CHAPTER XVI

Covenant and Communion in First Corinthians

Alan. R. Millard

[p.242]

While the currents of New Testament inquiries are reflected frequently in studies of the Old Testament, the streams of Old Testament research are followed into the New Testament less often. This is a natural situation in view of the New Testament’s claim to fulfil the Old, a claim which Professor Bruce has helped to elucidate.¹ An attempt is made here, with temerity, to approach one of Paul’s epistles in the light of a fashionable Old Testament theme.

At present the Covenant concept is being investigated by form criticism on the basis of knowledge gleaned from other ancient Near Eastern Texts.² So far, however, very little use of resultant insights has been made in New Testament research, although this is one field where there is much common ground.³ In a basic study K. Baltzer has demonstrated the persistence of a covenant scheme from the Old Testament into the Dead Sea Scrolls and early Christian literature, without a detailed endeavour to find it in the New Testament.⁴ Preamble, historical prologue, stipulations, blessings and curses comprise the basic features of the scheme as represented in documents of the second millennium B.C. Baltzer identified parallels to these in sections of the Damascus Document and the Manual of Discipline from Qumran, and of the Didache, Barnabas and 2 Clement which he de-
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fined as dogmatic, ethical, blessings and curses. He located the preservation of the scheme in liturgical forms.

Now although it would be far-fetched to maintain that any New Testament book was constructed on this pattern, it would be surprising were the concept entirely absent from writings concerned with a new covenant. Hence it may be borne in mind when reading the Epistles that they were composed to explain various facets of the application of the New

³ F. C. Fensham is an exception, see his studies “The Curse of the Cross and the Renewal of the Covenant” in Biblical Essays (Stellenbosch, 1966), pp. 219-26, “Die Ofer en Maaltyd”; Tydskrif vir Geesestwetensk 5 (1965), pp. 77-85 (not accessible to me), and “Covenant, Promise and Expectation in the Bible” ThZ 23 (1967), pp. 305-22 with references. The essays by M. G. Kline in WTJ 27 (1964-5), pp. 1-20, 115-139, 28 (1965-6), pp. 1-37, should also be mentioned in this connexion.
Covenant to those who professed to accept its requirements, though they are not themselves covenant texts. So it is likely that echoes of the ancient scheme will appear.

All covenants were largely concerned with the conduct of the subject party, and the Apostle Paul felt a need for the instruction of the Corinthians in their personal responsibility as adherents of the New Covenant. The covenant theme is patent in the terms of 1:2, violated by the attitudes condemned in 1:10 ff. Further, as subjects they should never engage in any activity contrary to their Suzerain’s interests, seeking adjudication of disputes from another authority (6:1-8), or joining with vassals of another power in sensual pursuits (6:9-20; cf. 10:14-30), occupations for which there are numerous Old Testament parallels in political and moral spheres. In ancient times a vassal’s persistent disloyalty might result in reprisals by the suzerain, culminating in exile, or in withdrawal of the suzerain’s protection against hostile forces. Such a process is described in the long curses of Deuteronomy 28, vividly portrayed in Deuteronomy 29:18-28, and was partially activated in the days of the Judges, to take Israel as an example. A like effect is produced by the New Covenant: the Corinthians were weak, ill, and even dead through their misbehaviour (11:30). Here the Covenant provisions had taken force, as Paul emphasizes in chapter 11 by his juxtaposition of verses 26 and 27. Proclamation of the Lord’s Death, which was the solemnizing of the New Covenant (verse 25), implies acceptance of its consequences. The judicial language apparent in the subsequent verses has been observed already; we may look upon it as a reflection of the Old Testament’s covenant lawsuits (ריבע) where the Lord takes his people to court for their faithlessness. Paul tries to prevent that shame overtaking the Corinthians by pointing to the effect of the Lord’s Supper as proclaiming the inauguration of the New Covenant and their consequent blessing — proclaiming it, we understand, to those outside its circle who could be called upon in court, just as heaven and earth are summoned, being independent witnesses of the Old Covenant. That Covenant told to the pagan nations and works of creation what God had done for Israel (cf. Dt. 29:22-28), at the same time as it was narrated for
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the benefit of the subsequent generation (Ex. 13:8). This proclamation may be considered primarily out-reaching to those who observe the life of the church, in the present context, angels (4:9; 11:10) and higher powers (as in Eph. 3:10; 6:12), and also to those who might be drawn by its message (like the “unbeliever” of 14:24).

As the actions against vassals provided for in ancient treaties were intended to be punitive and remedial, so is the hardship which might befall the Corinthians. Indeed, they were required to implement the discipline of offenders among themselves by the “handing over to Satan” (5:5). That so grave a move was not final condemnation is shown by 11:32, it was rather a chastening to bring repentance and restoration. Extruded from the Covenant’s present benefits, the miscreant might be brought to realize his error, repent, and be received again. There is an obvious similarity with the machinery of the old Testament covenant which

---

6 References in K. A. Kitchen, op. cit., p. 98, n. 44.
7 Discussion by H. B. Huffmon, JBL 78 (1959), pp. 290-93; the stone in Jos. 24:26, 27 is also comparable.
delivered the disloyal nation to its enemies for a time, they acting as the, unwitting, agents of the Lord (so the Assyrians Is. 8:5 f, etc., Nebuchadrezzar Jer. 25:9 etc.).

The Lord’s Supper, we have seen, stressed the covenant-standing of the disciple of Jesus. Perhaps especial weight lies on the Judas-connotation of the words “in the night in which he was betrayed” (11:23) in the light of the Corinthians’ lax behaviour there and possible incurrence of guilt (11:27). In ancient times the obligated party laid his hand upon the sacrificial victim, identifying his fate with that of the animal should he break his oath, e.g. “This head is not a ram’s head, it is Mati’-il’s head... if Mati’-il [breaks] this treaty, as the head of this ram is cut off... so may the head of Mati’-il be cut off...”. While many major aspects of Jesus’ death cannot be compared with the ancient covenant forms, this one may, and Paul undoubtedly had it in mind at this juncture, as commentators point out, referring principally to Exodus 24 and to the Passover. In the account of the original Passover the precept is present in appropriate guise, “None of you shall go out of the door of his house (marked with the blood) until the morning” (Ex. 12:22). That is to say, any man who left the house repudiated the promised safety of the blood, and exposed himself to death of his own will. An analogous situation is envisaged in Joshua 2:18, 19: none of Rahab’s family would be in danger unless they left the house marked by the scarlet strand, but anyone who did would be liable to the same fate as the other citizens of Jericho.

Each time the Corinthian Christians shared the Lord’s Supper they purported to show their allegiance to the covenant it symbolized, and therefore could not but expect its provisions to be active upon them for good or for ill. This follows the ancient pattern in which the regular reiteration of the covenant terms by vassals was a condition; compare, for example, the formal requirements of Deuteronomy 16:1-12; 31:10-13 and the blessings and curses listed. Two purposes were accomplished by this prompting of memory: thanksgiving which involved renewal of loyalty to the gracious Suzerain, and recollection of the commitments undertaken in response (well illustrated in Jos. 24:16-18). To facilitate the repetition, copies of the covenant — terms were preserved in some sacred place — in the Ark in Israel, in various temples in other states — or engraved on “public” monuments as at Shechem (Dt. 27:2 ff.) and Sefireh. Remembrance of the establishment of the covenant was, therefore, an integral feature of the pattern.

This similarity with the ancient covenant form is important for the interpretation of 11:24-25. We have seen the place of remembering the covenant among obligations placed upon a vassal, an obvious safeguard against human frailty, against the instinctive revolt at restraint. Yet J. Jeremias would understand these words as “This do, that God may remember me”, arguing that “God remembers the Messiah in that he causes the kingdom to break in by the parousia” and “As often as the death of the Lord is proclaimed at the Lord’s supper, and the maranatha

---

9 It would appear hard to avoid this association of ideas even if the primary sense is of God delivering Jesus to his enemies.

rises upwards, God is reminded of the unfulfilled climax of the work of salvation until (the
goal is reached, that) he comes”. 12 He says of the command, “The usual interpretation,
according to which it is the disciples who should remember, is strange. Was Jesus afraid that
his disciples would forget him?” 13 Yet surely that is the point; because Jesus knew that the
disciples might forget him and all that he signified, he instituted the meal of the New
Covenant. Therein he was to be celebrated often as the Lord and the Lamb, providing the
example recalled in exhortation to forgetful readers by Paul in Philippians 2 and by Peter in 1
Peter 2.

The usage of terms for remembrance in the Old Testament and in Jewish literature and
inscriptions is a mainstay of Jeremias’ views Many references are collected, of which it is
claimed, “for the most part they speak of God’s remembrance”. 14 However, scrutiny of the
Old Testament texts gives reason to doubt the relevance of some and the force of others. At
the time Jeremias completed the revision of the current edition of his book an exhaustive
monograph on the Hebrew root _ZKR_ “to remem-
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ber” was published by W. Schottroff, 15 examining each occurrence and rendering unnecessary
any detailed analysis here. What comes to notice when reading Jeremias’ references is the
careful precision of the Hebrew text when the subject of remembering is God, e.g. Exodus
28:29 _ř-zikkarôn lipnè yhwh tâmid_ , “as a memorial before the Lord continually”, cf. 28:12;
Numbers 10:10 _w’hayâ lâkem řzikkarôn lipnê_ “lôhêkem_ , “And they shall be a memorial of
you before your God”. In fact, whenever God is the subject, this is made clear either
specifically, as in the passages just cited, or by the context of rituals in his sanctuary, as found
several times in Ecclesiasticus 45. 16 On the other hand, the repetition of the Passover meal is
to be simply _lâkem řzikkarôn_ , “And this day shall be to you for a memorial, and you shall
keep it as a feast to the Lord; throughout your generations you shall keep it, a feast ordained
for ever” (Ex. 12:14). Therefore the phrase _ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ_ is essential in Acts 10:4 if
God is to do the remembering, and is not an optional addition to a firmly established
formula. 17 (Accordingly Jeremias’ related attempt to take Mark 14:9 as foretelling a
remembrance by God is to be rejected.)

In the dedicatory or votive inscriptions recovered from early synagogues the unstated subject
of the phrase _dĕkir לְתָבָר_ may be understood as God with some degree of plausibility, “May
God remember so-and-so with mercy”. 18 Nevertheless, among scores of comparable Aramaic
texts (Nabataean, Palmyrene, Hatrene) are many which add “in the presence of such-and-such a
deity”, suggesting that the remembering is carried out by human agents in invocation of the
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12 _The Eucharistic Words of Jesus_, ET of _Die Abendsmahlswoorte Jesu_³ (Göttingen, 1960) revised to 1964
13 _Ibid._, p. 251.
14 _Ibid._, p. 248. The following observations partly repeat the remarks of D. Jones, _JTS_ N.S. 6 (1955), pp. 183-91,
who deals with the LXX renderings of the O.T. passages.
16 Cf. Schottroff’s remarks, _op. cit._, p. 313. The exegesis of Num. 5:15 and 1 Ki. 17:18 as bringing sin to God’s
memory (Jeremias, _op. cit._, p. 248) is disputed by Schottroff, pp. 265-70.
17 As Jeremias states, _op. cit._, p. 248, n. 1.
18 _Ibid._, pp. 244, 245.
god. Indeed, support for this view as a general interpretation can be found in the Jericho synagogue inscription quoted by Jeremias. The structure was built at the instigation of a group of people whose names are not enumerated, perhaps because they were too many. But after the memorial formula stands the sentence “He who knows their names and those of their children and of their households shall write them in the Book of Life [beside] the Righteous”, token of an assurance that they would not be forgotten by God, although men could not recall them by name. Certainly the intention of such texts is to bring the benefactor’s name into the presence of God (the absence of a divine name or title may be explained by the context of the memorial, namely in the synagogue or its precinct, just as the pagan texts are found in the vicinity of a shrine and many of them lack a divine name). Now a few Jewish dedications exhibit their authors’ beliefs more clearly, expressing their sanctified bribery: “Remembered be for good Judan bar Ishmael who made this ... As his reward may he have a share with the righteous” (Chorazin inscription, third century A.D.), and “May ... be remembered for good whose acts of charity are constant everywhere and who have given five golden denarii. May the King of the Universe give his blessing in their undertakings” (Hammath-by-Gadara, early fifth century A.D.). The remembrance formula can be understood as addressed to the reader, and his reaction can hardly be expected to take a form far different from that of Ecclesiasticus 45-50 (note especially 44:7-15), giving praise to God for the noble acts of “famous men and our fathers that begat us”.

A similar explanation can be given for the common ejaculation ziikrônoô libraîkâ “his memory for blessing” following the name of a dead person. While some require a visible structure (cf. Gen. 11:4; II Sam. 18:18), it is said of the righteous “their words are their monument” (Genesis Rabbah 82:10). Furthermore, the Ecclesiasticus passage suggests that an unblessed memory is almost equivalent to assignment to perdition, the lot of the wicked in Proverbs 10:7. Therefore the expressions zikro’no’ libra’ka “his memory for blessing”, its fuller form zikro’no’ libra’ka’lehlaye’ha’olam habba’ “his memory for blessing for life of the next world” d’kîr Ft’ab “be remembered for good” and the like, can be applied to human remembrance as plausibly as to divine.

The result of this approach is to negate Jeremias’ claim that in Palestinian Judaism formulae on the style of d’kîr Ft’ab were “understood as a wish (‘may the memory of the righteous be a blessing’) relating to the merciful remembrance of God” as opposed to the interpretation of “Hellenistic Judaism... referring to the good memories which the deceased left behind among his contemporaries”. Thus Paul’s words mean that the Supper of the Lord was initiated to remind the disciples of the Lord of the work be had done.

Dissent from Jeremias’ understanding of the remembrance does not preclude a prospective sense in that any covenant looks forward to the continuance of the suzerain’s protection and to
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19 Schottroff, op. cit., pp. 73 f.
the obedience of the vassal. At all times the covenant-subjects are to be prepared against a
visit from their lord (Gk. παρουσία as in Hellenistic Egypt\(^{24}\)) or a summons to his presence,
and their readiness is shown in the regular recollection of their promises and of his in a
solemn repetition linking past, present, and future.

The ancient covenants provided for their physical preservation, principally through sanctions
against any who might alter the manuscript or destroy it by some means. With a covenant like
the New Covenant, not
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committed to writing in the first place but written on the hearts of its adherents (Jer. 31:33
etc.), the possibility of alteration is greater. Others of Paul’s letters demonstrate that fact, even
among his own converts. For those who destroyed the covenant documents divine annihilation
was promised, as much as for those who purposely contravened their terms. Such apostates
are condemned by Paul, also, “If any one has no love for the Lord, let him be anathema”,
which is followed immediately by the cry of the loyal vassal, “Our Lord, come!” (16:22)
involving reward and punishment.\(^{25}\) Meanwhile the memorial rite reiterating the basis of the
covenant is the most appropriate method of ensuring the faithful continuance of the covenant
people. Should the disciples of Jesus forget him, what man would remember him as Lord (cf.
Is. 53:8 LXX = Acts 8:33)?

\(^{24}\) Arndt, p. 635, s.v., 2b.

When Jesus first gave the cup to be drunk, He said it was the blood of the New Covenant. The New Covenant is a specific four-part promise of God. It is a promise of God so important that it took Jesus’ sacrifice to establish it. Taking Communion, then, we must be careful to be totally committed to this covenant and this promise in our lives. The New Covenant. Hebrews 8:10. There are very clear conditions for the taking of Communion in the Bible. This should not be surprising when one considers what it means. There is no higher or holier action that a human being can enter into than to enter into and renew their covenant with God through Communion. a covenant scheme from the Old Testament into the Dead Sea Scrolls and early Christian literature, without a detailed endeavour to find it in the New Testament.4 Preamble, historical prologue, stipulations, blessings and curses comprise the basic features of the scheme as represented in documents of the second millennium B.C. Baltzer identified parallels to these in sections of the Damascus Document.Â 24:26, 27 is also comparable. Alan. R. Millard, â€œCovenant and Communion in First Corinthians,â€ W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce. This volume examines 1 Corinthians 1-4 within first-century politics, demonstrating the significance of Corinthâ€™s constitution to the interpretation of Paulâ€™s letter. Bradley J. Bitner shows that Paul carefully considered the Roman colonial context of Corinth, which underlay numerous ecclesial conflicts. Roman politics, however, cannot account for the entire shape of Paulâ€™s response. Bridging the Hellenism-Judaism divide that has characterized much of Pauline scholarship, Bitner argues that Paul also appropriated Jewish-biblical notions of covenant. Epigraphical and papyrological evidence indi