ɜut. 5.6–21), the Book of the Covenant (Exod. ı.22 [or 21.1]–23.19), the Holiness Code (Lev. ·–26), and the Deuteronomic laws (Deut. 12– ı). The Ten Commandments can be under- ɔod as the heart of Israel's convenantal rela- ınship with God, since they include an identi- ation of the suzerain, God's acts on behalf of ·ael, and Israel's obligations to God formulated apodictic style. Most of the obligations incum- nt upon Israel in the Decalogue deal not with ltic issues, but with the relations between peo- : in an orderly society. The Book of the Cov- ant, containing casuistic laws with many par- ɜls in other ancient Near Eastern traditions, is umed by many to be the oldest collection of /s in the Bible. The Holiness Code forms the lest core of Priestly (*P) legislation and is so med on account of its concern with Israelite ıal *purity and *holiness. The Deuteronomic ·s, although presented as a speech delivered Moses in Transjordan before his death, are ociated in modern scholarship with the cultic orms of King *Josiah of Judah (640–609 BCE; 2 Kings 22.1–23.30; 2 Chron. 34–35). The jor concern of this corpus of religious legis- on is with the centralization and purification he cult and its sacrificial system in the *Tem- in Jerusalem.

CARL S. EHRLICH

New Testament Views

'he modern New Testament is a fourth- tury anthology of mid- to late first-century uments, composed in Greek and reflecting social and religious stresses of a new religious ·ement seeking to define and eventually to inguish itself from Greek-speaking *syn- gue communities. In such a charged and nging context, "the Law" (Grk. *nomos*) re- ed widely divergent treatments, although its nition remains constant: the Law is God's :lation through *Moses to Israel.

aul. The earliest and most problematic source 'aul. Written to predominantly *gentile com- ıities, his letters often address questions of ics and authority. On these occasions, Paul's :ments concerning the Law can only be seen ınself-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 ı its commandments (1 Cor. 7.19; Rom. 8.4, –10; Gal. 5.14, authorizing his instruction ppeal to Lev. 19.18; cf. his defense of his tolic rights by quoting from "the law of ɜs," 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. 3.31). 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 overcome (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, 24–26; 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 unthought-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 intemperate—defy a consistent interpretation. He himself seems aware of the tensions 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. Jesus of Nazareth, living

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY LIBRARY

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 condemns 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

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

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 disharmony. 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

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 incestuous 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. *ʾăhābâ; ḥesed*). 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.

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY LIBRARY

2.2; Isa. 54.5–8), a father his firstborn son (Hos. 11.1–3; Jer. 31.9), a mother the child of her womb (Isa. 49.15). God manifests his love in and through his saving acts, most especially in his bringing Israel up from Egypt (Exod. 15.13; Deut. 4.37; 33.3; Neh. 9.17; Ps. 106.7; Hos. 11.4). Narratively and theologically, this liberation culminates in the Sinai *covenant, when God gives Israel his *tôrâ* (literally, "teaching"), instructing Israel on their social and religious obligations in light of their election. Chosen by God's love (Deut. 7.7–8; 10.15), Israel is to respond in kind: loving the God who redeemed them and revealed his will to them, teaching his ways to all future generations (Deut. 6.4–7).

The covenant binding God and Israel likewise binds together society. The individual is charged to "love your neighbor as yourself," kindred and foreigner both (Lev. 19.18, 34). The Bible specifies the concrete actions through which this love is to be expressed: support for the *poor (Lev. 19.9–10); honesty in measurements and in social interactions (v. 11); prompt payment to laborers; just law courts, favoring neither rich nor poor; respect for the elderly (vv. 13, 15, 32). A system of tithes underlay the welfare both of the poor, the fatherless (*see* Orphan), and the *widowed, and of *priests and *Levites who, unendowed with land, are "the Lord's portion" (Num. 18.20; Deut. 18.1–2). Right behavior, group affection, and communal social responsibility are thus the concrete measure of Israel's commitment to the covenant. And God, in turn, "keeps" or "guards" his steadfast love for Israel (Exod. 34.7; 1 Kings 3.6; Isa. 54.10; 55.3). Ultimately, Israel's confidence in redemption rests in her conviction that God's love is unwavering, his covenant eternal, his promises sure (Ps. 119.41; 130.7; Zeph. 3.17).

Much of this tradition, both social and theological, comes into the earliest strata of New Testament writings. Paul urges his gentiles in Galatia to be "servants of one another through love [Grk. *agapē*], for the whole law is fulfilled in one word, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself'" (Gal. 5.13–14, quoting Lev. 19.18). In powerfully poetic language, he exhorts the Corinthians to be knit together as a community through love (1 Cor. 13–14; cf. Rom. 14.15). Mark's Jesus sums up the *Torah with the first line of the *Shema (love of God) and Leviticus 19.18 (love of neighbor; Mark 12.28–31). The *Q material of the later *synoptic Gospels extends this last: followers of Jesus are to love not just their *neighbor but also and even their enemies (Matt. 5.43–48 par.). Perhaps, by the criterion of multiple attestation, this ethic of passive—indeed, even active (Matt. 5.39–41)—nonresistance may go back to the historical Jesus himself. Paul teaches similarly: persecutors should be blessed; vengeance eschewed; injustice tolerated (Rom. 12.9–13.14; cf. 1 Cor. 6.7; so too other first-century Jewish texts, such as *Joseph and Asenath* 29.3–4 [cf. Prov. 20.22]; Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2.30.212 [cf. Deut. 20.19–20; 21.10–14]).

Love became the theological lodestone of nascent Christianity. Christ's sacrifice on the cross was understood as the ultimate sign of God's love for humanity (John 3.16; cf. Rom. 8.39). The eucharist (a community meal celebrating this sacrifice) was referred to as the *agapē*, or "*love-feast". Christians exhorted themselves to love one another (see esp. 1–3 John), calling each other brothers and sisters. Such designations and community enthusiasms, misheard at a hostile distance, fueled dislike of the new groups, who were often accused of expressing love carnally at their convocations (Tertullian, *Apology;* Minucius Felix, *Octavius*). Yet in their care for both their own poor and the poor of the late Roman city, Christians, like their Jewish contemporaries, distinguished themselves by acts of public philanthropy—a fact noted with some irritation by the non-Christian emperor Julian (the Apostate, ca. 360; *Epistle* 22). This philanthropy was the social expression of the scriptural injunction to love the neighbor.

The Christian concept of love, in both its social and its theological applications, underwent elaborate and idiosyncratic development in the work of Augustine. In the unprecedented ecclesiastical situation after Constantine (d. 337), with the church increasingly merging with late Roman imperial culture, Augustine argued that the state coercion of heretics (by which he meant most especially his schismatic rivals, the Donatists) at the behest of the church is an act of Christian love, since it is done for their ultimate spiritual welfare. Theologically, he explored the concept of the *Trinity as a dynamic of divine (and, ultimately, of human) loves: the Trinity should be understood on the analogy of the relations between and process of human self-knowledge and self-love *(De Trinitate)*. Finally, and most influentially, Augustine came to analyze all humanity (and thus, given his theological anthropocentrism, all reality) according to loves: those enabled by God's love to love God belong to the "heavenly city"; those whom God leaves to their own fallen state love carnal things and thus belong to the "earthly city."

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, attest to the power of this essentially Augustinian notion of *caritas* and *amor Dei* as the Christian virtues par excellence. PAULA FREDRIKSEN

Love-feast. The love-feast (Grk. *agapē,* 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; 20.7), "breaking bread . . . with glad and generous hearts" is associated with distributing goods "to all, as any had need"; only Jude 12 uses *agapē* 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 sees the loving inseparably from the eating. Eating in *agapē* (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 24.30–31, 35–36; John 21.12; see Exod. 24:11).

The love-feasts of early Christians draw on metaphors in Israelite scripture and sectarian practice linking food and law, commensalism, and covenanted 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 commensalism and community, could be blindly indiscriminate eaters of Jewish-Christian feasts (1 Cor 11.17–23). Reports of Jesus as "a glu and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors sinners" (Matt. 11:19 par.), like Peter's v (Acts 10.9–11.18), show how Jewish-Chri feasts could be blatantly indiscriminate to f Jews who shared their view of the body temple but not their abrogation of all the epitomized in the dietary rules, except "th of love" and its new creation.

Underlying the conflicts that New Testa writers attributed to differences among an tween Jews and *gentiles are deeper visio the complexities of humans and their u seen in the presence of Judas and Peter at Cl table, a juxtaposition that suggests the kin conflicts that led to the historical separati the "loving" meal *(agapē)* from the blessing distribution of the bread and wine, or "th giving" *(eucharistia),* as Ignatius (ca. 115 CE) it. With the incorporation of the church int Roman empire during the fourth centur those well fed enough to abstain from mille dreams of banquets gradually replaced the encompassed in the bread and wine with a paratory fast. GILLIAN FEELEY-H.

Luke. *See* Luke, The Gospel According to; of the Apostles.

Luke, The Gospel According to. The thir pel is "the first volume" (Acts 1.1) of a tw work, Luke-Acts, composed by the same a and dedicated to Theophilus. In conten gospel is related to the Marcan and Mat gospels; collectively, these three Gospels the group usually called *synoptic, i.e., th dition that developed independently of th pel according to *John.

Content. The content of the Lucan gosp be summarized under eight headings. (1) A *prologue* (1.1–4), written in a stylized pe sentence, states the author's purpose in w (2) Two chapters are devoted to an *infanc rative* (1.5–2.52), recounting in studied pa ism the birth and childhood of *John the B and those of Jesus. (3) One and a half ch (3.1–4.13) set forth the appearance of J the desert, his preaching and baptist caree his imprisonment by Herod Antipas as a *p to the events inaugurating Jesus' public career,* n the latter's baptism, sojourn in the deser temptation by the devil. (4) The story of *Galilean ministry* (4.14–9.50) begins progra

the community's life. In a theological sense, the emphasis can fall primarily either on God's judgment on his sinful people or on his *mercy in still preserving a nucleus of them as a hope for the future, and these differing emphases are reflected in various biblical writers.

Perhaps the earliest occurrence of the idea is in the *Flood story (Gen. 7.23), where the stress is on the scale of the judgment, although with the implication that the survivors will constitute a new beginning. But it is with the prophets that the concept of remnant is really developed. In *Amos, the remnant is above all the hopeless residue of the nation's utter destruction (Amos 3.12; 5.3), although there is a faint hint that repentance may yet avert the fullness of judgment (Amos 5.15).

It is in the book of *Isaiah that the idea of remnant assumes particular prominence. In the basic message of the prophet, it is a sign of doom (Isa. 10.19; 17.5–6), and the name of his son, "a remnant shall return" (Isa. 7.3), originally signified the same. However, in what are probably postexilic supplements, the remnant is the group that returns to God and so embodies hope for the future (Isa. 10.20–21), where the son's name is reinterpreted (11.11–16). This group consists of the "needy," who trust in God alone (Isa. 14.32), as is most clearly brought out in *Zephaniah (2.3; 3.12). *Jeremiah and *Ezekiel display the same phenomenon as Isaiah, the remnant as evidence of utter destruction (Jer. 8.3; Ezek. 14.21–23) but also as a promise of a future hope (Jer. 23.3; Ezek. 11.13–20).

Hence those who survived the *exile identified themselves as the remnant (Ezra 9.15). But, in the postexilic period, dissident groups emerged, such as the *Qumran community, who saw themselves as the true remnant to be vindicated at the end (e.g., 2 Esd. 12.34). So Paul, in the long argument of *Romans 9–11, citing biblical prophecies, concludes that the Jews who follow Christ are the remnant of Israel, "chosen by grace" (Rom. 11.5). J. R. Porter

Repentance. Sincere contrition, involving acknowledgment of wrongdoing in the sense of both admitting guilt and feeling guilty (Lev. 5.5, 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 great prophetic concept *šûb*, "turn" (cf. rabbinic *tĕšûbâ*, "repentance"), meaning both a turning from *sin and a returning to right action, *Torah, 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. 6.5). 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.* 3.9.232; cf. Matt. 5.24–25).

In the *Septuagint, *metanoia* and *metanoeō* (literally, "a change of mind") often express "repentance" and "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 to repent in 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 summons these gentiles to God: they are called not to "repent" as such, that is, to return, but to turn (Grk. *epistrephō*) 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" idols meant a "turning to" Christ, and so *epistrephō* 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. Despair, he argued, inhibits repentance; if one does not repent, he cannot repudiate his sin and so be forgiven. In taking this position, Augustine came close to the view of the rabbis: "Let the sinner repent, and he will find atonement" (*y. Mak.* 2:7, 31d). Paula Fredriksen

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. 2.20; 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 semidivine, 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. 26.19; 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 plied literally, denoting coming to life agai death through an act of God in a transcen mode of existence beyond history. This n istence, however, is not conceived in an ir ualistic fashion; it is the elect people o (Dan. 12.1) who are corporately resurrecte transcendental character of this resurrecti is indicated by such similes as "shine lil brightness of the sky" (Dan. 12.3).

*Jesus proclaimed the *kingdom of C concept couched in apocalyptic terms ai volving a new cosmic order. It was to shortly; God was already at work in Jesus istry to bring it about. Jesus' proclamatio implied impending corporate resurrection people of God, or at least of those wh sponded positively to his message. In the c versy with the *Sadducees, Jesus used a reminiscent of Daniel 12.3 to describe the scendental character of the resurrection lif resurrection will be "like angels in heaven" 12.25). Critical scholarship regards the p tions by Jesus of his own resurrection (8.31; etc.) as creations of the post-Easter munity after the event. Since, however, preaching of the kingdom implied resurre there can be no question that he foresa corporate resurrection of God's people as beyond his own death (Mark 14.25). But is nothing in his authentic preaching to su that he expected an individual resurrectio himself.

The Easter Event. It is in this framewor the Easter event should be understood. appeared alive to his disciples after his *cru ion. The earliest record of these appearan to be found in 1 Corinthians 15.3–7, a trac that *Paul "received" after his apostolic call tainly not later than his visit to Jerusalem CE, when he saw Cephas (Peter) and James 1.18–19), who, like him, were recipients o pearances. The early community adopted models to interpret this fact: rapture, resu tion, and exaltation. According to the first m Jesus was "taken up" (Acts 1.11; Luke Mark 16.19) or "received" in heaven (Acts *see* Ascension of Christ). According to the ond, God "raised Jesus from the dead" (1 15.4, where the passive "was raised" is a di passive denoting an act of God; cf. Acts 2 The third model, exaltation, is found by i without a preceding reference to the resu tion, in a pre-Pauline hymn (Phil. 2.6–11).