or OG. See Lim1997, 140-60. Hengel also comments, ‘Paul sometimes used a Greek text revised according to the Hebrew, as in his citation in Isaiah 52:7 in Romans 10:15, though in his immediately following citation in Romans 10:16 of Isaiah 53:1 he once again follows the Septuagint version’ (2004, 81).


Allen 2012, 184.
In this section, however, we question this conventional understanding. In the first place, it must be stressed that the maltreatment of the servant is incongruous with the Jewish notion of sacrifice. By definition, a “sacrifice” must be spotless and without blemish (cf. Lev 22:17–20; Mal 1:6–2:3). A sacrifice cannot be an object of punishment or torture, since this would jeopardise its spotlessness. In this light, the ill treatment of the servant, who is described as being “stricken”, “struck down”, “afflicted”, and “oppressed”, disqualifies the servant from being a spotless sacrifice to God. Hence, it is far from evident whether first century Jews who were familiar with the Temple cultus would have automatically associated the suffering of the Isaianic servant with the practices of sacrificial offerings.

Such extreme abuse of the servant is inconsistent with the role of the scapegoat in the Yom Kippur ritual, at least in the light of the description of Leviticus 16.391 The task of the scapegoat was not to be tortured as an object of punishment as the means of atonement, but simply to be a vehicle that carries away all the iniquities of Israel into the wilderness. Thus, it is not necessary that the scapegoat be afflicted, let alone be killed, as Milgrom explains: ‘According to the rabbis, the goat was pushed off a cliff (m. Yoma 6:6…). Philo, however, presumes that the goat was allowed to live (Plant. 61). Killing the goat was not essential, for the high priest would resume the service as soon as he was notified that the goat had reached the wilderness (m. Yoma 6.8…)’.392 Whybray also points out, ‘The ritual of the sending away of the goat may thus be seen as a symbolic action, or dramatization, of this definitive removal of sin, in this case from the whole people. There is no “suffering” or “punishment” imposed upon the goat that could in

---

391 There is a possibility that the scapegoat was maltreated in the late Second Temple period. We shall return to this point in due course.
392 Milgrom 1991, 1045. McLean explains, ‘it must be noted that the Levitical scapegoat was not a victim of mob feeling, but was carefully and dispassionately selected by casting lots. The ritual was deliberate, disciplined and limited in scope, not a spontaneous, uncontrolled act of mass aggression’ (1996, 67).
any way be said to be vicarious’. In what follows, then, we shall examine the validity of the popular view that the “suffering” in Isaiah 53 should be considered from the sacrificial perspective.

2. 2 Isaiah 53 and the blood sacrifice

As mentioned above, the image of the “suffering” servant contrasts with common Jewish notions of sacrifice. Moreover, in the light of the crucial role of “blood” in the Jewish sacrificial offering, the absence of this term in Isaiah 53 makes it more difficult to assume that the servant is likened to an animal for blood sacrifice. Many scholars take the appearance of the word לַאֲם in 53:10 as concrete evidence that Deutero-Isaiah had a blood-sacrificial image in mind, since this word normally signifies “guilt offering” in Leviticus 5. Oswalt thus maintains, ‘It is when the “life” of the Servant is offered as a sin offering that God’s purpose in bringing him to this place is realized (“prosper”).’ While the exact difference between תָּאֳם (“sin offering”) and לַאֲם is a matter of scholarly debate, it is true that both designations generally refer to a sacrificial offering.

Nonetheless, the highly ambiguous syntax of this sentence does not allow us to conclude that this must express the idea of sacrificial offering. As Whybray explains, ‘The verb לָאֲם/לַאֲם

---

393 Whybray 1978, 49.
394 E.g., Childs 2001, 417; Allen 2012, 178-80.
395 Oswalt 2003, 586.
396 Gerstenberger comments, ‘the substance of these two designations, however, can hardly be distinguished. Both are concerned with liberating from the contamination of sin generated by the perpetrator’s misbehavior. Accordingly, the cases in Lev. 5:21–24 (6:2–5E), which actually fall completely outside the definition of “inadvertent” transgressions, are also included in the catalog of sin offerings’ (1996, 65).
397 Joachimsen states the line in question (לָאֲם תְּאָם תָּאֶבֶם נְפָלִים) is ‘corrupt, disputed and untranslatable’ (2011, 386-90).
never occurs elsewhere in the Old Testament with the name of a sacrifice (whether or not) as its object. The phrase is unique. It cannot be said to be in any way an example of priestly or sacrificial terminology; and to take it for granted that it means “offer a guilt-offering” is to make an unwarrantable assumption’. He goes on to argue, ‘It is sufficient to conclude, especially in view of the remarkable possibilities of metathesis, haplography and dittography which this sequence of letters must have presented to a succession of scribes, that the text is so uncertain that 53:10 cannot properly be used to support any theory of the vicarious suffering of the Servant’. While a number of scholars still maintain that the text in question clearly denotes a sacrificial offering, an irrefutable argument is lacking.

In OG, on the other hand, an allusion to a sacrificial offering seems to be explicit: ἐὰν δῶτε περὶ ἁμαρτίας (Isa 53:10b). Since the phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας is the technical term that stands for “sin offering”, first century readers might have recognised a sacrificial image in this verse.

Yet, things are not quite so simple.

It is important to note that the form of the verb δίδωμι is the second person plural, which suggests that the agent who offers this sin offering is neither the Lord nor the servant. Indeed, there is a marked difference between MT and OG concerning this verse, as Ekblad explains:

‘The LXX of Isaiah 53:10 is completely different from the MT. The MT begins with a

---

398 Whybray 1989, 64. Koole, however, contends, ‘In my view, the v. refrains from using a common sacrificial term because there is now no question of a material compensation but of someone who offers himself’ (1998, 321).
399 Whybray, ibid., 66.
401 Concerning this phrase, there are no textual variants in ancient manuscripts. In later manuscripts, there are some manuscripts that replace ἁμαρτίας by πλημμελείας, which signifies “guilt offering”. The evidence is, however, late. Cf. Harmon 2010, 62, n. 61, 62.
402 As we studied in chapter 2, the phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας can signify both the blood sacrifice and the scapegoat in the Yom Kippur rite (Lev 16:5).
statement concerning the Lord’s delight in crushing the servant and making him sick if his life would make a guilt offering...In contrast, in the LXX a statement about the Lord’s desire to purify the servant is followed by an invitation for the addressees to give a sin offering resulting in their seeing a long-lived posterity. Hence, neither MT nor OG of 53:10 should be regarded as the decisive evidence that the servant is likened to a blood sacrifice.

A sacrificial image can be detected in 53:7b (“like a lamb that is led to the slaughter”). Admittedly, the immediate context of this phrase seems to be agricultural rather than sacrificial, as the following phrase suggests (“like a sheep that before its shearers”). Yet, first century readers might have seen the paschal lamb image in this phrase. A potential allusion to a paschal lamb would be more explicit in OG than in MT. In MT, the servant is depicted as ἀρνὴ (masculine) as well as ἀρνήτας (feminine), whereas he is described as ὡς πρόβατον (neuter) as well as ὡς ἄμνος (masculine) in OG. It is not clear why OG translator(s) adopted ἄμνος rather than its feminine form ἄμνας, but he may possibly have the paschal lamb in mind (cf. Exod 12:5). Interestingly, the combination of these two Greek words appears in Leviticus 14:10, which is the instruction for the purification ritual for lepers: καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ὑγιής λήμψεται δύο ἄμνους ἑναισθίους ἀμώμους καὶ πρόβατον ἑναισθίον ἀμωμον καὶ τρία δέκατα σεμιδάλεως εἰς θυσίαν. Hence, first century readers of OG Isaiah might have been reminded of a sacrificial...
victim of some kind when reading 53:7b.\textsuperscript{410}

2. 3 Isaiah 53 and the scapegoat

Some scholars maintain that the scapegoat image can be observed in the description of the suffering servant. The significance of the phrase \textit{נֶאֶס נֶאֶס חַדָּשׁ} in 53:12 becomes intelligible in the light of the scapegoat, as Whybray comments, ‘This is the only passage [Lev 16:22] in the Old Testament in which the phrase \textit{נֶאֶס נֶאֶס חַדָּשׁ} is used with an animal as the subject of the verb. [I]t is nowhere stated that an animal slaughtered in sacrifice “bears the guilt” of the person(s) for whom that the sacrifice is offered’.\textsuperscript{411} The similarity between these two phrases might therefore suggest a connection.

Another allusion to the scapegoat can be found in OG Isaiah. As regards Isaiah 53:4, while the servant is described as bearing “sickness” (אָמַרְתָּא) in MT, he is said to “bear our sins” in OG: \textit{οὗτος τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει}.\textsuperscript{412} Ekblad comments: ‘The LXX’s matching of different Hebrew words with \textit{ἁμαρτίας} in Isaiah 53:4ff specifies the LXX’s particular understanding of how the Lord responds to sin through the servant’.\textsuperscript{413} While these linguistic connections remain indecisive, there seems to be a conceptual similarity between the suffering servant and the scapegoat as to their roles. Admittedly, there is no evidence in Rabbinic literature that the suffering servant was likened to the scapegoat. However, at the end of the first century, the

\textsuperscript{410} Incidentally, a number of the Church Fathers clearly associated this passage with the death of Christ. For instance, in the fourth century CE, Ambrose writes, ‘How can he obtain freedom if he denies the Blood by which he was redeemed? For, it is the price of our freedom, as Peter says: “You were redeemed with the precious blood,”’…as He himself said: “I was led like a lamb to be sacrificed,”’. Ambrose, \textit{Letters to laymen 69}.

\textsuperscript{411} Whybray 1978, 48. See also Adela Yabro Collins 1998, 177; Blenkinsopp 2002, 351.

\textsuperscript{412} See also Isa 53:11, 12 in OG.

\textsuperscript{413} Ekblad 1999, 213. See also Hengel 2004, 124.
author of the Epistle of Barnabas identifies Jesus with both the Isaianic servant and the scapegoat (cf. Barn. 5.2,14; 7.6–11; 14.7–9). To be sure, this does not necessarily mean that the author of Barnabas detected the scapegoat image in the description of the Isaianic suffering servant. He might have simply depended on the two different strands of early Christian interpretations of the death of Christ. Yet, according to Barnabas, the scapegoat is described as the object of abuse, as all the people spit upon it and pierce it (cf. Barn. 7.8). This description is reminiscent of the maltreatment of the suffering servant. Stökl Ben Ezra argues that there are reasonable grounds for assuming that Barnabas reflects the historical scapegoat ritual. He argues that Barnabas’ description of the scapegoat ritual exhibits some commonality with another ancient source, the Mishnah. According to both texts, the scapegoat was roughly treated by the people (cf. Barn. 7.8; m. Yoma 6.4). Both sources also mention the scarlet ribbon on the head of the scapegoat (cf. Barn. 7.8; m. Yoma 4.2; 6.6).

In this connection, there is a possibility that the scapegoat was seen as an evil image in the late Second Temple period. The scapegoat was sent to the unknown figure “Azazel” (cf. Lev 16:8–10). There is evidence that this figure was associated with one of the rebellious angels called Asa’el, appearing in the book of Watchers. This demonic angel was imprisoned in a hole in the desert, while the scapegoat was dispatched to the desert (cf. 1 En. 6–11; Lev 16:21–22). Thus Stökl Ben Ezra suggests, ‘The punishment of the demon resembles the treatment of the goat in aspects of geography, action, time and purpose’. In the light of these

---

415 The book of the Watchers is the first part of 1 Enoch (1–36). According to this book, Asa’el and other angels corrupted humans through intercourse with human women, as well as by teaching forbidden things to mankind. They were bound by the archangels, and thrown into the darkness (1 En. 6–11). In 4Q180, 4Q181, and 4QBook of Giants, Asa’el is called “Azazel”. Cf. Stökl Ben Ezra 2003, 87, n.42.
416 For his detailed discussion, see ibid., 87-8. See esp., Hanson 1977, 220-5.
points, there seem to be reasonable grounds for assuming that some first century Jews regarded
the scapegoat as the object of “punishment”. Nevertheless, a conceptual analogy between the
suffering servant and the scapegoat is not so robust. Granting that the scapegoat was roughly
treated for whatever reason in the late Second Temple period, we have no evidence that first
century Jews thought that the scapegoat was punished on their behalf. They might have simply
wished to expel the creature that bore their sins from city of Jerusalem.

2. 4 Summary: sacrificial imagery in Isaiah 53

As discussed above, while the suffering servant depicted in Isaiah 53 could have evoked some
sacrificial images, such as the paschal lamb or the scapegoat, these images remain, at best,
impressionistic. It is difficult to claim that one of these images would have functioned as the
decisive lens through which first century Jews grasped the meaning of the “suffering” of the
servant. We shall now turn to a more fundamental reason why it is inappropriate to explore the
theme of the suffering befalling the servant from the sacrificial perspective.

2. 5 Suffering and the covenantal curse

The sacrificial system described in Leviticus 1–16, which includes a whole range of
blood-sacrificial rituals as well as the scapegoat ritual, was designed to maintain the covenant
relationship between God and his people. As Williamson comments, ‘sacrifice was the means
by which the central blessing of the covenant - communion between Yahweh and his people -
was ensured and maintained’.\footnote{Williamson 2007, 111.} When the covenant between God and Israel remains sound,
God’s people benefit from the divine presence among them, and the daily sacrificial offering as “a pleasing aroma” plays the key role to maintain God’s presence in the sanctuary (cf. Exod 29:38–46). Moreover, the people of Israel can escape the divine punishment by observing sacrificial remedies in a proper manner. However, once the covenant has been broken, God will abandon the sanctuary (Lev 26:31), and the people must endure the covenantal punishment, or the “curse” of the covenant, for the designated period (i.e., exile; cf. Lev 26:33–34). Davidson explains thus: ‘The people thought that redoubled assiduity in ritual and increase in the splendour of their gifts would atone for their offences, however great. But their idea was a misconception of the very principle of the ritual system, which had respect only to those true to the fundamental conditions of the covenant relations which they had transgressed’. What is more important, the sacrificial system itself has no power to restore the broken covenant. The people of the broken covenant had lost the sanctuary, which made it physically impossible to observe any sacrificial practice. Hence, the restoration of the covenant ultimately depends on God’s covenant faithfulness to the patriarchal promises (cf. Lev 26:42–45).

It is important to remember that Isaiah 40–55 as a whole addresses God’s people in exile, the severest form of the covenantal curse and punishment. In this situation, the people have to endure the designated term of punishment. Serving the full term of punishment is an important theme in Isaiah 40–55, as Gary Anderson explains,

“This image of the day laborer in the book of Job [Job 7:1–2] is crucial, I believe, for understanding the term in Second Isaiah. The laborer is hired for a specific unit of time, and at the end of that time, a commensurate wage will be owed for his service. Such is

---

418 Davidson 1904, 318.
419 See our review of E. P. Sanders in chapter 1.
the situation in the book of Second Isaiah, wherein the debt-slave is also obligated to fulfill a term of service. When the debt-slave has worked for a sufficient amount of time, the debts will be considered repaid and the term of slavery will end. 420

Koole argues that the theological view that reckons exile as a debt payment appears in the book of Leviticus, as the phrase יְהַלְעִיתָם (“they will pay their debt”) in 26:43 shows. Deutero-Isaiah uses exactly the same phrase in 40:2, which strongly suggests that he shares this particular understanding of exile. But Koole cautiously comments, ‘This “paying” does not in itself attribute merit to the suffering of the exiles. It is clear that the discharge of debt in [Isa] 43:25; 44:22; 48:9 is due to God’s initiative’. 421 The end of the exile can only be realised after the full penalty for the transgressions has been paid, but this would not happen without the divine initiative. In Deutero-Isaiah’s view, it seems that God singles out an innocent person, to suffer the covenantal punishment in full measure on behalf of his people (cf. 53:10). 422 Deutero-Isaiah does not explain how or why this suffering servant can bear the people’s sins and the consequences. Nonetheless, in the light of the narrative flow of Isaiah 49–55, the most plausible context for the suffering and death of the servant would be such a covenantal context.

Hence, in order to explore the theological background of the “suffering” of the Isaianic servant, we need, apart from the Jewish sacrificial perspective, to bring into the discussion a quite different idea, namely, that the suffering of a faithful Israelite could terminate the covenantal curse. Although Deutero-Isaiah does not explicitly use the term “curse”, the Deuteronomic idea of exile as the curse of the covenant is clearly articulated in his discourse

---

420 Anderson 2009, 47.
421 Koole 1997, 54.
422 As Koole rightly indicates, ‘Verse 6 [of Isaiah 53] elaborates on the foregoing in a number of ways. The “we” is defined at the beginning and end of the v. as “we all”. This means that these “all” are clearly distinguished from the one substitute’ (1998, 254).
(e.g., Isa 43:27–28; 50:1). In this light, we describe the soteriology of Isaiah 53 as follows: the suffering servant redeems and heals his people by bearing their sins and iniquities, and vicariously suffering the punishment as the curse of the covenant (cf. Deut 27:15–26; 28:15–68; Dan 9:11).

2. 6 Sacrifice and Suffering in the late Second Temple period

At this stage, for the overall purpose of our study, we shall make a necessary detour, in order to apply what we discussed above to the first century milieu. In the Second Temple period, especially at the time of the Maccabean crisis, one can find evidence that some Jews believed that the sufferings of the faithful could reverse the effect of the covenantal curse (cf. 2Macc 6:12–17; 7:32–38). As John Collins succinctly describes, ‘The deaths of the brothers will be instrumental in bringing to an end the age of wrath. The punishment of the nation was just, but the sufferings of the martyrs absorb the punishment and so bring it to an end’. While it is outside the scope of our research to provide a full investigation of the origin of such an idea, it is helpful to consider the relationship between “suffering” and “sacrifice” in the late Second Temple context. Clements suggests that the idea that the “suffering” could restore the covenant had been developed against the backdrop of the loss of the First Temple, which inevitably entailed the loss of the sacrificial means for maintaining the covenant. In his words,

The entire experience of defeat and exile had sentenced Israel to “die among the nations

---

423 As to the theological views of 2 and 4 Maccabees, see, e.g., Williams, Sam 1975; Van Henten 1997; Williams, Jarvis 2010. Nickelsburg argues that there are some allusions to the Isaiahic servant poems in 2 Maccabees 7 (cp. 2Macc 7:1 and Isa 50:6; 2Macc 7:10–11 and Isa 50:4; 2Macc 7:12 and Isa 52:14–15). Cf. Nickelsburg 1983, 243.
in an unclean land” (see Amos 7:17)...Yet the very agency and means by which holiness had, in past years, been assured to Israel, namely, the temple of Yahweh in Jerusalem, had been destroyed and rendered ineffective. Without the temple there could be no sin-offering to guarantee the continuance of a holy relationship to Yahweh. The ravages of guilt and disease, understood as the threats and misfortunes from which divine holiness brought deliverance, could no longer be held at bay. Yet now Deutero-Isaiah introduces his boldest of assertions, that God will accept sufferings of the Servant-Israel, perhaps largely focused on the specific sufferings of the unnamed prophet himself, as the [דָּבֶד] by which the restored nation will be purified.425

It seems that this Isaianic “suffering” theology persisted even after the re-establishment of the Temple and sacrifices. At least some Jews during this period had mixed feelings about the Temple and its cultus. At one end of the scale there existed “rejectionist” groups, such as the Qumran community, who withdrew from the Temple and its activities.426 From their viewpoint, especially after the Hasmonean family took over the high-priestly office, the Second Temple and its priests were so corrupt that there was no atoning effect in the Temple cultus.427 At the opposite end there were those, such as aristocratic priests, who fully endorsed the validity of the Temple and its cultus.

In between these two extremes, there would have been Jews who observed sacrificial activities yet were somewhat dissatisfied with some aspects of the Temple and/or its ruling priests.428 For instance, the book of Tobit, which was probably written before the Maccabean

---

426 Klawans defines “rejectionist” as follows: A rejectionist approach not only criticizes the current temple as inadequate in some way but also takes the critique to the next level by boycotting the temple and possibly by establishing some sort of alternative (2006, 147).
427 The “Animal Apocalypse (chs. 83–90)” in 1 Enoch, which is probably composed at the time of Judas Maccabeus, expresses a negative view of the Second Temple: ‘And they began again to build as before and they raised up that tower and it was called the high tower. And they began again to place a table before the tower, but all the bread on it was polluted and not pure’ (89.73).
428 It would be anachronistic to use the rabbinic sources uncritically, but rabbinic remarks about the corruption of the priests do fit well with the kinds of concern we find in Second Temple texts. It seems,
crisis, expresses some ambiguity about the rebuilt Temple. In his testamentary discourse, Tobit says that when the people return from the exile, “they will rebuild the temple of God, but not like the first one until the period when the times of fulfilment shall come” (Tob 14:5). Intriguingly, Tobit goes on to say that after “they all return from their exile” the Temple will be restored yet again, but this time its glory will match all that the prophets promised. This clearly shows that the author of Tobit is not content with the Second Temple. To be sure, dissatisfaction with the Temple does not necessarily mean a sense of uncertainty about the efficacy of the sacrificial activities in the Temple. Presumably, those Jews who participated in the Temple activities believed in the efficacy of sacrifices. Nevertheless, it seems that some continued to believe that the covenant relationship had not been fully restored even though the Temple and its cultus had been reestablished. There are two reasons for this conclusion.

First, as N. T. Wright maintains, there was an undeniable gap between a temple filled with divine glory, which was foretold by some latter prophets (cf. Ezek 43:1–9; Hag 2:7–9), and the actual state of the Second Temple: ‘Nowhere in the so-called post exilic literature is there any passage corresponding to 1 Kings 8.10f., according to which, when Solomon’s temple had been finished, “a cloud filled the house of YHWH, so that the priests could not stand to minister because of the cloud; for the glory of YHWH filled the house of YHWH”’. One of the crucial purposes of the sacrificial system is to maintain God’s presence, not least his glory (cf. Exod 29:43), in the sanctuary, as Klawans argues, ‘The purpose of the daily burnt offering –

---

429 Cf. N. T. Wright 2013, 154-5.
430 As the positive descriptions of the activities in the Second Temple, see the Letter of Aristeas 83-99; Sir 50.
431 N. T. Wright 1992, 269. See also N. T. Wright 2013, 95-108.
and perhaps some other sacrifices as well – is to provide regular and constant pleasing odors to the Lord, so that the divine presence will continually remain in the sanctuary’. Moreover, it is vital to remember that the Second Temple was inherently incomplete due to the lack of the most important component where God’s glory appears, namely, the Ark of the Covenant (cf. Exod 25:22; Num 10:35–36). In principle, Jews throughout the Second Temple period could not adhere closely to the prescription of the Yom Kippur blood ritual (Lev 16:13–15). In the light of these points, the absence of the divine glory in the Temple might have raised a question, at least among some Jews, concerning the effectiveness of the Temple cultus and the status of the covenant relationship.

Second, which is closely related to the previous point, there was also an undeniable gap between a glorious restoration of Israel foretold by the prophets, and the actual state of Jews as a nation. According to the book of Zechariah, the future state of Jerusalem shall be: “And it shall be inhabited, for never again shall it be doomed to destruction; Jerusalem shall abide in security” (Zech 14:11; cf. Jer 33:16). Hence, some Jews of the time seem to have believed that the covenantal curse, as evidenced by their perennial subjugation to ungodly Gentiles, still bore down on their nation. The prevalence of the so-called “penitential prayers” (e.g., Neh 9; Isa 63:7–64:11; Dan 9:7–19) in the late Second Temple period corroborates this point. Schuller states, “When we move beyond the canon of the Hebrew Bible and into the Greco-Roman period, we do have a great deal of prayer material, if we put together everything from all the caves of the Judean Desert plus all the prayers and hymns that appear in the Apocrypha and

---

432 Klawans 2006, 72.
432 See our discussion in chapter 3,3.4.
434 See especially Werline 1998.
Pseudepigrapha, plus prayers in Philo and Josephus’. Rom-Shiloni maintains that the thrust of these prayers is directed to the renewal of the covenant relationship: ‘The complaints and the petitions addressed to God in the laments designate him as the partner who should be called to renew the covenant relationship with his loyal, patient, though suffering, people (Lam 5:19–22).’ The wide popularity of this type of prayer strongly suggests that not a few Jews were uncertain whether the covenant relation with their God was fully restored. As James Scott argues, ‘One reason that the curse and the exile were seen as continuing during this period is that the glorious OT expectations of national restoration failed to materialize’.  

The idea that some kind of “suffering” might help to restore the covenant seems to have arisen in this historical context. In particular, on occasions when Jews were banned from conducting sacrificial practices and annual feasts (cf. 1 Macc 1:41–53; 2 Macc 6:1–11), such an idea would have been brought to the fore. This idea, however, coexisted with their belief in the efficacy of and need for sacrifices. This is because some Jews suffered and endured the harsh persecutions exactly for the sake of the restoration of the Temple cultus (cf. 2 Macc 10:1–8). All of this suggests the possibility that some Jews of this time imagined that both sacrifices and suffering were effective in relation to the covenant, though in different ways: the former helped to maintain the covenant, the latter helped to mitigate the ongoing effects of the

---

436 Rom-Shiloni 2006, 60 [Rom-Shiloni’s emphasis].  
437 Scott 1993a, 649.  
438 N. T. Wright argues, ‘In different ways, sacrifice, suffering, and the experience of exile itself were held to carry redemptive significance’ (1992, 301).  
439 In this connection, in the Second Temple period, some Jews might have thought that the means of atonement was not limited to the Levitical sacrificial system, as Sirah 3:30b writes, “so almsgiving atones for sin”. See also Sir 35:1–13; Jas 5:19–20. Cf. Gathercole 2002, 39.
covenantal curse. This point is highly suggestive to the overall purpose of our study of Paul’s soteriology.

With the discussion concerning the meaning of “suffering” in mind, we shall now explore how Paul might have understood the fourth servant poem within the broader context of Isaiah 49–55.

3. Isaiah 49–55

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this section is to delineate the major themes as well as the narrative flow of Isaiah 49–55 to which Paul would have paid particular attention. Prior to this investigation, it is necessary to clarify the aim and scope of our research.

Our starting point lies in the fact that Paul identifies Jesus with the suffering servant in Isaiah 53. Given this identification, other weighty issues are sorted out accordingly. For instance, for those Jewish Christians who were convinced that Jesus was the suffering servant depicted in Isaiah 53, the “many” who were to be justified by the servant were almost automatically identified with themselves (cf. Rom 5:19; Isa 53:11). With these assumptions, the following study shows that there are three major themes in Isaiah 49–55: the fulfilment of Abrahamic promises, the new Exodus, and the new creation. These visions are accomplished by the suffering servant, whose dual task is to redeem Israel as well as to bring salvation to the nations.

\[\text{\footnotesize\textsuperscript{440}}\text{ For some Jews, such as the author of 4 Maccabees, it seems that these two concepts are more or less conflated. See chapter 3.3.2.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize\textsuperscript{441}}\text{ See the detailed discussion offered by Shum as to the relationship between Hebrew texts of Isaiah 53:11 and Romans 5:19 (2002, 196-200).}\]
What is remarkable is that this is precisely the underlying narrative flow of the epistle to the Galatians, as will be demonstrated in the next chapter. Hence, the investigation conducted below is highly relevant to our main concern in the next chapter: Galatians 3:13 and its distinctive soteriological idea.

3.2 Macro structure of Isaiah 49–55

We examine first the macro structure of Isaiah 49–55. John Sawyer stresses the importance of the motif of “personified Zion”: ‘This [a close study of the Zion passages] is merely to highlight the vividness and effectiveness of the story, and the resemblance between the two motifs, the one [i.e., the servant poems] studied almost to the point of idolatry by Christian exegetes, the other almost totally ignored’. Patricia Tull Willey provides a convincing picture, arguing that Isaiah 49–54 consists of the interplay between two protagonists, Zion and the servant of the Lord:

Attention in chapters 49–54 actually alternates between Zion and the other metaphorical figure, the so-called “servant of YHWH,” who sometimes speaks and sometimes is spoken for. These sections are devoted to each figure. These sections alternate with one another:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isaiah References</th>
<th>Type of Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isa 49:1–13</td>
<td>Servant section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 49:14–50:3</td>
<td>Zion section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 50:4–11</td>
<td>Servant section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Isa 51:1–8]</td>
<td>Section addressed to masculine plural “you”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 51:9–52:12</td>
<td>Zion section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 52:13–53:12</td>
<td>Servant section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 54:1–17</td>
<td>Zion section</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sawyer 1989, 93. See also Woude 2011.
... Because of the interpretive weight traditionally given to the servant, relationships between the two entities have only recently begun to be examined.\textsuperscript{443}

Willey’s structural analysis is helpful, and sheds light on the neglected yet prominent figure of “personified Zion/Jerusalem”. Indeed, by paying particular attention to this figure, we can see clearly a narrative development in Isaiah 49–54, which highlights the dramatic reversal of the fortune of Zion (from the lamentation in 49:14 to the great joy in 54:1).\textsuperscript{444} Blenkinsopp also comments that the appearance of this figure signals that the narrative of Isaiah 40–55 moves to a new stage:

With this dialogue between Zion and Yahveh [sic] we reach a turning point in the book, and in the second main section of the book in particular. Up to this point the focus has been on Israel/Jacob, and Jerusalem/Zion has been mentioned only sporadically as city (35:10; 44:26, 28; 46:13) and as representative of Jewish communities (40:2; 41:27). From now on, this situation will be reversed, and the real and symbolic Jerusalem will emerge out of the shadows.\textsuperscript{445}

While the voice of Zion often represents the voice of the people of Israel (e.g., Isa 49:14), this voice is not the same as the voice of the servant. Hence, given that the servant also represents Israel, this means that Israel is somehow bifurcated, as Childs aptly comments, ‘The name Israel has largely been replaced by Zion/Jerusalem [in chapters 49–55]. The servant, now the

\textsuperscript{443} Willey 1997, 105-6. See also Blenkinsopp 2002, 339-40. To be sure, the implicit yet most important protagonist is the God of Israel himself, as Mettinger comments, ‘The idea of the Divine Warrior, who vindicates his kingship in a new victory over the forces of chaos, is something that gives a profound unity to the whole book of Isaiah 40–55. From the point of view of contents 51:9–52:12 with the proclamation of YHWH as king in 52:7 constitutes the summit’ (1997, 150).

\textsuperscript{444} As Sawyer aptly comments, ‘In the dozen or so passages about Zion there is a clear progression, from abandonment, loneliness and fear to fulfilment and joy; and the same goes for the Servant whose fortunes are traced from a time when he is weak and afraid and feels like a worm (41.14) to heroic suffering and triumph in ch. 53’ (1989, 99).

\textsuperscript{445} Blenkinsopp 2002, 310.
embodiment of Israel (49:3), moves to center stage and his response in suffering obedience is set in striking contrast to the complaint of Israel. The opposition and scorn of his opponents from within Israel mounts until it reaches a climax in chapter 53'. The narrative in Isaiah 49–54 revolves around the sharp contrast between the two protagonists.

Hence, we basically concur with Willey’s analysis of the structure of Isaiah 49–54. It is, however, possible to claim that both personified Zion and the servant of the Lord are implicitly mentioned in Isaiah 55 as well. While the servant of the Lord is not explicitly mentioned in this chapter, one of his crucial vocations, that of bringing salvation to the nations, is clearly articulated in 55:4–5. Likewise, although personified Zion does not appear in Isaiah 55, her image seems to be alluded to in 55:13. In 51:3, the transformation of Zion from the wilderness into God’s garden is foretold, and 55:13 describes the realisation of this vision. Thus, it is valid to include Isaiah 55 in the scope of our investigation. In what follows, we shall closely examine the roles of these two protagonists respectively, and consider the relationship between the two in Isaiah 49–55. This study will be the foundation of our investigation of Galatians in the next chapter where one of our goals is to demonstrate the close relationship between Galatians 3:13, which potentially alludes to the suffering servant, and 4:27, which explicitly mentions personified Zion in Isaiah 54:1.

\[446\] Childs 2001, 390.
3. 3 Personified Zion

3. 3. 1 Zion as the city as well as its inhabitants

Concerning personified Zion, Willey explains, ‘In Second Isaiah the city of Zion is personified as a woman bitterly lamenting her own destruction. This image of the city as weeping “Daughter Zion” shares important characteristics not only with previous Judahite literature, especially Lamentations, but also with Mesopotamian city laments’. Thus, in the first place, “Zion” represents the anthropomorphic image of the ruined city of Jerusalem itself. Zion is also described with a maternal image. The book of Lamentations and Isaiah 49–54 share the image of Zion as the mother of its inhabitants (cf. Lam 1:5, 16; Isa 49:20, 22, 25; 51:18, 20; 54:1). The lamentations of Zion are occasioned by the loss of her “children” (i.e., its inhabitants) due to their deportation. What Zion eagerly awaits is the repatriation of those who are living in foreign lands. Moreover, Baltzer suggests that the barrenness of Zion described in Isaiah 54:1 is associated with that of Sarah (Isa 51:2): ‘at the end of the primeval history and before the beginning of the stories about patriarchs and matriarchs, the text read: “Now Sarah was barren; she had no child.” This is a very marked passage, in which the root שָׁנָה occurs for the first time in the book of Genesis’. In Isaiah 49–54, Zion does not simply refer to the ruined city of Jerusalem. Zion is also a figurative representation of the people of exile (i.e., the “children” of Zion/Jerusalem), who

---

447 Willey 1997, 106.
448 Baltzer, 2001, 434. See also Brueggemann 1998, 151; Oswalt 1998, 415-6; Blenkinsopp 2000, 361. Jeremiah, on the other hand, associates Rachel with the land of Ramah, from where the people were deported to Babylon (Jer 31:15).
have been afflicted and enslaved by foreign powers (cf. Isa 51:16; 52:3–5). A close examination of the following passage illustrates this point:

**Isaiah 49:13–15**: Sing for joy, O Heavens, and exult, O earth; break forth, O mountains, into singing! For the Lord has comforted his people, and will have compassion on his suffering ones. But Zion said, ‘The Lord has forsaken me, my Lord has forgotten me.’ Can a woman forget her nursing-child, or show no compassion for the children of her womb? Even these may forget, yet I will not forget you.

Here, the God of Israel is described as the mother of the children, while the Lord is often depicted as the husband of Zion (cf. Isa 50:1). In this light, it seems that the “Zion” that is complaining is not simply the ruined city of Jerusalem that has lost its inhabitants, but also the people in exile, the “children” of mother Zion.

3. 3. 2 Three themes associated with Zion

(i) Abrahamic promise

Three points should be made with reference to the theme of personified Zion in Isaiah 49–54.

First, the hope of the restoration of Zion is rooted in God’s faithfulness to the patriarchal promises. Given that the desolation of personified Zion is compared to the barrenness of Sarah, it is plausible to find an implicit yet substantial relationship between the promise of the repatriation of its inhabitants and God’s promise to Abraham as to his heir (Gen 15:1–21; Isa 51:2). In 54:3–4, Deutero-Isaiah seemingly alludes to God’s promise to Jacob in Genesis

---

449 Torrey 1928, 402.
28:13–14, which is the repetition and reconfirmation of God’s promise to Abraham in Genesis 22. If this is correct, the restoration of Zion described in 54:1–2 is juxtaposed with the patriarchal promises. Strikingly, the very Abrahamic promise to which Paul refers in Galatians 3:8 is reaffirmed in Genesis 28:14.

The phrase “do not fear” in Isaiah 54:4 also has a patriarchal ring, which repeatedly appears in conjunction with God’s promise of blessing to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Gen 15:1; 26:24; 46:3; cf. Isa 44:2). The Abrahamic promises occupy a pivotal role not only in Genesis, but also in other parts of the Pentateuch. Indeed, the Exodus itself is a fulfilment of God’s promise to Abraham (cf. Gen 15:13–16; Exod 2:24). Likewise, in Isaiah 49–55, the Abrahamic promises are the basis upon which the hope of the restoration of Zion is built.

(ii) New Exodus

The second point, which is closely related to the first, concerns the depiction in Exodus language of the deliverance of Zion. Many scholars argue that the new Exodus is the central theme of Isaiah 40–55 as a whole. Indeed, the Exodus images are scattered throughout Isaiah 49–55 (e.g., Isa 51:9–11; 52:3–5, 12).

A heavy use of Exodus imagery becomes intelligible by considering the fact that the addressees of Deutero-Isaiah are viewed as being in a state of “exile”. In fact, “exile” and “exodus” are two sides of the same coin, as Goldingay comments, ‘End-of-exile faith has parallel features to exodus faith’. The ideas of both “exile” and “exodus” are fundamentally

---


rooted in the notion of “covenant”. Whereas “exile” is the climactic curse of the covenant triggered by grievous sins,452 “exodus” is a sign of the faithfulness of God to the covenant, which leads to the renewal of the covenant.453 As the first Exodus was the fulfilment of God’s covenantal promise to Abraham (cf. Gen 15:13–14; Exod 2:24–25), so also the Isaianic new Exodus is predicated on God’s faithfulness to his patriarchal, covenantal promises (cf. Isa 51:2).

(iii) New Creation

Thirdly, the restoration of the fortune of Zion is coupled with the realisation of the new creation for the whole created order.

Isaiah 51:3: For the Lord will comfort Zion; he will comfort all her waste places, and will make her wilderness like Eden, her desert like a garden of the Lord; joy and gladness will be found in her, thanksgiving and the voice of song.

Isaiah 55:12–13: For you shall go out in joy, and be led back in peace; the mountains and the hills before you shall burst into song, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands. Instead of the thorn shall come up the cypress; instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle; and it shall be to the Lord for a memorial, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off.

There exists a clear thematic connection between 51:3 and 55:12–13, as Goldingay and Payne explain: ‘Cypress and myrtle are the kind of trees that turn wilderness into woodland (cf. 41.19)’.454 In 51:3, the hope of the restoration of Jerusalem is imaginatively developed by way of a visionary transformation of the wilderness into the Eden-like new creation, and associated

453 Cf. Exod 2:24; 6:5; Lev 26:42, 45; Deut 7:8; Ps 105:8; 106:45; 111:5.
454 Goldingay and Payne, 2006 (vol. 2), 379. Moreover, as Blenkinsopp argues (2002, 372-3), Isaiah 55:12-13 can be viewed as a reversal of the curse upon the land of Eden described in Genesis 3:18.
with the promise of numerous descendants of Abraham (cf. Isa 51:2; 54:1–2). It is thus valid to see 55:12–13 as the affirmation of the statement in 51:3.

Deutero-Isaiah repeatedly and emphatically stresses that the God of Israel is the creator God of the whole universe (e.g., Isa 40:28). From this theological point of view, therefore, the redemption of Israel is inseparably linked to the redemption of the entire universe. The hope of a new creation is one of the central motifs in Isaiah 40–55 (e.g., Isa 44:1–5). Hence, 55:12–13 should be seen as a climactic statement of the whole section.

3. 4 The dual task of the servant of the Lord

3. 4. 1 Redemption of Israel

Having exploring the theme of Zion in Isaiah 49–55, we now examine another protagonist, the servant of the Lord, who accomplishes the redemption of Zion.

The primary task of the servant is to accomplish the redemption of Zion, which is a figurative representation of the exiled people. However, not all Israel responds positively to the salvific works of the servant. A close examination of Isaiah 50:10–11 will clarify this point:

**Isaiah 50:10–11:** Who among you fears the Lord and obeys the voice of his servant, who walks in the darkness and has no light, yet trusts in the name of the Lord and relies upon his God? But all of you are kindlers of fire, lighters of firebrands. Walk in the flame of your fire, and among the brands that you have kindled! This is what you shall have from my hand: you shall lie down in torment.

Blenkinsopp stresses the importance of this passage, ‘The concluding verses are crucial for interpreting the passage as a whole and perhaps also for the interpretation of Isa 40–55 as a
whole’. In 50:10, it is noteworthy that the phrase “fears the Lord” is juxtaposed with that of “obeys the voice of the servant of the Lord”. Needless to say, God’s people who obey the voice of the servant are not identical with the servant himself. Thus, the “servant” here does not represent the nation as a whole but an individual whose authority is given by God. In OG, this point becomes clearer: “Who among you is the one who fears the Lord? Let him hear the voice of his servant”.

More important, the whole passage suggests that there are two groups within Israel. One group of people trusts God and his servant even in the darkness. The other cannot wait for God’s help and thus try to kindle the fire by themselves. Indeed, the nation of Israel is divided over this servant. Some obey the voice of the servant, but the others do not, as Beuken maintains, ‘In der Paränese wendet derselbe kultische Beauftragte sich an zwei unterschiedliche Gruppen: die Gerechten und die Gottlosen’.

The fact that Israel is divided over the servant is an important hermeneutical key to interpreting Isaiah 49–55 as a whole. Blenkinsopp argues, ‘With this structural feature we are on firmer ground since, beginning with chap. 49, we note a very different set of concerns. We hear no more about Cyrus and the fate of Babylon, no more satire and polemic is directed against Babylonian religion and culture, and attention is focused exclusively on matters internal to the community’. The task of the servant is to redeem Israel, but his redemptive work causes discord within Israel.

---

455 Blenkinsopp 2002, 322.
456 Beuken 1973, 180. Blenkinsopp also explains: ‘The speaker therefore is distinguishing between those who revere Yahveh and heed the prophetic message, even though bewildered and confused, who are urged to trust that the predictions will be fulfilled, on the one hand; and those who choose to live by their own lights, on the other hand’ (2002, 322). See also Childs 2001, 396.
3. 4. 2 Salvation for the nations

Deutero-Isaiah envisages the servant’s second task as extending salvation far beyond the boundaries of Israel to the ends of the earth. As Isaiah 49:6 says: “It is too light a thing that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the survivors of Israel; I will give you as a light to the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth”. The theme of universal salvation through the servant of the Lord becomes more conspicuous in OG Isaiah. For instance, Isaiah 49:8 in MT reads: “I have kept you and given you as a covenant to the people (יִבְשָׂם)”. The Hebrew word יִבְשָׂם can signify the people of Israel (e.g., Isa 62:12), a foreign nation (e.g., 10:6), or even humanity in general (e.g., Gen 11:6). However, the corresponding word ἐκβάλειν in OG is plural, which clearly represents the “nations” rather than merely the nation of Israel. The OG rendering is particularly conspicuous in the light of the fact that the translator(s) of OG rendered the word יִבְשָׂם as γένος in its singular form in 42:6.458 Ekblad thus comments, ‘It appears that while the MT emphasizes liberation for Israel, the LXX stresses salvation for the nations. According to the LXX Israel serves as mediator between God and the nations, the servant through whom God’s salvation is accomplished’.459 The theme of universal salvation is once again stressed in Isaiah 55:

**Isaiah 55:4–5:** See, I made him a witness to the peoples, a leader and commander for the peoples. See, you shall call nations that you do not know, and nations that do not know you shall run to you, because of the Lord your God, the Holy One of Israel, for he has glorified you.

---

458 The same word appears in 49:6 in the OG, but not in MT.
While the identity of the “he” who has glorified the “you” (i.e., the God of Israel) in this passage is not specified, the thematic connection to the “servant”, through whom God is to be glorified, is incontestable (cf. Isa 49:3). In this connection, the “glory of God” and the “arm of the Lord” (cf. Isa 52:10; 53:1) are used interchangeably in the Exodus narrative (cf. Exod 14:17–18; 15:16). Hence, verse 53:1 can be paraphrased in this way: “to whom has the Glory of God been revealed?” It is the suffering servant through whom the God of Israel is to be glorified. Deutero-Isaiah envisions this glorification of the God of Israel being witnessed by all the nations (Isa 52:10). At this point, we can find a strong thematic unity between 52:10 and 55:4–5. That is, the servant of the Lord has glorified the God of Israel in the presence of all the nations, which causes them to run to the God of Israel. In the narrative flow in Isaiah 49–55 the salvation of the God of Israel has been extended from Israel to the nations. Moreover, salvation for the nations through Israel is also the fulfilment of the Abrahamic promise, since God made an oath to Abraham that his seed (σπέρμα; Gen 22:18 in OG) would bless the nations, to which Paul refers in Galatians 3:8.

3. 5 Summary

As discussed above, the fact that Zion and the servant of the Lord appear alternately in Isaiah 49–55 strongly suggests a close relationship between the two. The servant assumes the role of redeeming Zion, who represents the Israelites under the covenantal curse (i.e., exile), through bearing their sins as well as suffering punishment on their behalf. The redemption of Zion is the fulfilment of the patriarchal promises, and is also described as a new Exodus. Moreover, the restoration of Zion will herald the new creation of the entire created order. While the primary
task of the servant is the redemption of Zion/Israel, his salvific work for his fellow countrymen is not accepted by all of them. Rather, his ministry provokes internal strife within the nation of Israel. On the other hand, the scope of salvation brought about by the servant is not limited to the boundaries of Israel.

Whilst there are several noticeable differences between MT and OG, the basic story line of each text is by and large identical. Although OG seems to put more emphasis on the theme of universal salvation, this theme is no less important in MT.

4. Conclusion

This chapter has established two points. First, we examined the validity of the contemporary scholarly view that sacrificial ideas are at the heart of soteriology of Isaiah 53. From the first century viewpoint, while sacrificial images such as the paschal lamb or the scapegoat might be detectable, the abuse and harassment of the servant makes it difficult to liken him to any sacrificial offering. While the description of the suffering servant in OG is on some points markedly different from that of MT, neither tradition clearly depicts the servant as a sacrificial offering to God. Rather, the theme of suffering in Isaiah 53 is more intelligible in a covenantal context wherein the servant suffers in full the covenantal punishment and curse on behalf of his people.

Second, we examined the major themes of Isaiah 49–55, to which Paul would have paid special attentions. This section depicts the interplay between two protagonists: Zion and the suffering servant. The servant bears the sins of his people, and thereby accomplishes the deliverance of Zion. This deliverance is coloured with the Exodus language, and understood as
the fulfilment of patriarchal promises. Furthermore, the redemption of Zion leads to the redemption of the entire world, which also fulfils the Abrahamic promise.

In the next chapter, we explore ways in which these findings relate to Galatians. In particular, we ask whether the narrative flow of Isaiah 49–55 observed above can be found in the narrative substructure of this epistle.
1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this chapter

We now focus on one more critical passage for our study: Galatians 3:13. In the light of our study of Jewish sacrificial practices and ideas, it seems that the word *κατάρα* in this passage should not be interpreted in a sacrificial context, since the cursedness of Christ is incompatible with the holiness of sacrifice. We have examined, however, that Paul adopts several sacrificial terms in his soteriological statements (e.g., Rom 3:25). That Paul uses both sacrificial and non-sacrificial terms in his salvific statements raises a question of whether his soteriology is based on a consistent understanding of sacrificial ideas.

In what follows, we shall argue that Galatians 3:13 is indeed another piece of evidence that Paul understands the meaning of sacrifice within the covenantal framework. We contend that Paul here addresses the problem of those who are under the curse of the covenant. Since the sacrificial system is not designed for the termination of the covenantal curse, Paul sheds light on a different aspect of Jesus’ death as a solution of the plight of Jews.

In the previous chapter, we demonstrated the meaning of the “suffering” of the servant in Isaiah 53 is most intelligible in the covenantal context. This chapter argues that Paul’s statement in Galatians 3:13—“Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us”—makes good sense in this Isaianic context. This may sound odd, since Paul neither quotes from Isaiah 53 in this verse, nor does Deutero-Isaiah state that the suffering servant became a *κατάρα*. 
Nevertheless, we shall demonstrate 1) that there exists a structural similarity between Isaiah 49–55 and Galatians 2–4 at the level of underlying narrative, and thus 2) that the soteriology of Isaiah 49–55 forms the crucial backbone of Galatians 3:13–14.

As we saw above, the theme of the redemption of Zion is closely related to the three themes of the Abrahamic promises, the new Exodus, and the new creation. Dumbrell argues that the Abrahamic promises function as the basis for the fulfilment of the other two themes (the new Exodus and the new creation) and of another important theme (salvation for the nations) in Isaiah 49–55:

Already in the prophecy the use of the double name Jacob/Israel (cf. 48:1) has indicated the validity of the old election motifs and thus the belief is clear that the disaster of 587 B.C. has not cancelled out the ancient promises…the restoration of Zion means for Isaiah the direct continuity of the Abrahamic promises. This leads in [Isa 51:] 4–6 to the incorporation of the nations into the new sphere of salvation. In this way the second arm of the Abrahamic promises, Israel’s function in respect of the world, is referred to…After an address of reassurance to the redeemed in vv. [Isa 51:] 7–8, direct links between Creation, Exodus, and second Exodus are forged in vv. 9–11. The implicit link between creation, Sinai and Davidic covenants (cf. the specific mention of Zion in v. 11) is therefore offered. All occurs within the more specific Abrahamic framework with which the chapter has begun.

In this chapter, it will be shown that the same collocation of ideas is found in Galatians. In Paul’s discourse, the Abrahamic promises function as the foundation for other major themes,

---

460 In this section, we use the terms “narrative” and “story” as being basically synonymous. The term “story” itself is elusive, though. In our argument, “story” does not simply signify a literary form. Rather, “story” is taken to be the foundation of the epistemological activities through which humans perceive reality and grasp its significance. I basically follow the argument of N. T. Wright that “story” is the basis of human worldview. See N. T. Wright 1992, 31-144; 2013a, 456-537.

such as salvation for Gentiles, the new Exodus, and the new creation. Such a similarity between Isaiah 49–55 and Galatians is not coincidental. Rather, this suggests that Paul’s arguments in this letter are deeply rooted in Isaiah 49–55.

Before proceeding to this discussion, we should review how Pauline exegetes have understood Galatians 3:13.

1. 2 Scapegoat or Deuteronomic curse?

The peculiar expression “Christ becoming a curse” has puzzled Pauline interpreters for centuries. How does this contribute to the salvation of mankind? A long-standing hermeneutical tradition associates this statement with the scapegoat ritual. Around the end of the first century CE, the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas* likens Jesus to the cursed scapegoat that bears the sins of God’s people. This does not mean that the author of *Barnabas* must have interpreted Galatians 3:13 in this way, since it is not certain whether he even knew Galatians. Still, the fact remains that in the early stages of the Christian movement the association of Christ’s death with a “curse” was linked with the scapegoat image. Some other Church Fathers also compare Jesus to the scapegoat. Much later, John Calvin argued:

> The mode of expiation with the other goat is now more clearly explained, viz., that it should be placed before God, and that the priest should lay his hands on its head, and

---

462 Cf. *Barn*. 7:6–8; 16:3-4. There is a scholarly consensus that Barnabas was written after the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE.

463 The Pauline influence on *Barnabas* is a matter of scholarly debate. Paget comments, ‘Of course, whenever we debate the subject of Paul’s influence on an early Christian writer, we immediately face a number of methodological problems. If we do not know that a writer knew Paul’s letter, what criteria might we use to determine if a writer is making use of them?’ (1994, 208 [Paget’s emphasis]).

confess the sins of the people, so that he may throw the curse on the goat itself. This, as I have said, was the only bloodless (ἀναιματέων) sacrifice; yet it is expressly called an “offering,” with reference, however, to the slaying of the former goat, and was, therefore, as to its efficacy for propitiation, by no means to be separated from it...Another means, therefore, of making atonement to God was revealed when Christ, “being made a curse for us,” transferred to Himself the sins which alienated men from God. (2Cor. v.19; Gal. iii. 13.)

In the modern era, moreover, a number of commentators view the scapegoat ritual as the crucial cultic background of Galatians 3:13. Insofar as the history of interpretation is concerned, therefore, there are solid grounds for connecting the cursed Christ with the scapegoat. Nonetheless, an analogy between Christ and the scapegoat suffers from two weaknesses. First, Paul is not quoting from Leviticus 16:22, but from Deuteronomy 21:23. As F. F. Bruce comments, ‘The text which Paul quotes to this effect had reference originally to the exposure of the corpse of an executed criminal’. The scapegoat was not executed in lieu of criminals who deserved capital punishment. As already discussed in the previous chapter, some first century Jews might have imagined that the scapegoat was subject to divine punishment, as the fallen angel Asa’el/Azazel was. Yet, we have no evidence that such an understanding of the scapegoat was held by the majority of first century Jews.

Philo, a first century Jewish thinker, describes the scapegoat as follows: ‘The one on whom the lot fell was to be sacrificed to God, the other was to be sent out into a trackless and desolate

---

467 Bruce 1982, 164. Hays further comments, ‘by Paul’s time the passage had also been read by some other Jewish interpreters as a reference to the Roman punishment of crucifixion’ (2000, 260). Cf. 4Q169 Frags.3-4 I 6-8; 11Q19 64.9–13; Dunn 1993, 178; Martinez 2014,56-60.
wilderness bearing on its back the curses which had lain upon the transgressors (ἐφ’ ἐαυτῷ κομίζοντα τὰς ὑπὲρ τῶν πλημμελητάντων ἀράς) who have now been purified by conversion to the better life and through their new obedience have washed away their old disobedience to the law’ (Spec. laws 1.188b). According to Philo, the scapegoat bears the curses, rather than becomes a curse. This description is congruous with the basic function of the scapegoat in the Yom Kippur rite, its role being to carry away what is undesirable for God’s people. In Philo’s statement, the scapegoat is depicted as a carrier of the curses, rather than the object of them. There would seem to be a subtle yet substantial difference between Philo’s account and Paul’s expression of “Christ becoming a curse”. By quoting Deuteronomy 21:23, Paul stresses that Christ, who was hanged on a tree, was himself actually cursed (ἐπικατάφρατος). This weakens the supposed analogy between the scapegoat and the cursed Christ.

Second, Paul most probably wants his readers to connect Deuteronomy 21:23 with Deuteronomy 27:26, quoted in 3:10. Both of these passages pronounce a “curse” on the law-breaker. The “curse” Paul has in mind here would then not simply be the individual curse associated with the person who hangs on a tree, but the corporate curse that befalls those who are ἐξ ἐργῳν νόμου. The sacrificial system is designed to allow law breakers to compensate for their sins through offering a sacrifice to God. Once the worst covenantal curses, such as exile, have been unleashed, however, the usual sacrificial remedies, including the scapegoat ritual, are of no avail. According to Leviticus 26:43, the designated passage of time
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668 As Hays argues, ‘Paul omits “by God,” leaving the source of the curse unspecified, and uses the same word for “cursed” that appears in Deut 27:26, ensuring that the reader will link the passages together’ (2000, 260). C. Stanley also indicates, ‘Paul replaced the Perfect ἐκκατηραμένος with the neutral adjective ἐπικατάφρατος, which was ready at hand from his previous citation of Deut 27.26 in Gal 3.10’ (1992, 246). Cf. Bruce 1982, 165-6; Witherington 1998, 235-7.

669 We shall discuss this point fully in what follows.
(the “sabbatical years”) must elapse, and the covenantal people must endure punishment during that period before the exile will come to an end. Buchanan explains, ‘When Israel sinned she was expected to be treated like a covenanter in debt. If she failed to observe sabbath years, then the Lord would enforce the required obligations of rest for the land by removing the people to a foreign country for the number of sabbath years she had overlooked’.470 This sabbatical theology is unmistakably at work behind some biblical passages, such as Isaiah 40:2, Jeremiah 16:18, 25:11, 34:8–22, and Daniel 9:1–27.471 From this viewpoint, the usual sacrificial measures are not sufficient to terminate the covenantal curse and restore the covenant relationship. If Paul sees the nation of Israel as still under the state of exile in a figurative sense,472 the theological background of Galatians 3:13 cannot be adequately explained by the scapegoat ritual, since, as a part of the sacrificial system, that ritual would not be effective in mitigating the curse.

Finlan, who argues for a “scapegoat” soteriology, questions the view that the Deuteronomic curse is at the core of Paul’s statement in 3:13: ‘Salvation in the Deuteronomic setting comes if the whole community repents (Deut 30:1–3). A Deuteronomic curse is not removed by someone “becoming a curse” for the community; this metaphor requires either a Levitical or a Greek (pharmakos) background. That is the image in Gal 3:13b, even though Paul starts out with the Deuteronomic curse in 3:10’.473 However, as Finlan himself concedes,474 Isaiah 53 clearly expresses the idea that one person suffers and endures curses for the sake of

471 Ibid., 9-15.
472 We shall consider this point in due course.
473 Finlan 2004, 105.
474 Ibid., 107.
the whole community. We posit, therefore, that the **theological background of Galatians 3:13 should be found in Isaiah 53**, as Schoeps maintains.\(^{475}\) The Deuteronomic curse is indeed the crucial backdrop of Galatians, but Deuteronomy 30 does not provide a clear-cut explanation of how the covenantal curse is to be dissolved. We contend that, in keeping with the findings in the previous chapter, Paul has identified such a solution in Isaiah 53 rather than in the scapegoat ritual.

1. 3 Harmon’s intertextual analysis between Isaiah and Galatians

In what follows, we shall demonstrate that the most plausible theological background of Galatians 3:13 is the suffering servant in Isaiah 53. One of the crucial goals in this chapter is to establish a substantial tie between Galatians 3:13 and 4:27. In Galatians, 4:27 is almost the only passage that quotes directly from the book of Isaiah (cf. Isa 54:1), and this verse is critically important for an understanding of the Isaianic influence on the epistle to the Galatians. As discussed in the previous chapter, the narrative flow of Isaiah 49–55 revolves around the interplay between the two protagonists, Zion and the servant. Isaiah 54:1 is at the zenith of the narrative flow where the restoration of Zion is accomplished through the suffering of the servant. If Isaiah 53 is an element in the theological backdrop of Galatians 3:13, there is likely to be a clear connection between Galatians 3:13 and 4:27 in Paul’s train of thought. The children of Zion, who now consist of both Jews and Gentiles, have come to birth through the suffering of the servant, namely, Jesus the Messiah.

\(^{475}\) Schoeps states, ‘The crucifixion of the Messiah was in truth His elevation, as was promised for Yahweh’s servant in Is. 52:13, and it took place in order to do away the curse of the law by the realization of that curse: “for He became a curse for us”’ (1961, 179). See also Hays 2000, 261.
In this regard, Matthew Harmon has recently conducted a comprehensive survey on the intertextual relationship between Isaiah and Galatians. His central thesis is: ‘while some have regarded this final section [Gal 4:21–5:1] as an afterthought, our contention is that Gal 4:21–5:1 function as the climax of the argument begun in Gal 3:1 towards which Paul has steadily been building’. He argues that the hermeneutical key of this passage lies in Paul’s citation of Isaiah 54:1, through which Paul re-reads Genesis 16–21 allegorically as well as eschatologically. Harmon maintains that Paul recognises the significance of Isaiah 54:1 within the context of Isaiah 51–54, which constitutes the core of Paul’s gospel. In Harmon’s view, Paul deploys a number of Isaianic allusions and echoes in his arguments in Galatians 3–4, which anticipate the climactic usage of Isaiah 54:1 in Galatians 4:27.

Harmon further maintains that Paul does not simply allude to a number of Isaianic texts in his argument. Rather, there exists a “shared narrative pattern” between Galatians 1–4 and Isaiah 40–66. His description of the “shared narrative” is, however, not without problems. He delineates this as follows:

A Servant is commissioned by God from before his birth to glorify the Lord through his ministry. The ministry consists of being a light to the nations so that the Lord’s salvation might reach to the ends of the earth...But before that salvation can become a reality, the curse must be lifted. So a Servant takes upon himself the curse so that the

---

476 Harmon 2010.
477 Ibid. , 173 [my emphasis].
478 Ibid. , 176-80.
479 Ibid., 183.
480 Harmon provides a comprehensive list of the passages in Galatians 3–4, where he detects Isaianic influence (Ibid., 186). While it is outside our aim to evaluate the Isaianic allusions and echoes he finds, it seems that some cases are questionable (e.g., the combination of Gal 3:6–9 with Isa 51:1–8).
481 His view, however, has drawn some criticism. Ciampa states, ‘In my view, there is too much in the passage [Gal 4:21-5:1] that is clearly directly dependent on the Genesis text and to which Isaiah makes little or no necessary contribution’ (2012, 200).
promised blessings of salvation might flow to all who are identified with the Servant. As a result of the Servant’s sacrificial and substitutionary death and vindication, the eschatological people of God was born as the long-promised descendants of Abraham who receive the promised inheritance.  

This description raises some critical questions. Setting aside for now the question of the narrative substructure of Galatians, we shall focus on whether his account of the narrative of Isaiah 40–66 is adequate. Harmon describes the mission of the servant as follows: ‘The ministry consists of being a light to the nations so that the Lord’s salvation might reach to the ends of the earth’. This statement is at best half-true. As we saw, the primary task of the ministry of the servant is the redemption and restoration of the survivors of Israel, although his ministry causes internal discord among the people of Israel. Bringing salvation to the nations is of course an important task of the servant, but this belongs to the second stage of the mission of the servant (cf. Isa 49:6). This point poses a further question. While Harmon presumably wishes to say that the servant bore the “curse” of both Jews and Gentiles, as far as the Isaiahic text is concerned, it is difficult to make his case. From the narrative context of Isaiah 49–55, it is unambiguous that “my people” in 53:8 does not refer to the peoples of the nations, but to the people of Israel. In fact, in every extant text, this word does not refer to the “nations”, as Ekblad explains, ‘The LXX’s τούς λαοὺς μου agrees with the MT and 1QIsa against the corrected 1QIsa (‘his people’). In the narrative flow of Isaiah 49–55, the servant first redeems his people (i.e., Jews) from the curse of the covenant through bearing punishment on their behalf, and then

\[\text{Harmon 2010, 253.}\]
\[\text{As to the “narrative structure”, see Hays 2002 [1983], 82-95; N. T. Wright 1992, 69-80.}\]
\[\text{Ibid., 190.}\]
\[\text{Ekblad 1999, 235.}\]
he summons nations that do not know the God of Israel (cf. Isa 55:5). Although his ministry caused an internal dispute among his fellow Israelites, his primary focus was still the redemption of his people, through whom (presumably) he would accomplish the second stage of his mission, that is, to be a light to the nations (cf. Isa 49:6). Only through this two-tiered salvific process, does the prophet envisage the oneness of God’s people, which consists of all the nations:

**Isaiah 56:6–7:** And the foreigners who join themselves to him, to minister to him, to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, all who keep the Sabbath, and do not profane it, and hold fast my covenant – these I will bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt offerings and their sacrifices will be accepted on my altar; for my house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples (πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν in OG).

It is our contention that such a “two-tiered” salvific process can be observed in Galatians 2–4 as well. Paul contends that Christ redeemed those who are under the curse of the law (i.e., Jews), through whom the blessings of Abraham would be brought to Gentiles (Gal 3:13–14). This would result in the formation of one people of the God of Israel, made up of Jews and Gentiles (Gal 4:27; cf. 3:28). Our primary aim in this chapter is to delineate such a narrative substructure beneath Paul’s arguments in Galatians 2–4. However, this exegetical enterprise has already been undertaken by several prominent scholars. Therefore, in the following, we shall turn our attention to their works.
2. Narrative reading of Galatians

2. 1 Introduction

The epistle to the Galatians has always attracted keen interest in Pauline scholarship. This letter, however, has received renewed interest in recent decades concerning its narrative element. It is the seminal work of Richard Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11*, which redirects Pauline scholars to this line of investigation. In this section, we shall first examine the work of Hays, and then move to the studies of James Scott, Florentino García Martínez, and N. T. Wright.

What is to be discussed is not simply a literary review of these scholars’ works. Rather, through engaging actively and critically with these scholars’ exegeses, we shall establish our own reading of Galatians 2–4 in the Isaianic light.

2. 2 Richard B. Hays

2. 2. 1 Introduction

The dissertation of Hays, published in 1983, has exerted a critical influence on Pauline scholarship. In Hays’ own words, the thrust of this work is: ‘As we shall see through an examination of Gal 3:1–4:11, in certain key theological passages in his letters, the framework of Paul’s thought is constituted neither by a system of doctrines nor by his personal religious

---

486 The first edition was published in 1983.
experience but by “a sacred story,” a narrative structure’. One of the central yet controversial exegetical claims in this work is that the phrase “the faith of Christ Jesus” \(\pi\i\sigma\tau\varepsilon\omega\zeta \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\varepsilon\upsilon\sigma\vartheta\omicron\upsilon\) (']

Cf. Gal 2:16) is a catch-phrase that condenses and invokes the story of the life and the death of Jesus the Messiah. Since much has already been written about this study, we shall concentrate on a few exegetical points that are relevant to our research.

2.2.2 Galatians 3:13–14: The death of Christ, the Abrahamic promise, and the Spirit

First, Hays suggests a strong connection between Galatians 3:14 and Isaiah 44:3. This proposal is significant for our study, since Galatians 3:13 and 3:14 constitute a single passage on a syntactical level. If the theological background of Galatians 3:14 can be found in Deutero-Isaiah, the same could hold true for 3:13. Hays addresses one of the vexing exegetical problems posed by Galatians 3:14: a logical connection between the Abrahamic promise and the bestowal of the Spirit:

In Gal 3:14 it is clear that “the blessing of Abraham” is somehow equated with “the promise of the Spirit.” But how can Paul pose this equation? Nowhere in the OT does the promise to Abraham have anything to do with the Spirit. The content of the promise is clear: the land, descendants, and an eternal covenant. There is no reference to the Spirit at all. Yet Paul speaks of the presence of the Spirit as an obvious evidence that the promise is now fulfilled. Is this a purely arbitrary assertion?

---

488 Ibid., 8. In his commentary on Galatians, Hays succinctly explains this phrase as follows: ‘As v. 16 [Gal 2:16] suggests, this formulation does not originate with Paul; it is the common property of early Jewish Christianity. But what does it mean? The phrase “the faithfulness of Jesus Christ” makes sense only if we read it as an allusion to a story about Jesus, “who gave himself for our sins to set us free from the present evil age, according to the will of our God and Father (1:4)” (2000, 240 [Hays’ emphasis]). Concerning the scholarly debate on the phrase \(\pi\i\sigma\tau\varepsilon\omega\zeta \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\varepsilon\upsilon\sigma\vartheta\omicron\upsilon\) (“faith of Christ” or “faith in Christ”), see the dialogue between Hays himself and James D. G. Dunn. Hays 2002 [1983], 249-97.
489 Ibid., 181 [Hays’ italics].
On this point, Hays points out that there is an interesting similarity between Galatians 3:14 and Isaiah 44:3:

A partial answer might be found once again in Paul’s use of scriptural testimonies concerning the messianic seed. The key text is Isa 44:3: ἐπιθήσω τὸ πνεύμα μου ἐπὶ τὸ σπέρμα σου καὶ τὰς εὐλογίας μου ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα σου. This promise is addressed, to be sure, not to Abraham but to “my servant Jacob and my beloved Israel whom I have chosen” (Isa 44:2). Nonetheless, the parallelism between this passage and Gal 3:14 is very striking, and the association of τὸ πνεῦμα and αἱ εὐλογίαι with τὸ σπέρμα might be of significance for understanding Paul’s thinking.490

While Hays suggests a possible relation of Isaiah 44:3 with the Davidic messianic texts such as 2 Samuel 7:12–14,491 we shall pursue a different line of interpretation.

It is noteworthy that Isaiah 44:1–3 seems to be closely related to the contents of Isaiah 49–55. Although Isaiah 44:3 is slightly remote from Isaiah 49–55, the thematic and linguistic connections between them are conspicuous:

**Isaiah 44:1–3 (in OG):** But now hear, O Jakob my servant and Israel whom I have chosen! Thus says the Lord God who made you and who formed you from the womb (ὁ ποιήσας σε καὶ ὁ πλάσας σε ἐκ κοιλίας): You will still be helped (Ἐτι βοηθήσῃ); do not fear, O Jakob my servant and the beloved Israel whom I have chosen, because I will provide water in their thirst to those who walk in a dry land; I will put my spirit on your offspring and my blessings on your children.

The exact phrase “who formed you from the womb” is repeated in the second servant poem (Isa 49:5), though the person is changed from second (σε) in 44:2 to first (με). The phrase “You will

490 Ibid., 182-3.
491 Ibid. 183.
still be helped” also resonates with the phrase in 50:7 (κύριος βοηθός μου ἐγενήθη). From the surrounding context, the “servant” described in 44:1–2 seems to represent Israel in a collective sense (cp. Isa 43:10; 44:21). However, this figure can also be identified with the “servant” appearing in Isaiah 49–55, who confronts the formidable opposition within the nation of Israel. The “servant” depicted in 44:1–2 can be distinguishable from the “offspring” and “children” mentioned in 44:3. Their relationship is interestingly analogous with that between the suffering servant in chapter 53 and the “children” in 54:1. That is, the “servant” in 44:1–2 and chapter 53 is the agent who implements the will of God, while the “children” in 44:3 and 54:1 are the beneficiaries of God’s blessings. Admittedly, unlike the case of Isaiah 49–55, 44:1–3 does not talk about the “suffering” or “punishment” of the servant. However, the theme of “punishment” is present in Isaiah 44:1–3 as well. Morales points out the fact that 44:1–3 is preceded by God’s declaration of the punishment on Israel (cf. Isa 43:27–28): ‘the prophet describes the restoration that will follow Israel’s punishment’.492 He also indicates the fact that the outpouring of the Spirit is connected to the end of the covenantal punishment in one of the documents found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, ‘The connection between the “blessings” and the “Spirit” [in 4Q504 5.15–16] most likely alludes to Isa 44,3, the only verse in the OT to connect these two terms. The Words of the Luminaries thus associates the gift of God’s Spirit with the restoration of Israel after its punishment for failure to keep the covenant’.493

In Isaiah 53–54, the servant suffers covenantal punishment in full, and then the promised blessings are to be realised to his σπέρμα (cf. Isa 53:10). Hence, the thematic tie between the servant in Isaiah 44:1–3 and the servant depicted in Isaiah 53 seems to be stronger than it

492 Morales 2010, 22.
initially appears. Considering these points together, although we do not have explicit evidence, it is possible to assume that first century exeges let such as Paul interpreted Isaiah 44:1–3 in conjunction with Isaiah 49–55.\footnote{Blenkinsopp suggests this possibility (2006, 252).} If Paul alludes to Isaiah 44:3 in Galatians 3:14, this further suggests that Paul could also have the larger Isaianic context, most probably Isaiah 53, in mind.

In his commentary of Galatians, Hays conjectures this possibility:

> How is this outcome dependent on Christ’s redemption of Israel from Deuteronomy’s curse? Paul does not explain the connection…but we can make some guesses. The prophetic text that most powerfully shapes Paul’s vision of the eschatological inclusion of the Gentiles is the book of Isaiah. Isaiah holds forth the vision of God’s final redemption and restoration of Israel as a prelude to the gathering of the Gentiles to worship the one true God on Mt. Zion (e.g., Isa 2:2–4; 60:1–22).\footnote{Hays 2000, 261 [Hays’ emphasis]. We shall fully discuss the relationship between Galatians 3:13 and Deuteronomy’s curse in the next section.}

We strongly support Hays’ suggestion, and the following studies will bolster this point.

2. 2. 3 The shared narrative substructure in Galatians 3:13–14 and 4:3–6

Second, Hays argues that a parallel relationship exists between Galatians 3:13–14 and 4:3–6. While a number of commentators point out a way in which the two are related, there are other marked differences as well. Whilst 3:13 clearly refers to Christ’s death, this event is completely absent in 4:4–5, as Hays states, ‘The blessings of salvation are achieved, according to 3:13, through Christ’s death on a cross, but 4:4–5 says nothing about his death’.\footnote{Cf. Hays 2002 [1983], 78.} If Galatians 4:4–5 has nothing to do with Christ’s death, it is difficult to find a theological parallel between this passage and 3:13–14.
In this regard, Hays provides a fresh perspective. He suggests that Galatians 4:3–6 and 3:13–14 share the same narrative substructure, namely, Paul’s gospel story. The same story can be recounted from different angles, which produce different formulaic statements. He explains the absence of Christ’s death in 4:3–6 in this way: ‘We must remember that Paul is recapitulating the story by means of allusion, not narrating anew. His readers already know the story. Thus, Paul omits the performance syntagm [i.e., Christ’s becoming a curse].’

Moreover, Hays offers a unique solution to a vexing problem of identifying “we” and “you” in these passages. He considers this problem in the light of “narrative syntagms”, which demand the clarification of who/what the “Subject”, the “Object”, and the “Receivers” are within the narrative logic. He states that ‘we may note that in both formulations the Receivers appear in the following order: (1) Jews, (2) Gentiles, (3) “us” (Jews and Gentiles together). However, the two formulations tell the story from different points of view: in Gal 4:5 “we” means the Gentiles, whereas in 3:13 “us” means the Jews’.

Hays concludes, The analysis has shown that Paul has not artlessly spliced together contradictory christologies, that the two formulations do cohere fitly in the structure of the narrative model. Thus we can demonstrate that, even if these christological formulations have their origins in hypothetical pre-Pauline traditions, they are united, at the level of Paul’s usage of them, in a single story-structure.

Hays’ case is of great importance for our study, since it suggests that the various arguments
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497 Ibid., 97.
498 There is no space space to expound this literary theory. See Hays’ own detailed account (Ibid., 82-95, esp. 85).
499 Ibid., 106-111.
500 Ibid., 107. We, however, disagree with his view. In our review of James Scott below, we shall contend that in both passages “we/us” almost always refer to Jews in general or Jewish Christians in particular.
501 Ibid., 111 [Hays’ emphasis].
Paul offers in Galatians 3:1–5:1 may well be derived from the same story.

2. 2. 4 The word ἀκοὴ in Galatians 3:2 and 3:5

Third, Hays opens up the possibility that Paul’s gospel in the epistle to the Galatians is deeply rooted in the gospel foretold by Deutero-Isaiah. He suggests that the word ἀκοὴ in Galatians 3:2 and 3:5 carries a strong Isaianic connotation. In order to understand his argument, it is vital to turn our attention to the opening verse of Isaiah 53:

**Isaiah 53:1**: κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; καὶ ὁ βραχίων κυρίου τίνι ἀπεκαλύφη; (Lord, who has believed our report? And to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?)

The verse quoted above has verbal and thematic links to the preceding verse:

**Isaiah 52:10**: καὶ ἀποκαλύψει κύριος τὸν βραχίων αὐτοῦ τὸν ἄγιον ἐνώπιον πάντων τῶν ἔθνων, καὶ δύονται πάντα τὰ ἄκρα τῆς γῆς τὴν σωτηρίαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ. (And the Lord shall reveal his holy arm before all the nations, and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation that comes from God)

The combination of the verb ἀποκαλύπτω and the noun βραχίων appears in both verses, which evinces the thematic linkage between the two. Hence, there should be a strong tie between τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν (our report) and τὴν σωτηρίαν (the salvation). This point is corroborated by the expression ἄκουστήν ποιήσω τὴν σωτηρίαν σου (make your salvation reported) in the following verse:

**Isaiah 52:7**: ὡς ἁρα ἐπὶ τῶν ὁρέων, ὡς πόδες εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης, ὡς εὐαγγελιζόμενος ἀγαθά, ὃτι ἄκουστήν ποιήσω τὴν σωτηρίαν σου (légων Σιων Βασιλεύσει
σου ὃ θεός.

(Like season on the mountains, like the feet of the one who proclaims the gospel of a report of peace, like the one who proclaims the gospel of good things, since I will make your salvation reported, speaking to Zion, “Your God will reign”; my translation)

In this verse, “the gospel of a report of peace” is used synonymously with “the salvation reported”. Taken together these linguistic and thematic linkages suggest that the word ἀχοή can be construed as the gospel itself. In fact, Paul takes the Isaianic gospel (εὐαγγέλιον) as the synonym for ἀχοή (cf. Rom 10:15–16). Hays argues that the term ἀχοή appearing in Galatians 3:2 and 3:5 is identical with the word Paul quotes from Isaiah 53:1 in Romans 10:16. After considering other usages of πίστις, Hays concludes, “it is certainly possible to defend the translation of ἀχοή πίστεως in Gal 3:2, 5 as “the message of faith (=the gospel-message)”.”

Although Hays’ claim for the linkage between the gospel/report of Isaiah 52–53 and the gospel/report of the epistle to the Galatians is a bit cautious, his argument that ἀχοή signifies the “message” rather than the “hearing” substantially supports this line of interpretation. If Hays’ argument is correct, in the light of the fact that Paul does not explain what the “message of faith(fullness)” (ἀχοής πίστεως in Gal 3:2) stands for, he must have presupposed that his addressees already knew what he means by this “message”. In other words, the “story of Jesus” Hays proposes as the “message” of the faithful one (Jesus) can be identical with the story of the Isaianic suffering servant who is faithful to his covenantal calling. This point suggests that Paul elaborated on the contents of Isaiah 49–55 during his stay in Galatia.
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503 Ibid., 131.
504 Harmon insists that ἀχοή in Galatians 3:2 and 3:5 should denote a human action of “hearing”. However, this construction diminishes the force of his own argument that Paul here depends on Isaiah 53:1. Cf. Harmon 2010, 125-33.
2.2.5 Summary

In Hays’ work we focused on three points, which are highly relevant to the purpose of our investigation. First, the theological background of Galatians 3:13–14 can be found in Isaiah 44:1–3, which seems to have a strong thematic link to Isaiah 53–54. Second, Galatians 3:13–14 and 4:3–6 should be viewed as parallel passages, which share the same narrative substructure. Third, there is a possibility that Paul’s gospel is fundamentally rooted in the gospel of Deutero-Isaiah. In what follows, then, we shall examine the scholars who expand and bolster the line of argument Hays initiated.

2.3 James M. Scott

2.3.1 Introduction

Hays argues that Galatians 3:13–14 and 4:3–6 are based on the same story, the story of Jesus Christ. Scott moves this idea in a new direction, claiming that this story is also the story of Israel, which is implicitly articulated in Deuteronomy 27–32. According to Scott, the story of Jesus Christ is inseparably linked to that of Israel, since Jesus Christ is the protagonist of the story of Israel. He demonstrates this point in two of his works: his seminal thesis Adoption as Sons of God, and his article ‘For as Many as are of Works of the Law are under a

---

505 Although Scott does not advocate a narrative reading of Galatians, his arguments virtually imply this. Scott maintains that the “new Exodus” is the crucial backbone of both Galatians 3:13–14 and 4:3–6. Since the theme of the Exodus unmistakably involves a narrative element, it is permissible to use the terms “narrative/story” in our review of Scott’s works.


507 Some influential scholars, such as J. Louis Martyn, strongly oppose this idea. Martyn states, ‘Galatians shows us a Paul who does not accept “covenant” as a term indicating a fundamental building block of his theology…Neither does he present as his theology a form of Heilsgeschichte in which Christ is interpreted in line with Israel’s history’ (1991, 179).
One of the most crucial contributions of Scott’s works is to highlight the particular historical situation of Israel, namely, the protracted exile.

Scott’s main concern lies in exploring the relationship of Galatians with the book of Deuteronomy 27–32, rather than with Deutero-Isaiah. Nonetheless, his study is important to our investigation, since the historical and theological background of Isaiah 49–55 is the exile of the people of Israel, which can be seen as the covenantal curse depicted in Deuteronomy 27–29. The role of the servant is to rescue the people in exile from their predicament, a rescue which eventually leads to the blessings to whole world. Hence, Scott’s argument indirectly supports our contention that this Isaianic gospel is the gospel that Paul presents in Galatians.

A critical weakness of Scott’s argument must be, however, while he maintains that Galatians 3:10 is about the protracted exile of Jews caused by the fracture of the Mosaic covenant, he insists that Galatians 3:13 and 4:3–7 alike concern the new Exodus of both Jews and Gentiles from the curse of the Universal Law. We contend that both 3:10–14 and 4:1–7 recount the same story, that is, the new Exodus of Jews from the Mosaic curse, which overlaps with the new Exodus of both Jews and Gentiles from the dominion of sin. With this point in mind, we first review Scott’s discussion on Galatians 4:1–7.

2. 3. 2 Galatians 4:1–7: The new Exodus

An increasing number of Pauline scholars now argue that the new Exodus story underlies Paul’s various arguments in the epistle to the Galatians. While there may well be more allusions to
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508 The former is published in 1992, and the latter in 1993b.
509 N. T. Wright also stresses the importance of this theme, and we shall see his argument in what follows.
the Exodus story in Galatians than there appear to be at first glance, Scott focuses on Galatians 4:1–7. He overturns the conventional understanding of Galatians 4:1–7 as being based on the Greco-Roman law of testamentary guardianship, and claims instead that the crucial theological backdrop of this passage is the ancient Exodus story.

Indeed, long before Scott’s proposal, the conventional view had attracted some sharp criticism, such as: (1) In Roman law, the existence of a guardian presupposes that the father of an heir has already died, as ‘the Roman practice was that a fatherless boy was under the tutor until fourteen but he remained under a curator much longer, usually until twenty-five’. The custodian of property continues to manage the inheritance entrusted to him, until the minor/heir reaches the appointed age. Paul allegedly refers to this legal arrangement in 4:1–2. However, in 4:3–7, the father is still alive when “minors” reach the appointed age, and he dispatches his “son/heir” in order to make the inheritance available to other “sons”. Hence, from a Roman juristic point of view, it is extremely difficult to find any logical connection between 4:1–2 and 3–7. (2) In Greco-Roman law, even if “minors” of a citizen are in the custody of guardians, it is an exaggeration to call them “slaves”. This is because sons of a free citizen are by nature free

---

511 Wilson maintains, ‘Several leading motifs and a variety of imagery and language arguably stem from the Exodus (e.g. redemption, slavery and freedom, adoption as “sons”, inheritance of the promises to Abraham, new creation). More importantly, a close reading of the flow of Paul’s argument reveals striking parallels with the narrative sequence of the Exodus story: promises to Abraham > redemption from slavery > adoption as “sons” > heirs of the promise > inheritance of the kingdom (cf. 3.6–29; 4.1–7; 5.21). So despite a lack of explicit citations from the books of Exodus–Numbers, the narrative traditions surrounding the Exodus still seem to have had a paradigmatic influence over what Paul says in Galatians’ (Op. cit., 551).

512 Hafemann describes Scott’s exegesis on Galatians 4:1–7 as ‘a turning point in the exegesis of the argument’ (1997, 334, n.12).

513 See, e.g., Barrett 1976, 8. It is important to note that Roman law and Greek law are fundamentally different from each other in some critical points. Cf. Moore-Crispin 1989.

514 Witherington 1998, 282. He goes on to argue, ‘Paul here seems to envision the death of the father and the appointment in a will of guardians and trustees, a normal Greek procedure’ (Ibid., 283).
citizens, even though their access to the property/inheritance is restricted in their adolescence. They do not become “free” through “adoption” only after reaching the appointed age. In addition to these points, Scott marshals several lines of linguistic evidence that support his contention, and claims that we should seek the theological backdrop of Galatians 4:1–2 in the Exodus story. He contends that the term νήπιος alludes to the Exodus:

In the rest of the Corpus Paulinum, νήπιος occurs in an ethical and spiritual sense of those needing instruction and moral development (cf. Rom. 2:20; 1Cor. 3:1; 13:11; Eph. 4:14), but never in a legal sense such as “minor.” More probably, νήπιος alludes here to Hos. 11:1, where, in a unique way in the Septuagint, the term refers to Israel as “young” at the time of the Exodus when God called Israel out of Egypt as his “son.”...Hence νήπιος in Gal. 4:1 might well allude to Hos. 11:1, in order to recall both the traditional divine sonship imagery connected with the Exodus (cf. Ex. 4:22; Deut. 1:13, 14:1; Isa. 63:16; Wisd. 18:13; mAbath 3:14 [citing Deut. 14:1]) and the temporal nature of being νήπιος.

Scott stresses that we should not overlook the logical link between 3:15–29 and 4:1–7, forged by the key term κληρονόμος. God promised to Jacob, the legitimate heir of Abraham, as follows:

---

515 Moore-Crispin explains, ‘in complete contrast to the status of those under Romans patria potestas, Greek sons (and sometimes daughters) had rights over family property even in the lifetime of their parents’ (1989, 219).
516 Scott 1992, 123-5. See also Hafemann 1997, 334; Byron 2003, 182-5.
517 Scott makes another five points that bolster his contention: 1) Evidence which indicates that the word ἐπιτήρησις was used not only in a Greco-Roman legal context but also in a Palestinian Jewish law of guardianship. 2) Scholars often fail to recognise a potential link between Gal 3:29 and 4:1 in terms of the word κληρονόμος (i.e., “the seed of Abraham”). 3) Although the phrase κύριος πάντων is too often construed as referring to the “(potential) owner of all (of patrimony)”, it would be more pertinent to understand it as the universal sovereignty promised to the patriarchs. 4) The juxtaposition of ἐπιτήρησις with ὀλεθρόν makes it improbable that the former denotes “guardians”, since the latter does ‘not fit the picture of Greco-Roman guardianship’ (ibid., 136). 5) Although many scholars construe πρόθεσιμος as referring to ‘the date set by the father for the termination of the guardianship’, there is virtually no linguistic evidence to support this interpretation. Cf. Ibid., 126-45. The criticisms against these points, see esp. Goodrich 2010.
518 Ibid., 145-6.
519 Ibid., 129-30.
“and your offspring shall be like the dust of the earth, and you shall spread abroad to the west and to the east and to the north and to the south; and all the families of the earth shall be blessed in you and in your offspring” (Gen 28:14). In the Second Temple era, this passage was often interpreted as referring to the promise of inheriting the whole world.\textsuperscript{520} Hence, at the time of Paul, it would not have been strange to call the heir of Abraham “the lord of all things” (\textit{κύριος πάντων}; cf. Rom 4:13).

Likewise, it is no exaggeration to call the ancient Israelis in Egypt “slaves”, as Scott states, ‘From the time of the Old Testament on, Israel viewed its 400/430-year sojourn in Egypt as a period of enslavement. This was already seen above from the use of δουλοῦν in Gen. 15:13 itself’.\textsuperscript{521} Keesmaat also indicates, ‘Almost half of the occurrences of δουλεία in the LXX are in this [Exodus] context’.\textsuperscript{522} Hence, it is indeed possible to detect an echo of the Abrahamic/Exodus story in 4:1–2. Scott thus contends: ‘God is seen as Father in Gal. 4:2 under the influence of Hos. 11:1, to which \textit{νήπιος} alludes in v.1. According to the imagery of Hos. 11:1, God called Israel as his son out of Egypt at the Exodus. This is what Rom. 9:4 calls the \textit{υἱοθεσία} of the Israelites, the divine “adoption as sons” which the people of God received at the Exodus from Egypt’.\textsuperscript{523}

Having expounded 4:1–2, Scott goes on to argue that the relationship of 4:1–2 to 4:3–7 is that of \textit{type} (First Exodus) to \textit{antitype} (Second Exodus). Given the unity of Galatians 4:1–7 ‘in which vv. 1–2 comprise the so-called “illustration”, and vv. 3–7, the “application” introduced

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid., 134-5. See \textit{Jub.} 32:19; Sir 44:19–23. 
\item Ibid., 143. Cf. \textit{Exod} 20:2-3. 
\item Keesmaat 1999, 67. 
\item Scott, ibid., 148. 
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
by ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου in 4:3 and “those who were under the law (ὑπὸ νόμον)” in 4:5 are identical, and refer to both Jews and Gentiles. In Scott’s view, Paul considers that all humanity is, irrespective of covenantal status, born “under the law”. Paul also believes that all mankind are under the “curse” of the law as a result of their sins. (Although we do not concur with these points, for now we shall leave them open.) Scott goes on to argue:

A passage like Isa. 43:1–7, which looks forward to the redemption of Israel (v. 1) as the sons and daughters of God (v. 6) in the Second Exodus, probably contributed to the 2 Sam. 7:14 tradition, as Hos. 2:1 obviously did in Jub. 1:25. Moreover, the 2 Sam. 7:14 tradition connects the divine adoption of Israel with the reception of the Spirit in the
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524 Scott 1992, 121.
525 Ibid., 162.
heart (cf. Jub. 1:23; TJud. 24:3), just as in Gal 4:5–6. Particularly important is the fact that Gal. 4:4–5 brings the adopted sons of God into relation with the messianic Son of God, just as in the 2 Sam. 7:14 tradition.  

Scott concludes that the ultimate goal of the “new Exodus”, through which those who were under the curse of the law are to be rescued, is to grant the divine “adoption” (υἱόθεσία) to them, as the ancient Israelites were adopted as sons of God after the first Exodus event.

2. 3. 3 Criticism against the “Exodus” reading

Scott’s proposal attracts criticism from some scholars. John Goodrich points out three weaknesses in Scott’s argument: (1) There is virtually no linguistic connection between Galatians 4:1–7 and the Exodus narrative. (2) Paul’s use of the present tense in Galatians 4:1–2 makes it difficult to find any historical allusion in this passage. (3) In Paul’s understanding, the Exodus event was not a way to freedom, but the road to the enslavement to the Mosaic law.  

Among Goodrich’s three points, the second point would be the most formidable one. It is more plausible that Paul here delineates a general principle rather than a specific historical event. Hence, Scott’s claim that Galatians 4:1–2 refers to the Exodus from Egypt is not entirely convincing. Rather, the argument of Scott Hafemann seems to hit the mark better: ‘Paul is here viewing Israel’s period of childhood/slavery as an interpretive principle representing whatever
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527 Ibid., 178-9. By the term “2 Sam. 7:14 tradition”, Scott means: ‘Subsequent Jewish tradition takes up the Adoption Formula of 2 Sam. 7:14 and applies it eschatologically either to the Messiah (4QFlor. 1:11), to Israel (Jub. 1:24), or to both (TJud. 24:3)...it is plausible that early Jewish tradition would read the promise of a new covenant in Isa. 55:3 in light of the promise in Hos. 2:1 to reestablish Israel’s broken covenant relationship, including their divine sonship, and, from there, apply the messianically-interpreted Adoption Formula of 2 Sam. 7:14 to all Israel of the Restoration’ (Ibid., 104-5). It is also worth noting that 2 Samuel 7:14 was associated with Genesis 49:10 as a messianic text: ‘The messianic interpretation of “your offspring” in 2Sam. 7:12ff. goes back to pre-Christian Judaism, see “Florilegium” from Qumran (4QFlor 1.10–11). A paraphrase of Gen. 49:10 combines this text with 2Sam. 7:10 (4QPatrB1)’. Dahl 1977, 130, n.12.

period of time is contextually in view'. It is clear that Paul sees not simply their sojourn in Egypt, but the whole period of the history of Israel as the period of slavery (cf. Gal 3:23–24).

Goodrich’s third point is, however, not persuasive. Paul, along with his Jewish contemporaries, would have clearly distinguished the significance of the Exodus event itself as God’s act of deliverance from the subsequent history of Israel characterised by their continual rebellion against God. That is to say, even if the people of Israel quickly and repeatedly fell prey to the bondage of sin, the Exodus event must have remained as the symbol of the way to freedom, which would have been implanted in the hearts of Jews through the celebration of the annual Passover feast. Hence, given that the theme of “freedom” plays an important role in this epistle (Gal 5:1), it is plausible that the Exodus story underlies Paul’s discourse from 4:1 onwards. As Scott argues, there is a strong thematic as well as linguistic parallel between Galatians 4:4–7 and Romans 8:14–17. If, as Keesmaat contends, the Exodus story underlies Romans 8:14–17, the same would hold true for Galatians 4:1–7. Indeed, the “Exodus” reading of this passage fits in well with the following passage (Gal 4:8–11). Wilson discusses that the motif of “wanting” to turn back to the state of slavery in 4:9 is reminiscent of the Israelites’ wilderness experience in the Exodus narrative, to which Paul refers in 1 Corinthians 10.

We must explore this point further.

In the Exodus narrative, the Israelites in Egypt were in the state of slavery (Exod 20:2–3). Likewise, the Galatians in a pre-conversion state is described as being “enslaved to beings that by nature are not gods” (Gal 4:8). In the subsequent Exodus narrative, the Israelites in the
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529 Hafemann 1997, 337.
530 Cf. Scott 1992, 244-52.
531 Keesmaat 1999, 54-96.
wilderness often grumbled: “would it not be better for us to go back to Egypt?” (Num 14:3). This was not simply a matter of grumbling, however. Rather, it was a rebellion against the God of Israel, since they implicitly chose Pharaoh as their lord. In the case of the Galatians, however, the issue is not about whether to return to idolatrous worship of pagan idols, but to start observing the Mosaic law. Does Paul, then, equate the Mosaic law (τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου; Gal 4:3, 9)\(^5\) with τοῖς φύσει μὴ ὁσιὸν θεοῖς (Gal 4:8), which presumably signify pagan idols? It is not necessarily the case. Instead, it seems that Paul insists that the ex-pagan Galatians now participate in the renewed covenant of Israel, and hence share the history of Israel as well (cf. 1Cor 10:1). Therefore, if the Galatians return to the Mosaic law, this signifies that they run counter to the salvation history of Israel that God is now leading through Christ and the Spirit. Hence, this move is tantamount to the rebellion of the Israelites in the wilderness, who attempted to run counter God’s salvific move conducted through Moses.

If this reading of Galatians 4:8–11 can be maintained, this dovetails with the “Exodus” reading of Galatians 4:1–7. Paul seems to presume that the Galatian Christians are wandering in the symbolic world of “wilderness”, through which they are advancing to the promised heritage of the whole world.

2. 3. 4 Galatians 3:10

(i) Problems of the traditional interpretation

---

\(^5\) The exact meaning of στοιχεῖα is a matter of scholarly debate. This term normally refers to material constituents of the cosmos. In the light of 4:5, however, it is more likely that this refers to the Mosaic law that was caught up in the power of sin (cf. Gal 3:22). Cf. Delling, “στοιχεῖα,” *TDNT* 7:670-87.
Galatians 3:10–14 is arguably one of the most controversial passages in the New Testament. Each verse has sparked furious exegetical and theological debate. In this passage, Scott focuses on Paul’s use of Deuteronomy 27:26 in 3:10, which sheds crucial light on the meaning of the whole passage. His study on Galatians 3:10 is interesting for another reason. His exegesis on this verse leads us to an understanding that seems to contradict his reading of Galatians 4:5, not least of the phrase ὁ πᾶ ὁ νήμων, which we reviewed above. We shall return to this point in due course.

In 3:10, Paul appears to warn that anyone who attempts to obey the whole law will be cursed (cf. Gal 5:3–4), although Deuteronomy 27:26, which Paul quotes here, ‘pronounces a curse on the person who does not continually follow the requirements of Torah’. How can Paul make such a claim? It seems that Paul implicitly suggests that the Mosaic covenant does not provide sacrificial remedies to those who break the law. That is to say, since there is no sacrificial remedy, even a single breach of the law inevitably leads anyone who tries to do the whole law into the curse of the law. Thus, Westerholm assumes Paul’s implicit presupposition as follows: ‘100 percent fulfillment is needed if one is to be found righteous’. Schoeps also reconstructs an implicit premise that underlies Paul’s argument: ‘His implied meaning, that no man can fulfil the law, is really intended to suggest the whole law in its 613 commands and prohibitions. It is for this reason the curse of the law strikes every man, for –see Eccl. 7:13– the complete observance of the law among men, i.e., among sinners, does not exist’.

Any attempt to obey the law is doomed to failure, because there is no way of compensating a breach
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534 C. D. Stanley 2008, 150.
535 Westerholm 2004, 375, n.66
536 Schoeps 1961, 176-7 [Schoeps’ emphasis]. See also Morris 1955, 53; Bultmann 1952, 263.
of the law. Hence, even a single breach of the law incurs the curse of the law.\footnote{Admittedly, this way of reading had already emerged in the second century CE. Cf. Justin, \textit{Dialogue with Trypho} 95.}

If this is what Paul had meant, however, his opponents could have immediately pointed out the logical flaw of Paul’s scriptural argument, since the Jewish scriptures do not demand \textit{sinless perfectionism} from those who observe the law. On the contrary, the Mosaic law presupposes human frailty, as Hays argues:

This is such a ridiculous caricature of Judaism, however, that it could hardly have been taken seriously as a persuasive argument in Paul’s time. If Paul had made such claims, the rival Missionaries could easily have refuted him by pointing out that the Law makes ample provision for forgiveness of transgressions through repentance, through the sacrificial system, and through the solemn annual celebration of the Day of Atonement.\footnote{Hays 2000, 257. E. P. Sanders states, ‘No rabbi took the position that obedience must be perfect. Pharisees and rabbis of all schools and all periods strongly believed in repentance and other means of atonement in the case of transgression’ (1983, 28). Moreover, Wisdom comments on Josephus’ statement in \textit{Ant.} 4.311-313 as follows: ‘Josephus writes that it is improper worship of the Lord which results in the curse, not the violation of one of the individual commandments in the law’ (2001, 119).}

As our study of Yom Kippur for first century Jews showed,\footnote{See chapter 2.3.2.1-3.} at least some pious Jews in this period, who humbly acknowledged their failure to obey all the commandments, firmly believed that God graciously forgave their imperfectness through Yom Kippur.\footnote{This does not mean that there was no Jew who felt confident in, even boasted of, the total obedience to the law in the first century CE. Judaism at that time was a diversified entity, and there would have been some Jews who had such mentality (cf. Phil 3:6). But even these Jews would still have believed in the efficacy of sacrifice that compensated their shortcomings. Moreover, what must be stressed here is that the Jewish scriptures do not demand perfectionism concerning the law (i.e., leaving no margin for error).} Hence, if Paul had made such an assertion without explaining why even the slightest breach of the law results in the covenantal curse despite the availability of the ample remediable procedures, his opponents could have censured Paul for distorting the scriptures. In such a case, Paul’s already threatened...
credibility and authority would have been totally ruined by his rivals. Schoeps provides a harsh comment on Paul’s alleged scriptural argument: ‘It is clear that in the heat of the contest Paul had allowed himself to be driven to make assertions which on calmer reflection he could hardly have maintained seriously, if only to run the risk of ridicule’.\textsuperscript{541} We cannot discount the possibility that there could be, among Paul’s rival mission, some Jews who took Paul’s argument as Schoeps takes it. Indeed, if anyone who attempts to fulfil the law falls automatically into the curse of the law, it raises a question of why God granted the law to Israel. It may suggest an embarrassing conclusion that God gave Israel the law in order to curse them, though Paul would have firmly rejected such a view. We should also be careful not to assume anachronistically that Paul exerted an unchallengeable authority over his congregations (cf. 2Cor 3:1; 10:10; 13:3). Rather, given Paul’s shaky situation in the Galatian crisis, he must have provided biblically solid reasoning why those who are of the works of the law are under a curse.

(ii) Subjection to the gentile power as a sign of the covenantal curse

A more plausible case is that Paul herein resorts to a common awareness among Jews, which even his rivals were forced to concede.\textsuperscript{542} From the political point of view, it was undeniable that Jews were in a state of “slavery” (cf. Gal 4:25).\textsuperscript{543} According to Josephus, Herod Agrippa II exclaimed to the riotous Judeans that they were actually “slaves”:

\begin{quote}
Passing to your present passion for liberty, I say that it comes too late. The time is past when you ought to have striven never to lose it. For servitude is a painful experience (ἡ ἀδικία).
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{541} Schoeps 1961, 183.
\textsuperscript{542} This is the point made by N. T. Wright (1991, 147).
\textsuperscript{543} Thielman 1989, 65-72; 1994, 127;
γὰρ πείρα τῆς δουλείας χαλεπή) and a struggle to avoid it once for all is just; but the man who having once accepted the yoke then tries to cast it off is a contumacious slave (ασθάδης δοῦλος ἔστιν), not a lover of liberty. 544

From the theological perspective, this miserable situation should be attributable to the Mosaic covenantal “curse”. The Jewish scriptures manifestly state that Israel’s subjugation to a foreign power is a clear sign of the covenantal curse, as Deuteronomy states:

**Deuteronomy 28:15**: But *if you will not obey the Lord your God by diligently observing all his commandments and decrees*, which I am commanding you today, then *all these curses shall come upon you and overtake you.*

**Deuteronomy 28:25**: The Lord will cause you to be defeated before your enemies; you shall go out against them one way and flee before them seven ways. *You shall become an object of horror to all the kingdoms of the earth.* 545

For those first century Jews who were familiar with the scriptures, ‘[t]he presence of foreign dominion unambiguously signifies that the covenantal curses are “clinging” to the people as God’s punishment for their refusal to repent’. 546

There is some evidence to suggest that Paul thinks his Jewish contemporaries have been under the covenantal curse as the result of the fracture of the covenant. First, in 1 Thessalonians 2:15–16, Paul describes ‘the death of Jesus as the culmination of Israel’s rejection of the prophets’. 547 In other words, Paul sees that even before Jews’ rejection of Jesus, they have continually been invoking God’s wrath by rejecting his prophets. Second, Paul’s harsh denunciation of the Jews of his day in Romans 2:17–25 strongly suggests that Paul, in line

545 Cf. Deut 28:48; Judg 2:14; 6:1–2; 10:6–9; Ezra 9:7
547 Scott 1993a, 651.
with OT prophets such as Jeremiah, asserts that the Jews as a nation have broken the covenant. Timothy Berkley points out, ‘The most important *vocabulary correspondence* has to do with the triad of charges against the Jew in Rom 2:21–22 of stealing (κλέπτειν), committing adultery (μοιχεύειν), and temple robbery (ἰρροσωλεῖν). They are paralleled in the list of indictments in Jer 7:8–11’.⁵⁴⁸ He further argues, ‘[Paul’s] point is that the efficacy of that mark of the covenant for salvation from wrath is lost if the covenant is not kept’.⁵⁴⁹ As Jeremiah contended that God’s covenant people could not simply rely on the symbol of the covenant, the Temple, which they profaned (cf. Jer 7:1–34), so Paul claims that Jews cannot rely on the mark of the covenant, the circumcision, which they nullify (Rom 2:25). On this point, Paul most probably alludes to the theme of the “circumcision of the heart” in the book of Deuteronomy.⁵⁵⁰ This theme only appears twice in the book of Deuteronomy (Deut 10:16; 30:6; cf. Jer 4:4; 9:25). Notably, in the latter instance, it is said that God himself will circumcise the heart of his people at the time of the great restoration of Israel. This conversely suggests that until the realisation of the circumcision of the heart, Israel must have been kept under the covenantal curse (cf. 2Cor 3:15). It is remarkable that Paul here quotes from Isaiah 52:5, where Deutero-Isaiah recapitulates the “history of Israel’s subjection” to gentile nations (Rom 2:24).⁵⁵¹ Paul suggests that this history of subjection still continues down to the present time.

---

Scott’s interpretation on Galatians 3:10

Scott argues that Paul’s shared awareness with his Jewish contemporaries that the covenant has been fractured is the basis of Paul’s assertion on Galatians 3:10. There is evidence that the negative assessment of the covenant status was held by at least some Jews who considered that the repentance of Jews as a nation was not deep enough. He points out that the penitential prayer in Daniel 9 is predicated on the Deuteronomic historical perspective, that is, all Israel are under the “curse” of the law. The wide circulation of this type of penitential prayer among first century Jews suggests that this Deuteronomic perception of history was deeply ingrained in people’s hearts.

Although there are many other prayers like Dan. 9.4–14 in the Second Temple period which could be adduced here, the foregoing examples suffice to make the point. There is a widespread penitential prayer tradition based on Daniel 9 which recognizes that the curse of exile warned about in Deuteronomy 27–32 for violating the covenant has indeed come upon Israel as of 587 BCE, and that the condition of exile would persist until God, in accordance with his own mercy and timetable, would listen to Israel’s confession of sin and bring in the restoration as Deuteronomy 27–32 had promised.

The Danielic idea of prolonged exile appears to have its roots in the book of Deuteronomy itself. This book stresses the perdurance of the covenantal curse: “If you do not diligently observe all
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552 Scott 1993b, 198-9.
553 See our discussion in chapter 4, 2.6. This is especially true for the Qumran community. Werline comments, ‘Even though they are daily prayers, the Qumran community believes that the Jews are in crisis. The nation’s sin has brought God’s judgment and the Jews are living in the last days. Therefore, while penitential prayer is a daily activity, it is also part of life in the “age of wrath” that leads to the eschaton’ (1998, 194).
554 Scott 1993b, 205-6. Cf. Ackroyd 1968, 242. The theology of “prolonged exile” can be observed in the Damascus Document (CD). As to CD I. 5–6, Knibb comments: ‘The first is that in contrast to Ezekiel [4:5] the three hundred and ninety years refer to the exile of the southern kingdom, not the northern. That is to say, we have here a reinterpretation of the length of the exile on a par with Daniel’s reinterpretation of the seventy years’ (2009, 201).
the words of this law that are written in this book, fearing this glorious and awesome name, the Lord your God, then the Lord will overwhelm both you and your offspring with severe and lasting afflictions and grievous and lasting maladies” (Deut 28:58–59). Paul probably amalgamates this passage with Deuteronomy 27:26 in Galatians 3:10. He might be creating a summative effect through multiplying the covenantal oath of “twelve curses” (Deut 27:15–26) by the oracle of the “lasting” curses (Deut 28:58–59), all of which would serve to remind his Galatian audience of the real peril of becoming partakers of the Mosaic covenantal curses.

It is also vital to note that in the Jewish scriptures the divine covenantal wrath is primarily poured out collectively rather than individually. Although some scholars attempt to discount the significance of this aspect in Paul’s argument, this is exactly the pattern that frequently appears in the Jewish scriptures. Kaminsky emphasises this point by referring to the actual case of “exile”:

The notion of sin being stored up over numerous generations and finally being released in a disproportionate manner upon the sinner, or the generation, that finally pushes God beyond his limit, is one that was discussed at length in the previous chapter. The whole notion of transgenerational punishment presumes that God can and often does store up sin in this fashion. The clear evidence for the existence of this principle can be found in the reaction to the respective Northern and Southern exiles. The deuteronomistic history portrays the generation that received such punishment as guilty, but it also stresses the notion that the punishment has been accumulating for a long period of time.
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556 Hays rightly stresses this point (2000, 258).
557 E.g., Schreiner 1993, 49-50.
558 Kaminsky 1995, 59. He further comments, ‘Each of these passages [Deut 4:23–26; 29:23–27; 2Kgs 17:14–18; 2Kgs 22:17] speaks rather directly about the ability of Israel to misbehave and thus transgress God’s covenant, and by doing so to stir up divine wrath. Once this divine wrath reaches a critical point, it is poured out upon the nation in the form of the covenantal curses that eventuate in the exile of the nation’ (Ibid., 61). See also Gen 15:16.
Paul unmistakably grasps the aspect of sin as “something being stored up” (cf. Rom 2:1–11; 12:19–21, 1Thess 2:16), which suggests that he is fully aware of the *durative* and *collective* aspect of the covenantal curse resulting from the outburst of divine wrath (cf. Deut 29:27–28).

The cumulative force of these points indicates that the aim of Paul’s quotation from Deuteronomy 27:26 is to hammer home that those who wish to bind themselves to the Mosaic covenant are inevitably destined to be under the ongoing covenantal curse. As Francis Watson comments, ‘The Pauline claim that “those who are of works of the law are under a curse” (Gal. 3.10) derives not from the assumption that the law requires an impossible sinless observance, but from the deuteronomistic interpretation of Israel’s history.’ With this line of understanding of the “curse”, Scott concludes:

With Daniel, Paul had at his disposal a tremendous scriptural advantage when he appealed to his Gentile addressees in Galatia to consider the means by which they received the Spirit (Gal. 3:1–5). He could evidently assume that his addressees knew and accepted Daniel 9 and the related Old Testament/Jewish traditions. He could therefore confidently posit in Gal 3.10 that the threatened curse of Deut. 27.26 had not only come upon Israel historically but also that it continued to abide on the people to his day. To the question, ‘Did you receive the Spirit by works of the law, or by hearing of faith?’ (Gal. 3.2, cf. v. 5), Paul was answering in effect that the former possibility is completely ruled out on the basis of Old Testament/Jewish tradition: the law did not bring the Spirit, but rather a long-term curse on Israel.

Hence, those “under a curse” denotes the specific group whose identity is defined by the Mosaic law. Paul’s usage of “curse” and “blessing” terminology is in this respect akin to that in the *Rule*
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559 We shall further defend this point in the next section.
561 Scott 1993b, 214-5.
of Community, as Werline explains, ‘This is an important transformation in the blessing–curse formula. Previously, as Nitzan argues, both blessings and curses applied to the same people and corresponded to this one group’s behavior. Now at Qumran, however, the inside group receives the blessings while it reserves the curses for the outsiders’. Likewise, Paul pronounces the “blessings” of Abraham exclusively for one group who are “in Christ” (Gal 3:9, 14), and the “curses” for those who are ἐξ ἑργῶν νόμου, or ὑπὸ νόμου (Gal 3:10, 13; 4:4).

We find Scott’s argument on Galatians 3:10 convincing. His argument on this verse poses, however, a question as to his exegesis on Galatians 4:5, which we studied above. Scott maintains that the “curse” of the law mentioned in 3:10 befalls Jews under the Mosaic covenant. He, however, asserts that Paul in 3:13 insists that Jesus redeemed from the “curse” not only Jews but also Gentile Christians who, before their conversion, had never observed the Mosaic law. Scott’s argument suggests that while Paul in 3:10 exclusively refers to the plight of Jews under the Mosaic covenant, he suddenly changes to another topic of the human plight under the Universal Law in 3:13.

According to Scott, Paul believes that the curse of the law is applicable to all humankind, irrespective of the observance of the Mosaic law, ‘The expression ὑπὸ νόμου in v. [4:]5a recalls the curse which the law pronounces upon mankind as a result of sin’. Scott further insists, ‘Paul teaches elsewhere that the law condemns both Jews and Gentiles (cf. Rom.
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562 Werline 1998, 136. Nitzan further explains, ‘Here [1QS 2.1–18], unlike the Bible, we no longer find a group of blessings posed against a group of curses, both of which are addressed to the same people. Instead, there is one group of blessings invoked upon those who enter into the covenant and undertake to observe it, and against it there are two groups of curses: first to those who do not enter the covenant, and second to those who have entered the covenant, but intentionally violated their commitment’ (1994, 126).

563 As to the significance of the contrast between “blessing” and “curse” in Galatians as a whole, see esp., Wilson 2007. See also Lee 2013, 32.

564 Scott 1992, 156.

565 Ibid., 174.
3:9–20) and thus confines them (Gal. 3:23). Since this issue is critically important to our study, we shall now evaluate the plausibility of Scott’s understanding of the phrase ὑπὸ νόμον in Galatians 4:5.

2. 3. 4 Critical assessment of Scott’s arguments

(i) Who are “under the law”?

Scott maintains that Paul regards all humanity, Jews and Gentiles alike, as being “under the law” in Galatians 4:5. We do not, however, concur with him on this specific point for two reasons.

First, this reading contradicts Paul’s usage of the phrase elsewhere, as the detailed studies of William Wilder and Brian Rosner convincingly demonstrate. For instance, in the case of 1 Corinthians 9:20, those who are ὑπὸ νόμον are clearly and exclusively identifiable with Jews under the Mosaic law. In fact, Paul plainly refers to Gentiles as “those outside the law” (1Cor 9:21; cf. Rom 2:12). In Romans, Wilder painstakingly demonstrates that the concept of “under the law” is not necessarily equated to that of “slavery to sin” (which condition is applicable to all humanity; cf. Rom 3:9) in this epistle. He indicates the fact that ‘while Paul freely denies that the Romans are “under the law” (6:14–15) he is careful only to affirm that they were once “slaves of sin” (6:17)’. This point is corroborated by the fact that Paul writes that Jesus was ὑπὸ νόμον (Gal 4:4). Since it is unlikely that Paul believes that Jesus was enslaved by the power

---

566 Ibid., 173.
567 Ibid., 173.
568 Wilder 2001, 80 [Wilder’s italics]. It is also noticeable that Paul clearly states that Gentiles “do not possess the law” (Rom 2:14; cf. Rom 9:4).
of sin, the term ὑπὸ νόμου simply indicates the historical fact that Jesus was under the Mosaic law.

Wilder also points out that Paul presupposes that the dominion of sin over humanity had already been established prior to the introduction of the Mosaic law (Rom 5:12–14), which proves that “slavery to sin” is not necessarily identical with the situation “under the law”. Rather, the latter signifies the worst condition of the former. When a person is under the dominion of sin, the act of giving the law to him does not alleviate but accelerates his miserable situation. As Wilder claims, ‘although Paul understood existence “under the law” to refer specifically to the Jews, he also understood such experience as a representative subset of human experience in general insofar as it expressed in its most potent form the more general human plight of slavery to sin’. This point is further strengthened by Paul’s argument in Romans 1–3:

**Romans 2:12**: All who have sinned apart from the law will also perish apart from the law, and all who have sinned under the law (ἐν νόμῳ) will be judged by the law.

**Romans 3:19**: Now we know that whatever the law says, it speaks to those who are under the law (ἐν τῷ νόμῳ), so that every mouth may be silenced, and the whole world may be held accountable to God.

While Paul here uses a different phrase (“in the law”: ἐν νόμῳ), he clearly distinguishes those who are bound by the law (i.e., Jews) from those who are outside the law (i.e., Gentiles). Gathercole argues, ‘It is difficult to expand the concept of those in the Law to the whole world…There is very little evidence that gentiles were subject to judgment according to Torah
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569 Paul also indicates that to be given the law is one of the prerogatives of Jews (Rom 9:4).
570 Ibid., 81.
571 Cf. 1Cor 9:21.
in Paul’s theology’. Paul repeatedly stresses that the possession of the law is the divine prerogative of Jews (Rom 2:17, 23; 9:4). Jews are, however, denounced by the law precisely because of this prerogative (Rom 3:19).

Nowhere in the other Pauline letters can we find a passage that refers to Gentiles as being “under the law”, we can therefore reasonably infer that, particularly in the light of the foregoing discussion, the same holds true for the epistle to the Galatians. In this epistle, however, the exegesis of the phrase ὅπο ἕμοι in 3:23 has become a fierce point of contention among Pauline scholars. It therefore deserves close attention. In order to understand the meaning of this phrase, it is vital to establish the context in which it is situated. With regard to the phrase ὅπο ἐμαρτίαν in the previous verse (i.e., Gal 3:22), the interpretation proposed by de Boer is brilliant, though our reading of the overall context from Galatians 3:19 onwards is significantly different from his. He aptly draws attention to the words τὰ πάντα (“all things”) in Galatians 3:22, which is neuter plural, and he compares it with the word πάντας in Romans 3:9, which is masculine plural. Since the latter clearly refers to “both Jews and Greeks” (cf. Rom 11:32), the former cannot have the same meaning. In this light, de Boer renders Galatians 3:22 as follows: “But the scripture imprisoned all things, including (the works of) the law, under the power of Sin.” The law, like everything else, is a captive of Sin’. This reading coheres with the preceding context, in which Paul stresses the inability of the Mosaic law to give life (cf. Gal 3:21). The implied logic behind verse 3:22 can then be expressed in this way: “Jews are given the law, but
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572 Gathercole 2002, 213.
573 Bruce Longenecker indicates, ‘In a sense, many of the differences among contemporary interpretations of Galatians arise from different understandings of the relationship between what Paul says in 3:22 and in 3:23’ (2012, 73).
574 De Boer 2012, 107 [de Boer’s italics]. See also de Boer 2011, 235. This is precisely the point Paul makes in Romans 7:7–25.
the law itself is under the power of sin. Thus, as a corollary, Jews are under the power of sin.”

De Boer’s argument on the next verse, however, is unconvincing. He insists that the “we” in 3:23 refers to ‘all believers in Christ, whether of Jewish or Gentile origin’.\(^{575}\) If this is the case, it implies that the word νόμος here does not represent the Mosaic law but a sort of universal law that is applicable to Jews and Gentiles alike, though de Boer is not unambiguous on this point. Whilst de Boer identifies νόμος in 3:17 and 3:19 with the Mosaic law,\(^{576}\) he does not provide a convincing account of why Paul suddenly employs the same word with a different meaning (i.e., the universal law) from 3:23 onwards. Moreover, if νόμος in 3:23 refers to a sort of universal law, it means that this law had been the disciplinarian (παιδαγωγός) of Jews and Gentiles alike, until Christ came (cf. Gal 3:24). We should, however, pay attention to the fact that Paul carefully switches the first person plural to the second person plural in verses 3:25–26: “But now that faith has come, we are no longer subject to a disciplinarian, for in Christ Jesus you are all children of God through faith”. In this light, and provided that it is more natural to construe the “law/disciplinarian” mentioned in verses 3:23–25 as identical with the “law” described in 3:17 and 3:19,\(^{577}\) the most plausible interpretation is that the “we” refers solely to Jews and the “you” refers to the Galatian Christians, respectively.\(^{578}\) Consequently, the appropriate context from Galatians 3:19 onwards is the history of Jews, in particular their experiences under the guardianship of the Mosaic law. Hence, those who are ὑπὸ νόμον mentioned in Galatians 3:23 must signify “under the Mosaic law”.

---

\(^{575}\) De Boer 2011, 240-1, 264; De Boer 2012, 108.


\(^{577}\) We have no good reason to doubt this, since both of them are depicted in the same historical time-table.

\(^{578}\) See especially the argument of Stendahl (1976, 21-3).
We therefore conclude that in the undisputed Pauline letters there is not a single instance that identifies those who are “under the law” with humanity in general.

(ii) Who are “under the curse of the law”?

Second, even supposing that Paul believes that the putative universal law exists and is applicable to everyone, and that all human beings are to be judged by this universal law, this does not mean that Paul thinks that all humanity are under the “curse” of this universal law. It is not the law _per se_ that causes “curses” or “blessings”. Rather, through the act of covenant-making, either or both parties make an oath, by which they are to suffer from the curse if they breach the covenant. The Israelites were liable for the curse of the law, since they swore an oath to obey the Mosaic law:

_Deuteronomy 27:26_: “Cursed be anyone who does not uphold the words of this law by observing them”. _All the people shall say, “Amen”_.

In the Deuteronomistic prophetic traditions, the “curse” only functions within the covenantal framework, as Weinfeld explains, ‘As the maledictions were a sanction against breach of treaty, so the purpose of the prophetic threats was to portray the calamities that would follow as a
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579 A similar view is found in a work of Philo. See _Abr_. 5–6, 15.
580 It seems that this sort of idea became popular in the aftermath of the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE, as Bauckham elucidates: ‘The assumption that God’s law is for Gentiles as well as Jews – with no attempt to define the difference between its universal and specifically Jewish features – appears particularly striking in a passage in book 8 [of the _Sibylline Oracles_], in which the notion of the two ways in the form in which it is presented by Moses to Israel at the end of Deut 30 expresses God’s address to all human creatures…4 Ezra too, quoting this very text (Deut 30:19), assumes that, though spoken by Moses to Israel, it is also the choice that confronts every human being (4Ezra 7:127–129)’ (2008b, 322).
581 See esp., Hahn 2009, 50–9. To be sure, according to Genesis 3, the whole humanity is under the curse without making any covenantal oath. In Galatians, however, Paul specifically discusses the curse caused by the Mosaic law (cf. Gal 3:10; 5:3).
582 Also see Deut 29:14–15.
consequence of the violation of Israel’s covenant with Yahweh’.\textsuperscript{583}

The descendants of the ancient Israelites who made a covenantal oath at Moab are automatically liable to the covenantal provisions, since this covenant is designed for all the succeeding generations of Israel:

You stand assembled today, all of you, before the Lord your God – the leaders of your tribes, your elders, and your officials, all the men of Israel, your children, your women, and the aliens who are in your camp, both those who cut your wood and those who draw your water – to enter into the covenant of the Lord your God, \textit{sworn by an oath}, which the Lord your God is making with you today; in order that he may establish you today as his people, and that he may be your God, as he promised you and as he swore to your ancestor, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob. I am making this covenant, \textit{sworn by an oath, not only with you who stand here with us today before the Lord our God, but also with those who are not here with us today}.\textsuperscript{584}

Moreover, the covenantal oath for the Deuteronomic covenant was restated and reconfirmed, with central emphasis on the covenantal “curse”, by the post-exilic community.

The rest of the people, the priests, the Levites, the gatekeepers, the singers, the temple servants, and all who have separated themselves from the peoples of the lands to adhere to the law of God, their wives, their sons, their daughters, all who have knowledge and understanding, join with their kin, their nobles, and \textit{enter into a curse and an oath to walk in God’s law}, which was given by Moses the servant of God, and to observe and do all the commandments of the Lord our Lord and his ordinances and his statutes.\textsuperscript{585}

The expression “entering into a curse” sounds peculiar. Also intriguing is the juxtaposition of

\textsuperscript{583} Weinfeld 1972, 137.
\textsuperscript{584} Deut 29:10–15. For a comprehensive survey of the theme of “curse” in Deuteronomy, see Wisdom 2001, 43-52.
\textsuperscript{585} Neh 10:28–29.
“curse” to “the oath” as well as to “the law”. On this point, Fensham comments, ‘The curse is closely connected to the oath. When the oath is broken, the curse will come into effect. It is a question of cause and effect. The breaking of the oath of the covenant automatically results in the curse’.\textsuperscript{586} The book of Daniel, a quintessentially apocalyptic piece of literature, clearly exhibits such a covenantal perspective: “All Israel has transgressed your law and turned aside, refusing to obey your voice. So \textit{the curse and the oath written in the law of Moses}, the servant of God, has been poured out upon us, because we have sinned against you” (Dan 9:11).

The covenantal oath was, therefore, a historical fact for Paul and many of his Jewish contemporaries. They believed that they were still bound by their ancestral pledge. This point is corroborated by the testimony of Josephus, who writes:

Such then is the constitution that Moses left; he further delivered over those laws which he had written forty years before and of which we shall speak in another work. On the following days – for assembly was held continuously – he gave them blessings, with curses upon such as should not live in accordance with the laws but should transgress the ordinances that were therein. Then he recited to them a poem in hexameter verse, which he has moreover bequeathed in a book preserved in the temple, \textit{containing a prediction of future events, in accordance with which all has come and is coming to pass}, the seer having no whit strayed from the truth.\textsuperscript{587}

Josephus believes that he and other Jews are still living under the covenantal provisions of the Mosaic law, which would dispense either blessings or curses according to their performance of the Mosaic law.\textsuperscript{588} Philo also states:

\textsuperscript{586} Fensham 1982, 237.
\textsuperscript{588} \textit{Contra} Waters, who claims that this passage offers no indication of the continuing significance of Deut 27–28 in his day’ (2006, 64). Lincicum comments on Josephus’ account, ‘One other major
A clear testimony is recorded in the Holy Scriptures. We will recite first the invocations [i.e., Deut 28:1] which he is accustomed to call benedictions. If, he says, you keep the divine commandment in obedience to his ordinances and accept his precepts, not merely to hear them but to carry them by your life and conduct, the first boon you will have victory over your enemies. For the commandments are not too huge and heavy for the strength of those whom they will apply, nor is the good far away either beyond the sea or at the end of the earth, so that it requires of you a lingering and wearisome exile…

Philo emphasises the fact that the Deuteronomistic blessing (“victory”) or curse (“exile”) is still relevant to the destiny of the national life of Israel, and thus calls for the stringent observance of the Mosaic law. As regards Philo’s reading of the last chapters of Deuteronomy, Lincicum explains, ‘Indeed, even in Philo’s figural appropriation of the Diaspora imagery, God’s ability to re-gather exiles functions as a given (cf. Praem. 117). This is not a major theme in Philo’s writings, nor does he develop an elaborate description of eschatological events, but he is aware of Deuteronomy’s exile-and-return schema and does not merely spiritualize it’.  

Morland conducts a comprehensive survey of ancient Jewish literature concerning how “curse” terminologies are used, and concludes: ‘Whenever we face a text with curse and blessing both in antithesis and sequence, we may suspect that it reflects conventional language dependent on the Deut 27–30 tradition’. Therefore, it seems undeniable that the difference, perhaps understandable from Josephus’s viewpoint after the war of 66–70 CE, is that Josephus casts this prediction [Deut 29:10–21] as cyclical in nature: “although the God who created you will give back to your citizens both your cities and your Temple, the loss of these will occur not once but often” (Ant. 4.314)’ (2010, 178). It is an open question whether Josephus envisages the eschatological deliverance of Jews, which entails the establishment of the Temple that would never be destroyed.
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589 Praem. 79-80.
591 As to the scope of research, Morland states, ‘I give preference to sources that may be dated prior to or contemporary with Paul. This means that I consider texts within the Hebrew Bible, the Apocrypha, the oldest Pseudepigrapha [sic.], Qumran, Philo, and Josephus’ (1995, 22).
592 Ibid., 50 [Morland’s italics]. Waters criticises this view, arguing: ‘Because the “curse/blessing” antithesis has a distinguished pedigree in the literature of the Ancient Near East, it is impossible to preclude, without such an argument, that Paul has drawn this pattern from other sources’ (2006, 89). It is
Deuteronomic covenantal perspective and its terminology of “curse and blessing” exerted a considerable influence on the hearts of many first century Jews. When these Jews heard the reading of Deuteronomy 27–30, they would likely be reminded of the fact they were still under the threat of the covenantal curses. As F. F. Bruce puts it, ‘It may be that the curses (with the corresponding blessings recited on Mount Gerizim, Dt. 28:1–6) were not pronounced once and for all, but were repeated periodically as part of a covenant-renewal ceremony. An elaborated form was repeated on solemn occasions by the covenant community of Qumran (1QS 2:1–18)’. If the Mosaic covenantal curses were so real for first century Jews, it would not be far-fetched to say that Paul considered that, for Jews, the only way to be released from the ancestral covenantal oath and the threat of the curse was to die with Christ (cf. Rom 7:1–6; Gal 2:19).

(iii) Reconsidering of Galatians 4:3–7

The argument presented above strongly indicates that the “curse” of the Mosaic law is only applicable to those who bind themselves to the Mosaic covenant. The term “under the law” is of course “impossible” to exclude any possibility. However, we can pose the question: which is more plausible for Paul to resort to the Jewish scriptures or to a pagan tradition, in order to defend his case?


We can maintain that this would have held true at least for those who experienced the catastrophe of Jerusalem in 70 CE, as Bauckham argues, ‘we have already seen how the closing chapters of Deuteronomy were a regular resource of Jewish eschatology, including those apocalypses which wrestled with the problem of understanding God’s purpose for Israel in the light of the catastrophe of 70 CE’ (2008b, 319).

Concerning Romans 7:1–6, N. T. Wright states, ‘He is addressing them as people who know the law. This could, of course, mean Roman law in general, in which, as in Jewish law, death pays all debts; but in view of the subject matter it is far more likely to mean the Jewish law’ (2002, 558). If Wright is correct, it would make better sense to see that “the Law” herein functions as a metonym for “the Mosaic covenant”, since Paul asserts that Christians should not abandon but fulfil the Law (cf. Rom 3:31; 8:4).
virtually equivalent to “under the Mosaic covenant”. Hence, Scott’s claim that both Jews and Gentiles are under the law in Galatians 4:5 is doubtful. What would be a proper reading of Galatians 4:3–7, then, if we apply our insight from the argument so far? First of all, it is necessary to identify the “we” (ἡμεῖς) mentioned in 4:3. In this regard, Scott argues:

[I]t must be taken into consideration that Paul uses the first-person plural to refer, at different times in the Epistle, to four distinct groups of people...First, Paul clearly uses “we” of Jews over against Gentiles in his speech in Antioch (cf. 2:15, 16, 17)... Second, Paul can also use “we” in reference to both himself and his fellow workers (cf. 1:8, 9; 2:4, 5, 9, 10), or third, in a statement reportedly made by the churches of Judea (cf. 1:23). Fourth and most commonly, however, Paul uses “we” to include both Jewish and Gentile believers.

Scott claims that the “we” mentioned in 3:25 belongs to the fourth category (i.e., referring to both Jews in general and the Galatian Christians), but we do not concur with his view for the reasons explained above. It is an exaggeration to say that Paul “most commonly” uses “we” to refer to both Jewish and Gentile believers. Rather, when Paul constructs his argument from the Jewish historical perspective, “we” in most cases refers to either Jews in general or Jewish believers in particular. Hence, we do not agree with Scott’s following statement: ‘It may be assumed, therefore, that in 4:3, 5, 6 ἡμεῖς includes the Galatian Gentile-Christians, especially
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596 Wilson argues that, in Galatians, the phrase “under Law” is used as rhetorical shorthand for “under the curse of the Law”. Wilson 2007, 31-37. However, at least in the case of Gal 3:23, it would make better sense to render this phrase as “under the Mosaic covenant”, since πατήρας γενόμενος in verse 3:24 does not necessarily involve a negative connotation. See Dunn 1993, 199. Instead, we concur with the view held by Hafemann, who indicates that νόμος too is being used as a metonymy, in the case for the Sinai covenant (cf. 3:17 and 4:24). Hafemann 1997, 342.

597 Scott 1992, 156.

598 Ibid., 156.

599 So with Witherington 1998, 236-7. In Galatians 4:21-31, Paul seems to apply both “you” and “we” more freely to Gentile believers (cp. Gal 4:26, 28, 31). We shall return to this point in due course.
since, as elsewhere in the Epistle, Paul bases a statement about “us” on a statement about “you” and then oscillates suddenly between “we” (v. 6b) and you (v. 7).  

The starting point of our argument is 4:5. Given that “those who were under the law” refers to Jews, the most natural reading of the subsequent “we” is that it also refers to Jews, though non-Christian Jews are not included in this word. As is the case in 3:23–26, here Paul would have spoken of the re- adoption of Jews first (4:5), then moved to the adoption of Gentiles (4:6a). Admittedly, the next phrase “into our hearts” (εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν) seems to contradict our reading, and the manuscript evidence for ἡμῶν would be stronger than υἱῶν (“your”). Yet, υἱῶν is more fitting to the immediate context, as Bruce comments, ‘The 2nd person pronoun υἱῶν would be expected after ἐστε in the preceding clause (hence, no doubt, its wide attestation as a variant reading)’. Even if Paul deliberately introduces the inclusive “we” (i.e., both Jewish and Gentile believers) for some theological reason, the fact remains that Paul switches from the first person (ἀπολάβωμεν) in 4:5b to the second person (ἐστε) in 4:6a, as he did in 3:25–26. Therefore, except for 4:6b, “we” in 4:3 and 4:5 most probably refers to Jewish believers.

In this reading, the contents of Galatians 4:3–7 and 3:13–14 are essentially the same. That is, Christ suffered the ultimate curse of the Mosaic Law to redeem (Christ-believing) Jews who
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601 On this point, Hays claims that 4:5a and 5b refer to Jews and Gentiles, respectively (2000, 284). However, the “eschatological adoption” of Jews who had been under the curse of the exile was an important theme for at least some of first century Jews, as Scott rightly claims.
602 It is the biblical idea that Israel, the wife of Yahweh, was once divorced, but would be re-engaged (cf. Isa 50:1; Hos 1–3). Moreover, in Hosea, the sons of Israel would be “re”-adopted by God (cf. Hos 1:8-9; 2:23). Hence, it would not have been strange for Paul to say that Jews “might receive adoption as children”.
603 Cf. Metzger 1971, 595.
604 Bruce 1982, 198.
605 Since Gentiles’ experience of the Spirit is the most crucial evidence for their acceptance by God (cf. Gal 3:1–5).
had been under the curse of the Mosaic law. Some of the redeemed Jews, like Paul (cf. Rom 15:16), are now dispatched to Gentiles, in order that the promised blessings to the nations may be fulfilled through their ministry. This understanding gains support from the historical fact of early Christian mission. The actual course of history of the early Christian movement had advanced in exactly this way. It is indisputable that all the earliest Christians were Jews. As a corollary, all the earliest missionaries to Gentiles were also Jews.

2. 3. 5 Summary

Although in one critical point we disagree with Scott, we find his larger argument to be convincing. Galatians 3:13–14 and 4:1–7 are rooted in the same story – a new Exodus from the protracted curse of the Mosaic covenant, which is foretold in the underlying narrative of Deuteronomy 27–32. The problem of Scott’s overall argument is that while he properly reads Galatians against the backdrop of Deuteronomy 27–32, he virtually ignores the significance of Isaiah 49–55 in Paul’s discourse. Still, his argument supports our contention that Isaiah 53 is the crucial background of Galatians 3:13, since Isaiah 53 itself ought to be understood as the realisation of the restoration of Israel envisaged in Deuteronomy 30. Scott’s argument is corroborated by the close study of the Dead Sea Scrolls, to which we shall now turn.

2. 4 Florentino García Martínez

2. 4. 1 Introduction

Scott maintains that the underlying theme of Galatians 3:10–14 is the deliverance from the
protracted exile. The plausibility of his argument would be strengthened if we can find a similar or parallel thought in other branch of Second Temple Judaism. In this regard, the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls takes on a growing importance, since the “exile-exodus” theme is critically important in the formation of the Qumran community. Schmidt argues that the “exile” mode of thinking shaped the self-identity of this community:

Of course, the [Qumran] Community presents itself as a dispersion, as a remnant, and it is true that it uses this model of the Exile in Babylon to think of its present separation from the Temple. But it does not limit itself to this model alone. With the exegetical daring customary with these masters of the commentary, the Pesher, it intertwines the theme of the Exile with that of the Exodus…It is because, at the end of the exile in Babylon, God ‘remembered the Covenant of the forefathers’ that he raised up a ‘remnant’: for it, he will renew his Covenant, for it he will again make a gift of the land (Damascus Document 1.4–8). Thus, behind the model of the Exile, there is another much more pregnant one: that of the Exodus.606

Martinez points out some striking thematic similarities between Galatians 3:10–14 and texts from the Qumran caves, and this would enable us to situate Galatians 3:10–14 within at least some Jewish theological currents in the late Second Temple period. In this section, then, we shall review his analyses of two of the main topics in Galatians 3:10–14: “the works of the law”, and “Spirit as the eschatological blessings”.

2. 4. 2 “Works of the law”

James Dunn argues that the phrase “the works of the law” (ἐργα νόμου) that appears in Paul’s
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606 Schmidt 2001, 144. This way of understanding the self-perception of the Qumran community becomes the scholarly consensus. E.g., J. J. Collins 1997, 52-70; Abegg 1997; Blenkinsopp 2006, 230-41.
soteriological arguments does not signify ‘good works done as an attempt to gain or achieve righteousness’ but a series of laws that function as the identity markers that separate Israel as God’s chosen people from the rest of the world:

[T]he phrase “the works of the law,” does, of course, refer to all or whatever the law requires, covenantal nomism as a whole. But in a context where the relationship of Israel with other nations is at issue, certain laws would naturally come more into focus than others. We have instanced circumcision and food laws in particular. In the Qumran sect the sensitive issues were not those between Jews and Gentiles, but those between Jews and Jews, and so focused on internal disagreements on issues like sacrifice and purity…Today we might think of issues like abortion, women priests, scriptural inerrancy, or papal infallibility. None of the disputants in such internal controversies would regard the point at issue as the whole of their faith or even as the most important element in their faith. But the issues have become foci of controversy to such an extent that the status of the opponent’s confession as a whole can in fact be called into question.

Martínez tests the validity of Dunn’s argument in the light of the Qumran documents. He maintains that the phrase “some of works of the Law” in 4QMMT does not simply refer to some important laws, but to the interpretation of these laws, which distinguishes the author(s)’ group from the rest of Israel. Martínez then basically endorses Dunn’s argument on “the works of the law”:

But if we consider the context of its first use in Galatians, after the two conflicts to which Paul has alluded before, the incident in Jerusalem (in Gal 2:2–4: the problem of circumcision) and the incident in Antioch (in Gal 2:11–14: the problem of the dietary laws), it seems clear that Paul uses the expression to refer to the practice of those laws
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608 Ibid., 358-9. See also Abegg 2006, 67.
that Peter and other observant Jews consider so important that they force them to separate from the people who accord less importance to these laws, be they Christians of Gentile origin who are not circumcised, or Christians of Jewish origin who have abandoned the dietary laws, as Peter did before changing his opinion. What this means is that for Paul, as for the authors of 4QMMT, the “works of the Law” are concrete norms, whose practice or refusal of practice, is considered essential for the identity of the group, forcing those who practice them to separate from those who do not practice them or who interpret them in a different way.609

Not a few scholars dissent from the reading proposed by Dunn and Martínez. Jason Meyer contends, ‘Paul explicitly refers to the broad scope of the law in other places in Galatians to include the whole law, not just the so-called ceremonial aspects of the law’.610 Martínez would have no quarrel with this point. However, as many commentators rightly acknowledge, this epistle as a whole is written in a highly polemical context, and we should not lose sight of this fact when interpreting the phrase in question. What is at stake is not an abstract argument of whether perfect obedience of the whole law is possible, but the urgent problem of determining who are the true descendants of Abraham, heirs according to the promise (cf. Gal 3:29). In this critical situation, it would have been natural for Paul to pay particular attention to a specific aspect of the law, namely, the Mosaic law as the identity marker.611

Galatians and 4QMMT have one key thing in common. Both attempt to demonstrate who are to be the beneficiaries of the eschatological blessings and who are to be cursed by the law.

609 Martínez 2014, 55-6. Barclay also comments, ‘The immediate context of the Antioch dispute makes clear that “works of the law” are equivalent to “living like a Jew”, and Paul’s point is that this distinctively Jewish pattern of behaviour is not an essential feature of justification’ (1988, 78).

610 Meyer 2009, 150, n. 117. Silva also states, ‘It is evident that the quotation from Deut 27:26, which immediately follows, has in view general obedience to the things written in the law’ (2001, 259). See also Schreiner 1991.

611 In the case of the epistle to the Romans, since the purpose of Paul is to demonstrate the failure of Jews as a nation to observe the Mosaic law, this phrase denotes the Mosaic law in general or as a whole. See Gathercole 2002, 239-40.
On 4QMMT, Martínez thus states: ‘This interpretation pertains not just to legal aspects, but also extends to the history of the people, since it refers to the blessings and curses that have happened or will still happen. Thanks to this interpretation, the group that wrote the document has discovered that the blessings and curses announced in Scripture have already happened and that they are now living in the “last days.”’

Those who observe “the works of the law” stipulated in 4QMMT are now enjoying and will enjoy the eschatological blessings:

4QMMT 99–108: And it is written that [all] these [things] shall happen to you at the end of days, the blessing and the curse […] and you shall ass[ent] in your heart and turn to me with all your heart [and with all] your soul […] at the e[nd] [of time] and you shall be […] [And it is written in the book of] Moses and in [the words of the prophets] that [blessings and curses] will come upon you] which […] [the blessings which came upon] him in the days of Solomon the son of David and also the curses which came upon him from the [days of Je]roboam son of Nebat right up to the capture of Jerusalem and of Zedekiah, king of Judah [that] he should bring them in […]. And we are aware that part of the blessings and curses have occurred that are written in the b[ook of Mo]ses. And this is the end of days, when they go back to Israel for[ever…] and not return […] and the wicked will act wickedly and […]

To be sure, there are clear differences between 4QMMT and Galatians as to the use of the phrase in question. Whereas “the works of the law” in 4QMMT is introduced in the context of an intra-Jewish controversy, Paul uses this term in the heat of crisis of Jewish-Gentile relations within early Christian communities. More important, the author(s) of 4QMMT and Paul hold diametrically opposed views on the importance of the Mosaic law for the eschatological people of God. As N. T. Wright explains, ‘MMT presupposed obedience to the biblical Torah itself,'

---

Martínez 2014, 54.
Translated by Martínez.
and added extra commands as a further interpretation of how precisely one should keep Torah...For Paul, in other words, faith is not something which is simply added to to existing Torah-observance; it supplants Torah-observance, denying it any importance.  

Still, it can be reasonably claimed that both of them broadly share an awareness of the critical role of “the works of the law”. They share the historical awareness that the eschatological time of blessings has already dawned, and they also share the urgent necessity to clarify who are really the beneficiaries of the eschatological blessings. In this context, the role of “the works of the law” is to distinguish those who observe them from the rest of the people: Whereas the authors of 4QMMT insist that those who are not doing “the works of the law” are still “under the curses of the law”, Paul claims precisely the opposite (Gal 3:10).

2. 4. 3 Spirit as a sign of the eschatological blessings

In Paul’s argument, the fact of Christ’s becoming a curse is directly linked to the reception of the promise of the Spirit (Gal 3:13–14). In this epistle, Paul repeatedly stresses the importance of the Spirit as a sign of the eschatological blessings, which enables Christians to fulfil the law (Gal 3:2–5; 4:6; 5:16–25; cf. Rom 8:4). In Paul’s train of thought, the “Spirit” and “grace” seem to be closely connected in relation to the law, as the following statements show:

**Galatians 5:18:** But if you are led by the Spirit, you are not subject to the law.

**Romans 6:14b:** since you are not under law but under grace.

In the Christian theological tradition, it has long been thought that the apostle Paul is the first

---

614 N. T. Wright 2013b, 347.
theologian to discover the doctrine of “grace alone”. This conversely suggests that Judaism in Paul’s time did not know the total dependence on God’s grace. However, Martinez states: ‘With the publication of the Cave 1 manuscripts of the Community Rule and of the Hodayot it became clear that the concept of sola gratia had its precedents’. Martinez’s comment becomes intelligible when we consider the role of the “Spirit” in the Qumran literature.

In the first place, we shall see two passages from the Hodayot that are somehow redolent of Paul’s argument in Romans (Rom 3:9–20), both of which stress that no one can stand in the divine law court.616

1QHª 15.31–32: For who is like you among the gods, O Lord? Who has truth like yours? Who can be righteous before you when he is judged? There is no utterance of the breath to offer in reply to your rebuke, and none is able to stand before your wrath.  
1QHª 17.14-15: And I know that there is hope in your kindness and expectation in the abundance of your strength. For no one can be justified in your judgment [כי לא צדק قول מהשם], and no one can be acquitted in your proceedings.617

Although the psalmist does not quote directly from the Jewish scriptures, he, like Paul, is most likely alluding to Psalm 143:2 and combining a divine court imagery. Most writings of the sectarian communities emphatically stress the necessity of the stringent observation of all the rules of the communities in order to maintain membership in the communities (e.g., IQS

---

615 Martinez 2014, 60.
616 It is generally considered that the Thanksgiving scrolls (Hodayot) are written by the Teacher of Righteousness or his close disciple. For the psalmist describes himself as follows: ‘But you have made me a banner for the elect of righteousness and an expert interpreter of wonderful mysteries in order to test [persons of] truth and to prove those who love moral discipline’. (1QHª 10.15–16). Cf. Grundmann 1968, 86-95.
617 Edited by Hartmut Stegemann with Eileen Schuller. Translated by Carol Newton. As to a typical pronominal suffix in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Qimron explains: ‘The regular 2nd person masculine singular form 존 does occur about 900 times’ (1986, 58).
1.1–20), and the psalmist of the *Hodayot (Thanksgiving Scroll)* emphasises this point as well (cf. 1QHª 6.25–29, 32–33). He nonetheless argues that any human effort falls short of attaining divine approval:

**1QHª 12.29–32:** What being of flesh is like this? And what creature of clay is able to do wondrous great deeds? It (exists) in sin from the womb, and until old age in faithless guilt. But as for me, I know that righteousness does not belong to humankind nor perfection of way to a mortal. To God Most High belong all the works of righteousness. The way of humanity is not established except by the spirit God has fashioned for it, in order to perfect a way for mortal beings, so that they may know all his works through his mighty strength and his abundant compassion toward all the children of his good will. But as for me, trembling and quaking have seized me, and all my bones shatter. My heart melts like wax before the fire, and my knees give way like water hurtling down a slope. For I remember my guilty acts together with the unfaithfulness of my ancestors, when the wicked rose against your covenant and the vile against your word. And I said, 'In my sin I have been abandoned, far from your covenant'. But when I remembered the strength of your hand together with your abundant compassion, I stood strong and rose up, and in my spirit held fast to (its) station in the face of affliction. For I am supported by your kindness, and according to your abundant compassion to me, you pardon iniquity and thus clean[se] a person from guilt through your righteousness.

The psalmist confesses that it is the righteousness of God that brings about the pardon of his sins. As Burrow argues, ‘The Thanksgiving Psalms and the concluding psalm of the Manual of Discipline express also a profound sense of the righteousness of God, by which a man is given a righteousness he could never attain for himself’. For the psalmist, righteous deeds are the

---

618 In 1QS, the obedience to the commandments are not simply for remaining in the covenant, but for the vindication in the Final Judgement. See Gathercole 2002, 96-110; VanLangingham 2006, 102-135. 
619 Edited by Hartmut Stegemann with Eileen Schuller. Translated by Carol Newton. 
outcome of the spirit that God graciously gives him (cf. 1QH a 4.29, 38; 5.35–36; 6.23–24; 8.29; 20.14–15). Frey puts the point well writing, ‘God’s holy spirit is the means of exaltation of the human being from dust, the means of removing the “perverted spirit”, or even the means of “justification,” and it is stated explicitly that humans as such cannot achieve it by themselves, but only by an action of God’s grace’.622

To Paul, righteous deeds cannot be produced by one’s own effort. Rather, they are the “fruit” of the outworking of the Holy Spirit within Christian believers (cf. Gal 5:22–23).623 On this point, there is a marked similarity between the sectarian authors and Paul, as Käsemann rightly states, ‘the Thanksgiving Psalms from Qumran show very clearly that the present manifestation of the divine righteousness was already being stressed in apocalyptic Judaism in precisely the same way as can be detected in Paul’.624 Since ‘Paul presumably was never able to read the “sectarian” texts from Qumran’,625 such a similarity is indeed striking. In the late Second Temple period, Paul was not unique in stressing the necessity of dependence on God’s grace, i.e., the divine spirit, for the fulfillment of the law.

The fact that Paul and the psalmist of the Hodayot held a similar view that only by the power of the divine spirit626 can humans obey or fulfil the law satisfactorily suggests that their

cannot establish his righteousness; for to God (alone) belongs the judgment and from him the perfection of the Way’. (1QS 11.10–11). Translated by James H. Charlesworth.

624 Käsemann 1969, 178.
625 Frey 2014, 240.
626 We cannot simply equate the “Holy Spirit” in the New Testament with the “spirit” variously described in the Qumran documents. It is often difficult in the Qumran writings to distinguish whether it refers to the divine spirit or a human spirit. Cf. Lee 2013, 168-9. The same holds true for Paul, as N. T. Wright indicates, ‘Throughout the passage [Rom 8:1–17] some have questioned which uses of “spirit” refer to the Holy Spirit and which to the human spirit that each person has’ (2002, 594). However, ‘whereas the expression “holy spirit” is very rarely used in the Hebrew Bible (and only slightly more frequently in the LXX), most of the Hodayot passages mentioning God’s spirit use the term “holy” to characterize it’ (Frey
eschatological expectations seem to have been rooted in the same cluster of biblical texts that envisages the fulfilment of God’s commandments in the eschatological community, such as Isaiah 59:21, Jeremiah 31:31–34, and Ezekiel 36:26–27. These texts envisage, as Deuteronomy 27–30 foretells, that Israel is to be kept in a dark period, or in exile in a metaphorical sense, until the glorious promises, such as the covenant renewal and the outpouring of the divine spirit, will start to be realised. As Wagner explains, ‘[T]his Deuteronomic story of exile and restoration, in which Israel is endowed by God with the ability to obey the covenant fully, shaped the self-understanding and hopes of at least some post-exilic Jewish groups. Paul’s own narrative of God’s dealing with Israel appears to have been similarly molded in a profound way by the sequence of events recounted in Deuteronomy 29–30’. N. T. Wright succinctly summarises the covenantal and eschatological perspective of 4QMMMT section C, which is partially quoted in the previous section: ‘This locates the writer’s own intended position within an eschatological scheme, prophesied in Deuteronomy, as follows: (a) blessings under Solomon; (b) curse from Jeroboam to Zedekiah, climaxing in exile, which is still continuing; (c) the return of God and to Israel, now being inaugurated’. We also find such an eschatological vision in the *Words of the Luminaries*: 631

4Q504. 5.9–16: You have remembered Your covenant whereby You brought us forth

---

627 See 4Q504 (the *Words of the Luminaries*) frags. 1–2 2.13–14, which allude to Jeremiah 31:31. Philip also argues that this text is probably influenced by Isaiah 44:3 (2005, 85). However, it is unlikely that this text originated in the Qumran communities (Smith 2006, 79-82). See also 1QH 12.10–12. As to the significance of Jeremiah and Ezekiel in Paul’s thought, Hafemann argues, ‘The letter/Spirit contrast in [2Cor] 3:6b thus brings together the concerns from both Ezek. 36:25f. and Jer. 31:31–34 as expressed in 3:3b and 3:6b respectively’ (1995, 158).

628 See especially Isa 63:7–64:12.


630 N. T. Wright 2013b, 341. See also Berstein 1996, 49-50; Wagner, ibid., 166, n.143; Smith 2006, 80-2.

631 Cf. Morales 2009, 271-2. See our review of Richard Hays in this chapter (2.2.2).
from Egypt while the nations looked on. You have not abandoned us among the nations; rather, You have shown covenant mercies to Your people in all [the] lands to which You have exiled them. You have again placed it on their hearts to return to You, to obey Your voice [according] to all that You have commanded through Your servant Moses. [In]deed, You have poured out Your holy spirit upon us, [bringing] Your blessings to us. 632

It is indeed plausible that Paul and the Qumran community had a similar historical perspective, namely, the end of the exile in their eschatological communities. 633 The sharp difference between them lies in the fact that Paul claims that Gentile Christians qua Gentiles can participate in the eschatological blessings. 634

2. 4. 4 Summary

The comparison of Pauline texts with some Qumran texts reinforced Scott’s case that the underlying narrative of both Galatians 4:3–6 and 3:13–14 is the new Exodus. This point further suggests the potential importance of Isaiah 49–55 for Paul’s discourse in Galatians, since the new Exodus is one of the central themes of Isaiah 49–55. Finally, we shall review a scholar who strongly advocates a narrative reading of Galatians as a whole.

2. 5 N. T. Wright

2. 5. 1 Introduction

N. T. Wright maintains that the narrative substructure beneath Paul’s various arguments in

632 Translated by Wise, Abegg, and Cook. See also Jub. 1.23.
633 Cf. Blenkinsopp 2006, 244.
Galatians 2–4 is the “story of Israel”. According to Wright, Saul of Tarsus, a “zealous” Pharisee, had in mind the story of an “unredeemed” Israel. That is to say, he was frustrated with Israel’s miserable situation of ‘continuing exile and subjugation’. This story is, however, freshly and radically re-shaped in a christological and pneumatological light. Wright describes this revised story as follows: ‘The resurrection itself demonstrated that the real enemy was not “the gentiles”, not even the horrible spectre of pagan empire. The real enemy was Death itself, the ultimate anti-creation force, with Sin…the experience of the spirit revealed the extent to which hardness of heart and blindness of mind had been endemic up to the point across the whole human race’.

In Wright’s view, however, Paul does not fully expound this “cosmic” or “apocalyptic” story in Galatians. Rather, Paul’s argument remains in the salvation-historical perspective: the primary purpose of Paul is to expound how the renewal of Israel’s covenant accompanies the inclusion of Gentiles into Abraham’s family. For this reason, both Deuteronomy 27–30 and Isaiah 40–55 occupy important places in Paul’s discourse in Galatians. The former pays particular attention to the redemption of Israel, while latter puts more emphasis on the universal salvation. This is a significant point of difference between James Scott and N. T. Wright. In Wright’s analysis of Galatians, Deutero-Isaiah plays a much more prominent role in Paul’s

---

635 Cf. N. T. Wright 2013a, 749. Concerning Wright’s view on pre-conversion Paul, see, e.g., Wright 1997, 25-37. He writes, ‘The theology which sustained the revolutionaries thus included a reading of Israel’s scriptures which told them in no uncertain terms where they were living in God’s plan and what they should do to further it. Saul, like a great many Jews of his day, read the Jewish Bible not least as a story in search of an ending; and he conceived of his own task as being to bring that ending about. The story ran like this. Israel had been called to be the covenant people of the creator God, to be the light that would lighten the dark world, the people through whom God would undo the sin of Adam and its effects. But Israel had become sinful, and as a result had gone into exile, away from her own land. Although she had returned geographically from her exile, the real exilic condition was not yet finished’ (1997, 30-31).

636 Bauckham 2008b, 326.

637 Cf. N. T. Wright, ibid., 752-64.

638 Ibid., 761.
discourse.

In what follows, we shall examine how Wright delineates the underlying story of Israel in Galatians 2–4, and consider whether his account is sufficiently convincing.

2. 5. 2 Galatians 2:11–2:21: The Antioch incident

Wright stresses that the hermeneutical key to Galatians 3–4 lies in the Antioch incident described in 2:11–14.\textsuperscript{539} This event poses a critical question to Christians in Antioch: what is the decisive factor that defines the people of God, Jesus the Messiah or Torah? As Wright puts it: ‘Which is the most important division: that between Jews and non-Jews (because Messiah-believing Jews would still be able to eat with non-Messiah-believing Jews), or that between those who believed and those who did not? Was Messiah-faith simply a subset of Judaism, leaving the basic structure untouched, or did it change everything?’\textsuperscript{640} Wright argues that this crucial question compels Paul to redefine clearly who are God’s chosen people, the descendants of Abraham. The redefining of God’s people inevitably leads to the reshaping of the story of God’s people in Paul’s train of thought. This reshaped story of Israel, argues Wright, underlies Paul’s subsequent arguments.

Wright maintains that Paul’s statement in 2:19–20 is not simply his autobiographical monologue, but in fact the story of Israel: ‘He is telling the story of what has happened to Israel, the elect people of God – and he is using the rhetorical form of quasi-autobiography, because he will not tell this story in the third person, as though it were someone else’s story, as though he

\textsuperscript{539} So Barclay comments, ‘Paul recounts the incident of his disagreement with Peter at Antioch over the question of eating with Gentiles. Although this event is probably recorded last in the series chiefly because it occurred last, it also serves an important purpose as a bridge between the more historical and the more theological sections of the epistle’ (1988, 76).

\textsuperscript{640} Wright 2013a, 854-5.
could look on from a distance (or from a height!) and merely describe it with a detached objectivity’.\(^{641}\) Israel, which had been defined by Torah, is now ‘formed according to the pattern of his [Jesus’] death and resurrection’.\(^{642}\) His point seems to be basically correct in the light of the similar expression in Romans 7:4, which is addressed to Jewish Christians (cf. Rom 7:1). If Torah becomes an impediment to the formation and fellowship of God’s renewed people, it must be set aside. Paul claims, according to Wright, that the old Israel died to Torah through dying in and with their Messiah.\(^{643}\)

2. 5. 3 Galatians 3:1–9: The story of Abraham

Wright maintains that Paul continues to tell the story of Israel from various angles in Galatians 3–4. ‘The single argument we think of as 3.6–4.7 divides itself into four parts, each one of which tells the same story in miniature. In each case the story begins with the earlier history of Israel, faces the problem which that history has run into, and postulates Christos as the one through whom the problem has been resolved, and the original purpose fulfilled’.\(^{644}\) Wright contends that Paul does not start telling the story of Abraham from 3:6 onwards because he is forced to do so by his opponents, who attempted to persuade the Galatians to accept circumcision by appealing to the story of Abraham, not least to the episode of circumcision in Genesis 17.\(^{645}\) On the contrary, Paul sets Abraham’s story at the outset of his scriptural discourse since he is fully aware of the founding character of Genesis 15 for the entire story of

\(^{641}\) Ibid., 852.
\(^{642}\) Ibid., 857.
\(^{644}\) Wright 2013b, 525.
\(^{645}\) Contra, e.g., Martyn 1997b, 297, 302-6. For a good summary of these scholars’ view, see Wisdom 2001, 140, n.57, 58.
Israel. According to Wright, Genesis 15 contains three important issues for Paul’s scriptural discourse.\(^{646}\) Since Wright’s argument in this regard is crucially important to understand Paul’s following arguments, we shall critically review Wright’s proposal in what follows.

The first issue is the “covenant”, as Wright states, ‘he [Paul] knows that Genesis 15 is the covenant chapter’.\(^ {647}\) Paul uses the episode in Genesis 15 not because it conveniently provides some key terms he wants to exploit, such as “faith” and “righteousness”.\(^ {648}\) Rather, in Wright’s view, Paul appeals to this chapter precisely because it contains the covenant-making episode, which is the foundation of God’s salvific plan through Israel, the “seed” of Abraham. This point is indeed crucial in Wright’s whole understanding of Galatians. His following argument, however, does not fully leverage this insight. That is, Wright translates the term διαθήκη in 3:15 and 3:17 as “the covenanted will”, and he suggests that Paul exploits the dual meaning (“covenant” and “will”) of this word.\(^ {649}\) This rendering is misleading for the following reason. It must be stressed that the biblical notions of “promise” and “covenant” are not the same. According to Williamson, the “covenant” exhibits two distinctive features:

- A covenant ratifies an already forged or existing elective relationship.

- The ratification involves the making of solemn promises by means of a verbal and/or enacted oath.\(^ {650}\)

Through the ratification process of a covenant, a promise is to be absolutised by means of a

---

\(^{646}\) Wright 2013a, 861.

\(^{647}\) Ibid., 861.

\(^{648}\) Against E. P. Sanders (2001, 66-7).

\(^{649}\) Cf. Ibid., 868.

\(^{650}\) Williamson 2007, 43 [my emphasis]. Quell also explains, ‘There is no firmer guarantee of legal security, peace or personal loyalty than the covenant. Regard for the institution is made a religious duty by means of the oath taken at its establishment’. Quell and Behm, “διαθήκη,” TDNT 2:115.
“verbal and/or ritualised oath”. A good example of the ritualised oath can be found in
Genesis 15, as Fretheim explains:

Jer 34:18–20 provides the only biblical analogy, where participants walked between
divided animals and thereby invoked death upon themselves should they be unfaithful
to the terms of the covenant. Not a regular sacrificial act…but it is a special rite for the
formalization of a solemn oath or promise, which is what “making a covenant” entails
in the context (v. 18). The promise works out as a ritual event, involving both word and
deed.

The absoluteness of God’s promise secured by the covenant is one of the key points of Paul’s
argument (cf. Gal 3:15–17). It is hence vital for Paul to introduce Abraham’s covenant-making
episode at this point. In this light, the term διαθήκη used in 3:15 and 17 should be rendered as
“covenant” rather than “will”, since a human will in the Greco-Roman legal context can easily
be revoked or altered after the ratification. Moreover, it does not make sense that God made
a “will” of whatever kind, since God the Father never dies. Paul’s point is that even a human
covenant made by an “oath” cannot be annulled, let alone the covenant sworn by God
himself. By rendering διαθήκη as “the covenanted will”, Wright obscures Paul’s point that a
promise absoutised by the covenant must be inviolable. Indeed, while Wright advocates the
“covenant” as the key category that integrates Paul’s various thoughts, he often uses this

651 Rendtorff explains this point as follows: ‘In this context [cf. Deut 7:8] the “oath” which the text talks
about stands in direct proximity to the “covenant”, whose upholder God is said to be (v. 9). For through
God’s faithfulness to his oath, which he proved in the deliverance from Egypt, Israel is to “know” that
God is the dependable God, who keeps his covenant and remains faithful’ (1998, 64).
652 Fretheim 1994, 446. Although some scholars dissent from this majority opinion as to the meaning of
this ritual, if a first century Jew read the passage in question in the light of Jeremiah 34:18–20, it seems
reasonable to suppose that he could come to the same conclusion.
653 Cf. Hahn 2009, 258.
654 See especially Hahn, ibid., 256-62.
655 Cf. Wright 2013a, 774-83.
term as shorthand for God’s single plan to rescue the world through Abraham and his family. However, Paul seems not use this specific term in such an abstract manner.

The second issue, closely related to the first, is the content of the Abrahamic promises. According to Wright, Paul understands the promises granted to Abraham in Genesis 15 as ‘the agreement that through him God would bless the whole world, giving him a single worldwide family.’ Wright further maintains that the word σπέρμα in Genesis 15 can signify “family”.

It is clear that the great majority of occurrences of σπέρμα in the LXX are collective, so that a plural would not make sense. However, precisely because this usage is so familiar, the word comes to be used, following the gradual extension of the Hebrew בנים for ‘family’ or ‘nation’...It is therefore clear that, under certain circumstance, בנים and its regular translation σπέρμα could have a new singular sense, deriving from the regular collective one, of ‘family’. This, I suggest, is exactly what our passage [Galatians 3:15–18] requires if it is to make sense.

Moreover, the σπέρμα in the context of Genesis 15 carries a strong universal connotation. Hence, God’s promise here could signify the formation of a “single”, “worldwide” family as the offspring of Abraham. In Wright’s view, Paul has exactly this meaning in mind when writing Galatians 3:16: ‘the promises did not say ‘your families’, as though referring to two or more families, but to one, ‘to your family’–hos estin Christos, which is Christos. The end of the

---

656 Cf. Wright 2009, 48-9. He also states, ‘I cannot stress too strongly, in view of persistent misunderstandings in some quarters, that, within this confluence of themes, ‘covenant’ and ‘salvation’ belong tightly together, the latter as the goal of the former, the former as the means of the latter’ (Wright 2013a, 795).
657 Wright 2009, 76.
658 Wright 1991, 164. In this connection, Lee refers to different interpretations of “seed” in the Jewish hermeneutical tradition, ‘It is interesting to note that Ben Sira alludes to Ps 27:8 [in Sir 44:21], and he connects it with Gen 22:17-18, just as Ps 72:17 alludes to Gen 22:18. However, while Ps 72:17 interprets the “seed” (ברב) as singular, referring to the ideal king of Israel, who will rule over the whole earth, Ben Sira takes the “seed” (ברב) to be collective, referring to the descendants of Abraham, who are destined to inherit the whole earth’ (2013, 138). Cf. Wilcox 1979.
chapter should leave us in no doubt that this does not mean ‘which is the single person Jesus’, but rather ‘which is the single Christos in whom the people are now incorporated’.\textsuperscript{659} Wright’s proposal is, however, not without its problems. Arguably, ἔλθη τὸ σπέρμα in 3:19, ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν in 3:23, and ἐλθοῦσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως in 3:25 are parallel expressions, and thus σπέρμα and πίστις in these verses should be interpreted as synonymous. Wright seems to interpret πίστις as the arrival of the Messiah Jesus, rather than God’s single family.\textsuperscript{660} In this light, it would be consistent to render σπέρμα in 3:19 in the same way.\textsuperscript{661} In this connection, it must be pointed out that, in the Abrahamic narrative, the σπέρμα of Abraham is not simply the beneficiary of the Abrahamic promises, but also the agent through whom the Abrahamic promises are to be brought to the nations.

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Genesis 18:18}: ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς.
\textbf{Genesis 22:18}: ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς.
\textbf{Galatians 3:8}: ἐν σοὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς.
\end{quote}

As Scott Hahn suggests, in Galatians 3:8, Paul might have alluded to both Genesis 18:18 and 22:18.\textsuperscript{662} Since Christ is indeed the agent through whom the Abrahamic promises have been brought to the nations (Gal 3:14), the christological reading of σπέρμα is more appropriate. In addition to these points, it remains uncertain whether God in fact promised Abraham a non-biological, single worldwide family. Indeed, it is by no means certain whether Paul

\textsuperscript{659} Wright 2013a, 389; 2013b, 531.  
\textsuperscript{660} On this point, however, Wright’s explanation is not entirely clear. Cf. Ibid., 1139.  
\textsuperscript{661} In fact, Wright’s interpretation has not gained wide acceptance in Pauline scholarship. See, e.g., Meyer 2009, 144-6. Hays’ view probably represents a consensus among scholars: ‘This last will promised an inheritance to Abraham and to his “seed,” which Paul identifies exclusively with Christ’ (2000, 263). See also Watson 2004, 191; Hahn 2009, 263.  
\textsuperscript{662} Hahn 2009, 246-7.
understands the Abrahamic promises in this way. Paul still believes in the physical descendants of Abraham as beneficiaries of the Abrahamic promises (cf. Rom 9:4; 11:28), which may contradict Wright’s proposal. Despite such problems, Wright’s interpretation of δὲ μεσίτης ἐνὸς in 3:20 as “but Moses is not the mediator of the single worldwide family” comports nicely with Paul’s assertion that ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Hence, Wright’s reading possesses, to a certain degree, explanatory power.

Wright presents the third issue of Genesis 15 as follows: ‘[Paul] draws particular attention to the fact that the characteristic of this worldwide family, if its members are to be true to their founding charter, is pistis’. Wright argues that Paul mentions Abraham’s “faith” not because he is the exemplar of “faith” par excellence, but rather because faith is the sole, common badge for Jews and Gentiles alike, as he explains, ‘Monotheism undergirds not only election, but also the christologically redefined election: this God will justify circumcision on the basis of pistis, and uncircumcision through pistis. Same badge, different route: Jews, already covenant members, need to be freshly ratified, while Gentiles, coming from outside, need to make their entrance’. Wright’s argument is valid, since Paul claims that pistis is revealed after the establishment of the Mosaic law, long after the Genesis story (Gal 3:23), although the exact meaning of pistis in this context remains highly controversial. In any case, the faith of Abraham foreshadows rather than defines the faith of Christian believers. The Abrahamic episode in Genesis 15 gives support to Paul’s point that “faith” is the sole identity marker for Christians.

---

664 Wright 2013a, 861.
665 Contra, e.g., Kim, who maintains, ‘This example of Abraham, the patriarch of God’s people, clearly shows what the principle is whereby human beings can establish a proper relationship to God and become his people. It is faith’ (2002, 128).
666 Ibid., 848.
is therefore vital for Paul to mention Genesis 15 in order to confirm this point.

2. 5. 4 Galatians 3:10–14: Curse and blessing

Having explained the foundational place of Genesis 15 in Paul’s discourse, Wright proceeds to the exegesis of 3:10–14. According to Wright, Paul continues to talk about the story of Israel. He contends that 3:10 is not based on the unstated presupposition, namely, ‘No individual in fact does the whole Torah’.667 Rather, Paul simply points out the historical fact that Israel as a whole has been suffering from the curse of the covenant.668

As regards 3:11–12, Wright argues against the popular view that Paul exploits the contradiction within the scriptures in order to make his case.669 That is to say, it is often considered that Paul provides scriptural evidence in order to deny a particular scriptural passage with which he does not agree. Indeed, many scholars argue that Paul to some extent uses scripture against scripture, upholding the biblical principle of “believing” (Hab 2:4), while negating the rival biblical principle of “doing” (Lev 18:5).670 Martyn even asserts that Paul is doing so by demonising the law as a creation of mean-spirited angels.671

If Paul had used the scriptures in this way, however, Paul’s opponents might have counter-argued:

We can say in conclusion, then, that, being the word of the one God, the Law does not

---

668 See our discussion in the review of James Scott in this chapter (2.3.3).
670 E.g., Betz 1979,147-8; Matera 1992, 121; McKnight 1995, 155.
671 Martyn 1997b, 325, 357. He insists, ‘On the basis of these linguistic observations alone, one could ask whether in writing Galatians Paul anticipates Marcion by suggesting that the Law did not come from the Father of Jesus Christ’ (Ibid., 365).
really contradict itself. At the level of intention the text quoted by Paul [Hab 2:4] and the text quoted by us [Lv 18:5] actually say the same thing. Habakkuk’s reference to life by faith is God’s assurance of life to the one who faithfully observes God’s commandments, as stated in Leviticus.672

In this case, it would have been extremely difficult for Paul to refute their argument. Even supposing that Paul wholeheartedly dissented from the alleged “work-righteousness” expressed in Leviticus 18:5, he could not deny that this verse is also “the word of the one God”! The only path Paul could have taken in this dilemma would have been to deny substantially the authority of the scriptures, since nowhere in the Jewish scriptures would he find a passage that describes the “doing” of the law as a bad thing.673 However, it is highly unlikely that Paul, for whatever reason, dismisses the authority of the scriptures. More important, it is questionable whether Paul opposes the “doing” per se, as John Barclay argues, ‘This means that when Paul polemicizes against “works of the law” he is not attacking “works” as such in an attempt to divorce “believing” from “doing”: the butt of his attack in this letter is “the works of the law”, that is, maintaining a Jewish life-style’.674 The “scripture against scripture” hypothesis has a fatal flaw.

Instead, claims Wright, Paul contrasts “faith” with “law” in a temporal sense. The period when God’s people were constituted by the “law” has gone, and the new era where God’s people are characterised by “faith” has already dawned.675 Concerning 3:11, then, Paul understands Habakkuk 2:4 in the light of the covenant renewal foretold in Deuteronomy 30:

---

672 Martyn 1997b, 330-1. Martyn argues that Paul would have expected that their rivals would say something like that.

673 An exceptional passage may be found in Ezekiel 20:25. Paul might have alluded to this verse, as some scholars suggest. We shall return to this point in what follows.

674 Barclay 1988, 82 [Barclay’s emphasis]. Moo also maintains, ‘Clear NT warnings of the necessity of putting away sin in order to gain eternal life (see also esp., Rom. 8:12-13) must not be swept under the carpet by a one-sided and unbiblical understanding of “justification by faith alone”’ (2013, 363).

675 Wright 2013a, 361. Silva seems to reach the same conclusion (2001, 265). In Habakkuk Pesher, “faith” is construed as the faithfulness to the Teacher of Righteousness (1QpHab 8.2-3).
Paul’s point, in using Habakkuk in this way, is that when that redefinition [of the covenant community] comes about, the demarcating characteristic of the covenant people is to be precisely their faith, their belief in Israel’s God: and this, obviously, enables him to align Habakkuk, in his redefinition of the covenant people, with the promise to Abraham, and its initial definition of that people as ‘those of faith’ (3.6–9).

As to 3:12, on the other hand, Paul’s point is that the “doing” of the law cannot fulfil God’s promise to Abraham concerning the single, universal family, since the “doing” of the law in fact results in the exclusion of Gentiles from the blessings of Abraham, as the Antioch incident exemplifies. In this way, Wright forges a close relationship between 3:6–9 and 3:11–12.

Wright then moves to 3:13, in which we take special interest, explaining that Paul sees Jesus’ death as the climax of the covenantal curse, ‘For Paul, the death of Jesus, precisely on a Roman cross which symbolized so clearly the continuing subjugation of the people of God, brought the exile to a climax’. Wright maintains that Jesus exhausted or consumed the Deuteronomic curse on the cross. He goes on to argue, ‘because he [Jesus] is Israel’s representative, he can be the appropriate substitute, can take on himself the curse of others, so

---

676 Ibid., 149 [Wright’s emphasis].
677 Ibid., 150. Boyarin also comments, ‘because it is in the doing of the Law, that is, in the focus on the corporeal, that the identity of the ethnic group is marked and established’ (1994, 54-5).
678 Concerning 3:12, another plausible interpretation is offered by Willitts. He states, ‘Ezekiel’s use of the Leviticus 18:5 clause in the retelling of the history of Israel [Ezek 20:11, 13, 21, and especially see 25] – his inner-biblical exegesis – broadens and further develops the clause’s significance beyond the Pentateuch. For Ezekiel, Leviticus 18:5 does not represent the positive purpose of the covenant, as it did in the Pentateuch, but now ironically, in light of Israel’s history, it comes to signify the unrealised purpose of the covenant within redemptive history’ (2003, 113). In other words, Willitts suggests that Paul interprets, like Ezekiel, Leviticus 18:5 in the light of the ongoing history of Israel (i.e., protracted exile).
679 Ibid., 146.
680 Ibid., 151.
they do not bear it any more’. 681

On this specific point, however, his view is not entirely convincing. It must be remembered that Moses and David, arguably two of the most prominent “representatives” of Israel throughout its history, were not allowed to take on themselves the curse of others (cf. Exod 32:31–33; 2Sam 24:17–25; 1Chr 21:17–27). From this biblical perspective, therefore, the representative of Israel is not qualified to be a bearer of the curse falling on the people.

According to the scriptures, the only figure eligible to bear vicariously the national plague is the Isaianic suffering servant. 682 In this connection, the theology of martyrdom found in 2 Maccabees and/or 4 Maccabees shows some similarity to Paul’s way of thinking. 683 It is hardly an accident that these texts also seem to be influenced by Isaiah 53 as well. 684 Hence, whether or not Paul’s ideas are influenced by the Maccabean literature, it is more plausible that both Paul and the authors of 2 Maccabees and 4 Maccabees are inspired by the book of Isaiah. Paul’s notion that Jesus bore, or even embodied, the curse of Israel as a whole, seems to assume that what qualified Jesus to undertake this task was his identification with the Isaianic servant, not simply that he was a representative for other Jews. Although Wright repeatedly stresses the importance of Isaiah 53 as the crucial background of Paul’s soteriology, 685 he remains

---

681 Wright 2013a, 865 [Wright’s emphasis].
682 This is not to suggest that the suffering servant is not the representative of Israel. Rather, being this representative would be the necessary condition for the assumption of this vicarious task, while being identified with the Isaianic suffering servant is a sufficient condition for undertaking this task.
683 The detailed study of the theology of martyrdom in these texts is beyond the scope of our research. For a detailed discussion on this topic, see, e.g., Williams 2010, 27-63. Williams’ account is, however, not without problems. For instance, he writes, ‘the author (of 4 Maccabees) states that the martyrs’ deaths purified the homeland (4Macc 17:21)’ (Ibid., 59). His statement that death purifies the land conflicts with the Jewish notion of purity and holiness. Moreover, he constantly describes “death” as a sacrifice to God, which also contradicts the Jewish notion of “sacrifice”. See our discussion in chapter 2, and especially chapter 3,3.2.
684 Cf. Williams, ibid., 41-2.
685 E.g., Wright 2013a, 813, 850-1, and especially 1137-9. See also Wright 2013b, 302.
ambiguous as to the relationship between Galatians 3:13 and Isaiah 53. When we pursue the logic behind Galatians 3:13 from the biblical perspective, Isaiah 53 provides the most plausible theological background.

Concerning the final verse in this passage, while Wright argues that the “we” in 3:13 certainly refers to Jews, he considers that the “we” in 3:14b signifies, at least mainly, Jewish Christians:

The first half of the verse is unproblematic: getting rid of the ‘curse’ enables the Abrahamic blessing to flow to the Gentiles as always intended (3.8). But does this leave Jews themselves still under the ‘curse’? No. The Messiah opens the way for them to come into the moment of covenant renewal, the moment which Paul can evoke with a mention of Deuteronomy 30, or of Jeremiah 31, or of Ezekiel 36 or indeed of Joel 2.32. I think it probable, therefore, that the ‘we’ of 3.14b (‘that we might receive the promise of the spirit, through faith’) refers at least primarily to Jews who, by faith, come into the same new-covenant membership into which Gentiles are being welcomed.\(^686\)

As we discussed above,\(^687\) Wright’s view on the “we” in 3:14b seems to fit in with the overall context. He could, however, have added Isaiah 44:1–5 and 59:21 as the crucial background texts for Paul’s statement in 3:14. Overall, Wright thinks that the central theological backbone of this passage is the Deuteronomic historical perspective, which envisions ‘the climax of the long story of God and Israel’,\(^688\) namely, the renewal of the covenant.\(^689\)

\(^{686}\) Ibid., 867.
\(^{687}\) See our discussion on Scott’s view.
\(^{688}\) Wright 2002, 658.
\(^{689}\) See particularly Deuteronomy 27–30.
2.5.5 Galatians 3:15–4:11: The ambiguity of the law

According to Wright, throughout 3:15–4:11 Paul recounts the ambivalent role of the Mosaic law within and in the light of the history of Israel, whereby the Mosaic law involves some elements contradictory to the promise to the Abraham: ‘(a) God promised Abraham a single family, not two families; (b) the Law threatens to create two families (as was already visible in Antioch when Peter and the others withdrew from table-fellowship with uncircumcised believers)’. 690

However, if the law and the promise come into conflict, the promise trumps the law. Even God’s law cannot annul the promise to Abraham, since this promise is not merely a promise but an absolute promise confirmed by God’s covenantal oath. 691

Nonetheless, this does not mean that the law is inherently wrong. Rather, Paul’s point is that the law is temporal in nature. One of the temporal roles of the law is to inform Israelites of the fact that they are sinful, which prepared them for embracing the age characterised by “faith”. Another temporal role of the law is to be παιδαγωγός for Israelites (Gal 3:25). As Wright explains, ‘The Torah was in fact like a babysitter, a paidagōgos, a role somewhat outside the repertoire of today’s western world’. 692 The termination of the period of the law results in the fulfilment of the Abrahamic promise, the birth of the single, worldwide family. Wright regards Paul’s statement in 3:28–29 as the denouement of the entire chapter: ‘One! That was the point of the chapter, from 3.15 right through to 3.29; that was the key element on which so much turned, as it was the key point which Paul was most anxious to convey to Peter at Antioch and to the Galatians in writing this letter’. 693

---

690 Wright 2013a, 868.
692 Wright 2013a, 874.
693 Ibid., 875. In line with, e.g., Dahl 1977, 109.
In 4:1–11, Paul goes on to tell the same story of Israel from a different angle, a new Exodus. In this narrative, however, the law is given a negative, antagonistic role. It “enslaves” Israel. As Wright explains, ‘The irony of this situation (sharply reflected in 4.3, where “we”, the Jewish people, had been “under the stoicheia”, the “elements of the world”) comes about because of the strange situation described in 3.19 and 3.22. There was nothing wrong with Torah, nothing inherently enslaving about it. But when the good Torah was given to the Israelites, it was bound to enslave them, because they were sinful’. In this new Exodus narrative, the law is no longer a gentle babysitter, but a dark, enslaving force, from which God’s people have escaped. Wright states, ‘For the moment we note the sharp edge of Paul’s messianic redefinition of the Jewish doctrine of election: those who belong to the Messiah are not under Torah. Jewish Messiah-believers have been redeemed from that state; Gentile Messiah-believers must not enter it’. By recounting the story of Israel in this way, Paul hammers home the reason why the law cannot be the true identity marker of God’s eschatological people.

2. 5. 6 Galatians 4:21–5:1: The story of Hagar and Sarah in the light of Isaiah

In the original context, Isaiah 54:1 is most probably about the repatriation of the exiled people to the ruined city of Jerusalem. Zion once lost its children (i.e., the inhabitants), but is now filled with the returnees from Babylon. One of the formidable exegetical questions concerning Galatians 4:21–5:1 is how Paul uses this Isaianic passage in his allegorical argument. Does he

---

694 Ibid., 878.
695 Ibid., 878.
696 For Wright’s full account of the “story of Torah”, see ibid., 505-16.
ignore its original context, and randomly connect it to the story of Sarah and Hagar.\textsuperscript{697}

Wright maintains that this passage forms a sequel to the previous argument, as he states, ‘He [Paul] is continuing to talk about the actual “inheritance” of Abraham’s family, as throughout 3.1–4.7.’\textsuperscript{698} Paul is not, however, retelling the story of Sarah and Hagar in a strange way. Rather, Isaiah 54:1 functions as the hermeneutical key that informs an allegorical significance of the story of Sarah and Hagar.\textsuperscript{699} Wright explains:

Isaiah 54 speaks of the restored Jerusalem, and had already been understood in Jewish tradition in terms of Sarah, referred to explicitly in Isaiah 51.1–3. But Isaiah 54 also comes, of course, immediately after Isaiah 53, where the Servant is finally vindicated and exalted after his suffering and death. And this triumph is itself the long-awaited kingdom of YHWH: the fourth ‘servant song’ was the vision which explained the ‘gospel’ announcement in Isaiah 52.7–12.\textsuperscript{700}

Wright regards the children of Sarah as representing the eschatological people of God: both Jews, who are figuratively returning from the exile, and Gentiles, who are ‘brought in from the outside’.\textsuperscript{701} The children of Hagar represent, on the other hand, the people who are under the Mosaic law, under the curse of exile.\textsuperscript{702}

Nevertheless, Wright does not think that Hagar and Sarah represent the “old” and “new”

\textsuperscript{697} Cf. Barrett 1976, 12.
\textsuperscript{698} Wright 2013a, 1134.
\textsuperscript{699} See also Willitts, who argues, ‘By way of preview, this paper asserts that commentators have interpreted the allegory in Gal 4,21–5,1 in the wrong way. It will be argued that the scriptural text Paul interprets in these verses is not Genesis and the Abraham story, but Isa 54 and the redemptive-historical story of Israel. From this observation it is concluded that the Genesis narrative is used allegorieally by Paul in order to create a paradigm for his readers’ (2005, 192) [Willitts’ emphasis].
\textsuperscript{700} Wright 2013a, 1137.
\textsuperscript{701} Ibid., 864.
\textsuperscript{702} Ibid., 1139.
covenants respectively.\textsuperscript{703} Rather, he contends that “two covenants” should be interpreted in the light of Galatians 3: ‘here in Galatians the context of chapter 3, where the original Abrahamic covenant is expounded at length, sets up a contrast not between the old (Mosaic) covenant and its renewal but between the Abrahamic covenant, as in Genesis 15 and Galatians 3, and the Sinai covenant made through Moses’.\textsuperscript{704} We do not concur with this view, however. The thrust of Paul’s argument is not the contrast between the law (the Mosaic covenant) and the promise (the Abrahamic covenant), but the theme of the \textit{renewal} of the covenant. Hence, we support the “old and new covenants” interpretation with four reasons below.

First, as Wright maintains, we should interpret the Genesis anecdote in the Isaiahic light, but not vice versa. Then, as Wright himself stresses,\textsuperscript{705} one of the central themes of Isaiah 54 is the \textit{renewal} of the broken covenant (cf. Isa 50:1; 54:10). The Abrahamic promise is the foundation of this covenant renewal (cf. Isa 51:2), but Deutero-Isaiah also refers to the Noahic covenant as the basis of the renewal of the covenant (cf. Isa 54:10). Moreover, as Williamson states,

\begin{quote}
[T]he Abrahamic covenant is alluded to in verses 1–3 (cf. Gen. 22:17); the Sinai covenant is picked up in verses 4–8; the Noahic covenant comes into focus in verses 9–10; and the Davidic covenant is introduced in Isaiah 55:3–4. Together this suggests that this ‘covenant of peace’ (or in the case of the next chapter, the ‘everlasting covenant’) constitutes the climactic covenant in which all the major divine-human
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{703} Concerning those who propose the “old/new” scheme, see Betz 1979, 243-6; Fee 1994, 413-6; Willitts 2004, 206; Gräbe 2006, 119; Williamson 2007, 199; Hahn 2009, 273-4; Meyer 2009, 124-37. The other popular view is that Hagar and Sarah represent the law-observant Christian mission and the law-free Christian mission, respectively. See Bligh 1970, 390-1; Barrett 1976, 13; Martyn 1985, 419; 1997, 320-2; Eastman 2007, 131-2; de Boer 2011, 287.


\textsuperscript{705} Wright 2009, 199; 2013a, 1138.
covenants find their ultimate fulfilment.\textsuperscript{706} The new covenant envisaged in Isaiah 54 is the renewal and the fulfilment of all the previous covenants. If Paul is aware of the surrounding context of Isaiah 54:1, Paul would have referred to the new, not simply the Abrahamic, covenant in Galatians 4:24.

Second, while the new, everlasting covenant of peace envisaged by Deutero-Isaiah is the fulfilment of the Abrahamic promise, the Mosaic covenant is also the fulfilment of the Abrahamic promise. God said to Abram: “Know this for certain, that your offspring shall be aliens in a land that is not theirs, and shall be slaves there, and they shall be oppressed for four hundred years; but I will bring judgement on the nation that they serve, and afterwards they shall come out with great possessions” (Gen 15:13–14). Paul knows that this promise was fulfilled literally, which led to the establishment of the Mosaic covenant (cf. Gal 3:17; Exod 12:40–41). Both the Mosaic covenant and the new covenant are the promised covenants, based on the Abrahamic promises.\textsuperscript{707} Hence, it is misleading to contrast the Abrahamic with the Mosaic covenant as the contrast between the promise and the law. Rather, Paul’s attention rests on the contrast between the flesh (σάρξ) and the Spirit (πνεῦμα). The Mosaic covenant can be associated with the “flesh”, since those who were given the law were in the flesh of Adam (cf. Rom 5:12–15), whereas the new covenant is clearly associated with the outpouring of the Spirit (cf. Isa 59:21; Gal 4:14). In this connection, it should be remembered that Isaiah 54:3 seems to allude to God’s promise to Jacob in Genesis 28:14–15.\textsuperscript{708} This is the reconfirmation of the very Abrahamic promise to which Paul refers in Galatians 3:8. Paul regards the essence of this

\textsuperscript{706} Williamson 2007, 161.

\textsuperscript{707} Scholarly opinion is divided as to whether the Abrahamic covenant is singular or plural. But we shall leave this question open. Cf. Williamson 2007, 89-91.

\textsuperscript{708} See chapter 4.3.3.2(i).
Abrahamic promise as the outpouring of the Spirit (Gal 3:14). If Paul takes notice of the scriptural allusion in Isaiah 54:3,709 his point should be that the Abrahamic promise of the Spirit is now realised in the new covenant. Therefore, it is indeed reasonable to construe Galatians 4:21–5:1 in conjunction with 2 Corinthians 3:1–18, which contrasts the old (flesh) covenant with the new (Spirit) covenant.710

Third, and closely related to the previous two points, in 4Q164, the eschatological vision described in Isaiah 54 is applied to the community.711 The majority of scholars, including Wright himself, conclude that the Qumran community regarded themselves as the people of the renewed covenant.712 When Paul applies Isaiah 54:1 to the Galatian Christians, he would most likely be stressing, as the Qumran community did, that they are the people of the renewed covenant, promised in the book of Isaiah.

Fourth, as discussed before, Paul carefully distinguishes “we (Jews)” from “you (Gentiles)” in his retelling of the Jewish history in Galatians 3:15–4:7.713 However, in this allegorical and apocalyptic discourse, Paul seems to apply “we” to Gentile believers freely (Gal 4:26, 31). This point suggests that the aim of this discourse is not to expound how “you” (Gentiles) join in the history of “we” (Jews). Rather, Paul’s focus here is to depict the new reality, or even the new creation, after the renewal of the covenant, envisaged in Isaiah 54:1–17. In this new reality, the distinction between “we” (Jews) and “you” (Gentiles) becomes irrelevant. If this reading is maintained, the “two” covenants in 4:24 should refer to the old and new

709 It is important to note that Paul seems to allude to Genesis 28:14 in Romans 4:13. In the late Second Temple period, Genesis 28:14 was often interpreted as referring to the promise of the inheritance of the whole world. See Jub. 32:19; Sir 44:19–23.
710 Pace Wright 2013a, 1139. In line with Meyer 2009, 133-4.
711 In 4Q164 (aQPltsa), Isaiah 54:11c, 12a and 12b are applied to the community. Cf. Cosgrove 1988, 82.
712 See N. T. Wright 1992, 207.
713 See our review of James Scott above (2.3.4).
covenants.

Considering these points together, we may conclude that the thrust of this discourse is not to contrast the promise with the law, as is the case in 3:15–3:29. Rather, the central theme is the renewal of the broken covenant, which is not available to those who still stick to the “old” covenant (Gal 4:30).

2. 5. 7 Summary

Wright’s thesis is that in Galatians Paul expounds how the redemption of Jews accompanies the inclusion of Gentiles into God’s people. Wright demonstrates this point by showing that in Galatians 2–4 Paul retells the freshly revised story of Israel from various angles. Although we disagree on some exegetical points, his basic argument is convincing. Given that Paul is keen to answer the question of who are the real descendants of Abraham, the heirs of the covenantal blessings, it is well-nigh inevitable that Paul would recount the story of Israel, which begins with the story of Abraham, to make his case. Paul’s particular concern is to demonstrate that the Mosaic law, given after the promise to Abraham concerning his heir that must embrace all the nations, cannot be the decisive factor that defines the descendants of Abraham. Paul’s argument on this issue is complex and sometimes ambiguous, but it is still clear what he wishes to prove: Gentile Christians can and must be among the real descendants of Abraham without doing the works of the law. Paul thinks that the formation of God’s new people, where the old sign of the covenant (i.e., circumcision) becomes irrelevant, results in the new creation (καινή κτίσις). Wright argues, ‘This [Galatians 6:15] is obviously parallel to 5.6, and elsewhere to 1

---

Corinthians 7.19, and the point is...that eschatology defines election: the “new creation” determines the identity of the single family, the “seed” promised to Abraham, and in doing so utterly relativizes the marks of circumcision, on the one hand, or any possible Gentile pride in uncircumcision, on the other.\textsuperscript{715} Wright thereby connects the theme of “new creation” with the main point of Galatians 2–4.\textsuperscript{716} According to Wright, moreover, the three themes of the fulfilment of the Abrahamic promises, the new Exodus, and the new creation converge on the central theme of this epistle, namely, the formation of the eschatological people of God in the renewed covenant (Gal 4:27). The fulfilment of the Abrahamic promise must involve the inclusion of Gentiles to God’s people, since Abraham shall be a father of many nations (cf. Rom 4:18; Gen 15:5). It can be no accident that we find all these elements in Isaiah 49–55. Therefore, Wright’s argument strongly supports the structural linkage between Isaiah 49–55 and Galatians 2–4.

3. Conclusion

We have studied the works of scholars who maintain, or at least suggest, a narrative substructure beneath Paul’s various scriptural arguments in Galatians 2–4. Admittedly, none of them strongly claims that Isaiah 53 is the crucial backdrop of Galatians 3:13. Nonetheless, their arguments substantially or indirectly support our contention.

First, Hays proposes that Paul alludes to Isaiah 44:3 in Galatians 3:14. In this connection, we see that Isaiah 44:1–3 has a strong thematic connection with Isaiah 49–55, which suggests

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{715} Wright 2013a, 1143 [Wright’s emphasis].
\textsuperscript{716} While we have no space to explore the theme of “new creation” in Galatians, Morales provides an excellent research on this issue with special attention to the Isaianic influence and the eschatological hope of the divine spirit (2010, 132-63).
\end{footnotesize}
that the suffering servant in Isaiah 53 is virtually identical with the servant in 44:1–2. Given that this is correct, we can see the clear linkage between the suffering of the servant and the outpouring of the Spirit on the descendants of Jacob (and implicitly Abraham as well). This is exactly the narrative flow in Galatians 3:13–14. This point suggests that the Isaianic servant stands in the theological background of Galatians 3:13.

Second, in the narrative flow of Isaiah 49–55, the curse of the covenant (i.e., exile) is dissolved through the suffering and death of the servant. As Scott and Wright convincingly demonstrate, we find the same narrative pattern in Galatians 3:10–14 where Jesus himself became a curse in order to redeem those who had been under the curse of the law. Such a similarity points to a thematic tie between Isaiah 53 and Galatians 3:13.

Third, García Martínez has shown that some texts from the Qumran caves exhibit notable similarities to Paul’s arguments in Galatians in terms of their theological perspectives. They share a cognate anthropological perspective (i.e., seriousness of human sinfulness), as well as a similar eschatological hope (i.e., bestowal of the divine spirit, which enables them to overcome fleshly weakness). These analogies further suggest that they share a distinctive view of the unfolding history of Israel, namely, the realisation of the end of exile is occurring in and through their communities. This bolsters the credibility of the second point mentioned above: the central theme of Galatians 3:10–14 is the termination of the covenantal curse, which results in the outpouring of the divine spirit on God’s eschatological people.

Fourth, Wright demonstrates that Paul repeatedly retells the story of Israel from various angles in Galatians 2–4, a story culminating in 4:21–5:1, which describes the fulfilment of the Isaianic vision in the new covenant community. The thrust of Paul’s argument is to demonstrate
that the decisive factor defining this eschatological community is Jesus the Messiah, not Torah.

In this light, the strong thematic unity between Galatians 3:10–14 and 4:21–5:1 clearly emerges. Both passages contrast one group (those who are under the Moaic covenant) with the other (the eschatological people of God). Isaiah 54:1 is understood in Galatians 4:27 as referring to the birth of the latter group, whereas Galatians 3:13 recounts how this has happened through Christ. Since the vision of Isaiah 54 is accomplished through the suffering of the servant, it is reasonable to see the connection between Galatians 3:13 and the Isaianic suffering servant.

Fifth, in Isaiah 49–55, the Abrahamic promises function as the foundation of other major Isaianic themes, such as the new Exodus, salvation for the nations, and the new creation. Moreover, the internal strife within Israel aroused by the works of the “servant” as well as the Gentile mission are also the vital themes in the series of servant poems in Isaiah 49–55. It is not likely to be a coincidence that all these themes also appear in the epistle to the Galatians. Rather, these observations strongly suggest that Isaiah 49–55 forms the crucial backbone of Paul’s argument in Galatians.

Given the cumulative force of our argument thus far for the critical influence of Isaiah 49–55 on the epistle to the Galatians, Hays’ suggestion that the word ἐκκαθάρισμα in Galatians 3:2 and 3:5 denotes the Isaianic gospel is plausible. Although Galatians 4:27 contains the sole direct quotation from Isaiah, this prophetic book is essential to Paul’s arguments in this epistle.717 Since Paul’s gospel proclaimed in Galatia is fundamentally rooted in the Isaianic gospel, the Isaianic influence extensively permeates Paul’s various arguments. We therefore conclude that Isaiah 53 is the crucial theological backdrop of Galatians 3:13.

---

717 In addition to 4:27, there are some allusions to the second servant poem (Isa 49:1-13), which applies to Paul himself (cf. Gal 1:15, 16; 2:2; 4:11).
4. Further implications

The conclusion mentioned above has two implications for our understanding of Paul’s soteriology. First, the term *ϰᾰτάϰα* in Galatians 3:13 should not be categorised as a sacrificial term. Paul’s aim here is not, as is the case of Romans 3:25, to explain Jesus’ death by an analogy with a sacrificial animal. Rather, Paul uses this term with covenantal as well as historical perspectives in mind. This point may reflect Paul’s profound sense of history and a deep understanding of the relationship between sacrifice and the covenant. Since Paul is aware of the fact that usual sacrificial means are not effective to retrieve the broken covenant, he alludes to a different theme in the Jewish Bible, namely, the Isaianic suffering servant.

Second, and related to the first point, while the crucifixion of the Messiah is an earth-shaking event for Paul (cf. Gal 6:14), this does not mean that Jewish history prior to the Christ event is irrelevant for his grasp of the significance of Jesus’ death. On the contrary, Paul understands one of the crucial aspects of Jesus’ death to be the redemption of Jews from their plight, namely, the Mosaic covenantal curse. This is exactly the task of the Isaianic servant, that is, to redeem Zion from her plight of the exile. Moreover, Paul recognises that Jesus’ death opens up a way to fulfil another task of the servant, namely, to be a light of the nations (Isa 49:6; Rom 2:19; 15:9). Indeed, Paul sees himself as an apostle of Jesus the Messiah to complete the second vocation of the servant (cf. Rom 15:16). This further indicates that Paul’s soteriology involves a *narrative* element, in which the history of Jews has reached, and is still advancing to, its appropriate goal and climax.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

The basic question driving this study is whether or not Paul’s use of sacrificial imagery reflects a consistent understanding of Jewish sacrificial practices and some of the key ideas behind them. We posit that a covenant model provides a sufficient framework through which we can find a coherence of thought in Paul’s use of sacrificial motifs and ideas. As test cases, we examined the three passages (1Cor 5:7; Rom 3:25; Gal 3:13) that relate to the three Jewish themes of Passover, Yom Kippur, and the Isaianic suffering servant. Admittedly, this investigation has not covered all the soteriological statements that involve sacrificial imagery (e.g., Romans 8:3). Despite this limitation, however, we suggest that the covenant model we propose has considerable explanatory power. Paul invokes and employs the three Jewish themes within the larger framework of God’s covenant with his people.

Passover is the celebration of God’s faithfulness to his covenantal promises, which was confirmed by the Exodus event in the past (cf. Gen 15:13–14; Exod 2:24). Paul proclaims that the God of Israel continues to be faithful to his covenantal promises. This is now manifested through Jesus, the Messiah of Israel (e.g., Rom 15:8; 2Cor 1:18–20; Gal 3:8). For Paul, the Exodus story provides several important motifs and themes that illuminate what the Christ event accomplished. The term πάσχα is one such example. Indeed, when Paul uses this term in 1 Corinthians 5:7, he does not merely intend to refer to the lamb that is slaughtered and consumed on the Passover night. Rather, he exploits the evocative power of the word πάσχα to allude to the whole Exodus narrative. Paul thereby expects his addressees to recall the Exodus story in a
christological light.\footnote{Contra Bultmann, who maintains, ‘The Christian proclamation cannot and may not remind hearers that God led their fathers out of Egypt, that he once led the people into captivity and brought them back again into the land of Promise, that he restored Jerusalem and the Temple, and so on. Israel’s history is not our history, and in so far as God has shown his grace in that history, such grace is not meant for us’ (1963, 31).}

For first century Jews, the primary purpose of observing the Passover feast was not only to remember the Passover event in the past, but also to participate in the whole Exodus story through the repetition of its key events. Thus, when Paul refers to πάσχα, he attempts to remind his addressees that they presently celebrate the feast of Unleavened Bread in purity, which itself is the repetition of one of the Passover events (cf. Exod 12:14–22, 39; 13:6–10). Moreover, they are now to imagine themselves on the new Exodus journey through the wilderness, advancing to the ultimate promised land.

As regards the words ἰλαστήριον and αἷμα in Romans 3:25, we stressed the centrality of “blood”, which is closely associated with “life”, in the process of Jewish blood sacrifices. The idea of “life-blood” that accomplishes both purification and propitiation is especially prominent in the Yom Kippur rite. From this vantage point, we challenged the conventional view that the word αἷμα in Pauline terminology is merely a metonym for Christ’s death. Rather, by mentioning the blood of Christ in a concrete sense, Paul draws an analogy between the Jewish blood sacrifice, in particular on Yom Kippur, and the life-offering of Christ. Paul, in other words, evokes the Yom Kippur blood ritual by referring to the place of the atonement (ἰλαστήριον) and to the blood-sacrifice itself.

For many first century Jews, Yom Kippur was the most important day for the maintenance of the covenant with their God. By observing Yom Kippur, the covenant relationship between God and Israel was confirmed and cemented through the annual forgiveness and purification of
sins and impurities. Paul, however, believes that God’s covenant is now expanded in the Messiah to include Gentiles. In this renewed covenant, the Christian community is seen as the Temple as well as “a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God” (Rom 12:1; cf. Rom 15:16). This implies that Paul sees that the renewed covenant entails the renewed sacrificial system, although ‘Paul does not have a systematically-worked-out and harmonized theory according to which the rites of the Bible are transferred to the Christian community, nor does his Temple have a specific physical location’. 719 The Christ event lies at the heart of this renewed sacrificial system. For the sake of God’s people in this expanded covenant, the ultimate Yom Kippur sacrifice, which justifies, sanctifies, and sustains God’s covenant people to the end, must be offered. To Paul, thus, Yom Kippur would have been an ideal motif to stress the unbreakable tie between God and the renewed covenant people (cf. Rom 8:35).

The word κατάρα in Galatians 3:13 also makes sense within the larger covenantal framework, though it focuses on the negative side of the covenant, the curse as the punishment for the covenantal breach. A certain reading of Deuteronomy suggests that the Mosaic covenant can be fractured beyond the point of no return, which brings down the series of enduring covenantal curses. The most severe curse (i.e., the exile) is triggered by the accumulation of certain grave sins such as idolatry. Significantly, the ordinary sacrificial means for maintaining the covenant play no role in terminating the curse. The people, bound by the covenantal oath, must endure the curse as a necessary condition for its termination. The suffering of the servant in Isaiah 53 is to be understood in this covenantal context: he bore the sins and suffered punishment in full measure in order to terminate the covenantal curse that had fallen on the

719 Newton 1985, 53.
covenant people. We argued that Paul’s usage of χατάρα should be interpreted against this
Isaianic backdrop. Jesus the Messiah of Israel as the suffering servant suffered punishment on
behalf of the people in order to redeem those who were under the curse of the law (i.e., Jews).
From Paul’s point of view, this act of Jesus led to the renewal of the covenant for Jews and to
the inclusion of Gentiles into this renewed covenant. Paul’s intention to use the term χατάρα is
not to evoke the image of a sacrificial animal. Rather, Paul’s adoption of this term reflects his
perception that Jews had been kept under the covenantal curse. Paul, in line with the Isaianic
thought, views the suffering of the righteous person (i.e., Jesus) as the means of restoring the
fractured covenant.

In conclusion, Paul’s use of the three themes noted throughout the study reflects his
understanding of the relationship between sacrifice, curse, and the covenant. Paul recognises
that Jewish sacrificial practices have multiple purposes. At the same time, they are deeply
rooted in the idea of the covenant. For instance, at the heart of the Passover feast lies the
celebration of God’s covenantal faithfulness, which was manifested in the Exodus event. Paul
uses the paschal motif with this point in mind. Paul, on the other hand, is well aware of the
distinction between what sacrificial practices can achieve (i.e., the maintenance of the covenant
relationship) and what they cannot (e.g., the termination of the covenantal curse). Hence, Paul
uses both sacrificial and non-sacrificial terms tactically in his accounts of the multifaceted
significance of the Christ event. Moreover, Paul carefully weaves these terms into his symbolic
narrative world. Indeed, Paul’s gospel is the retelling of the Isaianic story, which envisions the
redemption of Israel, humanity, and the whole created order.
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