The modern New Testament is a fourth-century anthology of mid- to late first-century uments, composed in Greek and reflecting social and religious stresses of a new religious covenant seeking to define and eventually to inguish itself from Greek-speaking synegroup communities. In such a charged and ening context, "the Law" (Grk.nomos) reied widely divergent treatments, although its notion remains constant: the Law is God's direction through *Moses to Israel.

The earliest and most problematic source Paul. Written to predominantly *gentile comities, his letters often address questions of ics and authority. On these occasions, Paul's concerns concerning the Law can only be seen self-consciously positive. The Law is the to decent community life and the standard group behavior (Gal. 5:15; 1 Cor. 14:34).
tiles "in Christ" should strive to fulfill it and its commandments (1 Cor. 7:19; Rom. 8:4-10; Gal. 5:14, authorizing his instruction to the Galatians). He's defense of his tolic rights by quoting from "the law of 28," Deut. 25:4, in 1 Cor. 9:8-9). One can—and Paul did—obtain *righteousness under the Law (Phil. 3:6). *Faith in Christ, Paul says, upholds the Law (Rom. 3:11). In the largest sense, the redemption in Christ comes to gentiles in order to confirm God's promises to Israel's *ancestors as preserved in Genesis, the first of the five books of *Torah (Rom. 15:8-9; cf. 9:4-5).

Yet elsewhere Paul virtually equates the Law with sin, death, and the flesh—the worst aspects of the "old aeon" that, through Christ's death, *resurrection, and imminent *parousia, is about to be overthrown (Rom. 6:14; 7:5-6). God gave the Law on account of transgression and in order to condemn: it is the "old dispensation," inglorious and incomplete, compared to the gospel of Christ (Gal. 3:16-21, 24-25; 4:10, 19-22; 5:21-31, a particularly tortured passage; 2 Cor. 3:12-15; Rom. 3:20; 4:15; 5:20; 10:4). How then can this same author possibly maintain that "the Law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good" (Rom. 7:12)?

Scholars have attempted to resolve this tension. Some, at one extreme, take Paul's negative statements as definitive of his (hence, the) gospel and his positive statements as the measure of an unhought-out sentimental attachment to his community of origin. Some at the other end maintain that Paul preached a two-covenant theology: Torah for Jews, Christ for gentiles. On this view, his only objection to the Law would be if Christian gentiles chose it, that is, opted as Christians for conversion to Judaism. But Paul's own statements—forceful, passionate, at times temperate—defy a consistent interpretation. He himself seems aware of the tension in his position. As Paul saw it, however, history would soon relieve him of the necessity to make sense of God's plan in electing Israel, giving the Torah, and then sending Christ. For Christ, Paul urged, was about to return, end history, and bring all under the dominion of God. This conviction, and not his statements on the Law, is the one consistent theme in all of Paul's letters, from first to last (1 Thess. 1:10; 4:13-17; Phil. 1:10; 2:16; 4:5; 1 Cor. 7:26, 29, 31; 15; Rom. 8; 9-11; 13:11-12; 16:20). It spared him having to work out a "theology of the Law.

The Gospels. The evangelists, writing some 40–70 years after Jesus' death, turned a negative attitude toward the Law (or the Jewish understanding of it) into the touchstone of Christian identity. This tendency makes for considerable confusion when one tries to reconstruct the views of the historical *Jesus of Nazareth, living...
and working in a predominantly Jewish environment, very likely had his own views on the correct interpretation of Torah, and these views may well have differed from those of his contemporaries. Argument about the Law between Jews was and is a timeless Jewish occupation: controversy implies inclusion. Transposed to a gentile context, however, argument can seem like repudiation.

Thus Mark’s Jesus turns an unexceptional observation (people are morally defiled by what they do or say, not by what they eat, 7:15–23) into a repudiation of the Law regarding kosher food (“Thus he declared all foods clean”; v. 19).

John’s Jesus condems his Jewish audience as sons of the lower cosmos and children of the devil (chap. 8): the Law, characterized throughout as that “of Moses” is, implicitly, not “of God,” from whom comes grace, peace, and the Son (1:16; 7:19–24). In his *Sermon on the Mount, Matthew’s Jesus presents his intensification of Torah ethics as if in contradistinction to Torah and Jewish tradition (“You have heard it said . . . but I say”; chap. 5). Luke, although retaining the theme of Jewish guilt for the death of Jesus both in his Gospel and in Acts, nonetheless wishes to present the new movement as continuous with a Jewish view of biblical revelation. Consequently he edits out or softens many of Mark’s anti-Law statements. And all the Gospels, no matter how strong their individual polemic against Jews and Judaism (see Anti-Semitism), and hence the Law, still present a Jesus who worships at *synagogue on the *Sabbath, observes Temple sacrifice, pilgrimage holidays, and *Passover rituals, and whose followers, honoring the Sabbath, come to his tomb only on the Sunday after his death.

**Later Traditions.** Both within the New Testament and without, later traditions are similarly ambivalent. Negative statements tend to occur in those passages where these new communities seek to establish their identity vis-à-vis Jews and Judaism; positive statements emerge where Christians wish to distance themselves from their Greco-Roman environment. Christian ethics are in the latter case a judaizing of gentile populations according to the principles of Torah: shunning *idols, sorcery, astrology, hetero- and *homosexual *fornication; keeping litigation within the community; supporting the *poor, especially *widows; and so on—all themes found especially in Paul’s Corinthian correspondence.

In the early decades of the second century, Christian dualists such as Marcion and Valentinus took the position that the God of the Jews, the God of the Law, was a second, lower, cosmic deity; God the father of Jesus, they held, thus had nothing directly to do with material creation and, thus, with the events and legislation given in scripture. Other Christians, committed to the unity of *creation and redemption, argued that the Law was of divine origin: only their particular group, however, knew how to interpret it correctly (that is, for the most part, allegorically; see esp. Justin Martyr, Dialogue with Trypho, and see Interpretation, History of, article on Early Christian Interpretation). The church’s ambivalence toward the Law eventually determined the structure of the Christian *canon itself. Retaining the *Septuagint even as it repudiated Judaism, the church incorporated the Law into its “Old” Testament, while maintaining that it was superseded or perfected by the “New.”

**Paula Fredriksen**

**Law and the Bible.** Municipal or national law is the set of rules that, within a state, orders its affairs and those of persons under its jurisdiction, and which, when necessary, is enforced by special organs of the state. There may be more than one municipal law in a state, as in the United Kingdom, which contains the Scottish, English, and Northern Irish legal systems, or in the United States, where each state has its own legal system in addition to the federal system. Other states, such as India, have special rules for special communities (e.g., for Christians). International law is the law between states and between states and other international entities.

Municipal law can be divided into the law that regulates the affairs of the state itself and that which deals with the rights and duties, privileges, and immunities of persons within it. This division is often described as one between public and private law, though these categories overlap.

The Bible has influenced all those systems of law that can be traced, sometimes tortuously, to western European sources. By and large, the legal systems of other societies have been less subject to its influence, though sometimes that influence was historically present, as with the Russian system, in which a traditional Christianity molded society in former centuries and is still to be discerned in such rules as those regarding contract.

There are two main groups within the broad European legal tradition. Civilian legal systems
We can now see how Paul meant the meal to be celebrated at Corinth. It certainly was an occasion for joyful celebration rather than a funeral meal, but some of the Corinthian Christians carried this element to excess. But it was supremely a way of proclaiming the death of Jesus as a sacrifice on their behalf and the inauguration of the new covenant. It was an occasion for bringing believers together in unity rather than in disarray. It was a meal for the temporary period before the Lord would return in triumph, and during that period it was one of the ways in which the union between the Lord and his people was expressed.

In Acts we have further evidence that the believers met regularly to break bread (2.42, 46; 20.7; and possibly 27.35). Since there is no reference in Acts to the cup or to any relevant sayings of Jesus, it is sometimes argued that here we have evidence of a somewhat different meal from the Pauline Lord’s Supper, a joyful celebration of fellowship with the risen Lord rather than a memorial of his death. There is, however, nothing incompatible between the two types of account, and the combination of solemn remembrance of the Lord’s death and joyful communion with him is entirely appropriate.

John’s account of the Last Supper lacks the eucharistic elements found in the other Gospels, because for John it was not a Passover meal; John recorded elsewhere teaching ascribed to Jesus about eating his flesh and drinking his blood (6.53).

There are other allusions to the Lord’s Supper in the New Testament. For example, the way in which the stories of Jesus feeding the multitudes are told (Mark 6.30–44; 8.1–10 par.) suggests that the evangelists saw a parallel between Jesus’ feeding the people with bread and his spiritual nourishment of the church. And the development of the understanding of the death of Jesus that we find in the New Testament most probably had its roots in the words of institution where the basic concepts of sacrifice and covenant are to be found.

See also Love-feast; Sacrament.

I. HOWARD MARSHALL

LOVE

Lot. The nephew of *Abraham and ancestor of *Moab and *Ammon. Because Abraham was the oldest son of Terah, and Lot’s father, Abraham’s brother Haran, had died (Gen. 11.27–28), Abraham was the head of the extended family and Lot was his dependent. As such, he traveled with Abraham to the land of *Canaan (Gen. 11.31); when a dispute arose between the two branches of the family over grazing land, Abraham arbitrated it, giving Lot first choice, and enabling him to settle in the *Jordan Valley (Gen 13.5–10), in the vicinity of *Sodom. When Lot was captured by raiding kings, Abraham led a campaign to rescue him (Gen 14.1–16), and when Sodom was about to be destroyed, Lot was spared (Gen 19.1–23), presumably because of his association with Abraham. Throughout these stories, Lot is portrayed as a less than heroic figure, who has no respect in his own family (Gen 19.14), is hesitant (19.16), and is tricked by his daughters (19.30–38).

This familial history is intertwined with etiological narratives that explain topographic features (the pillar of salt and the desolation of the Dead Sea region) and several names, especially Moab and Ammon. The account of the ince- nuous origin of these neighbors of Israel (Gen. 19.30–38) is both a genealogical recognition of shared ethnicity and a scurrilous rationalization of Israelite superiority.

In later literature, Lot is recalled as a righteous man, whose goodness saved him from Sodom’s punishment (Wisd. of Sol. 10.6; 2 Pet. 2.7–8).

MICHAEL D. COOGAN

Love (Hebr. 'āhāh; 'āsād). Human loves in all their rich variety fill the passages of biblical narrative: love at first sight (Gen. 29.18–20; Jacob and Rachel); sexual obsession (2 Sam. 13: Amnon and Tamar); family affection across generations (Gen. 22.2; 37.3; Ruth 4.15: between mother and daughter-in-law); long marital intimacy (1 Sam. 1: Elkanah and Hannah); servile devotion (Exod. 21.5); intense same-sex friendship (1 Sam. 18.1, 3; 20.17: David and Jonathan); enthusiastic loyalty toward a leader (1 Sam. 18.16, 28: Israel and Judah’s love of David). But the religious significance of the Bible’s view of love lies preeminently with its ways of speaking about God and most particularly about God’s relationship with Israel. Israel’s election, their redemption from Egypt (and, eventually, Babylon), the giving of the *Torah, the promise of the land—all are ascribed in biblical narrative and later rabbinic commentary to the fundamental and mysterious fact of God’s love for Israel and the people’s reciprocal love of God.

Human love serves as the readiest analogy when speaking of this relationship. God loves Israel as a husband loves his wife (Hos. 3.1; Jer.
The City of God, Augustine's great masterwork, may thus be seen as a lengthy survey of the history of love, from angels through pagan culture to Israel and finally to the ultimate revelation of God's love through Christ. Fifteen centuries of Western religious thinkers, such as Bernard, Francis, Dante, and Simone Weil, testify to the power of the essentially Augustinian notion of caritas and amor Dei as the Christian virtue par excellence. 

Paula Fredriksen

Love-feast. The love-feast (Grk. agape, which also means "love") is the common meal with which Christians first followed Christ's command at the Last Supper to "do this in remembrance of me" (e.g., Luke 22:19, 1 Cor. 11:24), and later to "feed my sheep" (e.g., John 21:17). According to Paul, Christians repeat the "Lord's supper" to "proclaim the Lord's death until he comes" (1 Cor. 11:20, 26). In Acts (2:43-47; 20:27), "break- ing bread . . . with glad and gentle hearts" is associated with distributing goods "to all, as any had need"; only Jude 12 uses agape to refer to the meal. Most scholars agree that Paul is ironic in advising the "hungry," wealthy Corinthians to "eat at home" (1 Cor. 11:34); he seems to be advising the eating inseparably from the eating. Eating in agape (1 Cor. 13), Christians will "discern" Christ's presence in themselves and others together (1 Cor. 11:29, 31), just as the elders of Israel finally "saw God, and ate and drank" in making the first covenant (Luke 24:30-35; 35-36). John 21:12; see also Exod. 24:11).

The love-feasts of early Christians draw metaphors in Israelite scripture and sectarian practice linking food and law, communalism, and covenantal communities, with concerns about how to see "face to face" the ineffable, imageless presence of God in daily life (e.g., Exod. 33:11; Deut. 34:10; 1 Cor. 13:12). The New Testament writers' visions of epiphany in loving-eating are inseparable from their sectarian assumptions about incarnation and universalism. Love-feasts were intended less to mark boundaries than to cross them by fostering "loving" relations among infinitely disparate people, Abraham's descendants in the "many nations" (Rom. 4:17; Gen. 17:5).

Paul shows how Corinthians, untutored in midrashic debates about the bodiliness of fleshly spirits whom God may feed or consume in a moment, and committed to their own views of communalism and community, could be blindly indiscriminate eaters of Jewish-Christian feasts (1 Cor. 11:17-23). Reports of Jesus as "a glib and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners" (Matt. 11:19 par.), like Peter's (Acts 10:9-11:18), show how Jewish-Christians could be blindly indiscriminate to fit Jews who shared their view of the body temple but not their abrogation of all the epistemized in the dietary rules, except "th of love" and its new creation. Underlying the conflicts that New Testa writers attributed to differences among Jews and "gentiles are deeper widespread in the complexities of humans and their union in the presence of Judas and Peter at Clapham, a juxtaposition that suggests the kin that led to the historical secularization of the "loving" meal (agape) from the blessing distribution of the bread and wine, or "th eating (eucharistia), as Ignatius (ca. 115 CE) saw it. With the incorporation of the church in the Roman empire during the fourth century, those well fed enough to abstain from milk dreams of banquets gradually replaced the encompassed in the bread and wine with a parary fast. 

Gillian Fleethy-H.
Repentance. Sincere contrition, involving acknowledgment of wrongdoing in the sense of both admitting guilt and feeling guilty (Lev. 5:17; 6:4). The sinner might signal repentance through fasting, weeping, rending garments, and donning sackcloth and ashes (2 Sam. 12:13–17; Jon. 3:5–10). Such emotional and even public acknowledgment of prior wrongdoing is but the first step toward forgiveness: remorse must be accompanied by resolve to cease doing wrong and do what is right (Isa. 1:17–18, 27; Amos 5:14–15). In biblical idiom, the sinner is called on to "circumcise the heart" (Deut. 30:6; Jer. 4:4), "wash the heart" (Jer. 4:14), or become "single-hearted" (Jer. 32:39); to make a new heart (Ezek. 18:31), a heart of flesh, not stone (Ezek. 36:26). These ideas are summed up in the Greek prophetic concept, "repent," (cf. rabbinic "shaffle", "repentance"), meaning both a turning from sin and a returning to right action, *Tora*, and God.

From the earliest biblical narratives through the Roman destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE, Jewish ideas of repentance were allied to the great system of sacrifice detailed in the Torah and centered especially in the Temple cult. Rites of communal and national repentance were enacted on the *Day of Atonement;* but at any time penitent individuals could make offerings at the Temple to atone for transgressions. Full repentance for voluntary wrongdoing against one's neighbor required, beyond remorse, restitution (plus, where pertinent, one-fifth more of the value of the thing restored, Lev. 6:9). Only then could one make the Temple offering for remission of sin. Sources stress that these offerings did not effect atonement automatically: the sinner's inner repentance is the necessary precondition of forgiveness (see Philo, *Special Laws* 1.234–38; Josephus, Ant. 3.9.392; cf. Matt. 5:24–25).

In the *Septuagint,* *metanoia* and *metanoeo* (literally, "a change of mind") often express "repent," and both appear frequently in the New Testament. Mark's Jesus begins his ministry with a call for repentance in the face of the coming *kingdom of God* (1:14; cf. Matt. 3:2, where the call is transposed to *John the Baptist*). Luke presents Jesus' mission as particularly a call to sinners in repentance to order to receive forgiveness (e.g., 5:32).

Paul scarcely speaks of repentance at all in his letters, but his audiences were for the most part gentiles who, unlike Jews, were under no obligation to live and worship according to the Torah. Hence Paul, addressing these gentiles to God, are they called not to "repent" as such, that is, to return, but to turn (Grk. *epistrophē*) for the first time. This term appears in prophetic passages both in the Septuagint and in Hellenistic Jewish literature as the anticipated response of the nations once the God of Israel reveals himself in glory at the end of days (Tobit 14:6; cf. 1 Thess. 1:9–10). In the context of Christianity, the "turning from" idiom means a "turning to" Christ, and so *epistrophē* comes to mean "to convert" (e.g., Acts 15:3); see Conversion.

Christian thinkers eventually expressed an elaborate theology of atonement and expiation for sin centering around the sacrifice of Christ, yet the emphasis on the importance of individual repentance remained. In his commentary on Paul's letter to the Romans, written in 395 CE, Augustine observed that the only sin against the Holy Spirit that could never be forgiven is despair, and he rejects repentance; if one does repent, he cannot repudiate his sin and be forgiven. In taking this position, Augustine came close to the view of the rabbis: "Let the sinner repent, and he will find atonement" (Jer. Mak. 2:7, 31b).

Rephaim. In several biblical texts (e.g., Isa. 26:14; Prov. 2:18) dead "shades" (NRSV) who inhabit the underworld; in other texts a race of fearsome giants who once lived in parts of Palestine and Transjordan (e.g., Deut. 2:10; 3:11, 13; Josh. 12:4; 13:12). Scholars have in the past considered these two meanings distinct, but texts from *Ugarit suggest they may be related. At Ugarit Rephaim-most often refers to members of the aristocracy (military, political, or religious) who, as a result of their status while alive, attain some sort of superhuman, even semi-divine, standing in the underworld. The probable etymology of Rephaim, from the verb meaning "to heal," also suggests that these dead Rephaim were thought to have power to help the living. The term Rephaim in the Bible likewise may refer to those among the deceased (e.g., the ancestral giants) who demonstrated extraordinary prowess during life and continue to exercise some sort of power after death. Notable in this regard is Isaiah 14:9, where the Rephaim of the underworld are described as those "who were leaders of the earth" and those "who were kings of the nations."

See also Nephilim.

SUSAN ACKERMAN

Resurrection of Christ.

Biblical Background. In all but the latest parts of the Hebrew Bible, the concept of resurrection was applied not to the life of the individual after death but metaphorically to the renewal of Israel corporately after the return from *exile* (see Isa. 66:19; Ezek. 37:1–14, where the resurrection language, especially in v. 13, is clearly metaphorical). In *apocalyptic* literature, beg with Daniel 12:2, resurrection language applied literally, denoting coming to life again after death through an act of God in a transcendent mode of existence beyond history. This insistence, however, is not conceived in an irreligious fashion; it is the elect people of God (Dan. 12:2) who are corporately resurrected and the resurrection character of this resurrection is indicated by such symbols as "shining light of the sky" (Dan. 12:3).

Jesus proclaimed the *kingdom of God* concept couched in apocalyptic terms as a new cosmic order. It was to shortly; God was already at work in Jesus' ministry to bring it about. Jesus' proclamation implied impending corporate resurrection of God's people, or at least of those who responded positively to his message. In the *Gospel* the *Sadducees, Jesus used a reminiscence of Daniel 12:3 to describe the scendental character of the resurrection life: resurrection will be "like angels in heaven" (12:25). Critical scholarship regards the portions by Jesus of his own resurrection (8:31, etc.) as creations of the post-Easter *mystery* after the event. Since, however, preaching of the kingdom implied resurrection there can be no question that he foresaw corporate resurrection of God's people as beyond his own death (Mark 14:25). But is nothing in his authentic preaching to say that he expected an individual resurrection himself.

The Easter Event. It is in this framework the Easter event should be understood. Appeared alive to his disciples after his crucifixion. The earliest record of these appearances is to be found in 1 Corinthians 15:3–7, a tract that *Paul received* after his apostolic call not later than his visit to Jerusalem (5:22), when he saw Cephas (Peter) and James (1:18–19), who, like him, were recipients of *earnest.* The early community adopted models to interpret this fact: capture, resurrection, and exaltation. According to the first to the first in Jesus was "taken up" (Acts 1:9; Acts 1:11; Luke 24:46; Mark 16:19) or "received" in heaven (Acts 1:10; see Ascension of Christ). According to the end, God "raised Jesus from the dead" (1:22; 1:15–4, where the passive "was raised is a a passive denoting an act of God; cf. Acts 2). The model, exaltation, is found by it without a preceding reference to the resur-