

The New Covenant at Qumran

Andreas Hauw¹

Abstract

This paper answers what the community at Qumran think about new covenant. It covers three manuscripts (*Temple Scroll*^a [11Q19], *Rule of the Community* [1QS, 4Q255-264a, 5Q11, 5Q13] and *Damascus Document* [4Q266-273, 5Q12, 6Q15]) because they use the phrase “new covenant” and present notions of the covenant. The proper contexts of the three aforementioned manuscripts, and the only one phrase “new covenant” found in the OT (Jer.31:31), including their theological, political and social issues are discussed. In addition, the emphasis of the concept of covenant in each manuscript and how it relates each other is explained. This paper concludes that the Qumran community reinterpreted the concept of covenant in a new way influenced by theological, political and social issues in its time.

Introduction

Covenant (*kārat*) is one of prominent terms in Hebrew Scripture and Israel considered themselves as the covenant community of God. The concept of covenant, however, differs from time to time. Our investigation here focuses on the concept of new covenant at Qumran Community. According to the excavated documents so far, which are numerous,² the Qumran Community’s concept of covenant are scattered in many different texts, such as 1Q28a, 1Q28b, 1QM, 1Q34, 1QH^a, 4Q501, 4Q504, 11Q19, 1QS, 4Q255-264a, 5Q11, 4Q266-273, 5Q12 and *Damascus Document* (CD). I will concentrate my research only on these texts: *Temple Scroll*^a (11Q19), *Rule of the Community* (1QS, 4Q255-264a, 5Q11, 5Q13) and *Damascus Document* (4Q266-273, 5Q12, 6Q15). Many issues about the concept of covenant at Qumran can be found in these particular texts.

In this paper I will address this particular question: what did the community at Qumran think about new covenant? For sure, Qumran community also used Hebrew Scripture, at least in some of their writings. Therefore why did they need a new covenant in addition to Hebrew Scripture? Did people at Qumran assume that there were new

¹ This paper was presented at Society of Asian Biblical Studies (SABS) conference 2018 (16-20 July 2018), STFT Widya Sasana Malang-Indonesia.

² Here I refer not only documents discovered in 11 caves of Qumran but also many documents outside them, in Egypt and Syria, for instance. Hundreds manuscripts discovered in Dead Sea area comprise some OT manuscripts and their commentaries, Apocryphal Writings and Sectarian Writings. Here I will limit my research only to Sectarian Writings, especially to the texts represent the concept of covenant.

interpretations on the first covenant that could be found in the writings of the patriarchs and the prophets? I assume we should investigate not only where the phrase “new covenant” could be discovered, but also all notions of the covenant found in the aforementioned three manuscripts. My assumption is based on: (1) The phrase “new covenant” appears only four times in Qumran texts (CD vi.19, viii.21, xix.33-34 and xx.12); (2) we have to investigate the concept of covenant quite thoroughly and then see the notion of “new covenant” in its proper contexts, placed among the other explanations of covenant in the other parts of Qumran texts, especially CD; (3) In the Old Testament (OT) texts, there is only one “new covenant” phrase, which only appears in Jer.31:31; (4) Qumran community reinterpreted the concept of covenant in a new way, since it imbued it with theological, political and social issues in its time. Before we commence our inquiry, I shall introduce Qumran Community in its historical framework.

1. Qumran Community in its historical framework

This section will reveal to us the identity of Qumran community in the context of Israel’s history.³ My explanation here is rather simple and not highly detailed.

1.1. Antiochus IV and his effect to Jewish Community

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

Almost at the same time, Jason led the Jewish community as high priest (175 BCE). After the end of Onias III’s priesthood, Jason immediately obtained the permanent

³ Investigation on the history of the Qumran Community has been done by many scholars, however elaborate survey has been prepared by Phillip R. Callaway. He started the study with archaeology, palaeography, essenes theory, damascus document, the pesharim, 4Qtestimonia and ended with the hodayat. He concluded his investigation that the Qumran Community should be put in between the second century and early first century BC. He supposed that the chief of the community must be an ex-high priest and the community’s enemy is Pharisees. He emphasized the conflict occurred because of different sectarian or disagreement within one particular group. See, *The History of the Qumran Community, JSPSS 3* (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1988).

post of high priest from the king. Presumably, he voluntarily offered the king an increase in taxes and extra contribution of 150 talents of silver, 2 Macc.4:7-8). Soon afterwards in 171 BCE, Menelaus, one of his officers, betrayed him. Menelaus was sent to Antiochus IV where he gave more money than Jason and asked Antiochus to appoint him as high priest in Jerusalem. Antiochus IV did not pay much attention to the tradition of high priest in Israel, since Menelaus did not come from the Zadokite line as Jason did. Finally, Menelaus was appointed as high priest in Jerusalem and Jason with his big number of followers fled to Transjordan (2 Macc.4:26). Jason attempted to rebel but failed (2 Macc.5:5-7); it is possible that the Seleucids' troops helped Menelaus.

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

1.2. Maccabees Revolt and Hasidic Movement

Persecutions by Antiochus IV caused Mattathias of Modein to start a revolution, but it was primarily a peasant war against the rich upper class in Jerusalem. Religious consideration, however, seems to be one of the reasons of the revolution. Mattathias refused to obey the king and killed the king's representative and a Judaeans who offered sacrifice in accordance with the royal command. Soon afterwards, he and his five sons fled to the hills, and later Judas, and not the oldest son, led the revolution (166-167 BCE).

This movement got the sympathy from all Jewish communities; one of them was a group called the Hasideans ("pious"). This group is one of the most important groups in helping us understand Qumran community, and soon it was also involved in the revolution. The Hasideans are mentioned for the first time in 1 Macc.2:42, and described as a group who "offered themselves willingly for the law". The Hasideans joined the Maccabees shortly after the beginning of the revolt. This might be caused by the

massacre of their fellow members on a Sabbath by Seleucids troops, since they refused to offer any resistance on that day (1 Macc.2:33-38, *AJ XII*, 274). We may infer that religious freedom was actually the main cause of the group's joining the Maccabean revolution, so as long as the ruler guaranteed religious liberty, the Hasideans would not rebel against the regime. Moreover, before the revolution, the Hasideans had already existed as a kind of religious party rather than a social movement.⁴ Lastly, in terms of religious affairs, this group lived on the basis of the Torah with utter strictness; the Hasideans gave the Mosaic law a central place in their daily life.

1.3. Hasidic Movement and Qumran Community

From archaeological evidences and literary materials, it can be assumed that the Hasidean community lived in Khirbet Qumran from about 150/140 BCE to 68 CE.⁵ From about 31 BCE, the settlement had been abandoned due to an earthquake⁶ and the community was finally destroyed by the Romans in 68 CE.

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

Many answers have been proposed regarding the identity of the righteousness teacher: Onias 3,⁷ one of the first Pharisaic masters,⁸ an anonymous High Priest who succeeded Alcimus in 160 BCE,⁹ the Pharisee Eleazar or the Essene prophet Judas,¹⁰

⁴ V. Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (Philadelphia and Jerusalem: JPS, 1961), 187-89; cf. J.A. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees, AB* (New York: Doubleday, 1976), 122.

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

⁶ Jagersma, *History*, 75.

⁷ H.H. Rowley, *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1952), 67-68; cf. William S. LaSor, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Faith* (Chicago: Moody, 1956), 224-225. He based his overview on the explanation on CD i.5 which said “390 years” and i.10 “twenty years”. He figured 390 years from the Exile (586 BCE) as the raising up of the “root” (of the Community) about 196 BCE, and the “twenty years” would put the Teacher of Righteousness at 176 BCE -which is close enough to be Onias 3.

⁸ Yose ben Yoezer, in G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspectives* (London: SCM, 1982), 160.

⁹ J. Murphy-O'Connor, Demetrius I and the Teacher of Righteousness, *RB* 83 (1976), 400-20.

¹⁰ W.H. Brownlee, The Historical Allusions of the Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash, *BASOR* 126 (1952), 18.

John the Baptist,¹¹ even Jesus of Nazareth,¹² and so on. These proposals are still unconvincing. Likewise, scholars have suggested that the wicked priest might be Jonathan, Simon, Alexander Jannaeus, or Hyrcanus 2, who all were the Hasmoneans (Maccabeus family).¹³ Previously, the consensus among scholars identified this figure as Jonathan, but later der Woude offered a theory that suggested a number of other figures.¹⁴ A recent research on historiographical context by Wacholder indicated the wicked priest as Pharisees and Sadducees.¹⁵ Yet, we must say that the real identities of both “the righteousness teacher” and “the wicked priest” are unknown. One obvious feature of “the righteousness teacher”, however, is his immense influence in the community, but it is hard to say, due to the lack of information, whether he was a founder of community or not. The community came into being 390 years after the fall of Jerusalem in 586 BCE, and yet, 390 seems to be a symbolic number. The evidence from archaeology indicates that the settlement was built in around 140 BCE, so this shows that the community came into being some decades earlier. We will discuss the meaning of the “land of Damascus” later. Lastly, we may infer that the community regarded itself as the true Israel, as we will see later in their writings. The community attacked the policy of high priest in Jerusalem but maybe also the Pharisees and Sadducees,¹⁶ and they called themselves Judah or Jerusalem (CD.vi.5). Then who the Qumran community was?

Several hypotheses have been proposed. The Essenes hypotheses by Sukenik,¹⁷ developed by Dupont-Sommer¹⁸ and Geza Vermes¹⁹, then followed by Milik²⁰ and Cross,²¹ suggest the Qumran community is identified with the Essenes. The “Groningen

¹¹ B.E. Thiering, *Redating the Teacher of Righteousness*, (Sidney, Theological Explorations) (1979).

¹² J.L. Teicher, Jesus in the Habakkuk Scroll, *JJS* 3 (1952), 53-55.

¹³ Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspectives*, 2nd edition. London: SCM, 1982, 161; cf. W.H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*, Missoula 1979, 95-98, cf. also B.E. Thiering, Once More the Wicked Priest, *JBL* 97, (1978), 191-205.

¹⁴ A.S. van der Woude, Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary, *Essays in Honour of Yigael Yadin*, *JJS* 33, (1982), 349-60.

¹⁵ Ben Zion Wacholder, “Historiography of Qumran: The Sons of Zadok and Their Enemies”, *Qumran between the Old and New Testament*, *JSOTs* 290 (Sheffield: Academic, 1988), 347-77.

¹⁶ Jagersma, *History*, 78.

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

¹⁸ Dupont-Sommer, A. *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (trans. G. Vermes) (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983), 349-68.

¹⁹ Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 4th edition (Sheffield: Academic, 1995), 20-40.

²⁰ J.T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judae* (trans. J. Strugnell) (London: SCM, 2nd ed. 1963), 80-98.

²¹ Cross, *Ancient*, 54-87.

hypotheses” by F. García Martínez, then followed by A.S. van der Woude, and to some extent followed by Ben Zion Wacholder and Gabrielle Boccaccini, consider the Qumran community as a break-away group from the Essenes.²² The “revised and augmented” Essenes hypotheses by Hartmut Stegeman propose that the Qumran community as the main Jewish Union in late Second Temple times and used its settlement as a study centre for all members, wherever they usually lived.²³ The Sadducean hypotheses by L.H. Schiffman suggest that the Qumran community was originated from a Sadducean sect.²⁴ One more important proposal is offered by Norman Golb. He mentioned that the Qumran buildings were actually fortresses and thus apparently had no connection with the caves. The manuscripts found in the caves were not left by the residents of Qumran but by people who fled from Jerusalem. The purpose of this was to hide the manuscripts from the approaching Romans around the time of the First Jewish Revolt.²⁵

To judge in detail which hypotheses is right is not our task now. All hypotheses mentioned above have weaknesses. The Essenes hypotheses have three weaknesses, as J.C. Van derKam has suggested:²⁶ (1) regarding the difference between The Community Rule (1QS vi.13-23) and Josephus report (*JW.* 2.137-139) about the entrance requirements for candidates; (2) Josephus (*JW.* 2.120, 160-161) and Pliny’s reports regarding the marriage in Qumran Community differs with 1QS. 1QS does not speak about marriage and offers no legislation, which was mentioned in Josephus’ and Pliny’s reports; (3) the name Essene has never occurred in Qumran texts. An objection also has been applied to the Sadducean hypotheses, since, for instance, the Qumran texts clearly

²² F. García Martínez, ‘Qumran Origins and Early History: A “Groningen Hypothesis”’, *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1989), 113-36; cf. “The History of The Qumran Community in the Light of Recently Available Texts”, *Qumran between the Old and New Testament*, *JSOTSS* 290 (1998, Sheffield), 194-216; F. García Martínez and A.S. van der Woude, ‘A “Groningen” Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History’, *RevQ* 14.56 (1990), 521-41; Wacholder, “Historiography”, 347-77; Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essenes Hypothesis* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 1988).

²³ H. Stegeman, “The Qumran Essenes: Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple”, in J. Trebelle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (eds), *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (STDJ, 11.1; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 83-166.

²⁴ L.H. Schiffman, ‘Miqsat Ma’še ha-Torah and the Temple Scroll’, *RevQ* 14.56 (1990), 435-57; cf. ‘The New Halakhiv Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Scroll Sect’ in H. Shanks (ed.), *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Random, 1992), 35-49, also in *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1994), 83-95.

²⁵ Norman Golb, “The Problem of Origin and Identification of The Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 124 (1980), 1-24; cf. “The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Perspective,” *The American Scholar* 58 (1989), 177-207.

²⁶ J.C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 87-92.

express non-Sadducean theological points, even though this objection has already been refuted by Schiffmann.²⁷ Golb's hypothesis or also known as the "Jerusalem Origin" hypothesis has been rejected too. Golb's hypothesis can explain why different opinions occurred between Qumran texts and Josephus' and Pliny's reports, but he cannot handle the evidence from Pliny in a convincing way, and he is not able to account satisfactorily for the buildings at Qumran.²⁸

Nevertheless, at this moment, the Essenes hypothesis with its developments is the most satisfactory theory we have. Here are the reasons that favor this claim: indeed, the Qumran community is related to the Essenes sect, since there are many similarities among them. Vermes gave three principal considerations: first there is no site other than Qumran to correspond to Pliny's report about settlements between Jericho and Engedi; second, chronologically speaking, the Essene activities as -described by Josephus- occurred between the rule of Jonathan Maccabeus (c.150 BCE) and the first Jewish war (66-70 CE), and the sectarian occupation of the Qumran site coincided perfectly with that period; third, the similarities of common life, organization and customs are so fundamental as to render the identification of the two bodies extremely probable, as long as some obvious differences can be explained.²⁹

If it is true that the Qumran Community was related to the Essenes, what do we know about the relationship between the Essenes and the Hasidic movement? Some claimed that the Essenes had its historical root in the Babylon, that is, in the Jews who returned from the Babylonian exile. We cannot believe it since there are no evidences for the claim, but just assumption. From the historical accounts above, we know that the Essenes started in Palestine with the rise of the Hasidic movement at the beginning of the second century BCE. Potentially, the Essenes were the survivors of the Hasidim and continued at Qumran.³⁰ In this light, we may infer that the Hasideans, which started in the beginning of the Maccabean revolt, were the pioneers of Qumran community and possibly also of many other sects at that time.

²⁷ See, "The New Halakic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect," *Biblical Archaeologist* 53 (1990), 64-73.

²⁸ See, VanderKam, *Dead Sea*, 97.

²⁹ Vermes, *Dead Sea*, 1995, 21.

³⁰ Vermes, *Dead Sea*, xxix. VanderKam gave some explanation of how the Essenes eventually escaped them selves to Qumran site, see, *Dead Sea*, 99-108.

Now let us turn to our main topic, which is to investigate the new covenant concept in Qumran texts. I shall demonstrate how Qumran Texts reflect the concept of covenant. First of all, Damascus Document (CD, 4Q266-273, 5Q12, 6Q15) will be elaborated, then our inquiry will cover the Community Rule (1QS, 4Q255-264a, 5Q11, 5Q13), and eventually the Temple Scroll (11Q).

2. The Covenant in Damascus Document (CD)

The Damascus Document comprises CD, and some fragments such as 4Q266-273, 5Q12, 6Q15. Characteristically, the central theme of the Damascus Document is covenant.³¹ In this part, however, I shall solely concentrate on CD because CD has already covered the most part of fragments 4Q266-273, 5Q12, particularly on the issue of covenant. The concept of covenant in CD is nearly the same as in 11QTemple, as we shall see later on. Probably, the different addressees caused differences in emphases. 11QTemple addresses all Israel, whereas CD tends to address a particular group of Israel. Very obviously, CD addresses a narrower audience, which is “the remnant” (i.1-2, 5-8). It raises the question: “who the remnant is?” But we will not take care of it, since it does not influence the concept of covenant that we are trying to describe. Instead, we might know about their identity afterwards. Since the community named themselves as “the remnant”, we may assume that the concept of covenant in CD is defined in accord with a more particularistic self-understanding.

It was Ernst Lohmeyer who first researched on the term covenant and concluded that the concept was beset with uncertainty and difficult to understand.³² Perhaps, it was caused by the fact that CD is a text that is mixed with legal and homiletic materials: the content of the text is divided into two parts: i.1-viii.21 and xix.1-xx.34 consist of exhortations in the form of a sermon, and ix.1-xvi.19 contain a collection of laws.³³

³¹ P.R. Davies, “The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of “Damascus Document”, *JSOT*, 25 (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1983), 50-53.

³² E.J. Christiansen, *The Covenant in Judaism & Paul: A Study of Ritual Boundaries as Identity Markers*. (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 107.

³³ Further discuss, see Emil Schürer. *The History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ 3* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987).

Compared with 11QTemple, CD is more frequent use in the term *b^er î* (42 times)³⁴ and still carries the OT meaning. Since it is obviously points to closed relationship with covenant occurred on Israel patriarchs, i.4 (*the covenant of the forefathers*),³⁵ viii.17-18 (*covenant of the fathers*), xii.10 (*covenant of Abraham*), xix.30-31, cf. 4QD^{a/e} 12, Jer. 34:13, 31:32, Deut. 9:5 and 7:8 (*the father's covenant*).³⁶ CD, and *Temple Scroll* as well, mentions closed relationship with Israel's ancestors inasmuch as God has delivered them to the sword, i.4-7, for they had forsaken God. The origin of covenant is referred to God and the validity of covenant rests in him as well, viii.15 (*"God loved...kept the oath"* allusion from Deut. ix.5 and vii.8), xix.27 (*he loves...keeps the oath*). In addition, phrases such as "my covenant", "His covenant", and "God's covenant" clearly indicate that the covenant is established by God and simultaneously valid³⁷ either with or without the human partner. The texts in iii.13 and iv.9 assume this view whereby preposition ל qualifies a relationship given by a superior to an inferior partner.³⁸ Conditions are set up to be fulfilled by human partner since the covenant has suzerainty character. Of note, the Sinaitic Covenant emphasizing law is implied in CD, leading one to identify "covenant" with "law."³⁹ Likewise, in the *Temple Scroll* covenant is read as having law as its content. As a result, the characteristic of being established by God assumes eternal implications, and the tendency of dependence on human response are still obvious.

To some extent, the Sinaitic Covenant influenced covenant in CD as evidenced by the phrase "covenant with all Israel" (iii.13, xv.8-9, xvi.1). Since the covenant is only available to those observing and keeping God's law, a narrowed down covenant is offered to a restricted membership based on ethics, in this case obedience to the law.⁴⁰

³⁴ See the list made by Karl Georg Kuhn. "ברית" *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen, 1960), 37.

³⁵ It is a quotation from Lev. 26:45 which in context of the Sinai covenant.

³⁶ For completely reading, see Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*.

³⁷ Cf. Christiansen, *Covenant*, 109; the texts are iii.11, v.12, vii.5, xiii.14, xiv.2, xx.17, i.17, iii.13, viii.1, xix.3.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, cf. M. Weinfeld, "ברית" *TDOT* 2 (ed. G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren; trans. John T. Willis) (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 253-79: "But with the remnant which held fast to the commandments of God He made His Covenant with Israel (לישראל) for ever" and iv.9 "...all who enter after them shall do according to (לעשות) that interpretation of the Law...".

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

⁴⁰ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 109.

This is supported by CD's opening statement, "*Hear now, all who enter the Covenant, and I will unstop your ears concerning the ways of the wicked*" (i.1-2). All who enter the covenant are not marked by circumcision, as in the Abrahamic Covenant, but are required to have a high level of knowledge of the Torah and to practice ethical behavior (xiii.11-13). CD and the Temple Scroll are not interested with the rite of the circumcision. The only marker that must be done after a candidate passes the examination on Torah knowledge and behavior, is a swearing in (cf. xv.6, 9 and 12). A candidate may be either one who turns from corrupt ways or one who is born within the community (xv.5-6, cf. also x.6-7). We are not sure if there was a trial period, or of the treatment of those who were rejected as members, if a special liturgy existed for this rite, or if it was open to women. A member was excluded if he violated the laws of the covenant⁴¹ or disobeyed God's law. But there was an opportunity for reconciliation, as stated above, since texts such as ii.4-5, iii.18, iv.6-10 and xx.34 mention God as the subject of the atoning act. Thus God himself is simultaneously seen as the initiator of the covenant, as well as the source of reconciliation (cf. also xv.7, xx.17). In contrast to this outlook, per the texts cited above, people may turn from sin by choosing to enter the covenant (cf. also iv.9-10), in this case by offering sacrifices (ix.14, xi.17-23 and xvi.13; more discussion of this below). So, CD asserts that community membership is only for those that pledge to adhere to the covenant on their own terms ("*enter the covenant*"). Therefore, this covenant is in effect not for the whole of Israel, but only to a particular group. In other words, emphasis changes from an ethnically broad covenant, such as the Sinaitic Covenant, to a particularistic covenant in which human faithfulness is still demanded.

Let us now see if "covenant" has an eternal connotation in CD, and if so, how to explain it. If the condition of human obedience must be met to enter covenant with God or enjoy a relationship with God, how does one validate this covenant?

As mentioned before, the establishment of a covenant by God grants its eternal, permanent characteristic. CD clearly states its eternal covenant characteristic in iii.4, "*Covenant forever*" and iii.13, "*But with the remnant which held fast to the commandments of God He made His Covenant with Israel forever.*" The use of "forever"

⁴¹ CD uses variety of terms such as "to transgress the covenant/ordinances", "to forsake the covenant /the commandments" or "to despise the covenant/the ordinances," cf. i.3, 20, iii.1, v.12, viii.9, 19, x.3, xv.3-4, xvi.12, xix.4-5, 32-33, xx.11-12, 29.

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

A remnant community in CD seems to consist not only of common people in Israel, but also a priest group or Levitic tribe. The text in iv.1-10 represents a covenant with this group in terms of atonement. Another text in ii.2-5 is an allusion to Mal. 2:7, which regards the guardianship of knowledge and Torah instruction as tasks of the priests.⁴² In these twofold tasks those in priesthood are seen as the ones who keep the law. Thus, a broad ethnic covenant becomes a narrower priestly covenant, with the validity of the covenant dependent on human obedience.

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

⁴² Cf. Christiansen, *Covenant*, 112.

who have special status within it.⁴³ The goal of perfect holiness is the aim solely for those elite individuals. Thus only a few people actually preserve the holiness, as the community understands it.

As I have already stated above, entry to the covenant have to be done by “enter the covenant” itself. In that term lays actually the meaning of “new covenant” concept as cited on previous paragraph. Come to “new covenant” is what humans belong to or enter to, it ignores God’s role. Simply human is carrying the role. What is new in “new covenant” here, as supposed by Qumran community?

Jaubert observes that “new covenant” is never opposed to an “old covenant” or replaces it.⁴⁴ “New covenant” must be seen from a broken covenant point of view. Consequently, its conditions and promises are related to those of the old covenant. Sanders understood that newness in “new covenant” takes place when new revelation is given by God. In other words, new content has been revealed in the “new” covenant. This is based on the interpretation of “hidden things” (iii.14) as a new content in the new covenant.⁴⁵ Christiansen rejects Sanders’ point of view; she interprets “hidden things” as a radicalized demand to introduce a new and different quality of covenantal relationship. This “radicalized demand” is created by new ways of interpreting the pre-existing covenant laws.⁴⁶ Thus she treats “new covenant” in CD in terms of introducing new conditions for one and the same covenant.⁴⁷ Furthermore, she explains, new covenant ensures the eternal covenant law is kept. As the new covenant is applied, an eschatological aspect is realized because the “teacher of righteousness” will be coming, in fulfillment of the restoration of the law, and the forgiveness promised in the OT becomes realized. Yet the new covenant retains a contemporary aspect also. CD sees the new covenant as a present reality.⁴⁸ This is manifest through a different relationship to God because of forgiveness, and holiness, required obedience both in the present and the future. Thus, new covenant in CD points both to realized eschatology and to the

⁴³ As GÖran Forkman interprets, *The Limits of the Religious Community: Expulsion from the Religious Community within the Qumran sect, within Rabbinic Judaism and within Primitive Christianity* (Lund, 1972), 66; cf. Christiansen, *Covenant*, 120.

⁴⁴ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 113.

⁴⁵ *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 242.

⁴⁶ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 129.

⁴⁷ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 130.

⁴⁸ Collins, “The Birth-Notion...” *EthL.* (1963), 582.

community's self-identification.⁴⁹ Inevitably, human commitment is required to validate the covenant with God; adherence to the law is obligatory.

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

The phrase in ii.11, “a remnant might be left to the Land”, likely refers to “the land of Damascus” cited in vi.19. Callaway suggests that this phrase has to be understood either in a literal-geographical or a metaphorical-symbolic way.⁵⁰ Those who interpret it literally propose that it refers to exile in Damascus or to a place of refuge outside the Qumran site as a place of refuge for the “Qumran community.”⁵¹ Most scholars, however, interpret it as being metaphorical-symbolic, that is, a symbol of refuge instead of a real place for taking shelter in which the community may practice perfect holiness (cf. 1.7-8).

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

⁴⁹ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 130-31.

⁵⁰ Callaway, “History”, 121-27.

⁵¹ Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 17; cf. Christiansen, *Covenant*, 121.

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

The community rule⁵² comprises a variety of laws and seems to have been a handbook for the community. The most interesting aspects of this document are community practice and theology. According to Christiansen it lacks any historical information.⁵³ The lack of any expression of continuity with the past in covenantal terms supports this assumption. Moreover, the term “new covenant” is not found in 1QS, but “covenant”, describing the relationship between the community and God, appears 32 times.⁵⁴

The terms “covenant of God” (x.10) and “His covenant” (v.18-20) were used in a dualistic scheme context, for example, good-evil or light-darkness, not in relating to the past established covenants in the OT. Those who belong to the covenant of God are in the light and vice versa. Christiansen suggests this phenomenon as a “timeless principle” rather than a historical foundation.⁵⁵ Thus the covenant is only for those who love God, without any relationship to the prior covenants.

The idea of covenant with ancestors —any covenant that God established with a patriarch— or God remembering covenant as appears in 11QTemple and CD does not appear in 1QS. Moses is mentioned four times (i.3, v.8, viii.15 and 22), but only in reference to the obligatory aspect of the covenant.⁵⁶ The absence of any reference to covenants with patriarchs is likely because there is no awareness of belonging to Israel as a covenantal nation, nor, as Christiansen said, “of a common past, of a shared relationship, or fate, uniting present Israel with Israel of the past and future, be it in faithfulness.”⁵⁷ Israel is mentioned several times without reference to any ideas of covenant, even in historical context. When Israel is mentioned, it is used to support the

⁵² There are three documents on this term, 1QS, 4QS^d and 4QS^e. The last two fragments will mention if necessary. There is a general agreement on a date for these manuscripts around 100 BC, see Schürer, *History*, 383-84. Michael A. Knibb, “The Qumran Community” *Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of Jewish & Christian World 200 BC to AD200* vol. 2 (Cambridge: CUP, 1987), 77-78 proposes 1QS’ structure as following: Statements of the aims of the community (i.1-15); Entry into the community (i.16-iii.12); Doctrinal teaching of the community (iii.13-4.26); Rules for structuring the life of the community (v.1-vii.25); The relationship to Israel and eschatological teachings (viii.1-ix.26a) and eventually is Conclusion (ix.26b-xi.22).

⁵³ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 146.

⁵⁴ Kuhn, “ברית”, 36.

⁵⁵ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 147.

⁵⁶ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 148.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

present validity of God's law (cf. iii.24, iv.3). The validity of the law is also maintained by priestly services since the priests' interpretation of law is the authority within the community (cf. v.20-22, ii.3, viii.11-16). The unique expression "their Covenant" (vi.18-20) is used in reference to that task of priestly interpretation. Since the pronoun refers to the priests, it articulates that the establishment of the covenant is done by priestly commitment. A priest, therefore, must study the law and encourage people to do the same (iv.2-5). Law study is for restoration of the covenant relationship, since the validity of the covenant is now based on legal principles (ix.3-6). The emphasis is on the priests' tasks to "keep the covenant" and "seek His will" through the law, rather than cultic service as cited in v.9 and 1QSb iii.22. Therefore, the covenant validity is built on the principle of law, rather than on history.⁵⁸

Since 1QS is not concerned with Israel's past, the promises of a land and offspring (in terms of a nation and people) are absent and now shift to the individualistic promises of peace and long life (iv.6-8).⁵⁹ One nuance appearing in these blessings is a future context contained in the phrase "life without end." It cannot occasion surprise that eternal punishment will come for evil through Messiah and Aaron (ix.11, ii.12-22).

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

The phrase "eternal covenant" appears four times, in iii.11, v.5, viii.9 and iv.22-23. The first three are in the context of atonement as a consequence of obedience, whereas the last relates to God's final judgment. Election determines entrance into an eternal covenant, as evidenced when God chooses the community to be his everlasting possession (xi.7-9). Furthermore, the elect will form a council of the community of holiness and to be eternal **plantation** forever. To be an elected person means being set apart for God in a community while simultaneously being God's eternal possession. On the other hand, to enter an eternal covenant demands humans' response—they must

⁵⁸ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 150-51.

⁵⁹ Complete text as follow: "And as for the visitation of all those who walk in this spirit, it shall be healing, great peace in a long life, and fruitfulness together with every everlasting blessing and eternal joy in life without end, a crown of glory and a garment of majesty in unending light."

accept the law and live accordingly. Entering this eternal covenant also meant escape from judgment, present restoration, and an end of injustice (iv.22-23). Thus, entering an eternal covenant has present connotations yet with future fulfillment. Exclusivity is clearly seen both in the idea of election and in the eternal covenant. The most important idea, however, is not its exclusiveness but as Christiansen mentioned, “the idea that God’s election is thought of as coinciding with the community as ‘the elect.’”⁶⁰ So it is apparent that some of Israel are chosen to live lives of obedience. To live in obedience is a fully human response or an act of conversion (cf. x.12 and ix.17). This is important since the validity of the eternal covenant is based on covenantal obedience because its establishment is in accordance with eternal precepts (viii.10).

I explained that the idea of eternal covenant is set within the context of atonement and God’s final judgment. Atonement is very apparent in viii.5-10 where it is considered in relation to election. The community, as an elected people, functions to bring atonement for the land (cf. ix.4-5) and it seems only for their own group (cf. v.6-7). Thus an expiatory service and its effects move from the temple in Jerusalem to the elected community in “exile” in order to sustain holiness in a real and concrete way (cf. ix.6). The community does ritual washings so as to receive justification (cf. ii.25-iii.12). Thus the atonement is applied to a narrower community (Qumran community), and with it eternal covenant exists. Furthermore, particular people play a role in the covenant relationship. Therewith a particularistic covenant relationship and the priestly covenant commitment take place.⁶¹

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

⁶⁰ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 154.

⁶¹ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 157-58 supports this statement by referring the metaphorical language such as “Everlasting Plantation”, “House of Holiness for Israel”, “Assembly of Supreme Holiness for Aaron”, “tried wall”, “precious corner-stone” and “a most holy Dwelling for Aaron”, “House of Perfection”, and “Truth in Israel.”

4. The Covenant in Temple Scrolls (11QT)

There is no scholarly consensus about the genre of 11QTemple.⁶² It is very obvious, however, that temple, holiness and land are the most important aspects.⁶³ The text addresses the issue of the validity of the temple that becomes the center for all Israel. As I shall show later on, the temple seems to function as a symbol of a covenant relationship between all Israel and its God, and it makes holiness as its goal.⁶⁴ How does it work and how does it link to the concept of covenant?

The term *b^er t̄* appears in the very beginning of text: “*Behold, I will make a covenant (b^er t̄)*” (ii.1).⁶⁵ God initiates a covenant with Israel in which he will expel foreign nations and ensure Israel does what he has said. In order to be holy before God (ii.9), Israel should not make a covenant with foreign nations (ii.5, 12). The covenant stands for relationship with God (“*You shall not worship another god*” ii.11), since it is established by Him in xxix.10.⁶⁶ The text points to closed relationships with covenants established with Israel’s patriarchs, an example of which is with Jacob, and appears to echo Lev. 26:40-46. Thus, the covenant is valid both in the past, present and future, even though 11QTemple never mentions “eternal covenant.” Nevertheless, its eternal validity is implied in lix.17,⁶⁷ which contains a promise of a future, that is, eternal kingdom of Israel and a king chosen by God, which is based on the Davidic Covenant. The covenants made with patriarchs also functions as a term for belonging to a community. In addition, lv.17 and lix.8⁶⁸ use the term *b^er t̄i* (“my covenant”) which assumes a setting up of an

⁶² For a parallel between 11QTemple and 1 Macc. 10:34-35, I suggest 11QTemple was written thereabouts 150 BC. Further discussion see Michael Owen Wise. *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran II*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 49 (Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1990). Regarding the genre proposals see Yigael Yadin. *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect* (New York: Random, 1985), 64-74 and see also an overview summary by Christiansen, *The Covenant*, 105.

⁶³ Wise, *Critical Study*, 155-94.

⁶⁴ Cf. Christiansen, *Covenant*, 106; cf. Wise, *Critical Study*, 155-94.

⁶⁵ All translations and reconstruction of Qumran texts I based on Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*.

⁶⁶ “*I will cause my glory to rest on it until the day of creation on which I shall create my sanctuary, establishing it for myself for all the time according to the covenant which I have made (karat) with Jacob in Bethel.*”

⁶⁷ “*But if he walk after my rules and keep my commandments and do that which is correct and good before me, no heir to the throne of the kingdom of Israel shall be cut off from among his sons for ever.*”

⁶⁸ lv.17, “*If among you, in one of your towns that I give you, there is found a man or woman who does that which is wrong in my eyes by transgressing my covenant (b^er t̄ i), and goes and worships other gods...*” lix.8, “*I will hide my face from them and they shall become food, plunder and prey. None shall save them because of their wickedness, because they have broken my covenant (b^er t̄ i) and their soul has loathed my law until they have incurred every guilt. Afterwards they will return to me...*”

already existing relationship in past time. Thereby, the covenant of God, as we have already seen, is valid even without a human partner. The idea that God is guarantor of covenant relationship is so strong, though, since the covenant is based on Old Testament concepts that practically speaking there is a tendency to make law the leading principle.⁶⁹ The human partner in a covenant relationship is under specific obligations, such as holiness.

In 5 or 6 appearances⁷⁰ the use of “covenant” is presupposed by obligatory covenants in the OT. Hence, the covenant is directly identified with law. Therefore, its validity is not only tied to God’s promise but is also conditional upon the human partner keeping the law. Moreover, the use of the term “eternal” with ordinances/statutes,⁷¹ instead of “eternal covenant” indicates that the emphasis to follow the law is a key principle for the relationship. As a result, the validity of covenant with God is for those who keep the laws or commandments as stated in lix.17.⁷² The leading principle is law, not covenant. It brings a new nuance that the emphasis of covenant changes from being dependent on God to human response. Thus, “covenant” is almost synonymous with “statutes”, and its validity is tied to human obedience.⁷³

Since covenant relationship is related to its obligations, the adherence to the law, it expects a restoration of holiness. The goal is for all the people to achieve holiness and perfection. Holiness, both ideal and real, can only be reached in the “land” that God has promised. For the “land” is significant inasmuch as it is the place where God’s law is valid, as stated on 11QTemple ii (set in context of Ex. 34.10-16). Keeping holiness becomes a condition of God’s presence in the land as well as for maintaining possession of the land (lx.16-17, which follows the view in Deuteronomy).⁷⁴ It assumes that Temple scrolls are built on the OT demand for holiness. A lack of holiness is a breach of the

⁶⁹ Benedikt Otzen, “Judaism in Antiquity: Political Development and Religious Currents from Alexander to Hadrian” (trans. Frederick H. Cryer), *Bibsemser* 7 (1990), 72.

⁷⁰ Yadin envisages that only 5 times the term *bʿr ʾt* are applied in 11QTemple, *Temple Scroll*, 483 (ii.4 – citing Ex. 34:12, xx.14 –covenant of salt-, xxix.10 –on festival laws on sacrifices-, lv.17 –on laws against idolatry- and lix.10 –as part of the laws on the royal authority-); whereas Vermes adds one more in ii.1, so six times.

⁷¹ For example 11QTemple xviii.8, xix.8, xxii.14, xxv.8, xxvii.4.

⁷² “But if he walk after my rules and keep my commandments and do that which is correct and good before me, no heir to the throne of the kingdom of Israel shall be cut off from among his sons for ever.”

⁷³ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 110.

⁷⁴ “When you enter the land which I give you, do not learn to practice the abominations of those nations. There shall be found among you none who makes his son or daughter pass through fire,”

covenant, stated by terms “*broken my covenant*” (lix.8) and “*transgressing my covenant*” (lv.17), resulting in the hiding of God’s face (ix.4-12) when God’s punishment will take place. The punishment for disobeying God’s law is devastation of the land (lix.2-13), instead of “eternal inheritance of the land” (li.15-16),⁷⁵ which is set in the context of Ex. 34:10-16. As a result, demands for holiness are extended to the whole of Israel. Examples of this nation-wide determinant are seen in Temple Scroll in xviii.16, xxii.12, xxxix.1, 12, etc.⁷⁶ God himself avoids meting out punishment by restoring the covenant through the act of atonement (lxiii.6, cf. Deut. 21:9). On the other hand, the people must offer sacrifices to fulfill the OT law (cf. Lev. 16:33, Num. 28:30). The cult serves the purpose of dealing with the people’s sins and/or transgressions.

As we have already seen, the land functions as the place for keeping God’s law and directly points to the whole of Israel attempting to maintain holiness. In this matter the temple holds the important function of helping to keep the law and holiness. God is present in the temple. People gather before the divine presence to offer sacrifices (xxi.6, xxxv.12-14, xlvi.7-10, xvi.15-18, xviii.7, xxvi.7, 9). At this point, the people are identified through its cult, centered on the temple as a place of holiness.⁷⁷ We assume the existence of a temple large enough for the people to gather, and a situation in which cultic holiness applies to both land and people (xix.11-xxv.2, li.7-10). Since these two functions of the temple act as conditions of covenant validity, then the temple is symbolic of covenant relationship. We can then infer that covenant relationship depends on the people’s obedience and is used as broad category for ethnic Israel.

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

⁷⁵ “*Justice and justice alone shall you pursue that you may live and come to inherit the land that I give you to inherit for all days.*”

⁷⁶ Refer to “tribes of Israel”, “children of Israel”, and the like.

⁷⁷ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 114.

5. Summary and Conclusion

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

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

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

A scope as narrow as that of CD is apparent in 1QS since those who enter the covenant will be worthy of being mentioned in the covenant relationship with God. The main difference between them is the complete absence of past history in 1QS. No past covenants are considered in the present covenant. The human partner must choose to enter the covenant with God, thus human response takes an important role in this relationship. Obedience to the law and holiness become primary conditions of the covenant in which radicalized demands take place instead of believing that God established the covenant as in the OT. It has happened since the salvation history of Israel does not take role in 1QS. Those who rejected to enter the covenant, as 1QS understands, are excluded from community. Thus a “new” particular religious society was growing in 1QS by means of priestly covenantal. A pure community is demanded in preparation of judgment where they will have “everlasting blessing and eternal joy in life without end, a

crown of glory and a garment of majesty in unending light” (1QS iv.7-8).⁷⁸ The aspect of eschatology is getting clear in 1QS.

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

Both see that the “new covenant” is needed in a broken relationship context; in the case of Jeremiah LXX emphasized to invalid covenant.

Both have the same purpose but different motif. By using “new covenant”, Jeremiah looks to a future new condition for relationship with God, something created by God. He expects, in the context of exile, God will deliver them from oppression. Whereby the *nationhood* will be maintained in the exilic situation. One more important point is to ask God in changing people’s hearts which refer to obedience. New covenant will be established by God and built on God’s forgiveness. New covenant, therefore, is assuming as unconditional, created by God and depends not on obedience and external signs but points straight forward to a new and different relationship between God and his people.

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

We already see special treatment for the phrase “new covenant” between Jeremiah and CD, now let us turn to the “new” concept of covenant in CD compared with the Old Testament.

The understanding of the relationship with God changes from the Old Testament period up to second temple period. In the Old Testament it is very obviously that the relationship with God manifest in the history of the people as well as in cult and worship. CD views the relationship with God begins with entering to the new covenant. 1QS

⁷⁸ Christiansen, *Covenant*, 184.

confined its community by keeping the holiness thereof a pure community appears. 1QTemple restricted the covenant relationship with God only for particular people, present and without relating with the past history of Israel.

Enter the covenant, simultaneously equal with to be a member of community, becomes symbol that the covenant relationship with God is taking place. Covenant markers in the Old Testament, circumcision for instance, have never been a question.

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

Regarding the establishment and validity of covenant, OT is very clear in this matter that, even though very dimensional, God is believed as the initiator to establish and also to validate the covenant. Human will response to this matter but in Qumran community the covenant may be established by human and the validity depends on human action. In the OT case, therefore, eternal characterize of covenant is certain but it will not happen in Qumran texts.

Eschatological point of view as a result of the expectation of covenant with God has more places in Qumran community than OT. Tied with this idea, Qumran community sees themselves as the “remnant” which the OT prophesied.

Bibliography

Brownlee, William H. "The Historical Allusions of the Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 126 (1952): 10-20.

_____. *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*. Society of Biblical Literature 24. Georgia: Scholar, 1979.

Callaway, Phillip, R. *The History of the Qumran Community*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 3. Sheffield: Sheffield, 1988.

Christiansen, Ellen Juhl. *The Covenant in Judaism & Paul: A Study of Ritual Boundaries as Identity Markers*. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995.

_____. "The Consciousness of belonging to God's covenant and what it entails according to the Damascus Document and the community rule." Pages 69-97 in *Qumran between the Old and New Testament* (ed. Frederick H. Cryer

- and Thomas L. Thomson). *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 290*. Sheffield: Academic, 1998.
- Clements, R.E. *Abraham and David: Genesis 15 and its Meaning for Israelite Tradition*, Studies in Biblical Theology, Second Series 5. London: S.C.M., 1967.
- Collins, Raymond F. "The Birth-Notion of the Cairo Damascus Covenant and its comparison with the New Testament." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 39 (1963): 555-94.
- Cross, F.M. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. Third Edition. Sheffield: Academic, 1994.
- Davies, Philip R. *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of "Damascus Document"*. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 25*. Sheffield: Sheffield, 1983.
- de Vaux, Roland. *Archaeology and The Dead Sea Scrolls*, London: British Academy, 1973.
- Dupont-Sommer, A. *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (trans. G. Vermes). Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983.
- Botterweck, J., and J.H. Ringgren, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Translated by John T. Willis. 15 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980-2000.
- Golb, Norman. "The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Perspective." *The American Scholar* 58 (1989): 177-207.
- _____. "The Problem of Origin and Identification of The Dead Sea Scrolls." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 124 (1980): 1-24.
- Goldstein, J.A. *I Maccabees*. Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1976.
- Guhrt, J. "Covenant, Guarantee, Mediator." Pages 365-372 in vol. 1 of *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. Edited by Colin Brown. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
- Jagersma, H. *A History of Israel: from Alexander the Great to Bar Kochba*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Josephus*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols.LCL. Cambridge: HUP, 1926-1965.
- Knibb, Michael, A. *The Qumran Community*. Cambridge Commentaries on writings of Jewish & Christian world 200BC to AD200. vol. 2. Cambridge: CUP, 2012.
- Kuhn, Karl Georg. *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.

- LaSor, William Sanford. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Faith*. Chicago: Moody, 1962.
- Martinez, Florentino García and A.S. van der Woude. "A "Groningen" Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History." *Revue de Qumran* 14.4 (56) (1990):521-541.
- Martinez, Florentino García. "The History of the Qumran community in the light of recently available texts." Pages 194-216 in *Qumran between the Old and New Testament* (ed. Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thomson). Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 290. Sheffield: Academic, 1998.
- _____. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Qumran texts in English*. 2nd ed. Translated by Wilfred G.E. Watson. Leiden: Brill and Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Milik, J.T. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judae*. Translated by J. Strugnell. London: SCM, 1963.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. "Demetrius I and the Teacher of Righteousness." *Revue Biblique* 83 (1976): 400-420.
- Otzen, Benedikt. *Judaism in Antiquity: Political Development and Religious Currents from Alexander to Hadrian*. Biblical Seminar 7. Sheffield: Academic, 1990.
- Ringgren, Helmer. *The faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Crossroad, 1995.
- Sanders, E.P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- Schiffman, L.H. "Miqsat Ma'se ha-Torah and the Temple Scroll." *Revue de Qumran* 14.4 (56) (1990): 435-457.
- _____. "The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect." *Biblical Archaeologist* 53 (1990): 64-73.
- _____. *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Philadelphia: JPS, 1994.
- Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987.
- Stegemann, H. "The Qumran Essenes: Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple." Pages 83-166 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (eds. J.Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner). Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. "The community of the renewed covenant: Between Judaism and Christianity." Pages 43-110 in *The Community of the renewed covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam). Notre Dame: Notre Dame, 1994.

Tcherikover, V. *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999.

VanderKam, James C. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

_____. "Covenant." Pages 151-155 in vol. 1 of *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James VanderKam). Oxford: OUP, 2000.

Vermes, Geza. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. 4th ed. Sheffield: Academic, 1995.

_____. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspectives*. 2nd ed. London: SCM, 1982.

Wacholder, Ben Zion, "Historiography of Qumran: The sons of Zadok and their enemies." Pages 345-377 in *Qumran between the Old and New Testament* (ed. Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thomson). Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 290. Sheffield: Academic, 1998.

Weinfeld, M. "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90 (1970): 184-203.

Wise, Michael Owen. *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran 11*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 49. Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1990.

Woude, A.S. van der. "Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habbakkuk Commentary." Pages 349-360 in *Essays in Honour of Yigael Yadin*. *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33 (1982).

Yadin, Yigael. *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect*. New York: Random, 1985.