Hiroaki Yoshimura

Did Jesus Cite Isa 6:9–10?

Jesus' Saying in Mark 4:11–12 and
the Isaianic Idea of
Hardening and Remnant

Hiroaki Yoshimura
Born 1958 in Fukuoka, Japan
Master of Political Science 1984 (Keio University, Tokyo)
Researcher of the Academy of Finland 1989
Fellow of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science 1991–1993
Expert researcher of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan 1993–1996
Master of Theology 2003 (Åbo Akademi University)

Cover: Tove Ahlbäck

DID JESUS CITE ISA 6:9-10?

Did Jesus Cite Isa 6:9-10?

Jesus' Saying in Mark 4:11-12 and
the Isaianic Idea of Hardening and Remnant

Hiroaki Yoshimura

Preface

The beginning of this research was in my master thesis of 2003 completed at the faculty of theology of Åbo Akademi University, "Jesus och förstockelsemotivet i Jes 6:9-10 (Jesus and the hardening motif of Isa 6:9-10)". In that thesis I concentrated on the authenticity question of Jesus' saying in Mark 4:11-12 analyzing the scholars' solutions for the question critically. The saying contains Jesus' citation from Isa 6:9-10, the passage manifesting the idea of divine hardening.

Before I finished the master thesis, I got interested in approaching Jesus' saying in question from the point of view of the reader of the book of Isaiah living in the context of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism. A simple but essential question arouse: "How did an ancient reader of that book understand Isa 6:9-10 and other related passages in the context where the concept of Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah was unthinkable?" Thus, this research is based on the presupposition that the elucidation of the way of ancient reader's understanding helps us to understand Jesus' saying in Mark 4:11-12, if it was uttered in the Palestinian Jewish context of Jesus' time. As such an ancient way of understanding became focused on, I found that my main concern was no longer to search for something 'authentic', which the study of the historical Jesus has been engaged in for many decades.

My former adviser, professor emeritus Karl-Gustav Sandelin and professor Antti Laato welcomed my updated research subject as a doctoral project to be pursued at the same faculty and even incorporated it in the Centre of Excellence of the Academy of Finland (Formation of Early Christian and Jewish Ideology) in 2004. I would like to express my gratitude to both scholars not only for arranging such a valuable opportunity for me but also giving me a lot of essential comments, criticisms, advice and encouragement for my research work through the years. In particular, professor emeritus Sandelin, even after having retired, has shown his unchanged interest in my subject and concern for the progress of the work. In fact professor Laato's Isaiah research inspired me to pursue this research. My gratitude is also due to professor Kari Syreeni, my new adviser since 2007, for overcoming together the transit stage of advisership and guiding me effectively to the completion of the research. Thanks also go to the other members of the post-graduate seminar for all their valuable comments on my research. In particular, I would like to thank lecturer doctor Sven-Olav Back for his advisership during the vacancy of professor and doctor Pekka Lindqvist for his advice in both academic and practical areas.

Apart from the post-graduate seminar at Åbo Akademi University a part of my work was presented in the joint post-graduate seminar with the Universities of Helsinki and Uppsala in 2007. I was also incorporated as a member of the research group "the Historical Jesus Workshop" at Åbo Akademi University which adjunct professor Tom Holmén established in 2006. In addition to regular seminar sessions, the Workshop organized a video conference in 2008 where I had the opportunity to present another part of the work and professor Gerd Theißen who officiated as commentator gave me encouraging comments for which I am deeply grateful. Naturally thanks also go to the organizers and participants of all those seminars.

I would also like to thank professor John S. Kloppenborg and adjunct professor Holmén for reading a draft of the whole research work and recognizing it to be able to be

a dissertation. Thanks to their critical comments I could improve many, though not all, points in the finalizing stage of the work.

I would like to mention that outside the academic world I got a lot of support from my friends during my research years. Actually in these over six years I have lived a life which is extraordinarily full of accidents, a serious illness and injury of family members, a long quarrel with the municipality authorities concerning the care of a handicapped family member, supporting a friend family whose tragedy caused by the decay of clergymen's marriage morals resulted in a nation-wide news item…. In such a stormy period of my life, without the support from my friends the life of my family might have got into a real dead end, to say nothing of the research work. Of all my friends who have supported us, I would like to mention my 'Diaspora' fellow in Finland, M.Th. Ken Takaki, whom I call one of the most Lutheran-minded Japanese, and also the congregation of the Japan Evangelical Lutheran Ookayama Church in Tokyo. I feel very sorry that I have not fulfilled their hopes yet. I wish this dissertation which is being published in the 110th anniversary of the Finnish Lutheran mission to Japan could mean the first particle of the fulfillment for them.

Finally this dissertation is dedicated to my dear wife Päivi and our beloved children Johanna (Finnish translation of Ἰωάννα) and Essai (Japanese translation of יִשַׁי, Ιεσσαι). The years of my research work were really the time when we were like in a voyage in the vast ocean. I may not always have been a good captain who does not show a gloomy face to the passengers in the middle of the rough weather. I will do better in the next voyage. Believe me. I have learned so much from the life and those ancient writings I dealt with in this ending one.

Turku / Åbo, March 2010

Hiroaki Yoshimura

Contents

1. Introduction

1.1. The problem: Jesus' saying in Mark 4:11-12

After Jesus had taught the crowd of people "a lot with parables" ("ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλά" in Mark 4:2) by the Sea of Galilee, the Twelve and some other followers asked him about those spoken parables ("ἠρώτων αὐτὸν […] τὰς παραβολάς" in 4:10). Now Jesus found himself alone with them, separated from the crowd. Since in his text Mark has presented only one parable prior to this, i.e. the parable of the sower (vv. 3-8), it is natural that Jesus' answer to the disciples' question should also concern that parable. This, however, it is not the explanation Jesus offers first (vv. 14-20); rather, he has something else to say first:

> (v. 11) (καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς·)
> ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεου· ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται,
> (v. 12) ἵνα *βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες*
> *ἀκούωσιν καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν, μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς.*

> (v. 11) (And he said to them,)
> "To you has been given the secret of the kingdom of God, but for those outside, everything comes in parables;
> (v. 12) in order that 'they may indeed look, but not perceive, and may indeed listen, but not understand; so that they may not turn again and be forgiven'" (NRSV)

Jesus then continues further and questions the disciples' failure to understand his parabolic teaching (v. 13): "You do not understand this parable. Then how will you understand all the parables? (οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην, καὶ πῶς πάσας τὰς παραβολὰς γνώσεσθε;)".[1] It is only after saying this that he goes on to give them the explanation of the parable of the sower.

---

[1] In NRSV, the first clause is interpreted as a question: "Do you not understand this parable?" Here I put a literary translation of the clause.

In Jesus' saying quoted above, the sentence which begins with a conjunctive ἵνα (v. 12) is a paraphrase of Isa 6:9-10, in which God commands the prophet Isaiah to harden the heart of the people of Israel, to make their eyes blind and their ears deaf, that is to say, to make them obdurate. At first sight, Jesus seems to mean that he uses parables in order to hinder "those outside" from understanding what they hear and prevent them repenting and being forgiven by God. Such an understanding of his meaning is made natural by two conjunctives ἵνα and μήποτε in the same sentence, which normally lead a final/telic clause with an affirmative respective negative force ("so that/in order that"; "so that not/in order that not/lest").

Jesus' saying has been called enigmatic.[2] Did Jesus really mean that he used parables in order to hinder a certain people from understanding as well as repenting and being forgiven? "On any interpretation of parable this is simply absurd", argues T.W. Manson. Perplexed he continues: "If parables had this object or result, that in itself would be the strongest possible argument against making use of them, and would make it impossible to imagine why Jesus should have employed such a way of delivering his teaching."[3] If Jesus did not purpose to use his parables like this, is it Mark's purpose to present Jesus' parables in such a way? The meaning of Jesus' saying in question has long been debated by scholars. In the following section, I will make a brief survey of suggested solutions.

1.2. A survey of previous studies

1.2.1. Opponents to the authenticity of the saying

Generally speaking, it is not until around the middle of the last century that scholars began to deal with the question of the authenticity of the saying and what the historical Jesus meant with it. Before this, scholarly attention was more concentrated on the Marcan level or on the level of the early Church.

---

[2] So Sanders 1985:112; Hultgren 2000:453.
[3] Manson 1948:76.

A. Jülicher is one of the most significant scholars who deny the historicity of the description in the Gospel of Mark concerning Jesus' intention to make a certain people obdurate by his parabolic teaching.[4] He argues that from the beginning to the end of his mission Jesus used parables for all kinds of listeners as means of raising the clarification and convincing power of his thoughts.[5] Therefore, any obduracy-causing intention was effected by the Evangelist.

But why did Mark have so radically a different idea than Jesus concerning the intention with parabolic teaching? Jülicher explains the caused change by considering the history of tradition. After the earthly life of Jesus, the disciples set to collect their master's teachings. In the process, they sorted the material into parabolic-allegorical and direct-concrete sayings. The former type of sayings came to be understood as mysterious. At the same time, the crowd to whom Jesus had told the parables became identified with the "verstockten, messiasfeindlichen, messiasmörderischen Judenvolke". These two notions, i.e., mysterious parables and obdurate Israel, together generated the idea that Jesus used parables in order to make a certain people obdurate, as it stands in the Marcan text.[6] Jülicher clarifies Mark's aim in composing the parable chapter for his Gospel as follows:

> Mc hat das Parabelkapitel 4 geschaffen, um eine wohlüberlegte und sein, über die inzwischen festgestellte Verstocktheit der Mehrheit in Israel empörtes Herz befriedigende Theorie zu entwickeln, die das Nichtverstandenwerden durch ein Nichtverstandenseinwollen erklärte.[7]

Nevertheless, Jülicher acknowledges that the parables used by Jesus actually had a hardening effect, although in a different way from what the Evangelist later envisaged. That is, the hearers of Jesus' parables failed to become guided by his teachings, whether they understood them or not. In that case, their obdurate situation occurred as an unexpected result of Jesus' parabolic teaching, and not as the realization of hardening

---

[4] According to W. Wrede, Jülicher is not the first scholar who denies the historicity of the Marcan description of Jesus' intention with parabolic teaching; however, his extensive argumentation is so influential that the scholarly consensus stands on it. See Wrede 1913:61.
[5] Jülicher 1899:1.146.
[6] Jülicher 1899:1.146-147.
[7] Jülicher 1899:1.135.

purpose. Both the lack of understanding and responsiveness of those who heard Jesus could have been a great worry to Jesus, as well as to Paul. However, according to Jülicher, Jesus did not set out to explain the actual obduracy of the hearers in the sense of predestination, as if it were the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies or caused by some supernatural power, as in the case of Paul (Rom 11:8, 10; 2 Cor 4:3-4). Therefore, Jülicher argues that the hardening purpose of Jesus' parables in Mark 4:11-12, equipped with the OT prophecy (Isa 6:9-10) is also a product of a later reasoning.[8] In Jülicher's argumentation, it seems unclear who is actually responsible for the saying of Mark 4:11-12, the Evangelist or some tradent before him, since they both could have shared the same idea concerning the nature of Jesus' parables and that of the Jewish hearers. But his point can be understood so that a radical change occurred with regard to the notion of Jesus' intention with parabolic teaching between Jesus and Mark, and that the latter inherited that change. For this reason, Jülicher also suggests that the historical Jesus should be understood without relying on what the Gospels present about him:

> Wer Jesus höher stellt, wer ihm nicht den Diamanten aus seiner unvergänglichen Ehrenkrone ausbrechen will, der bricht ein Steinlein aus dem Mauerwerk der Tradition und bekennt, dass der Zweck der Parabelrede trotz Mc und den andern Evangelisten ein noch einfacherer ist als diese Rede selber.[9]

Jülicher named the idea of the hardening purpose of parables Mark's "Theorie vom Parabelzweck" or "Theorie des Mc Parabelrede".[10] Later, scholars began to use the term "Parabeltheorie" to refer to the idea that Jesus used parables in order to conceal his true meaning from a certain people or/and to make them obdurate.[11] In this research, hereafter, this usage, the *Parabeltheorie*, will be followed.

W. Wrede continues in the same vein as Jülicher with respect to the denial that Jesus had the *Parabeltheorie*. He argues that the theory "schlägt den Parabeln selbst, wie

---

[8] Jülicher 1899:I.144.
[9] Jülicher 1899:I.148.
[10] Jülicher 1899:I.147, 124. On the basis of the examination of the parallel and related texts in Matthew and Luke, Jülicher argues also that they share the idea of hardening purpose of parables with Mark, so he also calls it "die synoptische Theorie vom Zweck Jesu mit seinen Parabellehren". See Jülicher 1899:I.127-131, 146.
[11] In the study of 1955 W. Marxen uses this term and likewise H. Räisänen in his study of 1973. J. Jeremias uses "Verstockungstheorie" in his study of Jesus' parables.

sie in den Evangelien vorliegen, schlägt den Wesen der Parabel überhaupt, der ihr eingeborenen Bestimmung zu veranschaulichen, zu erklären oder zu beweisen, geradezu ins Gesicht". It does not come as a surprise that he goes as far as claiming that Jesus would attribute that theory to a procedure whose cruelty rivals its eccentricity and senselessness![12]

Wrede differs from Jülicher however, in that it is essential for him to elucidate the meaning and function of Mark 4:11-12 in connection with the theology of the Gospel of Mark. He criticizes Jülicher for his failure to take into account the whole Marcan theology and, as seen above, focuses his question on how the *Parabeltheorie* was formed in the history of tradition to get finally to Mark's Gospel. What meaning and function does Mark 4:11-12 have in the theology of that Gospel, then? Wrede argues that in Mark, two ideas are closely connected with each other: firstly, that Jesus makes a secret of his Messiahship to the public, while he reveals it to the disciples; and secondly, Jesus' parables cause different positions with respect to τὸ μυστήριον (Mark 4:11) by their concealing function to the public, while they are explained to the disciples. Because of the connection of these two ideas, Wrede infers that τὸ μυστήριον which the disciples are given according to the first part of Mark 4:11, means the revelation of Jesus' Messiahship; while the second part of the verse means that "those outside" are excluded from that revelation.[13] Therefore, Wrede denies Jülicher's view that the *Parabeltheorie* was devised as a "theologische Zurechtlegung" stemming from the unsuccessfulness Jesus' messianic claim experienced.[14] The *Parabeltheorie* should not be understood as an attempt to explain the historical experience theologically, but solely from the point of view of the Gospel of Mark so that:

---

[12] Wrede 1913:61.

[13] In this way, Wrede's argumentation results in Mark 4:11-12 no longer being considered to function in connection with the parable context in which the verses are placed, but rather with the whole Marcan theology, *Messiasgeheimnis*. Wrede endorses this position in the following way: "Die Auffassung des Markus von der Tendenz der parabolischen Lehrweise Jesu ist nicht aus einer Reflexion über den Inhalt vorliegender Parabeln hervorgegangen, sie ist auch gar nicht an vorhandenen Parabeln kontroliert (…)". See Wrede 1913:62, also 57-58.

[14] So Wrede criticizes Jülicher's characterization of the crowd to whom Jesus told parables. Wrede argues: "Es wird dabei nicht einmal nötig sein, die besondere Art dieser Menge, d.h. die Schändilichkeit ihres Verhaltens gegenüber Jesus zu betonen oder auf das 'messiasfeindliche, messiasmörderische Judenvolk' zu verweisen". According to him, the crowd is not more than those from whom the meaning of the parables is concealed. See Wrede 1913:63-64.

sie (i.e., the *Parabeltheorie*) ist, auf der Grundlage der üblichen Ansicht vom Wesen des Gleichnisses[15], hervorgewachsen aus der allgemeinen Anschauung vom Geheimnis im Leben Jesu und von der verschiedenen Stellung der Jünger und des Volkes zu diesem Geheimnis.[16]

The meaning and function of Mark 4:11-12, as connected with the whole theology of the Gospel of Mark, is Wrede's central interest, and thus the question of the tradition behind the passage as well as its authenticity is irrelevant to him. He criticizes J. Weiss' attempt to clarify how the authentic part of the saying (4:11) got to the present place in the Gospel of Mark by way of misunderstanding leading to the formation of the *Parabeltheorie* together with the citation from Isa 6:9-10. Wrede argues that when the Evangelist's position is clarified by the saying that τὸ μυστήριον is revealed to the disciples but concealed from the others, there is no need to search for any source other than this position.[17] By declaring the authenticity question of Jesus' saying in Mark 4:11-12 to be meaningless, Wrede puts out the light on the history of tradition.

It is R. Bultmann, then, who definitely ascribes the saying in question to Mark's redactional composition. According to Bultmann, in the tradition which Mark received the Evangelist found the parable of the sower and its explanation intermediated only by the disciples' question as to the meaning of this particular parable, not as to the purpose of parables in general, as it stands in the present text. Mark composed Jesus' saying with the intention of altering the parable to a riddle. In this composition, he also changed the number of the word παραβολή in the disciples' question from the traditional singular

---

[15] This "Grundlage" means, according to Wrede, the notion of parable as riddle ("Rätsel") which was current at the time of the Gospel. See Wrede 1913:62-63.

[16] Wrede 1913:64. Wrede also clarifies the Marcan notion of the *Parabeltheorie* by arguing that in the Gospel, the effect of Jesus' parabolic teaching is thought to be valid only in the given period of time. He reasons that Mark 9:9 (i.e., Jesus' prohibiting the three disciples from announcing what they saw on the mountain until his resurrection) and 4:21-22 (i.e., his saying about the lamp put on the stand and the revelation of something hidden) are connected with each other. Based on this connection, he concludes that Mark 4:21-22 means that the secrecy of Jesus' Messiahship will end after his resurrection. See Wrede 1913:69-70.

As this connecting of Mark 9:9 and 4:21-22 shows, with respect to the effect of Jesus' parables, Wrede puts emphasis on the *concealing* effect rather than the *hardening* one in the *Parabeltheorie*, while Jülicher's position is to the contrary. This difference in emphasis can be considered to be due to the fact that Jülicher pays attention to the relationship between Jesus' saying in question and the early Church's idea of the obdurate Israel as the realization of the OT prophecies, while Wrede's attention is directed to the relationship between the saying and Mark's theology of revelation and concealment of Jesus' Messiahship.

[17] Wrede emphasizes this needlessness: "Unter diesen Umständen sollte man darauf verzichten, noch irgend einen Fetzen eines echten Jesuswortes im Texte zu suchen und gar noch einen ursprünglichen Sinn des Echten von dem bei Markus überlieferten Sinne zu unterscheden". See Wrede 1913:61.

(thus, the question concerns the parable of the sower) to the present plural, so that the question might concern parables (precisely speaking 'riddles') in general.[18] Although Bultmann neither deals with Mark's theological motif for his composition nor refers to the *Parabeltheorie*, it is likely that he relies on this theory to explain the Marcan composition.[19]

Since Bultmanns' exegesis many scholars have denied the authenticity of the saying in Mark 4:11-12.[20] However, in contrast to Bultmann, they tend to regard the saying as the composition by the early Church instead of originating with Mark. C.H. Dodd argues that the saying had something to do with the Church's questioning as to why the Jewish people do not believe in the Christian gospel. The answer was: because they are blinded by God. Thus, Jesus was understood to speak parables "in order to prevent those who were not predestined to salvation from understanding the teaching of Jesus". Dodd's idea that the Church reasoned the Jews' blindness to the Christian gospel as divinely purposed is similar to Jülicher's argumentation, although in the latter case, it is not necessarily clear who is responsible for the saying: the Evangelist or the tradent before him?[21]

Correspondingly, other scholars including G. Haufe, H. Räisänen, J. Gnilka (1978), R. Pesch, W. Grundmann, E. Schweizer , H. Weder and H. Anderson argue for the early Church's composition of the saying , and connect the reason for the composition with the

---

[18] Bultmann 1931:215, 351 (note 1), 356. How little attention the saying in Mark 4:11-12 is given in Bultmanns's generally indifferent attitude to the question of authenticity, can also be shown by the fact that he excludes the saying from his list of "Herrenworte". See Bultmann 1931:73; about his methodological point of view concerning authenticity question, see, e.g., Bultmann 1931:40-41.

[19] If so, with respect to the effect of Jesus' parables, Bultmann emphasizes the concealing effect of them like Wrede, not on the hardening effect like Jülicher. See fn 16 above.

[20] In addition to Bultmann, A. Suhl argues that the saying in Mark 4:11-12 was composed by the Evangelist to describe the experience of the Christian community of his time. According to Suhl's "These von der Schriftbenutzung des Redaktor", Mark's intention in using Isa 6:9-10 is not to describe the contemporary situation as the fulfillment of the OT prophecy but rather to put forth "qualifizierende Beschreibung" with the OT words which, thus, have "interpretierend-kerygmatische Funktion". See Suhl 1965:145-151.

It seems to me that M.A. Beavis ascribes Mark 4:11-12 to the Evangelist. Even though she does not deal with the question of the origin of the passage in her reader-response critical/audience critical study, she denies the Aramaic or Palestine provenance of the passage but emphasizes its Greek provenance in the Evangelist's context. See, e.g., her discussion in Beavis 1989:131-155.

[21] Dodd 1961:3-4. Although only the revised edition of Dodd's book has been available to me, it is likely that he is the one of the first scholars who argue for the composition of the saying by the early Church.

Church's rationalization of the unbelief of Jews.[22] Moreover, they tend to consider that the situation this took place in was at a stage of the early Church's history, when the community was strongly apocalyptically-oriented and isolated from the outer world.[23] On the other hand, Haufe, Gnilka (1978), Pesch, Grundmann and Anderson argue that the saying was first transmitted as an independent tradition and then inserted into the parable context by Mark,[24] while Räisänen, Schweizer and Weder argue that such an insertion happened in the pre-Marcan stage, so that already Mark found the saying as a part of the parable context. The reason for the insertion of the saying either by Mark or a pre-Marcan tradent has been explained in various ways. Generally speaking, those scholars who argue for the pre-Marcan insertion consider that the saying expressed the *Parabeltheorie* in the pre-Marcan phase of the tradition after which Mark changed its meaning with his redactional purpose. Those scholars who argue for the Marcan insertion consider that Mark did not necessarily intend putting forth the *Parabeltheorie* with his insertion, but rather emphasizing the incomprehensibility of Jesus' parables.[25]

---

[22] Haufe 1972:413-421; Räisänen 1973:119; Gnilka 1978:165; Pesch 1980:238-239; Grundmann 1989:123-124; Schweizer 1989:46-47; Weder 1990:114; Anderson 1994: 130-132. In his earlier study of 1961 Gnilka recognized the authenticity of the saying. (See discussion in 1.2.2.)

[23] So, e.g., Räisänen 1973:118-121; Gnilka 1978:167; Pesch 1980:238-239; Weder 1990:114.

[24] Haufe 1972:415; Pesch 1980:237-240; Gnilka 1978:162; Grundmann 1989:121.

[25] H-J. Klauck argues for the *Parabeltheorie* on the traditional level, but he differs from Räisänen, Schweizer and Weder in that he regards only v. 11 of the saying (Mark 4:11-12) as the composition by the early Church. He argues that the Church first composed v. 11 and then added it to the unity of the parable of the sower and the explanation of it or composed it at the same time as the explanation of the parable. In any case, the Church's purpose was to interpret Jesus' parabolic teaching as esoteric-apocalyptic. Then, Mark *re*interpreted such an esoteric-apocalyptic teaching by adding the citation from Isa 6:9-10. His purpose was, according to Klauck, to explain the unbelief of the Jews as the fulfillment of the OT prophecy, so that "v. 12 rückt die apokalyptische Parabletheorie in die prophetische Perspektive der Verstockung, die sich an den Gegnern Jesu vollzieht". In this schema the emphasis of *Parabletheorie* was changed from the conceiling effect of Jesus' parables (according to the early Church) to the hardening one (according to Mark). See Klauck 1978:245-253,256-259.

There are also scholars who deal with the question of Mark's relation with the *Parabeltheorie* without entering into the question of the authenticity of the saying, because they concentrate on the redaction-critical examination. As such scholars W. Marxsen (1955:255-271); H-W. Kuhn (1971:99-146) can be named.

1.2.2. Advocates of the authenticity of the saying

The argumentation of those scholars who deny the authenticity of the saying in Mark 4:11-12 has been shown. According to them, the saying is from Mark or from the early Church pre-dating him. There are, however, several scholars who argue for the authenticity of the saying.

T.W. Manson is one of the first advocates of the authenticity of the saying. He points out a similarity between Jesus' citation from Isa 6:9-10 in Mark 4:12 and the Aramaic version of the same Isaianic passage which is found in Targum ad Isaiah. He argues, therefore, that such a similarity "stamps the saying as Palestinian in origin and thus creates a strong presumption in favour of its authenticity".[26]

Here in the additional paragraph the similarity between Jesus' citation in Mark 4:12 and TgIsa 6:9-10 is clarified. First, four different texts, Mark, Targum, Masoretic text (MT hereafter) and Septuagint (LXX hereafter), are shown below.

Mark 4:12

ἵνα βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούωσιν καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν, μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς.

TgIsa 6:9-10

(v. 9) ואמר איזיל ותימר לעמא הדין דשמעין משמע ולא מסתכלין וחזן מחזא ולא ידעין
(v. 10) טפיש לביה דעמא הדין ואודנוהי יקר ועינוהי טמטים דלמא יחזון בעיניהון ובאודנהון ישמעון ובליבהון יסתכלון ויתובון וישתביק להון:

MT Isa 6:9-10

(v. 9) וַיֹּאמֶר לֵךְ וְאָמַרְתָּ לָעָם הַזֶּה שִׁמְעוּ שָׁמוֹעַ וְאַל־תָּבִינוּ וּרְאוּ רָאוֹ וְאַל־תֵּדָעוּ׃
(v. 10) הַשְׁמֵן לֵב־הָעָם הַזֶּה וְאָזְנָיו הַכְבֵּד וְעֵינָיו הָשַׁע

---

[26] Manson 1948:77.

פֶּן־יִרְאֶה בְעֵינָיו וּבְאָזְנָיו יִשְׁמָע וּלְבָבוֹ יָבִין וָשָׁב וְרָפָא לוֹ:

LXX Isa 6:9-10

(v. 9) καὶ εἶπε Πορεύθητι καὶ εἶπον τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ Ἀκοῇ
ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε·
(v. 10) ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν αὐτῶν
βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν, μήποτε ἴδωσι
τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσι καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσι καὶ
ἐπιστρέψωσι καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.

A strong similarity between Jesus' citation in Mark 4:12 and TgIsa 6:9-10 can be shown
when comparing Mark and the Isaianic passage of the MT and LXX in the following
three points: (i) the verbs stand in the third person in the citation and in the phrase after
the direct imperative in TgIsa 6:9, while they stand in the second person in the
corresponding phrase in the MT and LXX; (ii) unlike in the MT the citation and TgIsa
6:9 do not have the imperative concerning the hearers of the proclamation, while the
LXX has a future form; (iii) the hearers of the proclamation are not to be *forgiven*
(ἀφεθῇ, וישתביק) according to the citation and TgIsa 6:10, while they are not to be
healed (וְרָפָא) or God is not to *heal* them (ἰάσομαι) according to the MT and LXX
respectively.[27]

Further, Manson interprets Jesus' saying, based on *his* interpretation of TgIsa 6:9-10.
Firstly, he takes the ambiguous Aramaic word ד in TgIsa 6:9, which is considered to lie
behind ἵνα in Mark 4:12, as a relative pronoun. He argues that ἵνα came from the
translator's "misunderstanding" of ד as a final/telic particle, although this meaning is
possible for ד as well as a relative pronoun.[28] Secondly, corresponding to such a non-
final/telic solution, Manson further interprets דלמא in TgIsa 6:10, which is considered to
lie behind μήποτε in Mark 4:12, as an implied, conditional clause similar to "*if they saw*

---

[27] Manson mentions the first and third points. See Manson 1948:77. For more detailed discussion of the
similarity between Jesus' citation in Mark 4:12 and TgIsa 6:9-10, see, e.g., Jeremias 1984:11; Evans
1989:91-92.
    On the other hand, M.D. Goulder attempts to challenge this scholarly "nearly universal" attribution to
the targumic text by arguing that the similarity should be attributed to Mark 4:12 and the LXX. See
Goulder 1991:296 (also note 26). His attempt may be judged unsuccessful. See Chilton's harsh criticism of
it in Chilton – Evans 1994:302-304. Besides, M.A. Beavis argues that Jesus' citation in Mark 4:12 was
composed by the Evangelist on the basis of "a Greek version other than the LXX", "a lost Greek version of
Isaiah". I think it unwarranted that from her Greek centered reconstruction of the Marcan meaning of Jesus'
saying in Mark 4:11-12, she draws out such a document that supports her reconstruction but whose
existence cannot be demonstrated. Otherwise, her argument disproves in effect Goulder's argument for the
similarity between Jesus' citation and the LXX Isa 6:9-10. See Beavis 1989:140.
[28] Manson 1948:78.

and knew, (they would repent and be forgiven)", instead of the final/telic conjunctive ("*so that* they might not repent and be forgiven") which is also possible for דלמא.[29] His reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning of the saying is as follows (his solution to the problem of the meaning of ἵνα and μήποτε is emphasized):

> To you is given the secret of the Kingdom of God; but all things come in parables to those outside *who*
>> See indeed but do not know
>> And hear indeed but do not understand
>>> *For if they did*, they would repent and receive forgiveness.[30]

Accordingly, Manson argues that Jesus' saying has nothing to do with the hardening purpose of parables. Since the ד -clause is a relative and not final/telic clause, Jesus' intention to use the saying is to "illustrate" the outsiders as being unable to either perceive or understand, rather than making them obdurate.[31] At some stage in the history of tradition, Jesus' "illustrating" saying was connected with the unity of the parable of the sower and its explanation which also illustrates different natures of the hearers of his preaching. Thus, this intrusion is "perfectly natural".[32] Finally, in the stage of the

---

[29] Manson 1948:78-79. For the meaning of דלמא, Manson suggests also an alternative meaning "perhaps": "*Perhaps* they may yet repent". See Manson 1948:78-79.
[30] Manson 1948:78.
[31] Manson 1948:79-80. Manson reconstructs also the Aramaic, original form of Jesus' citation from Isa 6:9-10 as follows.

דחזן מיחזא ולא ידעין ושמעין משמע ולא מסתבלין דילמא יתובון וישתביק להון

Manson renders, moreover, the Greek translation of Jesus' saying based on this original form. According to him, the translator must have translated the Aramaic form in the following way, instead of the present Marcan text (the part of Jesus' citation is emphasized):

ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παλαβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται, *οἳ βλέποντες βλέπουσι καὶ οὐκ οἴδασιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούουσι καὶ οὐ συνίουσιν*, μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς.

However, according to Manson, the translator misunderstood the original citation by Jesus in this way (NB., the emphasized parts; emphasis mine):

דיחזן מיחזא ולא *ייחזין וישמעין* משמע ולא *יסתכלין* דילמא יתובון וישתביק להון

As it can be seen, "misunderstanding" concerns the change of the participial form of the verbs into the imperfect form, so the final/telic meaning can become unambiguous. According to Manson, this "misunderstanding" form became the base of the present Marcan text in 4:11-12. See Manson 1948:79 (also note 1).
[32] Manson 1948:76-77.

translation from Aramaic to Greek, "misunderstanding" of ד as telic/final occurred, so that the present Marcan text emerged with ἵνα as the translation of the Aramaic word.[33] From Manson's discussion it is not clear who is responsible for the erroneous translation, Mark or some tradent before him, or whether Mark wrote down his text conscious of the consequence of such a translation. These questions would be significant for the question as to whether Mark put forth the *Parabeltheorie* or not, but Manson does not touch upon it.

J. Jeremias develops Manson's argumentation concerning the authenticity of the saying in Mark 4:11-12 and the Jesuanic meaning of it.[34] In addition to the similarity between Jesus' citation in Mark 4:12 and the Aramaic version of Isa 6:9-10, Jeremias notes three other Palestinian characteristics found in the Marcan text: (i) the antithetic parallelism (Mark 4:11); (ii) the superfluous ἐκείνοις (4:11); (iii) the concealing way of describing God's deed (i.e., δέδοται, γίνεται, ἀφεθῇ in 4:11-12). For Jeremias, as for Manson, the similarity to TgIsa 6:9-10 is the most fundamental to his argumentation as to the authenticity and Jesuanic meaning of the saying.[35]

Based on a literal-critical observation, Jeremias draws a Bultmann-like, redaction-critical conclusion that the parable of the sower should have been followed by the explanation of it intermediated by the disciples' question as to the meaning of that particular parable.[36] In contrast to Bultmann, according to whom the saying in Mark 4:11-12 was composed by the Evangelist into the unity of the parable of the sower and its explanation, Jeremias argues that the saying is "ein selbständig überliefertes Logion" which was inserted into that unity by Mark.[37] Because it is an "independently" transmitted saying, the present parable context must be forgotten.[38] Jeremias enters into the Jesuanic meaning of the saying. But how can the meaning be reconstructed without a context? Jeremias offers the following solution:

---

[33] Manson 1948:78.

[34] In the first edition of his study of 1947, Jeremias did not refer to Manson in the discussion of the Jesuanic meaning of the saying. Manson began to be mentioned for the first time in the second edition of 1952,

[35] Jeremias 1984:11-12.

[36] About Bultmann's exegesis, see survey in 1.2.1.

[37] Jeremias 1984:10.

[38] "V. 11f (…) zunächst ohne Rücksicht auf den jezigen Zusammenhang exegesiert werden muß", so Jeremias 1984:10.

As far as the first part of the saying, Mark 4:11, is concerned, he infers from the antithetic parallelism of that part that since Mark 4:11b ("ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ") refers to revelation (i.e., "the mystery has been given"), 4:11c ("ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται") should imply something contrary to that revelation. If so, two key words, μυστήριον (4:11b) and παραβολή (4:11c), should have the same connotation to be able to form an antithetical parallelism. That is, on one hand, something mysterious is revealed ("τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται"), while on the other hand, it remains as such ("ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται"). Therefore, 'riddle' is considered to be the appropriate meaning of παραβολή. Such a reasoning can be supported by the fact that the Hebrew and Aramaic word מתל / משל also carries this meaning. Thus, as 'riddle' παραβολή in 4:11 is demonstrated to have nothing to do with Jesus' 'intelligible' parables. Accordingly, the original form behind the Greek construction γίνεται ἐν παραβολαῖς can be reconstructed to be the connection of הוה and the modal preposition ל, instead of the instrumental preposition ב. The Jesuanic meaning of the antithetic clauses in Mark 4:11 is thus gained: "Euch hat Gott das Geheimnis der Gottesherrschaft geschenkt"; "denen aber, die draußen sind, wird alles in rätselhafter Rede zuteil". Jeremias clarifies the latter clause further: "ihnen bleibt alles rätselhaft".[39]

The Jesuanic meaning of the second part of the saying, i.e., the citation from Isa 6:9-10 in Mark 4:12 also needs explanation. Jeremias reconstructs it based on *his* interpretation of TgIsa 6:9-10. Like Manson, he denies that the Aramaic forms lying behind the two Greek words, ἵνα and μήποτε, have a final/telic meaning. However, he interprets TgIsa 6:9-10 in a different way to Manson. As far as the Aramaic form behind ἵνα is concerned, he argues that it functions as a quotation mark, so the actual citation begins after that word.[40] For this reason, he reconstructs ἵνα as an abbreviation of ἵνα πληρωθῇ "so that the following thing might be fulfilled". In this sense Jesus warned that the obdurate condition (the impossibility of perceiving and understanding in spite of seeing and hearing) would fall upon "the outsiders". However, the fulfilment of such a

---

[39] Jeremias 1984:12-13.
[40] For Manson, the citation begins with ἵνα itself, because the word corresponds to the Aramaic word ד which is a part of Isa 6:9 in the Aramaic version.

curse is conditional thanks to the Aramaic form behind μήποτε reconstructed by Jeremias. He finds that in the rabbinical interpretation Isa 6:9-10 is no longer interpreted as God's threat but rather as the promise that God will forgive the people of Israel, *if they repent*. Jeremias then applies the rabbinical interpretation of the Isaianic passage to TgIsa 6:9-10 and puts forth a negative conditional meaning, "if not (es sei denn, daß)", for the Aramaic word דלמא which lies behind μήποτε, so that God's promise of forgiveness is also present in Jesus' saying. Jeremias assumes, thus, that the rabbinical understanding was valid in Jesus' time too.[41] His reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning of the saying is as follows (his solution to the problem of the meaning of ἵνα and μήποτε is emphasized):

> Euch hat Gott das Geheimnis der Gottesherrschaft geschenkt; denen aber, die draußen sind, ist alles rätselvoll,
>> *auf daß sie (wie geschrieben steht)* "sehen und doch nicht sehen, hören und doch nicht verstehen,
>>> *es sei denn, daß* sie umkehren und Gott ihnen vegebe".[42]

Accordingly, Jeremias argues that the true meaning of the saying is: "tun sie (i.e., the outsiders, my addition) Buße, so wird Gott ihnen vergeben". By using the saying, Jesus revealed his trust in "Gottes vergebender Barmherzigkeit" with respect to "the outsiders".[43] The result of Jeremias' reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning of the saying is something very far from the *Parabeltheorie*![44]

In contrast to Manson, Jeremias ascribes the insertion of the saying into the unity of the parable of the sower and its explanation to Mark. For what reason, then, did the Evangelist connect these two different traditions with each other? Did he intend to put forth the *Parabeltheorie*? Jeremias does not give a definite answer to the question. He assumes that Mark inserted the saying because of the "Stichwort παραβολή". The Evangelist found this word in two different traditional materials: one is Jesus' saying which uses the phrase "ἐν παραβολαῖς", while the other is the unity of the parable of the sower and its explanation containing the disciples' question which ought to have

---

[41] Jeremias 1984:13.
[42] Jeremias 1984:13-14.
[43] Jeremias 1984:14.
[44] "The all things (τὰ πάντα)" which become enigmatic to the outsiders, according to Jeremias, refers to the whole of Jesus' preaching. See Jeremias 1984:14.

concerned the meaning of this particular parable.[45] He argues that Mark understood the word παραβολή of the former tradition (i.e, Jesus' saying) to mean 'intelligible' parables "zu Unrecht", rather than the original meaning 'riddle', and therefore inserted it into the parable context.[46] In this way, the insertion may be due to Mark's superficial understanding of the word in question. It may, however, also have been his intentional redaction to characterize Jesus' parables in a new way by connecting them with the idea of the division of the people into disciples and outsiders. If the Greek conjunctives ἵνα and μήποτε have a final/telic meaning in the Marcan context, the *Parabeltheorie* is a probable answer to the question about Mark's intention. Jeremias, however, does not discuss the meaning of these words in the Marcan context, and hence Mark's intention is not clear from Jeremias' argumentation at all.[47]

Since Jeremias introduced his reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning of the saying in Mark 4:11-12 in 1947 and developed it on the basis of Manson's thesis and argumentation in 1952,[48] his reconstruction has influenced those scholars who argue for the authenticity of the saying. C.E.B. Cranfield, J. Gnilka (1961), J.R. Kirkland, W. Lane and C.A. Evans agree with Jeremias in that the saying is authentic, that it was transmitted

---

[45] About this Bultmann-like reconstruction of the disciples' question in the unity of the parable of the sower and its explanation, see 1.2.1.

[46] Jeremias 1984:14. In a similar way to Bultmann, Jeremias explains that Mark adjusted the number of παραβολή in the disciples' question from the traditional singular to the present plural (τὰς παραβολάς), when he inserted Jesus' saying which contains the plural (ἐν παραβολαῖς). See Jeremias 1984:10 (also note 1).

[47] Marxsen, who is an advocate of the Marcan insertion of the saying, criticizes Jeremias' argumentation concerning "Stichwort" as the reason for the insertion. From a closer redaction-critical point of view, he argues that Mark *understood* the word παραβολή of the saying ("ἐν παραβολαῖς") properly to mean the traditional 'riddle', rather than misunderstanding it as 'parable', and treated Jesus' parables in accordance with this understanding. Although Marxsen, thus, recognizes that an enigmatic character was attached to Jesus' parables by Mark, he denies the *Parabeltheorie* as the Evangelist's intention in inserting the saying into the parable context. Accordingly, he denies the final/telic meaning of ἵνα and μήποτε; instead, he interprets Jesus' saying in the Marcan context in the way Jeremias does for the Jesuanic context by applying Jeremias' solution of the meaning of ἵνα and μήποτε for that context to the Marcan context. Precisely speaking, Marxsen's thesis means that Mark did not have that *Parabeltheorie* which puts emphasis on the hardening effect of parables but on the concealing effect. As far as the Jesuanic meaning of the saying is concerned, the issue is not Marxsen's concern because of his concentration on redaction-criticism. See Marxsen 1955:255-271.

[48] Jeremias introduced his reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning of the saying for the first time in the first edition of his *Die Gleichnisse Jesu* of 1947. He developed his reconstruction on the basis of Manson's thesis and argumentation in the second edition of the book of 1952. My examination of Jeremias' reconstruction is based on the last edition of the book of 1984.

independently from the parable context and that Mark inserted it into that context.[49] In spite of the agreement in the description of tradition history, however, their opinions differ from each other concerning the very Jesuanic meaning of the saying. Cranfield, Kirkland and Lane agree with Jeremias that the original form behind μήποτε is related to the rabbinical interpretation of Isa 6:9-10 (see above), so that with the saying, Jesus meant the promise of forgiveness.[50] Gnilka (1961) reconstructs the Jesuanic meaning of the saying in the opposite direction. He starts from *his* interpretation of TgIsa 6:9-10 according to which דלמא of TgIsa 6:10 has no relation to the rabbinical interpretation, and therefore the harsh idea of divine hardening is also valid in TgIsa 6:9-10. Gnilka, however, argues that this idea is superseded by TgIsa 6:13 which by means of its extensive paraphrasing, no longer speaks of the emergence of holy remnant (as in the MT) but the salvation of the *whole* of Israel. According to Gnilka, Jesus, who had seen the majority of the Jews turn their back on him with only a small group of disciples left to him, used the saying to declare that Isaiah's prophecy concerning the hardening of the people and the emergence of holy remnant was realized in his mission. In this way, the saying manifests Jesus' opposition to the optimistic view of a general salvation.[51] Also Evans doubts that the rabbinical interpretation of Isa 6:9-10 as a promise of forgiveness can be applied to the original form behind the μήποτε–clause in the saying.[52] With regard to the ἵνα-clause, he considers that a relative ד-clause of TgIsa 6:9-10 lies behind it, not a ἵνα πληρωθῇ-clause as Jeremias argues. Thus, the judgment motif which μήποτε–clause expresses is directed to a closely defined circle of people, i.e., those *who* indeed hear but do not understand. According to Evans, Jesus used the saying to mean that he

---

[49] Cranfield 1952:49-66; Gnilka 1961:23-86, 198-205; Kirkland 1977:1-21; Lane 1982:156-159, 163; Evans 1989:91-106. As seen in 1.2.1, Gnilka denies the authenticity of the saying later.

[50] However, Cranfield and Kirkland do not discuss the original form behind ἵνα, but only mention that ἵνα means a final/telic meaning and consecutive meaning, respectively. See Cranfield 1952:58-59; Kirkland 1977:6-7. On the other hand, Lane agrees with Jeremias that the original form behind ἵνα is an abbreviation of ἵνα πληρωθῇ. See Lane 1982:156-159, 163.

[51] Gnilka 1961:198-204, also 26-28. As far as the original form behind ἵνα is concerned, Gnilka considers the possibility of a relative particle ד but also a final/telic form possible. In the latter case, he considers that the form could mean also the fulfillment of the Scripture in the same way as Jeremias' reconstruction of ἵνα as the abbreviation of ἵνα πληρωθῇ. See Gnilka 1961:26-28.

[52] Evans 1989:93; 202 (note 18). On the other hand, Evans recognizes the applicability of the rabbinical understanding to the targumic text of Isa 6:9-10, provided that the text is read in the context of the whole Targum ad Isaiah which originated from the fourth century CE. See Evans 1989:70-71.

"summarized the net effect of his total ministry in terms of the response of two groups of people", i.e., his disciples and the outsiders.[53]

Thus, it has been shown how these five scholars argue for the authenticity of the saying in Mark 4:11-12 following Jeremias' reconstruction.[54] They agree with him on three major points: (i) the saying is authentic but originally was not uttered in the parable context; the original context is unknown to us; (ii) the saying was transmitted as an independent tradition and Mark inserted it into the parable context, i.e., the unity of the parable of the sower and its explanation; (iii) the interpretation of TgIsa 6:9-10 is an important factor in the reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning of the saying. Their opinions on the very Jesuanic meaning, however, differ substantially from each other, depending on the interpretation of TgIsa 6:9-10 and on their view on Jesus' attitude to the idea which that text is supposed to put forth. Additionally, with regard to the question of Mark's purpose in inserting the saying into the parable context, Evans and Gnilka (1961) argue that the Evangelist entertained a *Parabeltheorie*, while the others refute this.

There is one scholar, R. Guelich, who argues that the saying is authentic, was transmitted independently, but inserted into the parable context by some tradent *before*

---

[53] Evans 1989:104-106.

[54] V. Taylor also argues that the saying is authentic and it was transmitted independently and inserted into the unity of the parable of the sower and its explanation by Mark. He does not refer to Jeremias at all, so it is not possible to know whether his argumentation is influenced by the latter, although it is likely. As the argument for authenticity, Taylor maintains, in addition to the Palestinian flavor of the saying, that Paul's motif of the obduracy of Israel in Rom 9-11 is not recognizable in the Marcan text. With regard to the Jesuanic meaning of the saying, he acknowledges that the original form of the saying is not available, but considers that confronted with opposition, Jesus thought Isa 6:9-10 to be suitable for describing his ironical situation. In this sense, Taylor recognizes the harsh motif of divine hardening (rather than something akin to a promise of forgiveness) for that Isaianic text Jesus cited. As the reason for Mark's insertion of the saying, Taylor considers, in addition to the "Stichwort" (like Jeremias), the possibility that Mark thought Jesus' parables had a concealing effect. See Taylor 1955:254-258.

B. Chilton argues that of the saying in Mark 4:11-12, only the part of Jesus' citation from Isa 6:9-10 (Mark 4:12) is authentic and that the early missionary Church composed the other part (4:11) to add to Jesus' citation; then, Mark incorporated them both with the parable materials to form the parable chapter of his Gospel. For Chilton, TgIsa 6:9-10 is very important to understanding the Jesuanic meaning of the citation from the Isaianic passage. He interprets the Aramaic text directly, not adapting it to the rabbinical interpretation, so he considers ד to be a relative particle and דלמא a final/telic conjunctive, so that Jesus' citation originally meant his harsh rebuke against the hearers for not understanding his teaching ("dull-wittedness"). Then the early Church, apocalyptically oriented and confronted with a hard opposition from the outer world, composed the exclusivistic text (Mark 4:11) which colored Jesus' citation with its point of view. However, according to Chilton, Mark softened the harshness of Mark 4:11-12 which he received from tradition, by use of his own notion of parable, i.e., the notion that parables can be understood by everyone at least "partially" and Jesus allowed a full understanding of them to the disciples, who in turn spread the full understanding to the world. Because of such a "positive (if only partial) value" of parables, Chilton denies that Mark put forth the *Parabeltheorie*. See Chilton 1984:90-98.

Mark. In other words, Guelich continues to trace the history of tradition which Räisänen, Schweizer and Weder stop at the early Church to the historical Jesus.[55] As argument for the authenticity of the saying, he points out the lack of persuasiveness in the argument for its provenience in the early Church. According to Guelich, the latter argument "need not exclude an original setting in Jesus' ministry. There is nothing inherently improbable about the suggestion of the Aramaic background of 4:11-12 or of its roots extending into Jesus' ministry".[56] Thus, in his reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning of the saying, Guelich shares the same view as those scholars who argue that the authentic saying was inserted by Mark, with respect to points (i) and (iii) mentioned above. With regard to the interpretation of TgIsa 6:9-10, Guelich considers that it does not put forth the harsh idea of a divine hardening as in the Hebrew text, although he does not go so far as to recognize the rabbinical interpretation of the passage as a promise of forgiveness as Jesuanic either. For the meaning of the form behind the present ἵνα–clause, he chooses a relative clause ("the outsiders *who* see, but do not understand") and for the form behind μήποτε–clause, correspondingly, an implied, conditional clause ("if they had understood"). Thus, Jesus' intention was to use the saying to describe "those who had found 'all things' to be in 'riddles', to have seen without perception and heard without understanding (…)", a fact which Jesus deplored immediately: "Had it been otherwise, they would have repented and been forgiven".[57] According to Guelich, the early Church changed this Jesuanic meaning, so that the original idea that the division of people was due to the mere fact of their responsiveness or non-responsiveness to Jesus' proclamation, was modified into an understanding that the division was due to a divine decision. Moreover, the Church inserted the saying into the parable context, so that Jesus' parables also became 'riddles' to be connected with the changed meaning of the saying.

---

[55] About Räisänen's, Schweizer's and Weder's description of the tradition history of Mark 4:11-12, see survey in 1.2.1.

[56] Guelich 1989:200. As another argument for authenticity, Guelich points out the existence of a similar motif to Mark 4:11-12 in other Gospel traditions, i.e., Luk 10:21/Matt 11:25-26; Luk 10:23-24/Matt13:16-17. See Guelich 1989:200. He also utilizes his interpretation of TgIsa 6:9-10 in the reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning of the saying.

[57] Guelich 1989:211-214. This reconstruction of Guelich is actually the same as Manson's (see above), although he refers to the latter only concerning the meaning of the form behind ἵνα–clause, but not the form behind μήποτε–clause. When Guelich discusses the meaning of both ἵνα– and μήποτε–clauses, the discussion concerns the Marcan level. See Guelich 1989:209-212.

In this way, the *Parabeltheorie* emerged. Mark, however, mitigated that theory by his redaction.[58]

In addition to the scholars who argue for the authenticity of the saying as an isolated tradition (subsequently inserted into the parable context by either Mark or a pre-Marcan tradent), there are also a few scholars who argue that Jesus uttered the saying just in the parable context, as it stands in the present Marcan text. They are J. Bowker, C.L. Blomberg, N.T. Wright and S.M. Bryan.[59]

Bowker argues that Jesus uttered the parable of the sower, the saying in question and the explanation of the parable just in the same sequence as Mark 4:3-20 with the purpose of exposing the whole of Isa 6:9-13. One argument for the connection between the saying and the parable of the sower is that in TgIsa 6:9-13, the motif of seed becomes significant. Thus, for him, the Aramaic version of the Isaianic passage is important for reconstructing the Jesuanic meaning of the saying. On the other hand, as he regards Jesus' parables against the background of the rabbinical parables which have an elucidating function, he denies that Jesus put forth the *Parabeltheorie*.[60]

Blomberg rejects Jülicher's research tradition in the study of Jesus' parables, in which parable, by concept, is regarded as separate from allegory. Blomberg emphasizes the allegorical nature of parable. According to him, Jesus' saying in question indicates that nature of parables, so the parable context is a perfect place for it; therefore, the whole sequence of three elements (i.e., the parable of the sower, the saying and the explanation of the parable) originates from Jesus. On a concrete level, however, Blomberg does not clarify the original connection between the saying and this particular parable of the sower.[61]

Wright argues in a similar way to Bowker that the sequence of the three elements reflects Isa 6:9-13. However, he recognizes the hardening function of Jesus' parables. According to him, Jesus told the parable of the sower as a kind of a critical review of the

---

[58] Guelich 1989:208-209, 212-215.
[59] Prior to these four scholars, as early as 1969, C.F.D. Moule discussed positively the possibility that Mark 4:11-12 was connected with the parable of the sower (4:3-9) and its explanation (4:13-20) already in Jesus' level. However, (in the Festschrift for M. Black) he discussed the question so carefully that he resulted in a mixed conclusion that the whole section of Mark 4:1-20 is "an intelligible whole, composed by the Evangelist but with a historically sensitive use of genuinely traditional material". See Moule 1969:95-113.
[60] Bowker 1974:300-317.
[61] Blomberg 1990:53-55.

history of Israel after their return from the exile, so that the postexilic community, which is compared to 'seed' in the parable, does not mean the holy remnant mentioned in Isa 6:13. Because of the subversive point of his message, Jesus must hide it from his enemies by using the form of an enigmatic parable. Wright argues that Jesus' saying refers to such a function of parable that helps him to by-pass the authorities' censorship. This is the meaning of the hardening function of parables, according to Wright.[62]

While Bowker and Wright focus on the relationship between Isa 6:9-13 and Mark 4:3-20 in the reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning of the saying, Bryan concentrates on the relationship between Isa 6:9-13 and Mark 4:11-12. He argues that Jesus was committed to the *Parabeltheorie*, that is, his aim was to promote all Israel's obduracy by proclaiming her impending judgment. According to Bryan, when Jesus directed the judgment at the whole people, his proclamation had such a function that in the process, a remnant was squeezed out, - a remnant for whom "the message of the mystery of the kingdom does penetrate and transform the world-view", so Jesus' citation from Isa 6:9-10 should be understood in connection with Isa 6:13, which speaks of the holy remnant that emerges only after the judgment of divine hardening and the following destruction of the nation. Bryan also denies the view that the saying was inserted into the parable context in the history of tradition. However, he does not clarify the original connection between the saying and the parable of the sower.[63]

As seen above, the views of even those scholars who argue for the authenticity of the saying in the parable context differ from each other. The common trait is that they concentrate on the Jesuanic meaning of the saying, so that they do not discuss the history of the tradition or the Marcan meaning of the saying as the terminal point of that history.[64] However, in the question of the relation of Jesus, responsible for the insertion of the saying into the parable context, with *Parabeltheorie*, Bowker denies such a relation; Blomberg and Bryan recognize the hardening function of parables literally, while for Wright, this function means a certain pragmatic use of parables (i.e., to get past

---

[62] Wright 1996:230-238.
[63] Bryan 2002:126-128.
[64] As the reason for his indifference of the traditional, exegetical methods, Wright mentions that the goal of the Jesus study must be based on "serious historical method, as opposed of the pseudo-historical use of home-made 'criteria'". He introduces the "method of hypothesis and verification", in which bypassing "much-vaunted 'normal-critical tool'" is justified. See Wright 1996:87.

the censor of the enemies). With regard to the Aramaic version of the Isaianic passage - important for those scholars who argue for the authenticity of the saying but as an independently transmitted tradition - only Bowker takes that version into account in the reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning of the saying; the others do not.[65]

1.3. The task

1.3.1. Specifying of the problem and defining of the task

It has been shown that the research situation concerning Jesus' saying in Mark 4:11-12 is far from a scholarly consensus.[66] The majority of scholars deny the authenticity of the saying, while a minority recognizes it. Amongst those scholars who deny the authenticity, however, some argue that the saying, composed by the early Church, was inserted into the present parable context by Mark, while others argue that it was inserted by a pre-Marcan tradent, so that Mark found it as a part of the parable context in the tradition. Among those who advocate the authenticity of the saying, most argue that the saying was transmitted independently, that is to say, Jesus did not utter it in the parable context,

---

[65] At first glance, Lane seems to argue that Jesus uttered the saying in the unity of the parable of the sower and its explanation, as he states: "A greater appreciation of the historical situation of belief and unbelief in which Jesus spoke the parables will indicate the appropriateness of this logion (i.e., Mark 4:11-12, my addition) to the context in which it is found". However, his logic is as follows: (i) by the parable of the sower Jesus taught (in a veiled way) something about the relationship between the coming of the kingdom of God in his own person and proclamation and the delay of the harvest, i.e., the consummation; (ii) by the explanation of the parable he clarified for the disciples the relationship between the events depicted in the parable of the sower and the revelation of the kingdom which remained obscure to them; (iii) by the saying which Jesus originally uttered in a different context from the unity of the parable of the sower and its explanation, he called attention to the contemporary situation in which the division of belief and unbelief emerged, but the sovereignty of the divine determination was in the process of completion; (iv) Mark inserted the saying between the parable of the sower and its explanation, understanding that both parts(i.e., the saying and the unity of the parable and the explanation) concerned the completion of the kingdom. In other words, according to Lane, the insertion occurred due to Mark's correct understanding of the original meaning of these two parts, which originally had been uttered in different contexts. See Lane 1982:152-163, especially 163.

[66] Also D. Flusser, like Bowker, considers the possibility that Jesus' parables can be understood against the background of the rabbinical parables. He also denies Jesus' *Parabeltheorie*. However, his thesis and argumentation leads to a peculiar source-critical reasoning. He argues that the form of the saying in Matt 13:11,13, in which the Isaianic citation is from LXX, is Jesuanic and that the Marcan form is dependent on the Lucan one, so that the former form, which expresses the *Parabeltheorie* most clearly, reflects a later development of the tradition. See Flusser 1981:235-263.

while a small minority argues that Jesus uttered it in connection with the parable of the sower and the explanation of it as the present text in Mark 4:3-20 shows. Among those scholars who argue for the authenticity but not in the parable context, some argue that the saying was inserted into that context by Mark, while others argue for its having been inserted by a pre-Marcan tradent, so that Mark himself received it as a part of the parable context. To make matters more complicated, even within the same group of scholars, the views on the Jesuanic *meaning* of the saying differ from each other, and there is more disagreement on Mark's purpose with his redaction relating to the saying.[67] It is no surprise that J.P. Meier judges all the arguments presented by the exegetes for the authenticity of the saying in question to be "unsuccessful".[68]

Whose view is right or near the truth? Did Jesus utter the saying in the parable context or not, with a purpose of the *Parabeltheorie* or without it? If the saying was not from Jesus, was it composed by the early Church or by Mark with a purpose of the *Parabeltheorie* or without it? If the saying originally (whether from Jesus or the Church) had nothing to do with the parable context, was it inserted into that context by Mark or some tradent before him? On the basis of the theses and argumentations put forth by the scholars, these questions can also be raised.

I first start by directing a skeptical question to those scholars who deny the authenticity of the saying. For example, does the saying in question express the view of the early Church that the Jews' unbelief in the Christian gospel was caused by God or Jesus, so that the saying originated with the Church? Is it not possible, however, that Jesus uttered it with one purpose and the early Church used it for another? Such a skeptical question is methodologically justifiable from the point of view of the possibility of plausible meanings in various phases in the history of tradition. This point of view is put forth by G. Theißen – D. Winter as follows:

---

[67] Therefore, the research situation is far from the conclusion which Beavis drew in 1989 from her survey of the previous studies on Mark 4:11-12. According to her, "*the consensus of scholarship is that Jesus himself used Isa. 6:9-10 to explain the purpose of his parable teaching*"; moreover, "(t)here is consensus that the saying (i.e., Mark 4:11-12; my addition) is authentic, and agreement that some early Christian tradent (usually identified as the Evangelist himself) placed the logion between the parable of the sower and its interpretation". See Beavis 1989:81, 85. The survey of the previous studies (1.2) can show that the research situation even in the time of her study was equally far from her conclusion.

[68] Meier confines himself to saying that only Mark 4:11 belongs to pre-Marcan tradition. See Meier 1994:491-492.

It is possible for a saying that has a plausible Christian sense to receive a different plausible meaning if it can be traced back to Jesus. Thus, in declaring a tradition to be inauthentic, we must always also *test* whether the saying, in a different meaning, cannot also be understood as a saying of the historical Jesus. *Fitting well into the context of post-Easter Christianity does not exclude the possibility that it also fits well into the context of Jesus' ministry.*[69]

Therefore, if such a test is not done, it is premature to conclude that a saying is not *Jesuanic*, even though a plausible sense can be found within early Christianity. I suspect that no scholar who denies the authenticity of the saying in Mark 4:11-12 has done such a test, or argued that there can be found no plausible meaning of the saying in the Jesuanic context, but rather they assume that it is not from Jesus.

However, the question arises: How is it possible to find such a different plausible meaning in order to be able to judge a tradition as Jesuanic (or Christian, if not possible)? According to Theißen – Winter, "historical understanding of an 'authentic' saying of Jesus requires knowledge of the whole historical context. This knowledge is the only way to clarify what it is that is to be determined as authentic or inauthentic".[70] That is to say, such knowledge is a precondition of testing a plausible, Jesuanic meaning. I think that the question of the "knowledge of the whole historical context" involves something more than simply collecting the background information. A. Laato's following thesis discloses that the possibility of plausible meaning is related to the scholarly reconstruction of history which should be continuously corrected, reformed or superseded with a new one:

biblical exegesis (…) is not a simple matter of interpreting texts but is a *process* in which the logical models or possible worlds are constructed to accommodate the validity of particular interpretations.[71]

---

[69] Theißen – Winter 2002:207 (emphasis mine).
[70] Theißen – Winter 2002:193.
[71] Laato 1998:5 (note 21; emphasis mine). I think that Laato's view on *process* in the exegetical studies corresponds to what E.H. Carr describes history as science should be. First, on a general level, Carr says: "It is recognized that scientists make discoveries and acquire fresh knowledge, not by establishing precise and comprehensive laws, but by enunciating *hypotheses* which open the way to fresh inquiry" (emphasis mine). Then, on a more concrete level, "Take, for example, Max Weber's famous diagnosis of a relation between Protestantism and capitalism. Nobody today would call this a law, though it might have been hailed as such in an earlier period. It is a *hypothesis* which, though modified to some extent in the course of the inquiries which it inspired, has beyond doubt enlarged our understanding of both these movements"

If a plausible, Jesuanic meaning can be found in view of "the whole historical context", this means that the meaning obtains the "logical model/possible world" which accommodates its validity. In this research, Theißen – Winter's 'requirement of the knowledge of the whole historical context' and Laato's 'construction of the logical model/possible world', both for the test of a plausible, Jesuanic meaning, are simply termed 'reconstruction of the Jesuanic context'. Clarification of this research's usage of the phrase "Jesuanic meaning" is useful here. When concerned with the reconstruction of the context in which a plausible, Jesuanic meaning of the saying is sought for, the correlation between the reconstructed context and Jesus is assumed. Thus, 'Jesuanic meaning' means *as if uttered by Jesus*, that is, what Jesus himself in such a context would/could have meant with the saying. It is, therefore, not to be understood as the real, authentic meaning, that is, the meaning in which the historical Jesus actually uttered by the saying. It is thus, hypothetical in intention. When it is stated that a Jesuanic meaning of the saying is *plausible*, it means that the saying is intelligible with that meaning in the Jesuanic context.

The second skeptical question is directed at those who argue for the authenticity of the saying: Do they reconstruct the Jesuanic context by which the meaning of the saying is tested, or which accommodates the validity of the meaning? Firstly, with regard to those scholars who argue for the authenticity but not in the parable context, it has been demonstrated above that all of them build on the interpretation of TgIsa 6:9-10. Manson, Jeremias and several others interpret the Aramaic version of the Isaianic passage by applying the rabbinical interpretation of the passage retroactively to it, as if that interpretation might have been valid in Jesus' time. Gnilka (1961) and Evans consider that Jesus could have adhered more to the spirit of the Hebrew Bible in spite of his reliance on the Aramaic tradition of Isa 6:9-10. Nonetheless, all those who build on TgIsa 6:9-10 concentrate on the interpretation of this limited passage. They do not interpret it in such a way that they elucidate what meaning and function Isa 6:9-10 had in the context of the Judaism of Jesus' time. The weakness of their lack of such a contextualized

---

(emphasis is mine). Carr 1990:59-60. That is to say, a result of exegetical study as a discipline of historical study should form a hypothesis for the next inquiry.

understanding of the Isaianic tradition can be seen by comparing their interpretation with the interpretation done by those who argue for the authenticity of the saying in the parable context. According to Bryan, as seen above, Jesus uttered the saying about divine hardening taking the motif of Israel's remnant into consideration, in the same way as these two things are connected directly with each other in the whole context of Isa 6:9-13. Wright argues that Jesus retold the remnant motif of Isa 6:13 in the parable of the sower and uttered the citation from Isa 6:9-10 in connection with this retelling. For the two scholars, searching for the Jesuanic meaning of the saying, Isa 6:9-10 should be understood by taking a larger context of the book of Isaiah into account, and in connection with some other motif of the book.

There are two problems in Bryan's and Wright's analyses however. Firstly, they do not demonstrate that the connection between the idea of divine hardening and the remnant motif was significant to the Jewish understanding of Isa 6:9-10 in Jesus' time. The two scholars merely consider that it was significant to Jesus personally; therefore, their dealing with the Isaianic passage does not reach the level of reconstruction of the Jesuanic context. Secondly, like other scholars who also argue for the authenticity of the saying in the parable context, they concentrate only on the Jesuanic meaning but do not put forth a plausible meaning in the context of Mark or the early Church. The point of Theißen – Winter mentioned above is that in the history of tradition, the plausible meanings of various phases must be different from each other. It is natural that a Jesus saying uttered in one historical context should have a different meaning and function than that used in a later context. Therefore, any "test" of plausible, Jesuanic meaning should not be done only with respect to the reconstructed, Jesuanic context, but also with respect to other plausible meaning(s) in different phases in the history of tradition. To put forth only the Jesuanic meaning means that the test stops halfway.

On the basis of the discussion above, in order to solve the problem of Jesus' saying in Mark 4:11-12, it should be determined whether it is possible to find a plausible, Jesuanic meaning of the saying in the Jesuanic context reconstructed on the Judaism of Jesus' time, and, if it is, compare this meaning with other meanings of various phases in the history of tradition, at least, the meaning in the Marcan context. With regard to the reconstruction of the Jesuanic context for the test of a plausible, Jesuanic meaning, I

presume that the meaning and function of Isa 6:9-10 in the context of the Judaism of Jesus' time is the key to the reconstruction. Focusing on such a contextualized understanding of this particular Isaianic tradition, the Jesuanic context to be reconstructed will not shed light on the overall situation, the time and place when and where Jesus lived, and wherein he would have uttered the saying. It represents only one aspect of such an overall context. Therefore, when, in spite of such a limited scope of context, a plausible, Jesuanic meaning of the saying is identified, this result should be checked against other aspects of the overall context. On the other hand, from this limited point of view relating to the context question, it also follows that when a plausible, Jesuanic meaning is not found, it may not be concluded yet that the saying is from the early Church. In this case, it would still be necessary to consider whether the meaning and the function of the Isaianic tradition in the Judaism of Jesus' time can be reconstructed in a different way, and also what the alternative key to the reconstruction of the Jesuanic context would be, other than that relating to the issue of the Isaianic tradition.

1.3.2. Two methodological points of view

1.3.2.1. Isaianic tradition on the "interpretative trajectory"

It has been stated above that the Jesuanic context should be reconstructed in order to test a plausible, Jesuanic meaning of the saying in Mark 4:11-12. Furthermore, it is relevant to find out what meaning and function Isa 6:9-10 had in the context of the Judaism of Jesus' time.

In the question of the meaning and the function of an Isaianic tradition in that context, J. Blenkinsopp's recent study of the influence of the book of Isaiah in Second Temple Judaism provides us with an important methodological point of view. According to him, the question of the influence of the book is related to the question of how it was formed. He summarizes the history of the formation of the book as follows:

A cumulative process of interpretation and expansion of an initial core of material was going on throughout the period of the formation of the book, until the point was reached after which commentary could no longer be incorporated in it but had to be written up separately. The existence of the Qumran pesharim on Isaiah, the earliest commentaries on the book, is an indication that this point had been reached by the 1st century B.C.E. (…).[72]

Thus, in the interpretative development of Isaianic materials there was such a *continuity* that the development continued even after the formation of the book was completed.

In addition, Blenkinsopp emphasizes that the interpretative development of Isaiah was oriented to a *consistent direction*. The "cumulative process of interpretation and expansion" was not a mere aggregative of successive redactors' works or a mosaic of their ad hoc redactions. According to him, such a direction emerged in the mid-fifth century BCE, at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, when the core component of Isa 56-66 was added to the earlier Isaianic materials.[73] At that time, "the self-segregating immigrant, Judeo-Babylonian community in Judah" began to use for self-identification the old prophetic concept of the remnant which originally encapsulated in the name of the prophet's son Shear-yashub was identified with the survivors of the national disasters as the nucleus of a new community.[74] After the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, the interpretative development of Isaiah was carried out by "an apocalyptically-minded dissident group at odds with the temple authorities", which can be demonstrated by the final form of Isa 65-66.[75] Such an apocalyptic and sectarian interpretative development of Isaiah led to that "the exile according to Isaiah came to be viewed as a prefiguring of the end time and its survivors as the community of the end time", so the development "served

---

[72] Blenkinsopp 2006:56, also 7.
[73] Blenkinsopp 2006:76.
[74] Blenkinsopp 2006:250, also 226. Blenkinsopp points out that "the holy seed" as the term for self-identification in Ezra 9:2 is the case where the self-segregating group used the old Isaianic concept, i.e., Isa 6:13c. See Blenkinsopp 2006:226.
[75] Blenkinsopp 2006:57. With regard to the question of the "dissident group", Blenkinsopp considers the possibility of the relationship between "those who tremble at the word of God of Israel כֹּל חָרֵד בְּדִבְרֵי" "אֱלֹהֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל" of Ezra 9:4, on the one hand, and the "servants" of Isa 56-66, the "tremblers at God's word (הַחֲרֵדִים אֶל־דְּבָרוֹ)" of Isa 66:5, on the other. Moreover, discussing the scholarly works on the Jewish sectarianism in the Second Temple period (like M. Weber's, O. Plöger's, P.D. Hanson's and O.H. Steck.'s works), he also considers the possibility of the link between the original sect mentioned in Isa 66 and Ezra 9, on the one hand, and "the assembly of the devout (συναγωγὴ Ασιδαίων)" of 1 Mac 2:42 in the time of the Seleucid rule, on the other. See Blenkinsopp 2006: 56-88.

as a powerful stimulus to the formation and consolidation of the well-known sects of the late Second Temple period".[76]

When the influence of the book of Isaiah in Second Temple Judaism is investigated, therefore, the focus should not be only on the completed form of the book. Such a *continuous* and *consistent*, interpretative development of the Isaianic materials should also be taken into account. That is, until the completion of the book, the materials were expanded and transformed in accordance with the apocalyptical-sectarian interests; after completion, i.e., after the point of no more expansion and transformation of the materials, the book functioned to those with apocalyptical-sectarian interests as "one of the most convincing sources of legitimacy and one of the most powerful resources for understanding and expressing their own identity and agenda"[77]. Thus, it can be said that the interpretative development until the completion of the book is 'internal' to Isaiah and the development after the completion is 'external' to it. Before the point of no more expansion and transformation of the materials was reached, such expansion and transformation were included in the book. According to Blenkinsopp, "in general, a critical reading of the book reveals an incremental and cumulative process of interpretation, of rereading (*Fortschreibung, relecture*) covering a period of several centuries".[78] He uses the term "interpretative trajectory" to describe the whole process (i.e., both internal and external) of this continuous and consistent interpretative development, which fostered the apocalyptic sectarianism in Second Temple Judaism, and regards the book of Daniel as the premier example of the external part of the trajectory.[79]

---

[76] Blenkinsopp 2006:250. Thus, Blenkinsopp emphasizes the magnitude of the influence of Isaiah in the Second Temple period, that is, its influence does not concern only the development of a sectarian and apocalyptic *way of thinking* but also *the actual formation* of eschatological and apocalyptic sects in the period. See Blenkinsopp 2006:227, also 58.

[77] Blenkinsopp 2006:88.

[78] Blenkinsopp 2006:100.

[79] Blenkinsopp 2006:57, 77. In addition to this apocalyptic-sectarian, interpretative trajectory, Blenkinsopp also mentions another trajectory, the trajectory in which the character of the author of the book was redefined from the traditional, social critic to the legendary, man of God by Deuteronomists. This 'internal' part of the interpretative development was inherited 'externally' by the Chronicles, the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, the Lives of the Prophets, Josephus and the Martyrdom of Isaiah. However, on account of the significance of the role played in the composition of the book of Isaiah and the influence on the Jewish way of thinking and actual movements in the Second Temple period, the apocalyptic-sectarian interpretative trajectory can be regarded as the major trajectory of Isaiah. Blenkinsopp himself emphasizes

This research argues that the concept of "interpretative trajectory" is the key to the question of the meaning and the function of an Isaianic tradition (e.g., Isa 6:9-10) in Second Temple Judaism. From this point of view, it becomes clear that the meaning and the function sought for, are not such that had been valid before the interpretative development, i.e., in the original context in which the tradition emerged. Rather, these have been expanded or transformed as a result of interpretative development. To seek for such a meaning and function, the principal frame of reference is the entire context of the whole book of Isaiah, because the meaning and the function of each tradition can be considered to be finally settled in that context which was formed in Second Temple Judaism. Moreover, when the interpretative trajectory is extended externally, the meaning and the function which were valid in the entire context of the book, might also have been operative outside the book, i.e., in the Jewish writings which emerged after Isaiah in the Second Temple period. As Blenkinsopp points out, an ancient reader of the book of Isaiah, having no idea of the Second Isaiah or the modern, historical-critical studies on the book, had only the practice of reading the Scripture "as an integrated whole with interconnected parts".[80] Such being the case, it is possible that when an ancient reader of Isaiah took up his pen, his understanding and interpretation of an Isaianic tradition was in continuity with the meaning and the function of the tradition which were settled in the final form of the book.

To sum up, to reconstruct the Jesuanic context for a plausible, Jesuanic meaning of the saying in Mark 4:11-12, it is necessary to seek for the meaning and the function of Isa 6:9-10 which were valid in the entire context of the book of Isaiah and which could also have been operative outside the book in Second Temple Judaism.

It can be demonstrated using one example that seeking for the meaning and the function of Isa 6:9-10 valid in the original context of the historical prophet is not relevant to a plausible, Jesuanic meaning of the saying in Mark 4:11-12. M.D. Hooker argues that Isa 6:9-10 "represents the prophet's understanding of his ministry to Israel at the end of his life rather than at the beginning". That is to say, in his later days, the prophet gave a theological explanation as to why the people of Israel had not accepted his proclamation,

---

that "the line leading from prophecy to apocalyptic eschatology is one of the principal interpretative trajectories in the book". See Blenkinsopp 2006:28-56, 57.

[80] Blenkinsopp 2006:278-279, also 252.

by inventing the idea of divine hardening as an explanation, and projected it retroactively on the description of his Temple vision of Isa 6. Hooker considers that Jesus and then the early Church found themselves in this same situation as the prophet Isaiah in as far as they were in need of an explanation for their failure in the proclamation to the Jews, so they made use of the Isaianic passage.[81] The problem of referring to the prophet's situation as the explanation of Jesus' and the early Church' use of Isa 6:9-10 is that this so-called "Rückprojizierung" theory concerning the authenticity question of the Isaianic passage is a much disputed one.[82] The prophet's situation which this theory describes is only an assumption. In fact, it is possible to put forth the thesis of the type presented by Hooker (i.e., Jesus and the early Church used Isa 6:9-10 for the purpose of rationalizing the failure of their mission), even if the Isaianic passage is authentic, that is, the hardening task was not projected retroactively by the prophet but really assigned to him in connection with the Temple vision. The real question is whether such a 'rationalizing' purpose as to the meaning of Jesus' saying is plausible from the point of view of the meaning and the function of the Isaianic passage in the entire context of Isaiah. It is presumed that if Jesus is the citer of Isa 6:9-10, he did it from that point of view, because as an ancient reader, he should have had the reading practice of the Scripture as "an integrated whole with interconnected parts". Although it cannot be proved that Jesus really read the whole book of Isaiah, it can be presupposed that he was a part of the culture where the ancient reading practice was prevalent. Thus, it is not necessary to reconstruct or speculate about the prophet's situation in order to explain Jesus' use of Isa 6:9-10.[83]

With regard to the meaning and the function of Isa 6:9-10 in Second Temple Judaism, Blenkinsopp does not deal with them in his study. [84] The examination of them must then be the task of this research.

---

[81] Hooker 2000:91-92.

[82] About the "Rückprojizierung" theory and the problem of it, see Laato 2002:219-220.

[83] A similar reference to the assumed situation of the prophet as the explanation of Jesus' use of Isa 6:9-10 can be found in Taylor's following argument: "It is possible that Jesus was impressed by the similarity between the results of His ministry and the experience of Isaiah and that He made use of the ironic words of Isa. vi. 9 f. (…) after the failure of the Mission of the Twelve and His own fruitless activity in Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum (…)". See Taylor 1955:258.

[84] Blenkinsopp mentions only that Matthew, in the parallel passage with Mark 4:11-12, chose the LXX form for the citation from Isa 6:9-10 (Matt 13:15), so that Jesus' purpose (in Matthew) with using parables

There are two scholars, Evans and Räisänen, who deal with the interpretation of Isa 6:9-10 or the significance of the idea of the passage in Second Temple Judaism.[85] Neither of them, however, examines the meaning and the function of that passage from the point of view of the above-mentioned interpretative trajectory. Evans concentrates on the meaning and the function of Isa 6:9-10 in the context of the historical prophet and then compares them with two interpretation cases of the Second Temple period, i.e., the Qumran Isaiah (1QIsaª) and the Septuagint Isaiah. Thus, he considers that the difference in the textual form indicates the situation of these two interpreting communities.[86] From this research's point of view, the point of comparison is not the meaning and the function of Isa 6:9-10 in the original context of the eighth century BCE, but in the context of Second Temple Judaism, i.e., the context in which the formation of the whole book was completed. In his examination, Räisänen sets Isa 6:9-10 in a larger frame of reference, namely, the notion of God as inciter of evil. His aim is to clarify how the texts which elaborate on this notion emerged in the three monotheistic religions, i.e., Islam, Judaism and Christianity, and what they originally meant. Therefore, he also examines Isa 6:9-10 in the original context of the historical prophet.[87] From the point of view of this research it is important to seek for the meaning and the function of the idea of divine hardening of Isa 6:9-10 in the entire context of the book, not to separate it from that context, or set it in some abstract frame of reference.[88]

---

might not be related with the idea of divine hardening. He does not touch upon the meaning of the Isaianic citation in Mark or the Second Temple background of that Isaianic passage. See Blenkinsopp 2006:162.

[85] Evans' study of 1989 deals with the history of the Jewish and Christian interpretation of Isa 6:9-10 from the time of the prophet to the time of rabbinical and patristic literature. About his examination of the interpretation of the Isaianic passage of Second Temple Judaism, see the chapters of his study concerning the Qumran Isaiah (1QIsaª), the LXX Isaiah and the historical Jesus in Evans 1989:53-60, 61-76, 103-106.

In his study of 1972, Räisänen's central interest is the phenomenon of the notion of God as inciter of evil which appears in the texts of the three monotheistic religions (Islam, Judaism and Christianity). He deals with Isa 6:9-10 which put forth the idea of divine hardening as a part of this phenomenon. About his examination of that notion of Second Temple Judaism, see the chapter concerning the early Jewish texts in Räisänen 1972:67-78.

[86] Evans 1989:17-40, 53-60, 61-76.

[87] Räisänen 1972:58-63.

[88] While focusing on this larger, abstract frame of reference (the notion of God as inciter of evil), Räisänen does not deal with the Second Temple translation or transcription of the Isaianic passage as in the case of Evans.

On the other hand, in the examination of the meaning and the function of Isa 6:9-10 in the original context of the prophet, Evans and Räisänen come to a similar conclusion. Both deny the theory that the Temple vision of Isa 6 concerns the inauguration of Isaiah's career as prophet; therefore, the vision concerns the change of the prophet's mission from the proclamation of repentance to the execution of

1.3.2.2. Question of criteria in the quest for the historical Jesus

The second methodological point of view concerns the historical Jesus. As has been stated in 1.3.1 above, in this research 'Jesuanic meaning' is hypothetical in intention. The question posed is: How can the historicity of the found meaning be evaluated? In the research of the historical Jesus, scholars have developed and applied various 'criteria of authenticity'. In the further progress in research, methodological precision has been made for using the criteria to avoid a distortion of history. One of the most significant results of this development in the time of the "Third Quest" for the historical Jesus[89] is that the 'criterion of dissimilarity' is nowadays applied solely with respect to the early Church, so that the understanding of Jesus might not be detached unnecessarily from the context of Second Temple Judaism in which he lived and worked.[90]

This developed use of 'dissimilarity criterion' cannot solve all the problems. This can be seen from the survey of the previous studies in 1.2 above. The arguments for authenticity put forth by those scholars who advocate it outside of the parable context, virtually meet this criterion, because, according to them, unlike in the Marcan or pre-Marcan context the saying had nothing to do with the parables in the Jesuanic context,. Thus, the Jesuanic, non-parabolic form and meaning of the saying is dissimilar from the Marcan or pre-Marcan parabolic form and meaning, so the saying is authentic! In spite of those scholars' consensus on the non-parabolic form as the original, however, their opinions on the detailed meaning of that form diverge from each other, as the survey of

---

judgment. Thus, both scholars emphasize the reality of the hardening task assigned to the prophet by God. On the other hand, Evans argues for both aspects of judgment and salvation as God's intention at the temple vision in view of the remnant motif of Isa 6:13, while Räisänen emphasizes the aspect of judgment. See Evans 1989:17-40; Räisänen 1972:58-63.

[89] Today, it is usual that the history of Jesus research is described by dividing it into three different phases: (i) the "Old Quest" in the late nineteenth century; (ii) the "New Quest" from the 1950s; (iii) the "Third Quest" becoming apparent in 1980s. Each phase represents its own methodological orientation. The first quest tended to detach Jesus from the Christian Church; the second, from Judaism; the third, while aiming at a secular historical research, emphasizes Jesus' Jewishness or approaches Jesus against the Jewish background. See Theißen – Winter 2002:76-171. There are different opinions as to who belongs to the "Third Quest" and who does not. For example, Wright, who introduced the very term "Third Quest", does not consider D. Crossan and the Jesus Seminar to belong to it, whereas Theißen – Winter reckon them. See Wright 1996:29-35, 44-74; Theißen – Winter 2002:142, 158-159.

[90] About the development of the authenticity criteria in the study of the historical Jesus, see Holmén 1999:47-80; 2001:24-36.

the previous studies shows.[91] The main reason for the lack of consensus in this regard is that the scholars do not reconstruct the Jesuanic context for the meaning they put forth. In terms of this research, they do not seek for the meaning and the function of Isa 6:9-10 in the context of Second Temple Judaism. On the other hand, Theißen – Winter's thesis about the possibility of plausible meanings of various phases in the history of tradition requires testing the possibility of a Jesuanic meaning both from the point of view of the Jesuanic context and from that of other plausible meanings of various phases.[92] The mere applicability of 'dissimilarity criterion' does not solve the question of the historicity of a Jesuanic meaning.

Theißen – Winter develop the criteria of authenticity by taking these two points of view into consideration. They articulate the real interest in searching for the historical Jesus so: "determining the material relation of Jesus to his context *and* to the history of his effects, in which there will be both points in common and points of disagreement, both lines of continuity and gaps of discontinuity".[93] Consequently, they reformulate the traditional criteria of authenticity into a new system of "criterion of historical plausibility" with two sub-criteria: the "criterion of Jewish contextual plausibility" and the "criterion of the plausibility of effects of Jesus in early Christianity". The first sub-criterion (i.e., "criterion of Jewish contextual plausibility") requires, firstly, the investigation of "what Jesus intended and said must be compatible with the Judaism of the first half of the first century in Galilee ('contextual appropriateness')" and then, to supplement and complement this by investigating "what Jesus intended and did must be recognizable as that of an individual figure within the framework of the Judaism of that time ('contextual distinctiveness')". The second sub-criterion (i.e., "criterion of the plausibility of effects of Jesus in early Christianity") focuses on two aspects of the effects: "those elements within the Jesus tradition that contrast with the interest of the early Christian sources ('resistance to tendencies of the tradition')" and "the coherence of enduring features that persisted despite the variety of tendencies at work within pluralistic early Christianity ('source coherence')". According to Theißen – Winter, with these criteria, it is possible to evaluate coherence and incoherence, continuity and discontinuity,

---

[91] See discussion in 1.2.
[92] See discussion in 1.3.1.
[93] Theißen – Winter 2002:173 (emphasis mine).

agreement and disagreement, from both the point of view of Judaism and of early Christianity.[94] In short, this "criterion of historical plausibility" means that in the study of the historical Jesus, the two perspectives should be integrated, so that Jesus is to be understood *both* as someone who was intelligible in the Jewish context *and* as someone who started up the process resulting in the composition of the Gospels as one of the effects of that process.

In any case, in order to answer the question about the historicity of the found Jesuanic meaning, an evaluation of the result of this research by this criterion of historical plausibility is needed.

1.3.3. Mode of procedure

In the following chapters, the meaning and the function of Isa 6:9-10 in Second Temple Judaism are first examined. Thus, in the second chapter, the meaning and the function in the entire context of the book of Isaiah will be elucidated. In the third chapter, whether and how the meaning and the function which were valid in that context were also operative outside the book in Second Temple Judaism will be examined. Then, in the fourth chapter, the possibility of a Jesuanic meaning of the saying in Mark 4:11-12 from the point of view of the meaning and the function of Isa 6:9-10 in Second Temple Judaism is investigated.

In order to find an appropriate procedure for the fourth chapter, one question is crucial: Is the present form of tradition allowed to be used as the starting point when searching for a Jesuanic meaning, so that this form as such will be set in the Jesuanic

---

[94] About the details of the "criterion of historical plausibility", see Theißen – Winter 2002:172-225. As a critical view on this criterion, Holmén points out that a possible problem arises concerning the investigation of Jesus' distinctiveness for the criterion of Jewish contextual plausibility, i.e., the logic: "if a tradition shows Jesus' distinctiveness within the Jewish context, it is authentic", presupposes that we know in advance what the distinctive, unique profile of Jesus is. Theißen- Winter is conscious of this inconclusiveness, but do not see their criteria as incompetent on this account. Instead, they speak of a "criterion of historically plausible comprehensive picture of Jesus ('comprehensive historical plausibility')". It is a presupposition to begin with, but, in the course of the research, it is tested, refined and corrected. In this sense, this "criterion" is not to be paralleled to the above discussed criterion of historical plausibility. It is "a regulative concept effective in all criteria, source-evaluation arguments, and indicators of distinctiveness". In this way, scientific process goes forward. See Theißen – Winter 2002:209-210, 211-212; Holmén 1999:77 (note 106), also 51 (note 14).

context reconstructed on the Judaism of Jesus' time? Or should the form be first re-arranged using conventional, exegetical methods and the new form then used as the starting point to search for a Jesuanic meaning? This question arises from an inconsistency which can be found in Theißen – Winter's study. As shown above, with their thesis about the possibility of plausible meanings of various phases in the history of tradition, they are cautious not to judge a Jesus tradition colored with a Christian sense to be non-Jesuanic.[95] However, in another place of the same study they insist that the Christian as well as the Jewish Christian elements should be "subtracted" from a Jesus tradition until the "clearly Jewish elements" are left in it; then, "we are probably close to the historical Jesus".[96] It should be noticed, however, that when all the Christian elements are subtracted, the remnant of the tradition itself can no longer bear a Christian meaning. In this case, there is no longer a need of the test for a Jesuanic meaning which Theißen – Winter require. In principle, the object of their test should be the very Jesus tradition which, consisting of both Christian and non-Christian elements or even only of Christian elements, has a plausible Christian meaning. Whether such a historical-critically suspicious tradition can have a different, plausible Jesuanic meaning in the Jesuanic context, is the point of the test. If such a meaning is found, the 'Christian' elements of the tradition now have nothing to do with the Christian meaning of the tradition; they are not superfluous to the Jesuanic meaning but constituent of it. That is to say, 'Christian' can be 'Jesuanic'. However, there is still a possibility of subtraction. If some elements of the tradition are found to be foreign to the Jesuanic meaning, it can be suspected that it might have come from the need of composing a Christian meaning for the tradition. Thus, whether a Christian element is Jesuanic or not, is determined by the Jesuanic meaning which is found in view of the Jesuanic context reconstructed on the Judaism of Jesus' time. 'Christian' is not always non-Jesuanic. Applying the subtracting approach to a Jesus tradition without such a determinant (i.e., a Jesuanic meaning) can lead to a pure,

---

[95] See discussion in 1.3.1.
[96] Theißen - Winter argue: "we must always first 'subtract' specifically Christian perspectives, clear post-Easter expressions of Christian faith, and material reflecting church tendencies (…). When in these remaining traditions (…) we discover clearly Jewish elements that cannot be explained as Jewish Christian reactions against the tendencies of Gentile Christianity (…), then we are probably close to the historical Jesus". See Theißen – Winter 2002:173, 179-180.

'authentic' form of the tradition; however, this form does not necessarily represent 'Jesuanic'.

Complication of the problem can also be exemplified as follows. Let us assume that we have a Jesus tradition X which consists of two elements α and β. X can be a saying, so α and β are its parts. Alternatively, X can be also a unity of individual sayings α and β. If an exegete perceives a tension between α and β for the reason that, for example, α corresponds to the Evangelist's general interest, while β is at odds with it, or that α shows a predominantly a Greek feature, while β an Aramaic feature, so the exegete determines that α is from the Evangelist's redaction and β is from tradition and subtracts the former from the tradition. If the exegete does not find a grave reason for determining that the element β is from the early Church, he or she will go on to consider the meaning of that element from the point of view of the context of the Judaism of Jesus' time. If a plausible meaning of X can be found, i.e., the unity of α and β, from the point of view of that context and thus X as such passes the test which Theißen – Winter require, what can be said about the above-mentioned exegete's arguments for breaking down of the unity? In this case, it is possible to consider the possibility that the Greek feature is due to the Graecizing of Aramaic tradition, or the alleged tension itself can be *re*considered, that is, *re*consider the relation between α and the Evangelist's general interest or even this interest itself, or other considerations to go through before the decision of breaking down can be weighed up. I do not go so far as to say that to put forth a plausible, Jesuanic meaning justifies the unity of X automatically. The meaning must be tested. If there is no difference between the found Jesuanic meaning and the Marcan or early Christian meaning, from this research's methodological point of view, the possibility of the former meaning for the unity of X should also be doubted. If however, the Jesuanic meaning can be found to be different from a Christian one, its claim can be supported.

For this reason, this research will choose to set *first* the present form of a Jesus tradition in the Jesuanic context to examine the possibility of a Jesuanic meaning of it and *then* control the result with exegetical methods as to whether or not there are grave redaction- and tradition-critical reasons against that meaning (in the exemplifying schema above, reasons for breaking down the tradition X). Here, I am fully conscious of a defectiveness of this procedure. As seen in 1.3.1 above, 'Jesuanic meaning' is

hypothetical in intention. In addition, in this research the Jesuanic context in view of which a Jesuanic meaning is sought for will be reconstructed centrally on the meaning and the function of Isa 6:9-10 in Second Temple Judaism. Thus, the reconstruction will not cover the overall context of Jesus but focus on one aspect of it. In spite of its hypothetical and limited perspective, I believe it is possible for this procedure to shed light on that part, though tiny, of the dark history of the Jesus tradition, the saying in Mark 4:11-12, to which scholars have not paid attention, especially in their redaction- and tradition-critical considerations of this tradition.

2. The Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant

2.1. Meaning and function of Isa 6:9-10 in the book of Isaiah

2.1.1. Hardening motif in the entire context of the book of Isaiah

Isa 6:9-10, which is cited in Mark 4:12, reads in the MT as follows:

v. 9 וַיֹּאמֶר לֵךְ וְאָמַרְתָּ לָעָם הַזֶּה
שִׁמְעוּ שָׁמוֹעַ וְאַל־תָּבִינוּ וּרְאוּ רָאוֹ וְאַל־תֵּדָעוּ:
v. 10 הַשְׁמֵן לֵב־הָעָם הַזֶּה וְאָזְנָיו הַכְבֵּד וְעֵינָיו הָשַׁע
פֶּן־יִרְאֶה בְעֵינָיו וּבְאָזְנָיו יִשְׁמָע וּלְבָבוֹ יָבִין וָשָׁב וְרָפָא לוֹ:

> (v. 9) And he said: "Go and say to this people: 'Hear and hear, but do not understand; see and see, but do not perceive.'
> (v. 10) Make the heart of this people hardened, make their ears dull, shut their eyes, so that they may not see with their eyes, hear with their ears, understand with their heart, and return and be healed."

Thus, God decides to make his people obdurate by hardening their heart and depriving them of the right sight, hearing and understanding, and assigns this task to the prophet Isaiah. A similar motif of obduracy inflicted by God is also found in Isa 29:9-10 and 63:17a, though those passages have no idea of the assignment of the hardening task to the prophet.

(29:9) הִתְמַהְמְהוּ וּתְמָהוּ הִשְׁתַּעַשְׁעוּ וָשֹׁעוּ
שָׁכְרוּ וְלֹא־יַיִן נָעוּ וְלֹא שֵׁכָר:
(29:10) כִּי־נָסַךְ עֲלֵיכֶם יְהוָה רוּחַ תַּרְדֵּמָה
וַיְעַצֵּם אֶת־עֵינֵיכֶם אֶת־הַנְּבִיאִים וְאֶת־רָאשֵׁיכֶם הַחֹזִים כִּסָּה:

(29:9) Linger and be stunned, blind yourselves and be blind. You are drunk, but not with wine; you totter, but not with strong drink.[1]

(29:10) For the Lord has poured out upon you a spirit of deep sleep; he has closed your eyes: the prophets; he has covered your heads: the seers.

(63:17a) לָמָּה תַתְעֵנוּ יְהוָה מִדְּרָכֶיךָ תַּקְשִׁיחַ לִבֵּנוּ מִיִּרְאָתֶךָ

(63:17a) Lord, why do you let us wander from your ways and harden our heart, so that we might not fear you?

In addition to these passages concerning *divinely inflicted* obduracy, throughout the book of Isaiah there are also passages which speak of a similar *obdurate condition* of the people of Israel as follows: Isa 42:7 (Israel's blindness except the servant); 42:18-20 (the deafness and blindness of Israel and the 'servant')[2]; 43:8 (Israel's deafness and blindness)[3]; 56:10 (the blindness of Israel's leaders)[4]; 59:10 (Israel's blindness). I also mention two more verses which indicate an obdurate condition of the people but without obduracy terminology: Isa 1:3 (Israel's inability to know the Lord and to understand); 6:5 (Israel as a nation with unclean lips).[5] In any case, among all these passages which speak

---

[1] For "שִׁכְרוּ וְלֹא־יַיִן נָעוּ וְלֹא שֵׁכָר", Blenkinsopp recommends an imperative reading, instead of qal perfect, as follows: "Be drunk but not with wine, stagger, but not with strong drink". Blenkinsopp 2000:403.

[2] About the difficulty in establishing the identity of the servant in this passage, see Blenkinsopp 2002:218-219.

[3] Blenkinsopp considers the 'people' in Isa 43:8 to refer to the people of Israel. See Blenkinsopp 2002:222-223.

[4] With regard to the identity of "watchman" in Isa 56:10 "צֹפוֹ עִוְרִים (his [=Israel's] watchmen are blind)", Blenkinsopp considers as acceptable the scholarly opinion that the civic and religious leadership is meant here. On the other hand, he mentions that the term can denote more precisely "prophet-sentinel". In this case, the issue here is an anti-prophetic diatribe which "agrees with what appears to have been a remarkable loss of esteem for the institution of prophecy in the early Second Temple period". See Blenkinsopp 2003:146-147.

[5] These two verses lack obduracy terminology unlike the five passages above (42:7; 42:18-20; 43:8; 56:10 and 59:10). However, it is possible that they speak of obduracy indirectly. In Isa 1:3 about Israel's inability to *know* the Lord and to *behave perceptibly*, the verbs ידע and בין (hitpol) are used. Both are used also in Isa 6:9-10 (בין in qal). Also Laato and H.G.M. Williamson consider Isa 1:2-3 to be related with Isa 6:9-10. See Laato 1998:101; Williamson 1994:49-50.

As far as Isa 6:5 is concerned, the verse in the same chapter as 6:9-10 discloses the spiritual condition the people of Israel had been under before they were made hardened.

As a more possible passage concerning obduracy, Isa 44:18 is a problematic verse: "their eyes were stuck so that they might not see; their heart so that they might not understand." It clearly speaks of obduracy. The first question is: Who makes them obdurate? The verb טחח has a passive meaning (be stuck shut) in qal. Blenkinsopp considers the verse to indicate divinely inflicted obduracy: "Yhwh has shut their

of obduracy, three (Isa 6:9-10; 29:9-10; 63:17a) speak of the obduracy inflicted by God, *divine hardening*, and one of them, i.e., Isa 6:9-10, expresses this idea the most harshly in the form of God's straightforward command to the prophet.

On the other hand, throughout the book of Isaiah there are also passages which speak of the annulment of obduracy, that is, the opening of the blind eyes and the deaf ears. Among them, the following passages speak explicitly of the annulment of obduracy: Isa 29:18 (the hearing of the deaf and the seeing of the blind); 32:3 (no longer shutting of the eyes as well as the carefully listening ears); 35:5 (the opening of blind eyes and deaf ears); 42:7 (God's assignment to the servant of the task to open the blind eyes and liberate prisoners from the dungeon); 42:16 (God's leading of the blind people to the unknown way and his turning the darkness into light); 50:4-5 (the opening of the ears of the servant)[6]. There are also passages which indicate the annulment of obduracy *less explicitly*: Isa 17:7 (the eyes of men looking at their Maker); 29:24 (the gaining of insight); 30:20-21 (eyes which see the teacher and ears which hear him);[7] 33:24 (the recovery of the inhabitants of Jerusalem from illness); 41:20 (God's salvific act to be seen, known, considered and understood by the people).[8] It should be noted that in all these passages, the annulment of obduracy, whether explicit or less explicitly, is mentioned in the context of the time of salvation often by means of the phrase "in that day (בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא)".[9]

---

eyes so that they cannot see (…)".Räisänen considers it to indicate the obdurate condition of some people, not divinely inflicted obduracy. The second question is: Who are obdurate or made obdurate? It is clear from the context that they are idol-makers. Evans considers the verse to concern *gentile* idol-makers. It may be. But it is equally possible that the verse is a warning against idol-makers *in general*, both gentile and Israelites. In any case, the verse does not clearly concern the obduracy of the people of Israel, and so it has been excluded from the list. See Blenkinsopp 2002:238-242; Räisänen 1972:63; Evans 1989:44-45.

[6] Laato identifies the speaker of Isa 50:4-5, "I", as the loyal servant of God. Laato 1998:140, 157, 160, 161, 172, 188, 195 and 196. Laato also touches on the possibility that the speaker is one of the disciples of the prophet in Isa 8:16-18. See Laato 1998:172, 188 and 196.

[7] The identity of the teacher is not clear. As Blenkinsopp points out, the teacher here has been interpreted as God in the Jewish tradition as well as in the modern commentary. He argues that the teacher here is the prophetic figure compared with the servant in Isa 40-55. See Blenkinsopp 2000:420-421.

[8] It should also be mentioned that in the book of Isaiah, the pouring out of God's spirit (Isa 32:14-15; 42:1; 44:2-3; 59:21; 61:1) is usually mentioned in the same context as the annulment of obduracy, so that the both can be considered as a parallel phenomenon. The phenomenon will be discussed later in the following section (2.2.1 and 2.2.2).

[9] Isa 35:5 and 33:24 lack this special reference to the salvific time in their context. However, with regard to Isa 35:5, the annulment of hardening will happen at the same time as God comes with vengeance to save the people (35:4) and the redeemed of God will return to Zion filled with everlasting joy (35:8-10), that is to say, on the day of salvation. Similarly, with regard to Isa 33:24, see the context of Isa 33:20-24. Isa

When the meaning and the function of Isa 6:9-10 in the entire context of the book of Isaiah is examined, it is worth noting that the idea of divine hardening is connected with the passages which speak of the annulment of obduracy. As a clear example, the divine hardening of Isa 29:9-10 (see above) is juxtaposed with the annulment of obduracy of Isa 29:18 in the same context. The former verses are a part of the passage in Isa 29:9-14 which speaks of God's censure of the people and his judgment. By uniting that passage about judgment (Isa 29:9-14) and Isa 29:15-24 which foretells the day of salvation (with the annulment of obduracy in Isa 29:18 as a part of this passage), a *reverse connection* between Isa 29:9-14 and 29:15-24 clearly emerges in the whole context.

Laato points out that there is a similar connection between divine hardening and the annulment of obduracy in the larger context of the book of Isaiah. The parallelism between Isa 6 and 40-55 is such a case. Several scholars argue that there are linguistic and thematic parallels between Isa 6 and 40:1-11. As examples of linguistic parallels, the expressions קוֹל קוֹרֵא / מִקּוֹל הַקּוֹרֵא in Isa 40:31 / 6:4 and קוֹל אֹמֵר in both Isa 40:6 and 6:8 can be shown. These are used to express the divine command to the prophet. In both Isa 6 and 40:1-11, the glory of God (כבוד) (in Isa 6:3 and 40:5) is central. With regard to the thematic parallels, it is all flesh which will see the glory of God in Isa 40:1-11, whereas it is only the prophet in Isa 6. Similarly, it is only the sins of the prophet which were removed in Isa 6:7, while it is those of the people or of Jerusalem in Isa 40:2.[10] All these parallels, linguistic and thematic, indicate that *Isa 40 opens the new age which reverses the condition of Isa 6*. In fact this reversed parallelism is substantiated in the subsequent passages in Isa 40-55 which proclaim the opening of the eyes and ears (Isa 42:7, 42:16, 50:4-5; see above), i.e., the annulment of obduracy.

Laato points out another connection which Isa 6 has in the whole book of Isaiah, i.e., the connection between Isa 6 and 56-66. Also in this connection, there are both

---

41:20; 42:7 and 50:4-5 also lack that reference in their direct contexts. However, in view of the main character of Isa 40-55 as the proclamation of salvation, the annulment of hardening in these passages can be regarded as the event of the day of salvation.

[10] Laato 1998:130-131. About these linguistic and thematic parallels between Isa 6 and 40:1-11, see also, e.g., Williamson 1994:37-38, also 38-56; Melugin 1976:83-84; Ackroyd 1987:106-108, 176; Rendtorff 1989:78-81; Sheppard 1996:269-270. Williamson shows a detailed list of those scholars who draw attention to the parallels between the two passages. See Williamson 1994:37 (note 21).

linguistic and thematic parallels. Isa 6:1 and 57:15 are an obvious case of linguistic parallel, because God's title (רָם וְנִשָּׂא) occurs in both verses. Additionally, the old names of Zion of Isa 62:4, עֲזוּבָה and שְׁמָמָה, are used in 6:11-12 in the account of the destruction which will befall Judah.[11] From this research's point of view, important thematic parallels to Isa 6 are found in Isa 63:7-64:11, the passage which is a community lament where the tragedy of the present is contrasted with the glorious past. It contains Isa 63:17, the verse which puts forth the same idea of divine hardening as Isa 6:9-10 (see above).[12] Thus, the notion that the present tragedy is due to God's judgment becomes clear. Isa 64:9 speaks of the destruction of the land in a way which is reminiscent of 6:11-12.[13] While Isa 62:4 mentions the destruction of Zion using the same terms as in Isa 6:11-12 (see above), the point of the verse is God's promise that these terms will be superseded by the new ones which denote the age of salvation. According to Laato, by linking this promise with the community lament where the idea of divine hardening is strongly present, the notion is that the salvation of the people is totally dependent on God's mercy.[14] Another thematic parallel to Isa 6 is Isa 65:21-22. This passage compares the fate of the people with a tree. This echoes Isa 6:13 which also describes their fate using the metaphor of a tree, falling down and then a new one subsequently growing out of the stump.[15]

On the basis of these linguistic and thematic parallels, it can be observed that the connection between Isa 6 and 56-66 reverses the 'reverse connection' between Isa 6 and 40-55 with respect to the idea of divine hardening. In the latter, one side of the connection (Isa 6) points to divine hardening, and the other side (40-55), to the annulment of it. In the connection between Isa 6 and 56-66 both sides point to the same direction. Laato sums up the dialectical structure of Isa 40-66 from the point of view of the idea of divine hardening as follows:

---

[11] As for the destruction of Jerusalem and Judah, the same term שְׁמָמָה is used in Isa 64:9 and also שְׁמָמוֹת in 61:4. About the linguistic parallels between Isa 6 and 56-66, see Laato 1998:131; also Williamson 1994:39, 55.

[12] Laato also argues that Isa 64:4 refers to this idea. According to him, the expression: "you (=God) have been angry and we have sinned" indicates that God's wrath prevents the people from turning from their evil ways. See Laato 1998:53.

[13] Isa 64:9 has also a linguistic parallel to 6:11-12. See fn 11 above.

[14] Laato 1998:131.

[15] About these thematic parallels between Isa 6 and 56-66, see Laato 1998:53, 131. According to Laato, the community lament of Isa 63:7-64:11 has a thematic parallel also to 8:16-18. See Laato 1998:53-54.

> Isaiah 40-55 presents the period of hardening as belonging to the past while the new period is at hand when the eyes and ears of the people will be opened to see the acts of Yhwh in history and listen to his Torah. On the other hand, Isaiah 56-66 uses the hardening task of Isaiah 6 in order to explain the theological dilemma, of how Yhwh has allowed his people to depart from him and how he has not yet restored it to its previous glory.[16]

It should be noted, however, that the reappearance of the idea of divine hardening of Isa 6:9-10 in this last part of the book (Isa 56-66) does not mean that God's promise of the annulment of hardening in other parts of the book has come to nothing. Laato also clarifies how the relationship between Isa 1-30 and 40-66 "balances dialectically between the fulfillment and the postponement of the predictions of Isaiah 1-39". According to him, Isa 40-55 proclaims that the time is at hand when the predictions of Isa 1-39 will be fulfilled; however, Isa 56-66 "extends this hermeneutic program of Isa 40-55 by transforming the fulfillment of the promised salvation to a future time when the people has become loyal to Yhwh".[17] Because the question is the "postponement" of the salvation, it is still desperately being waited for. In spite of the reappearance of the idea of divine hardening, the hope for the day of the annulment of hardening is not lost. Therefore, the idea should be understood to accompany implicitly the idea of the annulment of hardening in this last part of the book.

In fact, such an implicit presence of the idea of the annulment of hardening is found just in the immediate context of the most principal passage concerning divine hardening, Isa 6:9-10. Assigned by God to the task of making the people obdurate, the prophet asks him "How long, O Lord? (Isa 6:11)", that is, how long must the people be put in a hardened condition. God's answer is: until a tiny remnant is left after a series of devastation and destruction of the nation (6:11-13). He calls the remnant "holy seed (6:13c)", so the remnant is a blessed entity. In this way, from the context of the prophet's question about the duration of the hardening and God's answer pointing to the emergence of the remnant, it is clear that this holy remnant is at the same time the entity liberated from hardening. This case of the immediate context of Isa 6:9-10 confirms that when

---

[16] Laato 1998:85.
[17] Laato 1998:168.

searching for the meaning and the function of this passage in the entire context of the book, this cycle of the two aspects of hardening motif, i.e., the commencement of divine hardening and the annulment of it at the time of salvation, should be taken into consideration.

On the other hand, the immediate context of Isa 6:9-10 also shows that the hardening motif is connected with the motif of remnant. In fact, this motif is also one of the most widely used motifs in the whole book of Isaiah. The next subsection will examine what relevance the remnant motif has to the meaning and the function of Isa 6:9-10 in the entire context of the book of Isaiah.

2.1.2. Functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant

That the 'remnant' of Israel is one of the major motifs of the book of Isaiah can be shown by the fact that the words which refer to it (פלימה ,שארית ,שאר ; also associated verbs שאר, יתר) repeatedly appear in the book (Isa 1:8, 9; 4:2, 3; 7:22; 10:20, 21, 22; 11:11, 16; 17:6; 28:5; 30:17; 37:4, 31, 32; 46:3).[18] In the book, remnant motif is also closely connected with the motif of God's purifying of the people of Israel in the way that the holy remnant emerges after the purge of the sinful nation. Before examining the relevance of the remnant motif to the meaning and the function of Isa 6:9-10 in the entire context of the book, however, the way in which the motif of God's purifying of the people is present in the book of Isaiah is first investigated.

Isa 1:21-28 speaks of a peculiar plan of salvation which God will execute upon Zion. In order to make Jerusalem the righteous and faithful city, God destroys all the rebels, sinners and those who forsake him (Isa 1:28). As a result of the purge, therefore,

---

[18] In Isa 1:9 a specific word שריד is used. The word does not appear somewhere else. As Laato points out, this word denotes the sinful people of Israel in the context of Isa 1, while the other remnant terminologies refer to a blessed entity of the people, which emerges as a result of God's purification, as seen below. Thus, the use of the special word indicates the special case of a negative connotation. See Laato 1998:79.

In Isa 24:6 there is a verb שאר which is used to indicate the emergence of a remnant. But this remnant in the context of Isa 24-27, the so-called Apocalypse of Isaiah, refers to the remnant of the world's population, not of Israel, since God's judgment concerns the whole world. See Laato 1998:182. Blenkinsopp considers that in Isa 24:1-13, the author of the book of Isaiah has in mind the early, pre-diluvial, history of the whole humanity as narrated in Genesis. See Blenkinsopp 2000:351-352.

there will remain a remnant acceptable to God as the righteous and faithful city. In Isa 4:3 the remnant remaining in Jerusalem which consists of those "written among the living in Jerusalem" is called "holy". Similarly, also in Isa 6:13 those who remain after a series of destruction and devastation are called "holy seed". As Laato points out, the attribute "holy" supposes the effect of purification.[19] Isa 7:20 relates that God shaves the head of Judah using the Assyrian king as a razor. According to Laato, this metaphor signifies that God uses Assyria to purify his people and to cleanse the city of transgressors.[20] After this "shaving", there emerges a "remnant" which feasts on agricultural products, honey and milk (Isa 7:22). In the so-called Ariel songs in Isa 29:3-6, God will distress his city with its enemies. The "flame of devouring fire" of Isa 29:6 refers to the fiery furnace at altar, Ariel, which the appearance of God will ignite to burn the ungodly of Jerusalem.[21] In Isa 30:27-33 a similar motif of furnace (תָּפְתֶּה) is used (30:33). Laato considers the furnace there to be comparable to that of Ariel in Isa 29 and thus as the place where the wicked of Jerusalem will be destroyed through the Assyrian army (as well as the enemy itself).[22] Similarly, Isa 31:4-9 also expresses the motif of furnace in Jerusalem (31:9). The prey over which the lion growls (31:4) is Jerusalem which is left entirely to God's mercy. In the same way as the lion does not abandon his prey when surrounded by a band of shepherds shouting at it (31:4), God does not leave Jerusalem into the hands of the Assyrians. Thus, Isa 31:4-9 "explains, on the one hand, how the Assyrian threat is regarded as a cleansing whereby the sinners are annihilated from Zion and, on the other hand, how Assyria cannot conquer the city".[23] Finally, in Isa 33:10-16, the same motif is repeated, i.e., the destruction of enemies and sinners of Jerusalem in the consuming fire.[24]

---

[19] Laato 1998:75-76. C.f., Isa 62:12 which calls the people living in Jerusalem on the day of salvation "the holy people"; Isa 65:23 which calls the righteous remnant "the blessed seed". With regard to Isa 62:12, Laato argues that the verse implies the idea of purification. See Laato 1998:203.
[20] Laato 1998:102-103.
[21] Laato 1998:106-107.
[22] Laato 1998:108-109. With regard to the word תָּפְתֶּה, Blenkinsopp recommends the reading *toptoh* instead of the MT *topteh*. About the background of the word as meaning a cultic cite for ritual infanticide, i.e., Tophet (2 Kgs 23:10; Jer 7:31-33; 19:5-7), see Blenkinsopp 2000:423-424
[23] Laato 1998:109-110. Laato also argues that the exhortation of forsaking idols in Isa 31:6-7 is connected thematically with Isa 1:21-31, i.e., the passage about the cleansing of Zion, which contains the same exhortation. See Laato 1998:110.
[24] Here, the destruction of the enemies (33:10-12) precedes that of the sinners (33:13-16) in contrary to Isa 30:27-33 and 31:4-9.
    Laato scrutinizes the function of the whole chapter of Isa 33 in the book. The chapter is multilayered. On one layer it refers to Isa 36-37, which is a paradigm in the whole book of Isaiah. On that layer, the

It is true that the remnant terminology concentrates on the first part of the book, Isa 1-39. In the latter part, Isa 40-66, Isa 46:3 is the only verse where the terminology is present ("Listen to me, House of Jacob, the whole remnant of the House of Israel [כָל־שְׁאֵרִית בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל]").[25] However, if the close connection between remnant motif and the motif of God's purifying of the people of Israel is recognized, it becomes clear that the remnant motif is equally present in the latter part of the book through the presence of the motif of God's purification. As Blenkinsopp and Laato argue, the very beginning of the latter part, Isa 40:1-2, puts forth the theological meaning of the Babylonian exile; especially the latter scholar emphasizes the meaning as the "cleansing whereby the people's sins were removed".[26] Therefore, the entity of people which emerges as a result of such purification by God also emerges as the holy remnant consisting of a righteous group of servants after the return from the exile. On the other hand, in the last part of the book, Isa 56-66, God executes purification again. Throughout this part, the situation of the division of the people between the loyal servants and the disobedient is spoken of. Isa 65:6-8 relates that God will purify the people by destroying sinners and saving his servants. In Isa 66:15, in particular, the threat of annihilating the sinners by fire, which is a typical theme of Isa 1-39 (see above), appears. Thus, in the last part of the book, God's purifying is described as still being operative. Thus, the holy remnant is yet to emerge. The people are in the process of forming it.

As seen above, God's purifying operation usually refers to the attack by foreign nations such as Assyria and Babylonia or the predicament caused by such an attack like the Babylonian exile. Thus, God uses the foreign enemies as a means of purging the people of Israel to form the holy remnant.

The relevance of the remnant motif to the meaning and the function of Isa 6:9-10 in the entire context of the book of Isaiah is now examined. In the examination the motif of

---

salvific theme of Isa 33 has been fulfilled in the ideological-historical event of the miraculous salvation of Jerusalem from the Assyrian invasion in Isa 36-37. On the other layer, Isa 33 provides a paradigm for the future glory of Zion, so that Isa 40-66 reveals the eschatological dimension of Isa 33. To be precise, "Isa 40-55 proclaims the time of fulfillment of Isa 33, while Isa 56-66 renews the theme of longing for salvation which is so central in Isaiah 33". About the function of Isa 33, see Laato 1998:110-116.

[25] About this concentration, see the beginning of subsection 2.1.2.
[26] See Blenkinsopp 2006:230-231; Laato 1997:84. According to Lsato, also Isa 52:13-53:12 interprets the exile as a great event of atonement where the sins of the people were forgiven and the new future is guaranteed. See Laato 1998:176, 179, 186

God's purification which is closely connected with the remnant motif is taken into account.

Firstly, Isa 6:9-13, which contains both the idea of divine hardening and remnant motif is investigated. When the prophet Isaiah is assigned by God to make the sinful people obdurate, he asks God how long they must be put in the hardened condition (Isa 6:11). God's answer was: until the holy remnant emerges after a series of devastation and destruction of the nation (Isa 6:11-13). This remnant is acceptable to God, because he calls it "holy" (Isa 6:13). It is clear from the whole context that the remnant is an entity liberated from hardening. In this way, the sinful people will deliberately be put under the hardened condition in order that such a holy remnant may emerge in the end. The reason why God starts to create the remnant is the sinful condition of Israel (Isa 6:5; c.f., 6:7); that is, they are already in a virtually obdurate condition. In this sense, the obduracy as a cause justifies God's intention to create a holy remnant. Still, the question arises: Why does God harden the heart of the people which is already in an obdurate condition? Why is divine hardening necessary? It is clear that by the divine hardening, the obdurate condition of the people becomes something purposed by God. The mere, innate condition of the people might be insufficient to set the process of forming a holy remnant in motion, but with a divine purpose as igniter or catalyst, the process could be started. Thus, the divine hardening effects the formation of a holy remnant. There is a functional relation between the divine hardening and the formation of a holy remnant. When God sets to hardening, he anticipates the emergence of a holy remnant; so, when the remnant emerges, it means the end of hardening.[27] In this way, Isa 6:9-13 indicates that the two motifs of hardening and remnant are functionally connected. Each motif does not stand alone. Rather, one aspect of the hardening motif, i.e., the commencement of divine hardening, is connected with the process of formation of a holy remnant, while the other aspect, i.e., the annulment of hardening, is related to the emergence of the remnant. Correspondingly, the functional connectedness between the two motifs has two aspects: firstly, that God sets to hardening with a view to forming a holy remnant through the

---

[27] That the divine hardening presupposes the formation of a holy remnant is expressed by Laato in a more general term, that is, the idea of divine hardening "justifies the remnant theology". See Laato 1998:96.

purifying operation; and secondly, that as a result of the purification, a holy remnant liberated from hardening emerges.

Actually, this functional connectedness between the two motifs concerns the whole book of Isaiah, as is now explained.

"The remnant" of Isa 37:4, 31-32 which remains in Jerusalem in the time of the Assyrian invasion emerges as the realization of the holy remnant of Isa 6:13. As Laato points out, most of the remnant terminologies of the first part of the book (Isa 4:2, 3; 7:22; 10:20, 21, 22; 17:6; 28:5; 30:17) are linguistically and thematically related to that of Isa 37:4, 31-32,[28] so that the prophecies of a blessed remnant in that part of the book are crystallized in this historical remnant. If so, the humility which king Hezekiah shows before God and the prophet in Isa 37 can be considered as the evidence that the time of hardening has ended and thus God's purification through the Assyrian invasion is now fulfilled. In this way, the cycle of two aspects of the functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant, started by God's command to the prophet at the time of the death of king Uzziah, comes to an end with the emergence of the remnant in Jerusalem at the time of king Hezekiah in the Assyrian crisis.

However, this completion of the cycle turns out to be incomplete. Isa 39 which foretells the future Babylonian exile indicates that the miraculous salvation of Jerusalem from the Assyrian army does not mean the final salvation.[29] Another cycle of the two aspects of the functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant emerges to supersede the first cycle which concerns only the first part of the book (Isa 1-39), and this second cycle may concern the whole book. As seen above, in the beginning of the latter part of the book, i.e., Isa 40:1-11, the remnant of the people who suffer the exile emerges as a holy remnant by means of God's purification in the exile. Moreover, Isa 40-55 proclaims the liberation of the remnant from hardening. God promises to do it

---

[28] Laato 1998:77-78.

[29] Against the scholarly view that Isa 1 speaks of the catastrophic situation of Judah under king Ahaz, Laato argues that the chapter describes the situation of Judah in the time soon after the reign of Hezekiah, i.e., the situation under king Manasseh, which is mentioned in 2 Kgs 21. According to Laato, this explains why the remnant terminology of Isa 1:8-9 (שָׂרִיד) diverges from that of the other parts of the book. Although it refers to the same remnant which emerges in the time of the Assyrian invasion, it is no longer regarded as something blessed by God as in the other parts. In Isa 1:21-28, as seen above, God declares his purifying against the sinful remnant of Israel. Therefore, in Isa 1:8-9, the remnant terminologies such as שְׁאָר, שְׁאֵרִית, פְּלֵיטָה of the other parts of the book are avoided, because they denote a remnant positively. See Laato 1998:79-85; about the scholarly view on Isa 1 see Blenkinsopp 2006:37.

himself (Isa 42:13-18) and also through his servant (42:1-7) who himself become liberated from hardening by God (50:4-5). In Isa 40-55 the liberation from hardening is not proclaimed as having been realized but rather to be *at hand*.[30] Still, it is clear that the functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant in Isa 40-55 concentrates on the aspect that as a result of God's purification, a holy remnant liberated from hardening emerges. In the last part of the book, Isa 56-66, however, the emergence of the holy remnant liberated from hardening is no longer something at hand as in Isa 40-55. The people are in an obdurate condition (Isa 56:10; 59:10) and this obdurate condition is also found to be a divine hardening (63:17). The people are also in the process of God's purification by means of which the loyal servants will be saved, but the disobedient will be annihilated (see above). The functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant now turns to the aspect that God sets to hardening with a view to forming a holy remnant through his purifying operation. Thus, from the point of view of the whole book, this second cycle of the functional connectedness has not yet come to an end; the people are in the midst of it. Such being the case, all the promises of God concerning salvation and the emergence of a holy remnant, which are proclaimed not only in Isa 40-55 but also in 1-39, could have been reset to concern the future time beyond their original contexts where those promises were proclaimed to concern the salvation from the Assyrian invasion or the salvation relating to the return from the Babylonian exile.[31] If so, from the point of view of the whole book, the hardening task God assigned to the prophet at the time of the death of king Uzziah in Isa 6:9-10 is still valid, primarily in the sense that the present obdurate condition of the people as divine hardening dates back to the time of the prophet, but also in the sense that the event of the assignment of the hardening task to a prophet figure can be actual, if such a figure emerges.

The meaning and the function of Isa 6:9-10 in the entire context of the book of Isaiah have been examined. It has been shown that in the entire context, the two major motifs of the book, hardening and remnant, are functionally connected to each other.

---

[30] See Laato's summing up of the dialectical structure of Isa 40-66 in 2.1.1.
[31] Laato also points out that the motif of "the day of the Lord" of, e.g., Isa 2:6-22, was understood in the eschatological and apocalyptic categories during the postexilic period, as the book of Joel shows. See Laato 1998:20; also 2002:240-242.

Because the motif of hardening has two aspects in the book of Isaiah, i.e., the commencement of divine hardening and the annulment of it at the time of salvation, the functional connectedness between the two motifs has two corresponding aspects, that is, one aspect is that God sets to hardening with a view to forming a holy remnant through his purifying operation; and the other is that as a result of the purifying operation, a holy remnant liberated from hardening emerges. This functional connectedness is expressed in Isa 6:9-13 in a condensed way. As seen above, the time from the death of king Uzziah to the miraculous salvation of Jerusalem under king Hezekiah undergoes both aspects of the functional connectedness. The cycle of the two aspects is not, however, completed in that historical time. Another cycle begins to concern the whole book of Isaiah.[32] Because of the expanded validity of the cycle, the functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant can be referred to as "the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant". When the meaning and the function of Isa 6:9-10 in the entire context of the book is spoken of, they should be understood from the point of view of this Isaianic idea.

2.1.3. Additional remarks on the Isaianic idea

In this subsection, two problems concerning the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant are discussed. The problems arise from the fact that God's promises of salvation, among others, the formation of a holy remnant liberated from hardening, concern the future time from the point of view of the whole book. The first problem is: Who are hardened?; the second: When will the hardening be annulled and the holy remnant emerge?

With regard to the first problem (i.e., the object of hardening), the last part of the book, Isa 56-66, discloses the divided situation of the people into the loyal servants and the disobedient (e.g., Isa 57:14-21; 59:1-21; 65:8-25; 66:10-17). On account of this division, the task of the loyal servant of Isa 40-55 continues in the last part of the book through the hands of those servants. As Laato points out, the contraposition of the loyal

---

[32] This view of the two-cycled functional connectedness between the two motifs is near to Laato's view that the idea of divine hardening functions in *two dimensions*. However, his view focuses on only the one motif of the functional connectedness, i.e., the motif of hardening, not the both motifs of hardening and remnant. See Laato 1998:101-102.

servants ("we") and the disobedient ("you") in Isa 59 "demonstrates the formers' attempt to persuade the latter to share in the program of salvation which belongs to the whole people."[33] However, the prospect for the mission of the loyal servants of Isa 56-66 does not sound as promising as in Isa 40-55, because in this part of the book, the salvation is not depicted as an unconditional matter as in the preceding part (Isa 40-55).[34]

Even though the loyal servants have a burning heart of the mission to the disobedient, at the same time they confess that they share the hardened condition with them. In Isa 59:10 they say: "*We* grope like the blind along a wall, groping like those who have no eyes; *we* stumble at noon in the twilight (…; emphasis mine)". In Isa 63:17a they ask God: "Lord, why do you let *us* wander from your ways and harden *our* heart, so that *we* may not fear you (emphasis mine)?" By the use of the first person plural, the loyal servants obviously mean the whole people, both the loyal themselves and the disobedient, as if they were a part of the hardened whole. This is at odds with the view that the loyal servants should be those who are in a different position with respect to the hardened condition of the people. Are they not liberated from hardening, because they perform the mission to the disobedient? Why do they count themselves among those who are hardened by God? Räisänen argues that the verse as a part of the *exilic* lamentation psalm expresses a confession of sins on behalf of the people.[35] The question here is what meaning the passage has in the *postexilic* context, where the formation of the whole book was completed. Laato considers that in the context of the community lament of Isa 63:7-64:11 which speaks of the distress of Jerusalem in the *postexilic* period, Isa 63:17a means that "Yhwh is entreated to help his people that are incapable of turning to the right way".[36] Whether it is the confession of sins or the entreaty to God, however, it is not clear under what spiritual condition the loyal servants themselves are. Are they also made

---

[33] Laato 1998:202.

[34] About the conditional and unconditional nature of salvation in Isa 40-55 and 56-66, see Laato 1998:172-174, 185-200, 200-208. Laato argues that Isa 53, i.e., the chapter about the vicarious suffering of the loyal servant, has an important message for a reader of the book contemporary with the final redactor of it in the postexilic period, that is, "they (the readers contemporary with the final redactor; my addition) too should be ready to suffer for the sake of Yhwh while they await the salvation of Zion. Such a theme is presented in Isa 65-66". See Laato 1998:198.

[35] Räisänen 1972:64-65.

[36] Laato 1998:53-55, 82, 205.

hardened in the same way as the disobedient or are they really liberated from hardening but appear on the same footing as the disobedient in a rhetorical way?

I do not think that it concerns rhetoric here. When the author of the Damascus Document (CD) wrote in the second century BCE the first admonition, he describes his sectarian group, closely connected to Qumran, as having being in an obdurate condition for "over 20 years" from the birth of the group to the arrival of the "Teacher of Righteousness". According to the author, during that period, the members of the group, knowing their iniquity and guiltiness, "were like blind persons and groping for path (CD I 8-9; cf., Isa 59:10)". Their consciousness of sin and blindness does not mean, however, that they spent a life of transgression, but rather that they were heartily penitent, because they sought God "with an undivided heart"; therefore, God "appraises their deeds (CD I 10)", so that he sent them the "Teacher of Righteousness" in order to direct them in the path of his heart (I 11)". For the group, thus, the liberation from obduracy, starting outwardly from the arrival of the "Teacher of Righteousness", had started virtually from the entrance into such a penitent life which presupposes the consciousness of sin.[37]

A similar consciousness of sin is found in the last part of the book of Isaiah. The passage of Isa 63:7-64:11, of which the verse about divine hardening is part (63:17; see above), reveals a collective sense of sinfulness on the part of the loyal servants: "You became angry and *we* sinned (64:4)"; "*All of us* became something unclean (64:5); "You have hid your face from *us* (64:6)" (emphasis mine). Even though the loyal servants distinguish themselves as penitent and thus righteous from the disobedient who do not share penitence, their own sinfulness is real before the eyes of God. It is also possible to imagine that if the realization of God's promises of salvation is hindered because of the disobedient part of the people, the loyal servants' consciousness of sin and hardening could also be sharpened, because the situation of non-realization concerns them equally. Therefore, they cannot help doing their mission to the disobedient in order to get rid of hindrances to the realization of God's promises. In this way, before the salvation is realized and the holy remnant liberated from hardening finally emerges, it is no surprise that the spiritual condition of the loyal servants is characterized by themselves with an

---

[37] The Isaianic influence on the Damascus Document is discussed in detail in 3.3.2.

ambivalent mixture of sinfulness/hardening and righteousness, even though they are the harbingers of the holy remnant in the present time.

The second problem (i.e., the time when the hardening will be annulled and the holy remnant will emerge) is now investigated. From the point of view of the whole book of Isaiah a cataclysmic event is anticipated through which the disobedient will be annihilated and the holy remnant will emerge. It is true that solely within Isa 1-39 and 40-55 the Assyrian invasion and the Babylonian exile represent such an event respectively, although those events did not bring about the final salvation. However, the idea of annihilating sinners by fire, a typical theme in the first part of the book, also appears in the last part (Isa 66:15). Therefore, from the point of view of the whole book the prophecies concerning the Assyrian invasion and the Babylonian exile could have been reset, so that a similar foreign attack against Israel which has a purifying function will happen before the day of salvation.[38]

On the other hand, Isa 65:17ff and 66:22 state that God creates new heavens and a new earth, so it is also possible that the cataclysmic event is of an other-worldly, history-terminating and apocalyptic nature.[39] Moreover, the distinction between the loyal servants and the disobedient does not concern only the people of Israel but also the Gentiles. There are indeed numerous passages in the book of Isaiah which treat the other nations positively, so that, in the future, they will come to Zion to worship God and to learn his Torah (e.g., Isa 2:2-4; 11:10-16; 14:2; 25:6-7; 45:14-25; 49:22-23; 51:4-8; 56:6-7; 66:18-20).[40] But this Isaianic universalism does not mean that all the Gentles as such are acceptable to God. The enemies of Israel are judged to annihilation as is the case with Assyria and Babylonia. In Isa 63:1-6, which proclaims the judgment against the nations, Edom is mentioned as an example of the sufferer of the coming catastrophe over all nations which will not obey God. Laato argues that the very end of the book, Isa 66:24, describes the annihilation of rebellious nations by using the "Assyrian invasion" as paradigm in the following way: "The dead bodies of the wicked foreigners which the

---

[38] Based on the Qumran interpretation of Isaiah such as 4Q161 (4QpIsaᵃ) and 4Q285 (4QSM), Laato points out that the prophecies concerning the wars between Israel and the enemy nations in the past time were interpreted at Qumran as eschatological events. See Laato 1998:18-21, 41.
[39] Nickelsburg points out the apocalyptic nature of Isa 56-66. See Nickelsburg 1981:13-15.
[40] About the universalism in the book of Isaiah, see Laato 1998:152-156. There are also passages which speak of the universal nature of the servant's mission, e.g., Isa 42:6; 49:6; 52:13-53:12.

righteous will see are like the bodies of the Assyrian soldiers which the righteous remnant of Zion saw when the angel of Yhwh smote the soldiers".[41] The day of salvation will be preceded by an other-worldly, history-terminating and apocalyptic event in which the disobedient people both inside and outside Israel will have been annihilated; then, the holy remnant which is liberated from hardening will emerge and be joined by the loyal Gentiles.

2.2. The Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant and the OT

Before the next chapter, where the question of whether or how the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant was operative in Second Temple Judaism is examined, whether a similar idea can be found in other OT books is first investigated. It is well- known that many OT books contain hardening and remnant motifs, but the question is whether a similar functional connectedness between the two motifs can be found. The book of Daniel is excluded from this examination, because owing to its later time of origin, the book is a subject matter as one of the Jewish writings composed under the influence of the whole book of Isaiah, and thus is dealt with in chapter three. The examination in this section is a *comparison* between the book of Isaiah and those OT books whose composition could not have been influenced by the whole book of Isaiah. First, the hardening/obduracy motif of the other OT books is examined, and then the remnant motif and its relation with the hardening/obduracy motif.

2.2.1. Hardening/obduracy motif in the OT

F. Hesse categorizes the OT passages which concern hardening/obduracy motif into two groups: (i) the passages which speak of obduracy as a mere human condition and (ii) as a divinely inflicted one, i.e., divine hardening. Each group is further divided into three

---

[41] Laato 1998.166, 207.

categories, depending upon whom the hardened or obdurate condition concerns: (i) non-Israelite, (ii) individual Israelite and (iii) the whole nation of Israel.[42] For the purpose of this section, relevant passages are those which concern the divine hardening which is directed to the whole people of Israel.

Generally speaking, no other OT books contain a text which expresses the idea of divine hardening against the people of Israel as explicitly as the book of Isaiah. Still, there are some interesting passages, Jer 5:21, 23; Ezek 12:2-3a; Zech 7:11-12a, which resemble Isa 6:9-10 in that these passages mention three obdurate faculties of the people: the heart, eye and ear. However, as scholars usually point out, they do not refer to divine hardening but an obdurate condition of the people.[43] In spite of the resemblance, these passages have nothing to do with the idea of divine hardening.[44]

Among the possible cases concerning divine hardening, the most relevant is Deut 29:3. The verse exists in the passage which speaks of the covenant that God commanded

---

[42] Hesse 1955:25-27. Räisänen focuses on the passages concerning divine hardening and divides them into three groups in the same way as Hesse. See Räisänen 1972:47-52.

Even though the two scholars deal with the same subject matter, there are differences in their points of view and methods. While Hesse starts from the semantic problem concerning the obduracy/hardening motif, Räisänen treats the motif as a part of a larger problem, i.e., the problem of how passages that express the notion of God as a causer of *evil in general* emerged in the development of OT traditions. Räisänen's study therefore, does not cover only passages concerning divine hardening properly but also those concerning the incitement to evil by God. In his study, Räisänen tones down remarkably the notion of God as the causer of hardening, which Hesse tends to emphasize by attempting to penetrate into the ideological-religious atmosphere in the text. For example, Räisänen rationalizes that notion in various ways, i.e., (i) by interpreting the passage as concerning human self-obduracy not as divinely inflicted obduracy (e.g., Ex 7:14, 9:7; 8:11, 28; 9:34); (ii) by explaining divine hardening as due to the redactor's motif with monotheistic emphasis (e.g., Ex 7:3, 13, 22; 8:15; 9:12, 11:10; 14:8, 7, 17); (iii) by emphasizing human responsibility as an actual causer of divine hardening, in other words, by explaining divine hardening as God's punishment (e.g., Isa 6:9-10); (iii) by setting free a passage from the alleged motif of divine hardening (e.g., Deut 29:3; Isa 63:17; Job 17:4; 39:17). See Räisänen 1972:45, 55-56, 58-63, 63-65.

If Räisänen 'objectifies' history, Hesse 'de-objectifies' it. The latter opposes the psychological and demythologizing interpretation of hardening/obduracy as "obsession (Zwangszustand)". See Hesse 1955:29

[43] E.g., Hesse 1955:60-62; Räisänen 1972:63: Evans 1989:48-50.

Jer 5:21, 23 reads (NRSV): "(v. 21) Hear this, O foolish and senseless people, who have eyes, but do not see, who have ears, but do not hear"; "(v. 23) But this people has a stubborn and rebellious heart; they have turned aside and gone away".

Ezek 12:2-3a reads (NRSV): "Mortal, you are living in the midst of a rebellious house, who have eyes to see but do not see, who have ears to hear but do not hear; for they are a rebellious house".

Zech 7:11-12a reads (NRSV): "But they refused to listen, and turned a stubborn shoulder, and stopped their ears in order not to hear. They made their hearts adamant in order not to hear the law and the words that the LORD of hosts had sent by his spirit through the former prophets".

[44] Hesse takes up "the spirit of whoredom" of Hos 4:12; 5:4 which brings about an obdurate condition to the people, but acknowledges that there is no proof that God is the sender of it. He considers also whether Amos 4:6ff indicate an idea which is related to divine hardening, when God punishes the people so that their sinfulness might only be renewed. However, he does not argue it but ends up suggesting it. See Hesse 1955:56-59.

Moses to make with the people in the land of Moab in addition to the preceding covenant at Horeb. In this passage Moses reminds the people of all the wonders God had done for them after their departure from Egypt until "this day", i.e., the day of the covenant at Moab (Deut 29:1-2, 4-7), and exhorts them to keep the words of the covenant so that they may prosper in everything that they do (Deut 29:8). In vv. 1-2 it is emphasized that the people saw those wonders with their eyes. However, the following verse (Deut 29:3) says:

> But to this day the LORD has not given you a mind (lit. 'heart') to understand, or eyes to see, or ears to hear. (Deut 29:4 in NRSV)

Hesse argues that the author of Deut 29 did not content himself with stating Israel's self-obduracy, so he ascribed the cause of obduracy to God.[45] According to Hesse, this is clear from the expression of Deut 29:3 which relates that God is the giver of the heart to understand, the eyes to see and the ears to hear. If he does not give them, the people cannot understand, see or hear, so they are obdurate. Hesse considers, therefore, that the verse is dependent on Isa 6:9-10. But if Deut 29:3 concerns divine hardening, how is it possible to explain the tension between this verse and the following verses (Deut 29:4-7) which speak of God's more wonders (continuing from vv. 1-2) through which Israel *must know* their God? Hesse argues that the exilic or postexilic author of Deut 29:3,[46] influenced by Isa 6:9-10, purposefully introduced a contradiction like this: i.e., God makes the people obdurate, so they lack the knowledge of him (v. 3), whereas he guides them in the way that the knowledge is offered to them (v. 4f).[47] Also Evans regards Deut 29:3 as concerning divine hardening and thus as related to Isa 6:9-10 but from a different standpoint from Hesse. Evans argues that the verse should be understood in the seventh-century BCE context, so that it is a commentary on Israel's troubles at that time.[48] Still, in a similar way to Hesse, he argues that the deprivation of the receptive heart (Deut 29:3) and the production of an hardened heart (Isa 6:9-10) are two sides of the same coin, that

---

[45] Hesse 1955:73-74.
[46] Hesse argues that Deut 29:3 is of a postexilic origin, while he says in another place that Deut 29 is an exilic chapter. See Hesse 1955:61, 73.
[47] Hesse 1955:74.
[48] Thus, Evans considers Deut 29:3 is of a pre-exilic origin. See Evans 1989:50-51.

is, "in either way of expressing this concept, the Lord is regarded as the ultimate agent or cause, either of receptivity or obduracy".[49] Evans does not, however, touch upon the problem of the tension between Deut 29:3 and the following verses.

Räisänen denies that Deut 29:3 concerns divine hardening. He opposes, therefore, Hesse's solution of the problem of the tension between Deut 29:3 and the following verses. To him, Hesse reads too much into the text. According to Räisänen's solution, Deut 29:3, which in his opinion is of a postexilic origin, should be interpreted in light of the following verses, so that the lack of understanding is due to Israel itself. If so, Deut 29:3 in the present context suggests that "man can in fact reach no real knowledge without divine aid; that is, what is emphasized is the divine grace".[50] Thus, Deut 29:3 concerns divine grace rather than divine hardening.

G. von Rad's interpretation of Deut 29:3 seems to be similar to Räisänen's. He pays attention to the fact that the notion "today" is emphasized in the whole passage about making a convent at Moab (Deut 28:68-29:14).[51] The passage, thus, brings out the contrast between "today" (i.e., the day of the entrance into the covenant) and the past time before that covenant. Deut 29:3 indicates, therefore, the coexistence of two ideas: the one that "Israel could not yet at all grasp then what was troubling it"; the other, "all this is only now becoming intelligible to the present age".[52] How then is "becoming intelligible" possible? Von Rad says nothing about such a "divine grace" that God "today" makes all things intelligible by giving the people the heart to understand etc. Still, in his interpretation, the day of covenant implies a radical change of Israelites' spiritual insight, which is from God.[53]

P.D. Miller argues more definitely that Deut 29:3 means that God *"today" gives* such a renewed insight to the people: "Only in this cultic act (i.e., the entrance into covenant; my addition) does the Lord give the grace truly to see, to hear, and to

---

[49] Evans 1989:50-51.
[50] Räisänen 1972:63-64.
[51] The word "today (הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה ,הַיּוֹם)" is repeated six times in the passage in v. 3, 9, 11, 12, 14 (twice).
[52] Von Rad 1966:179.
[53] Von Rad 1966:178-179. Von Rad also argues that the gap here between "today" and the past can be bridged with the help of the apocalyptic idea that "not until the hour of a great crisis do the old traditions reveal themselves to the understanding" as well as "the contemporary quality of the old be demonstrated". Does he mean that in the present context Deut 29:3 originated in the postexilic period when the apocalyptic idea emerged in Judaism? His argument remains unclear in this regard. See von Rad 1966:179.

comprehend and acknowledge".[54] Moreover, against the exilic or postexilic background of the whole passage about the covenant at Moab (Deut 29), Miller considers that by means of Deut 29:3, the whole passage reflects the people's history of frequent failures which led to the loss of the land and exile. Based on such a contextualization of the text, he interprets Deut 29:3 as God *now intending to give* the spiritual insight to the people who *up to this day* had failed in comprehension.[55] Therefore, Deut 29:3 is related to the prophetic passages about God's promise of giving Israel a new heart in, e.g., Jer 24:6-7 and Ezek 11:19-20; 36:26-28.[56] Although he is not sure which is dependent on which, Deut 29:3 or these prophetic passages, the relationship between them is certain in any case. Moreover, Miller argues that the covenant at Moab in Deut 29 "*anticipates or reflects* the new covenant that the prophets announce out of the experience of exile and punishment by God for failure to live according to the divine purpose".[57]

On the basis of the discussion above, it can be summarized that outside the book of Isaiah, there is no text in the Old Testament which explicitly and positively expresses the idea of divine hardening against the people of Israel.[58] In the Old Testament, the motif of obduracy with respect to the nation of Israel predominantly concerns a mere *condition* of the people, not a divine hardening.[59] Deut 29:3 is a borderline case. Does this verse put

---

[54] Miller 1990:206. Miller's argument is based on N. Lohfink's, according to which Deut "29, 3-5 spiegelt eine Theorie des Vortrags der Heilsgeschichte: zuerst wurde die Geschichte in ihrer reinen Faktizität erlebt, und erst jetzt, beim (kultischen) Vortrag, gibt Jahwe die Gnade, wirklich zu segen, zu hören und zu begreifen, was eigentlich geschah". See Lohfink 1963:128 (note 5).

[55] Miller 1990:206.

[56] To support the relationship between Deut 29:3 and these passages in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, Miller points out that the latter passages use the same covenantal formulary as Deut 29: "they shall be my people and I will be their God". Therefore, according to him, these prophetic passages also imply a new and renewed covenant. See Miller 1990:206-207.

[57] Miller 1990:208 (emphasis mine). Therefore, according to Miller, Deut 30:6 about God's promise of the circumcision of heart is related to Deut 29:3. See Miller 1990:207-208.

[58] Evans puts forth the same conclusion, even though he argues that Deut 29:3 concerns divine hardening (see above). For him, thus, Isa 6:9-10 expresses "explicitly" this idea but Deut 29:3 not so. See Evans 1989:52.

[59] Three more candidate passages, Lev 26:16; Deut 28:28 and 28:65 can be investigated. Hesse, Räisänen and Evans do not touch upon them (except Deut 28:28 by Evans). Lev 26:16 and Deut 28:65 mention the "wearing out of eyes" which God causes to affect the people as a judgment (מְכַלּוֹת עֵינַיִם in Lev 26:16; עֵינַיִם כָּלְיוֹן in Deut 28:65). J. Milgrom, von Rad and S.R. Priver consider that the phrase refers to a concrete disease or some psychologically negative condition due to the failure of foresight or uneasiness of terror. With regard to Deut 28:28 which mentions the "madness, blindness and confusion of heart (בְּשִׁגָּעוֹן וּבְעִוָּרוֹן וּבְתִמְהוֹן לֵבָב)" with which God smites the people, von Rad and A.D.H. Mayes regards the phrase as referring to a concrete disease and physical afflictions. Thus, the passages have nothing to do with the idea of divine hardening. It seems that Evans more or less reckons Deut 28:28 to be the text of that idea;

forth the idea of divine hardening or state to the contrary that God "today" (i.e., in connection with the renewed covenant) will give his people what he has not given them so far? Even though Evans' thesis of "two sides of the same coin (see above)" is taken, it should be noted that the idea of divine hardening of Deut 29:3 refers to the state of affairs *so far*, while the idea of Isa 6:9-10 refers to God's decision to bring about a new state of affairs, and thus, the divine hardening is very dynamic in the Isaianic idea. Judging from these, Deut 29:3 may not be as strong a case as Isa 6:9-10. The problem of Deut 29:3 is dealt with in connection with the remnant motif in the following sub-section (2.2.2). The discussion on the relationship between the two motifs of obduracy/hardening and remnant will shed a new light on the problem.

It is true that there are numerous passages in the other OT books which speak of the obdurate condition of Israel.[60] In this sense, they contain obduracy motif itself. However, for the purpose of searching the other OT books for the functional connectedness of the Isaianic type, obduracy motif in the sense of a mere condition of the people is not relevant, because in the Isaianic connectedness, divine hardening is the important factor in God's purifying operation to form a holy remnant. When a passage containing obduracy motif is examined, the hardening motif of the Isaianic type which consists of two aspects, i.e., the commencement of divine hardening and the annulment of it in the day of salvation, as has been discussed, is taken into consideration.[61]

Although the idea of divine hardening directed to the people of Israel is a rare phenomenon in the OT, it should also be examined whether there are passages which concern another aspect of the Isaianic hardening motif, i.e., the annulment of hardening/obduracy in the salvation time. Evans treats the OT passages containing this aspect under the title "restoration texts".[62] Although he discusses the function of Isa 6:9-10 only in the context of Isa 1-39 and not the entire context of the book of Isaiah, it is suitable for the purpose of this section to inquire into his "restoration texts" as a clue to

---

however, he does not argue it. Rather he excludes it from his conclusion. See Milgrom 2001:2306; von Rad 1966:175, 176; Mayes 1981:355; Priver 1902:314; Evans 1989:47, 50.

[60] About the passages concerning the obdurate condition of Israel, see Hesse 1955:35-37; also 38-40.

[61] See discussion in 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.

[62] By "restoration" Evans means "restoration of spiritual sensitivity and discernment" not a physical movement like the return from the exile or the rebuilding of the city and temple. See Evans 1989:51.

the OT passages concerning the annulment of hardening/obduracy.[63] These are as follows: Deut 30:6 (God's promise to circumcise the heart of the people); Jer 24:7 (his promise to give the people the heart to know that he is the Lord); 31:33-34 (his promise to put his law into the heart of the people); 32:38-40 (his promise to give the people the heart to fear him); Ezek 11:19-20; 36:26-27 (his promise to remove the heart of stone from the people and to give them a heart of flesh).[64] Deut 30:11-14 (God's promise that "the word [i.e., God's commandment]" will be so near to the people that it is in their mouth and heart) can also be added, because in view of the whole context including Deut 30:6 the idea of the passage is near to Jer 31:33-34 (see above).[65]

In addition to these passages, also of note are those which are *possibly* related to the annulment of hardening/obduracy, i.e., the passages which speak of the pouring out of God's spirit. In the book of Isaiah, this event is mentioned in the same context as the annulment of hardening, so that they are parallel phenomena. For example, after Isa 32:3 mentions the annulment of hardening on the day of salvation, Isa 32:14-15 relates that the devastation of Israelites' land lasts until the pouring out of God's spirit on them, that is to say, the day of such pouring is the end of devastation which is the day of salvation.[66] In Isa 42:1 and 61:1, God pours his spirit out on the servant and also promises the same to the descendents of his servant Jacob (44:2-3) and to all the righteous who share in God's covenant (59:21). In the last part of the book, Isa 56-66, these descendents and righteous

---

[63] It is true that Evans deals with the idea of divine hardening of Isa 6:9-10 in connection with the remnant motif of Isa 6:13, so that the function of the idea is understood as the creation of a holy remnant which is the effect of divine hardening. However, his understanding of the function does not extend beyond the scope of "First Isaiah". Even though he says he intends to "observe in what ways the Isaianic obduracy motif functions in the canonical form of the book of Isaiah", his conclusion is that divine hardening is proclaimed in First Isaiah; then, the people's obdurate condition is confirmed in Second Isaiah. I do not think that he clarifies the function of the idea in the entire context of the book. See Evans 1989:17-52.

[64] Evans 1989:51-52. Ezek 11:19-20 and 36:26-27 also speak of the pouring out of the spirit. Below I touch on the question of whether this motif is related to the annulment of obduracy. Evans also refers to the "restoration texts" within the book of Isaiah: 29:18, 24; 32:3-4; 35:5; 42:7, 16; 49:9; 54:13 (cf. 30:21); 61:1. I am, however, doubtful whether 49:9 and 54:13 refer to the annulment of obduracy. With regard to 61:1, see the discussion below on the pouring out of the spirit.

[65] Ezra 9:8 speaks of God's promise to brighten the eyes of the postexilic community by leaving the community as a remnant. Is this a case of the annulment of obduracy? Scholars seem skeptical. E.g. Williamson says that the brightening of the eyes refers to "the rapid sense of physical revival" as a result of the restoration. Blenkinsopp interprets the phrase as "God cheered us". Myers interprets it in the same line, i.e., as "to revive the spirit". Three scholars refer to the same phrase in 1 Sam 14:27, 29 as a parallel. See Williamson 1985:136; Blenkinsopp 1989:181; Myers 1965:75

[66] Cf. Isa 6:11-13, according to which the devastation lasts until the emergence of a holy remnant, i.e., until the annulment of hardening.

are equivalent to the loyal servants of the divided community. In the discussion on the problem of their self-understanding as sinful and hardened, it has been demonstrated that they are those who are on the way to liberation from hardening.[67] In other OT books the pouring out of God's spirit is mentioned in Ezek 11:19; 36:26-27; 39:29; Joel 3:1 and Zech 12:10. Ezek 11:19; 36:26-27, in particular, mention the phenomenon in the context of the giving of a new heart by God. Because there are several passages in the book of Isaiah and the other OT books in which the pouring out of God's spirit is a parallel phenomenon with the annulment of hardening/obduracy, I take these passages as being possibly related to the annulment of it, even though scholars usually do not pay attention to this parallelism.[68]

As the conclusion of this subsection, it can be said that the book of Isaiah is the only case in which both aspects of the hardening motif, i.e., the commencement of divine hardening and the annulment of it in the salvific time, are present. In other OT books, only one aspect, i.e., the annulment of obduracy, is present. However it should also be noticed that because the latter lack the idea of divine hardening (which is the object of the annulment in the book of Isaiah) the obduracy to be annulled referred to in them may not concern divine hardening but rather the mere condition of the people.

---

[67] See discussion in 2.1.3.

[68] E.g. Blenkinsopp considers the pouring out of God's spirit in Isa 32:15 to refer to the transformation of the natural order; likewise Isa 44:3 refers to the demographic blessing. With regard to Joel 3:1, J.L. Crenshaw says that for Joel, the gift of God has nothing to do with obedience to legal statutes or with moral transformation but with a "direct access to inspiration", so he interprets the pouring out of God's spirit as an "endowment of God's vital force". C.L. Meyers – E.M. Meyers interpret the spirit being poured out by God in Zech 12:10 as a "particular temperament or disposition toward some sort of emotion or behavior". See Blenkinsopp 2000:434; 2002:233; Crenshaw 1995:164-165 Meyers – Meyers 1993:335.

On the other hand, M. Greenberg treats the pouring out of God's spirit of Ezek 36:26-27 as the annulment of obduracy, because it is mentioned in the same context as the endowment of a new heart by God. God "will replace Israel's hopelessly corrupted spirit with his own impulsion to goodness and righteousness" at the same time as he changes their hardened heart into a heart "of flesh". Evans counts some (not all) passages concerning the pouring out of God's spirit (Isa 61:1; Ezek 11:19; 36:26-27) among his "restoration texts" (i.e., the texts which refer to the annulment of hardening/obduracy; see above). It seems that he assumes that the two issues (i.e., the pouring out of God's spirit and the annulment of hardening/obduracy) are related to each other. See Greenberg 1997:730; Evans 1989:46, 49, 51-52.

2.2.2. Connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant in the OT

The remnant motif will now be examined to investigate whether there is a connectedness between the two motifs of obduracy and remnant in the other OT books to be found.

With regard to the passages containing the remnant motif for examination, instead of taking all possible, related OT passages, passages from those OT books which contain obduracy motif have been chosen. These are Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Deuteronomy. As seen above in the previous subsection, each of these has passages containing obduracy motif in the form of the annulment of obduracy, i.e., Jer 24:7; 31:33-34; 32:38-40; Ezek 11:19-20; 36:26-27; Deut 30:6, 11-14. Additional material from those books in which the idea of the annulment of obduracy is *possibly* present in the form of the pouring out of God's spirit is also taken. They are Ezekiel, Joel and Zechariah. As seen in the previous subsection, Ezek 39:29; Joel 3:1; Zech 12:10 are the passages which speak of the pouring out of God's spirit. (As far as Ezek 11:19 and 36:26-27 are concerned, they overlap the above-mentioned passages concerning the annulment of obduracy [i.e., Ezek 11:19-20; 36:26-27].) Such a selective approach to the OT passages about remnant is justified by the purpose of searching into a connectedness between the two motifs of obduracy and remnant.[69]

---

[69] As scholars who deal with remnant motif of the OT, G.F. Hasel and J. Hausmann can be mentioned. Hasel's thesis is that the relevant OT texts about the remnant had already been formed before the Babylonian exile and the later texts which refer to the remnant merely transmit individual aspects of the old notion, so that the postexilic period saw no independent and original notion of remnant. In his study, Hasel really starts from Genesis and ends with the historical prophet Isaiah as the climax in the history of remnant motif. See Hasel 1980.

Criticizing Hasel's thesis, Hausmann sets the problem antithetically to him, so that remnant motif of the OT deals with the problem which concerns the self-portrait ("Selbstverständnis") of the *postexilic* Jewish community. Therefore, to Hausmann the postexilic period is the climax of remnant theology. As the choice of passages here shows, this research's point of view is nearer to Hausmann's than to Hasel's, although I do not agree with her view that all passages that positively speak of remnant are of postexilic or "ausgehende" exilic origin. One problematic case of her analysis is Isa 6:13. She argues that because of the same term "holy seed" in Ezra 9:2, the term of Isa 6:13 refers to the postexilic community which does not consists only of the survivors remaining in the land of Judah but also the returnees from the exile, so that the community is "keinerlei Exklusiv-Formulierungen". On the other hand, as seen in the first chapter (1.3.2.1), Blenkinsopp argues that the term of Ezra 9:2 refers to the subgroup of the returnees which was fully loyal to the Torah and God's word. Even though the problem of the authenticity of Isa 6:13 does not belong to this research, it should be noted that there is no explicit reference to the return from the exile in Isa 6:13, as is the case in Ezra 9:4. The existence of parallel term itself cannot determine which is dependent on which, Isa 6:13 or Ezra 9:2. See Hausmann 1987:160-161; Blenkinsopp 2006:226-230, 64-72.

The passages in Jeremiah are investigated first. Hausmann points out that remnant motif is expressed in both the contexts of judgment and salvation. The passages in the judgment context are 6:9-15; 8:1-3; 15:5-9, 21:1-7; 24:1-10; 40:1-6; 42; 44:7-14, 24-30; those in the salvation context are 23:1-8; 31:2-6; 31:7-9; 50:19f; 51:50.[70] In the former passages, remnant is mentioned negatively; in the latter positively. She ascribes all the positive passages other than Jer 31:2-6 to the redaction which occurred in the final days of the exile or in the earliest days of the postexilic period; "Somit vollziehen auch diese Texte eine theologische Qualifizierung der nachexilischen Gemeinde".[71]

Concerning the relationship between the two motifs of obduracy and remnant, Jer 24:7, which speaks of God's promise to give the people the heart to know that he is the Lord,[72] is located in the passage of Jer 24:1-10 where remnant is mentioned in the negative judgment context. There God talks about "good figs" and "bad figs". The "good figs" denotes exiles. By means of a botanic metaphor ("plant them"; "not uproot them" in 24:6), God promises to bring them back to the land of Judah and restore them there. It is *they* to whom God will give the heart. On the other hand, the "bad figs" refers to "the remnants of Jerusalem who remain in this land (i.e., the land of Judah; my addition) הַזֹּאת שְׁאֵרִית יְרוּשָׁלַ֙ם הַנִּשְׁאָרִים֙ בָּאָ֣רֶץ (24:8)". They are destined for a total destruction. Thus, there are two kinds of remnant: the cursed remainders in Jerusalem who are termed "remnant", and the blessed exiles who are not yet referred to as 'remnant'. To the latter 'remnant' God will give the new heart, i.e., the annulment of obduracy.

The blessed exiles themselves are called "remnant" later in Jer 31. In the beginning, Jer 31:2-6 (which Hausmann considers to originate from the historical prophet,[73]) gives this a positive connotation, although the passage does not mention that they are the exiles or survivors of Judah. But in Jer 31:7-9, God promises to gather the exiles and bring them back to the land of Judah. From this point on they are called "the remnant of Israel (שְׁאֵרִית יִשְׂרָאֵל, v. 7)". Throughout the chapter the return of the exiles and their restoration is proclaimed. A botanic metaphor is used here, too: "I will sow the

---

[70] Hausmann 1987:112-113.
[71] Hausmann 1987:114-115. Hausmann argues that Jer 31:2-6 originates from the historical prophet because the use of שריד indicates the northern kingdom as the addressees of the oracle. See Hausmann 1987:113.
[72] See 2.2.1.
[73] See fn 71.

house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seeds of humans and the seeds of animals" (v. 27). Then, in v. 31 God begins to talk about a new covenant and promises to put the law into the hearts of the people (v. 33).[74] Thus, the exiles emerge as a remnant liberated from obduracy. Jer 32:38-40 is the third passage which mentions the new heart that God will give to the people.[75] Also there, the gathering and returning of the exiles by God (v. 37) is mentioned as well as a new covenant (v. 40) and a botanic metaphor ("I will plant them in this land", v. 41). Although the exiles are not termed "remnant", it is clear from the previous chapter 31 that the exiles are the remnant.

To sum up, it is clear that in three passages of Jeremiah which mention the annulment of obduracy (Jer 24:7; 31:33-34; 32:38-40) God's promise of restoration is directed to the exiles. All of them use a botanic metaphor to describe the restoration, and two of them (Jer 31:31-34; 32:38-40) also mention a new covenant, while all three contain the 'covenant formulary' (i.e., "They shall be my people and I will be their God").[76] By calling the exiles "remnant" in Jer 31:7, the term bears a double meaning in the book of Jeremiah: in the first instance it refers to the cursed remainders in Jerusalem; but in the second, to the blessed exiles who will be liberated from obduracy in connection with their return from exile. It is likely that the concern of the redaction is to change the notion of remnant from the former to the latter meaning. If so, on the redaction level, the idea of the annulment of obduracy is connected with the motif of remnant in this meaning.

What then can be said about the relationship between the two motifs of obduracy and remnant in the book of Ezekiel? Hausmann points out that it is typical of the book to mention remnant in the context of God's declaration of threat and judgement against the people. She argues that the prophet Ezekiel has no proper remnant theology, and that the mentioning of remnant in the book has no function of communicating the hope of the people's existence.[77] However, in the 'annulment' passages of Ezekiel the same interest

---

[74] See 2.2.1.
[75] See 2.2.1.
[76] About the covenantal formulary, see Miller's argument in fn 56.
[77] Hausmann 1987:94-95, 136-137. Hausmann also argues that Ezek 9:8; 11:13, which present the prophet's disparate question to God for the sake of the "remnant", speak of remnant positively, so they originate from the postexilic period. Additionally, according to her, Ezek 39:28, in which God promises to gather the exiles not to leave any *remnant* among the nations, is also a later redactional expansion of the material. See Hausmann 1987:93-95.

as in the corresponding passages of Jeremiah can be observed. In Ezek 11:19-20; 36:26-27, God promises to remove the heart of stone from the people and give them a heart of flesh and also to put his spirit within them ("a new spirit" in 11:19). These promises are mentioned in the context of God's promise to gather the exiles and to return them to the land of Judah (Ezek 11:17-18; 36:24). Moreover, the same 'covenantal formulary' as Jeremiah (see above) is used there (Ezek 11:20; 36:28). It is true that 'the exiles' in these passages are not termed "remnant". Nonetheless, the concern which they express is the same as that of Jeremiah: God will return the exiles to the land of Judah and give them a new heart (and also his spirit) in connection with their return. Therefore, it can be said that in the book of Ezekiel, the idea of the annulment of obduracy is connected with the motif of remnant even if it lacks a proper terminology.[78]

With regard to Deut 30:6 containing God's promise to circumcise the heart of the people and 30:11-14 containing his promise that the word (i.e., God's commandment) will be in their mouth and heart, the same thing as in the case of Ezekiel and Jeremiah can be said. In these passages, those who are given such a circumcised heart are the exiles. God will gather them and bring them back to the land of Judah (vv. 3-5) and give them the circumcised heart (v. 6). Although the exiles are not termed "remnant", the same concern as the passages of Jeremiah and Ezekiel can be found here, too.[79] In this connection, the problem of whether Deut 29:3 concerns divine hardening or the annulment of obduracy can be reviewed. As seen in the previous subsection, Miller argues for the relationship between that verse and those passages of Jeremiah and Ezekiel which mention the new covenant as well as the spiritual and physical restoration of Israel. It is possible that because of the close affinity to Isa 6:9-10, the origin of Deut 29:3 could have been much earlier than the Babylonian exile.[80] Nonetheless, I think that the sentence 'God has not given you the heart to understand to this day', will become intelligible *in*

---

[78] It is interesting to note that Ezek 36:25, 33 mention God's purification of the people from the sin explicitly. Otherwise, in comparison with the passages of Jeremiah, those of Ezekiel seem to emphasize God's initiative relating to the return and restoration more than Jeremiah. In Ezek 36:22 God says: "It is not for your sake, O house of Israel, that I am about to act, but for the sake of my holy name (…) [NRSV]" and he repeats the first half of the same oracle in v. 32. Cf. Jer 31:20.

[79] In comparison with Ezekiel's emphasis of God's initiative in the return and restoration (see fn 78), Deut 30:6 seems to imply the significance of human initiative. Deut 30:2 means that the restoration and gathering of the exiles by God must be preceded by the peoples' returning and obedience to God. Deut 30:10 repeats the same idea.

[80] So, e.g., Evans 1989:50.

the present context of Deuteronomy, if it is understood as a preceding clause which elliptically suggests a consecutive clause like this: 'As a matter of fact, God is about to give it to you, now that you enter a new covenant with him'. Therefore, the verse signifies the annulment of obduracy rather than divine hardening.

Finally, those passages *possibly* related with the idea of the annulment of obduracy in the form of the pouring out of God's spirit are examined. Ezek 11:19-20; 36:26-27 have already been discussed in connection with the passages concerning the annulment of obduracy. The pouring out of God's spirit in these two passages belongs to the context of the giving of a new heart by God. Ezek 39:29 mentions only the pouring out of God's spirit. Still, as its context is familiar to us, it is in connection with the gathering and returning of the exiles that the pouring of his spirit occurs. Therefore, the verse expresses the same concern as the other passages of Ezekiel.[81]

With regard to Joel 3:1f., it should also be noticed that the pouring out of God's spirit takes place in a quite different context than that of Ezekiel which happens in connection with the gathering and returning of the exiles. In Joel it is connected with the emergence of a remnant in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem (v. 5). According to Hausmann, "'Rest' ist hier nicht als Bezeichnung der gegenwärtigen Gemeinde gebraucht (wie z.B. in der Chronik), sondern *eschatologischer* Terminus für die zu erwartende, von JHWH gewährt werdende Idealgröße".[82] The same eschatological point of view also concerns Zech 12:10. Although the phrase "God's spirit" is not used there but rather stated as the spirit which God pours out for a positive change of the people,[83] this pouring is one of the eschatological events "on that day (בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא)" which is repeated in Zech 9-14.[84] In these six chapters of Zechariah, the remnant motif is topical. Hausmann argues that the remnant is an eschatological-apocalyptic entity in the last part of Zechariah: "Der Rest ist bei ihm (= Tritozechariah) die Größe, an die sich die jenseits der Geschicthe zu

---

[81] The difference is that in Ezek 39:29 no covenant or covenantal formulary is mentioned. On the other hand, God's initiative in the restoration is emphasized here, too. See v. 25: "Now I will restore the fortunes of Jacob, and have mercy on the whole house of Israel; and I will be jealous for my holy name (NRSV)". See also fn 78.

[82] Hausmann 1987:65 (emphasis mine).

[83] Therefore, this can be a weaker case of the annulment of obduracy than Joel 3:1. See the scholars' (Meyers – Meyers) view on the spirit of Zech 12:10 in fn 68.

[84] Zech 12:3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11; 13:1, 4; 14:4, 6, 8, 13, 20, 21. Zech 14:1 also mentions: "a day is coming for the Lord (יוֹם־בָּא לַיהוָה)". About the eschatological phrase motif of "the day of the Lord", see fn 31.

erwartenden Heilserweise Gottes binden. Golah wie durchlittenes Exil spielen bei Tritosacharja ebensowenig eine Rolle wie bei Deuterosacharja".[85] Zech 9-14 also describe how the remnant emerges through God's purifying operation: first, two thirds will be cut off and perish and then the remaining third will be put into the fire to be refined (13:8-9). If the pouring out of God's spirit (or the spirit God sends) is related to the annulment of obduracy, the passages of Joel and Zech 9-14 express a similar interest to the proclamation of the whole book of Isaiah which is systematized from the point of view of the last part of the book (Isa 56-66), according to which the holy remnant liberated from hardening will emerge in the eschatological-apocalyptical time.[86]

A conclusion from the results of this subsection can now be drawn. First, as the books of the OT other than Isaiah lack the idea of divine hardening, they do not contain the first aspect of the functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant, i.e., the aspect that God sets to hardening with a view to forming a holy remnant through his purifying operation. Second, with regard to the second aspect of the functional connectedness, i.e., that as a result of the purification a holy remnant liberated from hardening emerges, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Deuteronomy, Joel and Zechariah (9-14) are found to exhibit a similar idea. However, some remarks on their similarity are necessary.

As already stated in the previous subsection, the nature of the obduracy to be annulled may not be the same in these OT books as in the book of Isaiah. While in the latter it is divine hardening from the point of view of its entire context, in the former books it may be the mere obdurate condition of the people. Moreover, the central passages of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Deuteronomy relate that God will return the exiles to the land of Judah and liberate them from obduracy by giving them a new heart. In Jeremiah 'the exiles' is termed "remnant", so that the exiles virtually become the holy remnant liberated from obduracy. Following Hausmann, the notion of the exiles as such a spiritually renewed entity can be considered to belong to the concern of the redaction in the final days of the Babylonian exile or in the earliest days of the postexilic period. If so,

---

[85] Hausmann 1987:55. Hausmann divides Zechariah 9-14 into "Deutero-" and "Trito-"Zechariah. Here I mention them together as Zech 9-14.

[86] However, a difference behind the similarity should be noticed. While Joel has a particularistic point of view towards the Gentiles, Zech 9-14 express universalism of the same kind as the book of Isaiah, so that that part of the Gentiles which turns to God will join the holy remnant of Israel. In this regard Joel stands distant from the interest of Isaiah; Zech 9-14 nearer to it. With regard to the universalism in Zech 9-14 and Joel's particularism, see Hausmann 1987:55, 248-249; 251 respectively.

the 'similarity' does not go so far as to mean that the entity of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Deuteronomy and the Isaianic remnant belong to the same category. From the point of view of the whole book of Isaiah, the holy remnant has nothing to do with the community which is to return or has just returned to the land of Judah, but is an entity which emerges in the apocalyptic-eschatological time.[87]

Another question is how the central passages of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Deuteronomy were interpreted at the time when the formation of the whole book of Isaiah was completed deep in the Second Temple period. B. Halpern-Amaru demonstrates how the author of the book of Jubilees paraphrased Jeremiah, so that the physical and geographical return from the exile is rendered into a "spiritual return". The author read and interpreted Jeremiah from his postexilic point of view: "restoration of a lost purity, not exile and return to the land, is the signature of the imminent eschaton".[88] Although it is not possible to enter into a detailed discussion on the postexilic interpretation of the passages of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Deuteronomy, it is likely that the spiritually renewed entity of these books might have been interpreted as an apocalyptic-eschatological entity, detached from the context of the historical exile and return. It should be noted, however, that to Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Deuteronomy the postexilic interpretation is an 'external' matter, whereas to Isaiah the apocalyptic-eschatological notion of remnant is an 'internal' matter. That is, if someone had attempted to picture the remnant or the returned exiles of these three books with such a postexilic notion of remnant, his attempt should have been made outside the books in the form of rewriting, just as the case of the book of Jubilees shows. In the case of Isaiah such an attempt could have been incorporated in the development of the Isaianic traditions before the completion of the book.[89]

What then can be said about the books of Joel and Zechariah? Does their remnant into which the spirit is poured belong to the same category as the Isaianic remnant? There is good reason for a positive answer to this, because both remnants refer to an

---

[87] Of course, if the point of view of the whole book is ignored and the spiritually renewed entity of Isa 40-55 (called "remnant" in Isa 46:3) is limited solely to this part of the book, this entity and that of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Deuteronomy converge on the same point.

[88] Halpern-Amaru 1997:140-144.

[89] That the interpretative development of Isaiah until the completion of the book is 'internal' to Isaiah and after the completion it is 'external' to it is discussed in the first chapter (1.3.2.1).

apocalyptic-eschatological entity. In this regard they share the same point of view. However, the positive answer should be accompanied by reservations. As mentioned above, the passages about the pouring out of the spirit are treated as *possibly* related to the idea of the annulment of obduracy. Both in Joel and Zechariah, the obduracy terminology to characterize the remnant is lacking. Additionally, in Zechariah, the nature of the spirit as God's is not clear (see above).[90] If the remnant of Joel and Zechariah were explicitly characterized with (the annulment of) obduracy terminology, a more decisive answer could be elicited.[91] All in all, it may be concluded that the functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant is quite unique to the book of Isaiah.

---

[90] See discussion in the previous subsection and also fn 68 and 83.
[91] It should also be noted that Joel, who refers to "God's spirit" explicitly, has a particularistic point of view towards the Gentiles, which is odds with the Isaianic universalism. About the question of particularism and universalism of Joel, Zechariah and Isaiah, see fn 86.

3. The Isaianic idea in Second Temple Judaism

3.1. Introductory remarks

In the previous chapter, it was demonstrated that two motifs of hardening and remnant are connected with each other in the whole book of Isaiah and have an important function in the entire context of the book. Throughout this research this functional connectedness between the two motifs is referred to as "the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant".

The purpose of this chapter is to examine whether the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant was operative in Second Temple Judaism, so that it should be taken into account as a significant aspect of the Jesuanic context to seek for a plausible Jesuanic meaning of the saying in Mark 4:11-12. Analyzing Jewish writings from the Second Temple period is the task of this chapter, as outlined below.

Firstly, Jewish writings are categorised into two groups. The first group consists of early Jewish transcriptions and translations of the book of Isaiah. The second includes writings other than translations and transcriptions from Second Temple Judaism; however, the writings of *Palestinian* origin are the main focus in order to look at the Jesuanic context against its Palestinian background where Jesus lived and worked. This categorization is necessary from the point of view of the question to be discussed. In the analysis of the first group, the central question is: Is the textual form of transcription or translation something which can convey the same idea of hardening and remnant as the one reconstructed on the basis of the MT? If the answer is positive, a reader of the book of Isaiah in Second Temple Judaism had a good possibility that the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant could be conveyed to him through the text available to him. As far as the analysis of the second group of writings is concerned, the central question is: Is the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant operative in those Jewish writings in the way that the Isaianic functional connectedness of two motifs of hardening and remnant can be found in them? While a positive answer to the first question indicates that the Isaianic idea was operative in Second Temple Judaism on a potential level, a positive answer to the second question may disclose that it was operative on a concrete level. The latter case is possible, however, only if such a transcription or translation of Isaiah as could convey

that idea was in circulation. Thus, if it can be demonstrated that the Isaianic idea was operative in Second Temple Judaism on the potential level or on both potential and concrete levels, it would be possible to take it as an important aspect of the Jesuanic context for the saying in Mark 4:11-12.

Secondly, LXX Isaiah is included in the analysis of the first group, although this Greek translation of the book is not of Palestinian origin. The reason for this inclusion is that by comparing three Isaianic texts, MT, LXX and Qumranic, with each other, it is possible to assess to what extent the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant could have been the Jesuanic context for the saying in question. If a MT passage concerning the Isaianic idea agrees with the corresponding Qumran and LXX passage, this suggests that the idea was a common, Second Temple Jewish phenomenon, whether in Palestine or in the Greek world. If a MT passage agrees with the corresponding Qumran passage but against the corresponding LXX passage, the Isaianic idea can be judged to be a Palestinian phenomenon. Otherwise (i.e., in the case that a MT passage diverges from the corresponding Qumran passage, while the corresponding LXX passage is in agreement with either the former or the latter), it can be considered to show that the Isaianic idea, reconstructed on the basis of the MT, might not have monopolized the Jesuanic context for the saying in Mark 4:11-12.

Thirdly, the Aramaic translation of the book of Isaiah, the Isaiah Targum, is not included in the analysis of the first group, although thanks to the similarity to Jesus' citation in Mark 4:12, it can be considered possible that TgIsa 6:9-10 has something to do with the Aramaic tradition of the Isaianic passage in the Second Temple period in Palestine (and therefore, many scholars use the fact of similarity as the argument for the authenticity of Jesus' saying, as demonstrated in the first chapter). The reason for this exclusion is that the Isaiah Targum in the present form is multilayered; therefore, as such, it cannot be used as a material for examining the possibility of the influence of the Isaianic idea in the Second Temple period as in the case of the Qumran and LXX Isaiah. According to B. Chilton, the Isaiah Targum was formed on the basis of two exegetical frameworks, that is, the first Tannaitic version of Isaiah was composed before the Bar Kochba war in 132-135 CE (first framework) and was then complemented with an Amoraic version under the guidance of the Babylonian academies during the fourth

century (second framework).[1] On the other hand, the multilayered nature of tradition is not limited to these two major phases. Chilton points out that different strata are discernable also within the Tannaitic phase, so that some traditions from that phase even indicate their pre-70 CE origin.[2] If so, in principle such earliest traditions are to be sought for in the book, but this would be a far-reaching project, if it were to cover the whole book.[3] Although the whole Isaiah Targum is of no use for the purpose of examining possible influence of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant in the Second Temple Judaism, it is possible to analyze a limited text which is relevant to the present purpose instead. Since Isa 6:9-13 is the nucleus of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, the focus falls on TgIsa 6:9-13 with the question as to whether this Targumic passage expresses the Isaianic idea and has something to do with the Aramaic tradition of the passage in the Second Temple period or not. To answer this question it will be helpful to know in advance the background knowledge for the tradition behind TgIsa 6:9-13, and in particular whether the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant was operative in the

---

[1] About the theory of two exegetical frameworks of the Isaiah Targum, see Chilton 1982, especially his conclusion in pp. 97-102; also Chilton 1987:xx-xxv; 1997:547-562.

[2] For example, Chilton argues that TgIsa 22:15-25 and 28:1-4, i.e., passages which put forth a harsh criticism of the priestly hierarchy, contain a tradition from the Herodian period before the destruction of the Temple. As a matter of fact, his argument is directed against A. van der Kooij according to whom the former passage indicates the inner conflict of the Hasmonean rulers and the consequent Pompey's entering into the Temple in the first century BCE. Still, even in Chilton's exegesis, the tradition of these two passages has a pre-70 CE provenience. As other examples, TgIsa 29:1-3 indicate the successful Roman siege; 65:4, a lamentation of the building of a city by Herod Antipas; 25:2, a threat of building a heathen shrine before the Bar Kochba war. See Chilton 1987:xxiv; 1997:260-261; also his work of 1982 has more detailed discussion on the matter.

Evans argues against Chilton that TgIsa 53:8, i.e., paraphrase of the servant song, is of pre-70 CE origin; whereas Chilton considers the period between the two major wars, i.e., 70-135 CE, more probable. See Evans 1997:278-279.

Moreover, Laato argues that the targumic interpretation of Isa 10-11 as referring to the eschatological battle against the enemies of Israel is reminiscent of the interpretation at Qumran (e.g., 4Q161 and 4Q285). See Laato 1998:41.

[3] Chilton attempts to distinguish the Tannaitic and Amoraic sources in the Isaiah Targum from each other. According to him, "some of the chapters appear in their present orientation to reflect *more* the Tannaitic level of thinking, and some *more* the Amoraic level" (emphasis mine). With this reservation, he reckons chapters 7, 11, 15, 16, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 42, 49, 50, 52, 53, 55, 64, 65, as belonging to the former level and 13, 18, 21, 32, 33, 37, 39, 43, 44, 47, 51, 59 as belonging to the latter level. Moreover, he points out that there are some cases in which "both levels seem to be represented within the final forms of chapters" (10, 11, 34, 48, 54, 57, 58, 60, 63, 66) and that there are even such cases in which "much of the material in the Targum coheres with the general theological orientation of the document, but is not easily assigned to either of the two levels (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 17, 20, 30, 31, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 45, 46, 56, 61, 62). Because of the existence of the latter cases, he regards as more probable such a development line of the Isaiah Targum that "both (Tannaitic and Amoraic) phases were partial affairs, and only formed a coherent whole when they were brought together" rather than that "a complete Targum was produced at the Tannaitic phase, and reworked at the Amoraic phase" (addition mine). See Chilton 1987:xxiii-xxiv.

Second Temple Judaism in Palestine. It is, therefore, appropriate that the analysis of the Targumic passage should be placed after the analysis of the two groups of Jewish writings.[4]

Fourthly, the canonical book of Daniel is included in the analysis of the second group of Jewish writings. The reason for this is that, in contrast to the other canonical books analyzed in the previous chapter, as Blenkinsopp demonstrates, the book is not only chronologically but also thematically dependent on the whole book of Isaiah.[5]

Finally, in the analysis, the Jewish writings from the Second Temple period in Palestine (with the exception of LXX; see above) are the main focus. It is possible that other early Jewish writings originating after that period and outside that geographical area, as well as the later rabbinical literature, can contain such traditions which provide information about the influence of Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant. Those traditions, however, will play no greater role than giving additional evidence to the result of the analysis of the writings selected. Therefore, the exclusion of the other writings is not regarded as risky. Additionally, the examination of the possibility of the influence of the Isaianic idea after the Second Temple period and outside Palestine is of no direct relevance to the purpose of reconstructing the Jesuanic context for the saying in Mark 4:11-12.

---

[4] As far as the Syriac translation of Isaiah, the Isaiah Peshitta, is concerned, scholars have discussed whether the Peshitta version of the Old Testament is dependent on the Hebrew Bible, LXX or Targumim and whether it is of Jewish or Christian origin. Under these circumstances, the analysis of the Isaiah Peshitta will not serve the purpose of this research effectively, so it is excluded from the analysis here. About the problem of the Peshitta, see, e.g., Gelson 1997:563-582; Tov 2001:151-153.

Among the so-called daughter translations, i.e., secondary translations made from the LXX into various languages, Vetus Latina preserves many important Greek readings, although there is influence from the Hebrew Bible. About the "daughter translations" and Vetus Latina, see, e.g., Tov 2001.134, 139.

[5] See Blenkinsopp 2006:14-23. Nickelsburg also places the book of Daniel among its contemporary, non-canonical Jewish writings in his study of the early Jewish literature. See Nickelsburg 1981:19-25, 83-95.

3.2. Early Jewish transcription and translation of the book of Isaiah

3.2.1. Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah

3.2.1.1. Scholarly view on the problem of variant readings

To date twenty two manuscripts of Isaiah have been discovered in the Judean desert: two in Cave 1, eighteen in Cave 4 and one in Cave 5 at Qumran and one at Wadi Murabba'at.[6] For the most part these manuscripts are only random and damaged fragments with the exception of two manuscripts from Cave 1: the first one which preserves all sixty six chapters of Isaiah (1QIsa[a]), "the Great Isaiah Scroll", and the second which preserves, to a lesser extent, texts from 7:22 to 66:24, although often fragmentarily (1QIsa[b]). The manuscripts show a variety of variant readings in comparison with the MT. In the analysis of the Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah, two scholarly consensuses to solve the problem of those variant readings should be borne in mind.

The first consensus is that with respect to the Qumran "biblical" manuscripts, just like the manuscripts of Isaiah, a different approach should be taken from the one in the case of the Qumran "sectarian" writings like pesharim.[7] M. Abegg Jr. – P. Flint – E. Ulrich clarifies the background of this view:

---

[6] Because of the manuscript from Wadi Murabba'at, which is outside the Qumran site, it is more precise to say "manuscripts of Isaiah from the Judean desert". To simplify the matter, however, the term "Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah"is used here.

[7] G.T. Brooke classifies Qumran manuscripts into three groups: 1) those commonly labeled as "sectarian" manuscripts which reflect the life of the community at Qumran and the wider movement of which it was a part; 2) those which contain general Jewish literature of the late Second Temple period; 3) those which consist of "biblical scrolls". As Brooke acknowledges, the term "biblical" may be anachronistic, because the problem of which books belong to the canon might not have been solved so decisively in the Second Temple period. As Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich point out, 1 Enoch, one of the Pseudepigrapha from the point of view of the later standard, was clearly regarded as authoritative by the Qumran covenanters. See Brooke 2006:69; Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich 1999:480.

Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich classify Qumran manuscripts into two groups: biblical and non-biblical. They classify the non-biblical manuscripts further into five sub-groups: 1) rules and regulations; 2) poetic and wisdom texts, 3) reworked or rewritten Scripture; 4) commentaries or pesharim; 5) miscellaneous writings. See Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich 1999:xv.

Brooke regards the biblical manuscripts and the general Jewish literature to be non-"sectarian" for the reason that they were not copied or composed at Qumran but were brought there from outside. However, as shown below, several manuscripts were probably copied by the hands of Qumran covenanters or Essenes,

(…..) many or most of these (biblical; my addition) manuscripts were brought to Qumran from outside and were thus copied elsewhere.[8]

They also discuss the question that arises in the case where copying took place at Qumran, i.e., the question of "whether or not such Qumran scribes modified the text they were copying in order to produce distinctive Qumranic readings of the biblical text". Their answer is clearly negative: "The evidence to date suggests that such alteration did not take place".[9] The view that most of the Qumran biblical manuscripts were copied outside Qumran and even the special readings in them do not reflect sectarian ideology, is also endorsed by other scholars like Brooke and Tov.[10] This view is of great significance to the examination in this chapter, because it means that the biblical texts found in Qumran "thus reflect the textual situation of the Bible not only in Qumran but also elsewhere in ancient Israel".[11]

Here the implications this view has for the study of the Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah, especially 1QIsaᵃ which is the most important Isaiah manuscript from Qumran, may be considered. As G.T. Brooke points out, the earlier studies of this scroll, represented by W.H. Brownlee (one of the first identifiers of the scroll), tended to treat variant readings as reflecting the sect's ideological intervention. But it was not long

---

even though the copying did not necessarily take place at Qumran. If so, are they not also "sectarian"? As shown immediately below, the scholarly consensus is that Qumran covenanters did not reform the Scriptures in accordance with their creeds, so they did not have a Bible of their origin. They copied the Scriptures and other general Jewish literature and brought them to their site, because they thought they were important. At the same time they produced writings of their own origin. A better classification of the Qumran manuscripts, therefore, would be: those obtained with sectarian reverence and those of sectarian origin. Even non-biblical literatures can belong to the first category. Abegg Jr.'s etc classification seems to remain only on a formal level.

Abegg Jr.'s etc. note on the term "sect" and "sectarian" is also worth attention. The term can be loaded with bias from a modern point of view. Even though the term is used in this research for the sake of convenience, what they say should be kept in mind: "But both scholars and laypeople would do well to remember that during the entire Qumran period, the Pharisees and Sadducees were as much 'sect' as the Essenes were!". See Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich 1999:xvi.

[8] Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich 1999:xvi.

[9] As an example, Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich take 4QSamᶜ which was clearly copied by the same scribe who penned the main manuscript of the Community Rule (1QS). See Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich 1999:xvi.

[10] See Brooke 2006:74-77; Tov 2001:101-102, 266 (note 37). Tov argues: "The only clearly recognizable readings in biblical manuscripts which exclusively reflect the view of one of the religious groups in ancient Israel, excluding those of the other groups, are Samaritan". See Tov 2001:266 (note 37).

[11] Tov 2001:103.

before the text of the scroll became classified as "vulgar".[12] For example, E.Y. Kutscher argues that variant readings point to a "vernacular", "popular" character of the text used for study or home reading, while a "model" text, the predecessor of the MT, was preserved in the Temple.[13] On the other hand, in the text of 1QIsa[a] orthographical and morphological traits, contextual adaptations and other scribal practices typical to the Qumran sectarian writings have been found. Thus, it is likely that the copyist belonged to the same scribal school as Qumran.[14] E. Tov, however, stresses that such a sectarian background of the copyist does not change the matter. The employment of "Qumran practice" reflects, according to him, a "free approach to the biblical texts" which manifests itself "in adaptations of unusual forms to the context, in frequent errors, in numerous corrections and sometimes, also, in negligent script".[15] These facts only point to the vulgar nature of the text, so 1QIsa[a] was both copied and made corrections on the basis of something like the predecessor of the MT.[16] Tov sustains, thus, the general view: "the biblical scrolls copied in Qumran or elsewhere in ancient Israel do not show evidence of any sectarian views of Essenes or other groups".[17]

---

[12] Brooke 2006:74. This does not mean that Brownlee's influence ended. It is not possible here, however, to enter into the details of those studies which treat variant readings as the reflection of the sect's ideology. Tov discusses critically A. Rubinstein's study of 1955 which treat some variant readings in that way and also I.L. Seeligmann's study of 1958 of the same type. See Tov 1997:499-500; 2001:266 (note 37). As a more recent example Evans' study of 1989 can be mentioned. There he deals with Isa 6:9-10 in 1QIsa[a] in the spirit of Brownlee. See Evans 1989:53-60.

[13] See Kutscher 1974: 77-79, 82-83, 89-95.

[14] Tov calls these orthographical and morphological traits, contextual adaptations and scribal practices "Qumran practice". Notice, however, Tov's note on this term: "the term *Qumran practice* (…..) is somewhat misleading, but no better term suggests itself. In many ways this was *a* Palestinian scribal system, but it would be equally, if not more, misleading, to call these texts Palestinian, since the use of such terminology would imply that there are no other Palestinian texts. The name *Qumran practice* merely indicates that as a scribal system it is known mainly from a number of Qumran scrolls, without implying that this practice was not used elsewhere in ancient Israel". Tov 2001:108; 1997: 508. This means that the texts copied with this practice was not necessarily copied at Qumran; they were not necessarily copied by Essenes or Qumran covenanters, either, although it is likely that they were actual copyists. More about Qumran practice, see Tov 2001:107-114; also 103; 1997:508-510.

[15] Tov 1997:510.

[16] Tov 2001:193; 1997:503, 511. With regard to the time of origin of 1QIsa[a], for example, on the paleographical analysis VanderKam – Flint (2002:131), Ulrich (2000:384), Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich (1999:267) calculate it to be 125 BCE; Tov (1997:494) 150-125 BCE; and Flint (1997:483) at approximately 100 BCE.

[17] Tov 2001:102. More recently Brooke has criticized the characterization of 1QIsa[a] as vulgar text. He aims at approaching variant readings in a new way, i.e., not minimizing their significance (like Tov), still "without the assumption that such variants show sectarian ideological interventions" (like the first generation of Qumran scholars). See Brooke 2006:77. About Brook's critical view on Tov, see also the discussion below.

In addition to the necessity of distinguishing the biblical manuscripts from the sectarian writings, the second scholarly consensus is that the Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah, as well as other ancient witnesses of it, originate from *only one edition* of the book.[18] E. Ulrich asserts: "After all the thousand-plus variants in the Isaiah manuscript corpus are reviewed, no evidence appears that would ground a pattern of intentional change according to consistent principles which would constitute evidence for variant literary editions of the book".[19]

From the scholarly consensus discussed above, it can be concluded that on a general level the variant readings of the Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah may not produce such an effect that the functional connectedness between the two motifs of hardening and remnant is changed or lost in those manuscripts. That is to say, the Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah could have been basically capable of conveying the Isaianic idea to those who used them. However, it is the fact that in the analysis of the individual cases of variant readings, scholars do get into troublesome situations relating to the consensuses. Two specific problems and the scholars' solutions to them are now discussed.

The first problem concerns the validity of the criteria of textual criticism. For example, when there are a shorter and a longer variant for the same passage, can a plausible result really be gained by applying the criterion of the *lectio brevior/brevis potior* ("the shorter reading is to be preferred")? Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich rely on this criterion in two cases of Isa 2:9-10 and 2:22. In the first case, 1QIsaᵃ has a shorter reading but the MT and LXX have a longer one, so the latter readings are judged secondary. In the second case the LXX does not have the verse in question, while 1QIsaᵃ and the MT have it, so the verse is regarded as an intrusion.[20] They argue that such a variant tells us much about "the late stages of the history of the book's composition".[21] It means that the book of Isaiah was still open to such additional alterations even after the copying of 1QIsaᵃ in later second century BCE. In another place, Ulrich recognizes to the

---

[18] Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich 1999:267; VanderKam – Flint 2002:131; Ulrich 2000:386-387; Tov 1997:510-511. Some scholars assume that certain biblical writings (e.g., Jeremiah) had multiple editions because of the large-scale of variants. See, e.g., Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich 1999:267; Ulrich 2000:386. Against the assumption of multiple editions, Tov puts forth the view of "consecutive 'original editions'". This problem is touched upon later in this section.
[19] Ulrich 2000:387.
[20] Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich 1999:268.
[21] Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich 1999:267.

contrary that in the case of Isa 4:5-6 in 1QIsaᵃ, a shorter reading can be a result of the copyist's erroneous omission owing to *homoioarcton* ("identical beginning") of the subsequent verse. Still, he advocates the validity of the criterion, when he deals with Isa 40:6-8 as another example that a later scribe on 1QIsaᵃ might have made addition to the shorter text (corresponding to the LXX) produced by the original scribe, so the text by the later scribe became longer and corresponding to the MT. Ulrich argues also that such intentional insertions are "characteristic of the latter stages of the development of the book".[22]

Tov is sceptical of the validity of the *lectio brevior/brevis potior*. He argues that the criterion itself cannot determine whether a longer reading is due to a deliberate, later addition or whether a shorter reading, to a later omission. Therefore, the shorter readings of Isa 40:6-8 in the LXX and in 1QIsaᵃ can be explained by the Greek translator's and the Qumran scribe's omission, respectively, owing to *homoioarcton* contrary to Ulrich's view above.[23] In this way, Tov criticizes automatic application of all the other criteria of textual criticism.[24] He emphasizes that sometimes linguistically unusual forms should be chosen as original "opposed to corrected ones", while in other times, linguistically correct forms as original "opposed to corrupt ones". Tov puts forth his point: "to some extent textual evaluation cannot be bound by any fixed rules".[25]

---

[22] Ulrich 2000:386.

[23] Tov 2001:238-240.

[24] Tov discusses critically the validity of four "external criteria" ("unequal status of textual sources", "preference for the MT", "broad attestation", "age of textual witnesses") and three "internal criteria" ("lectio difficilior praeferenda/praevalet/praestat ['the more difficult reading is to be preferred']", "lectio brevior/brevis potior ['the shorter reading is to be preferred']", "assimilation to parallel passages [harmonization]. See Tov 2001:295-307.

[25] Tov 2001:309. Then, what on earth can one rely on in the OT textual criticism? According to Tov, it is fully the question of our "art", "faculty" and "experience". To quote him: "It is an art in the full sense of the word, a faculty which can be developed, guided by intuition based on wide experience. It is the art of defining the problems and finding arguments for and against the originality of readings. Indeed, the quintessence of textual evaluation is the formulation and weighing of these arguments. Often it deals with arguments which cannot be compared at all, such as the style of a given literary unit, its language, the morphology of biblical Hebrew, and the logical or smooth flow of a given text. Within this subjective evaluation, there is room for more than one view. That view which presents the most convincing arguments is probably the best. Many arguments, however, have a different impact on scholars and often no decision is possible, as, for example, between synonymous reading, between long and short text, or between two equally good readings in the context (…..). These difficulties, however, do not render the whole procedure of textual evaluation questionable, for such is the nature of the undertaking. Needless to say, one will often suggest solutions which differ completely from the one suggested on the previous day". See Tov 2001:309-310.

The second problem concerns that the scholarly consensus according to which variant readings are derived from one authorized edition and, therefore, there is no question of parallel editions (see above). In his extensive discussion as to the question of whether there was one single authoritative text or different pristine versions with equal status, Tov defends the assumption of one single edition and, therefore, in his textual critical analyses the predecessor of the MT has a superior position.[26] Brooke challenges this view. He argues that now that the variant readings of the Qumran biblical manuscripts have been liberated from the earlier scholarly view that they represent sectarian ideological intervention, "it is becoming increasingly important for all the variants in the Qumran scriptural scrolls to be considered on an equal footing with other extant readings". He criticizes Tov for minimizing the significance of several Qumran scrolls "by putting them in the category of copies of scriptural books presented according to Qumran scribal practices".[27] Although he does not defend the possibility of multiple editions explicitly, he suggests the potentiality of variant readings for this possibility.[28]

In fact, Tov does not hold on to his view so categorically. As a more practical approach, he puts forth an "assumption of consecutive 'original editions'" for some biblical books. This means: "when the next literary edition was created on the basis of the previous edition and was circulated, the previous one could not be eradicated. Therefore, even at a late period such as the time of the LXX translation or in the Qumran period, both literary forms were circulated".[29] On the other hand, Brooke is far from obsessive in his new approach. He acknowledges that the study of the Cave 4 Isaiah manuscripts "reveals a largely stable text tradition" and concludes: "this relative stability indicates authoritative status gained at an earlier stage in the Second Temple period".[30]

Based on the discussion above, the text-critical research on the book of Isaiah seems to be approaching a turning-point. Depending on future scholarly discussion, the course may be directed either to the consolidation of Tov's position or to what Brooke

---

[26] Two assumptions (i.e., one single edition or different pristine versions with equal status) are connected with the names of P.A. de Lagarde and P. Kahle, respectively. About Tov's discussion on two assumptions, see Tov 2001:164-180.

[27] Brooke 2006:76-77.

[28] See, e.g., Brooke 2006:72 and also 68-69.

[29] Tov 2001:177-180. By this assumption Tov explains the relation between 4QJer[a, c] (= the MT) and 4QJer[b, d] (= the LXX).

[30] Brooke 2006:82.

suggests. In the present state of affairs, Tov's MT centred position can be adopted as a secure assumption.[31]

3.2.1.2. Analysis of the text

If the scholarly consensus concerning the problem of variant readings of the Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah, i.e., the Qumran texts are not mixed with sectarian views or based on the other textual tradition than (the predecessor of) the MT, are assumed, it can be presupposed that on the macro level, the Qumran manuscripts could have been capable of conveying the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant to their readers.

However, a question remains on the micro level: Do the individual variants really not influence this capability, especially if their occurrence is significant quantitatively and qualitatively? For this reason Isa 6:9-13 of 1QIsaᵃ is now analysed as a test case. As seen in the previous chapter, this Isaianic passage is the most central of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant. Ten variants in Isa 6:9-13 are found in 1QIsaᵃ in comparison with the MT. They concern spelling, number, word-repetition, article etc. Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich treat them as minor variants, and translate the passage in such a way that there is no difference between 1QIsaᵃ and the MT with regard to the content.[32] Evans, however, interprets the same Qumran passage so that its meaning diverges from that of the MT because of the variant readings. Although he does his interpretation in the spirit of Brownlee (which no longer represents the scholarly consensus[33]), this shows it is possible to consider variant readings to be such that preclude the text from conveying its original idea. Whether the Qumran variant readings of Isa 6:9-13 can really affect the meaning of the MT is now examined.

---

[31] Blenkinsopp is also of the same opinion concerning the problem of variant readings of the Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah. He asserts that they "provide disappointingly few variants of genuine interpretative interest and provide no evidence for a distinct Isaianic literary or textual tradition". See Blenkinsopp 2006:91-92.

[32] See Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich 1999:279-280. With regard to Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah other than 1QIsaᵃ, the variants which their fragmentary texts show are mostly such as agree with either 1QIsaᵃ or the MT. See Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich 1999:279-280.

[33] See discussion in 3.2.1.1.

With regard to Isa 6:9-10 - the most central passage of divine hardening. Evans suggests a sectarian interpretation for the variant readings.

1QIsaᵃ[34]

ויואמר לך ואמרתה (v. 9)

לעם הזה שמעו שמוע ועל תבינו ראו ראו ועל תדעו (v. 10) השם

לב העם הזה ואוזניו הכבד ועיניו השע פן יראה בעיניו

ובאוזניו ישמעו בלבבו יבין ושב ורפא לו

MT

v. 9 וַיֹּ֙אמֶר֙ לֵ֔ךְ וְאָמַרְתָּ֖ לָעָ֣ם הַזֶּ֑ה

שִׁמְע֤וּ שָׁמֹ֙ועַ֙ וְאַל־תָּבִ֔ינוּ וּרְא֥וּ רָא֖וֹ וְאַל־תֵּדָֽעוּ׃

v. 10 הַשְׁמֵן֙ לֵב־הָעָ֣ם הַזֶּ֔ה וְאָזְנָ֥יו הַכְבֵּ֖ד וְעֵינָ֣יו הָשַׁ֑ע

פֶּן־יִרְאֶ֨ה בְעֵינָ֜יו וּבְאָזְנָ֣יו יִשְׁמָ֗ע וּלְבָב֥וֹ יָבִ֛ין וָשָׁ֖ב וְרָ֥פָא לֽוֹ׃

Evans argues that עׇל in v. 9 of 1QIsaᵃ is not a scribal misspelling of the negative particle אַל of the MT (so Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich). According to him, the word has a casual meaning as an abbreviation of על אשר ("because"). Similarly, he does not regard the verb form השמ in v. 10 of 1QIsaᵃ as a scribal error in omitting ן from הַשְׁמֵן, the hiphil imperative of שמן ["to harden, make fat"], in the MT (so Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich), but as the hiphil imperative of השמ ("to make appalled"). Moreover, while the change of ו of וּלְבָב֥וֹ in the MT into ב (so בלבבו in 1QIsaᵃ) is according to Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich's translation no more than a harmonizing of the phrase with בְעֵינָ֜יו and בְאָזְנָ֣יו, Evans considers the change to be intentional so that the negative final/telic construction (beginning with פֶּן) might be broken here.[35] As the result of these intentional variants the most central passage of divine hardening in the whole Old Testament has become a kind of admonition to the righteous people at Qumran, and "this people (העם הזה)" no longer

---

[34] For the text of 1QIsaᵃ I rely on Parry's – Qimron's edition of 1998.

[35] About two different views on the variant readings of Isa 6:9-10 of 1QIsaᵃ, see Evans 1989:53-56; Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich 1999:279-280.

refers to the people of Israel to be hardened but rather to the Qumran community who are admonished to hear and see.[36] Theoretically, Evans' interpretation, based on Brownlee's, is possible. However, if the passage of Isa 6:9-10 is interpreted to be the admonition to the righteous Qumran community itself, the interpretation is hardly consistent with the following discourse between the prophet and God (Isa 6:11-13). That is, the former asks God how long the situation of Isa 6:9-10 (i.e., admonishing to the Qumran community, according to this interpretation) will last, and then is told that it will last until the formation of a holy remnant. It is an odd idea that the community which already regards itself as such a remnant should be admonished to hear and see until its emergence in the future. The variant readings can be taken as minor as Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich as suggest in their translation.[37]

There is another possible case of sectarian interpretation in the passage of Isa 6:9-13. It concerns Isa 6:13.

1QIsaᵃ

ועוד בה עשיריה ושבה והייתה (v. 13)
לבער כאלה וכאלון אשר משלכת מצבת   במה זרע הקודש
מצבתה

---

[36] Evans supports the following interpretation of Isa 6:9-10 of 1QIsaᵃ by Brownlee:

> v. 9 (And he said: "Go, and say to this people:)
>   Keep on listening, *because* you may understand; keep on looking, *because* you may perceive!"
> v. 10 *Make* the heart of this people *appalled*:
>   Stop its ears and turn away its eyes –
>   lest it see with its eyes and hear with its ears.
>   *Let* it understand in its heart and return and be healed.'

See Brownlee 1964:186-187; Evans 1989:53-56.

[37] Abegg Jr – Flint – Ulrich's translation of Isa 6:9-10 of 1QIsaᵃ is as follows:

> v. 9 So he said, "Go, and say to this people: Hear indeed, but do not understand; see indeed, but do not comprehend.
> v. 10 Make the heart of this people fat, dull their ears, and blind their eyes; so they do not see with their eyes, or hear with their ears, with their heart understand, or turn back and be healed."

Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich 1999:280.

וְעוֹד בָּהּ עֲשִׂרִיָּה וְשָׁבָה וְהָיְתָה לְבָעֵר (v. 13)
כָּאֵלָה וְכָאַלּוֹן אֲשֶׁר בְּשַׁלֶּכֶת מַצֶּבֶת בָּם
זֶרַע קֹדֶשׁ מַצַּבְתָּהּ :

While מצבת and בָּ֫ם belong to v. 13b in the MT, in 1QIsaᵃ there is a space of almost one word between מצבת and במה (corresponding to בָּ֫ם in the MT), so the latter word begins v. 13c in 1QIsaᵃ. Since בָּ֫ם follows directly מצבת in the MT, it forms the ending part of v. 13b. In addition, a "holy seed (זֶרַע קֹדֶשׁ)" in the MT stands in the definite form with the addition of a definite article ה to "holy", זרע הקדש, in 1QIsaᵃ. Evans considers two alternative interpretations. The first, which is more sectarian, is put forth by J. Sawyer: "How can the holy seed be its stump?" It means that the holy seed is Qumran and the stump is the Jerusalem establishment (the interrogative "how?" comes from his interpretation of במה).[38] The other, less sectarian, is by Brownlee: "(so shall there be) among them the holy seed, its stalk" (במה is interpreted as a longer spelling of בָּ֫ם which consists of a preposition and pronominal suffix).[39] Whether Sawyer or Brownlee's interpretation is used, the central issue in Isa 6:13c of 1QIsaᵃ is, according to Evans, the identification of the holy seed with Qumran. Nonetheless, even if במה is separated from v. 13b and connected to v. 13c (as in the interpretations of Sawyer and Brownlee), it is important that the whole verse 13 should be understood as God's answer to the prophet's question "until when? (v. 11)", that is, 'until the emergence of the holy remnant'. In this case, the meaning which the text of the MT form conveys could not have posed a problem even to those people who regarded themselves as the realization of such a remnant. For them, the text could already have been a prophecy which is to be realized so as to refer to them without the need of intentional changes to the text. Saywer's sectarian interpretation is problematic from the point of view of the connection between the question of "until when?" and its answer. Brownlee's less sectarian interpretation seems competent from this point of view. In his interpretation of Isa 6:9-10 of 1QIsaᵃ, however, the subject matter of 'duration' is not hardening but "admonition", so it does not fit in

---

[38] Sawyer 1964:111-113; Evans 1989:56-58.
[39] Brownlee 1964:238-239; Evans 1989:56-58.

with the idea of the emergence of a holy remnant as the answer to the question of "until when?", as shown above. If the space between מצבת and במה in Isa 6:13 of 1QIsa^a is considered to be something more than the scribe's unintentional error, Brownlee's interpretation can be employed but only on the condition that the question of the duration ("until when?") concerns divine hardening. In any case the position that the variant readings of 1QIsa^a are minor can be sustained.[40]

From the discussion above it can be concluded that the variant readings of 1QIsa^a do not affect the meaning of the MT. Therefore, the textual form of the Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah is capable of conveying the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant on both the macro and micro levels.

3.2.2. Septuagint Isaiah

3.2.2.1. Scholarly view on the problem of differences

The problem of differences between the LXX and the MT has two aspects. To understand it, a look at Tov's discussion concerning the relation between the MT and the translations of the Hebrew Bible is first offered. According to him, if the content of a translation is identical with the MT, in all probability, its Hebrew Vorlage was also identical with the MT. If, however, there is a difference between them, it is due to the Hebrew Vorlage being different from the MT, or that the difference was created by "inner-translational factors". According to Tov these factors are as follows: (i) translator's exegesis, (ii) his way of representing Hebrew construction in his own language, (iii) inner-translational

---

[40] Abegg Jr – Flint – Ulrich's translation of Isa 6:13 of 1QIsa^a is as follows:

> v. 13   Even if a tenth remain in it, it too will in turn be burnt, like a terebinth or oak, the stump of which, felled, remains." The holy seed is its stump.

Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich 1999:280.

    Abegg Jr. – Flint – Ulrich do not deal with the question of the space between מצבת and במה in their translation. As a weakness of their translation, Brooke points out the lack of the "attempt in their translation to represent the paragraphing of the text as it is on the manuscript". See Brooke 2006:81.

corruptions.[41] Therefore, if the issue of the Hebrew Vorlage is the main focus in solving the problem of differences, the investigation concerns OT text-criticism, that is, the question of what textual forms circulated in the Second Temple period and the relationship they had with each other. But when the inner-translational factors, especially translator's exegesis, form the main focus instead, the question becomes the translator's reworking of the MT (or its predecessor) as the original text.[42]

In this examination of the problem of differences between the LXX and the MT, the focus is on the question of inner-translational factors, and not on the Hebrew Vorlage. The reason for this is that the analysis of inner-translational factors should be the starting-point for the solution of the problem of differences, even when the issue of Vorlage is in focus. As Tov argues, to reconstruct the Hebrew Vorlage, it should be examined, first, whether the deviation of translation from the MT resulted from translator's exegesis or some inner-translational corruption; if it is not, then, one may assume that the translation is based on a different Hebrew reading.[43] This order of examination which sets the issue of Vorlage to the last possibility may easily lead to the priority of the MT. However, it is methodologically tenable, because, as Tov points out, the use of inner-translational factors is a more objective method, while in the reconstruction of the Hebrew Vorlage, one often relies on "subjective opinion" and "intuition".[44]

Brooke, who questions the scholarly consensus that variant readings of the Qumran manuscripts represent deviation from the sole, standard text[45], holds onto a similar view also in the case of the LXX. He argues that the deviation of translation from the MT is no longer so readily considered to be the responsibility of the translators, but rather that the Hebrew Vorlage of the translation should be considered responsible for the deviation.[46] On the other hand, Ulrich puts forth the view that the Vorlage of the LXX Isaiah is 1QIsaᵃ and the translator translated this Vorlage "faithfully", "as best he could

---

[41] Tov 2001:123-128.

[42] Tov categorizes translator's exegesis into the following four types: 1) linguistic exegesis, 2) contextual exegesis, 3) theological exegesis, and 4) midrashic tendencies. See Tov 2001:124-128.

[43] Tov 2001:129.

[44] Tov 2001:124, 129. On the other hand, Tov acknowledges that there are also such "not a few" differences between the MT and the translations as make it difficult to decide whether they reflect a different Hebrew Vorlage or translational changes. Thus, the inner-translational factors cannot always solve the problem of differences. See Tov 2001:133.

[45] See 3.2.1.1.

[46] Brooke 2006:69-70.

understand it".[47] If this is the case, why then are differences between the LXX and 1QIsaᵃ also found? Ulrich argues that those differences are a matter of transmission of the Greek translation text, that is, they "are picked up in the transmission process as the Greek text was copied generation after generation". Therefore, "it is quite unlikely that all the passages now universally attested in the Septuagint were present in the original translation of the book into Greek".[48]

The marginalization of translator's exegesis and inner-translational corruption in favour of the issue of the Hebrew Vorlage is problematic. Truly, Ulrich's argument directly supports such a view that the original textual form of the LXX Isaiah could have been such as to convey the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, because the LXX translator translated 1QIsaᵃ as the Vorlage "faithfully"; if the present textual form of the LXX does not convey the idea, it is due to the transmission process of the original translation. As seen in the analysis of the Qumran manuscripts above, the textual form of 1QIsaᵃ is capable of conveying the Isaianic idea. However, it should then be ascertained on what basis it can be argued that the original translation of the LXX was so "faithful" that differences came up only in the transmission process. As Ulrich can recognize the possibility of such factors as caused differences in the transmission process, why can the possibility of the influence of inner-translational factors on the translation not be considered in the same way? The thesis that 1QIsaᵃ is the Vorlage of the (original) LXX can solve the problem of differences between the LXX in agreement with 1QIsaᵃ, on the one hand, and the MT, on the other. However, there are two more types of differences, i.e., differences between 1QIsaᵃ in agreement with the MT, on the one hand, and the LXX, on the other, and also between 1QIsaᵃ, on the one hand, and the LXX in agreement with the MT, on the other. It would be simplistic to ascribe those differences to the transmission of the LXX. Under these circumstances, Tov's following position is more sustainable:

> Although the LXX translation often deviates much from the MT because of the former's extensive exegesis, there is no reason to believe that its underlying

---

[47] Ulrich 2000:385.
[48] Ulrich 2000:387.

Hebrew text differed much from the latter. Therefore, the list of minor agreements between the LXX and 1QIsa[a] does not substantially alter this picture.[49]

Therefore, the approach in which the differences between the LXX and the MT are considered to be principally due to inner-translational factors, is more realistic.

3.2.2.2. Analysis of the text

To examine whether the textual form of the LXX conveys the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, Isa 6:9-13 of the LXX, the most central passage for the Isaianic idea, is first analysed. Other important passages then follow suit. The whole LXX Isaiah is not studied, because for the purpose of this chapter it is enough to be able to answer the question of whether the LXX conveys the Isaianic idea or not. If the answer is negative and the alternative idea is then inquired into, then, the study of the whole will be required. Although not all the passages in this research are analyzed, the analysis of Isa 6:9-13 along with some other important passages indicates the direction of changes made to the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, where the LXX is found not to convey the idea.

In Isa 6 of the LXX, the prophet's Temple vision is rendered almost as a direct translation of the MT, but only until verse 8. Then, Isa 6:9-13, the most central passage for the Isaianic idea, shows a drastic change in comparison with the MT. A close analysis of this passage is thus required.

Firstly, Isa 6:9-10 is taken. Two texts are shown below for comparison.

LXX

v. 9 καὶ εἶπε Πορεύθητι καὶ εἶπον τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ Ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε· v. 10 ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν, μήποτε ἴδωσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσι καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσι καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσι καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.

---

[49] Tov 1997:508.

MT

<div dir="rtl">

v. 9 וַיֹּ֕אמֶר לֵ֖ךְ וְאָמַרְתָּ֣ לָעָ֣ם הַזֶּ֑ה
שִׁמְע֤וּ שָׁמֹ֙וֹעַ֙ וְאַל־תָּבִ֔ינוּ וּרְא֥וּ רָא֖וֹ וְאַל־תֵּדָֽעוּ׃
v. 10 הַשְׁמֵן֙ לֵב־הָעָ֣ם הַזֶּ֔ה וְאָזְנָ֥יו הַכְבֵּ֖ד וְעֵינָ֣יו הָשַׁ֑ע
פֶּן־יִרְאֶ֨ה בְעֵינָ֜יו וּבְאָזְנָ֣יו יִשְׁמָ֗ע וּלְבָב֥וֹ יָבִ֛ין וָשָׁ֖ב וְרָ֥פָא לֽוֹ׃

</div>

In the MT, God gives the prophet a double command: to tell the people to hear and see but not to understand, on the one hand, and to make them obdurate by hardening their heart and shutting their eyes and ears, on the other. In the same passage of the LXX, however, God commands the prophet only to *inform* the people that they will hear and see but not understand. That is to say, the prophet's task is to predict the people's failure of understanding in spite of hearing and seeing, not to make them fail to understand.[50] With regard to the second part of the double command (i.e., to make the people obdurate), it is rendered as follows: "For (γάρ) the heart of this people was hardened (ἐπαχύνθη), they heard with their ears with difficulty, they closed their eyes, lest they might see with the eyes, hear with the ears, understand with the heart, return or I might heal them". In this way, while in the MT the verse about divine hardening (v. 10) speaks of the situation which the prophet must bring about, in the LXX the corresponding verse speaks of the reason why the prediction about the people's failure to understand is fulfilled. The motif of hardening is changed from the matter of task to that of reason.

Evans argues that by such rendering, the LXX translator wished to "tone down" the judgmental aspect of the Hebrew text.[51] It may be so. On the other hand, he also acknowledges that the idea of divine hardening in Isa 63:17, another passage about this

---

[50] It is possible that the Greek futures (ἀκούσετε, βλέψετε) has the imperative force here (as in the Decalogue). However, even so, in this case v. 9 cannot become equivalent to the corresponding verse of the MT, because the construction of οὐ μὴ + aorist conjunctive (οὐ μὴ συνῆτε; οὐ μὴ ἴδητε) does not have the imperative force as in the case of the MT. Rather, as J. Blomqvist – P.O. Jastrup point out, the construction expresses the strong negation of something future. Such being the case, it is natural that the Greek futures here should be understood as predicative future tense. Moreover, as Evans argues, in view of the alterations of the following v. 10, the verbs (ἀκούσετε, βλέψετε) should be understood as predictive future. See Blomqvist – Jastrup 1996:219; Evans 1998:62, 191 (note 12). About the alterations of v. 10, see discussion below.
[51] Evans 1989:63-64.

idea, is preserved in the LXX.[52] It is not possible, therefore, to draw a conclusion concerning the translator's general line with respect to the idea of divine hardening from only the translator's rendering of Isa 6:9-10. It is possible that the passive form ἐπαχύνθη (v. 10) indicates that the instigator of 'hardening the heart' is God.[53] In any case, the analysis must first be completed in order to be able to comment accurately on the translator's position on the motif of hardening.

A drastic difference continues in Isa 6:11-13 of the LXX. The two texts are shown below for comparison.

LXX

v. 11 καὶ εἶπα Ἔως πότε, κύριε;
καὶ εἶπεν Ἔως ἂν ἐρημωθῶσι πόλεις παρὰ τὸ μὴ κατοικεῖσθαι καὶ
οἶκοι παρὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἡ γῆ καταλειφθήσεται ἔρημος.
v. 12 καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μακρυνεῖ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ οἱ καταλειφθέντες
πληθυνθήσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· v. 13 καὶ ἔτι ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς ἔστι τὸ
ἐπιδέκατον, καὶ πάλιν ἔσται εἰς προνομὴν ὡς τερέβινθος καὶ ὡς βάλανος
ὅταν ἐκπέσῃ ἀπὸ τῆς θήκης αὐτῆς.

MT

וָאֹמַר עַד־מָתַי אֲדֹנָי וַיֹּאמֶר (v. 11)
עַד אֲשֶׁר אִם־שָׁאוּ עָרִים מֵאֵין יוֹשֵׁב
וּבָתִּים מֵאֵין אָדָם וְהָאֲדָמָה תִּשָּׁאֶה שְׁמָמָה:
וְרִחַק יְהוָה אֶת־הָאָדָם וְרַבָּה הָעֲזוּבָה בְּקֶרֶב הָאָרֶץ: (v. 12)
וְעוֹד בָּהּ עֲשִׂרִיָּה וְשָׁבָה וְהָיְתָה לְבָעֵר (v. 13)
כָּאֵלָה וְכָאַלּוֹן אֲשֶׁר בְּשַׁלֶּכֶת מַצֶּבֶת בָּם
זֶרַע קֹדֶשׁ מַצַּבְתָּהּ :

In the MT, the prophet asks God a question: "Until when" will his task of making the people obdurate be valid? God's answer begins with "until that" and then he speaks of a long process of destruction of the nation that leads to the point at which even such a

---

[52] Evans 1989:67-68.
[53] On the other hand, according to the translator's rendering, 'hearing with difficulty' and 'shutting the eyes' are due to the people themselves.

remnant that survives the destruction process, "the tenth", becomes burned. This further predicament of the remnant is compared with the felling of a mighty tree, which finally leaves only a stump. At the very end of the passage, God calls this stump of the tenth ("its stump")[54] "holy seed". In this way, in the MT, the emergence of this holy remnant (v. 13c) after the whole process of destruction (vv. 11-13b) signifies the time when the prophet's hardening task ends. In the same passage of the LXX, however, the destruction process is much shorter. It covers only v. 11, while in the MT it extends to the 'burning of the tenth as a mighty tree' in v. 13b. First in the LXX, as in the MT, God answers the prophet's question of "until when?" by beginning with "until" and speaking of the desolation of the cities and land in v. 11. Then, in v. 12, all of a sudden, he turns the course, by saying: "'after these things (μετά ταῦτα)' God will remove the men far off and 'those who remained (οἱ καταλειφθέντες)' will multiply on the earth". It is important to know here to whom this remnant, "those who remained", refers. Based on the examination of related passages of the LXX Isaiah, I.L. Seeligmann argues that the translator "contemporized" the motif of remnant of the book of Isaiah in such a way that the remnant of the people of Israel became identified with the Jewish Diaspora in Hellenistic Egypt, and the Diaspora in Egypt was also regarded as the rightful recipient of the promised salvation.[55] If so, the remnant of Isa 6:12 of the LXX, 'those who remained which will multiply on the earth', are also those whom 'God removes far off' in the same verse. In this way, verse 12 becomes the turning point in the LXX, which the translator's addition "μετά ταῦτα" also indicates, while in the MT such a turning point comes only at the very end of verse 13. Such being the case, the prophet's task of predicting will, in the LXX, end in connection with the emergence of the remnant being 'removed far off' and then 'multiplying'.

Isa 6:13 in the LXX is most problematic. The translator rendered the verse as follows: "and there is still 'the tenth (τὸ ἐπιδέκατον)' on the earth, and again it 'will be plundered (ἔσται εἰς προνομὴν)' as terebinth tree and oak, when it falls out of 'its

---

[54] In "its stump (מַצַּבְתָּה)" the suffix stands in the feminine singular, so it can be thought to refer to the "tenth (עֲשִׂרִיָּה)"

[55] Seeligmann 2004:288.

monument (τῆς θήκης αὐτῆς; αὐτῆς refers to γῆ)'[56]'". The last, temporal clause is, as Seeligmann admits, obscure.[57] He points out that the word τὸ ἐπιδέκατον as such belonged to the economic vocabulary of Egyptian Hellenism and meant something like "additional payment, interest, and capital increment". Here it is used in a sacrificial sense.[58] It may be possible that "the tenth" refers to the multiplied ('additional') part of the remnant, i.e., that part which was added to the original core, and this part will get into the situation of plunder. However this interpretation of "the tenth" is uncertain. In view of the context ("[…] and those who remained will multiply 'on the earth; and' [ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· καὶ] there is still the tenth on the earth [...]"), the word does not, at least, refer to the whole remnant, consisting of the multiplied part and the original core. It seems to refer to something else which cannot be identified here. In any case "the tenth" has nothing to do with the remnant which is 'removed far off' and then 'multiplying'. Even this partial solution of the problem of "the tenth" is helpful, however, in the examination of another, major problem of the same verse in the LXX, namely, the absence of the sentence about the holy seed.

As explanation for this absence, Evans argues that the deletion of the sentence occurred in the transmission process of the LXX Isaiah, that is, the tradent omitted the sentence which the translator had originally rendered in his translation. According to Evans, in the original translation, the word αὐτῆς should have appeared twice in the latter part of v. 13, first at the end of the last sentence in the present form (i.e., τῆς θήκης αὐτῆς) and then at the end of the allegedly deleted sentence which should have been the last sentence in the original form. He argues that the tradent made a mistake of *homoiteleuton*, that is, he skipped the sentence between the two αὐτῆς.[59] It seems a plausible explanation, but the reason for the absence of the sentence should also be investigated by paying attention to the context which the translator rendered.

Firstly, in the MT, "the tenth" is a medium remnant. It means that having emerged out of the whole people through the destruction process, "the tenth" will be reduced again to a further remnant called the "holy seed". In the LXX, however, the character of "the

---

[56] Seeligmann considers that the translator, on the basis of the Hebrew word מצבה, understood θήκη in the sense of "gravestone", "monument". See Seeligmann 2004:193.
[57] Seeligmann 2004:193.
[58] Seeligmann 2004:187-188.
[59] Evans 1989:20-21, 63.

tenth" as a remnant is obscure. As shown above, presumably it has nothing to do with the remnant which is 'removed far off' and then 'multiplying'. Whereas this remnant bears a blessed tone, "the tenth" which will be plundered does not. For this reason, verse 13 can be a deviation from the remnant motif of verse 12 in the LXX. If so, it is doubtful that the translator needed to term "the tenth" with the terminology of a blessed remnant "holy seed". Secondly, in the MT, the prophet's task is to make the people obdurate until the emergence of a holy remnant, so this "holy seed" is the term which is necessarily connected with the idea of the annulment of hardening in the whole context of Isa 6:9-13. In the LXX, the prophet's task is only to predict the people's failure to understand, so the end of the task means that the 'removed far off' and then 'multiplying' remnant then begins to understand with open eyes and ears. This leads one to the same consideration as above, that is, it might have been unnecessary for the translator to introduce terminology strongly connected with the idea of the annulment of hardening in the MT, in that verse where a deviation from the remnant motif of v. 12 had been made. Based on these considerations, I consider it to be more plausible that the absence of the sentence was the translator's intentional deletion than the transmitter's accidental omission. The context the translator rendered made the sentence superfluous.[60]

To sum up, the LXX translator made a drastic change to Isa 6:9-13.

Firstly, God assigns the prophet only the task of predicting the people's failure to understand until the emergence of the remnant which is 'removed far off' and then 'multiplying'. His task is far from making the people obdurate. It has already been mentioned that it cannot yet be concluded whether the translator really wanted to tone down the idea of divine hardening of the Hebrew Bible until the analysis of the other passages has been done. Still, at this point, it can already be seen that in this most central passage about the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant the functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant of the MT has been lost in the LXX. In the MT, the people already in an obdurate condition are intentionally made hardened with the view of forming a remnant which is liberated from hardening. In the LXX, out of the

---

[60] According to Seeligmann, the major part of the hexaplaric revision and nearly all Lucianic texts render the deleted sentence by σπέρμα ἅγιον τὸ στήλωμα αὐτῆς, following Origen. See Seeligmann 2004:213. Because τὸ στήλωμα does not have the meaning of 'stump' and αὐτῆς does not refer to the 'tenth' as in the case of the MT, the Greek rendering of the sentence, even in the revisions, cannot put forth the same motif of remnant as the MT.

people in obdurate condition, a remnant which is not obdurate emerges without a process of divine hardening. The functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant is also invested in the MT with such dynamics that the prophet plays an active role as the agent to realize God's plan to form a holy remnant. In the LXX, lacking such a functional connectedness between the two motifs, the prophet is far from being such an agent.

Secondly, the translator contemporized the motif of remnant, so that the Diaspora in Egypt was set to the status of a blessed remnant. In the MT the holy remnant is an apocalyptic-eschatological entity from the point of view of the whole book, so it emerges around the horizon of history. Because of this change, too, it can be argued that the functional connectedness of the MT (also of the Qumran transcription) between the motifs of hardening and remnant is lost in the LXX. Considering that the passage of Isa 6:9-13 is most central for the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, the chance of the LXX to convey the idea cannot be judged good.

As far as the other important passages are concerned, those relating to the idea of divine hardening, i.e., Isa 29:9-10 and 63:17 are investigated first.

With regard to Isa 29:9-10 of the LXX, the translator rendered the verses, so that God will, among others, close "'their (αὐτῶν)' eyes, the eyes of 'their (αὐτῶν)' prophets and 'their (αὐτῶν)' rulers", while in the MT God has closed the eyes of the prophets. Evans interprets the possessive pronoun αὐτῶν of the LXX, as referring to Israel's enemies or the wayward prophets of Israel but not to the whole people of Israel, on the grounds that "the translator wished to avoid the obvious sense of the Hebrew text in which the Lord is depicted as the cause of blindness in his people".[61] Thus, Evans applies his interpretation of Isa 6:9-10 of the LXX (see above) also here. This, however, is not the case. As Isa 29:13-14 shows clearly, the whole context of 29:9-14 concerns God's judgement against the whole people of Israel, so that the object of divine hardening is this whole people including the prophets and rulers, while in the MT the object is only the prophets and seers.[62] No doubt, the translator put forth the idea of divine hardening

---

[61] Evans 1989:66.
[62] Additionally, the verb about the closing of the eyes stands in the future (καμμύσει) in the LXX. In the MT the form of the verb (וַיְעַצֵּם) has a perfect sense in the sequence of perfect and imperfect.

against the people of Israel here, so it cannot be argued that the "toning down" is his general line with respect to this idea.

It seems that while the translator drastically transformed the idea of divine hardening in the context where the motif of an apocalyptic-eschatological remnant is originally present, he could use the idea here in the context where such a motif is not present.

With regard to Isa 63:17, in the MT a member of the loyal servants pleads with God for mercy: "Why, O Lord, do you make us stray from your ways and harden our heart, so that we might not fear you? Return for the sake of your servants (…)". The imperfect form of the verbs (תַּקְשִׁיחַ, תַתְעֵנוּ) demonstrates that in the eyes of the pleader, God actually effectuates his hardening operation against the whole people, so that his plea "Return!" really is a cry which comes in the midst of God's hardening operations. On the other hand, in his, otherwise direct translation of this passage, the LXX translator rendered the verbs into the aorist form, ἐπλάνησας, ἐσκλήρυνας. It is not so simple to know which time the punctual, non-durative aspect of the acts of the verbs concern. If the acts of making astray and hardening belong to the past, the pleader principally complains of those past acts of God. But the implication here is that although God once in the past hardened the people's heart he does not do the same in the present, yet the heart of the people is still left hardened, that is, they have not been liberated from hardening yet. If so, the plea "Return" in the LXX emphasises the liberation from the hardened condition, while in the MT, the emphasis is more on the curtailing of the present hardening operation. Although there is this difference in nuance between the LXX and the MT, both the MT and the LXX put forth the idea of divine hardening in the case of Isa 63:17, too. [63]

From the analysis above, concerning the LXX translator's line with respect to the idea of divine hardening the following conclusions can be drawn. It is true that he

---

[63] If the punctual, non-durative aspects of the acts of the aorist verbs do not concern the past, to which time do the acts of making astray and hardening belong, the present or the future? One possible key to the answer is the plea "Return" which also stands in the aorist, i.e., ἐπίστρεψον. Considering that all three verbs stand in the aorist in the same context, the pleader's nuance can be reconstructed as follows: "*Return* (aorist, i.e., punctual) instead of *making us astray* (aorist, i.e., punctual) and *hardening* our heart (aorist, i.e., punctual)". Since God's returning has not happened, the same is also true of the acts of making astray and hardening. In this case the aorist form of the verbs in the interrogation ("Why, O Lord […]?") can be understood as the pleader's expression of fear of such acts of God. Whether the acts belong to the past or concern a possibility of the present or the future, the idea of divine hardening is present as well.

changed Isa 6:9-10, so that the passage might not put forth the idea; however, he preserved it in the other places, Isa 29:9-10 and 63:17. It may, therefore, be too hasty to say that the translator "toned down" the Hebrew idea of divine hardening. On the other hand, as has been mentioned earlier, the translator seems to have transformed the idea drastically in the context where the motif of an apocalyptic-eschatological remnant is originally present (Isa 6:9-10), while he preserved the idea in the context where such a motif is, at least, not directly present (29:9-10 and 63:17). Such being the case, the translator's rendering of Isa 6:9-10 strips the Hebrew idea of the dynamics that the prophet plays an active role in the formation of a holy remnant as the agent. The change of the LXX can be characterized with the "toning down" of the idea of divine hardening only in the sense of the loss of this dynamic.

As far as the passage relating to the motif of remnant is concerned, Isa 10:20-26 of the LXX, where the translator put his point of view in characterizing the salvation of the remnant, can now be analysed. After v. 20, where it is stated that 'the remnant' (τὸ καταλειφθὲν Ισραηλ, οἱ σωθέντες τοῦ Ιακωβ; cf., שְׁאָר יִשְׂרָאֵל, וּפְלֵיטַת בֵּית־יַעֲקֹב) no longer relies on their enemy but on God, the text is rendered so that the remnant "will be based on God (ἔσται […] ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν […])" in v. 21 and "will be saved (σωθήσεται)" in v. 22, while the MT states that the remnant will "return (יָשׁוּב)" in both verses. As Blenkinsopp points out, 'return' as the meaning of the verb שׁוב has two dimensions in the book of Isaiah: the first is a physical or geographical return, e.g., 'the return from exile'; the second, a spiritual one, i.e., 'repent'.[64] It is seems clear that when characterizing the salvation of the remnant the translator consciously avoided that word which could have associated a spiritual return with a physical one.

It is indicative of his line that in the rendering of the name of the prophet's son "Remnant Return (שְׁאָר יָשׁוּב)", he only transliterated the part of "Return" into Ιασουβ, whereas he translated the part of "Remnant" into ὁ καταλειφθεὶς correctly. As a result, the Hellenistic Jewish readers who had no knowledge of the Hebrew could not have understood the background idea of the name of the prophet's son ὁ καταλειφθεὶς

---

[64] Blenkinsopp 2006:247. Blenkinsopp points out that שׁוב has the meaning of a physical return in Isa 9:12; 21:21; 37:7, 8, and the meaning of the return from exile in 35:10 and 51:11, while it has the meaning of repent in 6:10; 19:22; 31:6; 44:22; 55:7. See Blenkinsopp 2006:287 (note 37).

Ιασουβ. Blenkinsopp argues that that name had a significant role in the formation of the apocalyptic-eschatological way of thinking and sects in Palestine in the Second Temple period.[65] Without analyzing all of the LXX Isaiah, the translator's purpose in his rendering of the salvation of the remnant can hardly be explained. As a preliminary explanation, however, it can be suggested that if he identified the remnant, i.e., the rightful recipient of the promised salvation, with the Jewish Diaspora in Egypt (see discussion above), he might have felt that the Hebrew word which is an association of both physical and spiritual return was not suitable to the Diaspora context.

A passage relating to the idea of the annulment of hardening can also be examined. With regard to Isa 42:13-18, which speaks of the liberation from hardening through God, there seems to be no remarkable change. However, in Isa 42:1-7 which speaks of the liberation through the servant, the LXX translator rendered the text, so that the object of the liberation from hardening is no longer the remnant, i.e., those exiled and now returning to the land of Judah, as in the case of the MT. The passage in 42:6-7 of the MT: "(…) I have given you 'as a covenant to the people (לִבְרִית עָם)', as a light to the nations, to open the eyes of the blind" is rendered into: "(…) I have given you 'as the covenant of a race (εἰς διαθήκην γένους)', as a light of the Gentiles to open the eyes of the blind (…)". The change of 'the people' into 'race' also occurs in Isa 43:20 (from "my chosen people [עַמִּי בְחִירִי]" to "my chosen race [τὸ γένος μου τὸ ἐκλεκτόν]"). As Seeligmann points out, in those places "one would naturally expect λαός" instead of γενός,[66] because the people of Israel are the issue in the MT. If γενός does not refer to Israel or, strictly speaking, the remnant of it, i.e., those exiled and now returning, to whom, then, does the term refer? The answer is found in Isa 49:8 of the LXX. There the clause: "I have given you 'as a covenant to the people (לִבְרִית עָם)'", is rendered into: "I have given you as a covenant of the Gentiles (εἰς διαθήκην ἐθνῶν)". Thus, if the translator used 'race' as a synonym for 'Gentiles', the task of the servant in Isa 42:6-7 of the LXX (see above) does not concern the opening of the eyes of the remnant of Israel

---

[65] Blenkinsopp argues that the name שְׁאָר יָשׁוּב "provided a powerful impulse not only to the development of a sectarian and apocalyptic way of thinking (…) but also to the actual formation of eschatological and apocalyptic sects throughout the period of the Second Temple". As his examples show, such a way of thinking and formation of sects concerns the very situation of Palestine in the Second Temple period, not that of the Diaspora. See Blenkinsopp 2006:226-227.

[66] Seeligmann 2004:166.

but rather the eyes of the Gentiles. If so, the object of the liberation from hardening through God in Isa 42:13-18 in the LXX can also be reconsidered in this light. Considering that the translator regarded the Diaspora in Egypt as the righteous remnant and that the obdurate condition is finished on the part of this actual remnant (see discussion above), it is likely that he directed the idea of the liberation from hardening, at least in this part of the book, toward the Gentiles.

The analysis of the LXX Isaiah can now be summarised. It is clear that although the LXX Isaiah contains both motifs of hardening and remnant, the functional connectedness between them exhibited in the MT (also the Qumran transcription) is no longer to be found. With regard to the idea of divine hardening, although the idea as such is preserved on a general level (Isa 29:9-10 and 63:17), the dynamics with which the idea is invested in the MT (i.e., the prophet plays an active role in the formation of a holy remnant as the agent) is lost in the LXX (6:9-13). The translator also contemporized the motif of remnant, so that the Diaspora in Egypt became a blessed remnant. If this were to be the case, it would not be a surprise if he had let the idea of the liberation from hardening concern the Gentiles (Isa 42:1-7; cf., 49:8; 42:13-18). The analysis covers only a small part of the LXX Isaiah, however, and thus it is not possible to demonstrate how the translator connected the two motifs of hardening and remnant with each other in a different way from the MT, or whether he had his own line to connect them functionally. Nonetheless, it can be concluded that the LXX does not convey that Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant which the MT (also the Qumran transcription) does.[67]

---

[67] As another example of the LXX deviation from the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, Isa 59:1-9, which speaks of the obdurate condition of the people, can also be mentioned. The MT describes the divided situation of the people into two parts, loyal and disloyal, and refers to the disloyal part using the third person plural ("they"). This dichotomous point of view continues until 59:8. From 59:9 on the writer's point of view changes to a collective one, so that he confesses in 59:10 that the hardening belongs to the whole people as follows: "*We* grope like the blind along a wall, *we* grope like those who have no eyes; *we* stumbled at noon as in the twilight (…)". In the LXX, however, the dichotomous point of view still continues in 59:10, so that the blindness belongs to "them": "*They* shall grope like blind men along the wall, and shall grope as if *they* had no eye, and *they* shall fall at noon-day as at midnight (…)". Even though the dichotomous point of view changes into a collective one in verse 12 in the LXX and thus the sins begin to be confessed as "ours", the translator's rendering weakens the MT notion that even the loyal servants share an obdurate condition vis-à-vis God. About the question of the obduracy of the loyal servants, see discussion in 2.1.3.

3.3. Other Jewish writings

3.3.1. Scholarly view on the question of the Isaianic influence

In this section Jewish writings other than transcription and translation of the book of Isaiah from the Second Temple period in Palestine are analyzed. The central question is: Is the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant operative in those writings in such a way that the Isaianic functional connectedness between the two motifs of hardening and remnant can be found in them? Thus, the concern of this section is not the appearance of Isa 6:9-13 or other related passages in the other Jewish writings in the form of citation or allusion. In general terms the question concerns the ideological influence of the book of Isaiah on the other writings. By 'ideological influence', I mean such an influence that the meaning and the function of an Isaianic tradition which are valid in the entire context of the book of Isaiah are also operative in the other writings. In this way, the focus of this section is on the presence of 'idea' in the Jewish writings. The lack of citation from or allusion to Isa 6:9-13 or other related passages does not mean the lack of the influence of the idea.[68]

As already demonstrated in the first chapter (1.3.2.1), Blenkinsopp's study makes a large contribution to the research of the influence of the book of Isaiah in the Second Temple Judaism in Palestine. He explains the ideological influence of Isaiah using the term "interpretative trajectory". In this term, the issue of influence is connected with the question of the formation of the book. The book of Isaiah was formed as a result of a continuous and consistent interpretative development of the Isaianic traditions. Moreover, up until the point of the completion of the composition of the book, the traditions were expanded and transformed in accordance with the apocalyptic-sectarian interests, after

---

[68] There is no citation from or allusion to Isa 6:9-13 in the other Jewish writings in Evans' study of 1989 in which he examines the Early Jewish and Christian interpretation of Isa 6:9-10. With respect to the Jewish interpretation he does not find the Isaianic passage outside the Hebrew Bible (MT), IQIsaᵃ, LXX, the Targum and the Peshitta. He also includes Isa 6:13 in his examination of MT, IQIsaᵃ and the Targum.

J.J. Collins points out that Sibylline Oracles 1.360f contains an allusion to Isa 6:9-10. However, according to him, the whole passage of 1.324-400 is of Christian origin in the way that the allusion is an interpolation between Jewish oracles but the whole passage received an extensive Christian redaction. The possible allusion in SibOr 1.360f is not limited to Isa 6:9-10. Collins also mentions Matt 13:13-15; Mark 4:12; Luk 8:10; Joh 12:40; Act 28:26. See Collins 1983:343.

which, (i.e., the point of no more expansion and transformation within the book), the book in turn contributed to the birth of not only apocalyptic writings but also sects themselves.[69] Therefore, in the question of the ideological influences of Isaiah, focus must be given to the traditions whose meaning and function were set in the entire context of the book as a result of the interpretative development. Such Isaianic traditions could have had a real point of contact with the other writings which were written under the ideological influence of Isaiah.

Prior to Blenkinsopp's study scholars paid insufficient attention to the meaning and the function of an Isaianic tradition valid in the entire context of the book of Isaiah. Before beginning to analyze the Jewish writings, therefore, J.C. VanderKam's and M.A. Knibb's studies of the Isaianic influence on the Jewish writings are first investigated. These are examples which show how the 'entire' point of view can easily be neglected in the study of the influence of an Isaianic tradition.

In his examination of the Book of Parables in 1 Enoch 37-71, VanderKam argues that the writer of the Book transformed the concept of 'Chosen One/Servant' of Isaiah from something collective, which in the primary, biblical settings refers to God's people, into something more individualistic referring to an eschatological judge in the Enochic settings.[70] Is it true that the writer transformed the concept by himself?

As generally acknowledged, the identity of 'Servant' in Deutero-Isaiah is a complicated issue. It may be true, as Laato considers, that 'Servant' in Isa 53 refers *in the original context* to a group of the righteous in the time of the Babylonian exile.[71] In this sense, it is a collective concept *in that context*. Laato also points out, however, that Isa 42:1-9 and 49:1-13 have connections with Isa 11, shown by the linguistic parallels in the passages.[72] This means that in connection with Isa 11, 'Servant' in Isa 42 and 49 can refer to an individual ruler or judge of Davidic descent throughout the entire context of the book of Isaiah. From Isa 54:17 on, the plural form 'servants' is used instead of the

---

[69] See discussion in 1.3.2.1.
[70] VanderKam 1993:116-117. VanderKam also deals with the question of the "Son of Man" of the book of Daniel from the point of view of 'transformation'. Because the theme of this research is limited to the Isaianic influence, only the issue of 'Chosen One/Servant' of the book of Isaiah is handled.
[71] Laato 2002:224.
[72] Laato 1998:157-158, 160.

singular.[73] Referring to a sub-group of the righteous in the postexilic Jewish community, this 'servant*s*' is set in a tension with the disobedient part of the community throughout Isa 56-66.[74] It is, therefore, doubtful that in the entire context of the book, 'Servant', as the harbinger of the 'servants', would have appeared as something collective in the eyes of the postexilic readers. Moreover, in the entire context of the book, the prophecies of Isa 42, 49 and 11, being connected with each other, appear as something which will be realized in the eschatological time.[75] I think it doubtful that seen through such eschatological perspective, 'Servant' would have appeared in the eyes of the postexilic readers as something collective, either.[76]

From the discussion above, it can be argued that in the entire context of the book, Isaiah could have put forth the concept of 'Servant' as an individual judge and ruler of the eschatological time. If so, the writer of the Book of Parables did not actually transform the biblical concept from something collective into something individualistic and eschatological by himself; he did it under the ideological influence of the book of Isaiah. The point of view of the meaning and the function of an Isaianic tradition which are valid in the entire context of the book sets the writer's 'creativity' on a conditional basis.

Knibb examines the Isaianic influence on the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach. The allusions to Isaiah which are found in Sir 48:17-25 are of great importance. Sir 48:24-25, in particular, "clearly draw on a number of Isaianic passages".[77] Based on the passage level analysis, he concluded that "although these verses clearly draw on Isaianic material, they present Isaiah in a way different from that in the biblical book, namely as

---

[73] This change is due to Isa 53:10 mentioning the offspring of the suffering servant and also Isa 53:11-12, which speak of the "many" whom the servant will take care of. Moreover, Isa 56:6, 8 mention the possibility that non-Judeans will join the servant. See Laato 1998:156.

[74] See discussion in 2.1.2 & 2.1.3..

[75] So Laato 1998:158.

[76] About a complicated nature of the issue of the identity of 'Servant' of the book of Isaiah, Blenkinsopp's view can also be mentioned. According to him, 'Servant' in Isa 40-48 refers to the whole Israel; in Isa 49-54[55] it refers to an individual figure and in 55[56]-66 to the inner group of the Jewish community, i.e., "servants". He argues that the continuity between the individual servant and the group of servants is established in terms of the relationship between master and disciples. In the argumentation, he simply seems to join various tradition-histories together. Nonetheless, here is one example of the view that the suffering servant in Isa 53 refers to an individual even in the original context. See Blenkinsopp 1997:153-175.

[77] Knibb lists these passages: Isa 11:2; 40:1, 3-11; 42:9; 49:13; 51:3, 12, 52:9; 61:1-7. See Knibb 1997:648-649.

an apocalyptic seer".[78] That is to say, the author of the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach transformed the original figure of the prophet of the primary biblical settings into such an apocalyptic seer for his secondary settings. How does Knibb come to this conclusion? He considers first the possibility that Isa 6 is a factor of presenting the prophet as seer. However, he denies this, arguing that in comparison with the book of Ezekiel, Isa 6 clearly has a much lesser significance in presenting the prophet as seer. Therefore, it is the author of the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach himself who transformed the original figure of the prophet. This is the same problem as in the case of 'Servant' in VanderKam's examination (discussed above). Laato's comment on this conclusion of Knibb makes the point: "the whole Book of Isaiah as one literary unit was composed in an apocalyptic environment (cf., e.g., Isaiah 24-27 and 65-66). *It is not the first but the latest layers of the Book of Isaiah which define the framework in which the ideology of the whole Book should be considered*".[79] It is not the ancient writer's creativity but rather the ideological influence of Isaiah which caused the writer to transform the figure of the prophet.[80]

From the discussion above on the scholarly view on the question of the Isaianic influence, it seems likely that scholars have paid insufficient attention to the point of view of the meaning and the function of an Isaianic tradition which are valid in the entire context of the book.[81]

---

[78] Knibb 1997:650.

[79] Laato 1998:17 (emphasis mine).

[80] This position as to the question of the transformation of the figure of the prophet can be supported by Blenkinsopp. See fn 79 in the first chapter which deals with Blenkinsopp's interpretative trajectory relating to the figure of the prophet.

[81] In his study of 1993, J.H. Charlesworth deals with the question of the influence of the Scriptures in general on the birth of the Pseudepigrapha. His study, however, does not pay sufficient attention to the point of view of the meaning and the function of a canonical tradition valid in the entire context of the canonical book. He clarifies the biblical exegesis of the Pseudepigrapha into five categories: (i) *inspiration*; (ii) *framework*; (iii) *launching*; (iv) *inconsequential*; (v) *expansion*. Concerning the first four categories, his clarification is based on the question of how an individual passage of the OT gives the authors of the Pseudepigrapha inspiration, framework and so on. He does not touch upon the question of which level of the context the meaning and the function of the passage concern, the entire context of the canonical form of the book or the original context where the passage emerged. With regard to the fifth category "expansion", which to Charlesworth is the most important, he does not limit the biblical material for the Pseudepigrapha to the passage level. In some cases, he refers to a whole book of the OT or even several books as the basis of the Pseudepigrapha. If so, it is possible to consider that the meaning and the function of a canonical tradition, valid in the entire context of the canonical book, are also operative in the concerned Pseudepigrapha. Charlesworth, however, seems to focus on the creativity which the authors of the Pseudepigrapha exercised on the canonical books in order "to speak to the curiosities and needs of a later

Returning to the main course of discussion, an analysis of the Jewish writings from the Second Temple period in Palestine now follows. It has been demonstrated in the previous chapter that the meaning and the function of Isa 6:9-10 are determined by the functional connectedness between the two motifs of hardening and remnant in the entire context of the book of Isaiah. In the following two subsections it will be determined whether this functional connectedness can be found in those writings. Those Jewish writings which Blenkinsopp found to be on the interpretative trajectory will be taken for analysis.

3.3.2. Analysis of the writings

According to Blenkinsopp, the book of Daniel is situated on the 'interpretative trajectory' of Isaiah as the first major point after the composition of the book of Isaiah was completed. He demonstrates how there are plenty of thematic and linguistic affinities between the two books. He also remarks that those affinities are "not much noticed in the commentaries", but they can reveal the "ideological alignment" between them.[82] Among such affinities, two major ones, which are of direct relevance to the possibility of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, are taken under consideration.[83]

The first affinity concerns the view on history. According to Blenkinsopp, the final composer of Daniel, by setting the story in the exilic time, linked the exilic situation with

---

time" He also emphasizes the "sociologically conditioned" nature of the Pseudepigrapha. As the analysis in the following subsection shows, those apocalyptical books, which describe Israel's history, demonstrate how the social and political situation of the author's time cast a shadow on his writing. In this sense, the author wrote his Pseudepighapha as his reaction to some external factors, so that he spoke to the needs of his time by means of canonical books and passages which he revered. Nonetheless, the following question is still relevant: Did the meaning and the function of a tradition valid in the entire context of the canonical book not have something to do with the emergence of Pseudepigrapha in addition to the author's reaction to external factors and his creativity on the Scriptures? See Charlesworth 1993:20-43.

[82] Blenkinsopp 2006:14, 18.

[83] As other linguistic and thematic affinities which are not of direct relevance to the possibility of the Isaianic idea, the following can be mentioned: (i) the critique of the great empires; (ii) the historical panorama which is viewed from the perspective of the exile; (iii) the oracle "destruction is decreed" in Dan 9:26-27 and Isa 10:23; 28:22; (iv) echoes of Isaiah in Daniel's visions, e.g., Isa 6 (in addition to Ezek 1) in the first vision of Dan 7:1-28, Isa 14:3-23 in the second vision of Dan 8:1-27 and Isa 63:7-64:11 in the third vision of Dan 9:1-27. The list can be enlarged by the worldview of Daniel and Isa 24-27 which is typical of the apocalyptic sects, the motif of "object of horror" of Isa 66:24 and Dan 12:2 and the motif of "sealed book" of Isa 29:11-12 and Dan 8:26; 9:24; 12:4, 9. See Blenkinsopp 2006:14-22.

the present situation of the persecution by Antiochus IV. In this way the composer could express his "conviction that those for whom the stories and vision accounts were written were the successors and continuation of the pietistic group which formed in the Babylonian exile and which eventually returned to Judah". At the same time, "the linkage in effect cancels out the intervening centuries, which is to say the entire Second Temple period down to the emergence of the group for which the book of Daniel was written".[84] Such a 'cancelling out' can be explained by the composer's negative view on the postexilic period. It is expressed in Gabriel's prophecy in Dan 9:20-27. By extending the prophecy on 70 years of exile of Jer 25:11-12; 29:10 to 70 periods of 7 years (Dan 9:24-27), the period of the exilic situation has been made open-ended. Moreover, the "troubled time" of Gabriel's prophecy (9:25) covers the whole period of "62 weeks", i.e., the period from the time of Joshua, the first high priest after the return, to the murder of the high priest Onias III (9:25). This means almost the whole postexilic period down to the author's time.[85]

The negative view on the postexilic period and the 'cancelling out' of the intervening centuries in the book of Daniel can be found in the book of Isaiah. As seen in the previous chapter, God's promises of salvation in the first parts of the book of Isaiah (Isa 1-39 and 40-55) were reset to concern the apocalyptic-eschatological time in the final stage of the composition of the book.[86] In the midst of the divided situation of the people into the loyal servants and the disobedient, the former group, within and for which the book was composed, perceived that the postexilic reality was far from the realization of God's promises which originally had been proclaimed for the returnees from the Babylonian exile. The reset of them was then inevitable. As a result, the historical return from the exile and the following period together with the reconstructed Temple had no significance to the true salvation. Daniel shares such a negative view on the postexilic period. Blenkinsopp notes that for the composer of Daniel, the situation of the postexilic period is even comparable to that of divine hardening in the book of Isaiah:

---

[84] Blenkinsopp 2006:232.
[85] Blenkinsopp 2006:234.
[86] See discussion in 2.1.2.

> The period from the Babylonian exile to the emergence of the Danielic sect is seen as a time of distress, spiritual blindness, and failure, a situation comparable to that of those unable to read the sealed book in Isa 29:11-12.[87]

The second linguistic and thematic affinity concerns the characterization of the group, within and for which Daniel was written, as the "wise among the people (מַשְׂכִּילֵי עָם; Dan 11:33)". According to Blenkinsopp, the group is "the most impressive and, in its effect, the most significant borrowing from Isaiah to Daniel".[88] Those "wise" shall "understand (Dan 12:10)"[89], "make the many understand (11:33)" and "lead them to righteousness (12:3)". Moreover, they will face persecution and death (11:33-35) but are consoled with the apocalyptic-eschatological prospect of resurrection and immortality (12:3). Blenkinsopp argues that their functions and fate reveal that "the wise" is a replication of "the Servant" of Isa 52:13; 53 (especially 53:11).[90] Among their functions, the task of 'making the many understand' in Dan 11:33 (see above) might be highly interesting from this research's point of view. When it is recalled that 'to make the people not to understand' is one of the elements of the divine hardening which God commands the prophet Isaiah to bring about (Isa 6:9-10), the hiphil form of the same verb (בין) in Dan 11:33, "יָבִינוּ", could be understood to mean the reversal of hardening of Isa 6:9-10 (the qal form "יָבִין" in Isa 6:10).[91] If so, "the wise" have the function of liberation from hardening in the same way as the Servant of Isa 42:1-7. Therefore, if "the many (לָרַבִּים in 11:33)" denotes, as Blenkinsopp argues, the members of the sectarian community,[92] "the wise" as the leaders of the community work to prepare his community, the harbinger of the holy remnant, to become the true, such remnant in the apocalyptic-eschatological time. However, it should also be observed that even though Blenkinsopp characterizes

---

[87] Blenkinsopp 2006:21.

[88] Blenkinsopp 2006:22.

[89] Blenkinsopp translates יָבִינוּ as "are gifted with supernatural enlightenment". Here the word is simply rendered literally. See Blenkinsopp 2006:22.

[90] Blenkinsopp 2006:22; also 262.

[91] In Dan 12:10 "the wicked" are characterized as those who "shall not understand".

[92] Blenkinsopp mentions the possibility that the usage of the term "the many" is not consistent in Daniel. The term can refer to the people in general in Dan 11:33, while it is used as a technical term relating to the sectarian community in 12:3; however, the usage in 12:10 (lacking the definite article) is less clear. See Blenkinsopp 2006:233 (also note 11). J.J. Collins understands the term as 'people in general' in these cases, although he mentions that "the expressions מַשְׂכִּילֵי and רַבִּים are adopted as technical terms in the Qumran Community Rule *for the master and the rank and file of the sect* (emphasis mine)". See Collins 1993:367, 369, 385, 393, 400.

Daniel's view on the postexilic situation as comparable to the divine hardening of Isaiah (see above), the book of Daniel does not explicitly say that the obdurate condition of the people comes from divine hardening. It would be safer, therefore, to assume that the obduracy from which "the wise" liberate "the many" means a mere condition of them, rather than divine hardening.

What answer can be elicited to the question as to the possibility of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant in the book of Daniel? In the postexilic time when the people are in the obdurate condition, a righteous group "the wise" emerges, which in the midst of the persecution has the apocalyptic-eschatological hope of resurrection and immortality and works to liberate a certain part of the people ("the many") from obduracy to prepare the holy remnant. As has been seen above, in the view on history and the function and fate of "the wise", there are also linguistic and thematic affinities with Isaiah. Therefore, it is possible to recognize in Daniel the second aspect of the Isaianic functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant, i.e., the aspect that as a result of the purifying operation, there emerges a holy remnant liberated from hardening. However, Daniel lacks the first aspect of the functional connectedness, i.e., that God sets to hardening with a view to forming a holy remnant through his purifying operation. So it cannot be proved that the obduracy which is the object of "the wise's" liberating function is divine hardening. The assumption that in Daniel it is a mere condition of the people holds. I do not hold to the view, however, that this fact can be the decisive ground for denying the possibility of the Isaianic idea in Daniel. Of course, Isaiah was not the sole material available to the composer of Daniel; he surely read various OT and other Jewish writings and relied on their traditions, as Gabriel's prophecy clearly shows (see above). Nevertheless, I think that there are plenty of linguistic and thematic affinities with Isaiah which reveal that he was also a good reader of Isaiah.[93] If so, it is possible that in forming the notion of "the wise" the composer of Daniel could have been inspired by the Isaianic notion of the servant/the servants as the harbinger and agent of the apocalyptic-eschatological remnant which is liberated from hardening. Since his concern is directed to the end of the time when such a remnant is to emerge, it is not

---

[93] Blenkinsopp also points out that the motif of "the Book of Truth" of Dan 10:21; 12:1which contains the names of the elect is based on the idea of Isa 4:3 that the holy remnant is "recorded for life". See Blenkinsopp 2006:20.

surprising that the question of when and how the present obduracy came about (divine hardening?) was omitted from his composition of the book.

Blenkinsopp points out that the Isaianic, negative view on the postexilic period is not unique to Daniel but it is shared by other Jewish writings. In addition to Daniel, he lists the following writings of the Second Temple period in Palestine: the book of Jubilees, the Apocalypse of Weeks of 1 Enoch (1 En 93:1-10; 91:11-17), Enoch's Dream Visions (1 En 83-90), the Testament of Moses, the Damascus Document, 4QPseudo-Moses and the Testament of Levi. Because the presence of the negative view on the postexilic period is an important indicator of the influence of the book of Isaiah, in the following analysis these writings will be concentrated on in order to examine the possibility of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant.[94]

With regard to the book of Jubilees, according to Blenkinsopp, the first chapter of the book deals with Israel's history both before and after the Babylonian exile; the description of Jub 1:14 which states that the people forget the laws and the cult is corrupted, concerns the postexilic period.[95] He also points out that the notion of the holy remnant as God's righteous plant of Jub 1:16, which signifies the end of the sinfulness of Israel in 1:17-18, is adopted from the popular, "Isaianic metaphor for the sowing by God of the seeds for new people".[96] However, it is not as clear as Blenkinsopp suggests as to

---

[94] It would be more comprehensive when analyzing all the Jewish writings of the Second Temple period firstly, to examine the presence of the two motifs of hardening/obduracy and remnant. Then, if presence is found, to examine whether a functional connectedness between the two motifs can be found, and finally, if such a connectedness is found, to examine whether it is due to the influence of Isaiah or not. This procedure, however, requires a far-reaching analysis. In this research one Jewish writing, Enoch's Dream Visions of 1 Enoch (1 En 83-90) is analyzed in this way. It can be seen how analysis of this one writing requires so much space (see 3.3.3), that another, more 'economical' procedure is required. The merit of concentrating on Blenkinsopp's eight 'candidate' writings is that this gives writings that can be judged to have been written or composed under the influence of the book of Isaiah at least with respect to the view on history. As seen in the analysis of Daniel, the negative view on the postexilic period is relevant to the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant. The risk is that by using such an approach, from the start, such writings that could have been written or composed under the Isaianic influence in a respect other than the view on history can be missed. Therefore, the choice of writings here is far from exhaustive. This limited choice, however, means that if the result is positive, that is, if the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant is found in (some of) those writings, it is indicative of 'the' tendency; even if the result is not positive, it is not necessary to conclude just yet that there was no influence of the Isaianic idea at all.
[95] Blenkinsopp 2006:235.
[96] Blenkinsopp 2006:249. Blenkinsopp also argues that the metaphor 'God's hiding his face' as his judgment of exile is an "identifiably Isaianic theme", although the use of the metaphor is not confined to Isaiah. See Blenkinsopp 2006:243.

whether Jub 1:14-18 describes the process developing from the sinful condition of the people in the postexilic period to the eschatological time. In view of the preceding passage of Jub 1:7-13, it seems equally possible that the passage of 1:14-18 refers to Israel's history from the exilic time to the return.

On the other hand, Blenkinsopp's schema of the negative view on the postexilic period can be applied better to Jub 23:16-31. G. Nickelsburg divides the description of history in that passage into four parts: (i) sin (23:16-21; the Jewish society is characterized by a deep schism between the apostates who forsake the covenant and the pious who take up arms to bring the former back to the path of righteousness), (ii) punishment (23:22-25; God sends the persecutor, "the sinners of the Gentiles", against Israel), (iii) turning point (23:26; "the children will begin to search the law and to search the commandments and to return to the way of righteousness"), (iv) salvation (23:27-31; the salvation of such kind that history gives way to myth takes place, e.g., the return of human life to the prediluvial longevity and the absence of Satan and evil).[97] The passage does not deal with the whole period after the return as in the case of Daniel; however, it is clear from the ascription of the apostate Jews, i.e., Hellenized Jews, to the causer of the punishment through Antiochus IV, that the author of Jubilees saw at least the Hellenistic period negatively. In this sense, Jubilees can share the Isaianic (also Danielic) negative view on the postexilic period. Moreover, Nickelsburg argues that the fourth part of the historical description (see above) "reflects Third Isaiah's descriptions of life on the renewed earth and in the new Jerusalem (Isa 65:17-25)".[98]

The question then is: Does the emergence of the holy remnant and the liberation from hardening occur in the schema of Jubilees which covers the time from the sinful situation of the postexilic (Hellenistic) period to the eschatological time? As Nickelsburg points out, it is not clear to whom the "children" of Jub 23:26 that function as the agent of the turning point in the schema refer. He considers the possibility that they are limited to the righteous Jews who "share the guilt of Israel but will turn the tide by their increased righteousness", although it is also possible that they include those "some of the apostates"

---

[97] Nickelsburg 1981:77-78. Nickelsburg does not apply this division to Jub 1:14-18; therefore, it is doubtful whether the passage deals with the process developing from the postexilic period to the eschatological time, as Blenkinsopp thinks.
[98] Nickelsburg 1981:78. Nickelburg regards especially Jub 23:31 as an interpretation of Isa 66:14. See Nickelsburg 1981:78.

who repent.[99] In any case, it is clear that they are not identical with the whole Israel but are the righteous part of it, in other words, the holy remnant or the harbinger of it. This righteous part is called God's "servants" (23:29) which is the same term that is used to refer to a distinct, righteous group within the postexilic community in the last part of the book of Isaiah (Isa 56-66). Moreover, in the apocalyptic-eschatological salvation of Jub 23:27-31, such a thematic terminology as is seen in the Isaianic idea of the liberation from hardening can also be found, i.e., the righteous part will "see" (23:30) and God will "heal" them (23:29). In the former, the verb has no object, so the recovery of sight can be preserved; as regards the latter, it can be recalled that 'to make the people unhealed' is one of the elements of the divine hardening of Isa 6:10, so it is possible that God's healing here in the context of Jub 23:27-31 means the liberation from hardening/obduracy. Because the present analysis relies on the English translation of the text,[100] these thematic affinities lack confirmation on linguistic grounds. However, the presence of a similar view on history to Isaiah (and Daniel), the inferred presence of the motif of remnant and the characterization of the (harbinger of the) holy remnant by the thematic terminology related to the motif of (counter-) hardening ("see" and "heal") may suggest the presence of the second aspect of the Isaianic functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant as in the case of Daniel. However, the same reservation as for Daniel is valid here. The first aspect of the functional connectedness is lacking. In addition, as the four-part schema of history shows, Jubilees is deeply influenced in this regard by the deuteronomistic cyclic view on history of sin – judgment – salvation. On the other hand, it may also be noted that such themes as the function and characterization of the righteous part and as the change of the human history into the apocalyptic-eschatological era are incorporated into the deuteronomistic schema. Considering the linguistic and thematic affinities with Isaiah mentioned above, I think that as a reader of (also) Isaiah, the writer of Jubilees could have been inspired to this incorporation by the Isaianic notion of the servant/the servants and their function and characterization. Nickelsburg points out the influence of apocalyptic-eschatological thinking (among others from Isaiah) on the deuteronomistic view on history in the book

---

[99] Nickelsburg 1981:78.
[100] The translation used is by O.S. Wintermute in Charlesworth 1985.

of Jubilees and the Testament of Moses, that is, in them the cycle of sin – judgement – salvation ends up in the apocalyptic-eschatological era.[101]

The Apocalypse of Weeks of 1 Enoch (1 En 93:1-10; 91:11-17) [102] has a division of the history of Israel into equal periods similar to Daniel (see above). Here the history from the birth of Enoch (93:3) to the replacement of the first heaven by a new one (91:16) is laid out in ten weeks. As seen in the analysis of Jubilees, the motif of a new heaven here is also "one of several eschatological scenarios taken from Isaiah (Isa 65:17; 66:22)".[103]

    The sixth week corresponds to the pre-exilic period which is characterized by the terminology of obduracy: "all who live in it (i.e., the sixth week; my addition) will become blind, and the hearts of all will stray from wisdom (93:8)". As a consequence the temple is destroyed and the people exiled (93:8). The seventh week corresponds to the postexilic period;[104] however, the condition of the people is no better, because "there will arise a perverse generation (…) and all its deeds will be perverse (93:9)". Thus, for the author, the return from the exile is not a significant event; the people are in the same obdurate condition after their return as they were before. At the end of this seventh week, which is also the author's own time,[105] the agent of the eschatological time, "the chosen" who "will be chosen", emerges in 93:10. Nickelsburg expounds the ending verses of the seventh week (93:10; 91:11) as follows: "the plant of righteousness has been pruned to an elect remnant. These comprise the author's community, which is endowed with revealed, sevenfold (complete) wisdom, that is, the contents of the author's message and perhaps the rest of the Enochic corpus. They will function as 'witnesses of righteousness' and will be instrumental in uprooting the counter structure of deceit".[106] Thus, the idea that the emergence of the "elect" remnant is a herald of the end of the perverse postexilic period, is clearly present in those verses. Additionally, the plant term for the remnant here ("the everlasting plant of righteousness" in 93:10) according to Blenkinsopp, signifies that "in Isaianic terms, they (i.e., "the chosen"; my addition) will be a root or plant planted by

---

[101] Nickelsburg 1981:73-83; also 15.
[102] Nickelsburg - VanderKam's translation of 2004 is used.
[103] Blenkinsopp 2006:235.
[104] Blenkinsopp 2006:235. See also Nikelsburg 1981:146.
[105] Nikelsburg 1981:146.
[106] Nickelsburg 1981:146.

God (93:10; cf., Isa 60:21; 61:3)".[107] As seen in the analysis of Jubilees, the notion of the holy remnant as God's righteous plant can be said to have adopted from the popular, "Isaianic metaphor for the sowing by God of the seeds for new people" (see above).

As far as the motif of hardening/obduracy is concerned, there is no evidence of use of the (counter-) obduracy terminology in connection with the emergence of remnant. However, in the description of the people's obdurate condition in the pre-exilic period, the loss of wisdom ("stray from wisdom") can be paralleled with blindness in 93:8 (see above). The holy remnant, "the chosen", will be provided with "sevenfold wisdom and knowledge (93:10)". I think this characterization of "the chosen" signifies that they are liberated from obduracy and thus they can be set in a comparable position to the "the wise" of Daniel which in turn replicates "the servants" of Isaiah (see above). Although in a limited perspective, an influence from the second aspect of the Isaianic functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant can be recognized. However, also here, as in Daniel and Jubilees, the first aspect is lacking.

Enoch's Dream Visions (1 En 83-90) also deals with the history of Israel but starts back at the time of Adam and Eve.[108] In this writing, too, as Blenkinsopp argues, the Isaianic influence is clear. The author clearly had a negative view towards the postexilic period. Actually, Enoch's Dream Vision describes the period as the time of obduracy and corruption of worship no less than the time preceding the exile in the most detail of all the eight writings for analysis. Blenkinsopp also points out that the description of the final judgement and the new Jerusalem is dependent on Isa 54:11-12 and 60:21-22, while the motif of the conversion of the Gentiles in the eschatological time, absent in other seven writings, is dependent on Isa 64:2; 66:12, 19-21.[109]

Although Blenkinsopp does not mention such an Isaianic influence concerning the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, the two motifs of obduracy and remnant are conspicuously present in Dream Visions. The obduracy terminology like 'blindness' and

---

[107] Blenkinsopp 2006:235.
[108] Nickelsburg - VanderKam's translation of 2004 is used.
[109] Blenkinsopp 2006:236. Blenkinsopp points out, moreover, that the theriomorphic symbolism used in the description of history (i.e., human being is compared with various animals like Israelites as sheep, foreign oppressors as wild animals), which is unique to this writing, is dependent on the Isaianic image in Isa 56:9-12: See Blenkinsopp 2006:236.

'deafness' is repeatedly used to describe the condition of the people (e.g., 89:32, 41, 54, 74; 90:7), while the emergence of the pious group in the era preceding the apocalyptic-eschatological time signifies the holy remnant and the actual remnant terminology is used in that time (90:30). This group is really characterized by the liberation from blindness (90:30; cf., 90:6). Since Dream Visions does not focus only on the time preceding the apocalyptic-eschatological era and that era itself but also describe the long history of Israel using the obduracy terminology, it might be quite an interesting writing from the point of view of the possibility of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant. This writing requires a detailed analysis, and thus is dealt with in a separate subsection below (3.3.3).

The Testament of Moses, also known as the "Assumption of Moses", shares the same historical view on the postexilic period.[110] Here, too, the return from the exile is followed by "a time of general moral corruption with special reference to the profanation of the temple worship".[111] Nickelsburg points out that TMos 5-10 follow a similar deuteronomistic and apocalyptic-eschatological schema of history to Jub 23:16-32 (see above). The Jewish society is divided into the Hellenizers and their opponents (TMos 5-10; cf., Jub 23:16-21), so that God sends the persecutor, Antiochus IV, against the people as the punishment for their sin (TMos 8; cf., Jub 23:22-25); the turning point comes, when Taxo, who is to suffer martyrdom with his seven sons for the sake of the commandments of God, appears (TMos 9; Jub 23:26).[112] This is followed immediately by the eschatological time, the salvation of Israel, when history gives way to myth (TMos 10; cf., Jub 23:27-31).[113]

As far as the motifs of remnant and hardening/obduracy are concerned, the Testament of Moses does not mention a holy remnant with the terminology characteristic of it, e.g., "wise", "chosen", "elect", "plant" or "remnant"; further, Taxo and his sons are not characterized with (counter-) obduracy terminology, e.g., 'blindness' and 'deafness';

---

[110] J. Preist's translation in Charlesworth 1983 is used.
[111] Blenkinsopp 2006:238.
[112] Blenkinsopp points out that Taxo and his seven sons are reminiscent of those pious Jews who retreated to caves in the wilderness, and died in order not to profane the Sabbath (1 Mac 2:29-38). See Blenkinsopp 2006:238.
[113] Nikelsburg does not include TMos 6-7 in this deuteronomistic and apocalyptic-eschatological schema for the reason that these chapters belong to a later composition. See Nickelsburg 1981:81-82, also 212-214.

'see', 'hear', 'heal', 'understand' either. It can be observed, however, that Taxo has such a notion that life with transgression is not worth it; but rather that the aim of life consists of loyalty to God, so that he teaches his sons this notion and instructs them to follow him. Thus, Taxo can be seen to virtually perform the function of "the wise" of Daniel who themselves "understand", "make the many understand" and "bring them to righteousness" (see above). Moreover, their martyrdom is rewarded with the same astral immortality (TMos 10:9) as that is pledged to "the wise" of Daniel (see above).[114] Thus, it seems likely that there is a close relation between Taxo and "the wise".[115] If so, Taxo and those who follow his way can be characterized with the same function as "the wise": i.e., to liberate a certain part of the people form obduracy in the midst of persecution and to prepare them to form the holy remnant. The close relation to "the wise", however, can point to only the second aspect of the Isaianic functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant. The first aspect is lacking here, too.

The part of the admonitions in the Damascus Document shows how strongly the book of Isaiah influenced its description of history, especially the description of the origin of the sectarian group and the group's self-understanding.[116] The opening of the first admonition which is addressed to "all those who know justice, and understand the actions of God (CD I 1-2)" is, according to Blenkinsopp, "taken verbatim from Isa 51:7".[117] The description of history begins with Israel's unfaith (CD I 3) which led to the Babylonian exile (I 3-4) and continues to the time when a sectarian group closely connected to Qumran (I 7) emerges,[118] and the "Teacher of Righteousness" (I 11) arrives. After God delivered the people into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar,[119] the time came when he

---

[114] Blenkinsopp 2006:238; also Nickelsburg 1981:81-82.

[115] In addition to the close relation between Taxo and his sons, on the one hand, and "the wise", on the other, the author's interest in Daniel can be demonstrated by TMos 4:1-4 about the "one's" prayer in the exilic time which reflects Daniel's prayer of Dan 9:4-19.

[116] Unless otherwise mentioned, F.G. Martínez – E.J.C. Tigchelaar's translation from 1997 is used.

[117] Blenkinsopp 2006:238.

[118] Blenkinsopp calls the group the "Damascus sect". See, e.g., Blenkinsopp 2006:238-240.

[119] In CD I 3 the Isaianic metaphor of 'God's hiding his face' for the exile is used. About the metaphor, see discussion above concerning the book of Jubilees (fn 96 above).

"allowed a remnant to survive for Israel (I 4-5)"[120]. After this emergence of the remnant, i.e., the returnees from the exile, however, time suddenly jumped "390 years" which are counted from the beginning of the Babylonian exile (I 6). The time 390 years after the exile becomes a turning point in the history of Israel in two ways. Firstly, it is the time when God allowed a new remnant to emerge: "he visited them and caused to sprout from Israel and from Aaron a shoot of the planting (…; CD I 7)". It can be seen that the "Isaianic metaphor for the sowing by God of the seeds for new people" is used here.[121] Secondly, it is also the time of the end of God's wrath (I 5).[122] This means that since the time of Nebuchadnezzar until the emergence of the new remnant, which is also the author's own day, Israel has been under the divine wrath all the time, both in the exilic and postexilic time.[123] Thus, the author of CD had a negative view on the postexilic period.[124]

As far as the motif of hardening/obduracy is concerned, attention should be paid to the penitent nature of this new remnant "shoot of the planting". CD I 8-9 relates that "over 20 years", i.e., the time between the emergence of the remnant in the postexilic period and the appearance of the "Teacher of Righteousness", the members of the remnant "realized their iniquity and knew that they were guilty (…); but they were like blind persons and like those who grope for path". This motif of 'being like blind persons

---

[120] Blenkinsopp translates the clause השאיר שארית לישראל in this way. Martínez – Tigchelaar translates it as: "he saved a remnant for Israel". Charlesworth (G. Vermes) as: "he left a remnant of (to) Israel". See Blenkinsopp 2006:239; Martínez – Tigchelaar 1997:551; Charlesworth 1995:13; Vermes 1995:97.

[121] About this metaphor, see the discussion above concerning the book of Jubilees and the Apocalypse of Week of 1 Enoch.

[122] Blenkinsopp defends his interpretation of בקץ חרון as "at the end of the period of God's anger" against Martínez – Tigchelaar's interpretation as "at the period of wrath". In the latter interpretation, God's wrath concerns only the time when the new remnant emerges, so it becomes unclear whether his wrath concerns the whole postexilic period. Charlesworth translates the phrase in the same way as Blenkinsopp, while Vermes, in the same way as Martínez – Tigchelaar. See Blenkinsopp 2006:239 (also note 24); Martínez – Tigchelaar 1997:551; Charlesworth 1995:13; Vermes 1995:97.

[123] Concerning the calculation of "390 years", Blenkinsopp considers that although the number 390 is thematic, basing on Ezek 4:4-5, rather than the result of precise calculation, it is also chronologically plausible, because by the time of 390 years after the beginning of the Babylonian exile, i.e., by the early second century BCE, "movements of religious renewal must have been well under way in the Jewish community under the Seleucid rule". See Blenkinsopp 2006:239-240.

[124] Additionally, by putting the whole postexilic period in silence, i.e., by lumping the period with 390 years' wrath, the author could have linked the new remnant with the initial one which God had called into existence in the midst of the exile. Blenkinsopp clarifies how the Damascus sect regarded themselves as the legitimate successor and continuation of the first group who returned from the exile. See Blenkinsopp 2006:240, 247. It may be recalled that also the author of Daniel had a similar interest in regarding his group as the legitimate successor to the idealized exiles (see discussion above).

and groping for path' derives, as Blenkinsopp points out, clearly from Isa 59:10.[125] Their consciousness of sin and blindness does not mean, however, that they only spent a life of transgression, but rather that they were heartily penitent, because "they sought him (God; my addition) with an undivided heart"; therefore, God "appraises their deeds" (CD I 10), so that he sent them the "Teacher of Righteousness" "in order to direct them in the path of his heart" (I 11). Thus, for the members of the new remnant, the liberation from obduracy, which is also a central character of holy remnant, worked on the penitent level before the appearance of the "Teacher"; after that the liberation moved to the level of a deeper insight. If so, it is not surprising that the (harbinger of the) holy remnant is characterized with the obduracy terminology. In fact, as has been demonstrated in the previous chapter, "the servants" of the last part of the book of Isaiah have such a collective point of view that they are part of the sinful people vis-à-vis God, whereas as a penitent group they have a separating point of view vis-à-vis the disobedient part of the people and deplore them. In the latter part of the first admonition of CD, the author also deplores the opponents of the "Teacher of Righteousness", i.e., those who "stray from the path" (CD I 11-21). In this way, the author's point of view is comparable with that of the servants of Isaiah.[126] In the question of the possibility of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant in CD, attention can be paid to the author's view that as the result of the Babylonian exile and the following divine wrath as God's purifying operation, there emerges a holy remnant liberated from obduracy. Such being the case, his view can point to the second aspect of the Isaianic functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant. However, because of the lack of the first aspect in CD, it is not possible to prove that the obdurate situation in the book comes from divine hardening, although the author, relying on the hardening motif of the last part of Isaiah (see above), might have been conscious of the matter.

With regard to 4QPseudo-Moses, there remain five different, all fragmentary manuscripts (4QpsMoses[a - e] = 4Q385a, 387a, 388a, 389, 390). Blenkinsopp points out that the writing has a negative view on the postexilic period. He also argues that the silence which

---

[125] Blenkinsopp 2006:93.
[126] About the loyal servants' ambivalent mixture of sinfulness/obduracy and righteousness, see discussion in 2.1.3.

passed over from the time of the return from the exile to the seventh jubilee, which is the author's own time, implies that those who survived the wrath of God during that jubilee were in the line of succession to the returnees of the exile.[127] However, the fragmentary nature of the text makes it impossible to know whether the remnant in the seventh jubilee is characterized with the terminology of (counter-) obduracy and what role they play in the eschatological time.[128]

In the Testament of Levi, the 70 weeks of Daniel are restated as seven jubilees (TLevi 17-18).[129] Each jubilee has its own priesthood, and the priesthood is described as being increasingly corrupt in successive jubilees. The last three jubilees, the fifth to the seventh, correspond to the period from the return from the exile to the time of the composition of the text. In the fifth jubilee the return from the exile and the rebuilding of the temple are mentioned (17:10). However, this jubilee "shall be overcome by darkness (17:6)" and the same darkness concerns even the sixth and seventh jubilees (17:7). The seventh jubilee is described as the time of total corruption of the priesthood (17:11, also 8). After that, God will raise a new priest (18:2). Blenkinsopp argues that this eschatological priest brings with him a blessed epoch which is "described for the most part in terms taken from Isaiah".[130] However, Nickelsburg points out that the present form of TLevi 18 is almost certainly Christian, so it is not certain how the original tradition depicted that priest.[131] Because of his supernatural and angelic functions, this eschatological priest cannot be compared with the Isaianic type of agent forming the remnant. As Nickelsburg argues, the main point of this writing in the present form is that the history which began with the ordination of Levi gets to the time of the appearance of the last priest "who functions as the one who brings the earth back to its primordial state".[132] Thus it can only be

---

[127] Blenkinsopp 2006:

[128] The same problem concerns 4QAges of Creation (4Q180, 181) which Blenkinsopp takes as another example which mentions the holy remnant. See Blenkinsopp 2006:237-238.

[129] H.C. Kee's translation in Charlesworth 1983 is used.

[130] Blenkinsopp 2006:86-87. See also Kee's reference to the allusions to Isaiah with respect to TLevi 18.

[131] Nickelsbrug 1981:236-237. On the basis of the parallels between the prayer of Levi in the Aramaic Testament of Levi and the present Greek form, Nickelsburg considers that the Jewish author colored his description of the eschatological priest with language traditionally applied to the Davidic king. See Nickelsburg 1981:237.

[132] Nickelsburg 1981:237.

concluded that in the Testament of Levi, in spite of sharing the Isaianic, negative view on the postexilic period, the two motifs of remnant and hardening/obduracy are not found.

Eight writings, chosen on the ground that they share the Isaianic view on the postexilic period, have now been analyzed. In six of them, it was observed that the second aspect of the Isaianic functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant may be present, i.e., the aspect that as a result of the purifying operation, a holy remnant liberated from hardening emerges. In them, the agent(s) or actor(s) appear to form a holy remnant. Such a remnant and the agent(s) themselves are termed as "wise", "chosen", "elect" or "plant" in addition to being called "remnant". Among the six writings, Daniel, Jubilees, The Apocalypse of Weeks and Enoch's Dream Visions indicate the remnant's liberation from obduracy explicitly, i.e., with the counter-obduracy terminology such as 'see', 'hear', 'heal' or/and 'understand'. The Testament of Moses does so implicitly, that is, the liberation is implied by a close relation between "the wise" of Daniel and Taxo. In the Damascus Document, the (harbinger of the) holy remnant is characterized first by the obduracy terminology of the last part of the book of Isaiah (Isa 56-66); however, the group is clearly distinguishable from the rest of the people because of their liberation from obduracy, first on the penitent level and then on the level of a deeper insight given by the "Teacher of Righteousness". On the other hand, it can also be observed that all lack the first aspect of the functional connectedness, i.e., that God sets to hardening with a view to forming a holy remnant through his purifying operation. Thus, it cannot be proved that the obdurate condition referred to in these writings comes from divine hardening, although a good reader of Isaiah (especially the authors of Daniel and CD) might have been conscious of the matter.

The analysis of Enoch's Dream Visions now follows. As stated above, this writing requires a detailed analysis.

3.3.3. Special case: Enoch's Dream Visions (1 Enoch 83-90)

The reason for analyzing Enoch's Dream Visions (DV hereafter)[133], one of the constituent books of the whole 1 Enoch, separately, is that the motifs of obduracy and remnant are found in it in such an extended way that it may be the most interesting and essential writing from the point of view of the possibility of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant. Before starting to analyze the text, the textual problem of the book, which also concerns all the books of 1 Enoch, should be noted. The complete version of 1 Enoch is extant only in Ethiopian. The Ethiopian version, in turn, is only available in those manuscripts from not earlier than the fifteenth century, whose origin is thought to be a fourth – sixth century translation from a Greek version. The extant Greek manuscripts of 1 Enoch cover only one third of the Ethiopian version. Far more fragmentary manuscripts in Aramaic, thought to be the original language of most of 1 Enoch, have been discovered in Qumran; however, they cover only five percent of the complete version.[134] There are a lot of modern translations of 1 Enoch, both 'diplomatic', i.e., based on a certain Ethiopian manuscript (or manuscripts), and 'critical', i.e., based on a reconstructed version with Greek and Aramaic readings taken into account. In this research both are utilized, but priority is given to the translation of the latter type.[135]

The text is analyzed as follows. Firstly, an outline of DV is sketched which shows how the motifs of obduracy and remnant are present in it. Secondly, whether the two motifs have such a functional connectedness as in the book of Isaiah and whether the obdurate condition which is referred to in the book has something to do with divine

---

[133] This title is given to 1 Enoch 83-90 by, e.g., Charles 1913, Isaac 1983, Black 1985, Nickelsburg - VanderKam 2004. The "Book of Dreams" is given by Milik 1976, Vanderkam 1984.

[134] The counting of Greek and Aramaic covering rate is from Black 1985:1. Among the 1062 verses of 1 Enoch, Knibb counts 366 verses in the Greek fragments; 196 verses in the Aramaic fragments. Knibb 1978:6-21. However, as Kinibb admits, the Aramaic fragments are usually damaged severely, so "we are very far from possessing the equivalent in Aramaic of 196 verses of the Ethiopian version. See Knibb 1978:12. About the problem of Ethiopian, Greek and Aramaic manuscripts as well as the origin of 1 Enoch and its translation and recession history, see, e.g., Charles 1913: 165-171; Milik 1976:4-7, 70-88; Knibb 1978:1-47; Isaac 1983:6-8; Black 1985:1-7.

[135] Reckoned as the 'diplomatic' type of translation are e.g., Charles 1913, Knibb 1978, Isaac 1983. The latter two translations include notes on the Greek and Aramaic readings in their apparatus as well as notes on the readings of various Ethiopian manuscripts. The 'critical' type of translation is, e.g., Black 1985 and Nickelsburg – VanderKam 2004. Black's translation is based on his reconstruction of all 'putative' Greek variants. As far as Nickelsburg – VanderKam's translation is concerned, 1 Enoch 1-36 and 81-100 are based on Nickelsburg's critical reading of "all the textual sources" contained in his commentary of 2001 on the same part of the book. These five translations are utilized here.

hardening are examined. Finally, the presence of other Isaianic motifs in DV is determined, and some remarks on the influence of the book of Isaiah on the latter are offered. The presence of more Isaianic motifs can further prove the Isaianic influence on DV. As such additional, Isaianic motifs, two which are related with the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant are offered. These are the motif of the cataclysmic events in the eschatological time and that of the joining of the loyal Gentiles in the salvation (i.e., the idea of universalism).

3.3.3.1. Outline of the book and the presence of the two motifs

DV consists of two different dream visions which Enoch, the ancient, pre-Deluge patriarch, mentioned in Genesis 5:18-24, saw. The narrative setting is that he tells the visions to his son, Methuselah (mentioned in Gen 5:21-22, 25).

The first vision (1 Enoch 83-84) deals with a cosmic destruction in which the heaven fell down on the earth which, in turn, was swallowed up in the great abyss. Though it is interesting to discuss to what event the vision refers,[136] it should be noticed that in this introductory part of DV, the motif of remnant is clearly pronounced. Having been informed of the vision by Enoch, his grandfather, Mahalalel (mentioned in Gen 5:12-13, 15-17), instructs him to make supplication to God so that "a *remnant* may remain upon the earth, and that he may not obliterate the whole earth (83:8; emphasis

---

[136] With regard to the question of what event the first vision refers to, it seems that scholars generally regard the vision as concerning the Noachic flood and, therefore, title 1 Enoch 83-84 as such. See, e.g., Charles 1913:248; Milik 1976:41; Nickelsburg 1981:90; Isaac 1983:61; Black 1985:71; VanderKam 1995:71; Nickelsburg – VanderKam 2004:61. On the other hand, in another place VanderKam argues that the first vision "concerns the Noachic flood *and the final judgment*" (emphasis mine). VanderKam 1984:160. Collins does not confine the vision to the Deluge, either: "This brief vision is a *paradigm* of judgment, a reminder that the whole world would be destroyed. It implies the contingency of the world, its dependence on its Maker. It need not refer to any particular crisis (emphasis mine)". Collins 1998:68. Instead of the term "paradigm", Nickelsburg uses "typology". See Nickelsburg 2001:346-347, also 350-357. I agree that the perspective of the vision extends to the final judgment. If the function of pseudepigraphic apocalyptic writing is to consolidate the authority of ancient righteous figures through *vaticinia ex eventu*, I think that the inclusion of future perspective is suited to the author's purpose all the more. It should also be noted that one of the main themes of 1 Enoch is the final judgment, as the introductory part of the whole book (1 Enoch 1-5) indicates.

mine)".[137] Then Enoch prays to God: "(…) I make supplication and request that you fulfil my prayer, to leave me a *remnant* on the earth, and not obliterate all human flesh, and devastate the earth, that there be eternal destruction. And now, my Lord, remove from the earth the flesh that has aroused your wrath, but the righteous and true flesh raise up as a *seed-bearing plant* forever (…; 84:5-6; emphasis mine)". This prayer puts forth the idea that a remnant will be formed through annihilating the unrighteous so that it consists only of the righteous. Here, thus, there is present a very relevant motif from this research's point of view together with an important remnant terminology, "seed-bearing plant".[138]

The second vision (1 Enoch 85-90) deals with the history of humanity which extends to the eschatological, New Age. As a usual title of this part of DV, "Animal Apocalypse", shows, all the human figures are depicted as various animals, while the sinful angels are as fallen stars and the seven archangels as human beings.[139] Because the history from the Creation to the Israelites' return from the Babylonian exile follows in most parts the Biblical line, [140] all the Israelite and non-Israelite characters can be recognized fairly well in spite of the allegorical nature of the text. For example, from the time of Jacob, the Israelite (both individual and collective) is depicted as "white sheep", while some remarkable Israelite characters are "ram" or "lamb".[141] The characters of the period from the return from the exile to the Maccabean revolt, which is thought to be contemporary with the author of DV, can be decoded with the help of the knowledge of the history of Hellenistic world as well as the first and second books of Maccabees. DV is judged to have been composed between 164 and 160 BCE on the grounds that 1 Enoch

---

[137] The English translation is from Nickelsburg – VanderKam 2004. Likewise in the following, unless another translation is mentioned.

[138] Nickelsburg argues that the remnant motif here is from Isa 24:6 as well as Gen 7:23. With regard to the term "seed-bearing plant", he also argues that it is thematically parallel with Isa 6:13. See Nickelsburg 2001:353. It should also be recalled that Blenkinsopp's thesis that the notion of the holy remnant as God's righteous plant is adopted from the "Isaianic metaphor for the sowing by God of the seeds for new people". See discussion above in 3.3.2.

[139] Noah and Moses become transformed into human being (89:1; 89:36). For explanation of their transformation, see Nickelsburg 1981:97 (note 42).

[140] The exception is 1 Enoch 86-88, which speak of the fall of the sinful angels, the violence of the giants born from those angels and human women, the appearance of the seven archangels and their judgment of the fallen angels and the giants. These chapters are an expansion of the Biblical tradition in Genesis 6:1-4. Nickelsburg points out that the author in these chapters has drawn heavily on 1 Enoch 6-11. Nickelsburg 1981:91.

[141] For example, Saul, David and Solomon are depicted as a 'ram'. As for the animal figure of Jacob, it is translated as a 'white ram' in Black 1985 and Nickelsburg – VanderKam 2004. In Charles 1913; Knibb 1978; Isaac 1983 it is 'white sheep'.

90:9-17 seems to refer to Judas Maccabeus' successful war campaign and that there is no indication of his death.[142]

The motif of obduracy which concerns the people of Israel appears for the first time in the time of the Exodus and after it the motif appears repeatedly throughout DV.[143] The sin which Israelites committed while Moses was up the mountain is described as follows: "(…) and the sheep began to be blinded and to stray from the path that it (Moses; addition mine) had shown them (…; 1 Enoch 89:32)".[144] By means of a severe punishment Moses succeeded in returning "all the straying flock to their folds" (89:34-35).[145]

The next time the obduracy motif appears is in the time of Judges. 1 Enoch 89:41 relates: "And sometimes their eyes were opened and sometimes they were blinded, until another sheep arose and led them and brought them all back, and their eyes were opened". The iteration of obduracy and recovery from it fits very well to the situation described in the book of Judges, especially to a condensed form of this situation in Judges 2:6-23.[146] It can be stated that in order to describe the time of Judges the author of DV used the obduracy motif to paraphrase the deuteronomistic cyclic view on history (i.e., sin – judgment – salvation).

---

[142] See, e.g., Nickelsburg 1981:93. With regard to the time of composition, see also Milik's and Nickelsburg – Vanderkam's views on the matter. Milik 1976:43-44; Nickelsburg – Vanderkam 2004:133 (note e).

[143] When the Israelites entered into the desert after their crossing of the Red Sea, 1 Enoch 89:28 relates that the sheep "began to open their eyes and see" so that they were fed by God in the place where there was no water and grass. This implies that they were blinded at least for some time before they got something to drink and eat. Such a situation fits into the Biblical tradition concerning the Israelites' murmuring against Moses at Marah (Exodus 15:24) and in the wilderness of Sin (16:2-3). Still, there is no explicit mention of their blindness. Therefore, I take 1 Enoch 89:32 (see below) as the starting point of the obduracy motif concerning the people of Israel. On the other hand, 1 Enoch 89:21 mentions the blindness of Pharaoh and the Egyptians. It fits to the biblical traditions; however, the blindness of the Gentiles is not the concern of this research, because the focus is on the obduracy/hardening motif relating to the people of Israel and its connectedness with the remnant motif.

[144] The same description is repeated in the following verse (89:33). As can be seen in these two verses (1 Enoch 89:32 and 33) and also in later passages, the obduracy motif of DV predominantly concerns 'blindness' ('deafness' once in 1 Enoch 90:7).

[145] According to Isaac's translation (1983), 1 Enoch 89:36 indicates the liberation from obduracy by mentioning that the eyes of the sheep became opened by "that house" (e.g., 'tarbernacle' according to Nickelsburg 1981:97 [note 42]). This extra sentence does not exist in Charles 1913; Knibb 1978; Black 1985; Nickelsburg – VanderKam 2004.

[146] Not all readings allow the iterative meaning of obduracy and liberation. See, e.g., Issac's translation (1983). Still, all the other translators used here (Charles 1913; Knibb 1978; Black 1985; Nickelsburg – VanderKam 2004) have the iterative meaning.

After the reign of Saul, David and Solomon, the time of apostasy comes in the era of the two kingdoms.[147] 1 Enoch 89:51 relates: "(…) those sheep strayed and went off in many paths and abandoned that house (…)". Then, God sent his prophets to the people, who began to kill them (1 Enoch 89:51-53). God's saving of one sheep from the hands of the sheep clearly refers to Elijah (1 Enoch 89:52). J.S. Kloppenborg argues that the theme of "God's repeated sending of the prophets to Israel and their repeated and violent rejection" is a deuternomistic pattern "which occurs frequently in sermons and penitential prayers in the Tanak and Second Temple Jewish literature".[148] This time the passage about the people's straying does not mention their blindness. But since Israelites' blindness is often paired with their "straying" in DV, the blindness can be considered to be presupposed in 1 Enoch 89:51.[149]

The prophet's martyrdom is followed by the time when the obduracy motif reaches a striking turning point in the following three ways.

Firstly, the obdurate condition of the people now becomes irreversible. 1 Enoch 89:54 relates: "(…) when they abandoned the house of the Lord and his tower, they went astray in every thing, and their eyes were blinded". From now on, the iteration of obduracy and recovery from it will no longer be seen as earlier (as in the time of the Judges; see above). It is only at the advent of the eschatological events that 'lambs with opened eyes' (1 Enoch 90:6) appear. Until then, the people of Israel will be under obdurate condition even after the return from the exile and the rebuilding of the Temple (1 Enoch 89:74) through all the Persian and Hellenistic periods.

Secondly, just at this stage, God determines to give up the people into the hands of Gentile nations as punishment and for destruction. Until now, surely, the Israelites have

---

[147] 1 Enoch 89:44 relates: "And the sheep whose eyes were open saw the ram (i.e., Saul; addition mine) among the sheep until it forsook its path and began to walk where there was no path". In this translation and also Black's of 1985, "the sheep" with opened eyes refer to the people of Israel. It means that the obduracy concerns only the king. On the other hand, the Aramaic fragment of this text in 4QEn[d] shows the singular form of "the sheep", so, it refers to Samuel. As a matter of fact, Nickelsburg – VanderKam's and Black's translation is based on the Greek reading. Milik argues that the reading must be made in accordance with the Aramaic text. See Milik 1976:224-225. Curiously, in the translations of Charles 1913, Knibb 1978 and Isaac 1983, which are based on Ethiopian manuscripts, the sheep refers to an individual, i.e., Samuel. Thus, the Ethiopian version preserves the Aramaic form better than the Greek version in this case.
[148] Kloppenborg 2006:35, 220 (also note 5).
[149] Israelites' blindness is paired with their "straying" in 1 Enoch 89:32, 33, 54. Blindness is mentioned without straying in 1 Enoch 89:41, 74; 90:7.

continuously been annoyed by them. However, God has never been described as the instigator of the predicament of the Israelites. From now on he emerges as such an instigator. Phrases such as: God "*worked* much slaughter on them" (1 Enoch 89:54); "*abandoned*" them, Jerusalem and the Temple into the hands of Gentile nations (89:55-56), clarifies who the performer is. He even "*rejoiced* because they were devoured and swallowed up and carried off" (89:58)[150]. Nickelsburg points out similarly that at this stage, the verbs relating to God are changed from those which denote that he benefits the people to those that he abandons them.[151]

In connection with God's determination to abandon the people into the hands of Gentile nations, thirdly, one more remarkable thing happens. God commissions "seventy shepherds" to perform the task of destroying the people in cooperation with Gentile nations (1 Enoch 89:59-60).[152] Each of shepherds will do his job, one by one, in the period assigned to him (89:68; also 90:1, 5). However, God gives them a strict condition: "I will tell you which of them are to be destroyed" (89:60). Thus, it is God who decides who is to be destroyed and who is not; the shepherds must obey his decision and work as his agent. On the other hand, God is sure that his agents will not work like automatons. Therefore, he summons another agent, who will be found as one of the seven archangels later in 1 Enoch 90:22 (cf., 87:2-88:3), to give him a task of recording the shepherds' breach of the obligation, i.e., excess of destruction (89:61-64). This agent must report every excess to God (see 89:70-71, 76-77; 90:17; cf. 90:20, 22), so that God might annihilate the shepherds as punishment in the final judgment (90:22-23, 25). The author of DV, thus, acknowledges that innocent blood will be shed even in the world and in history which is supposed to be under the Almighty's control. Therefore, as M. Black mentions, in God's commissioning of the seventy shepherds, theodicy is combined with apologetic.[153] In the act of God, the other side of the coin can also be found, that is, the idea that no transgression will be overlooked nor left without retribution in the perspective of eternity. Through this idea, DV invests a reader with the following insight:

---

[150] All the emphases in the quotations here are mine.
[151] Nickelsburg 2001:389-390.
[152] Nickelsburg points out that the theme of God's abandoning of the people of 1 En 89:34-58 and the theme of his commissioning seventy shepherds of 89:59-64 are simultaneous with each other. See Nickelsburg 2001:390.
[153] Black 1985:270-271 (note 59), 272 (note 69).

the present world and history, existing *under* the heavenly realm and moving *towards* the eschatological, New Age realm, is really under the Almighty's control. The idea is an ideal case of "apocalyptic technique" in J.J. Collin's term.[154] Whichever idea is concerned here, apologetic or apocalyptic, one thing is clear: with God's commissioning of the seventy shepherds, the process of purification in which the unrighteous will be annihilated is started.[155]

In this way Israel's decisive obduracy and purification process are begun. After a series of destructive attacks from enemy nations, and Israel's subsequent destruction and exile (1 Enoch 89:65-68), there is the return from exile and the temple is rebuilt (89:72-73), but there is no change to the fundamental condition of the people. 1 Enoch 89:73 relates that all the offerings to the rebuilt temple are "polluted and not pure". 89:74 adds: "And besides all these things, the eyes of the sheep were blind, and they did not see (…)".[156] At the same time the Gentile nations continue to annoy and destroy the people (89:74-75; 90:1). Then, Greek occupants, who are characteristically depicted as various birds of prey, appear on the scene. The severity of their destruction is expressed in 90:1-4: "(…) they left them neither flesh nor skin nor sinew, until only their bones remained; and their bones fell on the earth, and the sheep became few" (90:4).

---

[154] Collins clarifies "apocalyptic technique" as follows: "Whatever the underlying problem, it is viewed from a distinctive apocalyptic perspective. This perspective is framed *spatially* by the supernatural world and *temporally* by the eschatological judgment. The problem is not viewed simply in terms of the historical factors available to any observer. Rather it is viewed in the light of a transcendent reality disclosed by the apocalypse. The transcendent world may be expressed through mythological symbolism or celestial geography or both. It puts the problem in perspective and projects a definitive resolution to come. This apocalyptic technique does not, of course, have a publicly discernible effect on a historical crisis, but it provides a resolution in the imagination by instilling conviction in the revealed 'knowledge' that it imparts. The function of apocalyptic literature is to shape one's imaginative perception of a situation and so lay the basis for whatever course of action it exhorts (emphasis mine)". See Collins 1998:41-42.

[155] With regard to the identity of the seventy shepherds, scholars have pointed out that the concept is a conflation of several Jewish, canonical and non-canonical notions. Nickelsburg summarizes them as follows: (i) the guardian angels of the (seventy) nations (Deut 32:8; Sir 17:17; Jub. 15:31; Dan 10:13, 20), (ii) the term "shepherd" which is used to describe the leaders of God's sheep and the notion that these shepherds are derelict in their duty and will be called to task (Isa 56:11; Ezek 34; Zech 13:7), (iii) the interpretation of Jeremiah's prediction of seventy years to refer to seventy periods of time (Jer 25:11-12; 29:10, as interpreted in Dan 9:2, 24-27). See Nickelsburg 1981:92, 97 (note 50, 51, 52, 53, 54). See also Charles 1913:255; Hengel 1974:I.187-188, II.126 (note 527); VanderKam 1995:85-88; also Nieckelburg 2001:390-391.

[156] 1 Enoch 89:74 also mentions explicitly that the blindness also concerns the shepherds.

The history then begins to turn to the eschatological stage. Those who fill the role of triggering this turn are "lambs" whose eyes are opened (1 Enoch 90:6).[157] They also cry out to the sheep, who neither listen to them nor attend to their words (90:6-7). Nickelsburg decodes the text as follows: "the younger generation (the pious Jews) open their eyes and appealed to the older ones (the Hellenizers) to return from their wickedness, but no avail".[158] The reason for the failure of their mission is due only to the sheep's obduracy: "they were extremely deaf, and their eyes were extremely and excessively blinded" (90:7). 90:8 is thought to refer to the murder of a former high priest, Onias III, who is "one of those lambs" with opened eyes, while 90:9a is thought to refer to the pious Jews' unsuccessful insurrections in 170/169 and 167 BCE against the Hellenistic and Hellenized leaders[159]. The history then enters upon the eschatological war. Scholars have pointed out that there is a serious textual problem in 1 Enoch 90:9b-19. This research follows Nickelsburg – VanderKam's critical reconstruction. The occupants' attack against the Jews is only intensified, as is the Jews' cry and lamentation (90:11). The archangel who records the seventy shepherds' work reports to God for the third time (90:17; cf. 89:70-71, 76-77). Now is the time of God's intervention. He comes to the earth with his wrath and splits the earth to wipe out the enemies (90:18). He also gives a large sword to the sheep and the enemies flee before them (90:19). That is, one part of the enemies is destroyed; the other flees.[160]

Following the eschatological war, the final judgement and the New Age come. God, sitting on the throne, judges all the unrighteous and punishes them, first, the fallen

---

[157] Nikcelsburg emphasizes the significance of the role of "the lambs". See Nickelsburg 2001:360, 361, 398.

[158] Nickelsburg 1981:92.

[159] About those insurrections, see Nickelsburg 1981:72.

[160] Nickelsburg – VanderKam's reconstruction is based on the sequence of 1 Enoch 90:9a, 11, 17-19. According to them, 90:9b-10, 12-16, which refer to the activity of Judas Maccabeus, are a doublet of the original construction of vv. 9a, 11, 17-19. The new verses are "an update of a slightly earlier apocalypse, interpolated around 163-161 BCE". See Nickelsburg – VanderKam 2004:133 (note e). It is interesting that in the new verses the activity of Judas Maccabeus affects the opening of the eyes of the sheep (90:9b). A different reconstruction of doublet is suggested by Charles 1913:258. Milik is against the hypothesis of doublet. According to him, 1 Enoch 90:13-15 refer to the battle of Bethsur at the beginning of 164 BCE and 90:16 refers to the neighboring nations' joint military campaign against the victorious Israel. Therefore, all the verses describe the historical events in sequence until God's direct intervention in 90:17. He attempts to count the date of DV more accurately than any other scholar, i.e., during the year of 164 BCE, a few weeks after the battle of Bethsur. Milik 1976:43-44. See also Black 1985:276-277 (note 13) who is also against the hypothesis of doublet.

stars,[161] second, the seventy shepherds and third, the "blinded sheep", i.e., Israelite renegades. All of them are "found to be sinners" and thrown into the fiery abysses (1 Enoch 90:20-27).[162] Thus the process of purification ends. The "old house", i.e., Jerusalem, is removed and replaced with a totally new sanctuary by God (90:28-29). The sheep *"that remained"* as well as those animals loyal to this remnant (90:30), together with the other sheep which had been dispersed and "destroyed" are gathered together in the sanctuary (90:33). Scholars agree that resurrection is referred to in the restoration of the destroyed.[163] This remnant, consisting of those sheep which survived and the resurrected righteous sheep as well as the loyal animals, is then characterized with the counter-obduracy terminology: "And the eyes of all were opened, and they saw good things" (90:30). The holy remnant has emerged.[164]

3.3.3.2. Functional connectedness between the two motifs

As has been shown in the outline above, the motifs of obduracy and remnant are clearly present in DV. The obdurate condition of the people is characterized with explicit obduracy terminology such as 'blindness' and 'deafness'. This condition concerns the pre-exilic and the postexilic periods equally. The motif of remnant becomes explicit in the eschatological time, when the nucleus of the righteous community is depicted as the very remnant of the people from whom the unrighteous are purged away. However, as seen above, this purifying operation of God is actually started up at the time of the 'turning point' in 1 En 89:54-64. *The remnant motif is introduced implicitly already at that time through the idea of the purifying operation.* Moreover, the eschatological

---

[161] About the fallen stars, see fn 140.

[162] The Israelite renegades are thrown into a different abyss from the fallen stars and the seventy shepherds. It is situated on the south side of Jerusalem. See 1 Enoch 90:26-27. Black regards the place as 'Gehenna'. Black 1985:278 (note 26). Cf. Nickelsburg 1981:93, 98 (note 59).

[163] Charles 1913:260; Nickelsburg 1981:93; Black 1985:279 (note 33); Collins 1998:70; Nickelsburg 2001:405-406.

[164] All the members of this remnant, i.e., those sheep which survived, the resurrected righteous sheep and the loyal animals, are finally transformed into "white cattle". The transformation occurs in connection with the appearance of a "white bull" with a large horn. The problem of the identity of this 'Messianic' figure falls outside the scope of this research. However, see, e.g., Milik 1976:45; Knibb 1978:216 (note 90.38); Black 1985:279-280 (note 37, 38); Nickelsburg 2001:406-407.

remnant is characterized by the explicit counter-obduracy terminology like 'opening of the eyes'. Therefore, the second aspect of the Isaianic functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant (i.e., as a result of God's purifying operation, a holy remnant liberated from hardening emerges) can be found in DV. The question remains: Is the obdurate condition in question a result of divine hardening?

In order to answer this question, it is necessary to establish whether the first aspect of the Isaianic functional connectedness can be found in DV. Attention is paid to the fact that in the 'turning point' when the obdurate condition of the people became irreversible, God also began the purifying operation by means of using foreign enemies and by commissioning the seventy shepherds. This 'turning point' is placed between the martyrdom of the prophets and the exile. The time can be pinpointed more closely. Black argues that God's commissioning of the seventy shepherds happens at the time of the Assyrian threat and attack against the two kingdoms and the fall of Samaria. Therefore, he identifies the major enemy animals in 1 Enoch 89:55, 56, 65, 66 as follows: lions – Assyrians; leopards – Babylonians; wolves – Egyptians.[165] Nickelsburg, on his part, argues for the time of king Manasseh, the successor of the king Hezekiah.[166] Whichever time it is, whether prior to the Assyrian invasion of Judah or after it (i.e., Manasseh's time), the 'turning-point' in question is contemporary with the prophet Isaiah, who received the oracle concerning the divine hardening and the holy remnant (Isa 6:9-13).[167] *The author of DV set the 'turning point' at the time contemporary with the prophet Isaiah.*

If Israel's irreversible obduracy in 1 En 89:54 is contemporary with the prophet, the question becomes: Does this fixation of obduracy have anything to do with the divine hardening of Isa 6:9-10? From the modern translations of 1 En 89:54, it is by no means clear whether the obduracy here is divinely inflicted one or not. The expressions are

---

[165] Black 1985:270-271 (note 55, 59). M. Hengel suggests a similar view on the time of 'the turning point'. See Hengel 1974:I.187.
[166] Nickelsburg 2001:355.
[167] The Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah 1-5 relates Isaiah's martyrdom under king Manasseh. According to Laato, "although the present form of the text is Christian, scholars agree that the story of Isaiah's martyrdom during the reign of Manasseh is of Jewish origin". See Laato 1998:26. I do not argue that the story is historically true, but only that it is plausible that Isaiah could have lived after Hezekiah's death (see 2 Kgs 32:32; also Isa 38:1-8).

general: "their eyes were blinded" or "became blindfolded".[168] If an Aramaic fragment of that verse remained, it might be possible to find the answer, but unfortunately there are only a couple of fragments from Qumran in existence and these refer to the Israelites' obduracy in contexts other than the 'turning point', 1 En 89:32 in 4QEn[c] and 1 En 89:28 in 4QEn[e], that is, the context *before* the 'turning point'. The verbs relating to obduracy, אתסמיה in the former verse and התפתחו in the latter, are both in the reflective form, not the causative, so the former verb does not express a divinely inflicted blindness; and the latter does not express the liberation from blindness by God.[169] Because they are only fragments relating to the motif of Israel's obduracy, it cannot be known for sure in what form the concerned Aramaic verb stands in 1 En 89:54, reflexive or causative.[170]

On the other hand, Nickelsburg argues that the passive form of the Ethiopic verb relating to blindness in 1 En 89:32, 33, 41, 54, 74; 90:7 indicates that a passive construction stood in the underlying Greek and Aramaic, so that the blindness of the people is something inflicted by someone, rather than the mere condition of the people.[171] However, he considers someone demonic, not divine, as the inflictor of blindness, although he regards the liberation of "the lambs" from blindness (1 En 90:6-7) as God's work.[172] The idea of divine hardening against the people of Israel is indisputably a biblical tradition! However, if the view that the verb relating to blindness is passive but in the sense that God is the agent is accepted, then divine hardening concerns all the cases of obduracy not only at the time contemporary with Isaiah and after it but also prior to this time.

---

[168] The first type of translation is in Charles 1913; Knibb 1978; Black 1985; Nickelsburg – VanderKam 2004. The second type is in Isaac 1983.

[169] 1 Enoch 89:32 in 4QEn[c] mentions the Israelites' blindness at their sin at Sinai: " וענא שריוא למאן]מיה (but the flock began to go blinded)". 4QEn[e] concerns the counter-obduracy. The fragment contains 1 Enoch 89:28 which states that the sheep "began to open their eyes and see", that is, recovery from the blindness: "ועיניהון התפתחו וחזו (and their eyes were opened [and they saw])". The Aramaic text and translation is from Milik 1976:204-206; 243-244.

[170] As seen in fn 147 above, 4QEn[d] contains 1 Enoch 89:44 in which Samuel's eyes, not the people's, became opened to see Saul forsake the path. Also here, the Aramaic verb "אתפתחו" is in reflexive form. See Milik 1976:224-225.

[171] Nickelsburg 2001:356, 380-381.

[172] With regard to the question of the inflictor of blindness, Nickelsburg considers the possibility of the demon Sammael, "even if the demon is never explicitly mentioned". See Nickelsburg 2001:380-381.

In order to solve the problem of whether Israel's irreversible obduracy in 1 En 89:54 has anything to do with the divine hardening of Isa 6:9-10, the fact that the Israelites' blindness of 1 Enoch 89:54 is qualitatively different from all the earlier cases of blindness should be taken into account.[173] As seen in the outline, blindness and recovery from it has been iterated before, in the time of the Judges. The iteration of blindness and recovery can be said to be parallel with the deuteronomistic, cyclic view on history: sin – judgment – salvation. The iteration no longer occurs however. The advent of the eschatological events must be awaited for the next recovery from blindness. The people *are left* under blindness through the times in spite of such events as could be characterized as a case of recovery, i.e., the return from the exile and the reconstruction of the Temple. Moreover, as another element of the 'turning point', at the same time God starts the purifying operation by means of using foreign enemies and commissioning the seventy shepherds. The aim of this purification is, as mentioned above, to form a holy remnant. *At the 'turning point' the Israelites' blindness becomes something fixed by God and they are put under God's purifying operation with a view to forming a holy remnant.* I think that these circumstances can be judged to be quite parallel with the first aspect of the Isaianic functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant (i.e., God sets to hardening with a view to forming a holy remnant through the purifying operation), even though DV does not mention a special figure to whom this task of fixation is assigned. Considering that the fixation of obduracy and the start of the purifying operation happen contemporary with Isaiah in DV's description of history, it seems likely that the 'turning point' reflects the situation of Isa 6:9-13, i.e., the first aspect of the functional connectedness. To describe Israel's history after the period of the killing of the prophets (or after the time contemporary with the prophet Isaiah), the author of DV might have followed the way that the motifs of hardening and remnant function in the book of Isaiah. After the 'turning point' of I En 89:54, thus, the obduracy more or less concerns divine hardening; and the recovery from it concerns the liberation from it by

---

[173] The significance of the turning point in question is also emphasized by Nickelsburg. He argues: "a significant dividing point within the era is indicated by a qualitative change in human and divine actions". See Nickelsburg 2001:355.
[173] So also Nickelsburg 2001:395.

God. The Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant is operative in DV much more fully here than in the other Jewish writings analysed earlier.

3.3.3.3. Remarks on other Isaianic motifs and the Isaianic influence on DV

The presence of other Isaianic motifs in DV is now investigated and some remarks on the influence of the book of Isaiah on the latter are offered. The presence of more Isaianic motifs can prove the Isaianic influence on DV still more. Two motifs related to the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, namely, the motif of cataclysmic events in the eschatological time and that of the joining of the loyal Gentiles in the salvation are investigated.

As shown in the previous chapter (2.1.2), God's promises of salvation proclaimed in the earlier parts of the book of Isaiah (Isa 1-39 and 40-55) have been reset to concern the apocalyptic-eschatological time in the entire context of the book. Additionally, the time of salvation becomes depicted as the time of cataclysmic events like the annihilation of rebellious nations by God's direct intervention (Isa 66:24)[174] and the creation of new heavens and a new earth (Isa 65:17ff; 66:22). As seen in the outline of DV, the motif of the annihilation of enemy nations is clearly present there. As far as the new creation is concerned, the transformation of the City and Temple into a new sanctuary where God himself resides with his holy remnant and the following transformation of the remnant into the same pure species ("white cattle") are phenomena comparable to the new creation. As Nickelsburg points out, the authors of the Jewish writings from the time of the Maccabean revolt, including DV, developed "the apocalyptic eschatology of Third Isaiah".[175]

With regard to the motif of the joining of the loyal Gentiles in the salvation, i.e., the idea of universalism in the eschatological time, after the destruction of the disloyal Gentiles, the loyal ones will join the holy remnant (1 En 90:30; see above). Thus, this motif is so clearly present in DV that it is unnecessary to comment more on it.

---

[174] It has already been shown in 2.1.3 that Isa 66:24 uses the 'Assyrian invasion' paradigm.
[175] Nickelsburg 1981:95.

It can also be said however, that similar motifs are also found in other OT books. For example, the idea of universalism is found in Zech 9-14; therefore, exegesis on DV with the book of Isaiah as the principal frame of reference might not be justified. But when it is possible to reconstruct the Isaianic functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant and find a similar connectedness in a non-canonical writing and also other Isaianic motifs in the same writing, why should the trouble to detour this major key (i.e., the whole book of Isaiah) be taken to do an exegesis of that writing through innumerable minor keys (individual passages, verses, phrases and so on of other OT books)?[176] Because of a close parallelism between DV and Isaiah with respect to the functional connectedness of the motifs of hardening and remnant and also because of the presence of other Isaianic motifs in DV, it can be stated that the author of DV was influenced by the book of Isaiah as a whole. No doubt, Daniel is situated on the Isaianic interpretative trajectory as "the first major point" outside the book of Isaiah[177]. Nonetheless, DV clearly occupies the major point on the same trajectory no less than Daniel.[178]

---

[176] One example of searching for such a minor key is VanderKam's discussion on the obduracy motif of DV. Earlier he only stated that in spite of its significance, the motif had not been studied sufficiently; therefore, "the motif of opened eyes is extremely important in AA (= Animal Apocalypse, i.e., the latter part of DV; addition mine) and deserves more extended study". Later, he took up the issue again and considered the possibility that the opening of the eyes of the remnant in the New Age (1 Enoch 90:35) was related to Gen 3:5, in which the serpent tells the woman that her own and her husband's eyes would be opened and that they would be like God (gods) if they ate the forbidden fruit. However, he continues: "the disappointing result suggests that this passage is not the immediate inspiration for the image in the Animal Apocalypse, in which it has a positive meaning". See VanderKam 1984:168 (note 79); 1995:80 (note 22).

[177] See discussion in 3.3.2.

[178] One possible way to disprove the Isaianic influence on DV would be to find some ideology which is against the interest of the book of Isaiah. One possible case is discussed by G. Zerbe, i.e., the issue of DV's "synergistic ideology, in which human military action works in concert with the divine and heavenly action". The ideology is in conflict with the Isaianic idea of "taking the stance of trust and waiting in view of God's exclusive prerogative for security and defense". See Zerbe 1993:65-95. It should be asked, however, whether DV really represents the synergistic ideology. Firstly, it should be observed that at the time of writing, the author of the original apocalypse (according to Nickelsburg – VanderKam's reconstruction, see fn. 160 above) had already seen the unsuccessful military actions of the Hasidim, while the author of the additional verses (see fn 160 above) had already seen the victory of Judas Maccabeus. I think that for the part of the former author, the text about human military actions is descriptive rather than prescriptive. Secondly, it should be observed that after the eschatological war, those military activists have no role in the final judgment and New Age. If the author had really considered them to be ideal, they might have been treated differently there. Moreover, 1 Enoch 90:34 relates that the sheep laid down the sword which had been given by God in the eschatological war, brought it to the new sanctuary and sealed it up in the presence of God. Thus, the motif of the eternal abandonment of weapons fits well to the motif of Isa 2:4.

Another possible case concerns DV's characterization of high priest Onias III as one of the lambs whose eyes are opened (1 En 90:7-8; see the outline of DV above). It seems to be at odds with DV's negative

3.4. Reconstruction of the Aramaic tradition behind TgIsa 6:9-13

3.4.1. The Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant as ideological background

The traditions of the Isaiah Targum are multilayered, consisting of two major exegetical frameworks, Tannaitic and Amoraic; moreover, different strata are discernable within the former framework, so that there are such traditions in it as originate from the Second Temple period.[179] In the question of the earliest traditions of the Isaiah Targum, TgIsa 6:9-10 is an interesting case in which the question of the possibility of pre-70 origin can be taken up for the reason that Jesus' citation from Isa 6:9-10 in Mark 4:12 shows a strong similarity to the targumic form of the passage in comparison with the MT (thus, also the Qumran transcription) and the LXX.[180] The task of this section is to reconstruct the tradition behind TgIsa 6:9-13, not relying on the argument of the similarity between Mark 4:10 and TgIsa 6:9-10.[181] The key question here is: Does the present form of the targumic version of Isa 6:9-13, the most central passage about the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, reflect the Aramaic tradition of the passage of the Second Temple period?

The result of the analysis of Jewish writings in the preceding two sections (3.2 and 3.3) will be a help to answering this question, because it provides us with important information on one aspect of the ideological background of the Second Temple Judaism

---

attitude to the temple of the whole postexilic period. Collins notices this problem and says that the passage "modifies the author's rejection of the Second Temple". See Collins 1998:69. In spite of such an inconsistency, it should also be noticed that in the main, DV is consistent with its attitude to the Second Temple, so that the temple worship is condemned for corruption; the temple and the city are to be replaced by the new sanctuary in the eschatological time. It is possible that the problem of the positive attitude to Onias III is related to the problem of the background of the author of DV. Hengel argues that DV (as well as Daniel and the Apocalypse of Weeks) was composed by the Hasidim, while Nickelsburg – M.E. Stone and Collins are skeptical about Hengel's "attractive" hypothesis. This problem is not discussed further here. See Hengel 1974:I.175-176; Nickelsburg – Stone 1983:19-24; Collins 1998:77-78.

[179] See discussion in 3.1.

[180] About the similarity and difference of the forms of Isa 6:9-10 of the MT, the LXX, the Targum and Jesus' citation in Mark 4:12, see 1.2.2 in the first chapter.

[181] As seen in the survey of previous studies (1.2), since the days of Manson and Jeremias, scholars have regarded the similarity between the TgIsa 6:9-10 and Jesus' citation in Mark 4:12 as proof of the authenticity of the latter. Without considering an Aramaic tradition behind these two texts the argumentation for the authenticity is, however, simplistic.

in Palestine. Below, based on the result of the analysis, a sketch of this background is offered.

With regards to the Qumran transcription of Isaiah and the LXX Isaiah, it has been demonstrated that by text form, the Qumran transcription can convey the same Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant as the MT. In the LXX, however, while the two motifs of hardening and remnant are contained, the functional connectedness between them is lost at least in the form of the MT (also the Qumran transcription). Such being the case, it is possible that the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant (in the form of the MT) could have been conveyed to the readers of the whole book of Isaiah in Second Temple Judaism *in Palestine* much better than in the dominantly Hellenistic Jewish context.

However, it is important to know whether the Isaianic idea was operative in the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism also on a concrete level, not only a theoretical level (i.e., the level of the capability of the available, biblical text to convey the idea). For this reason, Jewish writings other than the transcription and translation have been analysed. Relying on Blenkinsopp's study, eight writings which share the Isaianic negative view on the postexilic period were chosen. In six writings of them (Daniel, Jubilees, the Apocalypse of Weeks, Dream Visions, the Testament of Moses and the Damascus Document), the motifs of remnant and (counter-) obduracy are present, though the presence of the latter motif is somewhat implicit in the Testament of Moses and Damascus Document. The appearance of these motifs is also found parallel with the second aspect of the Isaianic functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant (i.e., as a result of the purifying operation, a holy remnant liberated from hardening emerges). In Enoch's Dream Visions, there are parallelisms with even the first aspect of the functional connectedness (i.e., God sets to hardening with a view to forming a holy remnant through his purifying operation). However, it has also been observed that because all (with the exception of Dream Visions) lack the first aspect, the obdurate condition mentioned or presupposed in them cannot be proved to have come from divine hardening, although a good reader of Isaiah (especially the authors of Daniel and Damascus Document) might well have been conscious of the matter.[182]

---

[182] See discussion in 3.3.2 and 3.3.3.

It is true that the book of Isaiah was not the only source for the authors of those books; in their writing, they surely relied on various biblical and non-biblical traditions. With respect to the functional connectedness between the motifs of obduracy and remnant, it is possible that they could have developed such a connectedness basing on other traditions than Isaiah. In the previous chapter, it has been demonstrated that the books of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Deuteronomy exhibit a connectedness between the motifs of remnant and (counter-) obduracy, so that the community to return from the exile or which has just returned to the land of Judah is given a new heart.[183] As demonstrated by the linguistic and thematic affinities shown by Blenkinsopp, however, the authors of the Jewish writings analysed in this research were also readers of the book of Isaiah. Moreover, they were obvious readers of the *whole* book of Isaiah, which can be proved by the negative view on the postexilic period that is common to them all. As shown in the analysis of those writings, their notion of a remnant liberated from obduracy is estranged from the context of the exile and return; for them, such a remnant is quite an apocalyptic-eschatological entity. Even if they could have developed the notion of remnant basing on other traditions from books like Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Deuteronomy, I think that the whole book of Isaiah would have been an important and common factor in such a development. Their notion of a remnant liberated from obduracy is thus the case where certain readers of Isaiah in the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism were influenced by the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant. Therefore, the idea should be reckoned as one aspect of the ideological background of the Judaism then and there, and which is also the Jesuanic context for the saying in Mark 4:11-12.[184]

If TgIsa 6:9-13 can be demonstrated to be able to convey the Isaianic idea which is an aspect of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism, it can be considered that this present form of the targumic passage at least *reflects* the Aramaic tradition of the Judaism at that time, although it is impossible to reconstruct the form of the tradition exactly word by word. But if not, it can be considered that it is due to one of the following two reasons.

---

[183] See discussion in 2.2.1 and 2.2.2.
[184] I do not mean that the readers of the whole book of Isaiah in the Second Temple period in Palestine were always influenced by the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant. For example, I am doubtful about the influence with respect to those readers who might not have shared the Isaianic negative view on the temple worship of the postexilic period like Jesus the son of Sirach and Josephus, although a detailed analysis of the writings by such readers should be done in order to be able to say something more certain.

Either that the Aramaic tradition of the Second Temple period was by form so far from the present one that the latter hardly reflects the former; the tradition then really conveyed the Isaianic idea, but was subsequently changed into the present form which does not covey it; or that the Aramaic tradition was by form near to the present form; however, the former did not convey the idea, and neither does the latter. In either case, the reconstruction of the tradition is more complicated than the case in which the present form of TgIsa 6:9-13 conveys the Isaianic idea and reflects the tradition, because a reconstruction of the change of the tradition is required in the first case, or in the second case an alternative meaning of the Isaianic passage in the Second Temple period should be sought for. At any rate the examination of the relationship between the present form of TgIsa 6:9-13, on the one hand, and the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant as ideological background of the Second Temple Judaism in Palestine, on the other, is the first step to solving the problem of the Aramaic tradition behind the targumic passage.

3.4.2. TgIsa 6:9-13 and the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant

With regard to the Targumic version of the passage of Isa 6:9-10, which puts forth the idea of divine hardening in the MT (and also the Qumran transcription), scholars have argued since the days of Manson and Jeremias that the targumist no longer interpreted the Isaianic passage as the text about that idea. According to them, the harsh idea of the Hebrew bible was drastically mitigated. This means that the present form of TgIsa 6:9-10 has no relationship with the idea of divine hardening. If so, the Aramaic tradition behind it either already lacked the idea (if the present form reflects that tradition), *or* (if the present form does not reflect it) the tradition had the idea but was changed later into the present form which no longer conveys it. As demonstrated in the survey of the previous studies,[185] scholars who argue for the authenticity of Jesus' citation in Mark 4:12 on the grounds of TgIsa 6:9-10 hold the former view, i.e., that Jesus, relying on such a mitigated interpretation of the Isaianic passage, had no hardening purpose. Evans puts forth the most extensive argumentation for the thesis of the mitigated interpretation of TgIsa 6:9-

---

[185] See 1.2.2.

10, although he does not apply this thesis to his interpretation of Jesus' saying in Mark 4:11-12.[186] His thesis and argumentation are now examined in more detail.

Evans offers three arguments for the mitigation of the Hebrew bible's meaning in TgIsa 6:9-10.

TgIsa

(v. 9) ואמר

איזיל ותימר לעמא הדין דשמעין משמע ולא מסתכלין וחזן מחזא ולא ידעין:
(v. 10) טפיש לביה דעמא הדין ואודנוהי יקר ועינוהי טמטים דלמא יחזון בעיניהון
ובאודנהון ישמעון ובליבהון יסתכלון ויתובון וישתביק להון:

MT

v. 9 וַיֹּאמֶר לֵךְ וְאָמַרְתָּ לָעָם הַזֶּה
שִׁמְעוּ שָׁמוֹעַ וְאַל־תָּבִינוּ וּרְאוּ רָאוֹ וְאַל־תֵּדָעוּ:
v. 10 הַשְׁמֵן לֵב־הָעָם הַזֶּה וְאָזְנָיו הַכְבֵּד וְעֵינָיו הָשַׁע
פֶּן־יִרְאֶה בְעֵינָיו וּבְאָזְנָיו יִשְׁמָע וּלְבָבוֹ יָבִין וָשָׁב וְרָפָא לוֹ:

First, with regard to TgIsa 6:9, the relative particle ד is inserted in the verse, so that the imperative form of the MT ("Hear and hear, but do not understand; see and see, but do not perceive [RSV]") becomes the participial clause which can be understood as indicative: "Go, and speak to this people *that hear indeed, but do not understand, and see indeed, but do not perceive*".[187] Thus, the targumic verse 9 refers to the description of the people who are in obdurate condition, and not God's command to the prophet to make them obdurate as in the case of the MT.[188] Evans also argues that "this people" no longer refers to the whole people of Israel but to that part of the people which is in an obdurate condition.[189] Second, with regard to TgIsa 6:10, the word דלמא, behind which the Hebrew word פֶּן stands in the MT, can be interpreted as a conditional conjunction with a

---

[186] Evans, thus, concentrates on the question of how the targumist interpreted the Isaianic passage in the time of rabbinical Judaism. Concerning his view on the question of the validity of the mitigated interpretation in the early tradition, see discussion below. About his interpretation of Jesus' saying, see survey of the previous studies in 1.2.2.

[187] Chilton's translation of 1987 is used.

[188] Manson, Chilton and Bowker also take ד as a relative particle. See Manson 1948:77-79; Chilton 1984:90-98; Bowker 1974:311.

[189] Evans 1989:70-71.

negative force, "if not", instead of as a final/telic conjunction with the same force "in order not to/lest". In the former case ("if not"), the verse means that the execution of God's command to harden is no longer on an absolute base as in the case of the MT (i.e., "Make the heart of this people fat, and their eyes heavy, and shut their ears *in order for them not to see with their eyes [...]*). Rather it is made conditional: "Make the heart of this people fat, and their eyes heavy, and shut their ears, *if they do not see with their eyes (...)*".[190] Third, there is a tendency to mitigate the harshness of the MT in other passages of the Isaiah Targum. Evans mentions TgIsa 29:9-10; 42:18-20; 43:8; 44:18 and 63:17 as such cases.[191] These arguments are now examined one by one.

As far as TgIsa 6:9 is concerned, the view that the obdurate condition concerns only a part of the people, not the whole, should first be questioned. For the argument for such a partial view, Evans relies on G. Stenning's theory that the Isaiah Targum has a tendency that God's judgment against Israel often is transferred to their enemies. He considers, therefore, that the object of the hardening task of TgIsa 6:10 is limited to that part of the people which is already in an obdurate condition.[192] If the question here is about the limitation of the object of the hardening task within Israel, however, the matter is different from the transfer of judgment to Israel's enemies, so it is inappropriate that Stenning's theory should be applied to this case. Moreover, the connection between TgIsa 6:9-10 and 6:11-13 makes the argument for the partial view questionable. If the hardening task of TgIsa 6:10 concerns only the already obdurate part of the people, it is logical to think that the judgment of devastation of the cities and the land of TgIsa 6:11-12 also concerns only that part of the people, so that the other, non-obdurate, part of the people fall outside this devastation process.[193] However, in view of verse 11-13, the holy remnant of TgIsa 6:13, "the holy seed", is described in such a way that after a series of devastations it finally emerges out of the whole people rather than out of a particular part of the people. If the judgment of devastation, thus, concerns the whole people, I think the object of the hardening task must do too. Therefore, "this people" of TgIsa 6:9 who are

---

[190] Evans 1989:71. Jeremias also takes דלמא as a negative conditional but interprets the verse further, so that it means God's promise of forgiveness. See Jeremias 1984:12-13; also discussion below.
[191] Evans 1989:73-75.
[192] Evans 1989:69, 70, 194 (note 10).
[193] Isa 6:11-12 are translated almost exactly in the corresponding passage of Targum, so there is no substantive difference between the MT and the latter.

already in obdurate condition and who are to be made obdurate in TgIsa 6:10 should be understood as the whole people as in the case of the MT.

The meaning of the Aramaic word ד, usually taken as a relative particle for the interpretation of TgIsa 6:9 (see above), is now investigated. In principle, the word can function as a final/telic prefix, so it leads a final/telic clause: "Go, and speak to this people, *so that they might hear indeed, but not understand, and see indeed, but not perceive*". As may be observed, this final/telic clause has virtually the same meaning as the imperative of the MT, because the point of the clause is to make the people obdurate. Evans, however, argues that for the meaning of a final/telic prefix, ד -clause should have a verb in the imperfect form, instead of the participial form as in the present case.[194] But is it a grammatical truth that a verb must always be in the imperfect in the ד- clause which has a final/telic meaning? The matter is not so simple. S. Segert points out that "Da das Partizip keine Zeitstufe an sich ausdrückt, konnte es auch aus dem Bereich der Zukunft das Imperfekt zum Teil verdrängen". He adds that such a tendency became general in early Judaism.[195] Where he gives an account of the participial form which refers to the future, he shows a proof that such a participial form has a final/telic meaning.[196] Although his proof (Dan 2:13) concerns the conjunction ו, not ד, it is important to note that the *participle can be used as the predicate of a final/telic clause*. The word ד now comes into focus. According to Segert, if a ד-clause contains the manifestation of will, it is to be regarded as a final/telic clause.[197] In fact, TgIsa 6:9 can be interpreted in such a way that God, by his command to the prophet, manifests his will to bring about hardening to the people. If so, ד leads a final/telic clause. In the case of the manifestation of will, Segert shows, however, such a proof that a ד-clause takes a verb in the imperfect, not in the participle.[198] Nonetheless as explained above it is possible for a participle to be used as the predicate of a final/telic clause. Such being the case, it is

---

[194] Evans 1989:1989:70. Manson and Chilton put forth the same view. As for the reason that Jesus' citation from Isa 6:9-10 in Mark 4:12 begins with ἵνα, Manson considers that the translator of Jesus' citation misinterpreted ד in the Aramaic form as final/telic prefix, because he took the original construction of ד with participial verbs as ד with imperfect verbs. See Manson 1948:79 (note 1); Chilton 1984:93.
[195] Segert 1975:382 (6.6.3.4.6.a)
[196] Segert 1975:382 (6.6.3.4.6.c).
[197] Segert 1975:360 (6.5.3.5.2.b).
[198] Segert 1975:439 (7.5.9.5).

theoretically possible that the word ד is employed in TgIsa 6:9 in order to confirm the future-final/telic meaning of the participle. On the other hand, a comment on the possibility to interpret ד as a relative particle can be offered. This is usually is taken for the interpretation of TgIsa 6:9. According to F. Rosenthal, the participle can be used, among other things, to indicate a "continuous and habitual" action, which in the case of TgIsa 6:9 refers to 'this people hear indeed, but do not understand, and see indeed, but do not perceive'. He continues: "However, this mode is more commonly expressed by הוה 'to be' with the participle".[199] Such being the case, the ד-clause of TgIsa 6:9 could more readily be regarded as a relative clause, if it were constructed together with the finite verb הוה, not by only the participle (so in TgIsa 6:9).

Based on the discussion above, it can be stated that the meaning of the ד-clause of TgIsa 6:9 is not a self-evident matter. To be a relative clause, the present form cannot be ideal (the lack of הוה). Although Segert does not give proof that ד functions as a final/telic prefix in the participial clause, it is theoretically possible. I think that theoretically speaking, two alternative interpretations of the ד-clause of TgIsa 6:9 are equally possible: one is the description of the people as obdurate (the ד-clause as a relative clause); the other is that God commands the prophet to make the people obdurate (the ד-clause as a final/telic clause).[200] However, using only this one verse, the question of whether the idea of divine hardening is preserved or lost in the whole passage of TgIsa 6:9-10 cannot be determined. The situation of TgIsa 6:10 must also be examined.

Evans has the following two arguments for his interpretation of the word דלמא of TgIsa 6:10 as a negative conditional conjunction, "if not". The first argument is that in the Isaiah Targum, there are a couple of verses (TgIsa 8:18; 42:19) in which a conditional

---

[199] Rosenthal 1963:55.
[200] According to Segert, a ד-clause can also lead to a subordinate declarative sentence. Segert 1975:360 (6.5.3.5.2.a). If the ד-clause of TgIsa 6:9 is not taken as the manifestation of will, this alternative is possible. Segert shows a proof (Dan 2:8) that a ד-clause with this function has participial verb. He interprets the participle as imperfect so that "ich weiß, *daß* ihr Zeit zu *erkaufen/gewinnen (versucht)* (emphasis mine)". See Segert 1975:436 (7.5.6.2). If this alternative is applied to TgIsa 6:9, the verse can be interpreted as: "Go, and say to this people *that* they *will hear indeed, but do not understand, and see indeed, but do not perceive*". In this case, a final/telic meaning is no clear. However, the obdurate condition of the people is described as a future event, and not as their present condition. This alternative also shows that the interpretation of ד-clause with a participial verb as relative clause is not exhaustive.

thinking is incorporated, although such a thinking lacks in the original text. Evans suggests, therefore, that TgIsa 6:10 should be interpreted in light of those paraphrases.[201] The second argument, which is decisive for Evans, is the proof from rabbinical literature. He argues that the conditional meaning of דלמא can be proved by the rabbis' interpretation of Isa 6:9-10.[202]

As far as the first argument is concerned (i.e., דלמא should be interpreted in light of the cases of incorporating a conditional thinking), the question is whether the interpretation of דלמא as a conditional conjunction really makes sense from the point of view of the whole context of TgIsa 6:9-13. If God with a conditional clause means two alternatives: 'Make the people obdurate, if they do not see or hear, but do not make them obdurate, if they see and hear', the prophet's following question "How long, O Lord? (TgIsa 6:11; the same question also in the MT)" becomes superfluous. The point of the prophet's question should be to ask God how long the people should be made blind and deaf. His question, thus, is at odds with the conditional nature of the hardening task. In view of the whole context, the execution of God's commands to harden should be on an absolute basis as in the case of the MT.

With regard to the argument from rabbinical literature, it is true that the rabbis no longer sustained the idea of divine hardening in their interpretation of Isa 6:9-10. As H.L. Strack – P. Billerbeck, on whom Evans relies, point out, generally speaking, the rabbis interpreted the passage so that it speaks of God's promise of forgiveness.[203] Taking such a rabbinical interpretation of Isa 6:9-10 into consideration, Starck – Billerbeck attempt to reinterpret this "ambiguous" conjunction דלמא of TgIsa 6:10 in the following direction:

> Mache stumpf das Herz dieses Volks u. schwer seine Ohren u. dunkel seine Augen, *ob* sie *nicht vielleicht* (דלמא) mit ihren Augen sehen (…).[204]

---

[201] Evans' suggestion concerns TgIsa 8:18 in particular because of a similar wording to TgIsa 6:10. See Evans 1989:71.

[202] As texts showing the rabbis' interpretation of Isa 6:9-10, Evans mentions the following: *Bahodesh* 1 of *Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*; *b. RHSh* 17b; *b. Meg.* 17b; *y. Ber.* 2.3; *Seder Eliyahu Rabbah* 16. See Evans 1989:138-141, 217 (note 14).

[203] Strack – Billerbeck 1922:662-663; also Evans 1989:138-141.

[204] Strack – Billerbeck 1922:663 (emphasis mine).

The rabbis' interpretation of Isa 6:9-10 as God's promise of forgiveness and Strack – Billerbeck's reinterpretation of דלמא have influenced the scholars' reconstruction of the Aramaic tradition behind TgIsa 6:9-10. Jeremias takes one step further in order to emphasize the idea of God's promise, so he further reinterprets דלמא as "es sei denn, daß (if not)". He also turns the negative force of conditionality ('if the people do not repent') to the positive one ('if they repent'). In this way, he attempts to make the rabbis' idea of God's promise of forgiveness be uttered explicitly by the present form of TgIsa 6:9-10.[205]

Moreover, Jeremias argues that this rabbis' idea was valid already in Jesus' time on the ground that the form of Jesus' citation from Isa 6:9-10 in Mark 4:12 shows a linkage with that targumic version of the Isaianic passage which conveys the rabbis' idea. He emphasizes: "Dieses *zeitgenössische* Verständnis von Jes. 6,10b als Verheißung der Vergebung muß auch für Mk. 4,12b vorausgesetz werden".[206] Thus, according to Jeremias, the interpretation of Isa 6:9-10 as the idea of God's promise of forgiveness was valid all the time from Jesus to rabbinical Judaism. In addition to the possibility of anachronism,[207] the problem of Jeremias' argumentation is that the meaning of דלמא as a negative conditional conjunctive ("es sei denn, daß") can hardly be proved.[208] For example, M. Jastrow puts forward two possible meanings of the word: (i) "lest"; "perhaps" and (ii) "perhaps"; it may be". In the biblical Aramaic, there is no proof for a meaning other than the final/telic meaning.[209] Although Jeremias argues that both the targumists and the rabbis interpreted the Aramaic word דלמא as "es sei denn, daß", he does not show the proof for this.[210] On the other hand, Evans means that the rabbis' interpretation of the Hebrew word פֶּן of Isa 6:10, which is rendered into דלמא, as a conditional conjunction is a sufficient proof that they also interpreted דלמא in the same

---

[205] See the survey of previous studies in 1.2.2.

[206] Jeremias 1984:13 (emphasis mine). As an extension of the chain of reinterpretation of דלמא, Jeremais interprets also the Greek word μήποτε of Jesus' citation in Mark 4:12 as a conditional conjunction with a negative force. See Jeremias 1984:13.

[207] So comments also Fitzmyer on Jeremias' argumentation. See Fitzmyer 1981:709.

[208] Jeremias puts forward three meanings of דלמא: (i) "auf daß nicht"; (ii) ob nicht vielleicht; (iii) es sei denn, daß". He chooses the third meaning. See Jeremias 1984:13.

[209] Jastrow 1972:299. As for the biblical Aramaic, see Koehler – Baumgartner 2001:1851-1852.

[210] See Jeremias 1984:13.

way.[211] It may be. However, it should be re-considered whether this rabbinical, conditional meaning makes sense *in view of the whole context* of TgIsa 6:9-13. It has already been demonstrated that the answer is negative in this regard. It should also be noticed that Evans recognizes the validity of the rabbis' understanding of דלמא only for *their* time. In this case, there is no reason to deny the meaning of דלמא as a final/telic conjunction, which just corresponds to פֶּן of the MT for Jesus' time.[212] He acknowledges, therefore, the possibility that the Aramaic tradition behind TgIsa 6:10 conveyed the idea of divine hardening. However, because of his view on the partial object of the hardening task (based on his interpretation ד of TgIsa 6:9 as a relative particle; see above), he considers that the divine hardening concerns only a particular part of the people, not the whole Israel (see above).[213] This thesis of the partial view has already been argued against.

The result of the analysis of TgIsa 6:9-10 can be summarized. Even though the Aramaic word דלמא of verse 10 in the rabbinical context can have other meaning than a final/telic conjunction, it is more plausible in view of the whole context of TgIsa 6:9-13 that the word functions as that conjunction even in the rabbinical context. The meaning of another Aramaic word ד is ambiguous. Two alternatives are theoretically possible, i.e., final/telic prefix or relative particle. Whichever is chosen, however, the whole passage of TgIsa 6:9-10 can convey the idea of divine hardening almost equally, provided that there is no change to the verse 10 as the centre for that idea in the passage. This can be shown as follows.

---

[211] Evans draws his conclusion about the rabbis' interpretation of פֶּן from his examination of *Bahodesh* 1 of *Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*; *b. RHSh* 17b; *b. Meg.* 17b; *y. Ber.* 2.3; *Seder Eliyahu Rabbah* 16. See Evans 1989:71, 194 (note 12).

[212] Evans himself acknowledges this and says: "I doubt in this case the rabbinic understanding represents an early tradition". Evans 1989:202 (note 18).

[213] Evans 1989:105. Evans also applies this interpretation of Isa 6:9-10 of the Aramaic tradition behind TgIsa 6:9-10 to Jesus' citation in Mark 4:12: "in Targum, the prophet was to make obdurate those who do not see. Similarly Jesus' ministry makes obdurate those who are outside his circle of followers. Thus, (…) the words of Isaiah seem to have been appropriated from the Aramaic tradition Jesus directed". See Evans 1989:105.

If ד is a final/telic prefix, the passage means:

> "Go and speak to this people,
>> so that they *might* hear indeed, but not understand, and see indeed, but not perceive (v. 9).
> Make the heart of this people dull, and their ears heavy and shut their eyes,
>> so that they *might not* see with their eyes and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts, and repent and it be forgiven them (v. 10)"

If ד is a relative particle, the passage means as follows:

> "Go and speak to this people
>> *that* hear indeed, but do not understand, and see indeed, but do not perceive (v. 9).
> Make the heart of this people dull, and their ears heavy and shut their eyes,
>> so that they *might not* see with their eyes and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts, and repent and it be forgiven them (v. 10)"[214]

With regard to Evans' third argument for the mitigation of the Hebrew Bible's meaning in TgIsa 6:9-10 (i.e., the presence of other passages in the Isaiah Targum which mitigate the harshness of the MT), it has been argued sufficiently above that in view of the whole context of TgIsa 6:9-13, the present form of TgIsa 6:9-10 *innately* conveys the idea of divine hardening. It is therefore no longer necessary to examine whether those other passages really affect the possibility of this form to convey the idea. The concern here is not the point of view of the whole Isaiah Targum but the *innate possibility* of this limited, particular passage of TgIsa 6:9-10 conveying this idea. Even if the whole Targum's point of view can be demonstrated to be negative to the idea, it concerns just the fourth century's point of view when the formation of the whole Isaianic Targum was completed.

---

[214] If an evaluation of the plausibility of these two alternatives is attempted, what Segert points out regarding the role of 'parallel structure' in deciding the tense of participle can be taken into account. He shows a proof of such a parallel structure from Dan 3:18. This means that in the case of TgIsa 6:9-10 it is possible to decide the tense of the participial verbs of the ד-clause of verse 9 according to the tense of the verbs of the דלמא-clause of verse 10. If, by way of this, the tense of the participles of the former verse is understood as imperfect, the ד-clause of that verse clearly appears to be a final/telic clause. Such being the case, the targumic version can be thought to stylize Isa 6:9-10 of the MT by changing the indirect imperative ("Hear indeed but […]") of verse 9 into the final/telic clause which is subordinated to the direct imperative ("Go and speak to this people"), so that the two verses might form a parallel structure (as the first of the two alternative translations of TgIsa 6:9-10 above shows). See Segert 1975:352 (6.6.3.4.6.b).

So if the text form of a limited part indicates the contrary point of view to the whole, one should be open to the possibility that both this form and its point of view originate from tradition.[215]

The latter part of the passage of TgIsa 6:9-13, i.e., 6:11-13 is now examined with regard to the question of the relationship between this part of the passage and the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant. The Aramaic text and B. Chilton's translation of 1987 are shown. (The parts in italics signal the differences from the MT.)

ואמרית (v. 11)
עד אימתי יוי ואמר עד דיצדיין קרויא מבלי יתיב ובתיא מבלי אנשא וארעא
תחרוב ותצדי : (v. 12) וירהיק יוי ית בני אנשא ותסגי צדיותא בגוה דארעא:
(v. 13) וישתארון בה חד מן עסרא ויתובון ויהון לצרבא כבוטמא וכבלוטא דבמיתר
טרפיהון דמן ליבישין ועד כען אינון רטיבין לקיימא מינהון זרעא כין גלוותא
דישראל יתכנשון ויתובון לארעהון ארי זרעא דקודשא נצבתהון:

> (v. 11) Then I said, "How long, O Lord?" And he said: "Until *the* cities are *devastated*, without inhabitant, and *the* houses without men, and the land lies *desolate* and devastated,
> (v. 12) and the Lord removes *the sons* of men and *devastation* increases in the midst of the land.
> (v.13) And *one in ten they will be left* in it and *they* will *again* be for *scorching* like *the* terebinth or *the* oak, which when *their leaves drop off appear dried up, and even then they are green enough to retain from* them *the seed. So the exiles of Israel will be gathered and they will return to their land." For the* holy seed is *their* stump.

As Chilton points out, verses 11 and 12 are almost a direct translation of the MT,[216] so there is no need to remark on them from the point of view of the relationship between TgIsa 6:9-13 and the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant. A considerable paraphrasing takes place in verse 13 however. There the motif of the exile and return is added, so that the "holy seed" is clearly connected with those who returned from the exile. With regard to the origin of this paraphrase, Chilton argues that "this surprising development of the tree imagery balances the preceding threat, and confirms the post-70

---

[215] Evans' arguments concerning the other passages of the mitigation of the harshness (TgIsa 29:9-10; 42:18-20; 43:5; 44:18, 63:17) seem tendentious and no substantial mitigation seems to take place in those passages. See Evans 199:73-75.
[216] Chilton 1987:15 (Notes).

perspective of the passage".[217] It is possible that the paraphrase fits the post-70 perspective. However, there is another and *earlier* perspective that the paraphrase fits *better*.

As discussed in the previous chapter, the description of the returnees from the exile as an ideal entity is found in the canonical traditions from the ending time of the Babylonian exile.[218] The very metaphorical characterization of the returnees with the Isaianic remnant terminology, "holy seed" of Isa 6:13, is found in Ezra 9:2. Indeed, the characterization of the returnees with this Isaianic term is a tradition from the early postexilic period.

However, this tradition could have become a source of tension in the Second Temple Judaism in Palestine. According to Blenkinsopp, for Ezra "the holy seed" did not mean the returnees as a whole, but that sub-group of returnees who were fully loyal to the Torah and God's word.[219] If this is so, it is possible that the remnant terminology originally used to refer to the returnees from the exile later came to be understood to refer to a special group within the postexilic community. In fact, in the later Second Temple period, the concern of the apocalyptic sects was to identify themselves with the ideal deportees and the legitimate successors of them, as the book of Daniel and the Damascus

---

[217] Chilton 1987:15 (Notes).
[218] See discussion in 2.2.2.
[219] As shown in the previous chapter (2.2.2), Hausmann argues that the last clause of Isa 6:13 concerning the "holy seed" originates from the time of Ezra. Although this research does not deal with the problem of the origin of that clause, I have put forth my critical point of view against Hausmann's thesis (see fn 68 in the previous chapter). As an additional critical point of view, it can also be mentioned that the term "holy seed" stands in the definite form in Ezra 9:2 (זֶרַע הַקֹּדֶשׁ), while it is in the indefinite form in the MT Isa 6:13 (זֶרַע קֹדֶשׁ). The definite form is also used in the same Isaianic verse of the transcription and translation of Isaiah from a later period, that is, the Qumran Isaiah (זרע הקודש) and the Isaiah Targum (זרעא דקודשא). It seems more plausible that the definite form of a term is dependent on the indefinite form of the same than vice versa. As another scholar who considers the last clause of Isa 6:13 to originate from the time of Ezra, Williamson can be mentioned. See Williamson 1994:35-36.

Blenkinsopp does not seem consistent in the question of the origin of this Isaianic term "holy seed". In one place, he mentions that the term was added by a Second Temple scribe as a pre-Qumran pesher comment on the word מַצֶּבֶת of Isa 6:13; in another place in the same study, he argues that the addition was made by a scribe after the fall of Jerusalem and the deportations, which suggests the time of the Babylonian exile. See Blenkinsopp 2006:100, 226.

There are also scholars who argue that the last clause of Isa 6:13 originates from the prophet Isaiah in the very context of Isa 6. As such a scholar, Hasel can be mentioned. He himself presents the list of the scholars of the same opinion. See Hasel 1980:240-248; also 241 (note 97). Evans considers the possibility that the clause is a later intrusion into Isa 6; however, he ultimately comes out in favor of the view that the idea of the clause represents that of the prophet Isaiah after all. See Evans 1989:20-21.

Document show.[220] This being the case, the Isaianic remnant terminology, the "holy seed" in particular, could have caused a tension in the Second Temple Judaism in Palestine between the two notions of holy remnant: i.e., the returnees from the exile and the special group within the postexilic community. The question then arises as to what 'the holy remnant' means Is it the actual, whole Jewish community made up of the descendents of the generation of the returnees and who gather on the temple worship in Jerusalem, or is it a special group within the community which has a critical attitude towards the existing temple cult and religious practice? Against such a background, the paraphrase of TgIsa 6:13 could have put forth the motif of the exile and return in the way that was relevant to the context of the Second Temple Judaism in Palestine.

The results of the analysis of TgIsa 6:9-13 are as follows: (i) the present form of verse 9-10 can convey the idea of divine hardening in the same way as the MT (also the Qumran transcription); (ii) verses 11-12 are virtually a direct translation of the corresponding passage of the MT; (iii) the paraphrase of verse 13 could have put forth the concern of the Second Temple Judaism in Palestine. Judging from these results, it can be concluded that TgIsa 6:9-13 has a clear relationship with the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant which is ideological background of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism. Therefore, it can also be argued that the present form of the targumic version of the Isaianic passage reflects closely the Aramaic tradition of the passage of the Judaism of that time.

---

[220] See discussion in 3.3.2.

4. History of Jesus' saying in Mark 4:11-12

4.1. Relationship between Jesus' saying and the Isaianic idea?

The examination of the previous chapter has shown how the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant was operative in the Second Temple Judaism in Palestine. As seen there, the Qumran transcription of Isaiah could have conveyed the same idea as the MT to the readers. As far as the other Jewish writings are concerned, although it cannot be said that the Isaianic idea influenced all the readers of the book of Isaiah at that time, it may have influenced some, as many of the writings analyzed demonstrate the idea's influence.[1] Therefore, the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant should be reckoned as one aspect of the ideological background of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism which also is the Jesuanic context for the saying in Mark 4:11-12. In other words, one should take into account the possibility that if Jesus cited Isa 6:9-10, living in a culture where the ancient reading practice of the Scripture as "an integrated whole with interconnected parts" was prevalent,[2] he could have understood this passage in terms of this Isaianic idea.

Even though scholars have not dealt with a plausible, Jesuanic meaning of the saying in Mark 4:11-12 from the point of view of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, three scholars, J.W. Bowker, C.A. Evans and N.T. Wright, consider the sequence of Mark 4:3-20, consisting of the so-called parable of the sower (4:3-8), Jesus' saying in question (4:11-12) and the explanation of the parable (4:14-20), as having a relationship with Isa 6:9-13, which is the most central for the Isaianic idea. According to them, in connection with this parable and its explanation, Jesus' saying bears relationship with this Isaianic passage. Thus, without reconstructing the Isaianic idea, these three scholars argue for a relationship between Isa 6:9-13 and Mark 4:3-20. How then are the two passages related to each other in the eyes of the three scholars? Their argumentations are now investigated.

---

[1] In the previous chapter (fn 184), I mentioned that it is doubtful that those readers who might not have shared the Isaianic negative view on the Second temple worship were influenced by the Isaianic idea.
[2] About the ancient reading practice, see 1.3.2.1.

4.1.1. Bowker

Bowker argues that the sequence of Mark 4:3-20 forms a unity which was composed as "an exposition of Isa 6:9-13". Moreover, opposed to what exegetes have usually thought, he argues that once born as an exposition of the scriptural passage, the parable of the sower, the saying in Mark 4:11-12 and the explanation of the parable existed as a unity *from the beginning*. That is to say, the present form and sequence of Mark 4:3-20 as such reflects the original form. He even suggests that the originator of such an exposition is Jesus himself for the reason that the citation from Isa 6:9-10 resembles the Aramaic form of the passage which is found in the Isaiah Targum.[3] How does he reach such an unusual conclusion?

Bowker starts by examining the rabbinical concept of *māshāl* and *misteyrin* (transliteration from the Greek *mustērion*). In rabbinical terms, according to him, the form of *māshāl* is enigmatic but its function or purpose is elucidative, so these two aspects (form and function/purpose) must be distinguished.[4] The function or purpose of *māshāl* is "to illustrate and argue cogently" and this "living tradition of parables" was also available to Jesus. Bowker, therefore, denies the final/telic meaning of the two Greek words, ἵνα and μήποτε, in Jesus' saying, because such a meaning renders Jesus' parables contrary to something elucidative.[5]

If so, how is it possible that Jesus, according to Mark 4:11-12, says that by means of such elucidative parables, "those outside" are excluded from the *mustērion* of God's kingdom? Bowker asserts that there is no inconsistency within Jesus' saying in question. In the rabbinic use of *misteyrin*, this concept has a function of separating the 'insider' of *mysteyrin* from the 'outsider' by referring to something uniquely given to Israel by God (i.e., Torah, *mishnah*). Then, for rabbis, *māshāl* is "a God-given means of helping and guiding those who find the immediate statement of *mishnah*, or *halakoth*, too difficult to implement or understand".[6] Thus, *māshāl* is, by function, illustrative and elucidative in

---

[3] Bowker 1974:300-317.
[4] This is his counter argument to Jeremias according to whom *parabolē* is elucidative both in form and function, and also to J. Drury according to whom *parabolē* is enigmatic both in form and function. See Bowker 1974:300-303.
[5] Bowker 1974:300-304. However, Bowker does not clarify the meaning of ἵνα and μήποτε.
[6] Bowker 1974:304.

connection with *misteyrin*. In the rabbinical discourse, "a rabbi gives a parable to an outsider in order to answer a question or difficulty raised by him", so that "the *māshāl* was as a means of answering or challenging the argument of the outsider".[7] Such being the case, to become the 'outsider' of *misteyrin* depends on the questioner himself who still finds it difficult to implement or understand *mishnah* even after hearing rabbi's elucidative *māshāl*.

As far as Jesus' saying in Mark 4:11-12 is concerned, *mustērion* in the saying seems to bear the same sense as the rabbinical *misteyrin*, because it also has the function of separating the 'insiders' who "have been given the mystery of God's kingdom" from the 'outsiders'. Therefore, Mark 4:3-20 is in "very close alignment with the familiar constructions of rabbinical discourse". Additionally the parables which Jesus spoke to the 'outsiders', therefore, are the "'clearest possible illustration' exactly as the rabbis used parables in their own dialogues with 'outsiders', with Romans and *minim*".[8] Sometimes the sequence of the rabbinical discourse is even extended so: "when the rabbi and his disciples are once more alone, the disciples ask for a better answer than the one given to the outsider, (...). The rabbi then gives a different statement of the main point, or a different interpretation of the text at issue".[9] Because such a rabbinical discourse fits Mark 4:3-20 well, this passage can be regarded as "an intelligible and necessary whole".[10]

When 'unity' is found in Mark 4:3-20, Bowker then examines the proper purpose of this unity of the passage. He argues that the passage *as a whole* is an exposition of Isa 6:9-13. First, Mark 4:3-20 contains a citation from a part of that Isaianic passage, i.e., Isa 6:9-10. Second, Mark 4:3-20 has another point of contact with Isa 6:9-13. Just as 'seed' is a central theme in the Marcan passage, it also plays an important role also in the Aramaic tradition of Isa 6:13. That is, in TgIsa 6:13 the 'seed' image is expanded from the original

---

[7] Bowker 1974:310.
[8] Bowker 1974:313.
[9] Bowker 1974:310. As examples of these rabbinical discourses, Bowker mentions *b. A. Z.* 54a, *b. San.* 91a, *Ber. R.* 19. 8, *Pes. R.* 21. 2.
[10] Bowker 1974:310. Bowker also points out that in the rabbinical use of parable and explanation of parable, "it is by no means uncommon for there to be an inexact match" in the component parts of parable and explanation. Bowker 1974:310. This is clearly his counter argument to those scholars of Jesus' parables who are inclined to think that a seeming incompatibility of parable and explanation indicates a different origin of them.

Hebrew form of the verse, so that 'seed' now is explicitly identified with the survivors of the exile.[11] Therefore, the parable of the sower is "offered as an interpretation of the whole Isaiah passage".[12] In this way, Mark 4:3-20 is related to the Aramaic tradition of Isa 6:9-13. The next question is: What is Jesus' purpose in making such en exposition of the Isaianic passage and how did he do it?

According to Bowker, by means of the parable of the sower, Jesus transformed the theme of the Aramaic tradition of Isa 6:9-13 into a teaching about "the reception of the word". Along with such a transformation, the metaphor of 'seed' was also changed from something referring to Israel's remnant to referring to the 'word'. Moreover, by introducing the 'soil' element into his exposition, Jesus invested Isaiah's prophetic 'word' spoken to the people with the function of "making clear the nature of the reception of the word".[13] In this way, the different natures of soil are paralleled with the different natures of response in the parable of the sower. Jesus also had to add the explanation to the parable, however, in order to illustrate his point (i.e., "making clear the nature of reception"), because his hearers could have missed it. As a result of such an exposition, there emerges "the familiar *blurring* of the distinction between the word as the seed which is sown, and the people who are sown".[14]

This is Bowker's thesis according to which Mark 4:3-20 was born originally as Jesus' exposition of Isa 6:9-13 based on the Aramaic tradition of the passage. There are some problems in his thesis, however.

First, the fundamental issue in Bowker's argumentation is that Mark 4:3-20 is parallel with the rabbinical discourse, in which a parable has an elucidating function; this is also the case with Jesus' parables. His parables should have no hardening function. The reason some people become 'outsiders' in spite of Jesus' elucidative parables is that they turn their back on what they understand through them.[15] However, the Marcan text,

---

[11] See the discussion on TgIsa 6:9-13 in 3.4.2.
[12] Bowker 1974:311.
[13] Bowker 1974:312.
[14] Bowker 1974:312 (emphasis mine).
[15] Bowker demythologizes the idea of divine hardening by employing a psychological interpretation. To the question as to why some people who hear Jesus' elucidating parables, see and hear well but without seeing or understanding, he answers: "in order that they may *not have to* turn and it be forgiven them; in other words, it is because of their purpose to allow nothing disturb 'the tenor of their way'"(emphasis mine). In this way, Bowker changes divine hardening into a human being's inclination to reject repentance when unpleasant truth is thrust at him or her through Jesus' elucidating parables. By referring to some Qur'ān

which is available to us, tells something different. There, neither the 'outsiders' nor the 'insiders' understand Jesus' parabolic teaching. The 'insiders' come to Jesus to ask him about the parables and are given the explanation of the parable of the sower; the 'outsiders', on the other hand, leave the scene losing the chance of hearing the explanation. Thus the parables do not function in an elucidative way. Moreover, in the Marcan text, there is no 'outsider' typical of the rabbinical discourse who raises a question or difficulty to the teacher (Jesus) who in turn gives a parable to answer or challenge their argument. The parabolic teaching is not given as such a means of answering or challenging in Mark 4:3-20. Therefore, the rabbinical discourse breaks off with the Marcan passage at these critical points. One should assume a different kind of function for Jesus' parabolic teaching in Mark 4:3-20 than those of the rabbinical discourse.

Second, as a solution for the inconsistency between the rabbinical discourse and the present Marcan text, Bowker seems to envisage a different form for the original unity of the three elements (i.e., the parable of the sower, Jesus' saying and the explanation of the parable) than what the present text shows, i.e., a form which reflects the rabbinical discourse better than the present text. He acknowledges, therefore, that the form in which Mark 4:3-20 now appears "has had its own (largely indeterminable) history, which may well reflect the interests of the Evangelist and the needs of some part of early Church".[16] This means that in the history of tradition, the original unity which should have reflected the rabbinical discourse became the present form which does not do it properly. If so, the literal reading of the Marcan text with the final/telic meaning of ἵνα and μήποτε can allow the understanding that Jesus' parables have a hardening function in the Marcan context, while they had an elucidating function in the original context. However, Bowker neither clarifies Mark's or the early Christian tradents' purpose with this unity of the three elements nor reconstructs the original form which reflects Jesus' 'rabbinical' purpose. It is not clear to what extent and how the early Church's or/and Mark's interests caused the Jesus tradition to depart from its original meaning. Answering this question is important for the verification of the hypothesis of Jesus' exposition of Isa 6:9-13.

---

texts, he also mentions that it concerns a universal religious phenomenon, "the phenomenology of religious rejection". See Bowker 1974:314-315.

[16] Bowker 1974:315.

Third, according to Bowker, Jesus made a paradigmatic change to the meaning of Isa 6:9-13. By way of exposition, he transformed this most central passage of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant into the teaching about the reception of the word in connection with the unity of three elements of Mark 4:3-20.[17] In that unity, the seed no longer refers to the remnant of the people but "the word". Accordingly, the prophet's word spoken to the people now functions to make the nature of the response clear. In this way, the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant disappears in the exposition of the Isaianic passage. However, as seen above, Bowker admits a "blurring" in the metaphor of seed for the word and for the remnant in Mark 4:3-20. In fact, he considers Mark 4:3-20 to be parallel with a rabbinical interpretation of Isa 6:13, *Bavli Ketubbot* 112b, which according to him, conveys the remnant motif.[18] Does Bowker think that Jesus did not transform the Isaianic idea into his teaching about the reception of the word completely? If Jesus did not abandon the old metaphor of 'seed' for the remnant alongside the new one for "the word" so that "blurring" results, what was his purpose with such a double metaphor? Bowker's argumentation does not touch on these issues.

4.1.2. Evans

Evans argues that the same Marcan sequence, Mark 4:3-20, is a "skilfully developed midrash" not only on Isa 6:9-13 but also Isa 55:10-11.[19] Moreover, he considers that this midrash was made by *Mark*.[20] According to Evans, "the evangelist Mark has interpreted the judgmental aspect of Jesus' parables (e.g., the "hardening" idea of 4:11-12) in terms of the word of judgement Yahweh commanded Isaiah to speak, which was designed to

---

[17] In fact, by interpreting the conjunction דלמא as a negative *telic/final* meaning, Bowker himself translates TgIsa 6:9-10 so that it conveys the Isaianic idea of divine hardening. See Bowker 1974:311. About דלמא as a decisive factor of preserving the Isaianic idea in the targumic text, see 3.4.2.

[18] See Bowker 1974:315.

[19] Evans 1985:464-468.

[20] Evans comments on Bowker's study above, he seems to misunderstand the latter's argumentation at some points. For example, Evans thinks that Bowker deals with the Evangelist's midrash not Jesus' exposition of it. Evans also thinks that in Bowker's argumentation, the midrash of Mark 4:1-20 only concerns Isa 6:13, although in reality it concerns Isa 6:9-13. See Evans 1985:465; also 1981:234-235.

render Israel obdurate".[21] On the other hand, he argues that the basic point of Mark's parable of the sower is "the efficacy of God's word" and that this theme is found in Isa 55:10-11[22]. In this way, these two Isaianic passages, "linked by the catchword 'seed' (Isa 6:13 and 55:10)", provide the basis for the midrash in Mark 4:3-20.[23]

So Evans gives an equal significance to Isa 6:9-13 and 55:10-11 as the scriptural background of Mark 4:3-20, although the former passage more clearly provides Mark 4:3-20 with a verbal quotation and a thematic affinity (especially when the Aramaic tradition of Isa 6:9-13 is taken into consideration). Evans argues, however, that the latter is equally significant, because it is what midrash is: "Midrash does not simply involve verbal allusions to or quotations of specific texts, nor is it simply commentary on such texts. Rather, midrash often involves the appropriation of the theology and hermeneutic of given texts (and these 'texts' may be a few verses or whole OT books)".[24] Therefore, the parable of the sower and its explanation "reflect the same metaphor and theology that we have in Isa 55:10-11". Converted with 'seed' metaphor, the motif of the efficacy of God's word is, according to Evans, present in the Marcan passage. On the other hand, he acknowledges that the motifs of hardening and remnant of Isa 6:9-13 are also present in the same passage: "the explicit citation of Isa 6:9-10 sets the tone of judgment and recalls the righteous remnant who were spared by God in order to become abundantly fruitful".[25] On the basis of two different Isaianic passages, the Evangelist aimed by Mark 4:3-20 to witness "the same theology of canonical Isaiah: out of judgment comes salvation".[26]

Evans' thesis and argumentation are now viewed critically. The first problem concerns the seed metaphor of the parable of the sower. Evans argues on the one hand that for Mark, the basic point of that parable is "the efficacy of God's word". On the other, he admits that in the same parable, Mark also refers to "the righteous remnant" of Isa 6:13. So, 'blurring' occurs to the metaphor of seed for the word and for the remnant

---

[21] Evans 1985:465-466.
[22] Isa 55:10-11 reads as follows: "For as the rain and snow come down from heaven, and return not thither but water the earth, making it bring forth and sprout, giving seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall my word be that goes forth from my mouth; it shall not return to me empty, but it shall accomplish that which I purpose, and prosper in the thing for which I sent it (RSV)".
[23] Evans 1985:466-467.
[24] Evans 1985:467.
[25] Evans 1985:466-467.
[26] Evans 1985:467.

as in the case of Bowker's argumentation. The use of the metaphor for the word is, according to Evans, due to a midrashic appropriation of the theology of Isa 55:10-11. However, it should be noted that in Isa 55:10-11, it is "rain and snow", not "seed", that is the metaphor for God's word. Moreover, God's word of Isa 55:10-11 is efficacious in unconditional terms ("it shall not return to me empty"), while "the word" in the parable of the sower is efficacious, depending on what kind of soil it falls into. Therefore, it cannot be said anything sure about the presence of the motif of Isa 55:10-11 (i.e., the efficacy of God's word) in the parable of the sower and its explanation in the Marcan text, even though midrash can make it possible.[27] It is necessary to clarify Mark's real purpose with that parable.

Another problem with Evans' thesis is that he assumes that the midrash on Isa 6:9-13 and 55:10-11 belongs to none other than the Evangelist. But the validity of this assumption depends on whether the meaning of the present text in the Marcan context is really what Evans considers it to be. If a different, plausible meaning is found for that context, the alleged midrash should either be placed to an earlier stage or discounted. Since his examination of the relationship between Jesus' saying in Mark 4:11-12, on the one hand, and the parable of the sower and its explanation, on the other, is not extensive, his thesis is yet to be verified.

---

[27] Also G. Lohfink, R. Gundry, A.J. Hultgren and K.R. Snodgrass deny the relationship between the parable of the sower and Isa 55:10-11. See Lohfink 1986:59; Gundry 1993:210; Hultgren 2000:189 (note 21); Snodgrass 2008:169. The question of the metaphor of seed for "the word" is discussed in details in 4.2.1.2.

There are also scholars who consider the connection between the parable of the sower and Isa 55:10-11. For example, concerning this parable and the parable of the automatically growing seed (4:26-29), C. Westermann says: "This is a clear example of the way leading from the comparison in the OT (i.e., Isa 55:10-11) to the parables in the NT". He does not discuss on which level of the parables, the Evangelist or Jesus. See Westermann 1990:43-44.

M. Boucher considers the possibility that Isa 55:10-11 is the background of the explanation of the parable of the sower (Mark 4:14-20). She says: "If the Markan interpretation (i.e., the explanation of the parable) is original, at least in its main point, then the background of the expression "the word" is the prophetic literature of the Old Testament", and refers to this Isaianic passage. See Boucher 1981:81.

M. Sabin regards Isa 55:10-11 and Jer 31:27-28 as a kind of general background of three 'seed' parables in Mark 4 (i.e., the parable of the sower in Mark 4:3-9 and the parables of the automatically growing seed and the mustard seed in 4:26-29; 30-32). With regard to the two latter parables, she discusses more specific OT verses for their background, but as for the parable of the sower, she does not discuss the connection between the parable and Isa 55:10-11 properly, but refers to only "a similar use of the seed/sower trope" in 4 Ezra. Additionally, there seems to be some confusion in her discussion concerning which level's midrash, Jesus' or the Evangelist', is in question. See Sabin 1992:3-26.

4.1.3. Wright

Wright also argues that Mark 4:3-20 is related to Isa 6:9-13.[28] However, unlike Evans, he is of the opinion that the relationship between the two passages comes from Jesus. Moreover, for Wright, the Marcan text faithfully reflects the history, while Bowker, as shown above, admits that the present text might have diverged from the history, reflecting the interests of the early Church and the evangelist.[29] In any case, Wright deals with the question of the Isaianic background of Mark 4:3-20 from a much broader point of view than Bowker and Evans and by taking into account all the possible factors, so his argumentation seems somewhat complicated.

The most important of Wright's thesis is this: the parable of the sower is "a retelling of the story of Israel" of the postexilic time.[30] He gives three "indications" which back up his thesis. From the point of view of the relationship between Mark 4:3-20 and Isa 6:9-13, the most relevant indication is the third one.[31] According to him, "within second-Temple Judaism, the idea of 'seed' is capable of functioning as a short hand for the 'remnant' who will return when the exile is finally over. The 'seed' is a metaphor for the true Israel, who will be vindicated when her god finally acts, 'sown' again in her own land".[32] As one of the most central inducements to such a usage of 'seed' in Second Temple Judaism, he refers to Isa 6:13c, the very passage about the emergence of a holy

---

[28] Wright refers to Bowker and Evans as previous scholars who have argued for the relationship between the two passages. See Wright 1996:236 (note 140).

[29] Wright seems to regard Mark 4:13 ("Do you not understand this parable? How will you understand all the parables?" [Wright's translation]) as a Marcan redaction. Still, for him, the verse is an addition which the Evangelist made based on his right understanding of the history. Therefore, it can be a part of the history, according to Wright. See Wright 1996:238.

[30] Wright 1996:230, 231, 232.

[31] The first "indication" is that the form of Mark 4:3-20 resembles that of an apocalypse such as Dan 2:31-45 for its cryptic story, its transition passage about the revelatory of mysteries and its point by point interpretations. Moreover, not only by the form but also by the content, the Marcan passage is close to Dan 2:31-45, that is, the parable of the sower in the first-century Judaism "asks to be understood as a retelling of Israel's controlling narrative about the kingdom of the world and the kingdom of god". I am skeptical of this paralleling of the *content* of Mark 4:3-20 and Dan 2:31-45, because it is not clear how the three cases of unsuccessful sowing in the parable of the sower are related to the four or five earthly kingdoms all smitten by the kingdom of God in the latter passage . See Wright 1996:231-232.

The second "indication" is that the parable of the sower is parallel with the parable of the vineyard in Mark 12:1-12. I am skeptical of this parallelism, too, because the three unsuccessful sowings in the former parable are listed in an organized way, while the unsuccessful sending of servants in the latter parable, occurring more than three times, is mentioned only as a repetition of similar event. See Wright 1996:232.

[32] Wright 1996:232.

remnant after the destruction of the Israeli nation. He also, however, refers to numerous Jewish texts - canonical and non-canonical- which express "the idea of return from exile as a 'sowing', and/or the returnees as 'seed'".[33] Against such a background, it is

[33] Wright 1996:232 (note 128). With regard to those canonical texts which associate 'sowing' and 'seed' with the return from the exile and the returnees respectively, he refers to the following: Ezra 9:2; Ps 126:6; Isa 1:9, 31:9 LXX, 37:31f, 43:5, 44:3, 45:26 (correctly 45:25), 53:10, 54:3, 60:21, 61:9, 65:23, 66:22; Jer 24:6, 31:27, 32:41, 46:27; Ezek 17:22f, 36:8-12; Hos 2:23 (BHS 2:25); Amos 9:15; Zech 10:8f; Mal 2:15. Non -canonical texts ("post-biblical material" according to his term) are Jub 1:15-18, 21:24; PssSol 14.2f; 1 En 62:8; 4 Ezra 8:41; 1QM 13:7; 1QH 8:4-26, 17:14.

I make following remarks upon some of these texts.

The 'remnant' of Isa 1:9 speaks of an ungodly remnant, so it is far from an ideal remnant. See discussion in 2.1.2 (fn 17). Moreover, Isa 1:9 does not mention 'sowing' or 'seed', so the verse should be excluded from his list.

The 'remnant' of Isa 37:31f which "shall take root downward" refers primarily to the Jerusalem survivors of the Assyrian invasion at the time of king Hezekiah. From the point of view of the entire context of the book of Isaiah, however, this remnant can allude to the one that emerges in the eschatological time as the final fulfillment of God's promises of Isa 1-39 and 40-55. In this sense, the verses can be included in the list. As Wright points out, LXX Isa 37:31 characterizes the generation after the remnant as 'seed'.

As far as LXX Isa 31:9 is concerned, there the verse God has 'seed' in Zion, when the Assyrian army is defeated. In the MT, God has "fire" in Zion to devour the enemy. In the LXX the idea of a blessed remnant is present. Although this remnant "seed" refers directly to that of the time of the Assyrian invasion, I think it can allude to the eschatological one for the same reason as in the case of Isa 37:31f (see above). So this text can be included in the list.

Isa 60:21, actually, does not mention "sowing" but "planting (מטע)" to refer to a blessed community. However, I think both the community "sown" and "planted" represent the same thing, so the verse can be included in the list. For the same reason, Isa 61:3 which has the word מטע should be included.

In Jer 24:6; 32:41 and Ezek 17:22f, God will "plant" (נטע for the verses in Jer; שתל for those in Ezek) the remnant of the people to the land of Judah. However, for the same reason as in Isa 60:21 (see above), these verses can be included in the list. Likewise in Amos 9:15, God promises to restore the people of the Northern Kingdom by using the word "plant (נטע)".

In Ezek 36:8-12, the mountains of Israel will "be sown (נזרעתם)". The question is what the 'seed' to be sown stands for there. From the context it is clear that the 'seed' is both a concrete one which bears fruit to the returnees from exile (see Ezek 36:8) and a metaphorical one, i.e., the returnees themselves who inhabit the land and multiply there to become the possessor of it (see 36:10-12).

In Zech 10:8f, God "sows" the people of Israel among the nations, that is, his sowing here means the exile of Israel not the return from exile. Therefore, the verses should be excluded from the list.

4 Ezra 8:41, as Wright points out, expresses a similar idea to the parable of the sower in Mark 4:3-8, i.e., human beings are "sown" in the world but not all of them will participate in salvation. However, because of a later origin of 4 Ezra (late first century CE), the verse cannot be used as a direct background of the Jewish notion of 'seed' in the second Temple period. At most, it is a later reflection of such a background as in the case of the parable of the sower, in which the reflection is more contemporary with that background. For this reason, the verse should be excluded from the list.

In Jub. 1:15-18 and 21:24, the returnees from exile are mentioned as "a righteous plant" (according to O.S. Wintermute's translation in Charlesworth 1985). Also in PssSol 14:2-3, "the trees of life" whose "planting is firmly rooted forever" are mentioned (according to R.B. Wright's translation in Charlesworth 1985). Even though the word 'seed' is not used, the metaphor is the same in these verses as in the case of Isa 60:21; Jer 24:6; 32:41; Ezek 17:22f; Amos 9:15 (see above), so they may be included in the list. See Charlesworth 1985:53, 96-97, 663.

As far as 1QH 8:4-26 and 17:14 are concerned, I do not find any 'seed', 'sowing' or 'planting' terminology in the texts. On the other hand, IQH 8:4-26, according to the order set by E.L. Sukenik, contains "planting (מטע)" six times. There, the term seems to indicate a once blessed community which

understandable that when the proclaimer of the kingdom of God uses the metaphor of 'seed being sown', he means that the exile is really over and "your God is at last sowing the good seed creating his true Israel".[34]

In addition to the metaphor of seed for the remnant, Wright argues that the parable of the sower contains another 'seed' metaphor, i.e., metaphor for God's word. Like Evans, he ascribes this second metaphor to Isa 55:10-13, the passage about the efficacy of God's word. Wright asserts that the two different metaphors are compatible with each other in the same parable. This is because this Isaianic passage is also "one of the central and classic prophesies of return from exile", so both metaphors concern the formation of a new, true Israel after exile.[35] By means of the parable about God's 'sowing' of a new, true Israel *and* of his efficacious word, Jesus informs his hearers that they are living in the days of the true return from exile. However, by disclosing that not all the seeds sown bear fruit. but rather that much of it goes to waste, the parable becomes a very critical proclamation against an optimistic view on the postexilic Israel. Wright clarifies this as follows:

> Israel as she stands may look as though she had returned from exile; she may want to consider herself automatically and inalienably the true people of YHWH; but only those who hear the word as it is now proclaimed and hold it fast, will form the remnant that Israel's god is creating.[36]

In this way, the parable of the sower not only informs the hearers of the coming of the new time, but also functions as a "cryptic warning and invitation"[37].

Moreover, Wright argues that this message of the parable is linked with the person telling it. That is, through the parable which relates that the story of Israel is at last reaching its goal, Jesus implies that his mission and kingdom-announcement is the factor

now is placed in predicament. I think that the passage, according to the order of Martínez – Tigchelaar, 1QH 16:4-26, can be included in the list. See Martínez – Tigchelaar 1997:181-183.

    Thus, among Wright's list, those which really are valid as the proof of 'seed'- and related metaphors of Second Temple Judaism are as follows: Ezra 9:2; Ps 126:6; Isa 31:9 LXX, 37:31f, 43:5, 44:3, 45:25, 53:10, 54:3, 60:21 (and 61:3), 61:9, 65:23, 66:22; Jer 24:6, 31:27, 32:41, 46:27; Ezek 17:22f, 36:8-12; Hos 2:23 (BHS 2:25); Amos 9:15; Mal 2:15. Non -canonical texts are Jub 1:15-18, 21:24; PssSol 14.2f; 1 En 62:8; 1QM 13:7; 1QH 16:4-26.

[34] Wright 1996:233.
[35] Wright 1996:233.
[36] Wright 1996:234.
[37] Wright 1996:234.

in realizing this climax.[38] By its very nature, thus, the message of the parable of the sower is subversive towards the ruling side i.e., Herod Antipas, Israel's religious leaders and the Roman occupation authorities. If these enemies understand this real meaning of the parable, they will not hesitate to take measures against the propagandist - who actually is the embodiment - of such a dangerous idea. Jesus "must therefore speak in parables, 'so that they may look and look but never see'", so the parable would "get past the censor – for the moment".[39] Thus asserts Wright, this is the true meaning of Jesus' citation of Isa 6:9-10.

In addition to the enemies ("those outside" in Mark 4:11), there is also another group of people. "Only those in the know must be allowed to glimpse what Jesus believed was going on".[40] They come privately to Jesus after his public parabolic teaching and are given the explanation of the parable of the sower. Through the explanation they are exhorted to persevere and become those that bear fruit, so Israel's blessed destiny will be realized in them. Thus, the explanation functions as an additional challenge to 'those inside', who are "in the know". Therefore, for Wright, there is no doubt that this explanation is a natural conclusion of the sequence of Mark 4:3-20, that is to say, the explanation which comes from Jesus' mouth.[41]

To sum up, Wright's argumentation for the relationship between Isa 6:9-13 and Mark 4:3-20 is based on his interpretation of the parable of the sower: the parable is a retelling of the story of Israel of the postexilic period. By means of this parable Jesus proclaimed that God was finally at work setting up the true Israel in the form of the fulfilment of the two Isaianic prophecies of Isa 6:11-13 and 55:10-11 concerning God's 'sowing' of two different kinds of seed, i.e., the holy remnant and his efficacious word, after the destruction of the nation. Because Jesus linked his critical message of the parable to his mission, it bore a subversive character against the ruling class. Therefore, the message needed to be unintelligible to them at least for some time. This is why his parables required the hardening function of Isa 6:9-10 with respect to "those outside". To

---

[38] Wright 1996:235-236. Wright also argues that in addition to the climax realizing through his mission, Jesus implies that his career is an "encapsulation" or "recapitulation" of the prophetic heritage. See Wright 1996:235-236.
[39] Wright 1996:237.
[40] Wright 1996:237.
[41] Wright 1996:238.

the 'insiders' who are "in the know", Jesus gave an additional challenge through the explanation of the parable.

There are some problems with Wright's argumentation and thesis. First, with regard to the presence of the motif of Isa 55:10-11 (i.e., the efficacy of God's word) in the parable of the sower and its explanation, I am sceptical of his explanation for the same reason as in the case of Evans' thesis.[42]

Second, for Wright, the hardening function of Jesus' parables means that by using them, Jesus conceals his true, subversive intention from his enemies, so that he could continue his mission safely ("get past the censor"). However, it is far from what the Isaianic motif of hardening is. When God commands the prophet to make the people obdurate, he does not mean that the prophet should evade the enemies' pursuit with the help of a cryptic proclamation, but that he *really* must make the people obdurate. Jesus' citation from Isa 6:9-10, in fact, contains the very clause which refers to this harsh judgment of the impossibility of repentance and forgiveness ($\mu\dot{\eta}\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon\ \dot{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\tau\rho\dot{\epsilon}\psi\omega\sigma\iota\nu\ \kappa\alpha\dot{\iota}$ $\dot{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\theta\hat{\eta}\ \alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tauo\hat{\iota}\varsigma$" [Mark 4:12]), so that such a judgment is clearly *the aim* in making "those outside" obdurate. For this reason, it is hard to imagine how this judgmental aim with hardening can be connected with the aim of making parables unintelligible to secure a safe mission. There is a tension between the Marcan text which Wright considers faithful to the history and his interpretation of it.

Third, there is another tension between the text and the interpretation. Wright suggests that while Jesus intentionally made his parables unintelligible to "those outside", the same unintelligibility did not necessarily affect the 'insiders' who were "in the know". The Marcan text, however, tells something different. The disciples' question to Jesus about his parables (Mark 4:10) and also his comment on their failure to understand the parable of the sower (4:13) suggest that the parables were equally unintelligible to the 'insiders'. Thus, the hardening function of parables (according to Wright's understanding) affects them! This does not correspond with what Mark 4:11-12 says about the object of the hardening. Additionally, the explanation of the parable of the sower which the 'insiders' were given should be characterized as a clarification of the unintelligible saying rather than an additional challenge to the 'insiders'.

---

[42] See discussion on Evan's thesis and argumentation in 4.1.2.

Bowker admits that the present Marcan text in Mark 4:3-20 does not necessarily reflect the original form of that passage; however, he confines his examination to the original *meaning* of the passage.[43] Thus, he does not reconstruct the original form which corresponds to that meaning; nor does he clarify, either, what meaning the present form has in the Marcan context. I think a similar problem concerns Wright. Even though for him the Marcan text reproduces the history, the text and that history which he reconstructs on the basis of it do not actually correspond to each other.

The thesis and argumentation of the three scholars who maintain the relationship between Isa 6:9-13 and Mark 4:3-20 without reconstructing the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant has now been investigated.[44] Although Evans maintains the unity of Mark 4:3-20 is not Jesuanic (unlike Bowker and Wright) but rather the evangelist's midrash, all the three have something common with respect to the meaning of the parable of the sower. According to them, the "seed" of the parable is related to the holy remnant of Isa 6:13c which emerges after a series of destruction and devastation of the Israeli nation (6:11-13b). In addition, the Marcan passage contains another element of the Isaianic passage, i.e., Isa 6:9-10, in the form of Jesus' citation. These two elements ('seed' as the holy remnant of Isa 6:13c and the citation from Isa 6:9-10) are central to their argument for the relationship between the two passages.

---

[43] See 4.1.1.

[44] S.M. Bryan argues for the relationship between Isa 6:9-13 and Mark 4:11-12 (not Mark 4:3-20) on the Jesuanic level. About his thesis, see survey of previous studies in 1.2.2. Although he argues that Jesus cited Isa 6:9-10 in the parable context as it appears in the present text, he does not deal with this original unity of Jesus' saying or the parable context from the point of view of Isa 6:9-13, as Bowker, Evans and Wright do. Therefore, he does not examine the meaning of the parable of the sower in this connection. In the question of how hardening occurs, Bryan follows Blomberg according to whom parables lead one to the crisis of decision; then, "the decision to reject the message brings hardening". If this rejection means the rejection of what the hearer *understands*, the present Marcan text tells something different. In that case, Bryan shares the same problem as Bowker (see above). See Bryan 2002:126-128.

Like Wright, K.R. Snodgrass maintains that in the parable of the sower both metaphors of seed for the people and the word are operative, and that the parable "is based on the idea in Isa 6:9-13". Accordingly, his interpretation of the parable of the sower is similar to Wright: "if we are correct that Isaiah 6 is the frame on which the parable was formed, then there is no need to drive a wedge between God sowing his people and God sowing his word. It is by sowing the word that the end-time people is planted". However, in his analysis of the parable his primary concern seems to be to clarify Mark's intention with the parable. Sometimes he touches on Jesus' intention in connection with the analysis of Mark and says, e.g., "What Mark really intends, which is quite in keeping with Jesus' intent, is clear (…)". Moreover, even though he refutes the arguments against the authenticity of the explanation of the parable of the sower in Mark 4:14-20, he focuses on the relationship between the parable and Isa 6:9-13, not the whole passage of Mark 4:3-20 and Isa 6:9-13. See Snodgrass 2008:155-172.

There are, however, some problems in their argumentation and theses. Firstly, they do not solve the problem fully as to the seed metaphor of the parable of the sower. They argue that in the parable, "seed" is a metaphor for "the word" *in addition to* 'remnant'. As stated above, I am sceptical of Evans' and Wright's argument that this second metaphor for "the word" originates from Isa 55:10-11.[45] Without referring to this Isaianic passage, Bowker argues that Jesus just *transformed* the Isaianic metaphor of "seed" for remnant into that for "the word". Still, he acknowledges that in the parable of the sower, there is a "blurring" of two different metaphors of seed. *Therefore, examining what the seed metaphor stands for in the parable of the sower, becomes a key to the problem, i.e., the relationship between Jesus' saying in Mark 4:11-12 and the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant. If the metaphor for remnant is judged not to exist in that parable, then, Jesus' saying loses an important point of contact with the remnant motif in its immediate context, and it becomes hard to demonstrate the relationship in question. If however, the metaphor for remnant can be found to exist, even in the form of co-existing with the metaphor for "the word", such a relationship can be presumed in connection with the parable of the sower. In this case, however, the question of how two different metaphors function in the same parable must be clarified. This is left untouched by the three scholars.*

The second problem concerns the tension between the reconstructed Jesuanic meaning of Mark 4:3-20 and the present form of that passage. Bowker, who considers a parallelism between Mark 4:3-20 and rabbinical discourse, denies the hardening function of Jesus' parables because of the elucidative function of the rabbinical parables. However, the present Marcan text clearly manifests the hardening function. Bowker admits that the present text does not necessarily reflect the Jesuanic meaning which he reconstructs. But he does not clarify further what the present text means in the Marcan context. Even in the Jesuanic context, he neither elucidates a closer meaning for it, nor suggests the Jesuanic form of Mark 4:3-20 that corresponds to such a meaning. The same problem concerns Wright. Even though the Marcan text, for him, should be a reproduction of the historical circumstances, the text does not fully correspond to what he suggests the history to be. He understands the hardening function of Jesus' parables in

---

[45] See discussion in 4.1.2 and 4.1.3.

such a way that Jesus uses these cryptic sayings as a means of dodging the enemies in order to make his position safe. But the Marcan text manifests the very Isaianic idea of divine hardening, so that Jesus' parables are related to the Isaianic harsh judgment of the impossibility of repentance and forgiveness as his real aim in making "those outside" obdurate. Wright also considers that the hardening function of the parables (according to his understanding) affects only them. The Marcan text, however, says that even the 'insiders', i.e., Jesus' disciples, did not understand the parables. Therefore, the explanation of the parable of the sower which Jesus gave them is no more than a clarification of the unintelligible saying. Turning to Evans, who maintains the unity of Mark 4:3-20 to be a Marcan midrash on Isa 6:9-13 and 55:10-11, one of the problems of his thesis is that he assumes that the midrash belongs to no other than the Evangelist. This depends on whether the Marcan meaning of the text is really what Evans maintains it to be. It is necessary to clarify the relationship between Mark 4:11-12 and the parable of the sower also on the Marcan level.

From the discussion above, *it seems appropriate, firstly, to presuppose that a Jesuanic meaning reconstructed on the basis of the present Marcan text cannot help being different from the Marcan meaning of the same text, because the former meaning is inferred by setting the text in the Jesuanic context, while the latter meaning by setting the same text in the Marcan context. Secondly, the reconstruction of a Jesuanic meaning should be accompanied by considering the Jesuanic form, though approximate, which corresponds to the reconstructed Jesuanic meaning as fully as possible. Thirdly, the Marcan meaning of the present text should be elucidated. This is because, fourthly, a redaction- and tradition-critical explanation should be sought for as to the divergence between the Jesuanic form and meaning, on the one side, and the Marcan form and meaning, on the other. To perceive divergence and to seek for an explanation for it, is, I think, a proper way of controlling the plausibility of the reconstructed, Jesuanic form and meaning.*

By means of the critical examination of the three scholars' theses and argumentations offered above, I can confirm this research's position concerning the mode of procedure discussed in the first chapter. That is, it is possible to start collating the present Marcan text with the reconstructed Jesuanic context in the Second Temple

Judaism in Palestine. The question then arises: "How much of the text can be taken as a Jesus tradition *X* for the collation, only Jesus' saying in Mark 4:11-12 or the saying as an element *α* united with another element *β* to form a whole tradition *X*?"[46] The Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant as one aspect of the Jesuanic context in view of which a Jesuanic meaning of the saying in Mark 4:11-12 should be elicited has been reconstructed. It is important to find such additional elements that represent the remnant motif, now that Jesus' saying in question is taken to represent the hardening motif. Therefore, to seek for a Jesuanic meaning of the saying, the Jesuanic meaning of the parable of the sower in the context of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism should first be reconstructed, and then examined as to whether and how this parable is related to the remnant motif. Taking the result of the examination into account, a Jesuanic meaning of the saying in Mark 4:11-12 in view of the Jesuanic context is then sought for. In this way, the parable of the sower becomes the key to the question of whether and how Jesus' saying in question is related to the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, in other words, whether and how Jesus cited Isa 6:9-10 in terms of the Isaianic idea.

The Jesuanic meaning of the parable of the sower and the saying in Mark 4:11-12 is the main subject of the following subsection (4.2), to which the consideration of a Jesuanic form of the tradition belongs.

In the final subsection of this chapter, (4.3), I will elucidate, firstly, the Marcan meaning of Jesus' saying and, then, seek for a redaction- and tradition-critical explanation as to the divergence between the Jesuanic and Marcan meanings and forms.

---

[46] For the discussion on a Jesus tradition *X*, element *α* and *β*, see the first chapter (1.3.3).

4.2. Jesuanic meaning of the saying and the Isaianic idea

4.2.1. Remnant motif and *Parabola Seminantis*

4.2.1.1. *Parabola Seminantis* in the eyes of the scholars

The so-called parable of the sower (Mark 4:3-8 and par.) could be an enigmatic parable of Jesus, even though it has been well-known to the Bible readers throughout the ages, and it might be thought that its message is plain and clear. Wright's following comment smashes such a popular belief:

> of all the oddities about the parable of the sower, perhaps the strangest is this: there is still no agreement on what it was originally supposed to mean.[47]

A conspicuous example which demonstrates this state of "no agreement" is that the parable has been given various titles. The common title "the parable of the sower", which implies the parable concerns 'the sower', is found, e.g., in Aland's *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum* in its Latin and English title. The German title in the very same book, however, is "das Gleichnis vom 'vielerlei Acker'".[48] Some scholars have used "the parable of 'the seeds'"[49] and others a mixed form like "the parable of 'the sower and the seeds'" or "das Gleichnis von 'Saat und Ernte'".[50] Although "the parable of the sower" seems to be the most popular among the scholars,[51] many of them use this title 'provisionally', that is, under the conventional naming, they explore something other than 'the sower' in the parable's real message.[52] Additionally, there are some scholars who believe the parable to be simply about 'the sower' and who have specified the title with an additional adjective such as "das Gleichnis vom 'zuversichtlicher' Sämann".[53]

---

[47] Wright 1996:230.
[48] E.g., E. Linnemann and H. Weder use this title in their exegesis on the parable. See Linnemann 1978:120; Weder 1990:108-109. Jeremias denies this title, because for him it is more suitable to the explanation of the parable in Mark 4:14-20. See Jeremias 1984:149 (note 2).
[49] E.g., Guelich 1989:186.
[50] The former is by Anderson 1994:125; the latter by Jeremias 1984:149.
[51] It is possible that this popularity is due to Matthew's Jesus calling the parallel parable (Matt 13:3-8) "the parable of the one who sowed" (Matt 13:18).
[52] E.g., Garnet 1983:39-54; Lohfink 1986:36-69. These two scholars' exegesis on the parable are dealt with below.
[53] E.g., Gnilka 1978:155.

With regard to the naming of this parable, I have chosen to use the common title "the parable of the sower" without taking a position to what this title implies, and hereafter, I use the abbreviation of Aland's Latin title *Parabola Seminantis*, *PS*, for this parable.[54]

The difficulty in finding the original meaning of *PS*, which has led scholars into different interpretations under various titles, has been explained by Bultmann, whose view on the matter in turn has influenced the scholars of later generations. According to him, the original meaning of Jesus' parables became unknown in the history of tradition; so one can grasp only a general meaning, but not the special point, "weil der Anlaß, bei dem das Gleichnis gesprochen wurde, nicht bekannt ist".[55]

Some scholars have attempted to approach the original meaning of *PS* through examining the interpretations suggested by other scholars to find own solution. C.E.B. Cranfield divides the scholarly interpretations into two groups: the first one focuses on the abundance of the harvest in the last verse of the parable (Mark 4:8); the second group gives "more weight to the differences of soil and so make it a parable about hearing the Word of God".[56] Cranfield himself joins in the latter group.[57] A.J. Hultgren puts forward two main lines of interpretation. In the first, "the parable is linked to the ministry of Jesus and his disciples, and it provides encouragement to the disciples for sowing (= proclamation) in spite of obvious rejection of the message". In the second, "it anticipates

---

[54] On the variety of the titles of *PS*, see further, e.g., Gnilka 1978:159; Lohfink 1986:48-49; Wright 1996:230.

[55] Bultmann 1931:216. This view is referred to by, e.g., Cranfield 1951:402; Kuhn 1971:112 (note 70); Lohfink 1986:36 (note 2). In spite of no reference to Bultmann, Gnilka 1978:159 expresses the same view.

Bultmann himself considers four possibilities of the original meaning of *PS* in the form of question: "ist sie ein Trost für jeden Menschen, wenn nicht alle seine Arbeit Frucht trägt? ist sie in diesem Sinn gleichsam ein halb resignierter, halb dankbarer Monolog Jesu? ist sie eine Mahnung an die Hörer des göttlichen Worts? der Predigt Jesu? der Verkündigung der Gemeinde? Oder ist in der ursprünglichen Parabel überhaupt nicht auf das Wort reflektiert, und ist etwa im Sinn von 4. Esr 8,41 zu verstehen (...)". See Bultmann 1931:216. The question of the relationship between *PS* and 4 Ezra 8:41 is discussed below.

[56] Cranfield 1951:399-403. As those who belong to the first group, Cranfield mentions A.E.J. Rawlinson, W. Lowrie, C.H. Dodd, B.T.D. Smith and J. Jeremias. He acknowledges the different interpretations within the first group, depending on whether the harvest is regarded as the success of proclamation or as the consummation of the kingdom of God; still, they have a common feature, i.e., encouragement to the hearers in spite of failures. As those belonging to the second group, W.O.E. Oesterley, H. Roux and A.M. Hunter are mentioned. Further, as the third alternative, Cranfield mentions Bultmann's four different possibilities of the interpretation of *PS* (see fn 55 above). This is omitted here.

[57] See Cranfield 1951:403-414, esp., 412.

the coming of the kingdom of God in spite of small beginnings".[58] For Hultgren, the question is not either/or. Since the kingdom was at the heart of Jesus' proclamation, so also can the parable "be understood within the historical ministry of Jesus to have been a word of encouragement in proclaiming the kingdom".[59]

Although scholars have suggested various interpretations of *PS*, which may be grouped in one way or another,[60] one can discern a certain fundamental consensus which penetrates the scholarly interpretations. In his analysis of the interpretations of *PS* from Jülicher to the scholars of the 1970s, Bultmann observes three fundamentals. From the point of view of this research, two of them are relevant: (i) for scholars, *PS* concerns "the fate of the seeds" and connects it "inseparably" with the experience of the preacher as the sower; (ii) for them, this 'preacher' is Jesus ("Die Frage, wer der Sprecher des 'Wortes' ist, wird insofern von allen Exegeten in gleicher Weise beantwortet, als Jesus also der Sprecher des Wortes gilt").[61] Thus, in the interpretation of *PS*, the scholars identify the act of sowing with that of preaching, the preacher with Jesus, and the seed with his word of proclamation, so that the picture of 'the sower sows the seeds' is a metaphor for 'Jesus proclaiming the word about the kingdom'.

To this day, this understanding of the metaphor still seems to be influential in the interpretation of *PS*. Recent scholars' interpretations are now summarised.

As seen above, Hultgren's interpretation is based on understanding the metaphor as 'Jesus preaching the word'. In his case the metaphor of the sower also extends to the

---

[58] Hultgren 2000:188. As scholars of the first line of interpretation, Hultgren mentions Oesterley, B.T.D. Smith and Jeremias; as those of the second line, N.A. Dahl and N. Perrin are mentioned.

[59] Hultgren 2000:188.

[60] In addition to Cranfield and Hultgren, V. Taylor, C.S. Mann and H. Anderson also divide the scholarly interpretations into four (Taylor and Anderson) and three (Mann) groups. However, their criterion of division does not seem clear; additionally, Mann and Anderson do not mention which scholars represent each group. See Taylor 1955:250-251; Mann 1986:261; Anderson 1994:128-129.

[61] Bultmann 1975:30-34, esp., 31 and 33. The scholars whose interpretation Bultmann examines are Jülicher, Wellhausen, Fuchs, Klostermann, Jeremias, Grundmann, E. Haenchen, A. Schlatters, Dahl, F. Hauck, J. Schniewind, E. Schweizer, Dodd and Linnemann. In contrast to Cranfield and Hultgren (see above), Bultmann does not put forth his solution of interpretation but only a short and modest comment: "Ebenfalls kann das Gleichnis auch ein Wort des Trostes sein wie für den Verkündiger, so auch für den verzagten, seiner selbst nicht sicheren Hörer". See Bultmann 1975:34.

The third fundamental of the scholarly interpretations concerns the eschatology of *PS*: "the scholars understand the harvest basically as the eschatological event, in which the judgment is realized and the salvation the believers wait for becomes reality". The first and second fundamentals are dealt with here because they are relevant from the point of view of this research, i.e., the question as to the relationship between *PS* and the remnant motif.

disciples, i.e., future preachers of the word. Gnilka accepts the same understanding of the metaphor,[62] and R. Gundry likewise, although in a more modest way ("we scarcely know enough to deny").[63] R. Pesch and H. Weder, both based on the same understanding, consider that *PS* contains two points: Jesus' confidence in the eventual success of his mission and the exhortation of hearing to those who were listening.[64] The latter point expands the understanding of the metaphor of *PS*, so that the soils are now identified with the hearers. In other words, the hearers are exhorted to become good soil.[65] Such an expanded understanding of the metaphor is strongly maintained by P.B. Payne.[66]

These recent scholars maintain *explicitly* the understanding of the metaphor for 'Jesus preaches the word about the kingdom'. Among recent scholars, there are also those who do so only *implicitly*. Jeremias and W. Grundmann argue that the harvest in the last verse of *PS* symbolizes the coming of the kingdom of God.[67] Thus, Jesus' purpose with this parable is to convince his hearers that the kingdom will come like the seed which falls on the good soil grows and bears fruit.[68] Although the metaphor of sowing, sower and seed is not discussed, they consider that Jesus told this parable because of the followers' doubt about the success of his proclamation.[69] In other words, Jesus compared his activity with the act of sowing which expects both loss and gain.[70] It is clear that Jeremias and Grundmann assume the same understanding of the metaphor. W.L. Lane acknowledges that the act of sowing and the seed refer to Jesus' preaching and his word about the kingdom, respectively. However, he argues that this metaphor is not a primary consideration in *PS*, because the central point of the parable is the coming of the kingdom both in the veiled manifestation in the present time and in the full disclosure at the end.[71]

---

[62] Gnilka 1978:159-161.
[63] Gundry 1993:209.
[64] Pesch 1980:230-234; Weder 1990:108-111.
[65] So Pesch 1980:234.
[66] Payne 1983:163-169. In fact the same view as Payne's is already expressed by Cranfield and the second group of scholars with whom he joins. See discussion above.

  B. Gerhardsson and C.L. Blomberg also emphasize the point of Jesus' encouragement of hearing to his hearers. However, they identify the sower with God and the seed with his word rather than with Jesus and his word. See Gerhardsson 1967-68:165-193; Blomberg 1990:226-229.
[67] In fact Jeremias and Grundmann's interpretations are examined by Bultmann. They are dealt with here on the grounds that their studies to which I refer here are of a later edition than those Bultmann refers to.
[68] Jeremias 1984:149-150; Grundmann 1989:118-121.
[69] Jeremias 1984:150.
[70] Grundmann 1989:119.
[71] Lane 1982:153-155.

However, there are some recent scholars who do not enter into the question of the metaphor because of the lack of the information on the original context of *PS*. Guelich judges that it is not possible to interpret *PS* in a more detailed sense other than that it concerns "the outcome of God's eschatological activity in history". This means that God's eschatological activity, like scattered seeds, encounters opposition and failure but also produces an abundant harvest. But "lack of a specific context within Jesus' ministry makes further precision impossible".[72] In a similar manner, H-J. Klauck considers that by means of *PS*, Jesus clarified for his hearers their situation with respect to the kingdom of God. But he concludes: "Bei dieser allgemeinen Intentionsangabe läßt man es am besten bewenden".[73] More concisely, E. Schweizer considers that Jesus called the hearers' attention to the reality of "God in action (Gott am Werk)" in the midst of the opposition.[74]

Finally, two recent scholars, J.D. Crossan and B.B. Scott, who do not rely on the dominant understanding of the metaphor of seed or content themselves with putting forth a general or concise comment on the Jesuanic meaning of *PS* can also be mentioned.

Crossan maintains that the Jesuanic meaning of a parable can be found, when it exhibits, by form and content, divergences from both early Judaism and early Christianity.[75] Based on such a principle of double dissimilarity, he seeks to reconstruct "the situational function in the life of Jesus which gives birth to the form which we call parable".[76] As a result, Jesus' parables are judged to be something other than the rabbinical type of parables which are tied to ethical problems of life or to the exegetical difficulties in the biblical text. Correspondingly, the controversial or homiletic situations which form-critical studies have reconstructed for the *Sitz im Leben* of Jesus' parables are only applicable to early Church. In those studies, parable is regarded as the effect of a

---

[72] Guelich 1989:196-197.
[73] Klauck 1978:196-198.
[74] Schweizer 1989:44-46.
  It is interesting to note that these three scholars point out something unique in the eschatology of *PS* in comparison with that of Jewish apocalyptic. According to them, *PS* lacks the idea of "one grand harvest of deliverance and/or judgment" or "die Vernichtung aller Finde am Ende" which is characterized by Jewish apocalyptic. Klauck mentions this uniqueness of eschatology as one of the reasons for the authenticity of *PS*. See Guelich 1989:197; Schweizer 1989:45; Klauck 1978:197.
[75] Crossan 1973:262. Crossan uses the term "late Judaism" for early Judaism.
[76] Crossan 1973:263. As seen in the methodological discussion in the first chapter, today scholars do not support double dissimilarity as a criterion of authenticity. See 1.3.2.2.

controversial situation. According to Crossan, however, "Jesus' parables are the primary and immediate expression of his own experience of God", so they are "the ontologico-poetic articulation of the kingdom's in-breaking upon himself". Therefore, for Jesus, parable is the *cause* of a controversial situation.[77] In view of such a "situational function", Crossan interprets the Jesuanic meaning of *PS* to be "the gift of the kingdom's advent and the joyful surprise of its experience: despite all the problems of sowing there is the abundant harvest (…)".[78] Since Jesus' parables are thus a verbal crystallization of his prominent religious experience, it is meaningless to attempt to clarify the metaphorical elements of *PS*.

Scott seeks for the Jesuanic meaning of *PS* from the point of view of the original hearers of the parable. According to him, *PS* causes a disjunction of form and content. That is, the form of three failures (Mark 4:4-7) and the threefold numbers of growth (4:8) lead to an expectation of hyperbole growth; however, thirty-, sixty and one hundredfold yield represent just a good harvest, not hyperbolic,[79] so this harvest is an ordinary, everyday event. The hearer resorts to the proverbial structure of Jewish traditions in order to make sense of the parable. Scott realizes, however, that the accent of failure in the parable challenges the expectation of success. At the end, the hearer is left to find that "in failure and everydayness lies the miracle of God's activity".[80] But, only then, can he "experience God's ruling activity under the most unfamiliar guises (…) in the everyday". By "the most unfamiliar guises", Scott means Jesus' fellowship with prostitutes and tax collectors. In Crossan's term (see above), *PS* functions as the cause of this controversial activity of Jesus. Scott explains the Jesuanic meaning of the parable in the following way: because "the accidents of failure are not exploited for their possible moral overtones but are coordinated with the harvest", "the kingdom does not need the moral perfection of Torah nor to apocalyptic solution of overwhelming harvest".[81]

---

[77] Crossan 1973:263-265.
[78] Crossan 1973:266.
[79] Scott 1990:358.
[80] Scott 1990:361-362.
[81] Scott 1990:362.

4.2.1.2. Reconsideration of the Jewish background of *Parabola Seminantis*

The question to be examined now is: Is it not possible to understand *PS* in terms of remnant motif, as Wright does so clearly, but scholars usually do not?[82] As a matter of fact, Bultmann, in his earlier days of career, put forth a different point of view with regard to the question of the seed metaphor than the dominant understanding of it. When he discussed the "kinship (Verwandtschaft)" between Jesus' parables and Jewish (i.e., early Jewish and rabbinical) ones as indicator of the authenticity of the former, he mentioned 4 Ezra 8:41 as a proof of the Jewish kinship of *PS*.[83] The verse reads:

> For just as the farmer sows many seeds upon the ground and plants a multitude of seedlings, and yet not all that have been sown will come up in due season, and not all that were planted will take root; so all those who have been sown in the world will not be saved.[84]

As the text shows, the something to be sown is not identified with the word of proclamation but with *human beings*. On the other hand, 4 Ezra also has a passage which states that God sows the Law in the Israelites (9:30-33)[85]. Thus, there are two possibilities of the metaphor of sowing in that book. Bultmann did not choose the understanding that the Law is sown but rather that human beings are sown for the metaphor of *PS*. Unfortunately, he does not explain his choice.

Among recent scholars, G. Lohfink and P. Garnet emphasize that in *PS*, the object of sowing is the people of Israel. As seen above, in his interpretation of *PS*, Wright pays attention to the metaphor of sowing seed for God's sowing the people.[86] He relies on the latter scholar. K.R. Snodgrass can also be mentioned as a scholar who pays attention to

---

[82] Bowker cannot be counted as a scholar who interprets *PS* in temrs of a remnant motif, because he argues that Jesus transformed the Isaianic motif, as seen above. See discussion in 4.1.1.

[83] Bultmann 1931:216-222. Bultmann argues that such a kinship demonstrates that "Jesus (…) in der jüdischen Tradition stand und als Mann seiner Zeit und seines Volkes Gleichnisse bildete wie auch seine Zeit= und Volksgenossen". On the other hand, he also recognizes the possibility that the early Church took parable material from the Jewish tradition and rendered it into Jesus' parable. See Bultmann 1931:216.

[84] B.M. Metzger's translation in Charlesworth 1983 is used.

[85] 4 Ezra 9:30-33 relates: "and you said, 'Hear me, O Israel, and give heed to my words, O descendants of Jacob. For behold, I sow my Law in you, and you shall be glorified through it forever.' But though our fathers received the Law, they did not keep it, and did not observe the statutes; yet the fruit of the Law did not perish – for it could not, because it was yours. Yet those who received it perished, because they did not keep what had been sown in them."

[86] See 4.1.3.

the same aspect in the interpretation of *PS*. He refers to both Lohfink and Garnet.[87] Lohfink examines what the act of sowing stands for in the OT. He finds three passages where God is the subject of sowing as follows:

> Zech 10:9: "Though *I scattered them* (וְאֶזְרָעֵם: lit., '*I sowed them*') among the nations, yet in far countries they shall remember me, and they shall rear their children and return." (NRSV)

> Hos 2:25: "and *I will sow him* (i.e., personalized Israel; וּזְרַעְתִּיהָ) for myself in the land. And I will have pity on Lo-ruhamah, and I will say to Lo-ammi, 'You are my people'; and he shall say, 'You are my God.'" (NRSV Hos 2:23)

> Jer 31:27f: "The days are surely coming, says the LORD, when *I will sow* (וְזָרַעְתִּי) *the house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seed of humans and the seed of animals*. Just as I have watched over them to pluck up and break down, to overthrow, destroy, and bring evil, so I will watch over them to build and to plant, says the LORD" (NRSV)

Lohfink's following observation is worth noticing.

> Wenn im Alten Testament von Gott selbst gesagt wird, daß er aussät, so geht es ausnahmlos um das Säen *von Menschen*, wobei mit diesen Menshen stets Israel gemeint ist. Gott hat sein Volk unter die Völker gesät (zerstreut), oder er sät es in der kommenden Heilszeit im Lande neu an, damit es wieder zum wahren Gottesvolk wird.[88]

He also points out that 1 En 62:8 is an early Jewish example which expresses the same metaphor of sowing seed in a clearly apocalyptic and eschatological sense.[89] The verse reads:

> And the congregation of the chosen and the holy will be sown; and all the chosen will stand in his presence on that day.[90]

---

[87] Even though Lohfink's study of the metaphor problem in *PS* is more extensive than Gartner's, Wright refers only to the latter's study. See Wright 1996:232-233 (note 128). Likewise, Hultgren includes only Garnet's study in his comprehensive list of bibliography concerning *PS* (sixty one studies apart from sixty seven "frequently cited commentaries and studies"). So, Lohfink's study is forgotten by them both. See Hultgren 2000:199-202 and also xxv – xxix; Wright 1996:230-239. I have already commented on Snodgrass's interpretation of *PS*. See fn 44 above.

[88] Lohfink 1986:59-60.

[89] Lohfink 1986:60. Lohfink does not refer to 4 Ezra 8:41 as another example of the metaphor of 'sowing seed' for 'people being sown'. I think his position is justified, because his and also my own concern here is the OT and early Jewish (namely Jesus' time) background of *PS*. 4 Ezra, however, belongs to the post 70 CE literature, so one cannot rely on it as the background of *PS* which is from pre 70 CE. It is right to say that the metaphor of 4 Ezra reflects such an earlier Jewish background.

Therefore, Lohfink rejects the dominant understanding of the metaphor of sowing and seed in *PS* (i.e., the metaphor for 'Jesus' proclaiming the word about the kingdom of God'). The reason why scholars have adopted this understanding is, according to him, that their previous knowledge of Jesus' explanation of *PS* in Mark 4:14-20, which refers to "the word" as the sown (v. 14), orients their interpretation in advance.[91] This is a surprising state of affairs, because most scholars judge this explanation to be a secondary composition by the early Church. Thus, consciously or unconsciously, they infer the Jesuanic meaning of *PS* from something which they themselves judge to be no use in actually finding that meaning!

Is Lohfink's view justified? Whether the metaphor of 'sowing seed' for 'proclaiming divine word' is lacking in the OT and Second Temple Judaism or not, is now examined.

Klauck observes that the connection between seed and word, sowing and proclamation, is a common phenomenon in the ancient Greek civilization.[92] On the other hand, he mentions that a similar connection is also found in the OT and early Judaism, though sporadically ("nur ansatzweise"). As proof, he refers to Isa 55:10f; Hos 8:7; 10:12; Prov 22:8; Job 4:8; 3 Bar 15:2; TLevi 13:9.[93] However, one should notice that they are far from connecting seed and word, sowing and proclamation. With regard to Isa 55:10f, the existence of such a connection in the verse has already been refuted.[94] As far as the other passages are concerned, the thing which is sown is not 'word' but "righteousness", "goodness", "injustice" or something similar, the result of which is either gained or suffered by a human being in the casual chain of his behavior in much the same way as the sower reaps from his good or bad seed. Thus, the subject of the act of sowing is not God, either, but human beings. Snodgrass concludes: "It must be granted that it is much easier in the OT to demonstrate *God's* sowing is metaphor for restoration

---

[90] I rely on Nickelsburg's and VanderKam's translation in Nickelsburg – VanderKam 2004.
[91] Lohfink 1986:58-59.
[92] Klauck refers to e.g., Plat., Phaedr 276b-277a; Plut., Phyth Or 1 (394E). See Klauck 1978:192 (also note 37 and 38). Gundry also refers to Philo *All.* 3.59 §170; Antiphon frg. 60, Hippoc. *Lex* 3; Pl. *Phdr.* 61 (276E-277A); Plut. *De Pyth. or.* 1 (394E); Quint. *Inst.* 5.11.24; Sen. *Ep.* 38.2; *Corp. Herm.* 1.29. See Gundry 1993:208.
[93] Klauck 1978:192-193 (also note 40 and 41).
[94] See the discussion in 4.1.2. As seen there, Lohfink, Gundry, Hultgren and Snodgrass also deny that Isa 55:10f expresses the metaphor of seed as God's word.

of the exiles than for proclamation of the word".[95] It is true, as demonstrated above, that 4 Ezra has a passage which says that God sows the Law in the Israelites.[96] However, when taking the post 70 CE origin of the book into consideration, it is unlikely that the passage is proof that the metaphor of 'sowing seed' for 'proclaiming the divine word' was current in the Palestinian Judaism at the time of Jesus. Rather it merely reflects a new type of metaphorical idea which appeared so late as at the time of the explanation of *PS* in Mark 4:14-20.[97]

It can be concluded that in Second Temple Judaism, particularly in its heartland, Palestine, the metaphorical expression of 'God's sowing' does not stand for 'his sowing the word' but for 'his sowing his people'.[98] This conclusion can be reinforced by numerous other Jewish texts in which "sowing" or "planting" is associated with the return from the exile or the restoration of Israel, and "seed" with the returnees from exile or members of the restored Israel.[99] Such being the case, the imagery of restoration which the metaphor aroused in the Jews at that time could have contained two dimensions in terms of time perspective: the first dimension is that the restoration refers to the historical return from the Babylonian exile; the second, that the restoration refers to the apocalyptic eschatological restoration of the true people of God. Therefore, in order to seek for a Jesuanic meaning of *PS*, one should pay attention to this Jewish tradition on which both

---

[95] Snodgrass 2008:168. From the point of view of this research, I think that Scott does not deal with the background of the metaphorical thinking in a correct way, because he argues that the metaphor for God's sowing human being is a later 'expansion' of other traditions. See Scott 1990:359-361.

[96] Moreover, 4 Ezra 4:28-32 relates that evil or good is sown to the human hearts. The subject of sowing, however, is not mentioned in contrast to 4 Ezra 9:30-33.

[97] In addition to the explanation of *PS* in Mark 4:14-20 (and the parallel passages in Matt 13:18-23; Luk 8:11-15), there is no metaphor of seed for the word or no expression that the word or the gospel is 'sown' found in the NT,. Otherwise, the cases in which botanic expression is used for the word or the gospel are few: in Jas 1:21 "the implanted word" is mentioned and in Col 1:5-6 "the gospel" is described as "growing" and "bearing fruit". In Acts 6:7; 12:24; 19:20 the "growing (αὐξάνω)" of God's or Lord's word is mentioned.

[98] Philo in Alexandria says in *Leg. All.* 1, 49, 79 that God sows insight and virtue in the human soul; in *All.* 3:39, he compares teaching to sowing seed. See also Klauck 1978:194; Gundry 1993:208. In terms of time, Philo belongs to Second Temple Judaism, but his thought was probably influenced by Greek culture.

[99] Those Jewish texts which Wright refers to have already been examined critically,and as a result of the examination I have listed twenty-nine texts which can be recognized as associating "sowing" or "planting" with the return from the exile or the restoration of Israel; "seed", with the returnees from the exile or the members of the restored Israel. These are: Ezra 9:2; Ps 126:6; Isa 31:9 LXX, 37:31f, 43:5, 44:3, 45:25, 53:10, 54:3, 60:21 (and 61:3), 61:9, 65:23, 66:22; Jer 24:6, 31:27, 32:41, 46:27; Ezek 17:22f, 36:8-12; Hos 2:23 (BHS 2:25); Amos 9:15; Mal 2:15; Jub 1:15-18, 21:24; PssSol 14.2f; 1 En 62:8; 1QM 13:7; 1QH 16:4-26 (1QH 8:4-26 according to Sukenik's order). See my examination in fn 33 above. Wright's list can be supplemented with some more texts from Garnet's and Klauck's lists: Isa 5:1-7; Ps 80:8-16; 90:5; Jub 36:6. See Garnet 1983:41; Klauck 1978:193 (note 43).

the Jewish speaker of *PS* and his Jewish hearers stood. Against such a Jewish background, Garnet reconstructs the reaction of the first hearers of *PS* as follows: "(i) As individuals their sympathy was likely to be drawn to the main subject of the story, the seed; (ii) Collectively they were aware that the people of Israel was often spoken of in Scripture in terms of seed and of God's planting, especially in the context of the themes of Exile and Restoration; (iii) The imagery used to describe the fortunes of the seed in the Parable was such as to re-inforce this view (…)."[100]

I think it is a surprising situation that when examining the Jesuanic meaning of *PS*, most scholars have not paid any attention to the metaphor of 'sowing seed' for 'God's sowing the people of Israel'. Even a scholar like Jeremias does not question what the metaphor of 'sowing seed' could really mean in Second Temple Judaism.[101] Even in those cases when scholars do touch on the issue, they do so insufficiently. For example, in the discussion on the metaphor of *PS*, H. Weder refers only to those OT and Jewish texts which concern the casual chain of a human being's behavior (Prov 11:22; 11:24 LXX; Hos 10:12 LXX; cf. the discussion above on Klauck's examples) or the metaphor for 'God's sowing the Law in the people' (4 Ezra 9:31), but not to those texts containing the metaphor for 'God's sowing the people of Israel' or corresponding metaphors of 'planting' and 'seed' at all. He then concludes that 'sowing' is a metaphor for 'Jesus' proclamation'.[102] Such an insufficient and one-sided treatment of the Jewish tradition can also be found in other scholars' interpretation which touches on the question of the metaphor.[103] This is a defect in the study of the Jesuanic meaning of *PS*.

---

[100] Garnet 1983:41.

[101] See Jeremias 1984:149-150. Instead, Jeremias touches on the metaphor for 'God's sowing the people of Israel', when he examines the explanation of *PS* in Mark 4:14-20 (Jeremias 1984:75-78 [esp., 77 note 6]), but not with *PS* proper. As demonstrated below, his discussion on the question of the metaphor is insufficient.

[102] Weder 1990:109-111. Weder refers to also Isa 55:10 as a text which demonstrates the metaphor of seed as 'God's word'. This understanding of the metaphor of that passage has already been refuted. See discussion in 4.1.

[103] Pesch, who explicitly argues for the metaphor of *PS* for 'Jesus' preaching the word of God', argues: "Die Metaphorik von Aussaat, Wachstum und Ernte *für das Handeln von Menschen und (seltener) das Wirken Gottes* ist im AT, in der jüdischen Literatur, im NT und in der hellenistischen Umwelt verbreitet (empasis is mine)". However, he refers to only 4 Ezra 8:6, 41f; 9:30ff as the proof of the metaphor of sowing, growth and harvest but not more. See Pesch 1980:231.

   Gnilka refers to Hos 8:7; 10:12; Job 4:8; Prov 22:8; Sir 7:3; Ps 126:5 as the proof of the metaphor of 'sowing', but not more. These are the texts in which the human being is the subject of sowing. (He also refers to Isa 61:3, but the word 'sow' is not found there.) He refers to Isa 28:24-26 as the text in which God is the subject of sowing. However, it is not clear what the object of sowing stands for in that passage. Why

As seen above, in the Second Temple Judaism in Palestine, the metaphorical expression of 'God's sowing' did not mean 'his sowing the word' but 'his sowing his people'. From the point of view of this research, this is a very significant point, in examining whether *PS* contains the remnant motif or not. If 'seed' symbolizes the people of Israel, *PS* seems, at first glance, to speak of the formation of a blessed remnant which emerges after the loss of the other part of the people. Lohfink and Garnet, who emphasize the metaphor for 'God's sowing his people', however, develop such an interpretation of *PS* as lacks this motif. Their interpretation is now examined.

Lohfink argues that *PS* speaks of the restoration of the people of God, so "Der gesamte Acker Israel wird neu besät. Ein neues Volk, das wahre Israel, soll heranwachsen".[104] In his interpretation of *PS* he emphasizes the *collectivity* of the sown and subsequently growing people. That is, the people are sown and then grow *as a whole* and also encounter the threatening factors and enemies *as a whole*, as he describes: "Das Werk Gottes, die Schaffung des wahren, endzeitlichen Israel, ist also vom Anfang bis zum Ende von mächtigen Opponenten bedroht". However, the sown people win the final victory over those factors and enemies: "Das endzeitliche Gottesvolk wächst schon heran und es bringt seine Frucht".[105]

In addition to the collective point of view of *PS*, Lohfink also argues that the growth of the people of God is not characterized as an apocalyptic eschatological but an "evolutive" event in the parable. For him, the bearing of fruit in the end of the parable symbolizes the growth of the sown people to "einem zahlreichen Volk".[106] From such a

---

does he not refer to the clear texts such as Zech 10:9, Hos 2:25, Jer 31:27f? See Gnilka 1978: 158 (and also note 11).

    Klauck, as seen above, parallels the Greek metaphor of 'seed' as 'word' with the OT and Jewish texts concerning the casual chain of a human being's behavior, although the latter texts do not treat 'seed' as 'word'. In fact, Klauck also refers to the texts containing the metaphor for 'God's sowing/planting the people of Israel' like 4 Ezra 8:41; 1 En 62:8; Hos 2:25; Jer 31:27; Ezek 36:9; Zech 10:9, Amos 9:15; Ps 90:5, PssSol 14:4; Jub 36:6; 1 QS 8:5. However, he does not take this metaphor into account in the interpretation of *PS*. See Klauck 1978:193 (also note 42 and 43).

    Hultgren asks: "Do the seeds represent the word of God, or do they symbolize people (…)?" He, then, refers to only 4 Ezra 8:41 as a Jewish text which has a metaphor of seed as 'people'. However, he concludes that the accent of that passage on only a few being saved "is not in the parable " (i.e., *PS*). Thus, he excludes this metaphor from the interpretation of *PS*. See Hultgren 2000:185.

[104] Lohfink 1986:62.
[105] Lohfink 1986:62.
[106] Lohfink 1986:63.

deuteronomic notion,[107] he infers that Jesus' concept of the kingdom of God is neither placeless nor utopian, but rather that it has a place where it becomes visible and concrete, namely, the land of Israel. The coming of the kingdom is, thus, "kein Geschehen, das der Zeitlosigkeit des Jenseits angehört".[108] Against the view that the bearing of fruit symbolizes the coming of the kingdom,[109] Lohfink argues that the kingdom is actually launched at the moment of God's act of sowing. Therefore, the parable speaks of the kingdom's growth or "evolution", in which the kingdom victoriously struggles against the threatening factors and enemies.[110]

A criticism of his interpretation of *PS* can be mounted. First, the parable lacks such a collective point of view as the Jewish tradition has. In this tradition, the people, truly, are sown as a whole among the nations for exile (Zech 10:9) or sown as a whole to the land of Judah for restoration (Hos 2:25; Jer 31:27f), or the congregation of the holy and chosen as such is identified with something sown (1 En 62:8); so that the sown is an entity which has a common fate and feature. In *PS*, however, the whole of the sown seed is not brought to "die wahre endzeitliche Israel" automatically; some are devoured immediately, others are scorched after a short time of growth and others are choked after a certain length of growth, but the rest completes its growth and bears fruit. The sown seeds do not share a common fate and feature, but such a collective thing is divided into individual cases. *An individualized point of view is intruded upon the traditional, collective point of view. This would have caused a discrepancy to those who were used to the collectivity of the metaphor of the sown seed, and thus they found PS unintelligible.*[111]

---

[107] See Deut 30:5, 16; see also Bar 2:34.

[108] Lohfink 1986:63.

[109] E.g., Jeremias 1984:149-150.

[110] Lohfink 1986:64. Lohfink considers the "theologigeschichtlich" reason why scholars have not paid attention to the "evolutive nature (evolutiven Züge)" of *PS*. According to him, when J. Weiß introduced the "theozentrische und escatologische Struktur des Reiches Gottes" in the beginning of the twentieth century, it excluded any simple view of development from the concept of the kingdom. Therefore, "die tatsächlich vorhandenen evolutiven Züge der Wachstumsgleichnisse wurden nicht mehr gesehen". See Lohfink 1986:65.

[111] In the criticism of Lohfink's view on the collectivity of *PS*, Gundry points out that the collectivity of Israel as God's planting does not fit the distinction of the different fates of seeds in *PS*. See Gundry 1993:210. H-W. Kuhn also points out that the harvest is not described as a gain from the total of the sown seeds in *PS*, "weil eben nicht das Verhältnis der Aussaat zur Ernte, sondern nur das Verhältnis ganz bestimmten Samens zur Ernte angesprochen wird". See Kuhn 1971:112-113.

The question of the discrepancy between the collectivity of the metaphor of the sown seed and the individualized fate and feature of seeds is discussed in more detail by J. Liebenberg. However, he argues that *PS* stands on the individualized point of view; therefore, Lohfink's interpretation based on the

The individualization of the fate and feature is indicated by the use of the singular to refer to seed individually, that is, ὅ (Mark 4:4) , ἄλλο (4:5) and ἄλλο (4:7) refer to unsuccessful seed; ἕν, ἕν, ἕν (4:8) to successful seed, while the plural ἄλλα (4:8) refers to the total of these three successful seeds.[112] Lohfink denies such a view of the singular as an individualized reference. He argues that each of these indefinite pronouns refers to a "mass of seeds (Saatmenge)", i.e., ὅ (Mark 4:4) as "eine Teilmenge des Gesäten", ἄλλο (4:5) as "eine andere Teilmenge", ἄλλο (4:7) also as "eine andere Teilmenge" and ἄλλα (4:8) as "andere Teilmengen", then ἕν, ἕν, ἕν (4:8) as "ein Teil hiervon".[113] However, one should notice that the division of the common fate and feature is still clear, even in such a collective understanding of the indefinite pronouns.

Second, three unsuccessful cases and one successful case in *PS* should be considered from a more typological point of view than a mere "evolutive" point of view. For Lohfink, these cases form "the various phases (vierschiedenen Phasen)" which the kingdom of God must pass to reach its completion. It is true that those cases are placed in *PS* in the order of growth, so the first case concerns the seed before germination; the second case, the one after a short time of growth; the third case, the one after a certain length of growth; the fourth case, full growth. In this way, the parable can indicate a progressive (evolutive) point of view. Still, the point is not a collective progress but a progress mixed with a typological point of view. That is, in the process some parts are lost for various reasons but the other part remains to gain the final goal at the end of the process. In this sense, a remnant motif can be recognized in *PS*. However, this remnant motif is not similar to the one which is related to the Jewish, traditional metaphor of God's sowing. In the latter case the sown seed as a whole may symbolize the restored, true remnant of Israel as in the case of Hos 2:25; Jer 31:27f and 1 En 62:8. In the former case, i.e., the remnant motif of *PS*, the sown seed themselves become divided further into

collective point of view cannot be sustained. I argue that *PS* stands both on collective and individualized points of view; therefore, Lohfink's interpretation, which does not regard the discrepancy due to the two points of view, cannot be sustained. I can mention one problem with Liebenberg's argumentation. That is, while Lohfink applies the *Jewish* metaphor of the sown seed to the reconstruction of the *Jesuanic* meaning of *PS*, Liebenberg deals with the applicability of the metaphor in connection with his analysis of the *Marcan* meaning of it. It is no surprise, therefore, that he judges this Jewish metaphor not to be applicable to such an analysis. See Liebenberg 2000:362-368.

[112] About this individualized reference, see Gundry 1993:194; Guelich 1989:195; Gnilka 1978:158-159.

[113] Lohfink 1986:44. Klauck also denies the individualistic reference to seed. See Klauck 1978:191.

the part which is lost and that which remains. In *PS* the motif of remnant is actually the motif of the remnant of the remnant. As stated above, owing to the individualized point of view, *PS* should have been an unintelligible saying to the Jewish hearers. I can also add: *because of a typological point of view, the parable might have led the hearers beyond unintelligibility to come to the question as to what on earth such a division of fate might mean*. In view of other Jewish traditions, the 'birds', 'rootlessness' and 'thorns' in particular could have had negative connotations also metaphorically.[114] Why does God not sow all the people properly, when his act of sowing the people concerns the restoration of Israel?

The reason why Lohfink pays no attention to the individualized and typological points of view of *PS* can now be considered. For him this parable ought to be an ideal application of the Jewish traditional metaphorical thinking. Therefore, such elements of the parable as are at odds with its application must be marginalized, so the individualized and typological points of view are transformed into the question of "phases" of the process which a collective entity passes through. Even when these points of view can be recognized as such in *PS*, however, it does not follow that the presence of the Jewish traditional metaphorical thinking in *PS* should be denied.[115] The question is *not* either the total application of that thinking or the total denial of it, but rather that the two different kinds of point of view - collective and individualized/typological - coexist in *PS*, so a discrepancy between them is generated in the same parable. In this way the parable is not structured only by the metaphorical dimension to which a collective point of view pertains, but also by one more dimension to which an individualized and a typological points of view pertain. What is this another dimension? I suggest that it is a realistic dimension vis-à-vis a metaphorical one. Actually, the image of the various fates of the seeds is nothing but a realism of the natural phenomenon: the seed which fell along the

---

[114] With regard to the negative connotation of 'birds', see Jub 11:10-24; 1 En 92:1-19; with regard to 'rootlessness', see Sir 40:15; with regard to 'thorns', see Jer 4:3; cf., *Rab. Exod* 42:7. M.P. Knowles examines the intertextual relationship between Jub 11:10-24 and Mark 4:4, 15 and argues that Jesus' intention with using the bird motif in Mark 4:4, 15 was to recall for the hearers of *PS* the haggadah concerning Abram's youth in Jub 11:10-24. One of the points of his studies is that through this intertextuality "an organic link" between *PS* and the explanation of it is demonstrated with respect to these specific verses of the parable and the explanation. However, the problem is that Knowles considers that the intertextuality of Jub 11:10-24 concerns the whole parable and explanation. See Knowles 1995:145-151.

[115] As seen in fn 111, this denial is Liebenberg's position.

path was devoured by the birds; the one falling on rocky ground was scorched by the sun; the one falling among thorns was choked by them; the one which fell into *good soil* grew to bear fruit, naturally. Because of the realistic image, the full application of the Jewish traditional metaphor of God's sowing is disturbed. Thus, by hybridizing the metaphorical and realistic dimensions, the speaker of *PS* dares to make the traditional metaphorical thinking unstable.[116] At this stage, even though it is not clear what his intention is with such hybridization, it is likely that to the ears of the Jewish hearers who were used to the metaphor of God's sowing, *PS* would have been an unintelligible saying.

Garnet's interpretation of *PS* is also examined critically. As seen above, he reconstructs the reaction of the first hearers of *PS*. I think his reconstruction, based on the Jewish tradition of the metaphorical expression of 'God's sowing', is plausible. However, the problem of his argumentation begins with his "exilic method" which he employs in order to specify the reconstructed reaction further. By this method, he renders every part of *PS* translatable with exilic themes. For example, he reinterprets the place: "beside the way", in which a seed falls, as the place "passed by". According to him, it alludes to the exilic situation of Israel, because some exilic texts of the OT (Jer 18:16; Lam 1:12) use the verb "pass by (עבר)". Moreover, the rocky place, in which another seed falls, is simply explained as a desert which symbolizes the devastated state of Israel in exile.[117] I think Garnet's reinterpretation is far-fetched. Furthermore, in his conclusion, *PS* did no more than give the first hearers such an understanding that their situation in the postexilic period is that of exile *as a whole*.[118] Thus, Garnet does not discern in *PS* a tension which is caused by the intrusion of the individualized and typological points of view. I think his conclusion with respect to that part of the first hearers' reaction which he further specifies by the "exilic method" is not plausible.[119]

---

[116] As seen in fn 114, the realistic dimension contains a negative metaphorical connotation with respect to 'birds', 'rootlessness' and 'thorns'. Also, these negative metaphors could have made the traditional metaphorical thinking of God's sowing the people unstable.

[117] Gartner 1983:42-46.

[118] Gartner 1983:48-49.

[119] Gartner also says that *PS* is a perplexing saying to the hearers, because it does not challenge them to do anything and thus they remain "entirely passive". Only Jesus' disciples could have suspected: "Surely he cannot mean that!" According to Gartner, the dilemma which the readers fall into concerning Jesus' purpose of *PS* is due to their inclination to understand Jesus' parables in this way: "there was something that Jesus wished to communicate and that he used the parable to communicate it". Instead, relying on J.D. Crossan's theory on Jesus' parables, Gartner argues for "the world-of-discourse approach" to parable. I can

4.2.1.3. Jesuanic meaning and function of *Parabola Seminantis*

The conclusion of the discussion concerning the Jesuanic meaning of *PS* so far is this: in the context of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism where the metaphorical expression of 'God's sowing' stands for 'God's sowing the people of Israel', *PS* should have been unintelligible, because the full application of this Jewish traditional metaphor is disturbed by the realistic dimension in the parable. Another understanding of the metaphor of 'sowing' for the causal chain of a human being's behavior can be tested.[120] In this case the sower is no longer God but a human being. However, when what is sown is assumed to be something like 'goodness', 'righteousness' or 'injustice', the casual chain does not work at all in *PS*, because in the parable the seeds sown in the good soil do not represent something good nor do the seeds in the unsuccessful cases represent something bad or wrong. Thus, the parable is unintelligible. Besides, as seen above, in the Palestinian Judaism the metaphorical thinking of 'God's sowing the word' was not likely.[121] Therefore, in the Palestinian Jewish context of Jesus' time, *PS* should have been far from a "simple and clear" saying as Jeremias characterizes Jesus' parables generally[122].

The problem of the Jesuanic meaning of *PS* has not yet been solved. I have just stated that *from the point of view of the first hearers*, it is unintelligible and question-arousing, but it is not clear yet what intention the speaker of *PS* had with this parable. *The Jesuanic meaning needs to be explored from the point of view of the speaker*. For this reason, Jesus' explanation of *PS* (hereafter "Explanation") as found in Mark 4:14-20 is now explored. Its attachment to the parable presupposes the unintelligibility of the latter. It is true that like an almost exegetical axiom, the authenticity of Jesus' explanations of

---

understand this approach as something like this: Jesus' purpose of telling a parable is to involve the hearers in sharing his experience of the aspect of life which that parable concerns. I think Gartner's dependence on Crossan is problematic, because the latter bases his theory on the 'criterion of double dissimilarity', that is, Crossan detaches Jesus from both the early Christian and Jewish context. How can such an approach to Jesus' parables be consistent with Gartner's attempt to seek for the Jesuanic meaning of *PS* in the very Jewish context? I judge his complicated conclusion concerning the meaning of *PS* in this critical light. See Gartner 1983:49-50. About Crossan's theory on Jesus' parables, see 4.2.1.1.

[120] About this understanding of the metaphor, see discussion in 4.2.1.2.
[121] See discussion in 4.2.1.2.
[122] "Sie (= Jesus' parables) führen die Hörer in eine ihnen vertraute Welt; das ist alles so schlicht und klar, daß ein Kind es verstehen kann, so einleuchtend, daß Hörer immer wieder nur antworten kann: Ja, so st es". Jeremias 1984:9.

his parables is denied by the majority of scholars,[123] so doubt whether Explanation is a help to elucidating the original speaker's, (i.e., Jesus'), point of view, may easily arise. Nonetheless, this research's approach to Explanation can be justified, because it primarily examine *whether or not* Explanation is a clue to the solution of the problem of the unintelligibility of *PS*. It does not assume or deny the authenticity of Explanation *a priori*. There is no reason not to consult such a material that is attached to a saying because of the unintelligibility of the latter. The use of Explanation can also be justified by the fact that both opponents and advocates of the authenticity of Explanation usually interpret the Jesuanic meaning of *PS* based on the dominant understanding of the metaphor of 'sowing seed' for 'Jesus' preaching the word about the kingdom'. This research's understanding of the metaphor (i.e., for 'God's sowing the people of Israel') challenges thus the scholarly view on the Jesuanic meaning of *PS* and the relationship between *PS* and Explanation to reconsideration.

At the beginning of Explanation, Jesus declares: "The sower sows *the word*". After the perplexity caused by *PS*, this declaration would have caused further confusion for the Jewish hearers who expected the metaphor of 'sowing seed' to stand for 'God's sowing the people of Israel for restoration'. The unexpected identification of seed with "the word" is actually an allegorization of the metaphor. If the speaker had consistently meant the people by the seed, he would not have needed to utter this meaning, because the metaphor was already familiar to the Jewish hearers. Now it was 'decoded' in a new way. The speaker's intention should have been to lead them to a new metaphorical world. By allegorizing the metaphor, the declaration could also blur the function and the identity of the sower. According to the Palestinian Jewish tradition in the Second Temple period, if the object of sowing is 'the people of Israel', its subject is God. If the object is 'the word' however, who then is the subject, since God never sows 'the word' in that tradition? Does God take on a new role of 'sowing the word', or is some other messenger introduced for the purpose of sowing the divine word? Thus a blurring occurs with respect to the function or the identity of the sower.

---

[123] Among the 'recent' scholars to whom I have referred above, i.e., Hultgren, Gnilka, Gundry, Pesch, Weder, Jeremias, Grundmann, Payne, Guelich, Klauck and Schweizer, only two (Payne and Gundry) recognize the authenticity of Explanation.

In spite of the allegorizing declaration, one should notice that in Explanation the metaphor of seed for human beings is not replaced by the new metaphor of seed for "the word" at all. Rather, *the new metaphor is incorporated into the old one, so that Explanation carries the double metaphor of seed for human beings and for the word.* This is revealed by the Greek text of Explanation. The underlined part shows that the sown is identified with human being and the italicized part with "the word".

v. 14 ὁ σπείρων *τὸν λόγον σπείρει.*

v. 15 <u>οὗτοι δέ εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν·</u>[124] ὅπου *σπείρεται ὁ λόγος* καὶ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν, εὐθὺς ἔρχεται ὁ Σατανᾶς καὶ αἴρει *τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐσπαρμένον εἰς αὐτούς.*

v. 16 καὶ <u>οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπειρόμενοι,</u> οἳ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνουσιν αὐτόν,

v. 17 καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ῥίζαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιροί εἰσιν, εἶτα γενομένης θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζονται.

v. 18 καὶ <u>ἄλλοι εἰσὶν οἱ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπειρόμενοι·</u> οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσαντες,

v. 19 καὶ αἱ μέριμναι τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου καὶ αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμίαι εἰσπορευόμεναι συμπνίγουσιν τὸν λόγον καὶ ἄκαρπος γίνεται.

v. 20 καὶ <u>ἐκεῖνοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπαρέντες,</u> οἵτινες ἀκούουσιν τὸν λόγον καὶ παραδέχονται καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἓν τριάκοντα καὶ ἓν ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἓν ἑκατόν.

Attention should be given to the following fact: the plural agents, οὗτοι, οἱ, ἄλλοι, ἐκεῖνοί, οἵτινες, do not refer to "the word" but to human-beings, because, firstly, "the word" stands as singular and, secondly, those plural agents are the subjects who "hear 'the word' and immediately receive it with joy" (v. 16), "immediately fall away" (v. 17), "hear 'the word'" (v. 18) and "hear 'the word' and embrace it" (v. 20)[125]. By referring to the NT texts which say "the word grows (Acts 6:7; 12:24; 19:20; Col 1:6)" and "the word bears fruit (Col 1:6, 10)", Jeremias argues that Explanation is the case of a similar

---

[124] This clause "these are the ones on the path" lacks the participle of the verb "σπείρω" as in v. 16, 18 and 20. However, I consider that it is presupposed here, because, as Taylor points out, the clause refers to "ὃ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν" in *PS*. See Taylor 1955:259. If there were the participle of "σπείρω" here, a troublesome repetition would emerge, since the subsequent clause has the same verb in connection with "the word". I think the lacking of this verb in the first clause is deliberate.

[125] The meaning of the verb παραδέχομαι of v. 20 which I interpret as "embrace" is discussed below.

phraseology.[126] But this is inaccurate, because in Explanation, the subject of growing and bearing fruit as the one who hears "the word" and so on is human being, not "the word".[127] Such being the case, the sown word is incorporated as an additional element into the basic structure in which human beings are sown. Following Guelich's term, the former seed (i.e., "the word") is "extraneous" to the parable and the latter (i.e., human being) is "indigenous" to it.[128]

The question, then, is, what the purpose of this incorporation is. The answer can be found in the discussion above on what *PS* speaks of in relation to the Jewish remnant motif, that is, a further division of the remnant into the part which is lost and the remaining part which, then, forms the ultimate remnant.[129] In fact, Explanation deals with the mechanism of this division by means of "the word". Gundry's examination of the verbs used for the actors in Explanation elucidates this mechanism. While the actors of failure only "hear (ἀκούω) 'the word' (Mark 4:16, 18)"[130] and "receive (λαμβάνω) it at once with joy (4:16)", the fruit-bearing actors have one extra verb "embrace (παραδέχομαι)"[131] in addition to "hear" (4:20). With "παραδέχομαι" as the separating factor of the fruit-bearing actors from the actors of failure, the former actors can be characterized so: they "*embrace 'the word' immediately*, so that Satan cannot snatch it away. They *embrace it deeply*, so that persecution because of it cannot induce them to

---

[126] Jeremias 1984:76 (also note 7 and 8). One should observe that in Col 1:10 the subject of bearing fruit is not the word but human beings.

[127] A possible exception is the last clause of v. 19: "ἄκαρπος γίνεται". The subject of the clause is unclear. It is possible that the singular form refers to "the word" of the preceding clause as an implied subject. However, if the last clause corresponds to the last clause of v. 7 in *PS* ("καὶ καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκεν"), it is possible that the subject of the former clause refers to something sown in the latter clause, i.e., human-being. However, it is clear in v. 20 that the singular forms "ἓν (…) ἓν (…) ἓν (…)" do not refer to "the word". They are individual cases of "ἐκεῖνοι /οἵτινες" who hear and embrace the word, i.e., human-beings. The structure of the sentence of v. 20: ἐκεῖνοι /οἵτινες - ἓν (…) ἓν (…) ἓν (…) corresponds to that of v. 8 in *PS*: ἄλλα - ἓν (…) ἓν (…) ἓν (…).

[128] Guelich 1989:222.

[129] See 4.2.1.2.

[130] In the first case of failure ("the ones on the path") the verb "hear" does not appear. However, the phrase "the word sown to them" means that they have a contact with the word. That is to say, they hear it.

[131] Gundry translates "παραδέχομαι" as "to welcome". I think it important to be able to distinguish this verb used in the fruit-bearing case clearly from the verb "to take (λαμβάνω)" which is used in the case of failure ("take the word with joy"), so I take "embrace" as meaning "παραδέχομι". Act 16:21 can be counted as another case where παραδέχομαι has such a meaning as 'taking or acceptance on a deeper level'. There the Philippians indicted Paul and Silas for proclaiming a foreign cult (ἔθη), i.e., the Christian faith which the Romans were not allowed to "embrace/espouse or practice (παραδέχεσθαι οὐδὲ ποιεῖν)". In his translation of the verb, Gundry seems to pay attention to the usage of Acts 15:4.

apostatize. They *embrace it exclusively*, so that other concerns do not stifle it".[132] Thus, the verb "παραδέχομαι" contains all the three aspects (i.e., embrace "the word" *immediately*, *deeply* and *exclusively*) and they are all attributed to the fruit-bearing actors. Therefore, Explanation puts forth a profound insight: becoming fruit-bearing, in other words, becoming a member of the ultimate remnant, is dependent upon whether a human being establishes a steadfast relationship with "the word" which he or she "hears" and "receives with joy". The quality of this relationship will be disclosed, when he or she is confronted with persecution or the concerns of life.

In this way, the double metaphor is devised to teach the conditions of membership in the ultimate remnant: *the sown as such, whether in the sense of the restored community (Hos 2:25; Jer 31:27f) or of the eschatological one (1 En 62:8), do not symbolize the true remnant of Israel; only that part of the sown seed which establishes a steadfast relationship with "the word" which also is sown constitute the true and ultimate remnant.* Through Explanation the hearers of *PS* could have found the solution to the problem of the unintelligibility of the parable, i.e., unintelligibility due to the full application of the Jewish traditional metaphor of God's sowing being disturbed by the realistic dimension of it. The intention of the speaker of *PS* can be clarified so that he challenged the Jewish metaphorical thinking to redefine the true and ultimate remnant. All this demonstrates that *PS* and Explanation are inseparable from each other. While the former arouses perplexity and question, the latter gives the solution. Their inseparability and challenging function should have been relevant and meaningful to the context of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism.

It is at this stage that an attempt can be made to define the identity of the sower of the word and the meaning of fruit-bearing in order to give more precision to the Jesuanic meaning and function of *PS* and Explanation. Through this precision it is also possible to make clearer the intention of the speaker of *PS* and Explanation, and the nature of the challenge he posed to the Second Temple Judaism in Palestine.

If the sower sows the people of Israel, he is surely God. But who is the sower of "the word"? Did the speaker of Explanation equip God with this new function in addition

---

[132] Gundry 1993:206 (emphasis mine; his translation "welcome" is changed into "embrace" here, see fn 131).

to the traditional one, or did he introduce some messenger of God as another sowing actor? The problem of the identity has been further complicated by the problem of "the word". Most scholars regard this unmodified word "τὸν λόγον" as "ein von der Urkirche geprägter und häufig gebrauchter terminus technicus für das Evangelium",[133] and so use this as a strong proof that Explanation was not uttered by Jesus but composed later by the early Church.[134] From only the fact of the Christian technical term, however, it cannot be concluded that there was no Semitic, i.e., Hebrew or Aramaic, construction behind "τὸν λόγον". R.E. Brown argues that "the prophetic employment of *dabar*/(logos) for the divine message entrusted to them" could well have served as precedent for Jesus' use of this or a similar Semitic expression behind ὁ λόγος to refer to his preaching of the kingdom.[135] Guelich argues likewise: "The strong evidence that ὁ λόγος became a technical term synonymous with the Christian gospel in the language of the early Church should in no way preclude a similar usage by Jesus".[136] This means that in the history of tradition, a Semitic, original form was substituted for the unmodified usage of ὁ λόγος by the early Church.[137]

If Jesus used a Semitic word, which later became translated into the Greek word ὁ λόγος, what did this "the word" mean for him and whom did he consider to be the sower of it? According to Brown, as seen above, in Explanation, Jesus adopted the prophets' employment of דבר for the divine message in order to refer to *his* proclamation of the kingdom of God. In doing so, the sower becomes the one who proclaims the kingdom, i.e., Jesus himself. However, precision needs to be made to this reasoning with respect to the content of "the word" to begin with. First, it should be borne in mind that דבר can primarily refer to the divine message which is entrusted to the prophets, as presupposed in Brown's reasoning. Second, however, such a "divine message" should not be

---

[133] Jeremias 1984:75-76. Jeremias also refers to the NT texts which are the proof of his argument. See Jeremias 1984:75 (note 4).

[134] In addition to Jeremias, this argument against the authenticity of Explanation is used by, e.g., Bultmann 1931:202; Gnilka 1978:173; Grundmann 1989:125; Klauck 1978:203; Schweizer 1989:48; Weder 1990:111; Räisänen 1973:72.

[135] Brown 1962-63:42.

[136] Guelich 1989:221.

[137] The same view is expressed by Cranfield 1951 and also Payne 1983:178. The latter says: "It is natural that the translation of Jesus' teaching into Greek in the Church community would use 'church vocabulary' where that vocabulary faithfully expressed Jesus' teaching. Greek vocabulary statistics cannot determine the authenticity of Jesus' <u>Aramaic</u> sayings".

considered so narrowly that it concerns only the prophecy of the restoration and vindication of Israel. The divine message termed with דבר also comprehends the Torah, as Deut 5:5, 22 show (see also Num 15:31). Since the Torah is also the source of joy according to Ps 1:2 (see also Ps 119), "the word" which is described as the cause of joy in Explanation (Mark 4:16) can comprehend it. Such being the case, in the Jewish context, the word דבר may connote the law and the prophets. Therefore, to reconstruct the historical background of a Jesus tradition, one should not stop at the stage of early Christianity, and conclude by defining "the word" as merely the technical term for the Christian gospel. The unmodified usage of דבר which refers to God's commandment can be found also in the OT (Deut 30:14; cf., 30:11). Moreover, when the Qumran covenanters interpreted the Psalms and the Prophets in their pesharim, one of the most frequent formulae they used was פשרהדבר על.[138] Thus, the unmodified usage of "the word" is by no means the patent of early Christianity.

The question of who the sower of such דבר is can now be addressed. If the speaker of *PS* and Explanation means God, he equips the latter with a new function in addition to the traditional 'sowing the people of Israel'. But if the speaker means some messenger of God, he lets two actors work in *PS* and Explanation, each with each own function, so that the sowing of human beings is ascribed to one and the sowing of the דבר to the other. It can be argued that it is difficult to perceive two different, sowing actors in *PS* and Explanation. However, because of the clear existence of two different sown seeds, i.e., human beings and the word, in Explanation, the presumption that one type of seed sown is ascribed to one actor and the other type to another actor, is not impossible. When two different sowers are assumed, then, another question arises: Who is the messenger of God? If דבר is understood to be a compound of the law and the prophets, the messenger does not need to be identified with a particular person, Jesus, but can be considered in more general sense to be a prototypal, righteous Jewish teacher.

At this point, Brown's reasoning can be re-examined. According to him, Jesus, following the tradition of the prophets, adopted דבר for his proclamation of the kingdom

---

[138] See Blenkinsopp 2006:99, 100-101.

of God. It cannot be denied that the kingdom is the heart of his proclamation. On the other hand, it is unlikely that דבר lost its traditional connotation of the law and the prophets even because of the new connotation adopted by Jesus. If this had been the case, the *Jewish* hearers could not have had a point of contact to his message in the usage of דבר. For this reason, it is plausible that in Jesus' usage of "the word" the proclamation of the kingdom of God was incorporated into the law and the prophets. It is not within the scope of this research to elucidate on the relationship between these three elements; however, it can be presumed that the concept of the law and the prophets would somehow have been specialized by the incorporation of the kingdom proclamation.[139] From such a specialized concept of the law and the prophets it is possible to infer that Jesus had some special view on them. The far-reaching question of Jesus' view on the law and the prophets is not addressed here. In any case, if Jesus means that the sower of such דבר is God, he treats the latter as the collaborator of his incorporating the kingdom proclamation into the law and the prophets. But if he means a messenger of God, it is logical that the sower of Explanation who proclaims דבר in such a special way should be parallel with the one who in practice does in the same way, that is, Jesus himself. Thus, if the unity of the three elements in דבר, i.e., the law, the prophets and the proclamation of the kingdom of God, is taken into consideration, Jesus and God begin to overlap each other as the sower of "the word" in Explanation. God or Jesus, the sower of "the word" is the one who proclaims דבר in the special way ascribed to Jesus. If so, from Jesus' point of view, the question of whether the sower is God or Jesus himself might have made no difference - Moreover, it might be the reason why it was not necessary for him to disclose the identity of the sower in an allegorical way.

---

[139] The view here that three elements, the law, the prophets and the kingdom of God, are united with each other in Jesus' proclamation seems to contradict Luk 16:16 ("the law and the prophets were until John; since then the good news of the kingdom of God is preached […]"), so Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom seems to displace the law and the prophets. However, Jesus immediately continues to speak of the permanent validity of the law: "But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one dot of the law to become void. Everyone who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery, and he who marries woman divorced from her husband commits adultery (Luk 16:17-18)". The translation of the text is from RSV. In Matt 5:17-20 Jesus declares the validity of the law and the prophets more sharply. Thus, the view of this research gets support from these Jesus' traditions.

As far as the metaphor of fruit-bearing is concerned, from the point of view of the Jewish tradition (i.e., the tradition of the metaphorical expression of 'God's sowing' for 'God's sowing the people of Israel'), it can mean the numerical increase of the remnant, as Lohfink argues.[140] However, in the case of Explanation a different interpretation is necessary, because it does not include a collective entity, but rather individual human beings who grow like plants and then bear fruit, the first person thirty, the second sixty and the third one hundredfold. The metaphor of fruit-bearing here can be paralleled with the simile of Ps 1. There, a righteous person who establishes a steadfast relationship with the Torah (Ps 1:2) is likened to a tree which is planted by the water, grows lively and yields fruit (1:3). The life of such a person with Torah as growth substance becomes blessed (1:3).[141] One should not be misled in understanding the metaphor of fruit-bearing in Explanation by referring to the NT texts about "the growth of the word" and "the fruit-bearing of the word", as Jeremias does (see above).

On the other hand, Ps 1:5 mentions "the congregation of the righteous" from which the sinners are excluded. The idea that Torah grows the person who embraces it and his life becomes blessed, is not confined to the individual level. In Ps 1 the collective point of view is present in the sense that only the righteous persons make up the congregation in question.[142] The same thing concerns also *PS* and Explanation, since they deal with the ultimate remnant and the conditions of the membership in it, on the basis of which the remnant is formed. Because the metaphor is not decoded in Explanation, it is hard to clarify further what it stands for. Still, as K. Dronsch points out, the lack of the clarification at least speaks against the ethical understanding of Explanation, because it

---

[140] See 4.2.1.2.

[141] P.C. Craigie emphasizes that the blessing which the life of a righteous person receives should not be regarded as a "reward" but rather as "the result of a particular type of life", that is, "just as a tree with a constant water supply *naturally* flourishes, so too the person who avoids evil and delights in Torah *naturally* prospers, for such a person is living within the guidelines set down by the Creator". Craigie 1983:60-61.

On the other hand, M. Dahood interprets Ps 1:3c so that it means "whatever it produces is good", that is to say, the subject of the sentence remains to be the "tree", and is not changed into "the righteous" as in the case of Craigie's interpretation. Thus, in Dahood's interpretation, the sentence tells how the life of a righteous person is good in the eyes of God, rather than how it is blessed by God. Dahood 1966:4.

[142] The collective point of view which Ps 1 puts forth is recognized by C. Levin. He argues that the final edition of Psalms had its Sitz im Leben not in the temple liturgy but in "Hasidic" conventicles of the Greco-Roman period. At this point Ps 1 was added to emphasize the polarity between the righteous and evildoers. According to him, the process of de-liturgizing the Psalms also involved the reinterpreting of them in a collective sense. See Levin 2003:291-313.

does not say concretely what to do. She argues that it speaks of "die existentielle Ausrichtung des Menschen". I think the Jesuanic meaning of Explanation points in this direction.[143]

The question: Is Explanation a help in elucidating the point of view of the speaker of *PS*, so that it is possible to clarify his intention with the parable and also the nature of the challenge he posed with *PS* and Explanation to the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism?, is now addressed.

As seen above, the solution to the problem of the Jesuanic meaning of *PS* is based on the Jewish tradition concerning the metaphorical expression of 'God's sowing' for 'God's sowing the people of Israel'. *PS* should have been unintelligible in the Palestinian Jewish context of Jesus' time, because the application of the traditional metaphor is disturbed by the realistic dimension in the parable. The sole *PS* could not have conveyed anything to the hearers; therefore Explanation is necessary. It gives the solution to the problem of the unintelligibility of the parable by teaching the true membership in the ultimate remnant. It is the speaker's purpose to arouse perplexity to the hearers and then give them the solution. In this way, *PS* and Explanation each have their own function, but together they make up the whole; they are not separable from each other. Together they challenge the Jewish traditional, metaphorical thinking. However, the challenge posed by *PS* and Explanation is not confined to the question of metaphor. For example, the message of *PS* and Explanation would unavoidably have led to a collision with such an idea that in effect Israel together with the Temple cult is the realization of the prophecies concerning the restoration after the exile.[144] *PS* and Explanation would have been estranged from this historical remnant, consisting of the survivors and returnees from the exile and their descendants, and pointed to the ultimate and true remnant which emerges

---

[143] Dronsch does not regard Explanation as Jesuanic, See Dronsch 2007:307.

[144] Who then had such an idea that the existing Israel in effect is the realization of the prophecies concerning the restoration after the exile? Although I do not inquire into the question, the Jewish groupings which Dunn mentions are suggestive (he mentions them in his criticism of Wright's view that the Jews living in the Second Temple period were thought of as still in exile). According to Dunn, the Sadducean priests responsible for the twice daily *Tamid* offering in the Temple presumably did not think of themselves as still in exile and the Pharisees were confident of blamelessness. In addition to these groupings, Dunn adds Sir 50 which praises the Second Temple High Priest Simon and 2 Mac 2:17 which proves "the confidence that the purification of altar and temple attested the restoration of Israel's heritage". See Dunn 2003:473-474; about the studies on which Dunn relies in his argument against Wright, see also note 422, 423, 424.

from it instead.[145] In this case, against such remnant thinking for the status quo, the speaker of *PS* and Explanation could have shared a common interest with the Jewish apocalyptic movement in which also the idea of the ultimate and true remnant appears.[146] However, the possibility that the speaker's idea of true and ultimate remnant can even diverge in details from that of other strands of the Jewish apocalyptic thinking, depending on, for example, how his view on the law and the prophets diverge from others' as in the case of Jesus' incorporating the proclamation of the kingdom of God into the law and the prophets should also be noted. Thus, the challenge posed by *PS* and Explanation also concerns the redefinition of the Jewish thinking of the remnant itself.

Because a positive answer has been reached as to whether Explanation is a help in elucidating the point of view of the speaker of *PS*, it is appropriate to deal with the question as to the authenticity of Explanation from a new point of view. This research's reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning and function of *PS* and Explanation will contribute to the argument *for* authenticity, because it works meaningfully and unmistakably in Palestinian Judaism in the time of Jesus. One should not let the alleged Christian technical term and other expressions of Explanation veil this fact. However, the argumentation of this research is totally different from also that of those scholars who have argued for the authenticity of Explanation so far. Their argumentation is not based on the Jewish tradition of the metaphorical expression of 'God's sowing'. In order to

---

[145] At first glance, this research's conclusion concerning the original unity of *PS* and Explanation and the challenging nature of their message seems to be similar to that of Wright's (see 4.1). However, the latter's thesis and argumentation are based on problematic presumptions. Firstly, Wright assumes that the way of understanding of the metaphorical expression of 'God's sowing' for 'God's sowing the word' was as valid as the other way of understanding of it i.e., 'God's sowing the people of Israel'. That is not the stance of this research. Secondly, according to him, those hearers of *PS* who went to Jesus after the public teaching, i.e., the 'insiders', "glimpsed" the message of *PS,* and therefore Explanation which they were given in the esoteric teaching was something like an additional challenge. It is argued here that Explanation is just a clarification of an unintelligible and question-arousing saying. Moreover, Wright's thesis and argumentation leave problems unsolved with respect to the original unity of *PS*, Jesus' saying in Mark 4:11-12 and Explanation, as discussed above. See 4.1.

Dunn criticizes Wright's view on the basis of which the latter interprets the 'sower' parable (i.e., the view that the Jews living in the land in the Second Temple period thought of themselves as still in exile) as the view of "grand narrative" which is out of place from a post-modernistic point of view. Without taking a stand to Dunn's point of view, I only mention that I criticize Wright's interpretation from a different point of view. See Dunn 2003:470-477.

[146] The idea of the ultimate and true remnant in the Jewish apocalyptic literature can be found, e.g., in 1 En 90:20-33. From 1QM 13:8, 1QS 6:8 and CD 1:4; 2:11 it is clear that the Qumran community regarded itself as such a remnant.

investigate this issue, Payne's argumentation, one of the strongest advocates of the authenticity of Explanation, is analyzed.[147]

Payne's approach is that he finds the cases in the OT where the verb זרע (to sow) takes the soil as its object, i.e., '*sowing the soil with seed*' instead of 'sowing seed in the soil'. On the basis of such proofs, he argues that the masculine plural participles in passive "σπειρόμενοι" in Mark 4:16 and 18 refer to 'soils sown with the word', not 'seeds sown in various situations'. In this way his approach supports such an interpretation of *PS* and Explanation that they exhort the hearers to become good soil. This interpretation corresponds to his basic understanding of the metaphor of 'sowing seed'. Payne even attempts to reconstruct the Aramaic form of the concerned clauses.[148] However, as Hultgren points out, the Greek text of Explanation clearly compares human beings with plants and not soil.[149] Moreover, as Guelich shows, Explanation "does not shift between 'seed' sown and 'soils' sown but between two different (unsuccessful and successful) 'seeds'".[150] As Payne reconstructs the Aramaic, original form in such a way that זרע could take 'soil' as object, his reconstruction seems to be contrived.[151]

Generally speaking, scholars, from Jülicher to this day, whether arguing for or against the authenticity of Explanation, neglect the problem of the double metaphor of the seed or do not take it seriously.[152] When, for them, the metaphor of 'sowing seed' stands

---

[147] In addition to Payne, B. Gerhardsson, W. Lane and C.L. Blomberg argue for the authenticity of Explanation based on the understanding of the metaphor of 'seed' and 'sowing' for 'the word' and 'preaching'.

Gerhardsson's thesis, according to which *PS* and Explanation is an exposition of *Shema'* (Deut 6:4-9), is problematic, because, e.g., it leads him to speculate that Mark redacted a tradition which is preserved in Matthew's *PS* and Explanation. Gerhardsson's thesis is criticized as an example of "uncontrolled midrashic approach" by, e.g., Klauck 1978:206 (note 98) and Blomberg 1990:229 (note 45).

Lane and Blomberg argue for the congruence between *PS* and Explanation. I think their argumentation can be applied to Jesus' level as well as Mark's level, so it is insufficient to demonstrate the congruence on Jesus' level. See Lane 1982:152-155; 160-163; Blomberg 1990:226-229.

[148] About Payne's argumentation and his proofs of the OT texts, see Payne 1980:564-508; 1983:163-207, esp., 172-177. As a matter of fact, Moule suggested earlier than Payne the possibility of the 'soil is sown with seed' being the key to the interpretation of Explanation, although he does not enter into the detail. See Moule 1969:112.

[149] Hultgren 2000:192 (also note 28).

[150] Guelich 1989:222 (addition mine).

[151] Payne's reconstruction of Mark 4:16a is as follows: "הנון אנון דיעל שועא דיאזדרעו". See Payne 1980:566; 1983:174-175. When the verb takes 'seed' as the object, the reconstruction can be changed into "הנון אנון דיעל שועא אזדרעו" by omitting the relative pronoun די from דיאזדרעו.

[152] E.g., Lane, Schweizer and Weder do not pay attention to the double metaphor of seed in Explanation at all in their exegesis. See Lane 1982:160-163; Schweizer 1989:48-49; Weder 1990:111-113.

primarily for 'Jesus' preaching the word about the kingdom', it is not surprising that the metaphor for 'God's sowing the people of Israel' is neglected or underestimated in their interpretation of *PS* and Explanation.[153]

Turning to those scholars who deny the authenticity of Explanation, Jeremias is one who argues against the authenticity the most extendedly. His arguments can be summarized as follows: (i) on the general level, Jesus' parables are quite understandable to the first hearers in the contemporary Palestinian context, so the parables are, by nature, far from enigmatic sayings which necessitate an allegorical explanation;[154] (ii) in this particular case, Explanation contains plenty of terminology which is typical of the NT, especially the Epistle; (iii) Explanation changes "die eschatologische Spitze des Gleichnisses" into "einer Mahnung an die Konvertiten".[155] These points are now dealt with in order.

Firstly, although Jülicher's view on the sharp distinction between parable and allegory has influenced scholars' research on Jesus' parables, it has also been argued that Jesus' parables should be understood from the point of view of the Jewish tradition of משל and מתל, which is a comprehensive concept, covering even enigmatic sayings, in comparison with the Greek concept of rhetoric παραβολή. The argument is justified,

---

Among the scholars who pay some attention to the issue, e.g., Jülicher considers that this inconsistency of the metaphor of seed is related "mit einer echt volkstümlichen Nachlääsigkeit". Jülicher 1899:II.533.

Jeremias only mentions that the double metaphor is an indication of two different kinds of thinking concerning the metaphor of seed, but does not examine its function in Explanation at all, likewise Dodd, Taylor, Gnilka, J. Marcus and Hultgren. Jeremias 1984:77 (also note 5 and 6); Dodd 1961:4; Taylor 1955:258-262; Gnilka 1978:174-175; Marcus 2000:308; Hultgren 2000:189-190; cf., 191-193.

Klauck considers that this "Inkonzinnität" indicates that Explanation was composed with a different purpose from *PS*. That is not the stance of this research. See Klauck 1978:202-203.

R. Pesch and Brown consider that the metaphor of seed for human beings belongs to the later tradition in the early Church, while the metaphor for the word belongs to the original context of *PS*. That is contrary to the position of this research. See Pesch 1980:242-243; Brown 1962-63:42-43.

R. Gundry tries to solve the problem of the double metaphor by regarding human being as "the middle term", i.e., human being is related to both seed and soil. I think his solution fits the Marcan context better than the Jesuanic context. I touch on his solution later in 4.3. See Gundry 1993.205

[153] Interestingly, Guelich, who does not apply the dominant understanding of the metaphor to the interpretation of *PS* (see discussion in 4.2.1.1), understands the significance of the double metaphor of seed at least in the interpretation of Explanation. He also argues that the seed as human being is "indigenous" and the seed as the word "extraneous". See Guelich 1989:221-223.

[154] See Jeremias 1984:7-9.

[155] About the second and third points, see Jeremias 1984:76-77. In details, Jeremias has three more arguments against the authenticity, i.e., (iv) ὁ λόγος is absolutely used; (v) the interpretation of sowing as proclamation does not belong to Jesus' usage; (vi) *PS* in the Gospel of Thomas lacks Explanation. I include the arguments (iv) and (v) in the following discussion on (ii) and (iii) respectively. The problem of *PS* in GThom is discussed in subsection 4.2.3.

because מָשָׁל of the OT is usually translated into παραβολή in the LXX. So, the possibility of an expanded meaning of παραβολή in the Jewish context should be noted. Such being the case, it would be no wonder if, unlike modern scholars, Jesus had made no distinction between parable and allegory, and thus uttered such kind of parabolic saying that necessitated explanation, as it occurs in the OT, apocalyptic and rabbinic literature.[156] In fact, among the opponents to the authenticity, several scholars do not take this first argument against the authenticity as decisive, but focus on other arguments.[157]

---

[156] Manson categorizes מָשָׁל of the OT into five groups: (i) brief sentences of popular wisdom, ethical axioms and proverbs in general; (ii) bywords; (iii) "a perplexing group of cases" like Num 23:7, 18; 24:3, 15, 20, 21, 23; Ps 78:2; Job 29:1; (iv) "parables" in a normal sense; (v) fables. According to him, 'parable' which belongs to the fourth group has two distinct meanings, i.e., "its own meaning as a story and a further meaning – and this is the important thing – by application to persons or events or both together". This applied meaning is not immediately intelligible to the hearers but must be revealed by the speaker as in the case of Nathan's parable to David in 2 Sam 12:1-14. See Manson 1948:57-66.

About the comprehensive meaning of מָשָׁל and the corresponding meaning of παραβολή in the LXX and the Gospels, see also Cranfield 1951:405-406; Brown 1962/63:37-38; Guelich 1989:217-219; Hultgren 2000:13-14; Lane 1982:149-150; Moule 1969:109-110; Drury 1973:374-379.

[157] This position is most clearly represented by Guelich. Pointing out the nature of מָשָׁל and the existence of the explanation of parables in the OT, other Jewish and rabbinic literatures, he asserts: "we have no reason 'in principle' or 'by definition' for denying the authenticity of the interpretation" (i.e., Explanation). Then, he examines the 'case by case' arguments against the authenticity of Explanation and finds that the change which Explanation made to *PS*'s structure and the focus is "the most persuasive evidence for the secondary nature" of Explanation. Thus, this change in structure and focus as well as other elements of Explanation (i.e., the presence of the terminology of the missionary Church and the absence of the Semitism) "strongly indicate an application of the parable in the life of the early Church". However, he continues that this does not provide a "basis for denying *a priori* that Jesus interpreted this or any other parable". After all, according to Guelich, what one can say at the very most concerning the authenticity of the explanations of Jesus' parables is: "the interpretation as we now have it appears to have extended the comparisons of the parable in a way that makes the reconstruction of that interpretation impossible and the issue moot. See Guelich 1989:218-219.

H. Anderson, likewise, admits that the possibility that Jesus himself appended Explanation to *PS* cannot be denied, but argues that Explanation does not originate from Jesus because of the transformation of the central message of *PS*. See Anderson 1994:132-133.

Hultgren, after criticizing Jülicher's thesis for its sharp distinction between parable and allegory, states that the allegorical interpretations appended to some parables (i.e., Mark 4.13-20 par.; Matt 13:36-43; 13:49-50) "may or may not be attributed to Jesus" and the question of authenticity should "be taken up case by case". He goes on to deny the authenticity of Explanation on the basis of the lack of Semitism, the presence of the Christian concerns and the transformation of the message of *PS*. See Hultgren 2000:13-14, 189-190.

Interestingly, Bultmann considers the presence of the Christian terminology and the inconsistency between *PS* and Explanation to be the *primary* reasons for denying the authenticity of Explanation. See Bultmann 1931:202-203.

With regard to the second argument, i.e., the existence of the NT terminology,[158] the discussion above concerning the unmodified usage of ὁ λόγος merits consideration, Once the plausible meaning and function of *PS* and Explanation is found in the Jewish context, it is justified to assume an Aramaic construction behind that word and thus to take the possibility of Graecizing of the tradition seriously. It is impossible to reconstruct the original, Aramaic saying exactly, but based on the knowledge of the Jewish context and with the help of the present Greek text, as in this research, a plausible meaning and function of Jesus' saying can be sought for. Examining the alleged existence of the NT terminology, Snodgrass demonstrates that "many of the words that Jeremias lists" "can hardly be called *common* early Church language".[159] In spite of this, however, one more skeptical question can arise: "Why does Explanation not show as much Semitism as *PS*?"[160] It must be acknowledged here that it is hard to find a plausible reason for this question. Originally Explanation might have been in such a structure that could be translated into Greek smoothly, or alternatively it might have been under more pressure of Graecizing than *PS* for some reason.[161] In any case, such answer as 'because Explanation originated from the early Church' is too simplistic.

---

[158] Jeremias counts the following words as the proof of the NT terminology: σπείρω (1 Cor 9:11); ῥιζα meaning "spiritual endurance" (Col 2:7; Eph 3:17); πρόσκαιρος as a typically Greek word (2 Kor 4:18; Heb 11:25); ἀπάτη (Eph 4:22; Col 2:8; 2 Pet 2:13; cf., 2 Thes 2:10; Heb 3:13); πλοῦτος (nineteen times in the NT outside of the Gospels; among them, fifteen times in the Pauline letters); ἄκαρπος (1 Cor 14:14; Eph 5:11; Tit 3:14; 2 Pet 1:8; Jude 12); παραδέχεσθαι (Acts 15:4; 16:21; 22:18; 1 Tim 5:19; Heb 12:6); καρποφορεῖν (Rom 7:4f; Col 1:6, 10). See Jeremias 1984:76 (also note from 10 to 17).

[159] For example, "speirein ('sow') meaning "preach" was only at 1Cor 9:11"; the metaphor of *riza* ("root") for inward stability "is common in the OT and elsewhere, and its origin cannot be assigned to the early Church"; and so on. See Snodgrass 2008:166.

[160] Klauck counts the following traces of Semitism of *PS*: the participial use of σπείρων with the generic article in Mark 4:3; ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ with infinitive corresponding to ויהי ב in v. 4; παρά corresponding to על like "auf den Weg" (however, Klauck considers the meaning of παρά as "an Wegrand hin" possible) in v. 4; καρὸν διδόναι instead of καρποφορεῖν (v. 20) in v. 7; ἕν - ἕν - ἕν corresponding to the Aramaic word of multiplication חד in v. 8. Additionally, he points out that the parataxis is dominant and the hypotactic participle is lacking in *PS*. See Klauck 1978:186-187.

On the basis of the lack of a hypotactic aorist participle, M. Black asserts: "Here in Mark we may speak with confidence of a literal translation Greek version of a parable of Jesus." Black 1967:63. The same observation of Semitism in *PS* is also referred to by, e.g., Hultgren 2000:189; Payne 1983:166; Taylor 1955:250; Jeremias 1984:149 (note 2); Gundry 1993:193-194.

[161] On the basis of what G. Grundmann considers the tradition history of Explanation to be, it is possible to think that when *PS* and Explanation were transmitted hand in hand, these two parts might not have necessarily been under the same degree of pressure to adapt them to the Church's situation. That is to say, when early Christians reflected the message of the whole set of *PS* and Explanation from the point of view of their situation, Explanation, like a *consequence* of reasoning, could have been a natural target which they adapted to their reflection and colored it with their terminology, while they did not need touch the *premise*

The third argument concerns the problem of inconsistencies between *PS* and Explanation. As a matter of fact, in the reconstruction of this research, this problem does not exist, because *PS* and Explanation could have formed a unity in the context of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism. Nonetheless, comment is offered on the eschatology of *PS*. Scholars like Jeremias argue that the fruit-bearing refers to the eschatological harvest, and that the amount of the harvest, thirty, sixty and hundredfold, is a hyperbole typical of apocalyptic thinking.[162] However, it is also pointed out that the amount of growth is realistic, considering an individual seed-corn's possibility to germinate several stalks.[163] Even so, one should not deny the eschatology of *PS* and Explanation as Lohfink does. In the Jewish apocalyptic context, such a motif as 'remnant', 'fruit-bearing' and 'harvest' could naturally also have had eschatological connotation.[164] In addition, as Klauck points out, by form Explanation is modeled after the apocalyptic way of expression such as Dan 4:8f, 17-19.[165] The question of whether eschatology is present or not in *PS* and Explanation is not relevant here. It is present. Rather, the relevance is that this parabolic teaching deals with the question of the *membership* in the ultimate remnant. Thus, it sheds light on a very specific aspect of eschatology.

An attempt at reconstructing the Jesuanic meaning of *PS* in the Palestinian Jewish context of the Second Temple period has been offered. In this attempt it has become clear that by means of the unity of *PS* and Explanation, the speaker taught the conditions of membership in the ultimate remnant of the people of Israel, and thus challenged the Jewish thinking of remnant to redefinition. Because the reconstructed meaning and function of *PS* and Explanation works meaningfully and unmistakably within the context

---

of reasoning, i.e., *PS*, itself. In this cycle, *PS* could be transmitted as faithfully as possible, while Explanation was vulnerable to adaptation. Note that Grundmann himself regards Explanation as secondary. See Grundmann 1989:119.

[162] The unrealistic nature of the thirty – sixty – hundredfold harvest is also claimed by, e.g., Hultgren 2000:188; Grundmann 1989:120.

[163] About the possibility of a single seed to germinate several stalks, see Lohfink 1986:50-57; Payne 1983:181-186. Guelich also mentions the possibility of an individual seed producing a hundred. See Guelich 1989:195. It can be said that Jeremias counts the amount as the produce of the whole field, in which case the amount naturally becomes unrealistic, because all seed-corns do not share the same maximal possibility.

[164] As early Jewish texts which indicate that 'fruit-bearing' and 'harvest' have an eschatological connotation, Joel (BHS) 4:13 (cf. Mark 4:29); 1 En 10:16-19; 2 Bar 29:1-8.

[165] So Klauck 1978:201.

of Palestinian Judaism at the time of Jesus, the speaker of this whole parabolic teaching can be ascribed to Jesus as Mark does (as well as the other synoptic writers), and the Jesus tradition of this whole teaching, though accessible to us through the Gospel of Mark, can be judged to reflect historicity.[166] As far as the problem of "the word" is concerned, it has been demonstrated that in the Jesuanic context there could have been two possibilities of the meaning of דבר. The first, more Jesuanic, meaning is that "the word" comprehends three elements: the law, the prophets and the proclamation of the kingdom of God, and the incorporation of the third element might have specialized the concept of the first two in comparison with the case of no such incorporation. The second, more neutral, meaning is that "the word" comprehends only the law and the prophets. If the speaker of *PS* and Explanation is Jesus, I think the former meaning more appropriate for Jesus' usage of the word. In any case, Jesus could have meant that the ultimate remnant must be made up of only those who establish a steadfast relationship with "the word". Relying on the apostolic tradition, the early Church later reformulated "the word" into its technical term.

The conclusion concerning the Jesuanic meaning and function of *PS* and Explanation is, however, not fully verified yet. If the Jewish tradition of the metaphorical expression of 'God's sowing' was still operative in early Christianity, the Evangelist or some Christian tradent could have composed the whole parabolic teaching of *PS* and Explanation with the meaning and function reconstructed here. Therefore, it is important to examine the meaning and function of *PS* and Explanation in the context of the Gospel of Mark and also to consider whether and how the Jewish tradition in question was operative in early Christianity. These matters are discussed in a later subsection (4.3). In addition, the possibility of reconstructing the original *form* of *PS* and Explanation must also be examined. In the reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning and function, I did not intervene in the present text, not prune it or graft anything onto it. I simply utilized it as a good material in an approximate way.[167] The position of the present Greek text in relation

---

[166] It is another matter that in the Marcan context, not the Jesuanic context, the unity of *PS* and Explanation has its *own* meaning and function. This is discussed later in 4.3.1.

[167] As matter of fact, Lohfink examines *PS* in the opposite way. He, first, examines the text critically to get a 'rational' form, and then applies this to the Jewish tradition of the metaphor of 'seed' and 'sowing'. This is one main reason why his and this research's solutions of the Jesuanic meaning of *PS* diverge from each

to the reconstructed meaning and function is examined in the last part of this subsection (4.2.3).

Before this, however, one more vital problem, namely, the problem of the Jesuanic meaning of the saying in Mark 4:11-12 and its relationship with *PS* and Explanation, must be solved. This is the subject of the next subsection.[168]

4.2.2. Jesuanic connection between the saying and *Parabola Seminantis*

4.2.2.1. Scholars' view on the Jesuanic meaning of the saying

In the first part of this subsection an attempt will be made to discover the important premises to seek for a Jesuanic meaning of the saying. This is done by analyzing the solutions of those scholars who advocate the authenticity of the saying.

In the survey of previous studies in the first chapter it has already been clarified how those scholars reconstructed the Jesuanic meaning of the saying in question, and its Jesuanic context in order to test or justify their solutions of the meaning. The survey disclosed that there are –in the main - two different views on the authenticity of the

---

other so much, in spite of sharing the same starting point concerning the Jewish tradition. The problems with his reconstruction of the original form of *PS* are discussed in 4.2.3.

[168] As the last word of this subsection, I comment on the question which has occupied the mind of scholars in their interpretation of *PS*, i.e., the question of which comes first, sowing or plowing, in the agriculture in the ancient Palestine. Claiming that sowing preceded plowing, Jeremias argues that such a way of agriculture is the background of *PS*, so it becomes quite understandable why the sower scatters his seeds onto all kinds of soils, good and bad, even "on the path ($\pi\alpha\rho\grave{\alpha}$ $\tau\grave{\eta}\nu$ $\acute{o}\delta\acute{o}\nu$)". Jeremias' view has been popular and repeated, but it has also been criticized. Hultgren sums the critical arguments. Firstly, the order of sowing and plowing might not have been so uniform in ancient Palestine. While Jub 11:11 indicates sowing prior to the plowing under of seeds, Isa 28:24 and Jer 4:3 are instances to the contrary. Secondly, even though *PS* presupposes the imagery of sowing prior to plowing, "it is going too far to say that the imagery implies that some seeds are deliberately sown 'on the path' and in the other places in order to be plowed under later". Thirdly, the Greek phrase "$\pi\alpha\rho\grave{\alpha}$ $\tau\grave{\eta}\nu$ $\acute{o}\delta\acute{o}\nu$" can mean "along the path" as well as "on the path", so Jeremias' translation of it as the latter meaning "is forced, and it should be rejected". See Hultgren 2000:187 (also note 8-10); Jeremias 1984:7-8. About the criticism of Jeremias' exegesis based on the Palestinian agriculture, see Dury 1973:369; White 1965:300-307; cf., Jeremias 1966:48-53; Payne 1978:123-129.

From the point of view of this research, the question is irrelevant, because the unintelligible nature of *PS* remains regardless of the order of sowing and plowing. Whether it concerns the right sowing, in which plowing is left undone, or the bad sowing, in which seed are scattered on bad soils, the Jewish hearers of *PS* would have come to the same question: "Why does God employ such a dividing method in his making of the remnant?"

saying. I refer to them as scholarly view *A* and *B*. According to *A*, the saying is authentic, but it was not uttered originally in connection with the unity of *PS* and Explanation, bur rather was transmitted independently before being inserted into that unity. This whole position is also divided into two opinions, i.e., the insertion was done either by Mark or some tradent. According to *B*, the saying is authentic, and it was uttered in connection with *PS* and Explanation, so they were in unity from the very beginning. An examination of the Jesuanic context reconstructed by *B,* in order to test or justify their solutions of the Jesuanic meaning of the saying, is now given.

The scholarly view of *B* is summarized first. Blomberg and Bryan argue that Jesus utters the saying in the parable context and that Jesus' parables had a hardening function; however, they do not clarify the Jesuanic meaning of the saying in the very concrete parable context, i.e., the unity of *PS* and Explanation. Their thesis, concerning the relation between the saying and parable context, therefore, remains on a general, theoretical level; they do not clarify how the saying is connected with the unity of *PS* and Explanation. Bryan in particular considers that when Jesus directed his judgmental proclamation to the whole people of Israel, it had such a function that in the process, a remnant was squeezed out. He argues that this paradigm of Jesus' mission is also that of Isaiah; therefore, Jesus' citation from Isa 6:9-10 should be understood in connection with the remnant motif of Isa 6:13 according to which the holy remnant emerges after the judgment of divine hardening and the following destruction of the nation. In this way he argues for the relationship between Isa 6:9-13 and Mark 4:11-12, but the unity of *PS* and Explanation, which according to the result of the examination above concerns the very motif of remnant, is excluded.[169]

Bowker and Wright really reconstruct the Jesuanic meaning of the saying in connection with *PS* and Explanation. However, in addition to the criticism of them which has already been put forth,[170] the plausibility of their reconstruction should be questioned from the point of view of the Jewish context of the time of Jesus. As seen above, the two scholars assume that *PS* already contains the metaphor of 'sowing seed' for 'Jesus' preaching the word about the kingdom', as if this understanding of the metaphor might

---

[169] See Blomberg 1990:53-55; Bryan 2002:126-128.
[170] See discussion in 4.1.1 and 4.1.3.

have been valid in the Second Temple Judaism in Palestine. In this case, Jesus' hearers could have had a better chance of understanding *PS* than if they had understood the metaphor of 'God's sowing seed' only to mean 'his sowing the people of Israel'. Therefore, both scholars must fit the Isaianic idea of divine hardening to the parable, which is intelligible in principle. The result is a demythologization of that idea. For Wright, the real meaning of the idea is that Jesus' enemies were dodged by his parabolic teaching which turned out unintelligible *to them*; for Bowker, they turned their back on what they rightly understood through his parabolic teaching. It has been demonstrated in the previous section how *PS* would have been unintelligible to every Jewish hearer, enemy or follower of Jesus.[171]

Turning to scholarly view *A* it can be pointed out that there are two problems relating to their reconstruction of the Jesuanic context. The first problem concerns the Aramaic tradition of Isa 6:9-10 at the time of Jesus. As seen in the survey of previous studies, all the scholars in group *A* utilize TgIsa 6:9-10 in their reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning of the saying. From the time of Manson and Jeremias, most of them have applied the rabbinical understanding of Isa 6:9-10 to the targumic version of the passage. As a result, according to them, *at the time of Jesus* the Aramaic tradition of the Isaianic passage did not put forth the idea of divine hardening of the Hebrew Bible. According to this research's reconstruction of the Jesuanic context, their position should be denied. For grammatical and historical reasons, the present form of TgIsa 6:9-13, capable of conveying the same idea of hardening and remnant as the Hebrew Bible, it reflects the Aramaic tradition of the Isaianic passage in the Second Temple period.[172] These scholars' approach to the Jesuanic meaning through the rabbinical understanding can be said to be anachronistic.[173] Two scholars of this group, Gnilka (1961) and Evans, doubt the applicability of the rabbinical understanding of Isa 6:9-10 to the Aramaic tradition of the passage at the time of Jesus. However, they reconstruct the Jesuanic meaning on something other than the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, even though the Aramaic tradition of Isa 6:9-10 could have put forth that very idea. Gnilka

---

[171] Besides, Wright, Blomberg and Bryan do not deal with the problem of the Aramaic tradition behind TgIsa 6:9-13 which the examination in 3.4.2 demonstrates is relevant to the reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning of the saying.
[172] See 3.4.1 and 3.4.2.
[173] So comments Fitzmyer on Jeremias' analysis. See Fitzmyer 1981:709.

(1961) interprets the whole TgIsa 6:9-13, so that the idea of divine hardening of Isa 6:9-10 was superseded by the idea of the salvation of the whole Israel; Evans' point of view does not reach the remnant motif but is confined to the hardening motif.[174] When one seeks for a Jesuanic meaning of the saying in Mark 4:11-12 by utilizing TgIsa 6:9-10 as the reflection of the Aramaic tradition of the Isaianic passage of the time of Jesus, the functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant, i.e., the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, which the Aramaic tradition of the Isaianic passage could have had, should be taken into account.

The second problem of scholarly view *A* is that the scholars of this group separate the term παραβολή in the saying from Jesus' parables as exhibiting different concepts from each other. Following Jeremias, almost all of them argue that παραβολή means 'riddle/Rätsel' in the saying, and understand the phrase "ἐν παραβολαῖς" in an adjective sense, so that the clause "ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται" means 'all the things become *enigmatic*'.[175] Thus, originally, the saying had nothing to do with Jesus' intelligible parables. Actually, this conceptual separation of the term is employed not only by the scholars of this group but also by those who argue against the authenticity of the saying.[176] For both types of scholars, the conceptual separation is a fundamental premise for the view that the saying, whether uttered by Jesus or composed by the early Church, was originally independent of the parable context and later inserted into that

---

[174] See survey of the previous studies in 1.2.2. Also Chilton does not apply the rabbinical understanding to the interpretation of TgIsa 6:9-10, either. However, he argues that of the saying in Mark 4:11-12, only the citation from Isa 6:9-10 (Mark 4:1 2) is authentic. Then, like Evans, his point of view is confined to TgIsa 6:9-10 without regard to the functional connectedness between the motifs of hardening and remnant. See fn 54 in the first chapter.

[175] See survey of the previous studies in 1.2.2. As followers of this line of thinking can be listed, e.g., Cranfield 1952:56-57; Taylor 1955:256; Gnilka(1961) 1961:24-28; Evans 1989:104-105; Guelich 1989:208-209. Lane does not mention 'riddle' as the meaning of παραβολή in the saying; however, he considers "all the things become enigma" as the meaning of the clause in question. See Lane 1982:158. Manson and Kirkland consider that in the saying παραβολή has something to do with parables in general, but not a particular one like *PS*. See Manson 1948:76-80; Kirkland 1977:1-21.

[176] Scholars who argue for the authenticity of the saying and employ the conceptual separation of the term are Jeremias, Cranfield, Taylor, Gnilka(1961), Lane, Evans and Gnilka. Those scholars who argue for the composition of the saying by the early Church and employ the conceptual separation are, e.g., Marxen 1955:255-271; Haufe 1972:414-415; Räisänen 1973:115-121; Gnilka 1978:162-163; Pesch 1980:236-240; Grundmann 1989:121-123; Schweizer 1989:46-48; Weder 1990:105-108; Anderson 1994:130-132. Klauck and Chilton, who argue that of the saying, Mark 4:11 was composed by the early Church, also maintain that the term in the verse had nothing to do with Jesus' intelligible parables. See Klauck 1978:245-249; Chilton 1984:90-98.

context. While some scholars consider the insertion occurred erroneously,[177] many others argue that the saying was inserted purposefully, that is, with a view to remolding Jesus' intelligible parables into enigmatic sayings.[178] In any case, according to all these scholars, the same term παραβολή would have represented different concepts in different contexts, that is, as 'illustrative and intelligible speech' in the context where Jesus told parables, but as 'riddle' in the context of the saying in question. Such a conceptual separation is thought possible because of the fact that the Semitic term מתל / משל (which lies behind παραβολή in the saying as well as in Jesus' parables) has a very comprehensive meaning.[179] However, one should notice that this separation is applicable, only if the actual parables of Jesus are really illustrative and intelligible and far from enigmatic. *PS* is not the case. As seen in the previous section, it is the kind of parable that would have caused perplexity, and aroused questions in the context of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism. It is for this reason that Explanation was necessary to solve the unintelligibility of the parable. Therefore, not all of Jesus' parables should be defined categorically as illustrative and intelligible. At least in the case of *PS* and Explanation, it is not appropriate to apply the conceptual separation of the term, which is a premise for the view that the term παραβολή in the saying originally had nothing to do with Jesus' parabolic teaching. Thus, one should abandon this premise which scholars have relied on to reconstruct the Jesuanic meaning of the saying and to argue that the saying was originally interdependent of the parable context and was later inserted into that context.[180]

---

[177] Taylor and Jeremias rely on the "Stichwort" theory. See Taylor 1955:256; Jeremias 1984:14. About the theory, see survey of the previous studies in 1.2.2.

[178] I have listed those scholars who employ the conceptual separation of the term παραβολή irrespective of their attitude to the authenticity question of the saying. See the names of the scholars referred to in fn 176.

[179] Jeremias 1984:12 (also note 4), 16.

[180] I think that the conceptual separation of the term παραβολή can be questioned in more general terms, irrespective of the particular case of *PS*. If it is possible that the ancients used the term παραβολή or משל / מתל with one meaning ('riddle') in one occasion but with another ('illustrative and intelligible speech') in a different occasion *exclusively*, as modern scholars reconstruct his usage of the term, it should be equally possible that the ancients used the term *inclusively*. That is to say, they used it on every occasion in such a way that it conveyed a variety of meanings, just as each meaning, though conceptually different from each other in the eyes of modern scholars, is related to each other under the same term, rather than each meaning being put in its own detached cell. In the case of detachment, I think, a different term becomes necessary for each meaning.

In this connection, Drury's conclusion of his survey on the meaning of משל in the OT and παραβολή in the LXX is worth noting: in early Judaism "the connotations of riddle and puzzle which modern scholarship tires to detach from parable were firmly attached to it". According to Drury, the present Marcan text indicates that Mark made use of the early Jewish "living tradition of the parable riddle, and allegory".

To sum up, two important premises can be confirmed when seeking for a Jesuanic meaning of the saying in Mark 4:11-12: (i) *TgIsa 6:9-13 which can convey the same Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant as the Hebrew Bible reflects the Aramaic tradition of this Isaianic passage at Jesus' time;* (ii) *at least in the case of PS, the term παραβολή in the saying is not conceptually separated from Jesus' parabolic teaching in the context of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism.* Now, on the basis of these premises, a Jesuanic meaning of the saying will be sought for.

4.2.2.2. Jesuanic meaning of the saying

As shown in the survey of the previous studies, Jeremias understands the antithetical parallelism of the saying on the basis of the conceptual separation of the term παραβολή of the saying ("ἐν παραβολαῖς" in Mark 4:11c) from Jesus' parables, so that the phrase "ἐν παραβολαῖς" corresponds to the phrase in 4:11b: "τὸ μυστήριον (…) τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ". Now that the term παραβολή in the former phrase can be taken to refer to Jesus' very parabolic teaching, at least in *PS*, it is time to seek for the real antithetical parallelism by taking this actual parable context into account, not basing it on the conceptual separation of ἐν παραβολαῖς from Jesus' parables.

J. Marcus puts forth the following diagram of the antithetical construction of the saying which is of help in understanding the antithetical parallelism of the saying from the point of view of this research. [181]

Mark 4:11b	-	4:11c
τὸ μυστήριον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ	-	τὰ πάντα
δέδοται	-	γίνεται
ὑμῖν	-	ἐκείνος τοῖς ἔξω
(ἐν παραβολαῖς)	-	ἐν παραβολαῖς

He argues, then, that it is a reasonable assumption that the same tradition was as available to Jesus as to Mark. See Drury 1973:376, 379.
[181] Marcus 2000:302.

In this diagram, the phrase τὸ μυστήριον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ corresponds to τὰ πάντα, not ἐν παραβολαῖς. In fact, this correspondence has been suggested by several scholars.[182] The real point of the antithetical parallelism is that the disciples ("you") have been given the mystery of the kingdom of God, while the others ("those outside") have not. Therefore, in contrast to the first part of the antithetical parallelism (i.e., Mark 4:11b), the second part of it (ἐκεῖνος δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται [4:11c]) should be understood to connote *the situation in which the outsiders have not been given the mystery*. The phrase "ἐν παραβολαῖς" (in the parentheses on the lower left of the diagram) is supplemented by Marcus to make the antithetical construction complete. This supplement clarifies the antithetical idea more closely: the mystery of the kingdom of God has been given to the disciples *through Jesus' parabolic teaching*, while it has not been given to the outsiders *through the same teaching*.

As a matter of fact, Marcus' diagram is a revision of J.A. Baird's in which the content of the parentheses is "with explanations", instead of "with parables" as in the present case. According to Baird, the mystery of the kingdom of God has been given to the disciples through the explanations of parables.[183] The reason for Marcus' revision is that since the saying in question forms Jesus' answer to the disciples' question about the parables ("ἠρώτων […] τὰς παραβολάς") in Mark 4:10, both parts of his answer, i.e., 4:11b and c, should also concern the parables.[184] Therefore, according to Marcus, the disciples have been given the mystery of the kingdom of God through the parables, not the explanations of them. At this point, I note that when Marcus deals with the saying in connection with the unity of *PS* and Explanation, he discusses the matter on the Marcan level. In this subsection, the Jesuanic level is the issue. Nonetheless, his thesis and argumentation can be utilized in the seeking for a Jesuanic meaning of the saying, provided they do not conflict with this research's reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning and function of *PS* and Explanation.[185]

---

[182] In addition to Marcus, e.g., J.A. Baird 1957:202; R.E. Brown 1968:34; Klauck 1978:246; Bryan 2002:126.
[183] Baird 1957:202. Brown supports Baird's diagram. See Brown 1968:34.
[184] Marcus 2000:302-303.
[185] Marcus himself considers that the saying was transmitted independently of the unity of *PS* and Explanation and Mark inserted it into that unity. See Marcus 2000:290.

On my part, two arguments for the revision which Marcus makes to Baird's diagram, can be put forth. Firstly, according to Baird, the saying relates that the mystery of the kingdom of God *has already been given* to the disciples through the explanations of parables. If so, the saying should be placed *after Explanation*, because the acquirement of the mystery is conditional on the explanations. In reality, however, the saying precedes it, that is, the mystery has already been given to them before Explanation is told! Therefore, the mystery already given should not be understood to refer to Explanation.[186] Thus, Baird's solution ("with explanations") must be abandoned. Secondly, the supplement of ἐν παραβολαῖς clarifies that the disciples' acquirement of the mystery of the kingdom of God is the effect of Jesus' parabolic teaching (i.e., they have been given the mystery *through the parabolic teaching*).[187] With respect to the outsiders, their position can be understood by force of antithetical parallelism and with the explicit phrase ἐν παραβολαῖς, so that the same teaching did not bring about the same effect (i.e., they have not been given the mystery *through the parabolic teaching*). Thus, closely understood, the antithetical parallelism of the saying indicates that *the antithetical division of the hearers' position with respect to the mystery of the kingdom of God occurred as two different effects of Jesus' parabolic teaching*.

The search for a Jesuanic meaning of the saying on the basis of this understanding of the antithetical parallelism is now undertaken. The details of the saying are analysed, first by examining two important terms, "the kingdom of God (ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ)" and "the mystery (τὸ μυστήριον)".

'The kingdom of God' or 'the kingdom of Heaven' (Heaven as the circumlocution of God) is one of the major concepts in early Judaism and Christianity, so it is impossible and meaningless to deal with all aspects and problems of the concept here. Instead, the problem relating to the concept is carefully defined, so that a narrowed examination

---

[186] In the parallel text in Matt 13:11 and Luke 8:10 ("to you it has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of heaven/God") the question is about the giving of *a position to know* the secrets rather than about the giving of the secret. In this case, "the secrets" refers to the coming explanation of *PS* so that the sequence of the saying and Explanation becomes logical. It can be said that those parallels are the rational revision of the Marcan text.

[187] The supplement of ἐν παραβολαῖς serves also the function of perfect tense of the verb ("δέδοται"). According to Blomqvist – Jastrup, perfect tense involves two points of time: the one is when the state of things is prevailing and the other is when that state arose. Thus, the supplement clarifies the latter point of time, that is, Jesus' parabolic teaching is the point when the mystery of the kingdom of God was given to the disciples. See Blomqvist – Jastrup 1996:212.

might serve the purpose of seeking for a plausible, Jesuanic meaning of the saying. For this reason, one question is posed: "Did the concept of the kingdom of God have something to do with remnant idea in the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism?" If the answer is positive, understanding "the kingdom of God" in the saying from the point of view of the idea of remnant becomes relevant, because the idea is present in the immediate context of the saying, i.e., in *PS* and Explanation. Which Jewish texts then are to be analyzed in order to investigate the relationship between the concept of the kingdom of God and the idea of remnant?

As C.D. Duling points out, although the exact term "the kingdom of God" appears only once in the Jewish literature in the Second Temple period in Palestine, i.e., Psalms of Solomon 17:3, but never in the OT, there are, however, quite many related terminologies to be found in them, e.g., "the kingdom of YHWH" in 1Chr 28:5; 2Chr 13:8; indirect references to YHWH's kingdom by means of a personal pronoun like "his kingdom" or "your kingdom" in 1Chr 17:14; Ps 103:19; 145:11, 12, 13; Dan 3:33; 4:31; TMos 10:1; 1QM 12:7; other equivalent expressions in Ps 22:29; Obad 21; 1Chr 29:11; Dan 2:44; 7:27; 1Q 6:6.[188] Moreover, there are also many passages both in the OT and in other Jewish literature which, by referring to YHWH as "king" or "reigning", indicate that God is depicted as the king reigning over Israel, all peoples or history, or even nature. In this way, the idea of the kingdom of God is present in those passages.[189] Thus, the texts in which the idea is expressed by the direct terminology (e.g., the kingdom of God/ YHWH or "his" or "your" kingdom, etc.) and by the indirect terminology which characterizes God as "king" or "reigning", are relevant to searching for the relationship between the idea of the kingdom of God and that of true and ultimate remnant of Israel.

---

[188] The list of the texts here is my rearrangement of that of Duling. See Duling 1992:50-52. With regard to the Jewish literature in the Second Temple period in Diaspora, the term "kingdom of God" is found in WisSol 10:10.

מלכותכה in 1QM 12:7 is translated as "your/Thy kingdom" by Duling and Vermes, as "your majesty" by Martínez – Tigchelaar, as "your kingship" by Charlesworth. See Charlesworth 1991:121; Duling 1992:52; Vermes 1995:137; Martínez – Tigchelaar 1997:133.

המלוכה in 1QM 6:6 is translated as "the kingdom" by Duling, as "sovereignty" by Vermes, as "kingship" by Martínez – Tigchelaar and Charlesworth. See Charlesworth 1991:109; Duling 1992:52; Vermes 1995:131; Martínez – Tigchelaar 1997:123.

[189] Duling 1992:50; also Caragounis 1992:417. About the list of the OT texts in which God is referred to as king, see Caragounis 1992:417. About the list of the other Jewish texts from Palestine and Diaspora, see Duling 1992:50-52, 54-56.

One of the clearest cases of such a relationship is the last part of the Dream Visions of 1 Enoch. As shown in the previous chapter, God ("the Lord of the sheep") *sat on the throne* in the eschatological time to judge against all the blinded sheep and seventy shepherds (1 En 90:21-27). The sheep *that remained* were joined by the other sheep which had been destroyed and dispersed and also by the animals and birds which now became obedient to the righteous sheep (90:33, 30). God on the throne rejoiced over this enlarged remnant whose members were liberated from blindness (90:33, 35). In the book of the Watchers (1 En 1-36), Michael, the leader of the holy angels, told Enoch about the high mountain and the fragrant tree which he saw (1 En 24 – 25). The mountain whose peak is like a *throne of God* is the seat where he will sit on the great day of judgment and the tree and its fruit will be given to the "righteous", "pious" and "chosen" on that day, so that they will enter the eternal bliss (25:3-6). Since the sinners are destined to the eternal scourges and tortures on that day (e.g., 22:11), a body of the righteous, pious and chosen is equivalent to the true and ultimate remnant. Michael referred to God as king ("the King of eternity" in 25:3, 5) and so did Enoch, too (25:7).[190]

As mentioned above, the exact term "the kingdom of God" is found in Psalms of Solomon 17:3 in addition to the indirect terminology such as "King over the heavens (2:30)" and "our king forevermore (17:1, 46)".[191] What does God's kingdom mean in this book? After the psalmist declares that "the kingdom of God is forever over the nations in judgment (17:3)", he gives account of the history of the earthly Jewish kingdom. The sons of David were to be the human agents of God's kingship, but because of the people's sins, the Davidic throne was usurped by the Hasmonean dynasty, which in turn was deposed by the Romans (17:4-7). After that, Jerusalem continued to be full of sins and lawlessness (17:11-20) and the righteous part of the people fled to refuge in the wilderness (17:17). The historical account is then followed by the psalmist's prophetic prayer for the establishment of the Davidic, Messianic kingdom: "a son of David (17:21)" who is also "the Lord Messiah (17:32; 18:7)" and who will purge Jerusalem (17:30; 18:5), destroy the gentile nations and the sinners of Israel (17:21-25) and gather the holy people to shepherd "the Lord's flock" as the righteous king (17:32). It is clear that this

---

[190] For the text of 1 Enoch, the translation by Nickelsburg – VanderKam of 2004 is used
[191] For the text of Psalms of Solomon, the translation by R.B. Wright in Charlesworth 1985 is used.

Davidic, Messianic kingdom consists of the righteous part of the people from which the sinners are purged, in other words, the true and ultimate remnant of Israel.[192] Although the Messiah reigns over this kingdom as king, God is the ultimate king over him, as 17:34 indicates ("Lord himself is his [i.e., Messiah, my addition] king"), so that the Davidic, Messianic king is an earthly agent of the heavenly king.[193] Thus, God reigns over the true and ultimate remnant of Israel.

Turning to the Dead Sea Scrolls, the main and most important references to God as king and to his kingdom are found in the War Scroll.[194] Especially, in Col. XII of the Scroll, the terminology of God as king is frequently used in connection with "the chosen ones (בחיר)". God has established for himself those "chosen ones of the holy nation" (1QM 12:2) and engraved for them the covenant of his peace "in order to be king (למלוך) [...] during all times eternal" (12:3). God is also said to be in the splendour of "his kingdom (מלכותכה)" (12:7).[195] In the war against the enemy kings, God comes to the chosen ones as the "King (מלך)" of glory and the army of his angels are sided with them (12:7-9). In Col. XIII, these "chosen ones", i.e., the Qumran community, to whom the Prince of light is appointed and the light's lot is assigned, is also identified with "the remnant, the survivors (שארית ומחיה)" of God's covenant (13:9-10, 8).[196] To the Qumran community, God is the king who reigns over them, "the chosen ones", in other

---

[192] It seems that Nickelsburg's account of PssSol 17 focuses on the event of the removal of the Romans by the Messiah, and the character of the Messiah, so that the question of the membership of the Messianic kingdom is not paid attention to. See Nickelsburg 1981:207-209.

[193] It should also be observed that the kingdom of God existed as his heavenly sovereignty all the time even before the establishment of the Davidic, Messianic kingdom. For example, PssSol 17:7 relates that the real destroyer of the Hasmonean dynasty is God ("you, O God, overthrew them"). That is, God ruled from heaven the course of events on the earth through the human agents. Thus, the establishment of the Messianic kingdom is the moment when his kingdom becomes embodied earthly with the concrete members of it.

The apocalyptic or non-apocalyptic nature of this Davidic, Messianic kingdom and also of Psalms of Solomon itself has been discussed by scholars. About their parallels and distinctions with apocalyptical eschatology, see e.g., Nickelsburg 1981:208-209; Duling 1992:51.

[194] Duling 1992:52. In addition to the War Scroll, Duling refers to 1QH 10:8; 4QFlor. 1:3; 1QS 1:18, 23-24; 2:19-21 (cf., 1QS 9:24) as the passages in which God is referred to as king. See Duling 1992:52.

[195] As seen in fn 188, מלכותכה in 1QM 12:7 is translated differently to "your majesty" and "your kingship" as well as "your/Thy kingdom".

[196] מחיה as "survivors" is a translation by Martínez – Tigchelaar and also by Vermes. Charlesworth translates the word as "the preservation". See Martínez – Tigchelaar 1997:135; Vermes 1995:139; Charlesworth 1991:123.

words, the true and ultimate remnant of Israel, and assists them in the war against the enemy kings.[197]

The analysis above shows that the idea of God's kingdom was related to the idea of the true and ultimate remnant of Israel in those texts from the Second Temple Judaism in Palestine. It can be by no means said that the kingdom of God is a synonym for such a remnant. Nonetheless, the result of the analysis can demonstrate that in the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism, the idea of the kingdom of God could have had such an aspect as is related to the true and ultimate remnant of Israel; therefore, as the analyzed texts show, this remnant was conceived as the entity which God reigns over as king, i.e., the kingdom of God. When this relationship between the idea of the kingdom of God and that of remnant is taken into account, it may be presumed that "the kingdom of God" in the saying is related to the true and ultimate remnant of Israel which the unity of *PS* and Explanation speaks of in the immediate context of the saying. That is to say, "the kingdom of God" in the saying points to this remnant in the whole context consisting of the saying and that unity.[198]

If "the kingdom of God" in the saying is related to the true and ultimate remnant of *PS* and Explanation, what then does "*the mystery* of the kingdom of God" which has been given to the disciples mean? If this mystery means the knowledge about the formation of the remnant, such knowledge is actually given to the disciples by Jesus through

---

[197] "King" or "kingdom" terminology can be found in 1QM 12:15 and 16, however because of lacuna, it is not possible to reconstruct the clear meaning.

[198] Although Duling does not deal with the question of the relationship between the idea of the kingdom of God and that of the true and ultimate remnant of Israel, his conclusion supports ours. According to him, with respect to the idea of the kingdom of God, the major theme of the Jewish literature of the Second Temple period in Palestine is the ultimate vindication of the persecuted elect against the powerful and mighty kingdoms of the world. Especially, with regard to the Qumran community, the correlation between the kingdom and a purified, priest-directed Israel ruling over the nations reflects the perceived negative social experience of a marginal group. If the kingdom concept, thus, refers to the persecuted/marginalized elect who are to be vindicated, the idea of the kingdom of God is naturally related to the idea of true and ultimate remnant of Israel. See Duling 1992:51-52.

I also mention the possibility that Dan 7 is related to the idea of the true and ultimate remnant of Israel. In that chapter, four worldly kingdoms are succeeded by the "dominion, glory and kingdom", which God, "the Ancient of Days", confers on "one like a Son of Man" (Dan 7:13-14). The kingdom, however, is also received by "the Holy ones of the Most High" (7:18; cf. 7:27). Even though it is clear that the Holy ones are related to the Son of Man, their identity arises as a major problem of interpretation. Duling suggest three possibilities: (i) Jewish people as a whole; (ii) a sect of pious, righteous Jews; (iii) the angels. Laato, on his part, two possibilities: (i) the martyrs who were ready to die for the Torah during the Maccabean war; (ii) the angels who will defeat with the Son of Man the enemies of Israel some day. If the Holy ones are the pious, righteous Jews/the martyrs, the kingdom is synonym for the true and ultimate remnant of Israel. See Laato 2002:273-275; Duling 1992:50-51.

Explanation which speaks of how the true and ultimate remnant will be formed and what the condition of membership of it is. However, the giving of this *knowledge* happened in the form of Explanation only after the saying in question, while *the mystery* had been given before the saying ("To you the mystery of the kingdom of God *has been given*"). Such being the case, this giving of *the mystery* must have occurred as the effect of Jesus' parabolic teaching, not through Explanation. Therefore, to seek for a Jesuanic meaning of "the mystery of the kingdom of God", one must hold on to this sequence: first, the mystery was given through the parabolic teaching in spite of the disciples' failure to understand it; then, because of that failure, Jesus gave them Explanation. The "mystery" is something other than Explanation; the giving of the former precedes the giving of the latter.[199]

Even though "the kingdom of God", the attributive of τὸ μυστήριον, can be understood as being related to the true and ultimate remnant of Israel, it does not make the seeking for a Jesuanic meaning of the whole phrase "the mystery of the kingdom of God" an easy task. This is because like 'the kingdom of God', 'mystery' is one of the major concepts in early Judaism and Christianity.[200] For this reason, the problem relating to this concept is defined as in the case of "the kingdom of God".

---

[199] D. Flusser's study is one example that a scholar attempts to reconstruct the Jesuanic meaning of the saying without holding on to this sequence. Based on the presumption of the relationship between Jesus' and the rabbinical parables, he draws such a conclusion as leads to a peculiar source-critical thesis. According to him, the form of the saying in Matt 13:11, 13 is Jesuanic; and Matthew, after having looked at the Gospel of Mark, put the detailed citation from Isa 6:9-10 into Matt 13:14-15. Moreover, Mark 4:11-12 depends on Luke 8:10 and Mark completed the elliptical form of the latter. In this way, the idea of the hardening function of parable is ascribed to within early Christianity. As mentioned in fn 186 above, the Matthean and Lucan forms ("to you it has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of heaven/God") speak of the giving of *a position to know* the secrets, not of the giving of the secret itself as in the case of the Marcan form. Thus, in the former forms, "the secrets" refers to the coming explanation of *PS*, so the sequence of the saying and Explanation seems logical in comparison with the Marcan form according to which the mystery was given already before Explanation. From the point of view of this research, the 'logical' sequence in Matthew and Luke is a redaction of the Marcan form. I do not think that Flusser sufficiently clarifies why Mark would have changed the Matthean and Lucan form. In addition, he ascribes Jeremias' interpretation of the Jesuanic meaning of the saying (i.e., "to those outside all the things are enigmatic'") to the Marcan meaning. See Flusser 1981:235-263

[200] In his studies during 1950s (reproduced as a monograph in 1968), R.E. Brown scrutinized the notion of mystery in the OT, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha and the Qumran focusing on the Hebrew word סוד and the Aramaic רז and also the relationship between this notion and the concept of μυστήριον in the NT where this Greek term appears 28 times, among them only three in the Gospels, i.e., Mark 4:11 par. (Matt 13:11; Luk 8:10). According to J. Reuman, before Brown's study scholars thought the NT usage of μυστήριον represented "an intrusion into Christian vocabulary via Paul of a word from the Greek world and a concept from the pagan 'mystery cult'". Brown shed light on the connection between the NT usage of μυστήριον, on the one hand, and the related, Semitic words and themes in the OT and other early Jewish writings, on

In order to narrow the area of examination, attention is now paid to one of the oddest features of "the mystery of the kingdom of God" of the saying, that is, even though the disciples did not understand Jesus' parabolic teaching, the mystery, according to Jesus, had been given to them through the teaching. Concerning this problem of 'the mystery given without understanding', Marcus argues that the situation in the saying is similar to that of Dan 2:27-30, where "in king Nebuchadnezzar's parable-like dream, God has revealed and made known mysteries to the king, even though he does not yet understand the dream and will not do so until Daniel provides its interpretation".[201] According to Marcus, 'the mystery given or revealed' is one thing, but 'the mystery understood' is another. If however Jesus' teaching is comparable to Nebuchadnezzar's mysterious dream, was his teaching not mysterious also to the outsiders alongside the disciples? In other words, if Marcus is right, the mystery must have been given to the outsiders, too! However, according to this research's understanding of the antithesis of Jesus' saying, the outsiders have not been given it (see above). Gundry emphasizes that 'the giving of the mystery' is not the same thing as 'the revelation of the mystery'. According to him, "'has been given' instead of the expected 'has been revealed' states privilege, but stops short of implying that the disciples understand the mystery and thereby leaves the way open to their non-understanding and Jesus' explanation".[202] That is to say, the disciples have been given the privilege of getting an explanation, while the outsiders have not. However, the replacement of 'mystery' by 'privilege' is not of much help when seeking for a Jesuanic meaning of the saying, because it does not solve the problem of why the outsiders did not get the mystery or privilege, even though they heard the same Jesus' parabolic teaching as the disciples. The meaning of "the mystery" in the

the other. From the point of view of this research, one significant conclusion of his study is that "the mystery" in the saying in question is parallel to one aspect of the early Jewish notion of mystery, i.e., "divine providence and its workings in reference to man's salvation are referred to as mysteries". See Brown 1968:34. Reuman's comment mentioned above is found in the introduction written by him to Brown's study. See Brown 1968:iii-v. Almost at the same time as Brown, Gnilka (1961) also emphasized the relationship between "the mystery" in the saying and early Judaism. See Gnilka 1961:198-199.

On the other hand, Bornkamm's study of 1967 (reprinted in 1995) of the early Jewish notion of mystery concentrates on the Enochic literature and the LXX. He does not examine other Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha or the Qumran writings. Therefore, I think that his conclusion concerning the meaning of the mystery of the kingdom of God: "The μυστήριον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ which is revealed to the disciples is thus Jesus Himself as Messiah", is superficial. See Bornkamm 1967: 813-817, 819. Brown rightly calls into question Bornkamm's use of the much later, Hebrew Enoch. See Brown 1968:1 (note 1).

[201] Marcus 2000:298.
[202] Gundry 1993:298.

saying should be clarified in connection with this *dividing* of the hearers into those 'given' and those 'not given', because it is the actual context in which the term is used.

As stated in the discussion of the diagram above, the situation which the antithetical parallelism of the saying relates is that the disciples have been given the mystery of the kingdom of God through Jesus' parabolic teaching, while the outsiders were not. Both groups are under the same condition in two ways: both of them heard Jesus' teaching and neither of them understood it. With regard to the failure in understanding, it is clear for the part of the disciples, because they ask Jesus about the parables.[203] The failure should also concern the outsiders, because, as shown in the previous section, *PS* is an unintelligible saying in the context of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism. It should, therefore, have been as unintelligible to the outsiders as to the disciples.[204] The difference between the outsiders and the disciples is simply that the former group did not just join the latter in asking Jesus about the parables. When both groups of hearers are under the same condition, the dividing of them into those 'given' and those 'not given' occurs in a close parallel to this difference of their reaction to Jesus' parabolic teaching: the disciples were with Jesus after his parabolic teaching and could ask him about the parables he had told, while the outsiders were not with him after the teaching. It is possible to try to describe their divided reaction more concretely. If the dividing occurred immediately after his teaching, the disciples *remained with* him but the outsiders *left* him. If instead, this event occurred less immediately it presupposes a passage of time and/or a movement of place, the disciples *came to* him but the outsiders *did not come to* him. It is not possible to decide which is more accurate, but in any case, this difference of the hearers' reaction (to come/to remain or not to come/to leave) is closely related to the dividing of their position with respect to the mystery of the kingdom of God. In fact, the idea that a human reaction determines his or her relationship with 'mystery' is found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The related texts are now examined in order to see whether such an idea is the key to the meaning of "the mystery" of the saying.

---

[203] Therefore, Wright's theory, according to which the disciples "glimpsed" the message of *PS*, must be rejected. See discussion in 4.1.

[204] Therefore, Bowker's theory ("the phenomenology of religious rejection" in his term), according to which the outsiders understood the message of *PS* only to turn their back on it, must be rejected. See discussion in 4.1.

The Damascus Document (CD) relates in Col. III that Israel brought about God's wrath by deserting his covenant and their land became destructed (3:7-12), but "with those who remained steadfast in God's precepts, with those who 'were left from among them (מהם נותרו)', God established his covenant with Israel for ever, revealing to them 'hidden matters (נסתרות)' in which all Israel had gone astray (3:12-14)".[205] In this way, the revelation of "hidden things" occurred to the remnant of Israel which remained steadfast in God's precepts, that is, such steadfastness is the condition of that revelation.[206]

The Rule of the Community (1QS) sets in Col. IX regulations to "the Instructor"[207] concerning the treatment of two different kinds of people. According to the regulations, while he must avoid arguing with the men of pit and hide the counsel of the law from them (9:16-17), with respect to "those who choose the path", he must reproach them concerning the trustful knowledge and just judgement to "lead them with knowledge and teach them 'the mysteries of wonder and of truth (ברזי פלא ואמת)' in the midst of the men of the Community, so that they walk perfectly, one with another, in all that has been revealed to them (9:17-19)". Thus, "the Instructor" teaches the mysteries of wonder and of truth to those who choose the path, so their choice is the condition of receiving the teaching on the mysteries. Through such a teaching that starts from the time of their choice, they are led to perfection, which is also the process of the separation of them from the unrighteous.[208]

---

[205] The translation is by Martínez – Tigchelaar. "נותרו מהם" is translated as "remained of them" by Charlesworth, "the remnant" by Vermes. "נסתרות" is translated as "hidden matters/things" by all three. See Martínez – Tigchelaar 1997:555; Charlesworth 1995:17; Vermes 1995:99.

[206] According to CD 3:14-15, "hidden matters" concern God's "holy sabbaths, his glorious feasts, his just stipulations, his trustful paths, the wishes of his will".

CD 3:17-20 states that those to whom the hidden matters were revealed committed sin but God atoned for their iniquity "in his wonderful mysteries (ברזי פלאו)". The passage does not relate how God pardoned their sin; however, "those who remained steadfast in" the safe house he built will acquire eternal life, that is, as the condition of the acquirement of the eternal life, the same 'steadfastness' as in the case of God's precepts in CD 3:12 is required. The translation by Martínez – Tigchelaar is used. See Martínez – Tigchelaar 1997:555.

[207] "The Instructor" is a translation by Martínez – Tigchelaar. "משכיל" is translated as "the Master" by Charlesworth and Vermes. See Martínez – Tigchelaar 1997:93; Charlesworth 1994:41; Vermes 1995:82. For this figure, interestingly, the same word in Dan 12:3 is used, i.e., "those who are wise (המשכלים)" who shall shine like the brightness of the sky and lead many to righteousness in Dan 12:3.

[208] According to 1QS 9:19-21, "This is the time for making ready the path to the desert and he will teach them about all that has been discovered so that they can carry it out in this moment [and] so they will be

While these texts relate that those who are steadfast in and make a choice for the devotion to God's will enter into a relationship with the mysteries, the Rule of the Community shows also a contrary case in Col. V, that is, those who do not make such a choice have nothing to do with the mysteries. According to it, "the men of injustice who walk along the path of wickedness" have neither sought nor examined God's decrees in order to know "the hidden matters (הנסתרות)" in which they err (5:10-11).[209]

The examination above of various Qumran texts shows that in the view of the Qumran community, making a choice for the devotion to God's will is the condition of entering into a relationship with the mysteries.[210] However, the community's view should be described more precisely. For the Qumran community, this entering does not mean yet the acquirement of the complete knowledge of the mysteries. As Marcus points out, the view of the Qumran is that the perfection of such knowledge will be realized only in "the determined end and renewal". Therefore, according to him,

> the knowledge that is now revealed to the community accords with the age in which its members find themselves living. That age is a penultimate one, and so the knowledge that is now revealed – although it is decisive – cannot yet be termed complete understanding.[211]

Thus, making a choice or determining attitude is the decisive but not terminal point with respect to the person's relationship with the mysteries. By making a choice, he enters into a relationship with them and starts the process which leads to the perfection of the knowledge about them in the end of time.[212]

---

detached from anyone who has not withdrawn his path from all injustice". The translation by Martínez – Tigchelaar is used. See Martínez – Tigchelaar 1997:93.

[209] The translation by Martínez – Tigchelaar is used. See Martínez – Tigchelaar 1997:81.

[210] Is there not a similar view in the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism to be found outside the Qumran community? According to Brown's understanding of Sir 39:2-7, at least, the scribe who will seek out the secrets of proverbs and busy himself with the hidden meanings of parables receives of God knowledge to meditate on his mysteries. This can be considered to be a similar way of thinking to Qumran. See Brown 1968:9-10, 36.

[211] This thesis of Marcus is based on his examination of 1QS9:18, 10-25-26. See Marcus 1984:567-568.

[212] When the texts examined here disclose the significance of a human choice in the question of his relationship with mysteries, a question may arise: Is the point of view of the Qumran community not more that of predestination? For example, 1QHᵃ 10:13 states that God has made the writer a knowledgeable mediator of wonderful mysteries with respect to the elect of righteousness. On the other hand, "the elect of righteousness" refers to "all who turn away from offence (10:8, 9) and "those on the straight path (10:10)", that is to say, "wonderful mysteries" are mediated to those who make a choice. With regard to those verses,

It seems that this view of the Qumran community illuminates the situation which the saying relates, i.e., the situation where the disciples have been given the mystery in spite of their failure in understanding Jesus' parabolic teaching. They came to/remained with Jesus after the teaching to ask him about the parables. Their coming/remaining corresponds to their 'making a choice' or their 'determining attitude'. If so, Jesus' declaration: "To you the mystery of the kingdom of God has been given" means that by their making the choice to come/remain, they are allowed to enter into a relationship with the mystery. The disciples' failure to understand Jesus' parabolic teaching did not hinder them. Their making a choice, thus, was decisive. Moreover, since "the kingdom of God" is related to the true and ultimate remnant of Israel which *PS* and Explanation speak of, their entering into a relationship with the mystery of the kingdom of God means entering into a relationship with this remnant. Even though they failed to understand Jesus' parabolic teaching, from the moment of making a choice to come to/remain with him, they became qualified for the remnant which would be revealed in its perfection only at the end of time. Accordingly, they were concretely taught by Jesus about the membership of the remnant through Explanation, just as "those who choose the path" are to be taught about the mysteries in the Qumran community. If one tries to define the saying's meaning of the sole word "mystery", a dictionary-like definition is not possible. Definition is possible only when both the context of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism and the connection between the saying and the unity of *PS* and Explanation are taken into consideration. So 'the giving of the mystery of the kingdom of God' cannot be

I rely partially on Martínez's – Tigchelaar's and partially Vermes' translation. See Martínez – Tigchelaar 1997:163; Vermes 1995:193-194. Another example is 1QS 11:7 which relates: "to those whom God has selected he has given them (i.e., hidden things which are mentioned in 11:5-7; addition mine) as everlasting possession". According to this translation by Martínez – Tigchelaar and Vermes, the condition of the giving of the hidden things is God's selection. However, Charlesworh' translates the verse as "those whom God has chosen he has set as an eternal possession", so that God's choice has nothing to do with the giving of mysteries. See Martínez – Tigchelaar 1997:97; Vermes 1995:87; Charlesworth 1994:49. I think that human choice and God's selection form the both sides of the same coin. God selects his elect beforehand, which cannot be seen to anyone's eyes until the day when a human being makes his/her choice. Only then does God's selection becomes visible. In this sense, human choice does not contradict God's selection and *vice versa*.

On the other hand, entering into a relationship with the mysteries means that a righteous person also enters into an inner, spiritual struggle which lasts until the end of time. There are several passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls which speak of such a struggle inside the righteous man, e.g., 1QS 4:23-25; 3:21-23 (also the idea that such a struggle never means God's forsaking of the righteous in 3:24-25), 1QH^a 14:19-22. About this theme, see, e.g., Marcus 1984:567-568; Brown 1968:28-29.

understood more than as 'the allowing of entrance into a relationship with the true and ultimate remnant of Israel'. This, however, is enough for the purpose of this subsection.

Having clarified the meaning of 'the giving of the mystery of the kingdom of God' and having reconstructed the situation of the disciples, an attempt is now made to reconstruct the situation of the outsiders by force of the antithetical parallelism of the saying. Entrance into a relationship with the true and ultimate remnant of Israel was allowed to the disciples but denied to the outsiders. Thus, the latter's failure to make a choice or doing it in a negative way (i.e., not coming to/leaving Jesus) leads to their not being admitted. This contrary situation should be the starting point in seeking for a Jesuanic meaning of "ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται". Each element of this clause is now investigated in order.

With regard to the meaning of "those outside (ἐκείνοις τοῖς ἔξω)", the phrase can be interpreted theologically because, as pointed out by scholars, the same phrase in the Pauline corpus is *terminus technicus* for non-Christians, and the corresponding term in the rabbinical literature (החיצונים) means heretics.[213] However, here the question is the division of the hearers after Jesus' teaching. Therefore, the primary meaning of the phrase should be the concrete one, i.e., those who did not come to/left Jesus after his teaching. On the other hand, the phrase also connotes such a situation that they were excluded from entry into a relationship with the true and ultimate remnant of Israel. Only in this sense, is a theological understanding of the phrase possible in the Jesuanic context. It is no use bringing in the Christian or rabbinical term to obscure that context.

The phrase ἐν παραβολαῖς means 'by means of Jesus' parabolic teaching' and refers to his unintelligible parable of *PS*. The plural form of παραβολή indicates that when Jesus told *PS*, his parabolic teaching to the crowd of people actually consisted of more parables than this one. Thus the phrase should be interpreted precisely as 'by means of Jesus' parables'. However, in the sole connection between the saying and the unity of *PS* and Explanation, it is not possible to know what the other parables were.

As far as "all the things (τὰ πάντα)" is concerned, the diagram discussed above requires that the phrase should be understood to refer to "the mystery of the kingdom of God" on account of the antithetical parallelism of the saying. A discrepancy between the

---

[213] Klauck 1978:246; Marcus 2000:299; Gnilka 1961:83-84.

plural τὰ πάντα and the singular τὸ μυστήριον need not be regarded as a problem in the context of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism. There, the number of 'mystery' was quite freely changeable. For example, in the second chapter of the book of Daniel which has all cases of the use of רז in the OT (other than one case in Isa 24:16), this word appears in the singular five times and in the plural three.[214] In the Dead Sea Scrolls, in particular, as Marcus points out, רז, one of the three terms for hidden thing, i.e., mystery, and used the most often, appears more often in the plural than in the singular.[215] Brown points out, moreover, that the plural form of רז and the singular of סוד are often used in parallelism or interchanged in set expressions.[216] In this way, the view that τὰ πάντα refers to "the mystery of the kingdom of God", can be supported by the historical context, i.e., the Second Temple Judaism in Palestine, as well as the literal context, i.e., the antithetical parallelism of the saying.[217]

Finally, a reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning of γίνεται is attempted. By means of the parabolic teaching, Jesus offered both types of hearers the possibility of entry into a relationship with the true and ultimate remnant, i.e., "the mystery of the kingdom of God". However, those who did not come to/left Jesus after his teaching did not receive it, while those who came to/remained with him did so. Thus, the verb γίνεται indicates such an one-sidedness of the communication between the speaker and the hearers (i.e., 'offered but not received') with respect to the outsiders, while δέδοται indicates the reciprocal nature of the communication (i.e., 'offered and received') with

---

[214] Strictly speaking, the singular form רזה, רז refers to king Nebuchadnezzar's dream (Dan 2:18, 19, 27, 30, 41) and the plural רזין, רזי refers in a more general term to the mysteries which God reveals (2:28, 29, 47). But even so, it is not necessary to consider that the plural "τὰ πάντα" in Mark 4:11c has nothing to do with the mystery of 4:11b. Even though τὰ πάντα can refer to the mysteries in general, "the mystery of the kingdom of God" of 4:11b belongs to them and from the point of view of the antithetical parallelism 'the mysteries' of 4:11c can logically refer to the mystery of 4:11b.

The case of Isa 24:16 divides scholarly opinions on the meaning of רָזִי־לִי. Blenkinsopp argues that it means "I have my secret". NRSV interprets it as "I pine away". See Blenkinsopp 2006:17.

[215] Marcus 1984:564 (note 25). The other, two terms for mystery are סוד, נסתרות.

[216] Brown 1968:33 (also note 103 and 104). As examples of such a parallelism or set expression, Brown refers to 1QHª 12:27, 28 and 19:9, 10. See Brown 1968:33 (note 104). Brown relies on the order of 1QH according to E.L. Sukenik (i.e., 1QHª 12:27, 28 are 1QH 4:27,28; 1QHª 19:9, 10 are 1QH 11:9, 10).

[217] When scholars attempt to reconstruct the Jesuanic meaning of "τὰ πάντα" without regard to this historical and literal context or the connection between the saying and the unity of *PS* and Explanation, their conclusion is that the term refers to Jesus' teaching in general (e.g., Jeremias) or his mission in general including teaching and other works (e.g., Guelich). See Jeremias 1984:14; Guelich 1989:208.

respect to the disciples. So, for the part of the outsiders, "the mystery" just only "comes (γίνεται)".

It is now possible for the Jesuanic meaning of the clause "ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται" to be reconstructed as follows: with respect to those who did not come to/left Jesus, although the possibility of entry into a relationship with the true and ultimate remnant of Israel ("the mystery of the kingdom of God") was offered to them through Jesus' parabolic teaching as well as to his disciples, they did not, however, receive it. In other words, his parabolic teaching did not bring about the same effect to all the hearers. It is important that this difference of the effect of Jesus' parabolic teaching is noticed, in order to reconstruct the Jesuanic meaning of the citation from Isa 6:9-10 which follows the antithetical part of the saying.

Jesus' citation from Isa 6:9-10 extends the negative situation of the outsiders (i.e., their exclusion from entry into a relationship with the true and ultimate remnant of Israel), by linking it with the hardening motif ("ἵνα βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούωσιν καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν") the aim of which is to hinder them from repentance and forgiveness ("μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς"). Since their situation is the negative *effect* of Jesus' parabolic teaching, in this linkage their hardening can also be regarded as the same effect. In this case, a consecutive understanding can be considered suitable for the meaning of the much debated word ἵνα.[218] However, the present tense of γίνεται must be noticed in comparison with the perfect tense δέδοται in the preceding verse. While δέδοται refers to the positive effect of Jesus' parabolic teaching as *having already occurred* in this particular case, the present γίνεται makes it possible to imply that the negative effect of his teaching is not confined only to this particular case but can appear as a general and regular phenomenon with respect to a certain people, i.e., those who turn their back on him. From the present tense, thus, I infer that *Jesus, having seen a certain people's negative reaction to his parabolic teaching in this particular case, might have characterized his parables as having the function of*

---

[218] Scholars have suggested various solutions concerning the meaning of "ἵνα" on the Marcan level as follows: final/telic, consecutive, causal. About the scholars' solutions as to that level, see, e.g., Räisänen 1973:11-14; Evans 1989:92-99. On the Jesuanic level, Jeremias interprets the word as an abbreviation of ἵνα πληρωθῇ; Manson, Chilton and Evans, considering the Aramaic word ד to lie behind ἵνα, reconstruct the meaning of ἵνα as a relative pronoun. See Jeremias 1984:13; Manson 1948:76-80; Chilton 1984:90-98; Evans 1989:105-106.

hardening with respect to them in general terms. If the question is function, not effect, a telic/final understanding is suitable for the meaning of ἵνα. Furthermore, against the background of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism, where the current text of Isa 6:9-10, including the Aramaic tradition of it, could have conveyed the idea of divine hardening, it is natural that the Isaianic passage provided Jesus with an ideal material for such a characterization of the parable teaching. On the other hand, Jesus could not have meant that hardening is the total function of his parables. To those who came to/remained with him, his parabolic teaching functions in such a way that they are allowed entry into a relationship with the true and ultimate remnant. But to those who do not come to/left him, it functions so that they are not only excluded from it but also hardened. Which function is operative to an individual becomes clear at the moment the choice of coming to/remaining with him or not is made.

On the basis of the reconstructed, Jesuanic meaning of each element of the saying in Mark 4:11-12, the Jesuanic meaning of the whole saying in a form of free translation can now be put forth as follows.

| Mark 4:11b | 4:11c and 12 |

To you who came to/remained with me (i.e., Jesus),
the entrance into a relationship with the true
and ultimate remnant of Israel has been allowed
(i.e., the mystery of the kingdom of God has been
given) through my parabolic teaching,

As far as those who did not come to/left me are concerned,
to such a kind of people, my parabolic teaching does not cause the same effect as to you but functions so that they may become hardened in order to be hindered from repentance and forgiveness, and it has actually happened now.

The reconstructed, Jesuanic meaning is based on the connection between the saying and the unity of *PS* and Explanation, so this whole connection should be recognized as Jesuanic. On the other hand, the Marcan passage from which the Jesuanic connection is extracted contains one more saying, Mark 4:13, about Jesus' comment on the disciples' failure to understand his parabolic teaching. The next question is: Is this saying also an integral part of the Jesuanic connection or something extra to it?

Scholars tend to think that there is a tension between Jesus' saying about the disciples' acquirement of the mystery of the kingdom of God (Mark 4:11b) and his comment on their failure to understand here (4:13), because, according to them, in the latter saying Jesus rebukes the disciples for that failure; thus, his attitude to them changed abruptly from a positive to a negative one.[219] It is true that in the Gospel of Mark, Jesus' rebuke of the disciples is a repeated theme (Mark 4:40; 6:52; 7:18; 8:17-21; 8:31.32); therefore, Mark 4:13 is regarded as one of these cases, and the first case in the Gospel. However, when the saying in Mark 4:13 is detached from the context of the Gospel of Mark and regarded solely in the context of the Jesuanic connection of *PS* – the saying (4:11-12) – Explanation, it dose not necessarily mean a rebuke. Jesus' reaction to the disciples' failure to understand can be translated literally as: "You do not understand this parable. Then how can you understand all the parables?" In this case, the point of the saying is to emphasize that the understanding of *PS* ("this parable") is the key to understanding the other parables. Scholars, however, have tended to interpret this saying as a double question and thereby stress the rebuking nature of it. Thus, "You do not understand this parable? How can you (…)?"[220] As Gundry points out, this interpretation is problematic. If the first sentence is interpreted as a question, beginning with "οὐκ", it should lead to an affirmative answer: "Yes, we understand it". This contradicts the whole context, because they really did not understand![221] Thus, if the real meaning of the saying is to emphasize the significance of *PS* in understanding the other parables, there is no reason to regard it as a source of tension with the saying about the disciples' acquirement

---

[219] E.g., Räisänen 1973:39-47.
[220] E.g., see Gnilka 1978:173; Guelich 1989:216; Pesch 1980:241.
[221] Gundry 1993:204. Gundry also considers the possibility of interpreting the first sentence as parataxis, so that it is a subordinate clause to the second sentence: "if you do not understand this parable, then how can you understand all the parables" See Gundry 1993:204. This possibility is consistent with the meaning of the saying which emphasizes the significance of *PS* to the understanding of the other parables.

of "the mystery of the kingdom of God". As seen above, in the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism, the entrance into a relationship with mysteries could mean the start of the process which leads to the perfection of the knowledge about them in the end of time. Against such a background, it is likely that when Jesus intentionally uttered an unintelligible parable, he might not have expected the disciples to understand it immediately. There is, thus, no reason for his rebuking their failure to understand it. Therefore, the saying in Mark 4:13 can be seen as an integral part of the Jesuanic connection of *PS* – the saying (Mark 4:11-12) – Explanation.

With regard to whether the saying in Mark 4:13 belongs to the Jesuanic connection, another problem arises: What parables does the phrase "all the parables ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ $\tau\grave{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\beta o\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$)" refer to? As Gundry points out, "all the parables" may look forward to future parables in contrast with looking back to previous parables, as the phrase "the other parables" would have implied.[222] The use of the former phrase is understandable in the context of the Gospel of Mark, because in it, *PS* is followed by more parables (i.e., the parable of the automatically growing seed in Mark 4:26-29 and of the mustard seed in 4:30-32). However, in the Jesuanic context, as stated above, the phrase $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\beta o\lambda\alpha\hat{\iota}\varsigma$ ("by means of parables"; Mark 4:11c) indicates that Jesus told several parables in connection with *PS*.[223] If the saying in Mark 4:13 is detached from the Marcan context and regarded solely in the Jesuanic connection of *PS* – the saying (4:11-12) – Explanation, it is plausible that with the saying in question, Jesus might have referred to those parables which he uttered in connection with *PS*, and might have emphasized the latter parable's significance to understanding the others. In this case the saying would have contained "the other parables" as the Jesuanic utterance instead of the present "all the parables". When the redactor placed the parables of the automatically growing seed and of the mustard seed after *PS*, he ought to have adjusted "the other parables" into "all the parables". From the Jesuanic connection reconstructed so far, it is impossible to know what "the other parables" were like. They might have been as unintelligible as *PS*, so that they all perplexed the hearers, or they might not have been so unintelligible, so that *PS* formed the turning-point which began to perplex them. In any case, perplexed by all the

---

[222] Gundry 1993:207.
[223] In the Marcan context, Mark 4:2, 10 also indicates the same thing, even though the concrete parables are not mentioned but are placed only after *PS*.

parables or by *PS* alone, the hearers became divided into two groups after the parabolic teaching.

To sum up, the Jesuanic circumstances of the saying in Mark 4:11-12 can be reconstructed as follows: (i) Jesus uttered several parables to the crowd of people; (ii) at the end of this public teaching, he told *PS*; (iii) after telling *PS*, the crowd became divided into two groups, i.e., some came to/remained with Jesus while others did not come to/left him; (iv) those of the former group asked Jesus about "the parables" (Mark 4:10); (v) Jesus answered them first by mentioning the positive effect of his parabolic teaching with respect to those who were with him now, but by characterizing the negative effect of it as its hardening function with respect to those who were not; (vi) also by emphasizing the significance of *PS* to understanding the other parables he told; (vii) then, he gave them Explanation. These Jesuanic circumstances more or less correspond to Mark 4:2-20 except for the two exhortations of hearing and seeing in v. 3a-bα (Ἀκούετε. ἰδοὺ) and v. 9 (καὶ ἔλεγεν· ὃς ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω) and the identity of those who asked Jesus about the parables in v. 10 (οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα). The problem of whether these three elements belong to the Jesuanic circumstances is dealt with below.

4.2.2.3. Relationship between the saying and the Isaianic idea

It is now time to judge the relationship between the Jesuanic meaning of the saying in Mark 4:11-12 and the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant. Because the Jesuanic meaning of the saying has been reconstructed in connection with the unity of *PS* and Explanation, this whole connection should be taken into account in the judgement of the relationship.

As seen in the previous subsection (4.2.1), the unity of *PS* and Explanation concerns the remnant motif, one of the two pillars of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, because it speaks of the condition of the membership of the true and ultimate remnant of Israel. It is true that remnant motif as such also appears in other OT books than Isaiah,[224] so the presence of the motif by itself may not still demonstrate the very

---

[224] See discussion in 2.2.2.

Isaianic influence. However, it is worth recalling the result of the analysis of the Jewish writings in the previous chapter. The common concern of those authors under the Isaianic influence was the formation of apocalyptic-eschatological remnant. Jesus' notion of remnant corresponds to theirs, because it concerns such a remnant as emerges from the historical remnant (i.e., the community formed by the returnees of the exiles and their descendants). Furthermore, the unity of *PS* and Explanation is connected with the saying which contains the citation from Isa 6:9-10 reflecting the Second Temple tradition of the passage, i.e., the tradition which puts forth the Isaianic idea of divine hardening. Therefore, both on the formal ground, i.e., the citation from the very Isaianic passage, and the thematic one, i.e., the actual connection between the remnant motif and the Isaianic idea of divine hardening, I draw the conclusion that the Jesuanic connection of *PS* – the saying – Explanation has a relationship with the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant. In the beginning of this chapter it was stated that the possibility that in the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism, the citer of Isa 6:9-10 could have understood this passage in terms of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant should be taken into account. The connection between the saying and the unity of *PS* and Explanation, thus, demonstrates this possibility as a probability. Jesus' concern was the formation of the true and ultimate remnant of Israel and at the same time he was conscious that the formation of such a remnant involved the problem of hardening. In the Jesuanic connection between the saying and the unity of *PS* and Explanation, the two pillars of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant are present.

The relationship between this connection and the Isainic idea is not so simplistic a matter that Jesus, by his parabolic teaching, intended to make a certain people obdurate with a view to forming the true remnant of Israel. As seen above, hardening is not the total function of his parabolic teaching. Only to those who do not come to/leave him does it function in such a way that they are hardened. Whether the hardening function is operative or not depends on the hearers' making a choice. If all the hearers had come to/remained with Jesus after the teaching, he would not have needed to characterize the negative effect of the parabolic teaching as its function, but rather mentioning the positive effect of it (4:11b) would have been enough. However, the actual situation caused him to characterize his parabolic teaching with the hardening motif.

Thus, *Jesus' intention with the parabolic teaching can be understood better so that the hearers could be led to enter into a relationship with the true and ultimate remnant rather than that they would be excluded from it and hardened. He did not principally mean to use the parabolic teaching in order to make hearers hardened but just the opposite. Faced with such people as did not come to/remained with him after the teaching, he characterized it with the hardening motif with respect to them.*[225]

The understanding of Jesus' intention with the parabolic teaching in this direction can be supported by two of the three additional elements of Mark 4:2-20.[226] The first is "Hear! See! (Ἀκούετε. ἰδού)" in Mark 4:3a- bα and the other is "Let the one who has ears hear! (ὃς ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω)" in 4:9b. Scholars tend to think that these exhortations of hearing are connected with Explanation in the Marcan context, because Explanation, according to them, concerns the teaching about bad and right hearing.[227] In the reconstructed, Jesuanic meaning, the unity of *PS* and Explanation concerns something else, i.e., the teaching of the establishment of a steadfast relationship with "the word" as the condition of the membership in the true and ultimate remnant of Israel. So, in the Jesuanic context, the meaning of the exhortations should be reconstructed without regard to the question of hearing. In fact, Guelich points to the possibility of the relationship between these exhortations and the Isaianic motif of hardening. He argues that the "hearing and seeing" of the first exhortation corresponds to the "seeing and hearing" in the citation from Isa 6:9-10 in Mark 4:12 and also that the second exhortation "parodies a negative form of an expression in Jer 5:21 and Ezek 12:2 (…) that is thematically related to Isa 6:9".[228] This means that these exhortations of seeing and hearing are paradoxically related to the idea of divine hardening in Isa 6:9-10, and are in effect the exhortation of counter-hardening. If so, the exhortations are most suitable to the purpose of the liberation of the people from hardening and the formation of the true and ultimate remnant. Jesus uttered these exhortations just before and after *PS*, the parable key to the entrance into a relationship with the true and ultimate remnant. Moreover, the expression

---

[225] Bryan's theory, according to which Jesus used parables principally with the aim of hardening the whole people so that the true remnant might be squeezed out of the hardened people, should therefore be rejected. About his theory, see discussion in 4.2.2.1.

[226] About the three additional elements, see 4.2.2.2.

[227] See, e.g., Gundry 1993:191.

[228] Guelich 1989:196-197. Also Snodgrass points out the possibility of the relationship between the first exhortation (Mark 4:3) and the Isaianic motif of hardening. See Snodgrass 2008:153.

of the second exhortation ("Let the one who has ears hear!"), by its very nature, could have challenged the hearers to examine themselves as to whether they were the ones who had the ears to hear, in other words, were those who were liberated from hardening. This exhortation came after the last parable, *PS*, so it could also have had the role of offering the hearers the opportunity to make the choice to come to/remain with him (or not), after hearing his parabolic teaching which ended with that unintelligible parable.[229]

If Jesus' principal purpose with his parabolic teaching was to liberate his Jewish audience from hardening and lead them into a relationship with the true and ultimate remnant of Israel, he can be paralleled to the servant and the loyal servants of the latter parts of the book of Isaiah (Isa 40-55 and 56-66) whose task is to liberate the people from hardening and to lead them to joining the holy remnant. At the same time, Jesus can be paralleled to the prophet Isaiah who was assigned the hardening task by God, with a view to forming the holy remnant. In Jesus' perspective, a combination of the two aspects of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant can be found. When he worked for the formation of the true and ultimate remnant, his perspective corresponded to the second aspect of the idea, i.e., as a result of God's purifying operation a holy remnant liberated from hardening will emerge. But when he characterized his parabolic teaching with the hardening motif, his perspective leaned towards the first aspect, i.e., God sets to hardening with a view to forming a holy remnant through his purifying operation. Jesus operated on both aspects of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant. In other words, with respect to the motifs of hardening and remnant, the point of view of the whole book of Isaiah affected him.

---

[229] It is possible to define the hearers' making choice more precisely by time and place, that is, did the disciples remain with Jesus in the same place, while the outsiders left him, or did the former come to him while he was moving somewhere, while the latter did not come?

In the Gospel of Mark, a "house" is sometimes mentioned as the place for Jesus' teaching his followers and thus separated from his public teaching, i.e., in Mark 3:20; 7:17. If his private teaching beginning from Mark 4:10 is thought to have happened in a house, it presupposes a change of place and a passing of time, so that the disciples' 'coming to him' and the outsiders' 'not coming to him' can better indicate their making a choice. However, the methodological point of view of this research is inclined to be skeptical of identifying the Marcan context with the Jesuanic one.

On the other hand, in the biblical world, there are such cases where the hearers became divided into two groups because of the speaker's unintelligible teaching and a small number of them remained with him while the other hearers left. For example, Jesus' teaching about "the bread" in Capernaum in Joh 6:22-71 is such a case. Paul's teaching about the true God, his judgment and the resurrection in front of the Areopagus in Athens in Acts 17:22-32 is close to being another.

This seems to be the case of a perfect influence of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant. As seen in the previous chapter (3.3), the Isaianic influence on the Jewish writings is confined to the second aspect of the idea, although some authors, as good readers of Isaiah, might have been conscious of the first aspect. Dream-Visions of 1 Enoch contains both aspects; however, the idea of divine hardening of the first aspect is referred to only in the way that the present obdurate condition of the people is explained to originate from the time of the prophet Isaiah. Thus, in the Jewish writings no prophetic figure who is assigned the hardening task by God appears in a contemporized way. In Jesus such a figure can be found.

It is now possible to complete the reconstruction of the Jesuanic circumstances and meaning of the saying. The reconstructed circumstances and meaning build on an important aspect of the ideological background of the Second Temple Judaism in Palestine, namely, the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant. Attention has also been paid to other Second Temple, Palestinian Jewish points of view, such as the metaphor of 'sowing seed', the parallel relationship between the notions of holy remnant and the kingdom of God, the notion of mystery and that of parable. Therefore, I regard the reconstructed circumstances and meaning as a plausible core, and illustrate them in the following schema.

1. Jesus told several parables to the crowd of people.
2. When he told the last parable, *PS*, he began with the exhortation of counter-hardening by which he signalled that the coming parable concerned the liberation from hardening and, thus, the formation of the holy remnant. When he concluded *PS* which was an unintelligible saying to the hearers, he uttered another exhortation of counter-hardening which was meant to challenge them to self-examination concerning hardening.
3. The crowd became divided into two groups: one group came to/remained with him; the other did not come to/left him.
4. Those of the former group asked Jesus about "the parables".

5. Jesus answered first by mentioning the positive effect of his parabolic teaching with respect to those who were now with him, but by characterizing the negative effect of it as its hardening function with respect to those who were not.

6. He continued his answer by emphasizing the significance of *PS* in understanding the other parables he told.

7. Then, he told Explanation which disclosed that *PS* dealt with the condition of the membership in the true and ultimate remnant of Israel.

Examination as to whether it is possible to enlarge this plausible core of the Jesuanic circumstances further to other elements in the whole parable section of the Gospel of Mark, Mark 4:1-34 is now undertaken.

As far as the narrative elements, i.e., the lakeside setting for Jesus' parabolic teaching (Mark 4:1), the disciples' question about the parables (4:10) and the summary conclusion about Jesus' parabolic teaching (4:33-34), are concerned, it is only possible to say that to the extent that these narrations correspond to the reconstructed, Jesuanic circumstances and meaning, they can indicate historicity; otherwise, it is impossible to judge it. For example, the historicity of the lakeside setting is quite beyond the perspective of the reconstructed circumstances and meaning which build on the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, so it is impossible to say whether it belongs to the plausible core of the Jesuanic circumstances or not, though scholars point out that there is significant influence of the Marcan redaction in the setting.[230]

With regard to the disciples' question in Mark 4:10, the narrative clause: "when he became alone" can mean that Jesus left the place of teaching and the disciples came to him, but it may also mean that the outsiders left him so that he became alone and the disciples remained with him. The identity of those who asked Jesus about the parables, i.e., "those around him with the Twelve (οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα)", is also beyond the perspective of the reconstructed circumstances and meaning. Scholars usually argue that "with the Twelve" is a Marcan addition.[231] In this research, it is only possible to say

---

[230] See, e.g., Guelich 1989:190.
[231] See, e.g, Klauck 1978:243; Guelich 1989:204; cf., Gundry 1993:199.

that they are those who came to/remained with him after the teaching. They could have contained the Twelve, if the selection of them had taken place prior to this.

With regard to the concluding narration in 4:33-34, the clause: "with many such parables he spoke the word to them" (4:33), refers not only to *PS* but also to those parables which come after it in the Marcan context, i.e., the parable of the automatically growing seed (Mark 4:26 – 29) and that of the mustard seed (4:30-32). Therefore, whether this narration belongs to the plausible core depends on whether the very sequence where *PS* is followed by these two parables belongs to the same core. It is not possible, however, to solve the latter question in terms of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, because it is hard to find in these parables such an element as inevitably connects them with the plausible core of the Jesuanic circumstances. In the present location of the two parables in the Marcan context in particular, the "seed" can be understood directly as "the word", because Explanation which precedes them reveals this metaphor.[232] Thus, no motif of remnant can be found in these two parables in the present sequence.

As far as the two small parables of the lamp (Mark 4:21-22) and of the measurement (4:24-25), are concerned, at first glance it is possible to understand them to be Jesus' own additional, positive comment on the disciples' situation relating to their relationship with the true and ultimate remnant. In this case, the first parable means that the disciples embraced Jesus' teaching on the condition of the membership in the remnant as a revelation of the hidden thing, just as the light is put in the right place; the second parable shows that their decision to come to/remain with Jesus allowed them this teaching, just as something more is given to the one who already has. In this sense, these parables, together with two more exhortations of hearing in Mark 4:23 and 24b, can form a good continuation of Jesus' private teaching to the disciples. However, in terms of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, it is not possible to judge whether they belong to the plausible core of the Jesuanic circumstances. They can be as good as a later addition to the plausible core. Thus, only the reconstructed, Jesuanic circumstances remain as a plausible and sufficient core of historicity, when the reconstruction is built on the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant.

---

[232] So Gundry. See Gundry 1993:219.

However, the Jesuanic circumstances (i.e., *PS* told as the last parable of this particular parabolic teaching and sandwiched by two exhortations of hearing and seeing – the division of the crowd of people – the disciples' question – Jesus' saying about the effect and function of his parabolic teaching – his saying about the significance of *PS* – Explanation) and the meaning of the related saying in those circumstances need to be verified from a point of view other than the context of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism. The Jesuanic circumstances reconstructed here is almost identical with the present Mark 4:2-20. This result is very far from what most scholars have put forth concerning the history of the saying in Mark 4:11-12. According to them, the saying is not authentic or, if it is, it was not uttered in the parable context.[233] With regard to the *meaning* of the related sayings, this research does not agree even with those scholars who do argue for the authenticity of the connection of Mark 4:3-20.[234] What I have done is to detach the present, related texts from the context of the Gospel of Mark one by one, first, *PS*, then Explanation and the saying in Mark 4:11-12, the saying in 4:13 and finally the exhortations of hearing and seeing in 4:3a-bα, 9b, and regard them solely in the context of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism. In this procedure, I have found that they can form a meaningful connection; I have not found a grave reason for breaking down that connection. By no means am I claiming that all the Jesus' sayings in Mark 4:3-20 in the present form are identical to what the historical Jesus uttered in his language, but rather that the present text *reflects* the Jesuanic circumstances and the meaning reconstructed here. However, the present text should have had its own meaning in the Marcan context. If the meaning in that context appears to be the same as my reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning, the plausibility of the latter should be doubted, because from this research's methodological point of view, the meaning and function of the saying in two contexts, Jesus and Mark, should not be identical. If the meaning of Mark 4:3-20 in the Marcan context is demonstrated to be different from the reconstructed, Jesuanic meaning, then, the next step to verification is to search for a plausible explanation of how such a divergence between the two meanings occurred. This explanation should also include consideration as to whether the circumstances and meaning reconstructed here as

---

[233] See the survey of the previous studies in 1.2.1 and 1.2.2.
[234] About these scholars' theses and argumentations, see 4.1 and 4.2.2.1.

Jesuanic could not have emerged in post-Easter Christianity. These are the task of the next section. Before this, however, the question of the Jesuanic form which corresponds with what has been reconstructed so far forms the last task of this section.

4.2.3. Remarks on the Jesuanic form of the saying

Because it is impossible to reconstruct the saying exactly in the form in which Jesus uttered it, examination here must be confined to making remarks on the *possible* form. Since the Jesuanic meaning of the saying is reconstructed in connection with the related sayings, remarks are also directed to those sayings.

In this reconstruction, the Jesuanic circumstances of the saying appear to correspond almost to Mark 4:2-20. This is due to the method of detaching the present, related texts from the Marcan context one by one and regarding them solely in the context of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism when seeking for a plausible meaning of the saying in view of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant as one of the important aspects of the ideological background. The result is a meaningful connection of sayings which corresponds to Mark 4:2-20. This research's methodological point of view should, however, be recalled, i.e., the Jesuanic *meaning*, even though reconstructed on the basis of the present Marcan text, cannot be the same as the Marcan meaning of the text, because the former meaning is inferred from the text set in the Jesuanic context, while the latter meaning, from the same text set in the Marcan context.[235] Even if the reconstructed circumstances seem to be identical to the present text, it does not mean that the meaning of the former is identical with that of the latter.

In one place, actually, there is a tension between the reconstructed, Jesuanic meaning and the present Marcan form. As seen above, "all the parables" in the present form of the saying in Mark 4:13 may refer to the parables which come after *PS* in the Marcan context. However, in the Jesuanic circumstances, the form of the phrase should have been such as refers to those parables which were uttered in connection with *PS,* as discussed above. If so, the phrase was changed into the present form by Mark or some

---

[235] See discussion in 4.1.

tradent before him who placed the additional parables after *PS*.[236] Additionally, the Jesuanic form of the saying as a whole should have been something which emphasized the significance of *PS* as the key to understanding the other parables Jesus told in connection with it; so the saying might not have had a rebuking tone perceived in the entire context of the Gospel of Mark.[237]

As far as the saying in Mark 4:11-12 and two exhortations of hearing and seeing in 4:3a -bα and 4:9 are concerned, no such tension that the present form disturbs the Jesuanic meaning is found. Whether there is a tension between the Jesuanic meaning of *PS* and Explanation, on the one hand, and the present Marcan form, on the other is now examined.

With regard to the Jesuanic form of *PS*, several scholars reconstruct it in the way that the elements which they judge to be anomalous, inconsistent and redundant are deleted. Thus, their reconstruction tends to be a reduced form.

Crossan argues that the Mark 4:5b (the clause about the springing up of the shoot because of the lack of the depth of soil) and 4:6b (the clause about the withering of the shoot because of the lack of the root) are a later expansion to the original form that was effected by the corresponding clauses in Explanation in order to keep a balance between *PS* and Explanation. He also suggests that two participles ("growing up and increasing") in 4:8b were added as a result of this expansion.[238] In the reconstruction of this research, *PS* was told to be explained by Explanation. Therefore, originally there should not have been such a divergence – subsequently needing adjustment - between them. From this point of view, when Explanation has a clause about the receiving of the word with joy (i.e., Mark 4:16), it is appropriate that *PS* should have a corresponding clause like 4:5b; similarly, *PS* should have a clause like 4:6b corresponding to the clause of Explanation about the lacking of the root (i.e., 4:17). There is no reason to judge the two clauses of *PS* to be a later expansion. In the same way, there is no reason to regard the two participles in 4:8b as an addition resulting from expansion, either, as Crossan suggests.[239]

---

[236] See discussion in 4.2.2.2.
[237] See discussion in 4.2.2.2.
[238] Crossan 1973:244-248.
[239] T. J. Weeden explains Mark 4:7c ("and it bore no fruit") as an addition due to the adjustment to Explanation in the same way,. I have denied this adjustment theory in the discussion on Crossan above. As far as two particles in 4:8b ("growing and increasing") are concerned, Weeden does not resort to that theory

Contrary to Crossan, Lohfink argues that the correlation between the elements of *PS* and of Explanation indicates that the former elements are authentic rather than being alterations made to the original *PS*. This means that Explanation was composed in such a way that it corresponded to the form of *PS*. Therefore, Mark 4:6b (about the withering of the shoot) belongs to the original form. Lohfink, however, deletes such elements as 4:5aβ ("where it did not have much soil"), 4:5b about the springing up of the shoot and 4:6aβ ("it was scorched") as redundant. Thus, in his reconstruction of the original form of *PS*, by means of a rigid form-criticism he seeks for such a genuine form that *PS* and Explanation inevitably diverge from each other in both form and by meaning. The form reconstructed in this way puts forth the point of *PS* as follows: the negative development of three cases of unsuccessful seeds leads to the reversal of the successful one as a climax. Therefore, in the original form, *PS* draws a boundary between the three cases and the last, while in Explanation there is no such climax, because each case of four has the same value.[240] Based on this point, Lohfink specifies the meaning of *PS* by setting the reconstructed form in the context of the Second Temple Judaism in Palestine, that is, the Jewish way of thinking of God's sowing as his sowing the people of Israel. The result is that *PS* speaks of the evolution of the kingdom of God to the numerous people. The problem with this interpretation of the parable has been already discussed.[241] Although this research's interpretation is built on the same Jewish context as Lohfink's is, it reconstructs the Jesuanic meaning by setting the present text in as intact a way as possible in that context. Thus, this research tries to minimize the risk of losing access to the historical circumstances which is caused by unnecessarily trimming away such elements which have something to do with those circumstances.[242] Of course, there is a possibility

---

but argues that without a counterpart in Explanation, they were inserted "as the creation of the allegorizers" who expected the growth of the kingdom to full manifestation "in the face of their missiological reverses". It might be true. However, I tend to think that the idea of "the growth of the kingdom to full manifestation" could have been present in the Jesuanic meaning of *PS* – Explanation, so that the idea got strengthened in the missionary situation of the early Church. See Weeden 1979:103, 104.

[240] Lohfink 1986:37-50.

[241] See 4.2.1.2.

[242] As a matter of fact, Lohfink is careful as to whether his reconstructed form of *PS* is Jesuanic or not. The form is primarily "eine mnemotechnisch ausgerichtete Basisform für urchristliche Lehrer und Katecheten". With regard to the possibility that the form is Jesuanic, he states: " Daß er (i.e., Jesus, my addition) selbst ein aramäisches Äquivalent entsprechend der von uns rekonstruierten Form für seine Jüngerinstruktion geschaffen hat, dürfte zwar schwer nachzuweisen sein". See Lohfink 1986:49-50.

that the present text contains such elements that have nothing to do with the historical circumstances. In this research, the reconstruction is controlled *afterwards*.

Weder follows a form-critical approach more consistently than Crossan and Lohfink, by deleting from *PS* Mark 4:5aβ ("where it did not have much soil"), 4:5bβ ("since it had no depth of soil") and 4:6b (the sentence about the withering of the shoot because of the lack of the root) as explanatory addition, 4:7c ("it yielded no grain") as "überschüssig", and two participles in 4:8bβ (see above) as "eine Zerdehnung des Handlungsablaufs".[243] The result of his reconstruction is a more reduced form. Although Weder, like Lohfink, considers the boundary to be drawn in *PS* between the three cases of the unsuccessful seeds and the successful case, he does not pay attention to the Palestinian Jewish context of the Second Temple period, i.e., the metaphor of God's sowing for his sowing the people of Israel, in his reconstruction of the meaning of *PS*. As seen above, his interpretation is based on the dominant understanding of the metaphor.[244] The reconstruction of this research points in the contrary direction by form (non-divergence between *PS* and Explanation) and by meaning (paying attention to the context of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism).

At this point, the possibility of the relationship between the Jesuanic form of *PS* and the Thomas version of the same parable (GThom 9) should be reviewed. Thomas *PS* has a form which diverges from the synoptic version of the parable. Both those scholars who consider the priority of Thomas and those who consider the synoptic priority seem to be careful in arguing their positions. For example, S.J. Patterson admits that while some variants in Thomas *PS* are from "another tradition-history where it had retained earlier features", there are also such variants that are due to the parable having undergone its own secondary development. Payne, who argues that Thomas *PS* is a Gnostic embellishment of the synoptic *PS*, admits that "some part(s) of Gos. Thom. 9 could have come from a tradition other than those presented in the Synoptic gospels".[245] From the

---

[243] Weder 1990:101. Klauck puts forth almost the same reduced form of *PS* as Weder. Although he admits the hypothetical nature of the reconstructed form, he argues that the present form is a result of an embellishment of the oral tradition, so that the original form must be simpler than the present. See Klauck 1978:186-189.

[244] See Weder 1990:108-111. See also discussion in 4.2.1.2. Although Klauck puts forth as much reduced form as Weder, he does not enter into the question of metaphor, which is the reason that his interpretation remains on a general level, as seen above. See discussion in 4.2.1.1.

[245] See Patterson 1993:22-23; Payne 1983:187-193.

point of view of this research, the important variant in Thomas *PS* is that in the description of the seeds falling on the good soil, the focus is changed from the seeds *to the soil* which produces fruit. In the synoptic *PS* as well as the reconstructed, Jesuanic meaning, it is the seed which produces fruit. Thus, this change of focus can be a strong proof that Thomas *PS* is apart from the Palestinian Jewish context of the Second Temple period.[246] Moreover, the absence of Explanation in Thomas also indicates that *PS* was not understood in a way which made the parable meaningful in that context. Thus, the possibility of the relationship between the Jesuanic form of *PS* and Thomas is regarded as negative.

As far as the Jesuanic form of Explanation is concerned, according to the result of this research, the present form as such reflects the Jesuanic meaning. The problem is that the present form lacks Semitisms, as seen above.[247] The methodological premise of this research is whether the saying which has a plausible meaning in the early Christian context also has a different, plausible meaning in the Jesuanic context of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism should be tested. If the plausible meaning and function of *PS* and Explanation is found in the latter context, it is justifiable to assume that there was such an Aramaic construction behind the present, Greek expression that corresponds to this meaning and function. The Graecizing of that construction can then also be presumed. Thus, the solution of the problem as to whether the presence of a Christian terminology or the lack of Semitisms in a saying of Jesus is due to the wholesale invention by the early Church or the Graecizing of the Aramaic tradition, depends on whether the plausible meaning of the saying can be reconstructed on the Jesuanic context. From this research's point of view, the presence of a Christian terminology and the lack of Semitisms in a saying is not a conclusive proof that the saying originated from the early Church.[248]

---

[246] GThom 9 reads as follows: Jesus said, "Now the sower went out, took a handful (of seeds), and scattered them. Some fell on the road; the birds came and gathered them up. Others fell on rock, did not take root in the soil, and did not produce ears. And others fell on thorns; they choked the seed(s) and worms ate them. And others fell on the good soil and it produced good fruit: it bore sixty per measure and a hundred and twenty per measure." Translation is by T.O. Lambdin in B. Layton 1989:57.

[247] See 4.2.1.3.

[248] This point of view also means that even though an Aramaic term or construction can be found behind the present, Greek one in a Jesus saying, unless the plausible meaning is not reconstructed it is not a conclusive proof that the saying is Jesuanic. I try to clarify my point. While Jeremias argues that the word "πρόσκαιροι" in Explanation (Mark 4:17) has no Aramaic equivalent, Gundry points out the possibility that

4.3. The saying in the Gospel of Mark and in the early Church

In the preceding section, an attempt was made to reconstruct the Jesuanic meaning of the saying in Mark 4:11-12 in view of the Jesuanic, ideological context of the saying (i.e., the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant) and in connection with the related sayings (i.e., *PS* sandwiched by two exhortations of hearing and seeing, the saying in Mark 4:13 and Explanation). With regard to the Jesuanic form of the saying in question and the related sayings, it is only possible to say that the present Marcan form reflects the Jesuanic form so well that the Jesuanic meaning can be grasped through this Marcan form which is set in the context of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism. I also pointed out that the present form of the saying in Mark 4:13 is an exception of such a perfect reflection. However, it is impossible that the present Marcan form is so identical with the Jesuanic form that this form can be recovered by translating the present text directly into Aramaic. The reconstructed circumstances of the saying and the reconstructed meaning of all the related sayings should be understood as approximate.

In this section, an attempt to reconstruct firstly the Marcan meaning and function of the unity of *PS* and Explanation (4.3.1) and then the Marcan meaning of the saying in connection with that unity (4.3.2) is made. The examination procedure is similar to the reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning of these elements; however, in this section, those elements which have been detached from the Marcan context are set back into this context. Then, in the following sub-sections, the problem of redaction and tradition relating to the saying (4.3.3) and finally the history of the saying in the early Church (4.3.4) are dealt with.

---

the Aramaic word קצר lies behind this Greek word. Truly, this possibility is so significant that the seeking for the origin of Explanation does not stop at the Christian stage at least for the part of this particular word. However, the decisive factor is the plausible meaning which can determine whether this Aramaic word is appropriate for the Jesuanic context. See Jeremias 1984:76; Gundry 1993:209. In addition to the terminological level, a thematic level must be considered. Räisänen argues that Explanation's mentioning persecution and the danger of wealth (Mark 4:17, 19) refers to the later, Christian circumstances than the time of Jesus' mission in Galilee. See Räisänen 1973:73. However, the theme of persecution because of keeping the Torah and that of danger of wealth as hindering righteous life can be found in Jewish literature from the Second Temple period in Palestine, so these themes may have a root in the Jewish context.

4.3.1. Marcan meaning and function of *Parabola Seminantis*

According to this research's reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning and function of *PS* and Explanation, *PS*'s metaphor of 'sowing seed' could have raised the image that God initiates the restitution of the true Israel, the formation of holy remnant in the minds of the Jewish hearers in the Second Temple period in Palestine. At the same time, however, the division of the fate of this ideal entity into different ends could have caused perplexity and also raised question for them; then, Explanation disclosed that *PS* taught that the steadfast relationship with "the word" is the condition for the membership of the true and ultimate remnant of Israel. As the unity of *PS* and Explanation was moved from the context of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism to the context of the Hellenistic, Gentile Christianity, it is likely that the Christian proclaimers and hearers, authors and readers no longer had the same concern for the issue of the Jewish holy remnant which was to emerge from among the Jewish nation.[249] Moreover, it is quite possible that they had a different understanding of the metaphor of God's sowing in the culture where 'seed' was naturally conceived to be something to be proclaimed or taught, rather than a certain nation or human beings.[250]

The Marcan context itself indicates such a change of concern and a different understanding of the metaphor. In Mark 4:1-2, which scholars tend to regard as the Marcan redaction,[251] Jesus is set opposite the crowd of people. Sitting in the boat off shore, he gives his parabolic teaching to the people who stay "on shore", literally "on the land (ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς)". Gundry argues that when Mark composed this lakeside setting of Jesus' parabolic teaching, he was anticipating *PS* and Explanation. The Evangelist's way of understanding the metaphor of 'sowing seed' becomes clear in the composition as follows: "by his teaching, Jesus sows the seed of the word on the land (i.e., on the earth or soil – forms of γῆ in vv 1, 5 [bis], 8, 20), where the whole crowd are located".[252] Thus, the setting was devised to be connected with that image of Explanation in which the word

---

[249] The "Dream-Visions" (1 Enoch 83-90) shows the Jewish apocalyptical point of view concerning the Gentiles' relations with the Jewish holy remnant. In En 90:20-36, the loyal Gentiles are allowed to join the remnant of Israel only after the emergence of it. See 1 En 90:20-36 and also the discussion in 3.3.3.

[250] About the metaphor of seed in the ancient Greek culture, see discussion in 4.2.1.2.

[251] See, e.g., Guelich 1989:190.

[252] Gundry 1993:190.

is proclaimed to different types of hearers just as the seeds are sown to different types of soils. Against the Hellenistic cultural background and on the basis of the Marcan literary context, the Gentile Christian hearers or readers of *PS* could have glimpsed the meaning of the parable as the sowing having something to do with proclamation, the seeds with something to be proclaimed and the soils with hearers. In this way, the remnant motif, which is one of the pillars of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant and in which the metaphor of seed for human being was operative, disappeared from their understanding of *PS*. As a result, in the Marcan context, the unity of *PS* and Explanation no longer teaches the condition of the membership of the true and ultimate remnant of Israel.

As a consequence of the disappearance of the remnant motif, the two exhortations of hearing and seeing (Mark 4:3a-bα), sandwiching *PS*, can no longer have the meaning of counter-hardening which was related to the formation of a holy remnant in the Isaianic idea.[253] Estranged from the Jewish context, they now function as simple exhortations to hear and see.[254] Therefore, it is likely that with the repeated exhortations before and after *PS*, the Christian hearers or readers in the Hellenistic context could have understood that the parable had something to do with the issue of hearing, since the metaphorical thinking of sowing seed for sowing a teaching was valid in that context.[255] Their understanding became confirmed by Explanation, because in it, the term "hearing" was further reiterated

---

[253] About these exhortations' meaning as counter-hardening in the Jesuanic context, see the discussion in 4.2.2.3 above.

[254] A-M. Enroth-Voitila also emphasizes the exhortative ("parenetic") nature of the two sayings of Mark 4:3a and 4:9 in the Marcan context. She puts forth her thesis against the scholarly view which emphasizes the "esoteric" nature of the sayings. Although I agree with her concerning the nature of these saying, I point out two problems with her argumentation. The first one concerns the question of whom these exhortations are directed to. Enroth-Voitila argues that they are "the hearers and readers" of the Gospel of Mark. Then, the question arises: "Who are the hearers and readers?" I think such a type of question requires consideration of the outer-text context. Such a consideration in turn involves the question of the purpose of the Gospel, e.g., whether it is the instruction for Christians or the missionary proclamation for Gentiles. Her consideration, however, remains on the level of the inner-text context, because she only equates "the hearers and readers" of the Gospel of Mark with "all the hearers" of Jesus' teaching *in Mark 4:1-34*. With regard to the question of the Gospel's hearers and readers and the nature of it, discussion of this section will clarify this research's solution in the course of time. The second problem is that in the sketch of the history of tradition, she follows Räisänen and Guelich (who in turn follows the former) who both argue that the inauthentic Explanation had been added to the authentic *PS* before Jesus' saying about the hardening motif was inserted in the unity of *PS* and Explanation; then Mark received the connection of *PS* – the saying – Explanation from tradition (see 1.2 and 4.2.2.1). In her argumentation there is no regard to or analysis of such a problem as is significant to the understanding of the meaning and function of the unity of *PS* and Explanation, e.g., the problem of the double metaphor of seed in Explanation. See Enroth-Voitila 2004:16-32.

[255] See discussion in 4.2.1.2.

in the way that it precedes what happens to the sown seeds in all the four cases (Mark 4:15, 16, 18 and 20). From the point of view of exhortation, it is natural that in the case of the good soil this hearing is ideal. In this way, the unity of *PS* and Explanation has become an exhortation to the hearers or readers, so that their 'hearing the word' must be like the case of the good soil, concisely speaking: "Become good soil!" Such being the case, the Jewish metaphor of God's sowing meaning his sowing the people of Israel plays no active role in the unity of *PS* and Explanation; instead, the metaphor of seed and soil representing something to be proclaimed and human beings, respectively, is consolidated in the Marcan context.[256]

Although Explanation repeats the word "hearing" and *PS* is sandwiched by the exhortations of hearing, one should, however, not conclude too hastily that the unity of *PS* and Explanation simply teaches the kind of hearing which Christians must adopt and what kind must be avoided. It should be observed that the art of hearing is not the issue in Explanation. As the case of the seeds falling to the rocky place shows, the hearers received the word, because they understood it rightly to be something which brought about joy. They are good hearers. The issue here is, rather, as in the case of the Jesuanic meaning of Explanation, the kind of relationship the hearers of the word establish with the word *after hearing it*. On the other hand, in the Christian, Marcan context, "the word" (ὁ λόγος) no longer has the same connotation as in the Jesuanic context. It can be recognized that "the word" is now the technical term for the Christian gospel in which the Jesuanic three elements (i.e., the law, the prophets and the proclamation of the kingdom of God) should have been contained but in a different configuration to the Jesuanic "the word". To sum up, *the exhortation which the unity of PS and Explanation puts forth in the Marcan context is not that the hearers should hear the word deeply or with more insight, but that they should establish a steadfast relationship with "the word", the Christian gospel, they have heard.* The exhortative unity of *PS* and Explanation does not teach the art of hearing the word but rather the quality of the relationship with it. Thus,

---

[256] Gundry attempts to reconstruct the Jesuanic meaning of Explanation, according to which human being is defined as something like a fusion of two things: "seed cum soil", while the seed remains "the word". However, this solution of the problem of the double metaphor leads to the same as the Marcan understanding, i.e., the human being is a soil. See Gundry 1993:205, 207.

this teaching presupposes Christians as the hearers and readers of it, and so concerns Christian discipleship.

If the unity of *PS* and Explanation in the Marcan context puts forth the *exhortation* of establishing a steadfast relationship with the word, it is possible that in the Jesuanic context, by comparison, the unity had a more *descriptive* function. As seen above, Jesus' purpose with the unity of *PS* and Explanation was to teach the condition of the membership of the true and ultimate remnant of Israel, and to challenge the Jewish idea of remnant in his time to redefinition.[257] That is to say, he disclosed the truth in this regard. Surely, the Jesuanic unity of *PS* and Explanation could also have had an exhortative function in the sense that Jesus himself would have wished the people to adopt his point and to live in accordance with it. However, because of the disclosing and challenging nature against something conventional, the function of the unity can be characterized as descriptive in the Jesuanic context. Moreover, while lacking such a conventional matter to be challenged in the Marcan context, the function was more directly exhortative. Thus, a change can be perceived to have occurred to the unity of *PS* and Explanation between the two contexts: from a more descriptive function to a more exhortative one.[258]

---

[257] See discussion in 4.2.1.3.

[258] Marcus argues that Explanation has a descriptive function in the Marcan context, so that it puts forth the idea that "soil is the way it is, presumably because Gold has made it that way; people are either able or unable to hear, depending on how God has fashioned them". Therefore, according to him, the message of the unity of *PS* and Explanation "is not 'Become good soil!' Good soil is good soil, and bad is bad; the ground cannot change its own nature". After this argumentation, however, Marcus also states: "our passage *implicitly exhorts* the Markan audience to hold on, to continue listening to God's word, not to fall away, and so to show that they are indeed good soil (emphasis mine)". See Marcus 2000:312-313.

Guelich argues that the descriptive function in fact belongs to the stage where Explanation was composed. According to him, Explanation had the same purpose as *PS* itself, i.e., "to address the realities of both Jesus' ministry and that of the Church's mission". Thus, the eschatological thrust of *PS* was not altered in Explanation. Guelich argues, therefore, that the usual interpretation of Explanation as a paraenetic warning to the hearers is just a distortion of the eschatological thrust of Explanation. Such a distortion is, according to him, due to Jesus' exhortations of hearing in Mark 4:3a and 4:9 being thought to be connected with Explanation. In this way, Guelich's argument for the descriptive function concerns the stage of the composition of Explanation, not of that of Mark. He does not deal with its function in the Marcan context. See Guelich 1989:224-225, 233-234.

4.3.2. Marcan meaning of the saying and the *Parabeltheorie*

Now that the remnant motif has disappeared from the unity of *PS* and Explanation in the Marcan context, how does this change affect the meaning of the saying in connection with that unity? I note here that the element of the saying which can be directly affected by the disappearance of the remnant motif is "the mystery of the kingdom of God", because the unity of *PS* and Explanation no longer speaks of the true and ultimate remnant of Israel in the Marcan context. I try to elucidate the meaning of "the mystery of the kingdom of God" in the context of the Gospel of Mark.

According to Duling, the concept "kingdom of God" has the problem of "temporal ambiguity" in the Gospel of Mark, so this problem should be taken into consideration, when one attempts to seize the concept. Thus, he summarizes "the kingdom of God" as something "mysteriously present in the works and words of Jesus Christ" who "overcomes demonic opposition but is temporally defeated by a human political opposition"; still, it "will be seen in the future in its apocalyptic fullness".[259] Before that fullness, the kingdom of God can be perceived only through his mighty works (numerous exorcisms and healings and other miracles) and also his mighty words (see, e.g., Mark 1:22, 27). In this sense, "the kingdom of God" in the Gospel of Mark means God's rule with Jesus as its agent, rather than some human community which is made up of the elect. In the Jesuanic context of *PS* - the saying - Explanation, the phrase could have meant the latter, because it points to the true and ultimate remnant of Israel which the unity of *PS* and Explanation speaks of.[260] In the Marcan context, the concept focuses on the aspect of the ruler and his agent rather than that of the ruled.

An analysis of the meaning of "the mystery" is now offered. Scholars usually attribute Christology to "the mystery of the kingdom of God" in the saying. According to C.M. Tuckett, some scholars argue that the phrase refers to the secret of Jesus' identity as Messiah, Son of God, while to others it refers to the claim that with Jesus, the kingdom of

---

[259] Duling 1992:56-57.
[260] I have mentioned that "the kingdom of God" is not a universal synonym for the true and ultimate remnant of Israel in the Jesuanic context, but in this particular context of *PS* – the saying - Explanation, the concept could have had such an aspect as is related to the remnant. See discussion in 4.2.2.2.

God is breaking into the world.[261] On the other hand, there are also scholars who deny such Christological connotation of "the mystery".[262] I think that if "the mystery" refers to the secret of Jesus' identity as Messiah, the clause "the mystery has been given" should mean that the disciples who have been given this secret understand it, while the outsiders do not. It is hard, however, to think that the disciples really understand the secret before Peter's confession in Caesarea Philippi in Mark 8:29.[263] If, however, one holds on to the view that "the mystery of the kingdom of God" refers to the secret of Jesus' Messianic identity, the clause in question should mean that the secret has been revealed through Jesus' mighty works and words even though the revelation does not lead to the understanding of the secret. But in this case, his works and proclamations are not only witnessed by the disciples but also by his enemies, that is, the mystery should "have been given" to the latter category of people, too! The antithetical parallelism of the saying, however, means that "the mystery" has been given to the disciples, while not to the outsiders. This antithetical parallelism must be the precondition of seeking for the meaning of "the mystery" in the saying.

If both the disciples and the outsiders witness Jesus' mighty works and words and yet neither of them understand his parabolic teaching, one should observe that the dividing of the hearers into two groups, i.e., the one which comes to/remains with Jesus and the other which does not come to/leaves him, is a parallel phenomenon with the antithetical situation of 'giving of the mystery' and 'not giving of it'. I have actually paid attention to the same parallelism in the reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning of the

---

[261] Tuckett 1988:15-17. See also his list of scholars there who argue for the Christological meaning of "the mystery".

[262] G. Dautzenberg and S. Brown deny the Christological connotation of "the mystery" in the saying, and argue that the term refers to such an idea of God's kingdom as having nothing to do with Christology. Especially, according to Brown, Jesus' identity as Messiah first becomes clear in Peter's confession in Mark 8:29; therefore, if "the mystery of the kingdom of God" in Mark 4:11 has a Christological meaning, Jesus' identity must be present explicitly in connection with that verse. Tuckett criticizes his argumentation and argues that Jesus' messianic character is demonstrated even in the earlier chapters before Mark 4:11; the disciples simply do not understand it until Peter's confession and, moreover, his rejection of Jesus' passion and the cross in Mark 8:32-33 discloses that his confession did not indicate a perfect understanding of Jesus' messianic character. See Dautzenberg 1990:55-61; Brown 1973:61-64; Tuckett 1988:17.

[263] Even though the disciples had seen Jesus practicing exorcism, healing and other miracles many times, their question: "Who then is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?" in Mark 4:41, clearly shows that they did not understand Jesus' messianic identity before Peter's confession. Even after it, Peter was rebuked by Jesus for denying his teaching on the passion and resurrection of the Son of Man in Mark 8:31-33.

saying. This human choice of coming to/remaining with Jesus or not, has a special meaning also in the Marcan context, as clarified below.

In the latter part of the third chapter of the Gospel, just before the Marcan parable section of the fourth chapter, Jesus utters a harsh judgment against the scribes from Jerusalem because of their distortion of his exorcism (Mark 3:22, 23-30) and additionally makes an indirect, critical comment on his family who thought him mad (3:21, 31-35). Jesus declares that those who, at the moment of teaching in the house, sat around him ("τοὺς περί αὐτὸν κύκλῳ καθημένους") form his true family and they are even those who do God's will (3:33-35). In the narration, Mark uses the word "outside (ἔξω)" twice to describe the location of Jesus' (false) family (3:31, 32).

The scene is then changed to the public, parabolic teaching at the lakeside (4:1-9), which is followed by the private teaching (4:10-25).[264] The division of hearers into two groups occurs between Jesus' public and private teaching: one group, which comes to/remains with Jesus to ask about the parables, "those who are around him (οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν) along with the Twelve", in Mark 4:10 and the other which does not come to/leaves him, "those who are outside (ἐκεῖνος τοῖς ἔξω)", in 4:11. In the Gospel of Mark, Jesus' private teaching is described to take place in a "house" in Mark 3:20; 7:17. Mark 7:17, in particular, relates that such a house teaching happens after the public teaching. So, it is likely that Mark gives the hearers or readers of his Gospel to understand that also the private teaching in this parable section also happens in a place like a house, although he does not add the phrase "εἰς οἶκον" this time. In any case Mark seems to imply a movement of place from the lakeside to such a teaching place and also a passage of time which is necessary to such a movement. In this sense, in the case of the Marcan context, the human choice of coming to Jesus or not/remaining with him or not, can more easily be defined as 'coming to Jesus or not' rather than 'remaining with or leaving him'. Moreover, from the preceding episode about Jesus' teaching on his 'true' family (Mark 3:31-35), it is clear that those who come to Jesus after the public teaching in Mark 4:10 ("those who are around him", οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν) belong to the same category as those sitting around him in Mark 3:32 (ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτὸν) and in 3:34 (τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν κύκλῳ

---

[264] The question of which verse Jesus' private teaching from 4:10 continues until, is discussed in the following subsection (4.3.3). The setting of Mark 4:25 as the last verse of the private teaching is this research's solution.

καθημένους) whom Jesus declared to be his true family and the doers of God's will (3:34-35). This in turn means that those who do not come to him, i.e., "those are outside" (ἐκείνοις τοῖς ἔξω in 4:11), are neither Jesus' family of Jesus nor doers of God's will. Such being the case, the 'giving of the mystery of the kingdom of God', in the Marcan context, does not concern only those who come to Jesus in connection with this particular parabolic teaching, but rather more generally those who come to him to be close to him and to hear his teaching as the doers of God's will.

If those who come to Jesus in general terms can be regarded as the receivers of "the mystery of the kingdom of God", it is possible to elucidate the meaning of this "mystery" in the Marcan context. As seen above, "the kingdom of God" in that context means 'God's rule with Jesus as its agent'. In this case, 'the giving of "the mystery"' means that entry into a relationship with such a kingdom is allowed. In the Jesuanic context, "the kingdom of God" points to the true and ultimate remnant of Israel; in the Marcan context, to 'God's rule with Jesus as its agent'. The entrance into a relationship with it is given to all those who come to Jesus. Earlier the view that "the mystery" refers to the secret of Jesus' identity as Messiah was rejected, because the giving of such secret would have meant the revelation of his identity. This contradicts Mark's description of the disciples' failure to understand. As seen above, the antithesis of the saying relates that "the mystery" is given to the disciples but not to the outsiders in spite of the equal witness of Jesus' works and proclamations. Still, the former group does not understand Jesus' Messianic identity for long. 'The giving of "the mystery"' must mean something other than revelation. On the other hand, I do not agree fully with those scholars who deny the Christological connotation of "the mystery", either. Since Jesus is the agent of the kingdom of God in the Gospel of Mark, at least in this sense, the Evangelist should be thought to have invested "the mystery of the kingdom of God" with a Christological connotation, whether the disciples understand it or not. Nonetheless, 'the giving of "the mystery"' should not be regarded as equal to the revelation of it. These two things are different from each other.[265]

---

[265] What about the scholarly view that "the mystery" refers to the "claim" that with Jesus, the kingdom of God breaks into the world? If the giving of such a claim means that the disciples are made conscious of the content of the claim, the situation is the same as when 'the giving of "the mystery"' is regarded as the

From the discussion above, it becomes clear that in the elucidation of the Marcan meaning of "the mystery of the kingdom of God", the following four matters should be clarified: (i) the meaning of "the kingdom of God" in the Marcan context; (ii) the meaning of "the mystery" in connection with such a kingdom as its attributive; (iii) the implication of the antithetical situation of the 'giving/not giving' of "the mystery"' (Mark 4:11) to the meaning of the phrase "the mystery of the kingdom of God"; (iv) also the implication of the division of people into the two groups in a larger context of Mark to the meaning of the phase. A summary of its meaning in the Marcan context, by taking the solutions of the four matters into account, is now given.

As seen above, in the Marcan context, the division of 'the giving or not giving of "the mystery of the kingdom of God"' is not tied to the particular occasion of the parabolic teaching, but rather is due, in more general terms, to the human choice of coming to Jesus or not. The disciples' choice has already been made prior to that occasion. Moreover, in the latter part of the third chapter of the Gospel of Mark, their choice is characterized theologically, so that those who make such a choice are declared by Jesus to be his true family and the doers of God's will. Therefore, when Jesus mentions 'the giving of "the mystery of the kingdom of God"' in the occasion of the parabolic teaching (Mark 4:11b), he does not mean that the disciples are being given the mystery in connection with that occasion, but rather confirms that they have already been given it because of their having made the choice to come to Jesus. If so, the lack of the phrase ἐν παραβολαῖς in Mark 4:11b on the lower left of the diagram of the antithesis[266] serves Mark's purpose, because if this phrase were to remain in the diagram, Jesus' mentioning of 'the giving of "the mystery"' would refer explicitly to the disciples' choice in connection with this particular occasion of the parabolic teaching ("by way of parables") as in the case of the Jesuanic context. If 'the giving of "the mystery of the kingdom of God"' is not solely the effect of Jesus' parabolic teaching, in a parallel way the outsiders' exclusion of the mystery also can be separated from the effect of the teaching. In the Jesuanic context, the outsiders' exclusion can be understood to be both the *effect* of Jesus' parabolic teaching (i.e., due to the antithetical parallel with the

revelation of it. In my view, their consciousness should concern the fact that they are allowed entrance into a relationship with God's rule with Jesus as its agent.
[266] See 4.2.2.2.

situation of the disciples) and the *function* of the teaching (i.e., due to the present tense of γίνεται and the Aramaic tradition of Isa 6:9-10 at Jesus' time).[267] In the Marcan context it is possible that the hardening *function* of Jesus' parabolic teaching comes to the fore and is emphasized more. Below the Marcan meaning of Mark 4:11-12 in a form of free translation is proposed as follows (compare the Jesuanic meaning of the saying shown in 4.2.2.2).

Mark 4:11b	4:11c and 12
To you who join me (i.e., Jesus), the entrance into a relationship with God's rule with me as its agent (i.e., the mystery of the kingdom of God) has already been allowed since the day of your joining me,	
	As far as those who do not join me are concerned, my parabolic teaching functions to exclude them from this entrance so that they might become hardened in order to be hindered from repentance and forgiveness.

In this solution of the meaning of Mark 4:11-12 the hardening function of (Marcan) Jesus' parables becomes unambiguous. Many scholars, however, deny that Mark has the *Parabeltheorie*, and so interpret the two Greek conjunctives, ἵνα and μήποτε, as having meanings other than telic/final.[268] The only way to demonstrate or deny Mark's *Parabeltheorie* is to examine how Jesus' parables really function with respect to the problem of hardening in the Gospel of Mark. This question is now dealt with, by

---

[267] See 4.2.2.2.

[268] Scholars have suggested various solutions concerning the meaning of ἵνα and μήποτε in the Marcan context as follows: final/telic, consecutive, causal. About the scholars' solutions relating to the Marcan context, see, e.g., Räisänen 1973:11-14; Evans 1989:92-99. In the Jesuanic context, as seen above (4.2.2.1), Jeremias interprets ἵνα as an abbreviation of ἵνα πληρωθῆ; Manson, Chilton and Evans consider the Aramaic word ד to lie behind ἵνα, and reconstruct the meaning of ἵνα as a relative pronoun. See Jeremias 1984:12; Manson 1948:76-80; Chilton 1984:90-98; Evans 1989:105-106; also the discussion in 4.2.2.1. In addition to Manson's and Jeremias' solutions Snodgrass mentions other scholars' suggestion that ἵνα should be interpreted as a causal conjunction in the Jesuanic context. However, he does not disclose their names. See Snodgrass 1992:597.

examining Räisänen's thesis and argumentation, because, as Marcus points out, he puts forth the arguments against Mark's *Parabeltheorie* "most cogently".[269]

Räisänen argues that the Gospel of Mark is full of counter-elements of the *Parabeltheorie*. One of the strongest is, according to him, that in the Gospel, there are a lot of Jesus' sayings termed παραβολή which, however, are easily grasped even by Jesus' enemies or whose purpose is far from hiding his message from his hearers. The clearest case is the parable of the vineyard in Mark 12:1-12. The chief priests, the scribes and the elders "understood (ἔγνωσαν)" well that the parable was a harsh criticism of them and directed against them; therefore, they came close to arresting him (12:12). The second case is the parable of the divided kingdom and house (Mark 3:23-27). Although the hearers' reaction is not mentioned in the Gospel, there is no doubt that "the scribes from Jerusalem" understand what the parable means, because Jesus' condemnation of them relating to the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (Mark 3:28-30) immediately follows the parable. The parable and this condemnation together clarify the truth of Jesus' exorcism in divine power, and that the distortion of this truth deserves eternal judgement. Räisänen takes, moreover, the parable of the true defiler (Mark 7:15) as the case where Jesus' purpose in using parables is far from preventing hearers' understanding. On the contrary, before uttering the parable, Jesus exhorts the hearers to "understand (σύνετε)" what they hear (7:14) and he is clearly disappointed at the disciples' failure to understand the parable: "So are you also unable to understand? (7:18)". Jesus purposed to make them understand! According to Räisänen, the parable of the fig tree (13:28) cannot be characterized as something which makes Jesus' message hidden.[270]

A counter-argument against Räisänen's arguments against Mark's *Parabeltheorie* is now put forward.

Firstly, the parable of the divided kingdom and house and the parable of the vineyard, which Räisänen counts as the strongest cases against the incomprehensibility of parables, actually have something to do with *the function of hindering Jesus' enemies from repenting and being forgiven*. As seen above, the parable of the divided kingdom

---

[269] Marcus 2000:303.

[270] Räisänen 1973:27-33. Räisänen also takes Jesus' saying about the awakening servants (Mark 13:34) as an additional example of an illustrative parable, although the saying is not termed with "παραβολή" in the Gospel. See Räisänen 1973:29-30.

and house, which clarifies the truth of Jesus' exorcism, has the role of introducing Jesus' condemnation of his enemies for their distortion of this truth. Jesus clearly says that their distortion deserves eternal judgment, that is, the impossibility of being forgiven. With regard to the parable of the vineyard, the reaction of the hearers simply shows that they have become excluded from repentance. Therefore, these two parables indicate clearly that they have an effect of a certain people's losing repentance and forgiveness. They are, thus, consistent with the second (ultimate) purpose of the parables in Mark 4:12 (italicized): "in order that 'they may indeed look, but not perceive, and may indeed listen, but not understand; *so that they may not turn again and be forgiven*'". Such being the case, the alleged inconsistency between the comprehensibility of the parables, on the one hand, and the first, hardening purpose of parables in 4:12 (italicized): "*in order that 'they may indeed look, but not perceive, and may indeed listen, but not understand*; so that they may not turn again and be forgiven'", on the other, can be reconsidered. In view of the second, ultimate purpose, the 'understanding' mentioned in the first purpose ("perceive", "understand") should be an understanding that leads to repentance and forgiveness. Such a true understanding is at stake here. The two parables have an effect of hindering Jesus' enemies from such an understanding, even though the parables allow them an intellectual understanding. In other words: *when spoken to the enemies, Jesus' parables lead them to spiritual obduracy without blunting their intellectual ability*. In this sense, the two parables are consistent with both purposes of the parables of Mark 4:12.[271]

Secondly, a different function of the parable of the true defiler (Mark 7:15) should be considered, because it does not seem to lead the hearers to the loss of repentance and forgiveness. As seen above, Jesus wanted them to understand this parable; therefore, he was disappointed at the disciples' failure to understand. At this point, one should notice that this parable is set in a similar schema to *PS* in the following ways: (i) Jesus tells a parable in front of the crowd of people; (ii) after his teaching, only a part of them come to question him about the parable(s); (iii) Jesus gives the explanation of the parable together

---

[271] It seems that scholars usually take the question of spiritual obduracy as that of the lack of intellectual understanding of parables. This is evident from Manson's comment on the *Parabeltheorie* (demonstrated in the first chapter of this research: "If parables had this object or result [i.e., to hinder the hearers from understanding them, my addition], that in itself would be the strongest possible argument against making use of them"). When discussing the *Parabeltheorie* in the Gospel of Mark spiritual obduracy and the lack of intellectual understanding must be distinguished.

with his comment or counter-question as to their failure in understanding. As discussed above, the dividing of the hearers into two groups, i.e., the disciples who come to Jesus and the outsiders who do not, has a special meaning in the Gospel of Mark. It is true that with respect to the ability to understand Jesus' parabolic teaching, both groups are in the same position, that is, they do not understand it. With respect to the question of the relationship with God, however, those who come to Jesus are in a totally different position from those who do not. As demonstrated above, the former group is characterized as Jesus' true family and the doers of God's will. *When spoken to the crowd of people, Jesus' parables have an effect of dividing them into two different groups with respect to the question of their relationship with God*. Being set in the same schema, the parable of the true defiler can be understood to have the same function as *PS*.

Thirdly, with regard to the parable of the fig tree which only unveils Jesus' message about knowing the end time (so a further counter-case of the *Parabeltheorie* for Räisänen), one should notice that this parable, placed in the end of the Marcan apocalypse, is spoken to Jesus' four disciples.[272] It is natural that its function should differ from that of the parables which are directed to Jesus' enemies or the crowd of people.

It is apparent that in the Gospel of Mark, the function of parables differs depending on the addressees. When directed to the crowd of people, it has the function of dividing them into two groups. When directed to Jesus' enemies, it has a hardening function; when directed to his disciples, an illustrative function. This differentiation in function of the parables is equally applicable to the other parables in the Gospel. The parable of the lamp in Mark 4:21-22 and the parable of the measurement in 4:24-25 are spoken to the disciples. This is shown clearly by the narration "and he said to them", which introduces these two parables, because in the context "to them" refers to those who come to Jesus after his public teaching (Mark 11, 13, 21 and 24). The lack of explanation for these parables indicates that they are illustrative parables from Mark's point of view. With regard to the parable of the automatically growing seed in Mark 4:26-29 and the parable of the mustard seed in 4:30-32 both of which follow the parables of the lamp and the measurement, they are introduced by the narration "and he said" without mentioning to

---

[272] See Mark 13:3.

whom they are directed. The concluding narration in Mark 4:33-34 which follows the two seed parables, however, says: "with such many parables he spoke the word *to them* (…); he did not speak *to them* except in parables, but he explained everything in private to his disciples".[273] "Such many parables" must refer to the two seed parables, because in the concluding narration, "to them" cannot mean the disciples who hear the parables of the lamp and of the measurement but the crowd of people who are not yet divided into two groups at the moment of Jesus' public teaching. The narration also indicates that the crowd is divided after the public teaching. That is, according to this concluding narration, the two seed parables have the same function of dividing the hearers as *PS* and the parable of the true defiler. Moreover, as in *PS* and the parable of the true defiler, the narration mentions that the two seed parables are subsequently explained to the disciples by Jesus privately (4:34) although the explanations of them are not presented in the Gospel.[274]

The theses concerning the parables of Marcan Jesus are now summarized: (i) *in the Marcan context, the function of parables should be distinguished, depending on to whom they are directed, to the crowd of people, Jesus' enemies or the disciples; (ii) in Mark 4:11-12, Jesus mentions that his parables have a hardening function with respect to the outsiders who do not come to him; (iii) his parables really function to make his enemies hardened and destined for judgment.* That is to say, with respect to a certain category of people, Mark has the *Parabeltheorie*.

In addition to Jesus' parables, Räisänen takes two other factors which could invalidate the *Parabeltheorie* into consideration. The first is the Marcan motif of the disciples' failure to understand and Jesus' dissatisfaction with and rebuke of them on account of this. This motif appears repeatedly in the Gospel of Mark (4:13; 6:52; 7:18;

---

[273] Translation is from NRSV (emphasis mine).

[274] Marcus and Gundry argue that all the parables of Mark 4:21-32 (i.e., the parable of the lamp, of the measurement and the two 'seed' parables) are spoken to the public, because the concluding narration in 4:33-34 says that Jesus speaks only in parables to the public and explains them to his disciples. Accordingly, Gundry considers that the narrative scene is changed after Explanation without mentioning the change. Marcus is not sure where the change occurs, so it is also possible in his view that some of the parables in 4:21-32 are spoken to the disciples and the others to the public. See Gundry 1993:187; Marcus 2000:289. However, one should notice that in the Gospel of Mark, the parables are not always given to only the public, as the case of the parable of the fig tree shows.

8:17-21).[275] According to Räisänen, the motif contradicts the favoured position of the disciples which is indicated by the saying: "to you the mystery of the kingdom of God has been given". However, the motif is actually not as inconsistent with the *Parabeltheorie* as he considers. It has already been argued in connection with the reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning, that the present text of Mark 4:13, detached from the Marcan context, does not necessarily mean a rebuke but rather emphasizes the significance of *PS* as key to understanding the other parables.[276] The verse does appear to have a rebuking tone when regarded in the whole context of the Gospel, in which after that verse (Mark 4:13), Jesus' reaction to the disciples' failure to understand takes on more of a rebuking tone. In Mark 6:52 and 8:17-21 in particular, the hardening terminology is used to characterize the disciples. Nonetheless, one should reconsider what function this characterization has in the Gospel of Mark. If Marcan Jesus' purpose is merely the characterization of them, Jesus simply announces his opinion that they are no less hardened in heart, eyes and ears than the outsiders. Jesus' much longer and more detailed rebukings in Mark 8:17-21 are, in fact, not statements but questions: "(…) Do you still not perceive and understand? And do you not remember? (…) How many baskets (…)? (…) How many baskets (…)? (…) Do you not yet understand?" This is no longer a question of characterization, but rather (Marcan) Jesus' rhetorical warning of the disciples not to become those who lack understanding, i.e., outsiders.[277] Jesus' rebuking question to the disciples in Mark 7:18, contains a similar warning against becoming outsiders: "So are you also (καί ὑμεῖς) unable to understand?" Thus, if Mark provides Jesus' rebukings with such a warning function, though seeming to contradict the *Parabeltheorie*, they actually turn out to be Marcan Jesus' exhortative message that the disciples should be careful not to fall into the hardened state of the outsiders.[278]

---

[275] Räisänen also counts as belonging to this motif, Jesus' rebuke of the disciples' lack of faith (Mark 4:40), his reaction to their failure in exorcism (9:14-29) and his rebuke of Peter for the denial of Jesus' way to the passion and resurrection (8:31-32). See Räisänen 1973:39-47.

[276] See discussion in 4.2.2.2.

[277] However, Räisänen argues that the saying in Mark 8:17-21 is not a real question. See Räisänen 1973:40-43.

[278] Also Klauck considers that Jesus' rebuking saying in Mark 8:17-21 is a warning to the disciples. See Klauck 1978:254. Guelich argues likewise that the tone of rebuke in Mark 4:13 "comes as a warning and an encouragement to grasp the meaning of Jesus' ministry". See Guelich 1989:225.

In connection with this first counter-*Parabeltheorie* factor, Räisänen also takes the fact that Jesus gives the crowd of people his teachings and has compassion for them, so that he is far from making them

Another counter-*Parabeltheorie* factor is Mark 4:33. According to Räisänen, the narrative verse: "With many such parables he spoke the word to them, as they were able to hear it" (τοιαύταις παραβολαῖς πολλαῖς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον καθὼς ἠδύναντο ἀκούειν), indicates that the parables are basically understandable to people, which contradicts the *Parabeltheorie*. He, therefore, interprets the word ἀκούειν as "understand" not "hear".[279] It is problematic to read a particular view into the text. Guelich points out that the word καθὼς has two meanings in this context, so that this adverbial clause can mean: Jesus spoke the word in parables (i) *to the degree that* his audience could hear it, or (ii) *in a way* his audience could hear it.[280] From the point of view of the dividing function of parables, both alternatives are equally possible. The crowd listened to Jesus' parabolic teaching as much as they could and then some wanted to hear more but for the others it was enough (according to the first alternative), or they listened in their own way, so that some were drawn to his teaching but others were not (the second alternative). In either case, the clause is connected with the dividing function of parables, so there is no contradiction between the passage and the function of parables for the crowd of people.

It has been shown that in the Marcan context, Jesus' parables have the function of dividing people with respect to the crowd of people and that of hardening and judgment with respect to the outsiders and enemies.[281] Understood as such, the *Parabeltheorie* is found to be consistent in the Gospel of Mark. But if this theory is understood (as it

---

obdurate. Räisänen means, thus, that if the *Parabeltheorie* favors only the disciples, it should disfavor people in general. He refers to Mark 6:34 as an example. However, the people around Jesus there do not include those outsiders who become separated after his public teaching as in the cases of *PS* and the parable of the true defiler. In fact, they, who are "like sheep without a shepherd", are the followers of Jesus whom the hardening and dividing function of the parables do not concern. It seems that Räisänen confuses the crowd of people consisting of both disciples and outsiders and the crowd of people consisting only of disciples. See Räisänen 1973:33-39.

[279] See Räisänen 1973:48.

[280] Guelich 1989:256.

[281] If there is a deviation from the *Parabeltheorie* in the Gospel of Mark, Jesus' saying to the Syrophoenician woman (Mark 7:27) is the most likely case. The saying is not termed with "παραβολή", but can be regarded as a parable to the same degree as the saying about the awakening servants (Mark 13:34) which Räisänen takes as parable without the term (see fn 270). According to Jewish terminology, the woman can be categorized as "outsider ἡ ἔξω" theologically (see discussion 4.2.2.2). However, even though she was compared to a dog in Jesus' parable, she did not turn her back on him or become obdurate but accepted his comparison as such and showed him a deep humbleness. Her reaction is totally different from that of the enemies who heard the parable of the vineyard. On the other hand, it can also be doubted if she is really an 'outsider', because she had already believed in Jesus' divine power to cast the demon out of her daughter before she met him. (Matthew's Jesus acknowledges that she has a great faith [Matt 15:8].)

usually is) as Jesus' purpose in using parables being to hinder the hearers from understanding them and/or this hindrance concerns all the people and all the parables, the Gospel is found to be full of inconsistencies with the theory. This way of understanding it has influenced the scholarly understanding of Mark's purpose with Jesus' parables. Therefore, the view that Mark has no *Parabeltheorie* should be rejected together with the interpretation of the two Greek conjunctives, ἵνα and μήποτε in Mark 4:12, as non-telic/final which supports this view.

There are also problems in the theses and argumentation of those scholars who argue for Mark's *Parabeltheorie*. Namely, they do not pay attention to the differentiation of the targets of Jesus' parabolic teaching and/or of its functions corresponding to targets. For example, Gnilka argues that Mark's *Parabeltheorie* is related to the early Church's view that the Jews rejected the Christian gospel because God hardened them. Thus, according to him, Mark describes the hardening function of Jesus' parables as directed towards the whole Jewish nation.[282] Evans argues from an apologetic, Christological point of view that for Mark, Jesus' parabolic teaching causes hardening with respect to both the disciples and enemies; however, the revelation of Jesus' Messiahship at the cross and resurrection can be realized through his passion which is caused by this general hardening.[283] Schweizer argues likewise for the general nature of the hardening effect of Jesus' parables, but argues that Mark's purpose with such a general hardening is to emphasize that a human being can only gain the right insight as a divine gift.[284] Marcus acknowledges that the effect of the hardening function of Jesus' parables is not general but directed to a certain people. However, in order to argue against Räisänen's thesis that Jesus' parables are generally illustrative and comprehensible in the Gospel of Mark, Marcus attempts to demonstrate that they really are so incomprehensible that all of them are accompanied by explanation in a direct or indirect manner.[285] Gundry also recognizes

---

[282] Gnilka 1961:48-50; also 1978:164-172.
[283] Evans 1989:99-103.
[284] Schweizer 1989:46-48.
[285] Marcus 2000:303-307. One can find in both Räisänen's argumentation and Marcus' counter-argumentation something in common. They both understand the *Parabeltheorie* as the Marcan Jesus using parables in order for the hearers not to understand them. To verify his own view, Räisänen concentrates on demonstrating how the parables are comprehensible to the hearers, while Marcus on how they are incomprehensible. In the discussion concerning the parable of the vineyard and that of the divided kingdom and house, above, I have demonstrated that the question of 'understanding' in *Parabelthoire* does not

the differentiation of the targets of parables. However, he misjudges in categorizing the parables, so that the parables which make Jesus' enemies obdurate concern only those found in Mark 4:1-34; otherwise, for him the parables are illustrative.[286] Against these scholars, I only repeat this research's thesis: by function, Jesus' parables in the Gospel of Mark can be categorized into three groups (illustrative, dividing and hardening) depending on the targets (disciples, crowd of people and enemies). Moreover, the parables have a hardening function with respect to a certain kind of people (i.e., outsiders and enemies).

Finally, one discrepant view relating to the question of Mark's *Parabeltheorie* and the interpretation of ἵνα and μήποτε must be mentioned. As demonstrated above, their interpretation as telic/final is the precondition for the thesis that Mark has *Parabeltheorie*, while the interpretation as non-telic/final offers grounds for rejecting that thesis. Strangely, Räisänen, who denies Mark's *Parabeltheorie* most strongly, also argues for the interpretation of ἵνα and μήποτε as telic/final.[287] How can his interpretation of these words be consistent with his denial of Mark's *Parabeltheorie*? According to him, the theory concerns the tradition of pre-Marcan level, not the Marcan. Mark mitigated the traditional *Parabeltheorie* by his redactional addition of the motif of the disciples' failure to understand, albeit without making a change to the traditional text. The outcome was, thus, that the Marcan text allows the readers to read ἵνα and μήποτε as final/telic conjunctives but does not allow them to grasp the *Parabeltheorie*. Therefore, Räisänen characterizes the Marcan text as "ein Sammelbecken vershiedener Traditionen und Anschauungen, die oft nicht ausgeglichen worden sind" and also the Evangelist as a patcher of traditional materials rather than a creative theologian.[288] On the basis of the discussion above, it can be argued that Mark treated Jesus' parables systematically, i.e., under the guidance of a certain policy. This indicates that he was not a mere patcher but rather a creative theologian. But if his creativeness is focused, then, does his loyalty

---

concern the question of whether the parables are comprehensible or not, but whether the hearers are spiritually obdurate or not.
[286] Gundry 1993:201-204.
[287] Räisänen 1973:8-17. Evans and Black defend the telic/final meaning of ἵνα and μήποτε as strongly as Räisänen. See Evans 1989:91-99; Black 1967:211-216.
[288] Räisänen 1973:126 also note 12. Räisänen's thesis concerning the character of the Marcan text and the Evangelist's work is enlarged in his later study on the secrecy of Messiah in the Gospel of Mark. See Räisänen 1976:167-168.

toward traditional materials suffer at the cost of it? The following subsection concerns this question.

4.3.3. Redaction and Tradition relating to the saying

In this sub-section, a reconstruction of the tradition which Mark received relating to Jesus' saying in Mark 4:11-12 and his redactional elaboration on that tradition is offered.

With regard to Mark's redactional purpose relating to the saying, scholarly views are divided into two: Mark meant the *Parabeltheorie* with it or did not. Each of these two different views can be divided further into two on redaction-critical grounds. I.e., Mark received it from the tradition (i) as an independent saying, and inserted it into the parable context, or (ii) as a part of that context in the tradition. The division of the scholarly views is illustrated in the following table.

Table: Meaning of Mark 4:11-12 on redaction-critical grounds[289]

	Scholarly view 1	Scholarly view 2	Scholarly view 3	Scholarly view 4
Does the saying indicate a Marcan *Parabeltheorie*?	*Parabeltheorie*	*Parabelthorie*	Non-*Parabeltheorie*	Non-*Parabeltheorie*
Is the saying Mark's insertion or a part of the tradition?	Part of tradition	Mark's insertion	Part of tradition	Mark's insertion
Who argues for this view?	Gundry (1993) Schweizer (1989)	Marcus (2000) Evans (1989) Gnilka (1961, 1978) Grundmann	Räisänen (1973) Guelich (1989) Weder (1990) Chilton (1984)	Pesch (1980) Marxsen (1955)

In the previous sub-section, it has been demonstrated that Mark had the *Parabeltheorie* with respect to a certain type of people, and that the meaning of the two Greek conjunctives, ἵνα and μήποτε, has a telic/final meaning. Such being the case, the scholarly view 3 and 4, which deny Mark's *Parabeltheorie* entirely, are not plausible from this research's point of view. As far as the scholarly views 1 and 2 (advocates of

---

[289] As demonstrated in 4.2.2.1, Jeremias provides the advocates of the Marcan insertion of the saying with essential arguments for it; however, he does not himself discuss the meaning of it on the Marcan level but on the Jesuanic level. Therefore I do not find his place in the table.

Bultman, who argues for Mark' *composition* of the saying, can be categorized into the advocates of the Marcan insertion of the saying. However, with regard to Mark's *Parabeltheorie*, he only states that Mark composed and put the saying into the parable context in order to give parables enigmatic character. Because he does not clarify whether such a character concerns the hardening of hearers or the incomprehensibility of parables, his view on the question is not clear. See discussion in 4.2.2.1. I think a similar lack of clarity relating to the view on Mark's *Parabeltheorie* concerns some other scholars (e.g., Grundmann, Kuhn and Pesch) who argue for the Marcan insertion of the saying. Klauck argues for Mark's *Parabeltheorie*. However, he also argues that Mark 4:11 was a part of the parable context in the tradition, but 4:12 was Mark's redactional addition. See discussion in 4.2.2.1.

Mark's *Parabeltheorie*) are concerned, however, the problem of the scholars' thesis and argumentation have already been pointed out. They do not pay sufficient attention to the differentiation of the targets of the parables and/or of the function of them depending on the targets. In any case, the table shows that the question of whether Mark inserted the saying into the parable context or received it as a part of that context, is one key to the question of Mark's redaction and tradition relating to the saying.

The arguments for the Marcan insertion of the saying into the parable context are now examined. Jeremias finds two literal tensions on the ground of which he judges the saying to be inserted by Mark. The first tension is that the narration in Mark 4:35-36, immediately following the Marcan parable section, indicates that Jesus is still in the same boat into which he stepped in order to teach in parables the crowd of people on the shore of the lake (4:1). Jeremias argues that the private teaching which begins from 4:10 presupposes the change of time from day to night, which causes the tension to the sequence of Jesus' public teaching at the lakeside between 4:1 and 4:35. The second tension is the fact that even though the disciples asked about "the parables", Jesus gives them the explanation of *PS*, i.e., answers about only that one parable. Jeremias considers this tension to be due to Mark's insertion of the saying in question into the traditional sequence of *PS* and Explanation, in which the disciples' question concerns only *PS* (so παραβολή stood in the singular); Mark consequently adjusted the traditional singular into the plural, because παραβολή in the inserted saying stood in the plural ("ἐν παραβολαῖς").[290]

It is, however, possible to explain these alleged tensions from a different point of view. For example, the tension between the sequence of the lakeside setting from Mark 4:1 to 4:35 as one occasion on the one hand, and Jesus' private teaching from 4:10 to 4:25 as another occasion on the other, can be seen to be due to a traditional unit consisting of both Jesus' public and private teaching being put by the redactor into the larger, redactional sequence of the lakeside setting, instead of being due to the private teaching being put into the larger sequence, as argued by Jeremias. Moreover, with regard to the question of the number of παραβολή, since Mark 4:3 informs in advance that Jesus tells several parables, it is not odd that the disciples' question concerns "the parables",

---

[290] Jeremias 1984:9-10. See also the discussion in 4.2.2.1.

rather than only one particular parable. The reason why Jesus gives an answer about only one parable can be found in Mark 4:13 where Jesus says that *PS* is the key to understanding other parables, so from Mark's point of view Explanation suffices. There is, therefore, no need to find some tension to be solved. In this way, it is possible to see that the previously mentioned, literary tensions do not necessarily result from Mark's insertion of Jesus' private teaching and hence they do not actually form a tension. From this research's point of view, the sequence of the whole Mark 4:1-20 (i.e., the narration about Jesus' parabolic teaching at the lakeside – *PS* sandwiched by two exhortations of hearing and seeing – the narration about the change of the time and place for the private teaching and about the disciples' question about the parables – the two sayings – Explanation) seems quite free of literary tensions.[291] Such a literary tension as signals the question of tradition and redaction would be found better in view of a larger context of which the sequence of Mark 4:1-20 is a part, and also by paying attention to Mark's purpose with the parable section of Mark 4:1-34 in which the sequence stands. In view of his purpose, it is possible to find such marks and signs in the text which signal that Mark dealt with the traditional materials under the guidance of his purpose.[292]

In order to elucidate Mark's purpose with the parable section, those parts of that section which have not yet been dealt with, are now examined. These are: Jesus'

---

[291] With regard to the question concerning Mark 4:13, i.e., the question of whether the verse is about Jesus' rebuke of the disciples or not, this has been discussed in the previous section. When the saying is regarded in the Marcan context, it can be noticed that Jesus' rebuking really has a function of warning the disciples against falling into the situation of the outsiders. See discussion in 4.3.2. It should also be noted that the allowance of the entrance into a relationship with God's rule with Jesus as its agent (i.e., the giving of the mystery of the kingdom of God) does not need to mean that the disciples can understand Jesus' parabolic teaching. The situation is similar to the Qumran thought concerning the giving of mystery and the attainment of perfect knowledge (see discussion in 4.2.2.2). By coming to Jesus, they are given the mystery of the kingdom of God and then, as the ones who have been given the mystery, they also receive the private teaching.

[292] The elucidation of Mark's purpose with the parable section is the more relevant, when sufficient attention has not been paid to it in the scholarly discussion on the redaction and tradition of the section. As Tuckett points out, the dominant tendency in the study of that section has been that scholars concentrate on clarifying "the precise nature and extent of the source(s) which Mark has employed in this chapter", so that the parables in Mark 4 "are regarded as pre-Marcan, perhaps simply illustrations of the general fact that Jesus taught in parables, but in themselves of minor importance for determining Mark's ideas; for the latter, attention is focused on the context in which Mark places the parables, i.e. vv. 1-2. 10-13. 21-25. 33-34". While scholars engage themselves in such a question as whether Mark received all the three 'seed' parables in one set from the tradition or found only *PS* and Explanation as a set and then added two other 'seed' parables to them, Tuckett argues, "Mark's decision" to have those parables in the present context of his Gospel must be regarded "in positive terms in relation to his theology". As representatives of the dominant tendency in the study, Tuckett mentions, among others, the study of Jeremias, Marxsen and Kuhn. See Tuckett 1988:1-5.

continued private teaching in Mark 4:21-25, his continued, public parabolic teaching in 4:26-32 and the Marcan concluding summary of Jesus' parabolic teaching in 4:33-34.

Firstly, Mark 4:26-32 which consists of the two parables of the automatically growing seed and of the mustard seed, is examined. I will concentrate on the meaning of these parables in the Marcan context.[293] As seen above, the unity of *PS* and Explanation has an exhortative function in the Marcan context and, with regard to the question of the double metaphor of seed for the word or a human being, the metaphor for human beings is not operative in the unity of *PS* and Explanation. Since Mark 4:13 states that the unity is the key to understanding the other parables, the two other 'seed' parables should be understood in this light.

Regarding these two 'seed' parables as simply the continuation of the teaching of *PS* and Explanation, Gundry argues that they speak of discipleship rather than eschatology. With regard to the parable of the automatically growing seed (Mark 4:26-29), the seed should be understood to mean "the word" because the unity of *PS* and Explanation which precedes this parable operate on the metaphor of seed for "the word". The throwing of the seed "in the soil (ἐπὶ τής γῆς)" in Mark 4:26, therefore, connotes the preaching of the word just as in the case of *PS* and Explanation. Thus, the parable tells what will happen if the soil in which the seed is sown is good, in other words, in the case where a steadfast relationship with "the word" is established. The answer is: "the word" is brought to "the incomprehensibility of marvellous growth".[294] In the same way, from the point of view of the contrast between the rudiment tininess and the final hugeness, the parable of the mustard seed (Mark 4:30-32) illustrates what happens to "the word" sown in the good soil.[295] Gundry argues that the Marcan version of this parable is suitable for the issue of discipleship, while the Lucan version (Luk 13:18-19) for that of

---

[293] Jeremias who labels these parables as "contrast parable" concentrates on their meaning in the Jesuanic context but does not discuss it in the Marcan context. One of the most important issues which the scholars are engaged in concerning these parables is how they express an eschatological point of view in the Jesuanic, the early Church's, and the Marcan levels. See, e.g., Jeremias 1984:151, 145-149 especially 146 (note 2); Gnilka 1978:182-186, 186-189; Marcus 2000:322-331; Guelich 1989:245-246, 251; Pesch 1980:225-239, 263-264.
[294] Gundry 1993:219-222.
[295] Gundry 1993:226-230.

eschatology.[296] He fails to clarify the metaphor of "the birds of the heaven" which "rest under the shade of the plant" (Mark 4:32; cf., "nest in the branches of the tree" in Luk 13:19), however. If the eschatological point of view is withdrawn from the parable, the birds may no longer connote Gentiles who gather to the world-wide kingdom of God at the end of time. On the other hand, from the Marcan image of birds sheltering from the scorching sun, it is possible to infer that they refer to Jesus' disciples (in the inner-text context) and Christians (in the outer-text context where Mark wrote his Gospel) both of whom are under protection. In fact, this motif of disciples' protection is substantiated in the episode about their rescue from the storm in Mark 4:35-41 which follows immediately the parable section.[297]

Thus, when these two additional 'seed' parables are understood in the light of the unity of *PS* and Explanation in the Marcan context, discipleship emerges as their main theme. However, even though the two parables are contextualized by that unity, it does not necessarily mean that their function is also adjusted to the exhortative function of the latter. The two additional 'seed' parables describe what is promised to those who establish a steadfast relationship with "the word". The first parable relates that for them, it is only inevitable that "the word" will grow to bear fruit in a way beyond human comprehensibility. The second parable teaches that the invisibility of "the word" will turn into something substantial under which those who establish a steadfast relationship with "the word" will be safe. By comparing these ideas with natural phenomena, the two 'seed' parables *assure* the reader that the realization of them is equally natural and it is demonstrated by the episode of the disciples' protection which follows the parable section. Thus, *by the unity of PS and Explanation, Mark first exhorts the hearers or*

---

[296] Gundry considers that the Marcan version of the parable of the mustard seed depends on the pre-Q tradition which is reflected in the Lucan version. According to him, Mark's redaction can be found in that the "tree (δένδρον)" as a result of the growth of the seed (Luk 13:19) is changed into "aromatic plant (λάχανον [Mark 4:32])", while the smallness of the mustard seed is now mentioned explicitly by the added clause "being the smallest of all the seeds on the land (μικρότερον ὂν παντόν τῶν σπερμάτων τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς)". The change of the definition of the grown plant implies that the plant no longer connotes the universal kingdom of God. In this way, the eschatological point of view is withdrawn. The explicit mention of the emphasized smallness, on the other hand, stresses all the more the contrast between the initial invisibleness and the final bigness. See Gundry 1993:226-230.

[297] It is worth noticing that the same activities of the sower of the parable of the automatically growing seed, i.e., "sleep (καθεύδῃ)" and "rise (ἐγείρηται)", are used to refer to Jesus in the episode about his rescue of the disciples from the storm ("καθεύδων" and "διεγερθείς"). I think this linguistic parallelism demonstrates the thematic connection between the parable section and this episode.

readers to establish a steadfast relationship with "the word" and then, by the two additional 'seed' parables, assures them of the positive consequence of such a relationship.[298]

Secondly, Jesus' private parabolic teaching in Mark 4:21-25 are investigated. In the previous section (4.2.2.3), the possibility of the Jesuanic meaning of the parable of the lamp (4:21-22) and of the measure (4:24-25) in the Jesuanic connection of the sayings (i.e., *PS* sandwiched by two exhortations of hearing and seeing – two sayings in Mark 4:11-12 and 13 – Explanation) were considered. In that connection, the parable of the lamp could have referred to the event that through Explanation, the disciples received the teaching on the condition of the membership of the true and ultimate remnant of Israel as a revelation of the hidden thing, just as the light is put in the right place. The parable of the measure could have meant that their decision to remain with Jesus led them to gain this teaching, just as something more is given to the one who already has. In this sense, these parables, together with two further exhortations of hearing in Mark 4:23, 24b, are a good continuation of Jesus' private teaching to the disciples in 4:10-20. However, as already also stated, it is not possible to judge whether they really belong to the Jesuanic connection of the sayings. They could well be a later addition to that connection. I think that the same meaning of the two parables which is mentioned above as Jesuanic is suitable also for the Marcan context. However, such a consonance between the Jesuanic and Marcan contexts makes it difficult to determine whether the two parables in Mark 4:21-25 belong to the Jesuanic connection of the sayings, or were inserted later.

On the other hand, scholars interpret these parables in the Marcan context from the point of view of "Messiasgeheimnis". Based on Jesus' instruction not to publicize his transfiguration before his resurrection (Mark 9:9), W. Wrede considered that the parable of the lamp relates that Jesus' Messianic identity is concealed temporarily but will become public from the moment of his resurrection.[299] Following Wrede, many scholars have understood this parable to mean that Mark summons "his community to their missionary activity and responsibility of making known what had been concealed from

---

[298] Although Tuckett's approach to the two additional 'seed' parables is different from this research's, his conclusion is that they have an assuring function. See Tuckett 1988:24-25.

[299] Wrede 1913:69-71.

'the outsiders' but entrusted to the disciples by Jesus during his ministry".[300] In this light, the parable of the measurement has also been understood as a passage which further emphasizes the mission responsibility.[301]

Guelich, however, criticizes this type of interpretation as placing "far too much weight on a clue that first appears in (Mark) 9:9".[302] Moreover, Gundry points out that in the parable of the lamp, "there is nothing of a contrast between obscurative parables here (i.e., in the parable section) and plain speech at some point in the future; rather, the contrast lies between obscurative parables and clarifying explanations, both of which Jesus speaks on the present occasion".[303] If so, Wrede and his followers only interpret Mark 4:21-25 'off the present parable context'. Guelich's and Gundry's criticism indicates that one should be careful not to give the motif of "Messiasgeheimnis" a paradigmatic role in the parable section.[304]

What then is the real Marcan meaning of the parable of the lamp and the measurement?

According to Gundry, "the lamp" in the first parable refers to Jesus' parabolic teaching in the Marcan context,[305] that is, the putting of the lamp under the "buskel basket" or the "bed" represents the concealing function of parables, while the putting of it

---

[300] So describes Guelich scholars' understanding of this parable. See Guelich 1988:231. Among those scholars who understand the parable of the lamp in this way, some consider the parable to imply that the hardening effect of Jesus' parabolic teaching (Mark 4:11-12) is temporal; according to others, Mark thought that that effect was valid in his days as well as the days of Jesus' mission. About the scholarly discussions, see Tuckett 1988:21.

[301] Tuckett 1988:21.

[302] Guelich 1988:231 (addition mine).

[303] Gundry 1993:215 (addition mine).

[304] Dautzenberg points out that, after Wrede's study, scholars tended to understand the various parts of the Gospel of Mark, among others, the parable section (Mark 4:1-34) and particularly the meaning of τὸν μυστήριον in 4:11, to be penetrated by the motif of "Messiasgeheimnis". As such a study of the Marcan parable section as is influenced by Wrede's thesis, Dautzenberg mentions among others the study of Kuhn 1971, Gnilka 1978, Klauck 1978. See Dautzenberg 1990:38-39. More recently, on the other hand, studies which decrease the dominance of that motif by recognizing the alternative, main motif or even by characterizing Mark's Gospel as something like a patch work of traditional materials, have emerged. As the scholars who consider the alternative, main motif of the Gospel, Brown refers to Schweitzer 1970 and Keck 1965/66 who both argue for 'discipleship'. See Brown 1973:60. Gundry 1993 rejects "Messiasgeheimnis" and argues for the apology of the cross as the main motif of Mark. Dautzenberg considers the matter in a more relative way so that in the Gospel of Mark, the idea of the kingdom and that of the coming of the Son of Man coexist without relating with each other. The view of the Gospel of Mark as something like a patch work is presented by Räisänen 1973, 1976.

[305] On the other hand, it is fact that 'lamp' serves as a metaphor in a number of ways in the OT and Judaism as, e.g., God, David, Messiah, Torah, Israel, Jerusalem, Temple. See Guelich 1989:229.

on the "lamp stand" represents their revealing function.[306] If so, the parable of the lamp symbolically highlights the parables' function with respect to the disciples. This interpretation is quite near to what this research has put forth as a possible, Jesuanic meaning, although in this research I have focused on the content of the revelation (i.e., the revealed matter is the teaching on the condition of the membership of the true and ultimate remnant of Israel).

As far as the second parable of the measure is concerned, Gundry considers that "the measure with which you measure (4:24c)" means "the ways in which people hear Jesus' parabolic word", so the sentence "it will be measured to you (4:24c)" means "the treatment of hearers according to their way of hearing". In this way, he connects the issue of 'to measure' and 'to be measured' with the question of 'hearing Jesus' parables in a right way or a wrong way'. In fact, he even argues that this emphasis on hearing is consistent with the main of Explanation.[307] However, according to this research, the main point of Explanation is 'to or not to establish a steadfast relationship with "the word"', not 'to hear Jesus' parables rightly or wrongly'.[308] Therefore, I propose changing Gundry's connection between 'measure' and 'hearing' into a connection between 'measure' and 'establishing such a relationship'. Accordingly, the interpretation of the sentence "And it will be added to you (4:24c)" should be modified. According to Gundry, this means that those people who hear Jesus' parables rightly are promised "the adding of an explanation to the parable".[309] This research's solution of the Marcan meaning of the parable of the measure is as follows: those who follow the exhortation of *PS* to establish a steadfast relationship with "the word" are promised hope just as something more is given to the one who already has. In the Marcan sequence, this 'hope' is assured as an inevitable growth of "the word" to become fruit-bearing (in the parable of the automatically growing seed) and as a substantial outcome of "the word" which provides protection for those who establish a steadfast relationship with it (in the parable of the mustard seed). In this way, the parable of the measure has a role in introducing the two additional 'seed' parables in the Marcan context.

---

[306] Gundry 1993:212.
[307] Gundry 1993:217.
[308] See 4.3.1.
[309] Gundry 1993:217.

Thirdly, as far as the concluding narration about the summary of Jesus' parabolic teaching in Mark 4:33-34 is concerned, some scholars argue that there is a tension between the two verses. According to Räisänen, the first verse speaks of the comprehensibility of parables (therefore, his interpretation: "as they could understand"; see discussion in 4.3.2), while the second verse speaks of their incomprehensibility (therefore, the parables must be explained to the disciples afterwards). From such a tension, he concludes that the two verses belonged to different stages of the tradition.[310] In this research's view, however, the whole passage of Mark 4:33-34 speaks of the dividing function of Jesus' parables with respect to the crowd of people, as elucidated above,[311] and therefore, there is no tension found between the two verses.

From the examination of the elements of the Marcan parable section in Mark 4:1-34, it becomes clear that Mark's purpose with this section is to teach the hearers or readers of his Gospel discipleship. This is illustrated as follows:

- Jesus tells parables, *PS* among others, to the crowd of people. After his public teaching, the crowd is divided into two groups: the disciples who come to Jesus and the outsiders who do not come,
- Jesus characterizes the former group (actually the hearers and readers of the Gospel in the outer-text context) as those who have already been given entry into a relationship with God's rule with him as its agent, while he relates that his parabolic teaching functions as making the latter obdurate,
- By Explanation, Jesus teaches the disciples (i.e., the hearers and readers of the Gospel) the significance of the steadfast relationship with "the word" and exhorts them to establish such a relationship,
- By the parable of the lamp, he relates that through Explanation, the revealing function of his parabolic teaching is fulfilled to the disciples (i.e., the hearers or readers of the Gospel),

---

[310] Räisänen 1973:50-59; 114-121.
[311] See 4.3.2.

- By the parable of the measure, he relates that those who establish a steadfast relationship with "the word" are promised hope,
- Then, by two additional 'seed' parables told to the crowd of people, he assures the disciples (i.e., the hearers or readers of the Gospel) of an inevitable growth of "the word" to fruit-bearing and also a substantial outcome of "the word" which provides them with protection.

As can be seen above, although the *Parabeltheorie* is present in this parable section, the dominant theme of the section concerns the teaching on the discipleship based on a steadfast relationship with "the word". The practical relevance of the hardening function of Jesus' parables can be found actually outside this section, that is, in connection with the parable of the divided kingdom and house before the section and that of the vineyard after it. Such being the case, one can presume that Mark's redactional interest is concentrated on composing the section in accordance with his theme of teaching on discipleship. If so, there is a less compelling reason for assuming that Mark would have inserted such a saying which speaks of another theme, so that the section might become a complexity of different themes. It is more plausible that the saying about the hardening function of parables was in unity with some part of the parable context in the tradition and was merely preserved in the Marcan composition of the parable section, rather than arguing that Mark, while aiming at composing the section about discipleship, inserted the saying about another theme from another line of tradition. In this case, a literary tension should not be sought for between the parable context and the saying but rather within the parable context.

The latter type of tension can be found between the two additional 'seed' parables (Mark 4:26-32) and the other part of the parable section. In the sequence of this section, Jesus first teaches the crowd of people in parables (Mark 4:1-9), then he gives the disciples his private teaching, including Explanation and the parables of the lamp and of the measurement (4:10-25). He then teaches the crowd of people in parables again (i.e., the two additional 'seed' parables), and the concluding narration reports that even after this second public teaching, Jesus again gives the disciples a private teaching to explain

the spoken parables (4:33-34). Jesus is subsequently found in the same boat on the same day (4:35-36), as he began his (first) parabolic teaching (4:1). A digression from the same day event can be clearly seen twice, i.e., the public parabolic teaching, including *PS*, is followed by the private teaching (the first digression); then the public parabolic teaching including two additional 'seed' parables, comes again (the second digression) followed by its own private teaching mentioned in the concluding narration.

Such a digression from the main sequence is not a problem for Mark. One can find a similar digression in the sixth chapter of the Gospel, where Mark placed the episode about the murder of the Baptizer (6:14-29) between Jesus' sending the disciples out on mission (6:7-13) and their return to him (6:30). In this way, the time sequence is seriously interrupted. The digression in this fourth chapter can be understood so that the private teaching happens at a later occasion and in a totally different context from the main, redactional sequence between Jesus' public, parabolic teaching at the lakeside and his departure from there by boat.[312] The redaction-critical problem of the parable section is that such a digression occurs twice. I think the second public teaching followed by the narration is due to Mark insertion of the two additional 'seed' parables in order to complete his purpose of composing the section under the guidance of his main theme. Moreover, the placement of this second public, parabolic teaching after the first private teaching can have such an effect that Jesus' departure from the shore by boat does not happen after the private teaching but rather after the public teaching, as if the two 'seed' parables might be a continuation of the first public, parabolic teaching including *PS*.

If so, why is the concluding narration (Mark 4:33-34) necessary after the two 'seed' parables? If it were not here, the second public parabolic teaching would be able to

---

[312] A possibility of such a digression in the parable section is suggested by Lane. See Lane 1982:155.

On the other hand, one can argue that the digression in the case of the episode about the murder of the Baptizer of Mark 6:14-29 cannot be paralleled with the case of the private teaching of Mark 4:10-25 for the reason that the former belongs to a typical Marcan redaction technique, *inclusio*, which means that Mark includes a different material into a sequence of another material so that the former material is sandwiched between the divided parts of the latter. As examples of *inclusio* other than Mark 6:14-29, it is possible to mention: the controversy as to whether the source of Jesus' power is divine or demonic (3:22-30); the healing of the hemorrhaging woman (5:25-34); the cleansing of the temple (11:15-20). About these cases, see, e.g., Beavis 1989:46-47. However, one should also note that in these "other" cases, *inclusio* does not affect the time sequence of the main material; the included material goes in the main one well in terms of time sequence. But the case of Mark 6:14-29 causes a serious digression simply in terms of time, so that a reader's attention is forced to turn back from the main sequence for a while. It shows how Mark was free from composing a strict sequence in terms of time; in one case, time digression goes backward (Mark 6:14-29), in another, forward (4:10-25).

continue directly to Jesus' departure from the shore, and thus the sequence would go more smoothly. Because of this narration, according to which the two additional 'seed' parables are also explained to the disciples, this second public parabolic teaching as placed after the first digression seems to be a different occasion from the first one. However, in spite of a complication caused by the narration, Mark seems to have wanted to emphasize that these two 'seed' parables have a similar function to *PS* i.e, of dividing the crowd of people, and also are explained afterwards to the disciples in the same way as *PS*. If so, it is possible that when Mark inserted the two 'seed' parables here, he had already understood that they had a dividing function and were also explained afterwards, and moreover they were also told on the shore, so that it was easy for him to place them just before Jesus' departure from the shore of the lake. As a possible solution to the problem relating to the insertion of the two 'seed' parables and the redundancy of the concluding narration, I suggest that the two 'seed' parables belonged in the tradition to the first public, parabolic teaching including *PS,* but that Mark displaced them backwards and 'inserted' them after the private teaching. In this case, Mark could have understood that these two 'seed' parables were also told on the shore, and as a part of the parabolic teaching, together with *PS*, directed at the crowd of people had a dividing function of them. In such a tradition, the parables were also explained together with *PS* through Explanation. How were they explained, then? According to Mark 4:13, *PS* is the key to understanding the other parables, i.e., Explanation is enough to understand the two 'seed' parables. Thus, in the tradition the two parables belonged to "the parables" which the disciples asked about after the public teaching (Mark 4:10). By placing the two 'seed' parables after the private teaching and just before Jesus' departure by boat, it helps to avoid an abrupt change of scene from the private teaching to the departure from the shore where the crowd of people remained. Mark, however, did not want to leave unmentioned the fact that the two 'seed' parables had a dividing function and were really explained through Explanation to the disciples, and hence the additional narration was inserted.

Of course, it is also possible that the two 'seed' parables were chosen by Mark from a different line of traditional materials. But in that case, would the Evangelist have 'dared' to treat them as having been spoken on the shore and/or to write such a narration that relates that they had a dividing function and were explained, even if he was not sure

that that was really the case. In the case in which they were spoken in connection with *PS*, it was natural for him to treat them as having been spoken on the shore and also to mention that they had a dividing function and were explained. I think this possibility, i.e., that the two 'seed' parables were spoken together with *PS* in the tradition and then subsequently displaced backwards by Mark, is more plausible than that arguing that he took them from a different tradition.[313]

It is now possible to comment on the question of tradition and redaction concerning the remaining elements of the parable section and put forth a possible solution of the question.

With regard to Mark 4:21-25, it is not possible to judge whether the meaning of the passage, though reconstructed as Jesuanic, belong to the sure and plausible core of the Jesuanic circumstances or whether the passage was inserted later.[314] Additionally, the parable of the measure is found to have the function of introducing the two additional 'seed' parables in the present form (see above). So it is also not possible to judge whether Mark inserted this parable here, or whether he received it as a part of the parable context in the tradition and made some redactional changes to it.

With regard to the introduction narration about the lakeside setting for the public parabolic teaching in Mark 4:1-2, as stated earlier it is simply not possible to judge the historicity of the setting in spite or scholars pointing out that the present form demonstrates the Marcan redaction.[315] If the two 'seed' parables were told in connection with *PS* in tradition, however, at least the information about Jesus' telling several parables in connection with *PS* can be traditional.

---

[313] Gundry has already suggested Mark's displacing redaction to the traditional parable section. However, his point of view is different from this research's. Firstly, he argues that in the tradition, all four parables in Mark 4:21-34 should have been told at the same occasion as *PS*. In this research's view, the parables of the lamp and of the measure are told to the disciples. Secondly, as the reason for the displacement, Gundry argues that Mark wanted to emphasize his theology of the apology of the cross, that is, Jesus uses his parables to desensitize his enemies on purpose in order to realize his suffering and death on the cross. Therefore, he says, Mark displaced Jesus' private teaching (including his saying about the *Parabeltheorie) forward*. This research argues that Mark displaced the two 'seed' parables *backward*. Even though the outcome of Gundry's and this research's theory is almost the same, it does not mean that this research agrees with his reconstruction relating to the theology of the whole Gospel of Mark. I have reached my conclusion by 'looking at a tree without seeing the woods' (but without forgetting the fact that the tree is in the woods). I just do not take a position to his conclusions concerning the theology of the Gospel of Mark. See Gundry 1993:195-204.
[314] See discussion in 4.2.2.3.
[315] See discussion in 4.2.2.3.

This research's solution of the question of tradition and redaction relating the Marcan parable section is now offered.

<Traditional sequence>	<Redaction>	<this research's remarks>
	- Lakeside setting	- It is not possible to judge the historicity of the lakeside setting.
- Information on Jesus' speaking several parables to the crowd of people		
- Two 'seed' parables and *PS* sandwiched by the exhortations of hearing and seeing		- Two 'seed' parables can be from another line of tradition
- Information on the change of the scene to the private teaching and on the disciples' question about the spoken parables		
- Jesus' saying about the position of the disciples and the outsiders with respect to the mystery of the kingdom of God and the effect and function of his parabolic teaching		
- Jesus' saying about the significance of *PS* to understanding the other parables		
- Explanation		
		- Elements of Mark 4:21-25 can be from other line(s) of tradition or can be a part of the traditional sequence. The form of 4:24-25 can be due to Mark's redaction.
	- Concluding narration	

4.3.4. The saying in early Christianity

A reconstruction of two different meanings of the saying, Jesuanic and Marcan, has been given above. The Jesuanic circumstances of the saying which have been reconstructed is almost a direct reflection of the present form of Mark 4:2-20. In addition, the saying concerns the hardening function of parables with respect to a certain people in both the Jesuanic and Marcan contexts. Does this mean that there is no difference between the Jesuanic and Marcan meanings of the saying, so that the plausibility of this research's reconstruction of the Jesuanic circumstances of the saying and the Jesuanic meaning of all the related sayings is disproved? From this research's methodological point of view, it is not possible that the meaning of the saying is the same in the two different contexts. In spite of a superficial similarity in form and in meaning, it is possible to find a fundamental difference between the Jesuanic and Marcan meanings of the saying in the way that each meaning can be operative only in its own context. This is now presented.

In the Jesuanic context, when Jesus uttered the saying in unity with *PS* and Explanation, he did it in the context of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism. In that context where the metaphor of 'God's sowing seed' was understood to be related to the remnant motif, Jesus, by employing the double metaphor of seed for human being and for "the word", delineated the motif, so that establishing a steadfast relationship with "the word" is the condition of the membership of the true and ultimate remnant of Israel. His term "the word" contained three aspects: the law, the prophets and the proclamation of the kingdom of God. Although Jesus' teaching was descriptive rather than exhortative, he challenged the Jewish traditional motif of remnant to redefinition. In the Palestinian Jewish context of the Second Temple period where the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant was operative, Jesus' saying which puts forth the Isaianic idea of divine hardening, on the one hand, and the unity of *PS* and Explanation, on the other, could have formed a perfect ideological unity. Jesus' point of view was parallel to that of the servant and the loyal servants of the latter parts of the book of Isaiah (Isa 40-55 and 56-66) in the sense that his concern was also to form the holy remnant liberated from obduracy. Faced with the situation of division of the hearers, his point of view leaned to that of the prophet Isaiah who was similarly assigned the hardening task by God. Thus, his point of view and

thinking were affected by the point of view of the whole book of Isaiah with respect to the motifs of hardening and remnant. In this way Jesus' saying about the hardening function of parables is related to the the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant.

In the Marcan context, although Jesus utters the same saying in the same unity of *PS* and Explanation, he does so in the context of the Hellenistic Gentile Christianity. In the cultural milieu where the metaphor of 'sowing seed' was understood to be related to the proclamation of the word, the Jewish traditional motif of remnant was no longer operative. Jesus' teaching has nothing to do with challenging the Jewish tradition but rather exhorted those who had entered into a relationship with God's rule with Jesus as its agent. The exhortation concerns the establishment of a steadfast relationship with "the word". The Marcan Jesus' term "the word" contains the fourth aspect, i.e., the Christian gospel, in addition to the three elements (the law, the prophets and the proclamation of the kingdom of God) of the Jesuanic term. This establishment, however, is no longer related to the membership of the true and ultimate remnant of Israel, but rather to the true discipleship of Christianity. Thus, Jesus' saying which contains the citation from Isa 6:9-10 has nothing to do with the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant.

Therefore, even though the Jesuanic and Marcan meanings of the saying seem to deal equally with the hardening function of parables, there is a fundamental difference between them. Firstly, in the double metaphor of seed, the metaphor for remnant is lost in the Marcan unity of *PS* and Explanation, so that the unity no longer deals with the formation of the true and ultimate remnant of Israel, but rather the early Christian teaching on true discipleship. Secondly, corresponding to the change from challenging the Jewish remnant motif to redefinition into the teaching on the true discipleship, the function of the unity is changed from descriptive to exhortative. Thirdly, as a consequence, the saying has nothing to do with the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant in the Marcan context. When the Marcan meaning of the saying is understood to be operative in these changed circumstances, the seeming similarity between the Jesuanic and Marcan meanings does not meant that they are the same. Thus, one should presume a development between the two meanings of the saying from the Jesuanic to Marcan context: from the relationship with the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant to no relationship with it; from the double metaphor to the single one in the unity of *PS* and

Explanation; from the descriptive to the exhortative function in that unity. Because of the fundamental difference and change between the Jesuanic and Marcan meanings of the saying, I can say that this research's reconstruction has passed a control of plausibility.[316] However, this is only the first control.

As the second control, the thesis that the early Church is the matrix of the saying is also examined. As seen above in the survey of previous studies,[317] those scholars who argue that the saying originates from the early Church connect the composition of the saying with Church's rationalizing explanation of the Jews' unbelief in the Christian gospel by the idea of divine hardening. In fact, Isa 6:9-10 are cited for the purpose of explaining the Jews' unbelief in Act 28:27 and their unbelief in Jesus in Joh 9:39; 12:40. Those scholars who advocate the early Christian origin of the saying in Mark 4:11-12 mean that the Marcan and the two post-Marcan passages belong to the same, early Christian tradition. As a matter of fact, the same purpose of explaining the Jews' unbelief is also found in a pre-Synoptic writing, Rom 9-11. Even though the passage does not have a citation from Isa 6:9-10, it clearly articulates the idea of divine hardening especially in Rom 9:18, which states that the reason for the unbelief of the most of the Jews in the Christian gospel is that God hardens whom he will. Moreover, by relating that only a part of Israel forms the true Israel, not the whole Israel, Rom 9:6 clearly expresses the motif of Israel's remnant. The two themes of divine hardening and remnant continue in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle. First, Paul explains how, in the time of Elijah, God left the remnant of seven thousand who did not bow the kneel to Baal and then maintains that the situation is the same in his own time, i.e., a remnant was chosen by God's grace (11:5) and the others of Israel were made obdurate (11:7). Did Paul envisage the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant? If he did, it is possible to consider such a dependence relation of tradition that the saying in Mark originates from Paul's idea. Below I will examine

---

[316] On the other hand, in spite of the change which occurred to the unity of *PS* and Explanation in the Jesuanic and Marcan contexts, one should also observe that the basic idea is the same, that is, the establishment of a steadfast relationship with the word is the condition of salvation, whether the form of salvation is the entrance into a relationship with the true and ultimate remnant of Israel or with God's rule with Jesus as its agent, or whether "the word" has three elements: the law, the prophets and the teaching of the kingdom of God, or four elements (i.e., with the Christian gospel in addition to the forementioned three).
[317] See 1.2.

whether Paul's idea of divine hardening and remnant is really the same as the Isaianic idea and whether the notion of Rom 9-11, Acts 28:27 and Joh 9:39; 12:40 is so parallel with that of Mark 4:11-12 that this parallelism invalidates the development line between the Jesuanic and Marcan meaning of the saying.

With regard to Rom 9-11, for Paul, the hardening which God brought about for Israel has such a function that through it, salvation was transferred to the Gentiles. Moreover, the jealousy which this aroused amongst the Jews, would be the means by which Israel would return to salvation (Rom 11:11, 17 and 25). Thus, the divinely inflicted obduracy of Israel is connected with the salvation of Gentiles (and of Israel through their salvation). It is true that the book of Isaiah puts forth the idea of universalism, as seen in the second chapter. This means, however, that God makes Israel hardened, in order that the holy remnant liberated from hardening might emerge, to which the loyal Gentiles might then be joined. The universalism of Isaiah does not mean that salvation as such is transferred first to Gentiles, when Israel is under the divine hardening, so that Israel might eventually join the faithful Gentiles. Paul's idea of divine hardening is connected with the view that God transferred salvation to the Gentiles for the final salvation of Israel and that, for this reason, mission to the Gentiles must be carried out. Moreover, even though Paul mentions the remnant of Israel, he does not regard it as a significant factor for universal salvation, while the remnant is such a factor in the book of Isaiah. As Rom 9:16 and 11:5 indicate, the remnant of Israel has at least the significance of demonstrating that salvation is only by God's mercy and grace. Otherwise, the remnant is no longer the nucleus of salvation. Thus, in Rom 9-11, the idea of divine hardening has the function of explaining the belief of Gentiles and the unbelief of Jews and of justifying the mission to the Gentiles. Such a function does not concern the Jesuanic or Marcan meaning of the saying. Therefore, Paul's idea can be judged to be outside the development line between the Jesuanic and Marcan meanings of the saying.

A similar point of view to Paul is found in the Isaianic citation in Acts 28:27 and Joh 9:39; 12:40. In Acts 28:28 after his citation from Isa 6:9-10, Paul continues to say that because of the hardening of Jews, salvation was sent to Gentiles. As in Rom 9-11, the idea of divine hardening here has a function of explaining the belief of Gentiles and

the unbelief of Jews and also justifying the mission to the Gentiles.[318] In addition, in the context where Paul cites Isa 6:9-10, no significance is given to the remnant of Israel. Acts 28:24 relates that some Jewish hearers were convinced of Paul's teaching of the Christian gospel, while the others refused to believe; however, both of them left Paul (28:25) after which he uttered the Isaianic citation (28:27) followed by his statement that salvation was sent to Gentiles and "they will listen" (28:28).

As far as Joh 9:39; 12:40 are concerned, as Evans points out, both verses are thematically connected.[319] Joh 12:40 (the Evangelist's narration summarizing the unbelief of Israel's religious leaders in spite of Jesus' signs), relates that God made them blind. In Joh 9:39 (Jesus' saying in connection with the episode about his healing the blind man and the unbelief of the Jews), Jesus says that he makes them blind. Both verses express the same motif: in spite of the many signs Jesus gave, the leaders did not believe in him because they were made blind by him and God.[320] In addition, as in Rom 9-11 and Acts 28:24-28, the contrast between the belief of Gentiles and the unbelief of Jews becomes clear. Before the summarizing narration in Joh 12:37-43 in which Isa 6:9-10 is cited (Joh 12:40), some Greeks appear and wish to see Jesus (12:20-23). R.E. Brown calls attention to the theological significance of this episode in the Gospel of John: "The appearance of Gentiles wishing to see (believe in?) Jesus indicates that it is the time for him to lay down his life", because until this, the Johannine Jesus has only mentioned that his hour/time, "the hour of Jesus' return to his Father through crucifixion, resurrection and ascension", "has not yet come" (2:4; 7:30). But here, Jesus declares for the firs time that "the hour has come for the Son of Man to be glorified" (12:23; cf., 13:1; 17:1).[321] The summarizing narration about the unbelief of the Jews then follows. In this way, the idea of divine hardening is clearly connected with the theme of the belief of Gentiles and the unbelief of the Jews as in the case of Rom 9-11 and Acts 28:24-28. In addition, those believing Jews who can be paralleled with the remnant of Israel, have no significance here. In the same

---

[318] In Acts 28:27, the Isaianic citation is from LXX Isa 6:9-10. It uses a passive tense of the verb with respect to the hardening of heart. As seen in the previous chapter (3.2.2.2), this tense can mean a divine passive from the point of view of the whole context of LXX Isaiah.
[319] Evans 1989:134.
[320] Since John emphasizes the significance of signs, it is natural that the eyes should be the focus when his Gospel speaks of the hardening of Jews, while both eyes and ears are the focus in the Jesuanic and Marcan meaning of the saying which has been reconstructed.
[321] Brown 1966:469-471.

narration, John adds that many of the Jewish authorities believed in Jesus; however, they did not confess their faith because of their fear of the Pharisees (12:42). John characterizes them as those who love human glory more than the glory that comes from God (12:43).[322]

On the basis of the discussion above, the pre-Synoptic and post-Marcan Christian idea that the unbelief of Jews to the Christian gospel is due to divinely inflicted obduracy, belongs to a different line of tradition to the development line between the Jesuanic and Marcan meanings of the saying. Uttered in connection with the unity of *PS* and Explanation in the Marcan context, the saying speaks of the counter-example of the true discipleship and of the fate of the outsiders. It is more plausible that the meaning of the saying in Mark 4:11-12 is a result of the development of the Jesuanic saying through the context change from the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism to the Hellenistic Gentile Christianity, than that it was composed by the early Christian need to explain the belief of the Gentiles and the unbelief of the Jews as well as justifying the mission to the Gentiles. This research's reconstruction therefore can be deemed to have passed the second control.

The third control concerns the possibility that the circumstances of the saying and the meaning of all the related sayings reconstructed as Jesuanic originate from the earliest phase of early Christianity, i.e., the Jewish Christianity in Palestine. This control is the most burdensome, because, existing in the Palestinian Jewish context of the Second Temple period, the Jewish Christianity could have shared the same concern of the true and ultimate remnant of Israel as the Judaism of that day, and they were acquainted with book of Isaiah in the very context where the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant was operative; they had also access to that Aramaic tradition of Isa 6:9-13 which in the view of this research, could have put forth that idea in that context. Moreover, in the same context, 'God's sowing seed' could also have been understood to be the metaphor of God's forming remnant of Israel. Therefore, it is possible that the Jewish Christianity in Palestine could have been the composer of the connection which has been reconstructed

---

[322] The same fear concerns also the parents of the blind man whom Jesus heals. They do not dare answer the Pharisees' question about who healed their son, because they are afraid of excommunication (Joh 9:18-23).

as Jesuanic (i.e., *PS* sandwiched by the exhortations of hearing and seeing – the sayings in Mark 4:11-12, 13 – Explanation). Even if the Jewish Christianity had been the real composer of that connection, it might not have had that meaning which has been reconstructed as Jesuanic. This is clarified as follows.

In the Jesuanic context, Jesus uttered the saying as a reaction to the concrete situation which he brought about by his parabolic teaching. This research has demonstrated how three elements of this whole event, i.e., Jesus' parabolic teaching, the division of the crowd as a result of the teaching and Jesus' saying as a reaction to the division, are highly contextual in view of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism and the whole book of Isaiah. If the Jewish Christianity in Palestine had composed the whole context of the saying, the saying could no longer have been a genuine reaction to a concrete situation, but a devised one for the context in which the composer knew or conceived in advance what element should precede and follow the saying. In this way, he organized the context. If so, it is possible that in doing so, the composer should have taken his hearers or readers, i.e., the Jewish Christian community in Palestine, as a real audience of his composition, into consideration. Therefore, he would have had reason for composing the context with respect to his community. What then was the reason? I think that with regard to the unity of *PS* and Explanation, it is possible that he had the purpose of exhorting the community to establish a steadfast relationship with "the word". Then, the unity might no longer have had such a descriptive function as in the Jesuanic context. In that context, Jesus' purpose with the parabolic teaching was to teach the condition of the membership of the true and ultimate remnant and to challenge the Jewish understanding of remnant to redefinition. Since disclosing the truth in this regard is at issue, the function of the teaching can be better characterized as descriptive. On the other hand, in the Jewish Christian context in Palestine, the composer's purpose with Jesus' parabolic teaching would have been directed to the composer's community, not the Jews in general. If the community regarded itself as the realization of the true and ultimate remnant of Israel or the true harbinger of it, the composer's concern would have been to consolidate the membership which had been defined and clarified by their Lord not only through his words and works but also through his passion, crucifixion and resurrection. If so, I am inclined to think that the function of Jesus' teaching can be better characterized

as exhortative in the Jewish Christian context, so that the members of the community might not fall into the situation of the outsiders.

I admit that passing this third control is not an easy task. It is impossible to say more than that in the community situation, the reconstructed, Jesuanic circumstances of the saying and meaning of all the related sayings could have had an exhortative function better than a descriptive one. If so, the Jewish Christian meaning can be characterized as the first step toward the Marcan meaning. On the other hand, Theißen – Winter suggest the criterion by which the Jewish Christian element can be removed from a Jesus tradition as follows: "we must always first 'subtract' specifically Christian perspectives, clear post-Easter expressions of Christian faith, and material reflecting church tendencies (…). *When in these remaining traditions (...) we discover clearly Jewish elements that cannot be explained as Jewish Christian reactions against the tendencies of Gentile Christianity (...), then we are probably close to the historical Jesus*".[323] This research's reconstruction of the Jesuanic circumstances of the saying and meaning of all the related sayings can be judged not to contain such an element that is explained as a Jewish Christian reaction against Gentle Christian tendencies.

Finally, one other way of controlling the plausibility of the result of this research is to search other Jesus traditions for parallel thoughts. From the outset it must be acknowledged that it is hard to find a similar connection between the two motif of hardening and remnant in other traditions. In this sense, the present case may be too unique a phenomenon in the Jesus traditions. If this connection is dissolved into two elements, i.e., Jesus' comment on the division of the people using a hardening motif and his teaching on the establishment of a steadfast relationship with "the word" as the condition of the membership of the true and ultimate remnant, however, it is not impossible to find parallel thoughts in the Jesus traditions. For example, with regard to Jesus' comment on the division of the people, Matt 11:25/Luk 10:21 relates the divine decision of to whom revelation belongs and to whom it is denied.

As far as Jesus' teaching on the steadfast relationship with "the word" and the remnant is concerned, though not in connection with remnant motif, in Matt 7:24-27/Luk

---

[323] See Theißen – Winter 2002:173, 179-180 (emphasis mine).

6:47-49, he compares the person who hears and does his words with a wise man who built the house on the rock and the person who hears but does not do them with a foolish man who built on sand. In Luk 11:20 Jesus says that those who hear and keep "God's word" are blessed.[324] In Joh 15 Jesus compares his disciples with the branches of the vine and God with vinedresser, who "prunes (καθαίρω)" every fruit-bearing branch, so that it might bear more fruit. In v. 3 Jesus says that the disciples have already been "cleansed (καθαρός)" by his word. In the same Gospel Jesus emphasizes the abidance and keeping of his word, so that such abidance and keeping is paralleled with the abidance in him and his love (e.g., 14:23; cf., 15:7 in which τὸ ῥῆμα is used instead of ὁ λόγος; 15:10 in which ἡ ἐντολή is used). With regard to the remnant motif, it is possible to consider the parables of the good seeds and weeds (Matt 13:24-30; the explanation of the parable in 13:36-43) and of the net and fish (Matt 13:47-50) to be the saying which expresses such a motif. In the apocalyptic chapter in Mark 13, Jesus repeatedly expresses his concern for "the elect" (τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς) in the end of the time. Since a Jesuanic meaning of these traditions has not been sought for or the Jesuanic context for them not been reconstructed in this research, these are too raw material to be used to demonstrate coherence with the reconstructed circumstances of the saying in Mark 4:11-12 and the reconstructed meaning of all the related sayings. Therefore, they are referred to only as possible parallel thoughts for future examination.[325]

---

[324] In Luk 8:21 Jesus says that those who hear and do "God's word" are his mother and brother. However, this saying can be judged to be a Lukan redaction of Mark 3:34-35.

[325] If in the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism, the metaphor of sowing seed stood for God's sowing the people of Israel, how can the two 'seed' parables, i.e., the parable of the automatically growing seed and that of the muster seed be interpreted in light of it? These can be significant candidates for the cases of remnant motif.

5. Conclusions and Applications

In this final chapter, a summary of the findings of this research are offered, together with some conclusions.

This research sets out to prove the possibility of the Jesuanic meaning of the saying in Mark 4:11-12. To solve it, a reconstruction of the historical context in view of which a plausible, Jesuanic meaning of the saying is sought for, termed "the Jesuanic context", was first attempted. It should be noted that because the correlation between the reconstructed context and Jesus is assumed, 'Jesuanic meaning' is taken to mean no more than the meaning of the saying, as if it were uttered by Jesus. It is thus hypothetical in intention. In the reconstruction of the Jesuanic context, this research takes the presupposition that the meaning and the function which Isa 6:9-10 had in Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism represent an important aspect of the overall context for the saying in question.

In the second chapter, a reconstruction of the meaning and the function of that Isaianic passage in terms of the entire context of the book of Isaiah were presented. The reason for taking the entire context into account is that the meaning and the function which an Isaianic tradition had in Second Temple Judaism, where the whole book is formed, is of great relevance to the purpose of this research. The two motifs of hardening and remnant were found to display a functional connectedness in the whole book of Isaiah, particularly in Isa 6:9-13 in a condensed way, and this connectedness was found to consist of two aspects: firstly, that God sets to hardening with a view of forming a holy remnant through his purifying operation; and secondly that as a result of the purifying operation, a holy remnant liberated from hardening emerges. In this research, such a functional connectedness is termed "the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant". In comparison with other OT books which contain the motifs of hardening/obduracy and remnant, the functional connectedness between the two motifs was found to be quite unique to Isaiah.

In the third chapter various types of early Jewish writings were examined in order to examine whether and how the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant was operative in Second Temple Judaism. Firstly, this research demonstrates that the form of the Qumran

transcription of Isaiah is capable of conveying the Isaianic idea, while the LXX translation is not. Thus, the Isaianic idea could have been conveyed to the readers of the whole book of Isaiah in the Second Temple, Palestine Judaism much better than in a dominantly Hellenistic Jewish context. With regard to other Jewish writings from the Second Temple period in Palestine, several writings, written by the readers of Isaiah, were also found to indicate the influence of the Isaianic idea. In them, the two motifs of hardening/obduracy and remnant appear in a way parallel to the second aspect of the functional connectedness between the two motifs. In Enoch's Dream-Visions it is evident that there is a parallelism with the first aspect of the functional connectedness. However, because all the other writings lack this aspect, it cannot be proved that the people's obdurate condition mentioned or presupposed in the writings comes from divine hardening, although some authors might have been conscious of the matter. Nonetheless, when taking into consideration the capability of the Isaianic text form current in Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism, the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant should be reckoned as one aspect of the ideological background at that time. It should also be noted that this is also the Jesuanic context for the saying in Mark 4:11-12. It was demonstrated that the present form of TgIsa 6:9-13 reflects the Aramaic tradition of the Isaianic passage at the time of Jesus.

In the fourth chapter, the possibility of the relationship between the saying in Mark 4:11-12 and the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant was examined. Because the saying represents the motif of hardening, the possibility of remnant motif - in the immediate context of the saying, i.e., the parable of the sower (*PS*) - was first elucidated. This research demonstrates that in the unity of *PS* and the explanation of the parable of the sower (Explanation), by means of incorporating the metaphor of seed for "the word" into the Jewish traditional metaphor for remnant, Jesus taught that the steadfast relationship with "the word" is the condition of membership of the true and ultimate remnant of Israel. Because of the unintelligible nature of *PS*, there is no reason to judge the term παραβολή in the phrase "ἐν παραβολαῖς" in Mark 4:11 as conceptually separable from Jesus' parabolic teaching. Therefore, it can be acknowledged that the saying and the unity of *PS* and Explanation could originally have been connected to each

other. In this connection, "the kingdom of God" in Mark 4:11 could have pointed to the true and ultimate remnant of Israel.

With regard to the question of the relationship between the saying and the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, the examination demonstrated that the Jesuanic connection of *PS* – the saying – Explanation bears a relationship with the Isaianic idea both on formal grounds (i.e., the citation from the actual Isaianic passage) and the thematic one (i.e., the actual connection between the remnant motif and the Isaianic idea of divine hardening). Nonetheless, the principal purpose of Jesus' parabolic teaching was not to make a certain people hardened, but rather to lead the hearers of the teaching into a relationship with the true and ultimate remnant. Faced with the negative effect of the teaching (i.e., that some people did not come to Jesus/left him after the teaching), however, Jesus characterized his parabolic teaching as having the function of hardening with respect to those who turned their back on him. Thus, it is clear that there is a combination of the two aspects of the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant in Jesus' perspective. This perspective was parallel to the servant/the loyal servants of the book of Isaiah, as his concern was to liberate his Jewish audience from hardening and lead them into a relationship with the true and ultimate remnant of Israel. At the same time, it was also parallel to that of the prophet Isaiah who was assigned the hardening task by God with a view to forming the holy remnant. This research also demonstrates that the two exhortations of hearing and seeing which sandwich *PS* (i.e., Mark 4:3a-bα, 9) and another saying about the significance of *PS* to understanding the other parables (4:13) may also belong to the Jesuanic connection of the saying and the unity of *PS* and Explanation.

Elucidation of the meaning of the saying in the Marcan context was then offered. Even though the saying speaks of the hardening function of parables, as in the Jesuanic context, there is a fundamental difference between the Jesuanic and Marcan meanings of the saying. Firstly, in the double metaphor of seed, the metaphor of the seed for remnant is lost in the Marcan unity of *PS* and Explanation, so that the unity no longer deals with the formation of the true and ultimate remnant of Israel but rather the early Christian teaching on true discipleship. Secondly, corresponding to the change from challenging the Jewish remnant motif to redefinition into the teaching on true discipleship, the function of the unity is changed from being descriptive into a more exhortative one.

Thirdly, as a consequence, the saying no longer has anything to do with the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant in the Marcan context. The reconstructed, Jesuanic circumstances of the saying (i.e., *PS* told as the last parable of the public parabolic teaching and sandwiched by the exhortations of hearing and seeing - the dividing of the crowd into two groups followed by Jesus' private teaching - the saying about the effect and function of parables - the saying about the significance of *PS* to understanding the other parables - Explanation) seems almost identical with the present Mark 4:2-20; however, because of the divergence of the meanings between the Jesuanic and Marcan contexts, a development line can be perceived between them. It was also demonstrated that the other NT texts which contain the two motifs of hardening/obduracy and remnant (Rom 9-11) and the very citation from Isa 6:9-10 (Acts 28:24-28; Joh 9:39; 12:40) could have belonged to a different line of tradition development than that of the saying in Mark 4:11-12. With regard to the question of the possibility that the reconstructed Jesuanic circumstances of the saying and the reconstructed meaning of all the related sayings being from Jewish Christianity in Palestine, this research can say little more than that the Jewish Christian stage of the tradition can be judged as a step forward after the Jesuanic stage within the development line of tradition rather than being the starting point of that line.

Concerning the Jesuanic circumstances of the saying and the meaning of all the related sayings, the findings of this research are based on the presupposition that the meaning and the function which Isa 6:9-10 had in the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism represent an important aspect of the overall context for the saying. If, however, a different meaning and function of the Isaianic tradition were to be elicited, for example, by enlarging the materials covered (e.g., the Jewish writings written at the time of the formation of the last part of Isaiah and directly after 70 CE, or the interpretation of related OT books in the Second Temple period), it would inevitably require a revision of the findings of this research. Additionally, the possibility of another presupposition relating to the reconstruction of the Jesuanic context may also be considered. The presupposition of this research focuses on the issue of the interpretation of the Isaianic tradition, and thus the reconstructed context cannot represent the overall context for the saying but only one aspect of it. If the Jesuanic context were to be reconstructed by

focusing on some other aspect, e.g., an aspect which is dealt with from a sociological or cultural- or economic-historical point of view, it is possible that Jesus' saying in Mark 4:11-12 would gain a different Jesuanic context in view of which a different plausible, Jesuanic meaning of it could be sought for. In this way, the reconstruction of the Jesuanic context for the saying and of the meaning itself as put forward by this research is only a small contribution to the whole project of reconstruction.[1]

It is not appropriate to set out to argue against the Jesuanic meaning of the saying without wrestling with the question of the Jesuanic context. The route to total rejection of the Jesuanic meaning is, actually, an incredibly long one. Under these circumstances, it is somewhat surprising that so few scholars have concerned themselves with this matter. Moreover, even though several have done so, they have not reconstructed the Jesuanic context appropriately. The main reason for this is that they have failed to deal with the meaning and the function of the Isaianic tradition from the point of view of Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism; or even if they have attempted to do so, insufficient attention has been paid to the entire context of the book of Isaiah which is permeated with that point of view. In this sense, this research can be considered to be a relevant, though small, contribution to the solution of this long and much debated problem.

The solutions put forward by this research can be also controlled by the sub-criteria of Theißen's – Winter's "criterion of historical plausibility". As far as the first sub-criterion, i.e., "criterion of Jewish contextual plausibility", is concerned, the reconstruction of the Jesuanic meaning of the saying meets the requirement that "what Jesus intended and said must be compatible with the Judaism of the first half of the first century in Galilee ('contextual appropriateness')" because the saying in connection with *PS* and Explanation bears relationship with the Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, which is an important aspect of the ideological background of the Second Temple Judaism in Palestine. In addition this research demonstrates that Jesus' perspective was influenced by the whole book of Isaiah with respect to the motifs of hardening and

---

[1] As a recent example of the focusing on the sociological and economic-historical aspect of the Jesuanic context of a Jesus tradition, Kloppenborg's study of Jesus' parable of the vineyard tenants in Mark 12:1-12 can be referred to. For him it is unnecessary to focus on the Second Temple, Palestinian interpretation of an Isaianic tradition, i.e., Isa 5:1-7 to which the Marcan form of the parable alludes. The reason for this is that as the result of his examination of the Marcan text, the MT and the LXX texts, he judges the Isaianic allusion to have originated from the early Church. See Kloppenborg 2006, especially about his examination of the three texts, see Kloppenborg 2006:149-172.

remnant, that is, he assumed the role of the servant/the loyal servants of the latter part of the book as well as that of the prophet Isaiah. With regard to the requirement that "what Jesus intended and did must be recognizable as that of an individual figure within the framework of the Judaism of that time ('contextual distinctiveness')", Jesus' teaching, which challenged the Jewish traditional remnant motif to redefinition by using the double metaphor of seed, can be reckoned as such "contextual distinctiveness".

As far as the second sub-criterion, i.e., "criterion of the plausibility of effects of Jesus in early Christianity", is concerned, the discussion on the early Christian idea of hardening and remnant proves that the reconstruction offered here meets the requirement that within the Jesus tradition there are those elements which "contrast with the interest of early Church sources ('resistance to tendencies of the tradition')". On the other hand, with regard to the other requirement of this sub-category, i.e., within the Jesus tradition, there exists "the coherence of enduring features that persisted despite the variety of tendencies at work within pluralistic early Church ('source coherence')", it must be acknowledged that it is hard to find such a connection between the motif of hardening and remnant as reconstructed here in other Jesus traditions. However, if this connection is divided into two elements, i.e., the unity of *PS* and Explanation and Jesus' saying as a comment on the dividing of people, it is possible to find parallel thoughts with them. Of course, with regard to those parallel thoughts, the possibility of the Jesuanic meaning must be examined as a future task. Thus, even though this research cannot meet this last requirement satisfactorily, generally speaking, its reconstruction does demonstrate rather good plausibility in terms of the criterion of historical plausibility.

Finally, the significance of this research and its implications to the study of the historical Jesus, the Gospel of Mark and the NT study in general can also be mentioned.

This research demonstrates how Jesus' perspective was affected by the whole book of Isaiah with respect to the motifs of hardening and remnant. This is not surprising, when one considers that Jesus was part of a culture where the ancient way of reading the Scripture as "an integrated whole with interconnected parts" was prevalent. Such being the case, in order to seek for a plausible, Jesuanic meaning of one Jesus tradition related to another Isaianic tradition, the latter should first be contextualized by the entire context

of the book of Isaiah and also by the context of Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism. The fact that Jesus' perspective was affected by the whole book of Isaiah could also sustain the view that Jesus is an apocalyptic figure, because the Isaianic traditions were conditioned to an apocalyptic way of thinking in the final stage of the formation of the book of Isaiah.

Apart from Jesus' relationship with the book of Isaiah, the results of this research, according to which Jesus set the establishment of a steadfast relationship with "the word" as the condition of membership of the holy remnant of Israel, are at odds with the results of the Jesus research which states that he accepted human beings on an unconditional basis, as for example, E.P. Sanders puts forth.[2] However, other types of result are also possible, for example that Jesus required a change, e.g., repentance, on the side of the human beings. These results are represented by D.C. Allison, Jr and G. Theißen – A. Merz among others.[3] With regard to the two viewpoints, vying with each other in the question concerning Jesus' view on ethics and salvation, the results of this research add weight to the latter.

A new perspective in the specific area of the Jesus research, namely, the parables of Jesus, opened by this research, can also be mentioned. Jeremias believes that if one understands the Jewish context in which Jesus told his parables, one can also understand how his parables were comprehensible to his contemporaries; and therefore he concludes that Jesus' explanations of parables should be judged to be the early Church's product as a result of the allegorizing tendency of parables. This research, simply through understanding the Jewish context, demonstrates that there is also a case to be made that a parable is an unintelligible saying in that same context, and therefore, Jesus' hearers needed to hear the explanation of the parable. Current scholars tend to approach Jesus' parables and their explanations free from the view of a generic and categorical dichotomy of parable and allegory. This tendency, together with the attempt to reconstruct the historical context, has helped to open up new possibilities for the study of the parables of Jesus.

---

[2] Sanders 1985: especially 174-211.
[3] Allison, Jr 1987:57-78; Theißen – Merz 1996: especially 242-243, 335-337.

As far as the study of the Gospel of Mark is concerned, firstly, as this research's reconstruction of the Marcan meaning of Mark 4:11-12 and 4:21-22 demonstrates, it agrees with that scholarly tendency which decreases the significance of *Messiasgeheimnis* as the central motif of the Gospel of Mark. Secondly by means of the reconstruction of the Marcan meaning of the whole parable section (Mark 4:1-34), the teaching on true discipleship emerges as an important theme instead. In this sense this research agrees with the scholarly view that the Gospel of Mark was written for a "Christian audience only".[4] Thirdly, the reconstruction may pose a troublesome problem from a tradition-critical point of view. Since scholars are accustomed to the view that only the saying in Mark 4:11-12 was transmitted independently, the whole context corresponding to Mark 4:3-20 may, in their eyes, be too long a unity for the transmission of tradition. For example, M. Dibelius denies the existence of the pre-Marcan collection of parables as a prototype of the present parable section, because it was too extensive for the oral transmission.[5] If and only if human capacity can be demonstrated to be so limited that the oral transmission of this length of tradition is not possible, another possibility to sustain the transmission of this long tradition can be found in the assumption that there might have been fewer phases and tradents between Jesus and the Evangelist than scholars have usually assumed; thus the Evangelist could have received the tradition even directly from the eyewitness of Jesus' public parabolic teaching in question. It has been impossible to discuss the historicity of Papias tradition within the constraints of the limits this research. Whether it is possible that the eyewitness told the Evangelist about that particular teaching of Jesus and this telling was subsequently rewritten, i.e., that Peter told Mark and his telling was also made to cover the whole Gospel might be a subject for future research.[6]

---

[4] Beavis says that this view is the "critical consensus" of scholars. On her part, she puts forth a counter-thesis that the Gospel was written for the purpose of missionary teaching. See Beavis 1989: particularly 175-176.
[5] Gnilka 1961:53-54 citing Dibelius 1933:229-237.
[6] Those scholars who take Papias tradition into consideration in their argumentation concerning the origin of the Gospel of Mark, include Hengel and Gundry. See Gundry 1991:1026-1049; Hengel 1985:1-58. In his study of 2005, Kloppenborg presents a detailed grouping list of the scholarly views on the date of the Gospel. On the ground that Mark 13:2 has to do with the Roman siege practice of *evocatio deorum*, he judges the date to be post 70 CE. See Kloppenborg 2005:419-450 (also note 1-5).

Finally, this research indicates some new, possible areas of research which are significant to the study of the New Testament. That is, the research does not clarify whether or not the LXX Isaiah has its own way of connecting the two motifs of hardening and remnant with each other and, if so, what the connectedness is like, how it differs from the Hebrew Isaianic idea of hardening and remnant, or why such a difference has occurred. Answering these questions would require analysis of the whole LXX Isaiah. It would be, however, interesting to examine whether and how the LXX idea concerning the two motifs influenced Hellenistic Judaism and Christianity. Such an examination could even be relevant in demonstrating how the motifs of hardening and remnant which are exhibited by Paul, (Rom 9-11; cf., Acts 28:24-28), Luke (Acts 28:24-28) and John (Joh 9:39; 12:40), represent a 'different development line of tradition' and how the Hebrew and Greek lines developed in relation to each other in early Christianity.

Bibliography

A. Texts

A.1. Biblical texts

A.1.1. Hebrew

  (1) Biblia Hebraica
    1997   *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Fünfte, verbesserte Auflage; eds. K. Elliger – W. Rudolph). Stuttgart.

  (2) 1QIsa^a
    1999   *The Great Isaiah Scroll (IQIsa^a). A New Edition* (eds. D.W. Parry – E. Qimron). Leiden – Boston – Köln.

A.1.2. Greek

  (1) Novum Testamentum Graece
    1996   *Novum Testamentum Graece* (27. revidierte Auflage; eds. B. Aland – K. Aland – J. Karavidopoulos – C.M. Martini – B.M. Metzger). Stuttgart.

  (2) Septuagint Isaiah
    1967   *Isaias. Vetus Testamentum Graeum. Auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Gottingensis editum* (ed. J. Ziegler). Göttingen.

A.1.3. Aramaic

  (1) Isaiah Targum
    1962   *The Bible in Aramaic based on old manuscripts and printed texts. Vol. III the latter prophets according to Targum Jonathan* (ed. A. Sperber). Leiden.

A.1.4. English translation

  (1) NRSV
    1989   *The Holy Bible. Containing the Old and New Testament and the Deuterocanonical Books. New Revised Standard Version.* Peabody.

  (2) RSV

1971   *The Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version* (second edition). New York.

(3) Biblical texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls

1999   *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible. The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English* (eds. Abegg, Jr., M. – Flint, P. – Ulrich, E.). New York.

(4) Isaiah Targum

1987   *The Isaiah Targum, Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes. The Aramaic Bible. Vol. II* (ed. B. Chilton). Wilmington.

A.2. Old Testament Pseudepigrapha

A.2.1. General, English translation

(1) Charles, R.H.

1913   *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. With introductions and critical and explanatory notes to the several books. Vol. II. Pseudepigrapha* (ed. R.H. Charles). Oxford.

(2) Charlesworth, J.H.

1983   *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Vol. I. Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth). Leiden – New York – Köln.

1985   *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Vol. 2. Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost of Judeo-Hellenistic Works* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth). London.

A.2.2. Specific writing: 1 Enoch

(1) Aramaic (fragments of Qumran)

1976   *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic fragments of Qumran cave 4* (ed. J.T. Milik; with the collaboration of M. Black). Oxford.

(2) Greek (fragments)

1970   *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece* (ed. M. Black). Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum Quae Supersunt Graeca.

(3) English translation (except Charles and Charlesworth)

Black, M.

1985   *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch. A New English Edition with commentary and textual notes*. Leiden.

Knibb, M.A.
 1978   *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch. A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*. Oxford.

Nickelsburg, G.W.E. – VanderKam, J.C.
 2004   *1 Enoch. A New Translation. Based on the Hermeneia Commentary*. Minneapolis.

A.3. Qumran sectarian texts

A.3.1. Texts with English translation

(1) Charlesworth, J.H.
 1994   *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 1. Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth). Tübingen – Louisville.
 1995   *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 2. Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth). Tübingen – Louisville.

(2) Martínez, F.G. – Tigchelaar, E.J.C.
 1997   *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition. Vol. 1 (1Q1 – 4Q273)* (eds. Martínez, F.G. – Tigchelaar, E.J.C.). Leiden – Boston – Köln.
 1998   *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition. Vol. 2 (4Q274 – 11Q31)* (eds. Martínez, F.G. – Tigchelaar, E.J.C.). Leiden – Boston – Köln.

A.3.2. English translation

Vermes, G.
 1995   *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (revised and extended fourth edition). London, New York, etc.

A.4. Nag Hammadi Codex: Gospel of Thomas

Text with English translation

Layton, B. (ed.) – Lambdin, T.O. (trans.)
 1989   Tractate 2. The Gospel according to Thomas. *Nag Hammadi Codex II,2-7 together with XIII,2*, Brit. Lib. Or.4926 (1), and P. Oxy. 1, 654, 655. Vol. 1.* (ed. B. Layton). Leiden – New York, etc.

B. Literature

Abegg, Jr., M. – Flint, P. – Ulrich, E.
1999   *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible. The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English*. New York.
Ackroyd, P.
1987   *Studies in the Religious Tradition of the Old Testament*. London.
Allison, Jr., D.C.
1987   "Jesus and the Covenant: a Response to E.P. Sanders", *JSNT* 29, 57-78.
Anderson, H.
1994   *The Gospel of Mark*. NCB Commentary (reprinted). Grand Rapids.
Baird, J.A.
1957   "A Pragmatic Approach to Parable Exegesis: Some New Evidence on Mark 4:11, 33-34", *JBL* 76, 201-207.
Beavis, M.A.
1989   *Mark's Audience. The Literary and Social Setting of Mark 4.11-12*. JSNTSup 33. Sheffield.
Black, M.
1967   *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (3rd ed. With an Appendix on The Son of Man). Oxford.
1985   *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch. A New English Edition with commentary and textual notes*. Leiden.
Blenkinsopp, J.
1989   *Ezra-Nehemiah: a commentary*. OTL. London.
1997   "The Servant and the Servants in Isaiah and the Formation of the Book", *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah. Studies of an Interpretive Tradition. Vol. 1* (eds. C.C. Broyles – C.A. Evans). Leiden – New York – Köln, 155-176.
2000   *Isaiah 1-39. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB, vol. 19. New York, London, etc.
2002   *Isaiah 40-55. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB, vol. 19A. New York, London, etc.
2003   *Isaiah 56-66. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB, vol. 19B. New York, London, etc.
2006   *Opening the Sealed Book. Interpretations of the Book of Isaiah in Late Antiquity*. Grand Rapids – Cambridge.
Blomberg, C.L.
1990   *Interpreting the Parables*. Downers Grove.
Blomqvist, J. – Jastrup, P.O.
1996   *Grekisk Grammatik*. Århus.
Bornkamm, G.
1995   "μυστήριον, "μυέω", *TDNT* Vol. IV (reprinted), 802-828.
Boucher, M.I.
1981   *The Parables*. Wilmington.
Bowker, J.W.

1974	"Mystery and Parable: Mark 4:1-20", *JTS* 25, 300-317.

Brooke, G.J.
2006   "On Isaiah at Qumran", *"As Those Who Are Taught" The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL* (eds. C.M. McGinnis – P.K. Tull). SBL Symposium Series, no. 27. Atlanta, 69-85.

Brown, R.E.
1962/63   "Parable and Allegory Reconsidered", *NovT* 5-6, 36-45.
1968   *The Semitic Background of the Term "Mystery" in the New Testament.* FBBS 21. Philadelphia.
1970   *The Gospel according to John: introduction, translation, and notes. [1] I-XII.* AB Vol. 29. Garden City.

Brown, S.
1973   "'The Secret of the Kingdom of God' (Mark 4:11)", *JBL* 92, 60-74.

Brownlee, W.H.
1964   *The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible. With Special Attention to the Book of Isaiah.* New York.

Bryan, S.M.
2002   *Jesus and Israel's Traditions of Judgement and Restoration.* SNTSMS. Cambridge.

Bultmann, R.
1931   *Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition* (Zweite neubearbeitete Auflage). Göttingen.
1975   "Die Interpretation von Mk 4,3-9 seit Jülicher", *Jesus und Paulus. Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70. Geburtstag* (eds. E.E. Ellis – E. Gräßer). Göttingen.

Caragounis, C.C.
1992   "Kingdom of God/Kingdom of Heaven", *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (eds. J.B. Green – S. McKnight – I.H. Marshall). Downers Grove, 417-430.

Carr, E.H.
1990   What is History? (2nd ed., reprinted in Penguin Books) London, etc.

Charles, R.H.
1913   "Book of Enoch", *APOT Vol. II. Pseudepigrapha*. Oxford, 163-281.

Charlesworth, J.H.
1993   "In the Crucible: The Pseudepigrapha as Biblical Interpretation", *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (eds. J.H. Charlesworth – C.A. Evans). JSP Supplement Series 14. Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 2. Sheffield, 20-43.

Chilton, B.
1982   *The Glory of Israel. The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum.* JSOTSup 23. Sheffield.
1984   *A Galilean Rabbi and his Bible. Jesus' own Interpretation of Isaiah.* London.
1987   *The Isaiah Targum. Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes.* The Aramaic Bible Vol. II. Wilmington.

1997   "The Temple in the Isaiah Targum", *Jesus in Context. Temple, Purity, and Restoration* (eds. B. Chilton – C.A. Evans). Leiden – New York – Köln, 251-262.

Chilton, B. – Evans, C.A.
1994   "Jesus and Israel's Scriptures", *Studying the Historical Jesus. Evaluations of the state of current research* (eds. B. Chilton – C.A. Evans). Leiden – New York – Köln, 281-335.

Collins, J.J.
1983   "Sibylline Oracles. (Second Century B.C. – Seventh Century A.D) A New Translation and Introduction", *OTP. Vol. 1. Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments.* New York, 317-472.
1993   *Daniel: a Commentary on the Book of Daniel.* Hermeneia, a critical and historical commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis.
1998   *The Apocalyptic Imagination. An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (2nd ed.). Grand Rapids – Cambridge.

Craigie, P.C.
1983   *Psalms 1-50.* WBC Vol. 19 (general eds. D.A. Hubbard – G.W. Barker – P.C. Craigie). Waco.

Cranfield, C.E.B.
1951   "St. Mark 4.1-34", *SJT* 4, 398-414.
1952   "St. Mark 4.1-34", *SJT* 5, 49-66.

Crenshaw, J.L.
1995   *Joel: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* AB, vol. 24C. New York, London, etc.

Crossan, J.D.
1973   "The Seed Parables of Jesus", *JBL* 92, 244-266.

Dahood, M.
1966   *Psalms: introduction, translation, and notes, 1, 1-50.* AB Vol. 16. Garden City.

Dautzenberg, G.
1990   "Mk 4,1-34 als Belehrung über das Reich Gottes. Beobachtungen zum Gleichniskapitel", *BZ* 34, 38-62.

Dibelius, M.
1933   *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (Zweite neubearbeitete Auflage). Tübingen.

Dodd, C.H.
1961   *The Parables of the Kindgom* (revised edition). New York.

Dronsch, K.
2007   "Vom Fruchtbringen (Sämann mit Deutung) – Mk 4,3-9. (10-12.) 13-20", *Kompendium der Gleichnisse Jesu* (ed. R. Zimmermann). München, 297-312.

Drury, J.
1973   "The Sower, the vineyard, and the place of allegory in the interpretation of Mark's parables", *JTS* 24, 367-379.

Duling, D.C.
1992   "Kingdom of God, Kingdom of Heaven", *ABD* Vol. 4. New York, 48-69.

Dunn, J.D.G.
2003   *Jesus Remembered*. Christianity in the Making, vol. 1. Grand Rapids –
            Cambridge.
Enroth-Voitila, A-M.
2004   *"Whoever Has Ears, Let Him Hear" The Hearing Formula in Early
            Christian Writings*. Helsinki.
Evans, C.A.
1981   "A Note on the Function of Isaiah vi, 9-10 in Mark iv", *RB* 88, 234-235.
1985   "On the Isaianic Background of the Sower Parable", *CBQ* 47, 464-468.
1989   *To See and Not Perceive. Isaiah 6.9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian
            Interpretation*. JSOTSup 64. Sheffield.
1997   "Aspects of Exile and Restoration in the Proclamation of Jesus and the
            Gospels", *Jesus in Context. Temple, Purity, and Restoration (*eds. B.
            Chilton – C.A. Evans). Leiden – New York – Köln, 263-293.
Fitzmyer, J.A.
1981   *The Gospel according to Luke (I-IX): introduction, translation, and notes*.
            AB Vol. 28. Garden City.
Flint, P.W.
1997   "The Isaiah Scrolls From the Judean Desert", *Writing and Reading the
            Scroll of Isaiah. Studies of an Interpretive Tradition. Vol. 2* (eds. C.C.
            Broyles – C.A. Evans). Leiden – New York – Kölin, 481-489.
Flusser, D.
1981   *Die rabbinischen Gleichnisse und der Gleichniserzähler Jesus. 1. Teil.
            Das Wesen der Gleichnisse*. Judaica et Christiana. Band 4. Bern –
            Frankfurt am Main, etc.
Garnet, P.
1983   "The Parable of the Sower: How the Multitudes Understand it", *Spirit
            within Structure. Essays in Honor of George Johnston on the Occasion of
            His Seventieth Birthday (ed. E.J. Furcha). PTMS* 3. Allison Park, 39-54.
Gelson, A.
1997   "Was the Peshitta of Isaiah of Christian Origin?", *Writing and Reading the
            Scroll of Isaiah. Studies of an Interpretive Tradition. Vol. 2* (eds. C.C.
            Broyles – C.A. Evans). Leiden – New York – Kölin, 563-582.
Gerhardsson, B.
1967/68   "The Parable of the Sower and its Interpretation", *NTS* 14, 165-193.
Gnilka, J.
1961   *Die Verstockung Israels. Isaias 6,9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker*.
            SANT Band III. München.
1978   *Das Evangelium nach Markus. 1. Teilband. Mk 1-8,26*. EKKNT. Zürich.
Goulder, M.D.
1991   "Those Outside (Mk. 4:10-12)", *NovT* 33, 289-302.
Greenberg, M.
1981   *Ezekiel 1-20. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB
            Vol. 22. Garden City.
Grundmann, W.
1989   *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. THKNT. Berlin.

Guelich, R.
1989   *Mark 1-8:26*. WBC. Dallas.
Gundry, R.H.
1993   *Mark: a commentary on his apology for the cross*. Grand Rapids.
Halpern-Amaru, B.
1997   "Exile and Return in Jubilees", *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish and Christian Conceptions* (ed. J.M. Scott). Leiden – New York – Köln, 127-144.
Hasel, G.F.
1974   *The Remnant. The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah*. Andrew University Monographs Studies in Religion, vol. V. Berrien Springs.
Haufe, G.
1972   "Erwägungen zum Ursprung der sogenannten Parabeltheorie Markus 4,11-12", *EvT* 32, 413-421.
Hausmann, J.
1987   *Israels Rest. Studien zum Selbstverständnis der nachexilischen Gemeinde*. BWANT Siebente Folge. Stuttgart, etc.
Hengel, M.
1974   *Judaism and Hellenism. Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period. Volume One Text. Volume Two Notes & Bibliography*. London.
1985   *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*. Philadelphia.
Hesse, F.
1955   *Das Verstockungsproblem im Alten Testament*. BZAW 74. Berlin.
Holmén, T.
1999   "Doubts about Double Dissimilarity. Restructuring the Main Criterion of Jesus-of-History Research", *Authenticating the Words and Activities of Jesus. Vol. I (*eds. B. Chilton – C.A. Evans). Leidein – Boston – Köln, 47-80.
2001   *Jesus and Jewish Covenant Thinking*. Leiden – Boston – Köln.
Hooker, M.D.
2000   "Mark's Parables of the Kingdom (Mark 4:1-34)", *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables* (ed. R.N. Longenecker). Grand Rapids – Cambridge, 79-101.
Hultgren, A.J.
2000   *The Parables of Jesus. A Commentary*. Grand Rapids – Cambridge.
Isaac, E.
1983   "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch. (Second Century B.C. – First Century A.D.) A New Translation and Introduction", *OTP. Vol. 1. Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. New York, 5-89.
Jastrow, M.
1972   *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the midrashic literature. Vol. II (*printed in Israel).
Jeremias, J.
1947   *Die Gleichnisse Jesu*. Zürich.

1952	*Die Gleichnisse Jesu* (2. völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage) Göttingen.
1966	”Palästinakundliches zum Gleichnis vom Säemann (Mark IV. 3-8 par.)”, *NTS* 25, 123-129.
1984	*Die Gleichnisse Jesu* (10. Auflage) Göttingen.

Jülicher, A.

1899	*Die Gleichnisreden Jesu. Erster Teil. Die Gleichnisreden Jesu im Allgemeinen (Zweite, neu bearbeitete Auflage). Zweiter Teil. Auslegung der Gleichnisreden der Drei Ersten Evangelien.* Leipzig – Tübingen.

Kirkland, J.R.

1977	”The Earliest Understanding of Jesus' Use of Parables: Mark IV 10-12 in Context”, *NovT*, Vol. XIX, 1-21.

Klauck, H-J.

1978	*Allegorie und Allegorese in Synoptischen Gleichnistexten.* NTAbh. Neue Folge Band 13. Münster.

Kloppenborg, J.

2005	“*Evokatio Deorum* and the Date of Mark”. *JBL* 124/3, 419-450.
2006	*The Tenants in the Vineyard. Ideology, Economics, and Agrarian Conflict in Jewish Palestine.* WUNT 195. Tübingen.

Knibb, M.A.

1978	*The Ethiopic Book of Enoch. A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments.* Oxford.
1997	“Isaianic Traditions in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha”, *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah. Studies of an Interpretive Tradition. Vol. 2* (eds. C.C. Broyles – C.A. Evans). Leiden – New York – Kölin, 633-650.

Knowles, M.P.

1995	“Abram and the Birds in *Jubilees* II: A Subtext for the Parable of the Sower?”, *NTS* 41, 145-151.

Koehler, L. – Baumgartner, W.

2001	*The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (subsequently revised by W. Baumgartner – J.J. Stamm; transl. and ed. under the supervision of M.E. Richardson; study edition). Leiden.

Kuhn, H-W.

1971	*Ältere Sammlungen im Markusevangelium.* SUNT Band 8. Göttingen.

Kutscher, E.Y.

1974	*The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsaᵃ).* Leiden.

Laato, A.

1998	*“About Zion I will not be silent” The Book of Isaiah as an Ideological Unity.* ConBOT Series 44. Stockholm.
2002	*Inledning till Gamla Testamentet.* Religionsvetenskapliga skrifter nr 54. Åbo.

Lane, W.

1982	*The Gospel according to Mark. The English text with introduction, exposition and notes* (reprinted). Grand Rapids.

Levin, C.

2003   *Fortschreibungen. Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament.* BZAW
                Band 316. Berlin – New York.

Liebenberg, J.

2001   *The Language of the Kingdom and Jesus. Parable, Aphorism, and
                Metaphor in the Sayings Material Common to the Synoptic Tradition and
                the Gospel of Thomas.* BZNW und die Kunde der älteren Kirche. Band
                102. Berlin – New York.

Linnemann, E.

1978   *Gleichnisse Jesu. Einführung und Auslegung.* 7. Auflage. Göttingen.

Lohfink, G.

1986   "Das Gleichnis vom Sämann (Mk 4,3.9)", *BZ 30*, 36-69.

Lohfink, N.

1963   *Das Hauptgebot. Eine Unterschung literarischer Einleitungsfragen zu Dtn
                5-11.* An Bib Investigationes scientificae in res biblicas 20. Rome.

Mann, C.S.

1986   *Mark. A new translation with introduction and commentary.* AB. New
                York, London, etc.

Manson, T.W.

1948   *The Teaching of Jesus. Studies of its Forms and Content.* Cambridge.

Marcus, J.

1984   "Mark 4:10-12 and Marcan Epistemology", *JBL* 103/4, 557-574.

2000   *Mark 1-8. A new translation with introduction and commentary.* AB. New
                York, London, etc.

Marxsen, W.

1955   "Redaktionsgeschichtliche Erklärung der sogenannten Parabeltheorie des
                Markus", *ZTK*, 255-271.

Mayes, A.D.H.

1981   *Deuteronomy: based on Revised Standard Version.* NCB Commentary.
                Grand Rapids – London.

Meier, J.P.

1994   *A Marginal Jew: rethinking the historical Jesus. Vol. 2, Mentor, message,
                and miracles.* AB reference library. New York, Toronto, Sydney, etc..

Melugin, R.

1976   *The Formation of Isaiah 40-55.* BZAW. Berlin – New York.

Meyers, C.L. – Meyers, E.M.

1993   *Zechariah 9-14: a new translation with introduction and commentary.* AB
                Vol. 25C. New York.

Milgrom, J.

2001   *Leviticus 23-27. A New Translation with Interpretation and Commentary.*
                AB. New York.

Milik, J.T.

1976   *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic fragments of Qumran cave 4* (ed. J.T.
                Milik; with the collaboration of M. Black). Oxford.

Miller, P.D.

1990   *Deuteronomy. Interpretation.* A Bible Commentary for Teachings and
                Preaching. Louisville.

Moule, C.F.D.
1969   "Mark 4:1-20 Yet Once More", *Neotestamentica et Semitica. Studies in honour of Matthew Black* (ed., E.E. Ellis). Edinburgh.
Myers, J.M.
1965   *Ezra, Nehemiah: introduction, translation, and notes.* AB Vol. 14. Garden City.
Nickelsburg, G.W.E.
1981   *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah. A Historical and Literary Introduction*. Philadelphia.
2001   *1 Enoch 1: a commentary on the book 1 Enoch, chapters 1-36, 81-108.* Hermeneia, a critical and historical commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis.
Nickelsburg, G.W.E. – Stone, M.E.
1983   *Faith and Piety in early Judaism: texts and documents.* Philadelphia.
Nickelsburg, G.W.E. – VanderKam, J.C.
2004   *1 Enoch. A New Translation. Based on the Hermeneia Commentary.* Minneapolis.
Patterson, S.J.
1993   *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus.* Foundations and facets: reference series. Sonoma.
Payne, P.B.
1978   "The Order of sowing and ploughing in the parable of the sower", *NTS* 25, 123-129.
1980   "The Seeming Inconsistency of the Interpretation of the Parable of the Sower", *NTS* 26, 564-568.
1983   "The Authenticity of the Parable of the Sower and its Interpretation", *Gospel Perspectives*. Vol. 3, studies of history and tradition in the four Gospels. Sheffield, 163-207.
Pesch, R.
1980   *Das Markusevangelium: Einleitung und Kommentar zu Kap. 1,1-8.26.* HTKNT Bd 2.1. Freiburg.
Priver, S.R.
1902   *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy.* ICC. Edinburgh.
Rad von, G.
1966   *Deuteronomy: a commentary* (translated by D. Barton). OTL. Philadelphia.
Rendtorff, R.
1989   "Jesaja 6 im Rahmen der Komposition des Jesajabuches", *The Book of Isaiah. Le Livre d'Isaïe. Les oracles et leurs relectures unite et complexité de l'ouvrage* (ed. J. Vermeylen). BETL 81. Leuven, 73-82.
Rosenthal, F.
1963   *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* (second revised printing). Wiesbaden.
Räisänen, H.
1972   *The Idea of Divine Hardening. A Comparative Study of the Notion of Divine Hardening, Leading Astray and Inciting to Evil in the Bible and the Qur'ān*. Finnish exegetical society 25. Helsinki.

1973   *Die Parabeltheorie im Markusevangelium*. Schriften der Finnischen Exegetischen Gesellschaft 26. Helsinki.

1976   *Das "Messiasgeheimnis" im Markusevangelium. Ein redaktionskritischer Versuch*. Schriften der Finnischen Exegetischen Gesellschaft 28. Helsinki.

Sabin, M.

1992   "Reading Mark 4 as Midrash", *JSNT* 45, 3-26.

Sanders, E.P.

1985   *Jesus and Judaism*. London.

Sawyer, J.

1964   "The Qumran Reading of Isaiah 6:13", *ASTI* 3, 111-113.

Scott, B.B.

1990   *Hear Then the Parable. A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus*. First paperback edition. Minneapolis.

Schweizer, E.

1989   *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. NTD Teilband 1. Göttingen – Zürich.

Seeligmann, I.L.

2004   *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies* (eds. R. Hanhart – H. Spieckermann). Forschungen zum Alten Testamen. Tübingen.

Segert, S.

1975   *Altaramäische Grammatik mit Bibliographie, Chrestomathie und Glossar*. Leipzig.

Sheppard, G.T.

1996   "The 'Scope' of Isaiah as a Book of Jewish and Christian Scriptures", *New Visions of Isaiah* (eds. R. Melugin – M.A. Sweeney). JSOTS 214. Sheffield.

Snodgrass, K.R.

1992   "Parable", *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (eds. J.B. Green – S. Mcknight – I.H. Marshall). Downers Grove, 591-601.

2008   *Stories with Intent. A Comprehensive Guide to the Parable of Jesus*. Grand Rapids – Cambridge.

Strack, H.L. – Billerbeck, P.

1922   *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament: aus Talmud und Midrasch. Erster (Doppel-)Band. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. München.

Suhl, A.

1965   *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium*. Gütersloh.

Taylor, V.

1955   *The Gospel according to St. Mark. The Greek text with introduction, notes, and indexes*. London.

Theißen, G. – Merz, A.

1996   *Der Historische Jesus. Ein Lehrbuch*. Göttingen.

Theißen, G. – Winter, D.

2002   *The Quest for the Plausible Jesus. The Question of Criteria.* (translated by M.E. Boring). Louisville- London.

Tov, E.

| 1997 | "The Text of Isaiah at Qumran", *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah. Studies of an Interpretive Tradition. Vol. 2* (eds. C.C. Broyles – C.A. Evans). Leiden – New York – Köln, 491-511. |
| 2001 | *The Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd revised ed.). Minneapolis. |

Tuckett, C.M.

| 1988 | "Mark's Concerns in the Parables Chapter (Mark 4,1-34)", *Bib* 69, 1-26. |

Ulrich, Z.

| 2000 | "Isaiah, Book of", *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. In chief, L. Schiffman – J. VanderKam). Vol. 1. Oxford, 384-388. |

VanderKam, J.C.

1984	*Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition.* CBQMS 16. Washington.
1993	"Biblical Interpretation in 1 Enoch and Jubilees", *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (eds. J.H. Charlesworth – C.A. Evans). JSP Supplement Series 14. Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 2. Sheffield, 96-125.
1995	*Enoch. A Man for All Generations.* Columbia.

VanderKam, J.C. – Flint, P.

| 2002 | *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus and Christianity.* New York. |

Weder, H.

| 1990 | *Die Gleichnisse Jesu als Metaphern. Traditions- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Analysen und Interpretationen* (Vierte, durchgesehene Auflage). Göttingen. |

Weeden, T.J.

| 1979 | "Recovering the Parabolic Intent in the Parable of the Sower", *JAAR* XLVII, 97-120. |

Westermann, C.

| 1990 | *The Parables of Jesus. In the Light of the Old Testament* (transl. and ed. by F.M. Golka – A.H.B. Logan). Minneapolis. |

White, K.D.

| 1965 | "The Parable of the Sower", *JTS* 15, 300-307. |

Williamson, H.G.M.

| 1985 | *Ezra. Nehemiah.* WBC. Vol. 16. Waco. |
| 1994 | *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah's Role in Composition and Redaction.* Oxford. |

Wrede, W.

| 1913 | *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien. Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Makusevangeliums* (Zweite unveränderte Aurlage). Göttingen. |

Wright, N.T.

| 1996 | *Jesus and the Victory of God. Christian origins and the question of God. Vol. Two.* Minneapolis. |

Zerbe, G.

| 1993 | "'Pacificism' and 'Passive Resistance' in Apocalyptic Writings: A Critical Evaluation", *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (eds. |

J.H. Charlesworth – C.A. Evans). JSP Supplement Series 14. Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 2. Sheffield, 65-95.

C. Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	D.N. Freedman, ed., Anchor Bible Dictionary
APOT	R.H. Charles, ed., Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament
ASTI	Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
Bib	Biblica
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZ	Biblische Zeitschrift
BZAW	Beihefte zur ZAW
BZNW	Beihefte zur ZNW
CB	Coniectanea Biblica
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Tetament
EvT	Evangelische Theologie
FBBS	Facet Books, Biblical Series
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
ICC	International Critical Commentary
JAAR	Journal of the American Academy of Religion
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JSNT	Journal for the Study of the New Testament
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSP	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
NCB	New Century Bible
NovT	Novum Testamentum
NTAbh	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
NTS	New Testament Studies
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTP	J.H. Charlesworth, ed., The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha
PTMS	Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series
RB	Revue biblique
SANT	Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
TDNT	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
THKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Tetament
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary

WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZTK	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche

One of the most enigmatic of Jesus' sayings is found in Mark 4:11-12. In citing Isa 6:9-10 Jesus seems to mean that he uses parables in order to hinder a certain people from understanding, even to the extent of preventing them from repenting and being forgiven by God. For more than a century the same questions have caught the attention of scholars: Did Jesus really utter this saying? Was it not composed by the early Church or by Mark? Did the saying – whether it originated from Jesus or from the Church – originally refer to the hardening function of parables?

In order to solve this problem, by means of examining the book of Isaiah and various Jewish writings, the author first seeks to elucidate what idea Isa 6:9-10 could have conveyed to an ancient reader of Isaiah in the context of the Second Temple, Palestinian Judaism. The author then goes on to demonstrate that, against such an ideological background, the unity of the parable of the sower (Mark 4:3-9) and its explanation (4:14-20) is the key to understanding the saying in question. Thus, the connection of the parable – the saying – the explanation is intelligible in the Palestinian Jewish context of Jesus' time. Therefore, it can be argued that the whole connection is *Jesuanic*, and not from the early Church or Mark. The author also clarifies the meaning of the saying in the Marcan context and compares it with the meaning in the Jesuanic context.

This study sheds light on that part of the dark history of the Jesus tradition to which scholars have not previously paid attention.