

Quotation of Isaiah 6:9-10 in Matthew 13:14-15

Chang-Wook Jung*

1. Introduction

Before quoting the full text of Isaiah 6:9-10 in Matthew 13:14-15, Matthew alludes to the Isaiah's text in v.13, virtually summarizing the text¹⁾:

13. διὰ τοῦτο ἐν παραβολαῖς αὐτοῖς λαλῶ, ὅτι βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες οὐκ ἀκούουσιν οὐδὲ συνίουσιν,

14. καὶ ἀναπληροῦται αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἡσαΐου ἢ λέγουσα· ἀκοῆ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνήτε, καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε.

15. ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὠσίν βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν, μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὠσίν ἀκούσωσιν καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.

13 For this, I speak to them in parables, because ‘though seeing they do not perceive, and though hearing they do not listen, nor do they understand.’

14 To them indeed is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah that says: ‘You will certainly listen, but never understand, and you will certainly see, but never perceive.

15 Because this people's heart has been calloused, thus their ears are hard of hearing, and they have shut their eyes; lest they should see with their eyes, and listen with their ears, and understand with their heart and turn—and I would heal them.’²⁾

* A Professor at Chongshin University, New Testament.

1) Concerning the quoted text of Isaiah 6:9-10, Craig A. Evans notes that the text “has played an interesting and extremely important role in the gospel tradition”. See his article “The Function of Isaiah 6:9-10 in Mark and John”, *NovT* 24:2 (1982), 137.

2) The English translation is my own translation reflecting the Greek text. In this paper, English translations of the Bible are my own work if there is no other indication.

Matthew's fulfillment quotation of Isaiah 6:9-10 in this passage betrays the following peculiar features different from the fulfillment quotation in other parts of the Gospel:³⁾ 1) The conjunction ἵνα (in order that), which clearly points to the fulfillment of the quoted Old Testament passage, is omitted both in vv. 14-15 and in v.13, which summarizes the content of the quotation in the following verses. Instead, another conjunction ὅτι (because) substitutes the conjunction in v. 13; 2) the introductory formula for the fulfillment quotation in vv. 14-15 also departs from the one frequently found in the Gospel as ἀναπλήρουνται and προφήτεια in v.14, *hapax legomena* in Matthew, are never used in other Matthean formula quotations; 3) the cited text in vv.14-15 is virtually the repetition of the previous verse (v.13), which indicates that its repetition in the text is a redundancy. The logic of the narrative flows more smoothly without vv. 14-15 and the antithetical parallelism between v.13 and v.16, in fact, is interrupted by these two verses;⁴⁾ 4) the fulfillment quotation is presented not as coming from Matthew's hands but from Jesus' mouth uniquely in this instance; 5) the quoted text accepts the LXX whereas Matthew quotes from the MT in other formula quotations.

These peculiar characteristics have generated much discussion: Why did the Matthean text deviate from the usual method for Matthew to quote the Old Testament for the fulfillment quotation? Some scholars claim that the peculiarities signify that vv.14-15 is a later interpolation or/and that Matthew relies on sources for this quotation.⁵⁾ Others argue that several of these features, especially the usage of the conjunction ὅτι in v.13 and the avoidance of the

3) Graham N. Stanton refutes that the quotation in Matthew 13:14-15 belongs to the fulfillment quotation. *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992), 349. Most scholars, however, regard the quotation as a fulfillment quotation (Hagner, Davies and Allison etc. For detailed bibliography of their books, see below). Stanton's argument depends on his criteria for the formula quotation.

4) According to W. D. Davies and D. A. Allison, "the gospel text runs smoothly if 13:14-15 is omitted". *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew*, vol. II (London; New York: T & T Clark International, 1991), 394.

5) Stanton claims that most exegetes regard the quotation in Matthew 13:14-15 as "a later interpolation, perhaps on the basis of Acts 28:26-7 where a very similar version of Isaiah 6:9f is cited". See his book, *Studies in Matthew*, 349. In fact, he follows K. Stendahl. For his argument, see his book, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968), 131. Refuting that the quotation is a later interpolation, Donald Hagner asserts that Matthew himself inserted the quotation. *Matthew 1-13*, WBC 33A (Dallas: Word Books, 1993), 373.

conjunction ἵνα in v.13 and v.14, were designed to avoid or lessen divine predestinarian determination or intent, and to emphasize human responsibility for refusing to listen to Jesus' words in this passage.⁶⁾ If the Matthean text relies on sources for all the quotations, however, why did the quotation here deviate from his usual pattern?⁷⁾ Now we will look at the context of Matthew 13:11-15 to answer that question.⁸⁾ Some peculiar grammatical features and literary devices will be also examined in order to clarify the intention of Matthew and the meaning of the passage in Matthew 13:11-15.

2. The Usage of the conjunction ὅτι instead of ἵνα in v.13.

6) See Robert H. Gundry who notes that Matthew's introductory formula shows Matthew's intention to lessen the divine responsibility. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 257. Though emphasizing the balance between divine initiative and human responsibility, Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 371, accentuates human responsibility by stating that "the root problem is the unwillingness of the people to receive parables". He, *Matthew 1-13*, 373-375, also clearly asserts that Matthew's 'immediate concern is the culpable unbelief of Israel', though he does not exclude the existence of the predestination concept. See also Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 393, who note that "Matthew did not want to leave the impression that Jesus intended from the beginning to leave sinners in their plight". According to Craig L. Blomberg, the majority of scholars agree that "Matthew has weakened Mark's purpose clause and turned it into a result clause". See his book, *Matthew*, NAC 22 (Nashville: Broadman, 1991), 216. In contrast, R. T. France denies that the conjunction ὅτι in v.13 softens the harshness since the broader context clearly indicate "the division between the disciples' enlightenment and crowd's dullness". See his book, *The Gospel according to Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 222. See also his recent commentary, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids; Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 2007), 512-513. D. A. Carson also argues that the predestinarian tone clearly sounds in the Matthew text. *Matthew*, Expositor's Bible Commentary vol.8-1., Gaebelien, ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 309. Douglas R.A. Hare joins these scholars by postulating that the alternation of the conjunction does not soften Matthew's theory. *Matthew* (Louisville: John Knox, 1993), 149-150.

7) If the quotation is interpolated by other than Matthew, though such is implausible, the following question arises: why did he employ a different method?

8) Concerning the quotation of Isaiah 6:9-10 in other Gospels, Evans posits that the Isaiah text was quoted for each Evangelist's purpose. According to him, Mark and John, different from Matthew and Luke, present a harsh sense of the text, since for them, "christology must be understood in terms of suffering and the cross rather than in terms of miracles, vision, and apparition". "For both evangelists", he concludes, "Jesus' ministry promotes obduracy and thus provokes opposition and the sentence of the cross". See his article, "The Function of Isaiah 6:9-10 in Mark and John", 137-138.

Why did Matthew utilize the conjunction ὅτι in v.13 instead of the conjunction ἵνα which might clearly indicate the purpose for Jesus to speak in parables? The simplest solution would be that Matthew did so because his source included the conjunction. Another question still arises, however: Why did Matthew determine to employ the conjunction found in the source, even though it does not belong to his own style?

At this juncture, the conjunction ὅτι, which NTG²⁷ adopts, requires a textual critical investigation. According to Metzger, ὅτι is almost certainly the original reading with the grade 'B'. "Several representatives of the Western and of other types of text", he avers, "influenced by the parallel passages in Mark 4:12 and Luke 8:10, altered the construction to ἵνα".⁹⁾ He seems to assume that the copyists harmonized the Matthean text in accordance with the Markan and Lukan text by changing ὅτι to ἵνα.¹⁰⁾ The evidence, however, is not so strong that one may grade the text as 'B'. The following factors constitute the counter evidence to his argument. First, the external evidence is quite balanced as Western(old Latin etc.) and Cesarean text types as well as Coptic versions support the reading which includes the conjunction ἵνα. Geographical distribution of the witnesses also needs to be pointed out; the manuscripts which contain ἵνα are widespread throughout broad areas. It is true that some reliable manuscripts lend support to the text in NTG²⁷,¹¹⁾ but the external evidence is still balanced, or at least it does not clearly support the reading of NTG²⁷.

Internal evidence also does not explicitly lend support to one of these two readings. It seems, as pointed out above, that the editorial committee of United Bible Societies ascribes the presence of ἵνα to the scribes who had already been familiar with the texts of Mark or Luke. In fact, another possible, if not better,

9) Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 27. W. C. Allen declares that the author changed the conjunction ὅτι to ἵνα on purpose, because he could not tolerate the predestinarian tone. See his book, *Matthew* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1977), 146.

10) Concerning differences between Matthew and Mark, Hagner assumes that Matthew "intends to follow Mark", though deviating from Mark considerably. R. T. France also notes that Matthew's text represents the assimilation to the expression in Mark and Luke. See his book, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 506. nt.2. It is not wise to jump into the debate of the Synoptic problem and a possible source for Matthew and Luke. It suffices to mention that Matthew was probably independent of Mark or the possible common source for this quotation. Matthew might have relied on a source embedded with the style of the Septuagint.

11) This is, no doubt, why NTG²⁷ adopts the conjunction ὅτι.

explanation for their argument would be that the copyists, who were acquainted with the Matthew’s typical quotation formula, adopted the Matthean style with the conjunction ἵνα. At any rate, this argument also appears to prove the decision of the committee correct. A very different explanation is possible, however; some copyists who purported to refrain from the predestinarian note, a non-Matthean doctrine, altered the ἵνα clause to the ὅτι clause.

Concerning the present matter, the locution διὰ τοῦτο at the beginning of v.13 draws our attention since its usage in the Gospel of Matthew may provide a clue to the textual problem. The phrase is usually interpreted to point to the ὅτι clause in v.13; “this is why I tell them in parables, because...”, or more simply “The reason I employ parables in talking to them is....”¹²⁾ The problem is, however, that the Gospel of Matthew does not attest to the usage. The prepositional phrase always refers to the preceding argument, with the inferential meaning ‘therefore’ in the Gospel, though the conjunction ὅτι is absent (6:25; 12:27, 31; 13:52; 14:2; 18:23; 21:43; 23:34). It is admitted that such usage seems to occur in Matthew 24:44, where the phrase apparently points to the subsequent conjunction ὅτι;

NTG²⁷

διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὑμεῖς γίνεσθε ἕτοιμοι, ὅτι ἢ οὐ δοκεῖτε ὥρα ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται.

NKJ

Therefore you also be ready, for the Son of Man is coming at an hour you do not expect.

Nevertheless, the instance does not provide strong evidence, since it may be retrospective. The content of the ὅτι clause in v.44 is virtually identical to that of the preceding verses, v.42 and v.43.¹³⁾ Especially, the content in v.42 is the repetition of that in v.44b. Thus, the phrase διὰ τοῦτο in this verse, though

12) R. T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 512, nt. 14. See also D. B. Wallace who regards the instance as non-retrospective. *Greek Grammar: Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 333, n. 46. Leon Morris suggests that the phrase denotes “on account of this” “therefore” but adds that “the real reason follows” in 13b. See his book, *The Gospel according to Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 341, nt. 32.

13) 42 Keep awake therefore, for you do not know on what day your Lord is coming. 43 But understand this: if the owner of the house had known in what part of the night the thief was coming, he would have stayed awake and would not have let his house be broken into(NRS).

pointing to the preceding argument, contains the identical content to that of the following part of the verse. The instance in which the phrase διὰ τοῦτο points only to the following conjunction ὅτι is not found in the Gospel of Matthew. Outside of the Gospel, the phrase followed by the conjunction occurs nine times in the Johannine literature: John 5:16,18; 8:47; 10:17; 12:18,39; 15:9 (reversed order); 1 John 3:1; Revelation 18:8.¹⁴⁾ In all the instances, the phrase does not only refer to ὅτι but the preceding argument. As a result, the conjunction ὅτι in Matthew 13:13, which is referred to with the prepositional phrase διὰ τοῦτο belongs to the non-Matthean and non-New Testament style.¹⁵⁾

This seems to indicate that ὅτι clause is the original reading, since the clause represents a harder reading. The following elements, however, make this argument less plausible. The copyists may not readily recognize the problem of the usage of the conjunction ὅτι, since Matthew emphasizes the responsibility of human beings. In contrast, they easily realize the difficulty caused by the presence of the conjunction ἵνα, since it contradicts Matthew's theology. They altered the conjunction ἵνα to ὅτι, which harmonizes the content of v.13 with Matthew's tendency to emphasize human responsibility. In addition, it is difficult to recognize the peculiarity of the usage of διὰ τοῦτο referring to the following ὅτι, whereas the problem of the predestinarianism is recognizable. This alternation makes the meaning of the sentence and the passage in vv.13-15 rather ambiguous. The quotation of Isaiah 6:9-10 in the following verses might have forced the copyists to lessen the predestinarian emphasis with any means. With the conjunction ἵνα, the thrust of the passage becomes clear, i.e., divine

14) Concerning the usage of the phrase followed by the conjunction, John Nolland asserts that it indicates "double reference to causality" rather than clarification of the meaning by providing further explanation. He suggests that the instances in John 10:17 and 12:18 reveal double reference. His argument, however, is not convincing because such instances do not indicate double reference, but explication of the meaning with the addition of further explanation. See his book, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 534, nt. 38. In Matthew 24:44, John 5:16, 18; 8:47, no further explanation is given, but only a different expression appears for the same content. In the case of John 12:39; 1 John 3:1; Revelation 18:8, Nolland's judgment is valid. In all the instances, the ὅτι clause is closely related with the preceding argument to which the phrase points.

15) Most English versions translate the prepositional phrase and the conjunction as 'therefore...', 'because'. Some versions interpret them as "the reason (I speak)... is that". Interestingly, NIV regards the conjunction as the sign for the direct discourse: This is why I speak to them in parables: "Though seeing...".

determination: “therefore, I say in parables to them, in order that they, seeing, may not see and hearing, may not understand”. The copyists probably intended to avoid the conflict of this verse with Matthew’s theology that could be raised by the use of the conjunction ἵνα. Thus ἵνα may represent the original reading. These considerations may indicate that some copyists altered the ἵνα clause to the ὅτι clause rather than the *vice-versa*, though the other explanation is still more plausible.

Even if we concede, however, that the conjunction ὅτι represents the original reading employed by Matthew, it may convey a similar connotation to the conjunction ἵνα because it may indicate the result: “therefore, I say in parable to them, so that they...”¹⁶⁾ This usage is not well attested in the New Testament, but some probable instances are found in John 7:35; 14:22; 1Th 6:7, Heb 2:6.¹⁷⁾ Also noteworthy is that the LXX includes some instances: Gen 20:9, Jdg 14:3; 1Sa 20:1; 1Ki 18:9. In addition, the conjunction ὅτι, even though it is not interpreted as a resultive clause, should be understood as reflecting (virtually reiterating) the content and implications of the preceding verses, i.e., vv. 11-12 because of the function of the prepositional phrase διὰ τοῦτο. It should be pointed out that the phrase διὰ τοῦτο reflects the preceding argument, clarifying its meaning. The phrase has to be interpreted ‘therefore’ which refers to the preceding argument. Thus, vv. 11-12 denotes the following: Because the disciples are given by God the ability to know the mysteries and the outsiders are not given by God the ability, Jesus tells them in parables. For they cannot understand as the result of God’s initiative action to harden their hearts.¹⁸⁾

As a result, the ὅτι clause in v.13 implies that they neither heard nor saw since it is not given to them and they are deprived of what they have. In other words, the ὅτι clause reveals the phenomenon resulted from the divine intention described in vv.11-12.

16) BDAG, 732. See also C. A. Evans, “The Function of Isaiah 6:9-10”, 129. He does not agree with the view, though introducing it.

17) L. Morris, *The Gospel according to Matthew*, 30, nt. 51, points out that the conjunction should be understood as indicating purpose rather than result, though ‘result’ usage is grammatically possible.

18) Matthew utilizes the plural form of ‘mystery’ whereas Mark employs the singular form of the noun.

3. Did Matthew try to temper the severity of the doctrine of election?

In fact, Matthew does not try to simply alleviate the tone of predestination as some scholars assume. The passive verbs in v.11 draw our attention. Matthew explicitly declares that to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God is given to disciples but it is not given to outsiders, while Mark and Luke do not clearly express the second part. The comparison of Matthew's text with Mark's and Luke's demonstrates the force of Matthew's emphasis on the passive verb 'given'.¹⁹⁾ Both Mark and Luke merely depict that everything is given in parables to disciples. Different from Mark and Luke, Matthew manifestly compares the condition of the outsiders with that of the insiders by repeating the passive form of δίδωμι: "to know the mystery of the Kingdom of God is not given to them(outsiders)". This probably signifies that he does not necessarily attempt to avoid the predestinarian note. It is also worth noting that passive verbs occur again in v.12, which Mark and Luke place later in the last part of the passage, fourteen verses down in Mark and eight verses down in Luke;

12 ὅστις γὰρ ἔχει, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ καὶ περισσευθήσεται. ὅστις δὲ οὐκ ἔχει, καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

For whoever has, to him it will be given, and it will be exceeded; but whoever does not have, even what he has will be taken away from him.

It is also intriguing that the Matthean text includes one more passive

19) Matthew 13:11 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ὅτι ὑμῖν δέδοται γινῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἐκείνοις δὲ οὐ δέδοται.

He answered, "To you it has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it has not been given. (NRS)

Mar 4:11 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται,

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; (NRS)

Luk 8:10 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· ὑμῖν δέδοται γινῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς, ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ συνιῶσιν.

He said, "To you it has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of God; but to others I speak in parables, so that 'looking they may not perceive, and listening they may not understand'(NRS).

verb(περὶ σσευθῆσεται) than do the other two Gospels.²⁰⁾ With three divine passives, which are placed in the context of emphasizing the divine initiative, God's initiative is accentuated in this verse again.²¹⁾ For this reason, Jesus speaks to the outsiders in parables, so that(in order that) though seeing they cannot see and though hearing they cannot hear, nor can they understand.

4. Isaiah's Context

4.1. No predestinarian theme in Isaiah ch.6?

A proper explication of the quoted text, i.e., Isaiah 6:9-10 verifies this interpretation. Craig L. Blomberg claims that the context of Isaiah does not necessarily indicate "God's planning in advance to make his people sin."²²⁾ Since Israel already committed sins against God and refused to obey His words repeatedly, now God only confirms their rebellion and rejection. Blomberg pays attention to the future hope described at the very end of Isaiah ch.6: "But yet a tenth *will be* in it, And will return and be for consuming, As a terebinth tree or as an oak, Whose stump *remains* when it is cut down. So the holy seed shall be its stump"(NKJ).

It is undeniable, however, that the predestinarian theme still remains evident in the Isaiah text. This caused some Jewish documents to tone down the harshness of the predestinarian force in the text.²³⁾ The punishment will last for a long period of time and Israelites for that period will experience God's predestinarian work of hardening hearts and they must endure God's harsh determination.

20) Concerning the citation of Isaiah 6:9-10 in the Gospel of Mark, see Sug Ho Lee, "The Meaning of Isaiah 6:9-10 Quoted in Mark 4:12", *Journal of the New Testament Society of Korea* 15:3 (2008), 605-641.

21) Barclay M. Newman & Philip C. Stine posit that the subject of the verbs should be 'God' for the passive construction. See their book, *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Matthew* (London; New York; Stuttgart: United Bible Society, 1992), 490-491.

22) Craig L. Blomberg, "Matthew", G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, eds., *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 47.

23) The Isaiah text from Qumran caves reads Isaiah 6:9-10 as follows: "Keep on listening, because you may perceive. 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 (1QIsa)". The text is quoted from C. L. Blomberg, "Matthew", 47.

4.2. Divine passive and the conjunctions

God's initiative emerges prominently in the usage of the divine passive and the conjunction γάρ in Isaiah 6:10, both of which occur in Matthew 13:15. The passive verb ἐπαχύνθη in Isaiah 6:10 which is quoted in the Matthean text renders God's initiative in hardening their heart. In this context, the conjunction καί is to be interpreted as 'thus': "because the hearts of this people became calloused (by God). Thus (καί) they did not hear ...". BDAG notes that the passive form of the verb delivers active sense, suggesting its meaning as 'become dull', which most English versions adopt.²⁴⁾ One thing is still clear, however; the passive form may be identified as 'divine passive'. Noteworthy is that the passive form of the verb occurs in Isaiah 34:6 where the verb denotes the passive meaning: "is made fat with fatness".²⁵⁾ The clause from the first καί to the verb ἐκάρμυσαν indicates the result of the first part: "the hearts of this people were hardened (by God), and as a result(=thus) they did not hear...". The sequence of the deed should be quite logical: "Their hearts grew dulled (by God) and then they could not understand, though hearing, ..."

The sentences in the μήποτε clause in v.10b display the reversed sequence of the objects of the sentences in 10a as the word "heart" is placed at the end here while it appears at the first in 10a: "They see with their eyes and hear with their ears and then understand with their heart. The purpose of heart being calloused is expressed by this clause. "Their heart became coarsened lest they see, hear and understand and then return, thus(καί) I should heal them".²⁶⁾ The function of the heart is emphasized by being placed at the first and the last place respectively. The core of the content is reconstructed as follows: "since their heart became calloused by God so that their heart cannot understand". Here again, God's initiative emerges prominent.

With regard to the conjunction μήποτε, Luz argues that all the church Fathers understand the conjunction to be indicating purpose as related to Israel, not to God.²⁷⁾ Their interpretation is reliable, he claims, since Matthew replaced ἵνα

24) BDAG, 790.

25) According to Liddell and Scott, 1350, the verb in Isaiah 6:10 denotes the passive meaning 'was made dull'.

26) The conjunction καί could be understood in various ways. BDAG, 494-496.

27) Ulrich Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, vol.2 (Solothurn und Düsseldorf: Benziger, 1990), 314.

with ὅτι in v. 13. In other words, since the Jews refuse to see, hear and turn, God will not heal them. If they turn, therefore, God will cure them. God's predestination therefore, he concludes, cannot become the cause for the Jews to refuse to hear Jesus' words. But what if the conjunction ὅτι is not the original reading? What if it is used as a resultive conjunction? Or, what if the usage and meaning of the conjunction ὅτι with διὰ τοῦτο is different from the view most scholars assume correct. It is probable that Matthew quotes from the LXX in 13:14-15, not because he purports to emphasize human responsibility but because he intends to accentuate God's initiative. Matthew thus still emphasizes God's divine determination as much as other Gospel writers do.

The connection between two verses in Isaiah 6:9-10 of the Hebrew text is clear with the imperatives in v.10. In contrast, the translation of the Septuagint, which altered the imperatives to indicatives, makes the flow of the context smooth by inserting the conjunction γάρ:

9. Go to this people and say: You will indeed listen, but never understand, and you will indeed look, but never perceive 10. For this people's heart has grown dull, and their ears are hard of hearing, and they have shut their eyes; so that they might not... 28)

With the conjunction γάρ conveying a causal meaning here, the second verse provides the reason of the first verse, i.e., why they will never understand or perceive though seeing indeed and looking indeed. Why will they not understand nor perceive? The answer is that their hearts were already made callous by God.

5. Repetition of the similar content of v.13 in vv.14-15

Intriguingly, Matthew 13:14-15 repeats the core notion of Matthew 13:13.

28) Most English versions do not include the conjunction γάρ and the imperatives, reflecting the Hebrew text. Interestingly, NIV introduces the translation of the Septuagint in the margin, but without the conjunction in the beginning of v.10, which is an imprecise translation: 'You will be ever hearing, but never understanding; / you will be ever seeing, but never perceiving'. / 10 This people's heart has become calloused; / they hardly hear with their ears, / and they have closed their eyes

Why did the Matthew text reiterate the same content? Matthew still intends to emphasize the severity of God's election in v.14 by suggesting the reason of their unreceptivity in v.15, i.e., God made their hearts dull, though he appears to point to responsibility of human beings for rejecting Jesus' words.

Due to the repetition of the basic idea and the non-Matthean characters in the quotation, many scholars assert that vv.14-15 is interpolated by another author.²⁹⁾ It is more probable, however, that Matthew himself inserts vv.14-15 with a purpose between v.13 and v.16. For him, the content of v.13 might have not expressed his intention sufficiently. He might have been required to expand his answer in v.13 to the question of why Jesus taught in parables; "therefore I speak to them in parables so that(because) seeing they do(may) not see, hearing they do(may) not hear". The Greek text appears ambiguous with the usage of the conjunction ὅτι as it may suggest that Jesus tells his audience in parables either because their heart became coarse or so that they may not see and understand. Why did Matthew think the explanation in v.13 is insufficient? It contradicts what he pointed out as the reason to teach them in parables in v.11, i.e., divine initiative. His logic appears to vacillate from one side first and then to the other. Now Matthew must clarify his argument by synthesizing both contents in v.11 and v.13 and this is the very function of vv.14-15.

6. Matthew's dependence on the LXX for the quotation in 13:14-15

Why did Matthew accept the LXX text, though he usually ignored the LXX and followed the MT in other formula quotations? He did so simply because the LXX text of Isaiah fits his purpose of answering the question in v.10 and combining two apparent opposite arguments in v.11 and v.13. Then, the following question arises: In what sense does the LXX text accommodate Matthew's intention?

The quoted text in vv.14-15, emphasizing the deafness of ears of the outsiders and hardness of their hearts, suggests the reason why they do not understand as the conjunction γάρ in v.15 indicates. People will neither perceive nor

29) For scholars who argue for this, see above footnote 5.

understand, because their hearts were made fat and it was probably done by God. In the Hebrew Old Testament text, as pointed out above, the mood of the sentences in v.10 is imperative: make their heart fat! In the Hebrew text of Isaiah, imperatives are used for three verbs in 6:10, which the translator of the LXX changed to indicatives. Some scholars insist that the translator endeavors to avoid the harshness of the imperative force. The essential meaning of the LXX, however, still remains identical to that of the MT, as the MT conveys an ironical meaning.³⁰⁾ The translator of the LXX does not delete the harshness of the imperatives, but simply alters the method to express God's way by adopting the divine passive for the first verb in v.10.

As pointed out above, the presence of the conjunction γάρ in the LXX of Isaiah 6:10, which is absent in the MT, may indicate that the translator of the LXX intends to suggest the divine initiative of hardening people's hearts in a way differently from the MT. If the Gospel of Matthew is written for the Jews, the audience understood properly the meaning of Isaiah 6:9-10. Matthew thus quotes from the LXX in order to show God's initiative in hardening people's hearts.³¹⁾

Interestingly, John, who usually quotes from the LXX, adopts the Hebrew text for the quotation of Isaiah 6:10 in John 12:40, since he purposes to "present the divine determination as the cause of unbelief".³²⁾ His preference is sometimes referred to as a 'pesher quotation', which indicates that "John has tailored the quotation to his own theological purposes".³³⁾ In a similar way, Matthew accepts the LXX in Matthew 13:14-15 precisely, otherwise always citing from the Hebrew text, not because he intends to avoid the idea of divine determination, but because the LXX text, he believes, conveys the idea of divine determination. Matthew then embellishes other devices designed by Matthew himself like

30) Scholarly views vary concerning the avoidance of the imperatives. Some suggest that the usage of the indicative instead of imperative points to the avoidance of harshness (e.g., D. Hagner, *Matthew*, 374). In contrast, others claim that the basic meaning is all the same (e.g., D. L. Turner, *Matthew* [Grand Rapids; Mich: Baker Academic, 2008], 333; William Hendrickson, *Matthew*, 555).

31) Most scholars agree that the primary audience of the Gospel of Matthew were the Jews. See R. T. France, *The Gospel according to Matthew*, 17.

32) Maarten J. J. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), 121.

33) Maarten J. J. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*, 100.

divine passive forms in v. 11, v. 12 and even in v. 15, the conjunction γάρ in v. 14 and the phrase διὰ τοῦτο followed by ὅτι (or ἵνα) in v. 13.

It is accepted, of course, that Matthew, differently from John, paints the divine determination deliberately and meticulously. The divine initiative, however, is still displayed in Matthew as much as in John. Two things become clear: 1) that Matthew's text does not present the idea of divine determination as straightforwardly as John's text; 2) Matthew's text portrays the idea of divine determination as clearly as the Johannine text, and as meticulously.

7. Conclusion

The following points summarize the findings:

(1) If ἵνα, not ὅτι is the original reading in v.13, the divine determination is clearly expressed. Even if the ὅτι was in the original text, however, the conjunction does not weaken the idea of divine intent in accepting the gospel, since it may convey the force of result.

(2) The usage of διὰ τοῦτο in Matthew and other New Testament books demonstrates that the ὅτι clause alone does not exclusively suggest the reason of why Jesus speaks in parables, even if the conjunction means 'because'. The phrase διὰ τοῦτο, with the meaning of 'therefore', makes clear the connection of the preceding argument with the one which follows.

(3) Even if the conjunction ὅτι in v.13 refers to the phrase διὰ τοῦτο denoting the causal meaning 'because', the divine passives in vv.11-12 (two more than occur either in Mark or Luke) and those in v.15, as well as the causal conjunction γάρ in v.15 indicate that Matthew does not attempt to minimize the tone of the divine determination substantially.³⁴⁾

(4) Matthew adopts the LXX of Isaiah 6:9-10 because the LXX text conveys his intention: he strives to point to both divine initiative and human responsibility. Whereas the broader context of Isaiah 6:9-10, i.e., vv. 1-13, clearly promotes human responsibility, the Matthean text enlists only the two

34) D. L. Turner, *Matthew*, 340, emphasizes God's sovereign right in hardening people's ears. He argues that 'God is sovereign over the initial rebellious response as well as the further hardening'.

verses for this purpose. This explains why Matthew accepts the LXX; he seeks to avoid any misunderstanding arising with the use of the two verses divorced from Isaiah's context.

<Keywords>

Matthew 13:14-15, quotation of Isaiah 6:9-10 in the New Testament, purpose of the parable, fulfillment quotation, God's divine initiative in hardening people's heart, John 12:40

(투고 일자: 2010년 2월 23일, 2010년 4월 1일; 심사 일자: 2010년 2월 26일;
계재 확정 일자: 2010년 4월 5일)

<참고문헌>(References)

- Allen, W. C., *Matthew*, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1977.
- Baur, W., *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Beale, G. K. and Carson D. A., eds., *Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.
- Blomberg, C. L., *Matthew*, NAC 22, Nashville: Broadman, 1991.
- Blomberg, C. L., “Matthew”, *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.
- Carson, D. A., *Matthew*, Expositor’s Bible Commentary, vol.8, F. E. Gaebelein, ed., Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.
- Davies, W. D. and Allison, D. A., *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew*, vol. II., London; New York: T & T Clark International, 1991.
- Evans, C. A. “The Function of Isaiah 6:9-10 in Mark and John”, *NovT* 24:2 (1982), 124-138.
- France, R. T., *The Gospel according to Matthew*, Grand Rapids: Eermans, 1985.
- France, R. T., *The Gospel of Matthew*, Grand Rapids; Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 2007.
- Hagner, D., *Matthew 1-13*, WBC 33A, Dallas: Word Books, 1993.
- Hare, D. R. A., *Matthew*, Louisville: John Knox, 1993.
- Lee, Sug Ho, “The Meaning of Isaiah 6:9-10 Quoted in Mark 4:12”, *Journal of the New Testament Society of Korea* 15:3 (2008), 605-641.
- Liddell, H. G. et. al., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford; New York: Clarendon, 1996.
- Luz, U., *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, vol. 2., Solothurn und Düsseldorf: Benziger, 1990.
- Menken, M. J. J., *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*, Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996.
- Metzger, B. M., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed., Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Morris, L., *The Gospel according to Matthew*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Newman, B. M. & Philip C. Stine, *A Translator’s Handbook on the Gospel of Matthew*, London; New York; Stuttgart: United Bible Society, 1992.

Nolland, J., *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Stanton, G. N., *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew*, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992.

Stendahl, K., *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.

Wallace, D. B., *Greek Grammar: Beyond the Basics*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

<Abstract>

마태복음 13:14-15의 이사야 6:9-10의 인용정창욱 교수
(총신대학교)

마태는 마태복음 13:14-15에서 이사야 6:9-10을 인용하면서, 바로 앞 구절인 13절에서 이사야의 두 구절의 내용을 압축하여 소개한다. 14-15절에 이사야서를 인용하기 위해 성취 인용 형식(fulfillment introductory formula)이 14절에 사용된 까닭에 이것은 소위 말하는 ‘성취 인용’이다. 그런데 이 부분은 마태복음의 다른 곳에서 사용된 성취 인용 방식과는 다른 특징을 드러낸다. 첫째, 목적을 나타내는 접속사 *ὅτι*가 13절과 14-15절 두 곳에서 모두 생략되었다. 둘째, 14절에서 성취 인용을 소개하는 형식에 사용된 단어들은 마태복음의 다른 성취 인용의 경우에 결코 사용된 적이 없다. 셋째, 14-15절에 인용된 내용은 실질적으로는 13절의 내용의 반복인데 이런 방식은 마태복음의 다른 곳에서는 나타나지 않는다. 또한 14-15절은 논리의 흐름을 어색하게 만든다. 넷째, 14-15절에 인용된 내용은 예수님이 직접 언급하는 형식을 취하는데 이 같은 방식은 마태복음의 성취인용 중에서 오직 여기에만 등장한다. 다섯째, 인용된 본문은 마소라 본문에 의존하는 마태복음의 다른 성취인용들과는 달리 칠십인역에 의존하고 있다.

마태는 이 부분에서 왜 이렇게 자신의 방식과는 다르게 구약을 인용한 것일까? 많은 학자들은 마태가 다른 복음서 저자들과는 달리 인간의 책임을 강조하는 경향이 있는 까닭에 이 부분에서도 하나님의 말씀을 듣기를 거절하는 인간의 책임을 강조하기 위해서 독특한 방식을 사용한다고 주장한다. 다시 말해 예정론적 주제나 어조를 경감시키거나 없애려 한다는 것이다. 하지만 원문에 대한 주의 깊은 연구는 마태가 하나님의 말씀을 받아들이지 못하도록 인간의 마음을 굳어지게 함에 있어 하나님이 갖는 예정론적 주도권을 주도면밀하게 표현해 준다는 사실을 밝혀준다. 마태복음 원문에 등장하는 주요 헬라어 단어와 문법 사항들에 대한 연구와 인용되고 있는 이사야 6:9-10의 문맥에 대한 연구는 이와 같은 주장의 개연성을 높여준다.