

# Journal of Biblical Text Research. Vol. 26.

Published Semiannually by

The Institute for Biblical Text Research of the Korean Bible Society; April 2010

## Table of Contents

### • Paper •

[Kor.] A Linguistic Study on the Translation of 'אהיה' in Exodus 3:14 -----	Sung-Dal Kwon / 7
[Kor.] Job 42:1-7: Is There a Groundless Suffering? -----	Sang-Kee Kim / 32
[Kor.] The Translation Technique in Targum Hosea 1 -----	Sun-Jong Kim / 53
[Kor.] A Proposal on Translation and Interpretation of מַחִיר כָּלֵב in Deuteronomy 23:19 -----	Seong Hyuk Hong / 71
[Kor.] Use of the Book of Psalms in the Gospel of Matthew ----	Keunjoo Kim / 89
[Kor.] History of the Bible in France: From 1474 to 1910 (L'histoire de la Bible en France De 1474 á 1910) -----	Sung-Gyu Kim / 113
[Eng.] Quotation of Isaiah 6:9-10 in Matthew 13:14-15 -----	Chang-Wook Jung / 137

### • Book Review •

[Kor.] <i>A History of Bible Translation</i> (Philip A. Noss, ed., New York: American Bible Society, 2007) -----	Doo-Hee Lee / 155
--	-------------------

<Abstract>

### **A Linguistic Study on the Translation of ‘Ehyeh’ in Exodus 3:14**

Prof. Sung-Dal Kwon

(Westminster Graduate School of Theology)

This is a linguistic study on the Biblical Hebrew word ‘Ehyeh’ in Exodus 3:14. The word ‘Ehyeh’ appears three times in Exodus 3:14. In particular, the expression ‘Ehyeh Asher Ehyeh’, which is composed of the first and the second ‘Ehyeh’, is very important because it is related to an attribute of God. However, as this is a very obscure phrase even in Hebrew, many translators have struggled with it and have attempted translation in various directions since ancient times to the present. This study examines how this phrase was treated in ancient translations, in contemporary Korean and English translations, as well as in several commentaries, and discusses how the phrase should be understood from the linguistic aspect.

The methods of translation of the phrase are largely categorized into three group.

(1) All the occurrences of ‘Ehyeh’ in Exodus 3:14 are translated into a common noun rather than into a proper noun.

These occurrences are most common among ancient and contemporary translations. Among ancient translations, Septuagint, Targum Pseudo, Jonathan, and Targum Neofiti fall under this category, and most contemporary Korean and English translations and commentaries also belong to this category.

(2) All the occurrences of ‘Ehyeh’ in Exodus 3:14 are translated into a proper noun.

Targum Onqelos and Peshitta among ancient translations, ‘A Lateral Translation from Hebrew Bible(MT)’, and JPS Tanakh among Korean and English translations respectively, belong to this category.

(3) Only the first and third occurrences of ‘Ehyeh’ in Exodus 3:14 are translated into a proper noun.

This type of translation is found neither in ancient translations nor in contemporary English translations and commentaries. Only Rambam, a Jewish rabbi and commentator in the Middle Ages, and ‘Saejeumeun Bible’ among

Korean translations, have this view.

When ‘Ehyeh’ in Exodus 3:14 was examined closely from the morphologic, syntactic aspect, we found that only the first and third ‘Ehyeh’ are proper nouns and that the second ‘Ehyeh’ is an explanation for the first ‘Ehyeh’. Furthermore, we found that the latter interpretation is not acceptable in any tense or phase. According to the results of examination in the semantic, syntactic aspect, the second ‘Ehyeh’ should be included in the semantic category of ‘exist’ in a general sense but distinguished from other sentences which include verb ‘haya’, and should be interpreted as an expression indicating ‘existence’. In addition, although the first person is used, it is unnatural to interpret the term as a first-person being, and it is more natural to interpret as the First Cause who enables things to exist and whose attribute itself is existence. The translation closest to the view of this study was the third type of translation; unfortunately, however, the translation did not reflect the contents of linguistic analysis sufficiently.

<Abstract>

### **Job 42:1-7: Is There a Groundless Suffering?**

Dr. Sang-Kee Kim  
(Jeonju University)

This essay studies Job 42:1-7 as an open unit, though 42:1-6 is stylistically differentiated from V.7 and each of them is historically ascribed to other origin. Such an attempt can be justified by its chiasmic structure: V.2 and V.7 are placed on the semantic Axis of Recognition, that of God's power by Job and that of Job's relative righteousness by God. The former is not all that different from his previous response in 40:4-5, which would necessitate God's another speaking. V.3 and V.6 deal with Job's attitude toward God, which changes from his reluctant admission of his own speech act through ignorance to the willing resolution, not to do as before. V.4 and V.5 give a possible information about the immediate cause of the change. In V.4 Job presents himself as an inquirer to God, which speaks for his consistent, but not yet satisfied concern about his own fortune (cf. 13:22; 14:15a; 31:35). Job's rather unexpected response in V.5 cannot presuppose God's answer to his request, though our Text is silent upon that. Then we may well think about a gap between those two verses. This is well comparable to the change of mood in lament Psalms. When this is considered as reasonable, the event represented by the gap is distinguished from God's appearance in tempest in cap. 38-41\*, for God there behaved just like an adversary, who would force Job to admit his mortal ignorance and incapability before Him the Creator. In this regard God appears to keep up with the work of Job's friends including Elihu, who introduces and prepares God's intervention, that is, in 36:22ff.; Elihu's rhetorical questions in 37:15-19 anticipate God's in form and content.

Job story is written around the question: Can man really fear God for nothing? But it is treated in the modified form of groundless suffering. Job's friends judge his suffering as a logical consequence by the traditional theological conception "Tun - Ergehen - Zusammenhang", where they falsely deduce from his present that his past was under sin and wickedness, and to convince him of that.

The above structure makes clear that it is not the experience(=Erfahrung) of

God in storm, but that of the unmentioned in a unsayable event in gap, which makes Job accept and stand his reality symbolized by “dust and ashes”. In it man may not see any answer to the modified question. In fact, V.7 alludes to the existence of a groundless suffering, which in Job’s opinion must have come from God Himself; God shows himself to be on Job’s side. What matters is nevertheless that this suggests the change of the high-handed God in storm to God, who stands for having opposed Job. Both changes, Job’s and God’s, are textually conditioned by Job’s asking questions in V.4 - the importance of that point is not enough to emphasize.

God acts as intermediary agent to reconcile Job and his friends, while Job is still in pain. Job is therefore to become a friend of those friends, who should have befriended him. Before a groundless, so incomprehensible suffering of a person one should be on his side, though he seems to go so far as to blame and complain, that is what the Book Job says.

<Abstract>

### **The Translation Technique in Targum Hosea 1**

Dr. Sun-Jong Kim  
(University of Strasbourg)

Translation does not mean a simple rendering of words into another language. It is to meet with other cultures and times. In this respect, Targum is a path which leads the biblical readers to the ancient Hebrew text and offers a good model to translate and interpret difficult phrases in the Hebrew Bible. In addition to these functions in the domain of the Old Testament studies, the Aramaic Bible is also important for the New Testament studies in that the Aramaic language is a substratum of the New Testament Greek.

In this essay, we try to trace the translation technique in Targum Hosea 1. The targumist not only interprets theologically the Hebrew phrases in adding and repeating certain words or expressions, but also translates certain phrases conversely. The comparison of the Targum text with the Hebrew text leads us to conclude that Targum is an interpretation as well as a translation. The targumist does not merely translate the Hebrew text according to his translation principles but recreates an original text in the light of his theology. This translation process produces a new textual structure and an original theological message that we cannot find in his source text. The reader needs to understand this translation technique in the tension between the written text and the oral tradition after the textualization of the Hebrew Bible.

<Abstract>

## A Proposal on Translation and Interpretation of **כלב מחיר** in Deuteronomy 23:19

Dr. Seong Hyuk Hong  
(Seoul Theological University)

This study is basically intended to render a proposal on the translation of **כלב מחיר** in Deuteronomy 23:19 (Kor. 23:18). Although various Korean and English translators have offered different translations, they are classified mainly into two kinds. One translates the phrase as ‘the price of a dog’, the other as ‘the pay or wages of a male prostitute’. As we see here, **מחיר** can be translated as either ‘price’ or ‘wages’. As far as **כלב** is concerned, it is rendered as either ‘dog’ or ‘male prostitute’. We have two core issues with reference to the translation of **כלב מחיר**. The major issue is, on the one hand, concerned with choosing between the literal sense of **כלב** and its metaphorical sense. On the other hand, the second issue is a matter of selecting between two literal senses of **מחיר**.

This twofold conflict likewise appears in a scholarly debate on its translation. Their opinions about the translation and interpretation of **כלב** vary a lot. Nevertheless, we can categorize them in three different ways. The first group of scholars see **כלב** as either male prostitute or male sacred (cultic) prostitute. This view depends heavily upon the relationship with **קדשה** and **קדש** in Deuteronomy 23:18. They (Clements and Day) believe that there is evidence for acts of sacred prostitution within the Israelite cult. They even see them as having religious significance. As **כלב** is apparently equivalent to **קדש**, which as the masculine form of **קדשה** shows a close connection to sacred prostitution, they argue that it points to a male sacred prostitute. However, this view has been rejected by many recent scholars who believe there is no reliable evidence for the existence of sacred prostitution.

Secondly, O. Margalith and B. Peckham see **כלב** as a temple functionary. Margalith considers **כלב** to be the epithet of a temple servant, paying attention to the pairing phrase slave-dog. In a little different way, B. Peckham, referring to a fifth-century Phoenician inscription from Kition regards **כלב** as one of temple

servants in animal disguise who were involved in temple ceremonies as singers and dancers.

Thirdly, scholars such as Goodfriend and Stager believe that כַּלָּב literally refers to a dog. Goodfriend, in spite of his emphasis on its plain sense, appears to rely mainly on its metaphorical meaning, i.e., a dog as a priest in the non-Yahwistic cult, a strong term of opprobrium in ancient Israel. However, Stager understands כַּלָּב in its literal sense and associates כַּלָּב with the Canaanite healing cult on the basis of his discovery of hundreds of carefully buried dog carcasses at Ashkelon. He suggests that dogs representing the Canaanite healing god participated in the healing cult and were paid a sum for services rendered. Later the money was given to the attendants of dogs.

In the course of analyzing the three different views of כַּלָּב, we realize the key notion that כַּלָּב is very likely related to the heterodox, non-Yahwistic cult. More specifically, the present writer believes that it points to the ordinary participants in the heterodox foreign cult. While קָדֵשׁ and קָדְשָׁה in Deuteronomy 23:18 refer to the heterodox priest or servants (1Ki 15:11; 22:47; 2Ki 23:7), כַּלָּב refers to the general people who were engaged in the foreign cult. This is corroborated by the interpretation of זָנָה in its metaphorical sense, which in the Old Testament refers to Israel's faithlessness toward Yahweh and worship of other gods. The Deuteronomic author's concern for exclusive allegiance to worship Yahweh alone agrees with this interpretation. The author probably thought that such religious conduct is the absolute way to keep the boundaries of Israel's national identity.

With the preceding word גְּזֵרִים, which primarily means 'equivalent value' or 'price in exchange for' but could also mean 'money' (Pro 17:16), the present writer proposes that כַּלָּב should be translated as 'the money of a dog-like person' in an opprobrious sense. While כַּלָּב refers to ordinary participants in the heterodox cult, it is just an interpretation of כַּלָּב as a metaphor. In order to enliven the evocative power of the metaphorical expression in Korean, it is necessary to translate it as 'a dog-like person'.



<Abstract>

## Use of the Book of Psalms in the Gospel of Matthew

Prof. Keunjoo Kim

(Westminster Graduate School of Theology)

The present article investigates how the Gospel of Matthew uses the passages from the Book of Psalms, especially centered upon the cases known as explicit quotation in Nestle-Aland 27th edition. Some conclusions, based upon comparison with contexts in the Old and New, are suggested as follows:

1. First of all, basically, Matthew uses the Septuagint (=LXX) for his quotation of the Old Testament, which explains his Old Testament text different from the present Masoretic text (=MT). Judging from his reading similar to MT in some cases, he could have consulted a Hebrew Vorlage, same as MT, with a copy of LXX, or he could have had a Greek version more literally translated.

2. In some cases, Matthew has the same reading as one of Mark and LXX. But also in some cases, Matthew does not follow Mark, in citing LXX. This happens to citations having similar reading to Luke. This study demonstrates that whether Matthew follows Mark or Luke or changes them, depends upon his theological intention. There are many examples in which Matthew uses a passage from Psalms out of its own context. Our present investigation shows that there is a certain tendency of addition and omission when Matthew's citation deviates from the context in Psalms, as seen in 4:6; 13:35; 21:9. Contrary to this, we find that readings in LXX are quoted virtually identically in Matthew when his context seems to coincide with the context in LXX-Psalms, as seen in 21:16; 21:42; 22:44. There, however, is a case not to be easily classified, such as 27:46.

The above conclusion could be too stereo-typed. We have to admit that it is controversial how one can clarify "context in the Old Testament" as well as "context in the New Testament". Furthermore, the present study on Matthew's use of Psalms is a part of a possible investigation of Matthew's handling of the other Old Testament texts. Therefore, the present work can be suggested as a first step towards a more extensive and exhaustive study on Matthew's use of the Old Testament.

<Abstract>

## History of the Bible in France: From 1474 to 1910

Prof. Sung-Gyu Kim

(Westminster Graduate School of Theology)

In this study, we can trace more or less in detail the history of the French Bible from its origins until early twentieth century. **It is question** to briefly the history of production, not to study carefully the special issues on topics. It allows us to understand the extraordinary influence in development in France. The study shows that the French translation of the Bible has been slow in turbulent circumstances. In fact, there are two trends worth noting. **The first consist in what some** are translations in the interest of modernization. The latest view from the translation of the original languages. For Protestantism, Olivetan is considered an important man who knows the essential principle of the translation related to the spirit of the Reformation as Calvin. Since then, the question is put in the authentic translation. Thus, translators and publishers have inherited various discussions that recognize the birth of different types of Bible translation in the history of the Bible in France. If we take the 359 translations or reprints, we see that there were in France, or French, almost a first original edition of the sacred books each year (five in six years). We arrived at a figure of approximately 2000 editions and reprints of Scriptures from 1474 to 1910, that is to say four hundred and thirty five years, more than four French editions of the Sacred books each year (about nine every two years). The Bible story in France, said Samuel Berger, is a wonderful story. Blessed is he who can investigate a few pages! **These remarks** help us to recognize the birth of different types of Bible translation in the history of the Bible in France. Finally, we hope that **this study helps** Korean lecturer of the Bible to understand the history of French Bible.

## 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 text<sup>1)</sup>:

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 ἄκούσετε 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.’<sup>2)</sup>

---

\* 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:<sup>3)</sup> 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;<sup>4)</sup> 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.<sup>5)</sup> 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.<sup>6)</sup> If the Matthean text relies on sources for all the quotations, however, why did the quotation here deviate from his usual pattern?<sup>7)</sup> Now we will look at the context of Matthew 13:11-15 to answer that question.<sup>8)</sup> 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*, 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 NTG<sup>27</sup> 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".<sup>9)</sup> He seems to assume that the copyists harmonized the Matthean text in accordance with the Markan and Lukan text by changing ὅτι to ἵνα.<sup>10)</sup> 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 NTG<sup>27</sup>,<sup>11)</sup> but the external evidence is still balanced, or at least it does not clearly support the reading of NTG<sup>27</sup>.

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*, 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 NTG<sup>27</sup> 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....”<sup>12)</sup> 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;

NTG<sup>27</sup>

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.<sup>13)</sup> 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.<sup>14)</sup> 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.<sup>15)</sup>

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...”<sup>16)</sup> 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.<sup>17)</sup> 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.<sup>18)</sup>

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'.<sup>19)</sup> 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.<sup>20)</sup> With three divine passives, which are placed in the context of emphasizing the divine initiative, God's initiative is accentuated in this verse again.<sup>21)</sup> 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."<sup>22)</sup> 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.<sup>23)</sup> 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.<sup>24)</sup> 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".<sup>25)</sup> 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".<sup>26)</sup> 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.<sup>27)</sup> 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.<sup>29)</sup> 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.<sup>30)</sup> 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.<sup>31)</sup>

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".<sup>32)</sup> His preference is sometimes referred to as a 'pesher quotation', which indicates that "John has tailored the quotation to his own theological purposes".<sup>33)</sup> 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.<sup>34)</sup>

(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;  
게재 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*, 3<sup>rd</sup> 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: Eerdmans, 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*, 2<sup>nd</sup> 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>

**Book Review-*A History of Bible Translation***

(Philip A. Noss, ed., New York: American Bible Society, 2007)

Dr. Doo-Hee Lee

(Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary)

This book gives us a comprehensive overview of the history of Bible Translation, including not only translations themselves but also translation theory, translation techniques, and the translation field today. It is composed of five sections, Philip A. Noss's introductory chapter and four sections. Noss, as general editor, gives an overview of all the articles included in this volume, highlighting characteristics found throughout the articles. Four sections have its own editors and include several articles that deal with themes specific to each section. First section surveys translation themselves from the Septuagint to the vernaculars. Each contributor examines processes and the present status of translating. Second section turns our attention from translations themselves to epistemology and theory. There has been two opposing attitudes toward translation. One supports the literal translation, paying more attention to the original text. The other argues that the transfer of meaning (or message) is more important, trying to adapt the message of the original text to contexts of target languages and cultures. In this section, Stephen Pattmore examines the changing atmosphere that attempts to talk with other disciplines like semiotics, literary theories, and sociologies, etc. Even though the influence of Eugene Nida's frame is in active, other voices both inside and outside UBS emerge. Pattmore traces the trajectory of changing theories of translation from Eugene Nida's *TASOT*, *TAPOT*, *FOLTA* to Relevance theory. The third section discusses specific techniques of translation employed by different translators at different periods. It is worth noting that the common goal of employing various techniques, regardless of differences in details, was to 'actualize' the meaning of the original text. The fourth and last section portrays the status of translation in non-western countries like Africa and America.

It is commendable that this book reflects the attempts of interdisciplinary

dialogues of translation, both in practice and theory, with other disciplines that provide many insights and materials to consider. It is also remarkable that this book shows the understanding of translation as interpretation or ‘doing theology’. This understanding makes sure that translation is not simply to transmit linguistically a text from one language to another. Rather, translation involves diverse interests from translators and supporting institutions. Despite many merits of this book, I regret that this book does not discuss more about the status of Bible translation in Asia. It is too much focused on the Western part, whatever the reason may be. Still, I believe that this book is recommendable for the readers who want to survey a history of Bible translation at a comprehensive level, including practices and theories of translation both ancient and modern.