

UNITED WISDOM

Covenant: Reciprocity, Obligation, and Memory

Traditions and Worldviews

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-26-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Covenant: Reciprocity, Obligation, and Memory

> *“will we do, and obey”*

Exodus 24:7, English version JPS 1917; Mechon Mamre.

About this article

A promise can outlive the person who made it. Along with a house or a family habit, the next generation receives a question: what has been handed down — a gift, a debt, or a right? In Jewish biblical texts, covenant joins God's promise, the human response, and communal memory. But these covenants differ: Noah, Abraham, and Sinai involve different circles of participants and forms of obligation. “Reciprocity” therefore does not mean an agreement between equal partners with identical powers. This article examines specific scenes, the bond between generations, and the breach and renewal of relationships. We will ask how memory can sustain care and become a means of pressure, why inheritance does not remove the question of a personal response, and what is lost when fidelity becomes an unlimited demand. The practical section helps examine a promise of one's own while preserving the difference between an everyday agreement and a religious covenant. Readers need not already share the faith of these works: what matters is distinguishing the text's claim, its religious foundation, and our own further analysis.

I. Covenant creates a relationship through time

A promise sometimes outlives the person who made it. A house built for a family remains, or the habit of gathering on a certain day, or an obligation to care for someone who cannot yet ask. With these, the next generation receives a question: what exactly has been handed down — a gift, a debt, a right, a story about who they are? We can accept an inheritance without noticing the demands attached to it. We can preserve the demands and forget why they arose.

The Hebrew word berit is usually translated as “covenant.” In the biblical chapters examined here, it names an established bond that remains in force beyond a single conversation. It may have a promise, conditions, a sign, and a circle of participants. But this set of elements varies. Comparing specific scenes is more useful for understanding the word than starting with a single modern formula.

In an ordinary contract, we generally look for what is exchanged. One person hands over an object, another pays; duties can be listed, a breach established. A covenant may include

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

duties, but its subject is broader: who we are to one another, what past binds us, what our future should become. This distinction is a tool for reading, not a claim that ancient societies had no practical contracts or that every act of fidelity becomes sacred.

In Genesis 15, Abram asks about a future he cannot yet see. The narrative joins the promise of descendants and land to a ritual scene. In Genesis 17, the same thread gains a bodily sign and an address to later generations. One episode does not replace the other: expectation, the establishment of a bond, and its marking form different sides of the narrative. The reader sees that a relationship is sustained through more than the memory of an extraordinary event. It also depends on repeated forms of belonging.

This raises a difficult question. The longer an obligation lives, the more it affects people who were absent when it was first established. They are bound by their predecessors' story, yet face circumstances of their own. Covenant language makes this problem visible instead of treating continuity as the simple transfer of information. What is inherited is not only knowledge of the past. It is a demand addressed to the present for a response.

Yet a limit is needed here from the outset. A religious community may understand such a bond as established by God. A historian studies the texts and practices through which that conviction is passed on. Someone outside the tradition can reflect on continuity without accepting its theological ground. These ways of reading meet, but they do not automatically confirm one another.

II. Noah: a promise that includes all living things

In Genesis 9:8–17, the circle of the covenant is unusually broad: Noah, his descendants, and living creatures. The rainbow becomes its sign. Within the narrative, the promise not to destroy all flesh in another flood concerns the stability of the inhabited world. The text does not describe an assembly at which animals enter into an agreement with God. The idea of a bargain between equals is therefore especially misplaced here.

Nearby are commands concerning life and blood. The proximity of promise and requirements reveals two dimensions of the narrative: life continues through God's decision, and human life carries responsibility. But we cannot mechanically turn every verse in the chapter into a clause of a single modern contract. It matters more to see that the scene after the catastrophe answers both the question of the world's future and the question of the limits of human action.

The sign's addressee is especially striking. In the narrative, the rainbow is linked to God's remembering the covenant. Readers are more accustomed to a reminder that prompts a person to fulfill a promise. Here the sign also speaks of the reliability of the one who promised. The relationship is not built only around the human risk of forgetting. The religious picture of

the world itself affirms that the continuation of life has not been left at the mercy of the next catastrophe.

We should not draw a promise of individual safety from this. The chapter does not claim that an individual will never again suffer from water, war, or illness. Its scale is the living world and, within this narrative, the impossibility of another total flood. The difference between the world's stability and the protection of each life matters. Without it, a religious image easily becomes a cruel accusation against someone who has suffered: if a promise exists, their misfortune must be explained by their own guilt. The text does not support that conclusion.

One further feature matters for comparison with other covenants: universality here does not erase the later special bond with Abraham and Israel. The biblical narrative can hold together the horizon of all living things and the specific history of a people. These scales differ; neither has to be declared a refutation of the other.

III. Abraham: a promise of the future and a sign of belonging

Genesis 17 presents covenant through future generations, a change of name, and circumcision as a sign. The narrative joins a personal address to Abraham with the fate of his descendants. This is not universal advice for building confidence, but a specific narrative about kinship, God's promise, and belonging. A modern psychological analogy may help us notice the depth of a promise through time, but does not exhaust its meaning.

The change of name makes a future role part of the present. The person does not yet see all that has been promised come to pass, yet is already named in accordance with it. In literary terms, this creates tension between the current situation and a possible future. At the same time, the narrative does not hide Abraham's question and laughter. Hope is not presented as the absence of difficulty. The promise's mismatch with ordinary expectations makes the scene dramatic.

The bodily sign reveals another side: belonging cannot be reduced to an inward mood. It concerns the body, the household, generations, and public practice. A reading based only on individual choice misses this feature. The text also concerns children and people included in Abraham's household. The ancient social structure differs substantially from modern ideas about each adult's equal right to enter obligations independently.

It helps to name that difference directly. Historical understanding does not require us to carry every relationship of an ancient household into a family today. The chapter's theological significance and a modern ethical assessment of different social arrangements are separate questions. If readers wish to discuss the medical or legal aspects of a particular practice, an interpretation of Genesis alone is insufficient: other sources and a different subject of discussion are needed.

The covenant with Abraham also reveals that blessing and the line of the covenant are not identical. The narrative speaks differently about Ishmael and Isaac. This feature offers no basis for conclusions about the human dignity of modern groups or for turning an ancient text into a ready answer to a political dispute. Within this article, the narrower conclusion matters: the narrative does not portray all good relationships as identical. A particular bond receives a defined history, circle, and sign.

IV. Sinai: the people's response takes public form

In Exodus 24:3–8, Moses reports the words and ordinances, writes them down, and reads the book of the covenant. An altar and twelve pillars, corresponding to the tribes, stand beneath the mountain. Half the sacrificial blood goes onto the altar; after the reading and the people's response, the other half goes onto the people. The ritual bond is therefore more than marked: the narrative places the participants on different sides of one scene and joins them through an action. Readers encounter not only spoken assent, but a bodily image of obligation.

The sequence allows us to distinguish three sides of obligation. The written record has a definite content that can be read again. The people's response represents acceptance of that content. The blood gives the bond a weight that a declaration alone cannot convey. Portraying the ritual as an ancient version of signing a contract would be too easy: that translation would lose the sacrifice, altar, and address to God. But the distinction between content, response, and the establishment of a bond is visible without that substitution. No single element expresses the whole scene.

At the same time, our modern concept of informed individual consent should not automatically be attributed to the biblical assembly. The narrative presents the people as a collective participant. It does not tell us of a procedure in which everyone could separately refuse, renegotiate the terms, or choose a different community. Respectful reading means seeing the text's form without drawing our favorite modern model of freedom into it.

The reciprocity of the Sinai covenant is asymmetrical. Liberation, address, and command come from God; the people respond with fidelity and fulfillment. These are religious relations, not negotiations between parties with equal power. But asymmetry does not erase the importance of the response. The response makes the human being a responsible participant in the narrative: someone who must act, remember, transgress, return, and interpret.

Here the idea of obligation becomes especially dense. We can agree with a general picture of goodness without changing any actions. The covenant text makes fidelity concrete. It links belonging to the arrangement of relationships and everyday life. This concreteness allows the link between spoken words and deeds to be examined. Yet it cannot serve as ready

authorization for any leader who declares their demands sacred. The authority of a specific biblical covenant does not pass automatically to someone who borrows its language.

V. Memory makes the past an obligation in the present

In these works, memory acts through a story told anew. In Deuteronomy 26:1–11, the offering of first fruits joins the story of ancestors, oppression, and liberation to the present gift of land and harvest. The past becomes part of what a person does today. This is more than preserving information about origins.

This way of remembering changes the meaning of prosperity. A harvest can be understood as the outcome of one's own skill alone. The ritual story places it in a longer history: the person benefits from events and work that did not begin with them. Analytically, this lets us distinguish gratitude from claiming everything as our own achievement. But the religious act is not reducible to a useful exercise in humility: its participant addresses God within a particular tradition.

Memory can also reveal a duty toward another person. Deuteronomy 24:17–22 links care for the stranger, orphan, and widow to the memory of slavery. Here the past is not only a ground for one's own group's special dignity. It becomes a reason to notice another person's vulnerability. People must remember circumstances in which their own freedom was impossible.

This distinction helps in reading a shared history. The same story of suffering can justify withdrawal or broaden responsibility. Suffering itself does not determine how descendants will treat others. In the text considered here, the connection between memory and care is normative: this is how one should act. It is a command, not an empirical law stating that everyone who suffers necessarily becomes more responsive.

Memory also needs honesty. If a community keeps only its ancestors' noble decisions in its story, present members receive an example that cannot be challenged. If mistakes, dependence, and broken promises are preserved, room opens for responsibility without idealization. A covenant narrative can hold this complexity: fidelity is not the claim that the past was faultless. Sometimes remembering means acknowledging an unfinished duty that an earlier generation failed to carry out.

VI. Who is present when we say “we”

Deuteronomy 29:9–14 in Hebrew numbering lists different groups in the assembly and also speaks of those who are not here today. That phrasing widens the bond's circle through time. The people are represented by more than their present leaders and the adults immediately present. The narrative conceives of the community as a continuing history.

It is a powerful image, but it has a questioning side. When an obligation is spoken in the name of “we,” who actually has a voice? Who is included in care, and who only in demands? The text lists the participants of an ancient assembly; modern readers can separately ask how a collective promise affects those who had no chance to establish it. This is our further analysis, not a theory of democratic representation hidden in the chapter.

Consider a hypothetical example: several adults decide to preserve the family home. For them, this is gratitude toward their parents. For the grown children, maintaining the house may become an expense that determines their profession, place of residence, and relationships. “We have always done this” tells the history of the decision, but does not yet answer the question of a fair distribution of duties. Continuity becomes clearer when we can name what is being cared for and the real cost of continuing that care.

It matters here to avoid the opposite extreme. Not having chosen the circumstances of one's birth does not mean having no responsibility to others. We depend on language, work, infrastructure, and care that we did not create ourselves. But how to respond to that dependence requires discussion. Between rejecting every bond and submitting unconditionally to inherited demands lies considerable room for thoughtful fidelity.

In religious life, questions of belonging receive their own answers through interpretation, communal norms, and specific branches of Judaism. This article does not derive a single position held by all modern Jews from one chapter. A more limited idea matters enough: “we” can bind generations, but requires careful reading. Living people must remain visible behind it, not only the solemn form of a shared promise.

VII. A breach does not always end a relationship

In the Sinai narrative, the human response opens the possibility of fidelity and breach; in Jeremiah, renewal presupposes a history of a broken bond. But this cannot be made a definition of every covenant. In the scene with Noah, the promise to preserve living things is not presented as a bargain valid only until the next human wrongdoing. The difference matters: one narrative asks how human beings respond to a demand, another affirms God's promise to the world. The dramatic possibility of unfaithfulness belongs to particular relationships and does not explain the whole range of texts examined here.

In Exodus 6:2–8, remembrance of the covenant with the patriarchs is joined to the plight of the enslaved and a promise of liberation. God's remembering here does not mean that those bound by the covenant never suffered. On the contrary, the words arise within unfreedom. In the narrative's literary structure, memory keeps the future open where present circumstances seem to close it.

Renewal is an especially difficult subject. Jeremiah 31:30–33 in Hebrew numbering speaks of a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, of Torah written on the heart, and of forgiveness. We must preserve both the addressees and the content. This is not an unnamed promise to every reader to abolish all external norms. The text speaks of a transformed relationship to God's teaching in a particular prophetic context.

The newness allows us to ask how earlier content relates to a new way of living it. We can know a requirement and feel it solely as coercion. We can come to find it inwardly meaningful. Yet inward acceptance does not remove the need to distinguish a just obligation from an imposed one. A modern analogy shows the structure of the question; it does not prove the fulfillment of the prophecy or replace its theological interpretation.

In human relationships, renewal also requires more than a beautiful declaration. If a promise has been broken, the breach, its consequences, and changes that would make repetition less likely need to be named. Forgiving, restoring cooperation, and recognizing an earlier obligation as still binding are different decisions. They can be discussed separately. Covenant language helps reveal the depth of a lasting bond, but should not prevent people from assessing what exactly remains in that bond and what needs to change.

VIII. A particular bond and the dignity of others

The chapters examined here do not offer one flat picture. The covenant with Noah includes living things; the covenant with Abraham concerns descendants; the Sinai covenant concerns a people and commandments. These different scales make us hold universality and particularity together. Erase the particular history and the Jewish text loses its subject. Infer the lesser value of everyone else from that history and a conclusion appears that this comparison does not support.

A particular obligation is not identical to superiority. Parents are responsible first for their own child, but that does not mean someone else's child deserves less care. This modern analogy is limited: a people's covenant is not a family enlarged. It helps only to distinguish logically between a priority of responsibility and a ranking of human worth. Neither follows automatically from the other.

When reading religious texts, this distinction also guards against shallow universalism. Respect is sometimes understood as a promise to find the same idea in every tradition. Specific names, commandments, and stories are then declared secondary. But for people within a tradition, they may be the very meaning of fidelity. Respectful dialogue begins when readers are willing to encounter content that does not become their own faith.

For example, an interest in covenant memory does not require a person outside Judaism to borrow a ritual or declare themselves a participant at Sinai. They can read the text carefully,

understand the bond between memory and obligation, and then formulate a question about their own relationships. This preserves the distance between explaining and appropriating. Conversely, a believing reader is not required to turn God's promise into nothing more than a beautiful metaphor for a human agreement to make it intelligible to others.

Such reading makes reciprocity more precise. Reciprocity can mean a response to a gift rather than an equal exchange; memory can mean continuing a bond rather than listing achievements; particularity can mean a specific responsibility rather than a right to ignore someone else's life. But each meaning must be checked against the text. A generally benevolent formula does not replace carefully preserved distinctions.

IX. Fidelity remembers to whom it is addressed

In the texts considered here, covenant joins what is easily separated: gift and response, past and future, belonging and action. Each scene does so in its own way. The rainbow holds a promise to the living world; the sign of Abraham's covenant places the bond within the history of generations; the Sinai narrative gives the people's response a written and public form. Their differences help us avoid an overly easy definition.

What matters most in this reading is the ability to see obligation as a relationship, rather than an object once received and put on a shelf. It has an addressee. It concerns someone's life. Memory of its origins helps explain its meaning, but does not remove the need to attend to the present. If the form survives while people disappear from view, fidelity risks becoming the service of its own solemnity.

The opposite risk is to treat only the present mood as real. People then lose bonds that cannot be created anew from scratch every day. Another person becomes dependent on whether we feel like remembering today. A lasting promise resists that contingency. It lets us rely on yesterday's decision while circumstances and mutual understanding preserve its meaning. Revision requires clarity, but the need for revision does not make the earlier bond false.

A religious covenant remains more than this human analogy. For Jewish faith, the subject is God, Torah, and a people, not only a reasonable arrangement of shared life. Readers may not accept that foundation, yet can respect its specificity. Studying the tradition then broadens the language of reflection without turning someone else's teaching into a universal instruction.

A promise survives the words spoken through those who continue to answer for its content. Sometimes that response means preserving a form. Sometimes it means honestly acknowledging a breach and restoring action. Sometimes it means clarifying what was passed on to later generations. In each case, memory becomes substantive when it helps distinguish what was entrusted to us, whom it serves, and through what action today we actually continue the bond.

What this means in practice

The following practice is a modern reflective exercise, not a Jewish rite or a way of establishing a religious covenant. It suits one manageable obligation that a person has actually accepted: helping a relative, supporting a shared project, preserving an important family tradition. It is best to choose relationships in which discussion is possible and creates no additional risk.

First, write the promise itself in one concrete sentence. “I will be there” can mean very different actions; “I call once a week and give advance notice if I cannot” makes the subject of the bond clearer. Then name its ground separately: love, gratitude, earlier help, a shared aim, an agreement. The ground explains the duty's meaning, but does not replace its terms. Gratitude does not give the other party unlimited power to assign ever more demands.

The next question concerns time. When was the promise accepted? For how long? Have health, resources, or the participants changed? If conditions have changed, clarification does not necessarily mean abandoning fidelity. Sometimes clarification is what preserves real care. Without it, people continue to promise the impossible, while others build expectations on words no longer backed by action.

Next, examine the circle of participants. Have you accepted an obligation for someone else? Does your agreement rely on the unpaid work of someone who was absent from the conversation? A substantial difference may emerge between a beautiful collective “we” and the actual distribution of effort. It is better to discuss change concretely: what actions are needed, who can perform them, and what help is missing.

Finally, devise a form of remembrance. It might be a shared record of the agreement or a brief regular conversation. Its task is to preserve the content, not prove someone's eternal indebtedness. After some time, ask whether care has become more reliable and clearer. If the exercise has merely added accusations, it has not served its purpose. You can return to a smaller obligation that both parties understand. A lasting bond is strengthened not by the greatest possible number of promises, but by knowing what can actually be relied on.

Suppose the promise concerns helping older relatives. One person visits regularly, another sends money, a third hardly participates. The general formula “we care” hides different contributions. Before accusing anyone of unfaithfulness, it helps to find out what duties were actually agreed on, what each person can do, and where help still rests on an unspoken expectation. Sometimes a breach is found in an action, sometimes in the uncertain agreement itself.

Changing conditions need just as much attention. If someone promised to participate while in one state of health and can no longer do the same amount, discussing a change does not

necessarily mean rejecting the bond. The aim can remain while its form changes: find help, reduce frequency, distribute expenses. Yet a unilateral, silent disappearance differs from revision involving the people affected. In the first case, the other person is left with an expectation that no longer matches reality.

After such a conversation, it is worth recording not only the new actions but also what the promise does not include. Caring for a relative does not mean agreeing with every decision they make. Participating in family memory does not mean giving up one's own future. The right to refuse a new demand does not cancel a specific duty already accepted. These distinctions allow the bond to be kept without turning it into one party's unlimited power.

Finally, leave room for another participant's assessment. You may consider your contribution sufficient, while they see a need that has gone unheard. Their response does not become an automatic verdict, but should enter the conversation. Fidelity is tested by neither inward intention alone nor another person's demand alone. It needs clear terms, real capacities, and the chance to discuss consequences. This exercise does not define the content of biblical covenant; it takes up the article's question of what a promise does to a relationship through time.

Key quotation

> *“in their heart will I write it”*

God's speech in the prophetic text of Jeremiah, 31:32 in Hebrew numbering, 31:33 in several Christian editions. A short fragment from JPS 1917; the pronoun refers to Torah, named in the same verse. Verified text. The image of inward inscription does not remove the communal addressee or justify declaring the earlier Torah abolished.

Connections between traditions

The following comparisons are our analysis; historical influence is not established. Different grounds of fidelity remain different.

Positions and sources	Ground for comparison	Limit
Genesis 9:8–17 and Genesis 17	A promise joins the present to the future and receives a sign.	The rainbow marks a promise to all living things; circumcision is the prescribed sign of descendants' belonging. The scope and form of the human response differ.

Positions and sources	Ground for comparison	Limit
Exodus 24:3–8 and Jeremiah 31:30–33	The people's response and inward assimilation of Torah enter a relationship of fidelity.	A prophetic image of renewal cannot automatically be turned into the abolition of a norm or a change of addressee.
Deuteronomy 26:1–11 and 24:17–22	Memory of liberation participates in present action.	A grateful confession of history and a specific duty of care perform different tasks.
Exodus 24:7 and Zengzi, the Analects, I.4	Fidelity must appear in action rather than remain a favorable account of oneself.	A people's divine covenant differs from checking one's own reliability in human relationships.
Deuteronomy 29:9–14 and Epictetus, the Enchiridion, §§17, 50	Duty reaches beyond present desire.	An inherited communal bond is not identical to a Stoic attitude toward one's role and voluntarily accepted moral rules.

Primary sources

• Genesis 9:8–17. Hebrew text and English translation JPS 1917 at Mechon Mamre: the covenant with Noah and living creatures.

• Genesis 15. Mechon Mamre, JPS 1917: the promise to Abram and the ritual scene.

• Genesis 17. Mechon Mamre, JPS 1917: generations, names, and the sign of the covenant.

• Exodus 24:3–8. Mechon Mamre, JPS 1917: the book of the covenant and the people's response.

• Exodus 6:2–8. Mechon Mamre, JPS 1917: memory of the covenant in the liberation narrative.

• Deuteronomy 26:1–11. Mechon Mamre, JPS 1917: first fruits and the confession of history.

• Deuteronomy 24:17–22. Mechon Mamre, JPS 1917: memory of slavery and care for the vulnerable.

• Deuteronomy 29:9–14 in Hebrew numbering. Mechon Mamre, JPS 1917: participants present and absent.

• Jeremiah 31:30–33 in Hebrew numbering; 31:31–34 in several Christian editions. Mechon Mamre, JPS 1917: the new covenant and Torah on the heart. All the biblical entries above are chapters or specified fragments of one corpus actually read; they do not count as nine independent modern studies.

• Confucius and his students. The Analects, I.4, I.13, English version at the Internet Classics Archive; the translator is not explicitly named on the page used. A primary Confucian text; the specified sayings and nearby context were read. Role: reliability and the conditions of a promise.

• Epictetus. The Enchiridion, §§17, 50–51, translated by Elizabeth Carter. A primary Stoic text; the paragraphs were read. Role: a limited comparison of duty and constancy.

Tags

covenant, berit, Judaism, Tanakh, Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, Noah, Abraham, Sinai, promise, reciprocity, obligation, memory, generations, community, continuity, fidelity, breach, renewal, Torah, dignity, care, boundaries, responsibility, religious ethics, Zengzi, Epictetus, intercultural comparison

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of the United Wisdom project. He researches inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how the principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.