Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Introduction

Is there a coherent theology in Third Isaiah (TI)?[1] Volz says about TI, "*Tatsächlich sind die Unterschiede innerhalb der Abschnitte in zeitgeschichtlicher, stilistischer, geistiger und religiöser Hinsicht so groß, daß mir eine Einheitlichkeit der Persönlichkeit wie des Zeitraums ausgeschlossen erscheint.*"[2] According to Volz, there is no integrated theology in TI as the segments of the text are distinct in terms of theology as well as authorship. On the other hand, Skinner writes, "the theology of the Trito-Isaianic prophecies has too little independence or originality to be made the subject of separate exposition. . . . The forms and imagery in which the longing for salvation is expressed are mostly borrowed from the older prophet [Second Isaiah]," implying the theological unity of Isaiah 40–66.[3] Childs goes even further,

1. TI (Trito-Isaiah) was originally the name given to the alleged prophet who is assumed to have written the section of Isaiah 56–66. However, since the hypothesis of multiple authorship of chs 56–66 has been raised, it came to refer to the writing itself. In these days, it may denote either or both of them according to the context of discussion. My usage of the term does not necessarily mean the alleged anonymous prophet as the issue of authorship does not form part of the primary concern of my study. First and Second Isaiah are abbreviated as PI (Proto-Isaiah) and DI (Deutero-Isaiah), respectively.

2. Volz 1932:199. "Really the differences within the segments are so great from a chronological, stylistic, spiritual, and religious point of view that the unity of the personality [i.e., author] as well as the period seems to me impossible." My translation.

3. Skinner 1898/1917:lxv. He (1898:xlv–lxvii) has worked out the unified theological

commenting, "[R]ather, it is essential to maintain them [the chapters of TI] as genuine prophecy that responds to the divine word, 'Thus says Yahweh,' an integral part of the larger prophetic book of Isaiah." Childs proposes the theological unity of the book of Isaiah.[4]

The diverse views on the theological unity of TI may reflect the fact that there are so many materials in TI—diverse in theological themes, concepts, motifs, and traditions. This theological diversity in TI materials has often been considered incompatible in a unified theology. The theological unity has also been disputed due to the alleged different historical situations and references in TI. But others have considered that these are not explicitly determined by internal evidence. Those who emphasize the canonical relation of TI to the rest of the book of Isaiah tend to see the theological unity of TI, although this also increases the complexity of theological discussions of TI. Judging by these different approaches, the problem is not just about the existence of diversity, but also the interpretation of the various materials.

In reality, theological unity may be seen either as the conclusion of theological study or as the assumption and starting point of it. As I have observed, no one has tried to investigate and demonstrate the theological unity of TI (or the book of Isaiah). Every scholar seems to assume the theological unity or disunity in accord with their preconceptions of the TI material. If I assume theological unity instead of disunity (see 1.2), my previous question may be changed: What would a coherent theology of TI look like?

This is what I am going to do in this dissertation—construct a coherent theology of TI. After an in-depth investigation of the methodologies for Old Testament theology, Hasel has suggested that the task of OT theology is to provide the "summary explanations and interpretations of the final form of the individual OT writings or blocks of writings."[5] Even though his study focused on OT theology in general, it is a useful articulation of what this dissertation is seeking to accomplish, a summary of the theology of TI, which to some extent may also be "a Biblical (or OT) theology in miniature."[6]

The question of coherent theology is followed by another question: how may such a coherent theology be constructed? The theological synthesis of a book, as Martens proposes, acknowledges the importance of accurate and detailed exegesis, but it is essentially a creative and imaginative

concepts of DI and TI.

4. Childs 2001:443. Also see Childs 1979:325–30. Childs has written his commentary (2001) based on this assumption.

5. Hasel 1989:93. However, this may be only one of the possible goals of OT theology.

6. Kraus 1992:12.

process which may not be reduced to exegesis.[7] I assume that a coherent theology is possible only on the assumption of the theological unity of TI. On the other hand, Hasel suggested a multiplex approach to the structure of OT theology and warned against adopting unified dogmatic categories or a single structuring concept, in order that the various themes, motifs, and concepts related to one another could "emerge in all their variety and richness."[8] So, any single approach to the theology of TI may be avoided. Consequently, a balance is needed between focusing on a coherent theology and taking into due consideration the diversity of TI materials to construct the theology of TI.

I propose that eschatology, as a general future hope of Israel, is the key to the theology of TI (though I am aware of Hasel's warning about a unified category). This is because eschatology is a comprehensive framework of theology, in which many themes may be incorporated more systematically than in the case of 'theology.' Thus, if TI is proved to be primarily eschatology, this will open up a full range of theological perspectives of TI, although some aspects of the 'theology of TI' may be excluded by such a systemization. So, it is important to identify the appropriate approach to the eschatology of TI not only to tackle the theological issues but also to present its main features.

In this chapter, I want firstly to survey the study of the theology of TI to justify my assumption that we need to see TI as a theological unity and that the theology of TI needs to be understood in relation, especially, to the rest of the book of Isaiah (1.2). The survey is also in order to suggest possible categories for the eschatology of TI. As an excursus, I also want to identify some eschatological issues in the theology of TI to set a guideline to the discussion about the eschatology of TI by defining several terminologies and to make some assumptions for its study (1.3). An outline of the structure of the dissertation as well as a conclusion will follow afterwards (1.4).

1.2 History of the Study of the Theology of TI in the Book of Isaiah

Traditionally, the book of Isaiah was considered a unity in terms of authorship, as implied in the Biblical passages,[9] even though the Isaianic author-

7. Martens 1996:224.

8. Hasel 1989:92–96.

9. There are evidences of Isaianic authorship (of the book) in Isa 1:1; 2:1; 8:1. In the New Testaments, DI and TI are also ascribed to Isaiah in Matt 3:3; and 4:14, 12:17–18; Luke 3:4; Acts 8:28; Rom 10:20; John 12:38–41 etc. Archer 1982:285–86. Also see Apocrypha (Sir 48:24) and Talmud (*Baba Bathra* 15a).

ship of the second part of the book (chs 40–66) was doubted by Ibn Ezra in the twelfth century AD.[10] Although critical scholars have separated TI from the rest of the book of Isaiah in terms of authorship and historical settings, there also has been a stream which has continuously tried to see the unity and challenge a sharp division. I am going to survey how TI relates to the rest of the book, especially to DI, in its theological aspect.

Reformers in the Pre-Critical Period[11]

While the Biblical interpretation of the Middle Ages relied on the leading of the church or the church fathers, the reformers in general based their interpretation on Scripture itself, insisting on historical, grammatical and literal interpretation.[12] Luther had noticed the change of the subject matter in ch 40 that may distinguish the two parts of the book, but did not propose a different authorship.[13] Calvin thought that the exilic situation is presupposed in chs 40–66 by the projection of the prophet Isaiah's mind into the future.[14] The assumption of the authorial unity implied the theological unity of the book.

Luther's interpretive principle of the Bible was Christological, which is evidenced in the Messianic and ecclesiastical interpretation of the book of Isaiah (not just TI). For him, the entire Bible is to teach and understand the Christ.[15] However, Luther's external theological control seems too simplistic to cover in particular the various theological themes which are not directly related to the theological core in TI. The point is that he was selectively mining TI since he had another interest in his theological interpretation.

For Calvin, the interpretive control shifts more to the Scripture itself, while Luther has a Christological focus.[16] His exegetical method, as he him-

10. Harrison 1969:765; Sekine 1989:3; Fitzgerald 2003:3–4.

11. The reformers may not represent the pre-critical period because of its relatively short period in the history of the church since Jesus Christ, but may be symbolic for the period especially in comparison with the critical period.

12. Grant 1984:92; Farrar 1886:325–27.

13. Childs 2004:193.

14. Smart 1967:15.

15. Childs 2004:198–204; Grant 1984:94. Luther (1527–30/1972:311 and 329) sees Isa 60 as a prophecy about the kingdom of the Christ (i.e., the church), relating "arise, shine" in 60:1 to Eph 5:14 and 8, and Isa 61:1 as that of the Christ as Jesus uses this verse to identify his own person in Luke 4:18. Isa 59:20–21 is also Messianic as Paul quotes it in Rom 11:26–27; 63:1 refers to the resurrection and ascension into heaven of the Christ. Luther 1527–30/1972: 306 and 352.

16. Grant 1984:96.

self summed it up, was to achieve "lucid brevity." He commented on each verse of a chapter to describe its plain sense as briefly as the text allows, while the thorough discussion of theological issues was reserved for his *Institutes* (1546).[17] His interpretation of a text is in the context of the entire Bible and, for him, the interpretation may be applied to the times of the interpreters.[18] Even though he never thought of 'theology of TI' separately, the theological enterprise of TI for him is directly associated with that of the entire Bible (especially the New Testament).

In conclusion, for these two pivotal figures of the Reformation, TI is part, not only of the book of Isaiah, but also of the entire Bible, from which theological discussion may develop. They contributed to Biblical scholarship in that they insisted on the grammatical, historical, and literary interpretation of the text, rejecting church authority as the interpretive key of the Scripture. As Childs rightly commented, these two scholars did not make a clear distinction between the exegesis of the text based on the original historical situation, and the theological development based on the context of the interpreter's theological understanding.[19] The category that Calvin adopted in *the Institutes* is too comprehensive for our purpose as it is directed at the theological systemization of the entire Bible.

Source Criticism

The first serious challenge to the unity of the book of Isaiah came in the eighteenth century. Döderlein (1775) and Eichhorn (1780–83) suggested that the second part of the book is to be ascribed to another author in the Babylonian exile, because of the differences in historical settings, style, and

17. Steinmetz 1982:158. Calvin is evaluated to have made a balance between his two precursors Bucer and Melanchthon to setup his methodology.

18. The 'redemption' in ch 59:19–20 may have double entendre in that it may refer for the Jews to the deliverance from the Babylonia and for the Christians to the salvation of Christ (Calvin 1550:800). While 60:1 is associated with the church and 61:1 with the Christ himself, in 63:1 the prophet speaks simply of YHWH contrary to Luther (Calvin 1550:804, 817, and 834). The "metaphor" of 'the new heaven(s) and earth' (65:17) denotes not only the restoration of the church of God after the return from Babylon but also the salvation as has been manifested in the advent of the Christ and will have been fulfilled in the last resurrection (Calvin 1550:864). Calvin here seems to intend that the church does not necessarily refer to the New Testament church but to the universal church that covers both the New Testament and the Old Testament periods.

19. It may be noted that the entire canon is legitimately the context, if the Biblical theology is at issue (Childs 2004:203), as sometimes it has been emphasized that the OT theology is "part of the larger whole" (Hasel 1989:95).

language, and theological concepts.[20] Theological distinctions that brought the authorial distinction of the two parts (chs 1–39 vs. chs 40–66) included the emphasis on divine majesty in the first part vs. that of YHWH's uniqueness and eternity in the second part. While other deities are recognized in the first part although they are subject to YHWH [the Lord], their very existence is denied in the second part of the book. Other differences were the remnant concept as the faithful left in Jerusalem vs. that as the exiled and returned, and the Messianic king in chs 1–39 replaced by the Servant of YHWH in chs 40–66.[21] This view soon dominated the majority of scholars. However, are those theological differences so distinct that they cannot be integrated in a unified theology at a more comprehensive level? The lack of interest in explaining such a view reflects the turn to the historical that was a key movement in general culture and scholarship of the time.

The authorial unity of the book was further challenged by Duhm, whose commentary on the book of Isaiah (1892) is regarded as an epoch-making contribution to TI research.[22] Duhm identified three anonymous authors in chs 40–66, who are responsible for chs 40–55 (excluding the Servant Songs), the Servant Songs (as Duhm named them),[23] and chs 56–66 respectively. The first is the fruits of Second Isaiah (DI), who worked in Lebanon or Phoenicia around 540 BC. TI worked in Jerusalem shortly before the advent of Ezra and Nehemiah (i.e., a contemporary of Malachi).[24] Although Duhm had questioned the Babylonian setting of DI, the contrasts of Babylon vs. Jerusalem and exile vs. return in the two sections (DI vs. TI) became the common understanding among critical scholars thereafter due to Duhm's precursors (see above).[25] For Duhm, TI echoes the themes of the destruction as a past event and the future glory of Jerusalem in DI. In addition, the same editor not only put DI and TI together but also inserted several passages in DI and TI.[26] So DI and TI have some continuity. But, although he maintained the authorial unity of TI, which reflected the post-exilic Jewish community in Jerusalem, the possibility of disintegration in the authorial, literary, and theological unity of TI was latent. This is because

20. Childs 1979:316–17.

21. Driver 1913:242; Harrison 1969:775.

22. Sekine 1989:4.

23. The Servant Songs are as follows: (1) 42:1–4; (2) 49:1–6; (3) 50:4–9; and (4) 52:13—53:12. Duhm 1892:xviii.

24. Duhm 1892:xiii; Hanson 1975:33.

25. Smart 1967:16; Schramm 1995:22. The critical precursors such as Döderlein and Eichhorn had seen the prophet DI was in Babylon, as discussed above.

26. Duhm 1892:xiii, xviii. Later additions by the same redactor are 42:5–7; 44:9–20; 46:6–8; something in ch 48; 50:10–11; 52:3–6; 58.13–14; 59:5–8; and 66.23–24.

smaller units were continually identified and considered later redactional passages. Duhm held that chs 60–62 are continuous with the surrounding chapters in linguistic, stylistic, and theological respects, a surprising view from someone who had separated the Servant Songs from the context of DI.[27]

Duhm did not attempt a systematic theology of TI. His approach undermines the possibility of a comprehensive theological treatment because of its fragmentation of the subject matter that might be the basis for such a treatment. Duhm's aim was to distinguish authentic and inauthentic texts. Most would now regard this as strained, particularly in the way that the Servant Songs were isolated from their context.[28] Clements described the weakness of his approach as a "too hasty dismissal of so much material as unimportant or irrelevant."[29] However, despite the critical pitfalls in theological synthesis, his influence was crucial in that critical scholars who adopted a historical approach (whether source criticism or redaction criticism) tended to accept a sharp break between DI and TI.[30]

While Duhm's one-author hypothesis of TI has been maintained by a number of scholars,[31] it was challenged by others.[32] The literary unity of TI begins to disintegrate with Skinner, who argued that because of the diversity of subject-matter and the variegated standpoints, the text of TI cannot be from the same historical situation or be regarded as the work of a single author.[33] Even though the authorial unity of chs 40–66 was challenged by Skinner, he affirmed the theological continuity of DI and TI.[34] He discussed

27. Duhm 1892:xviii. In his position, Duhm stands against Cheyne and Kuenen.

28. Clements 1976:55; Skinner 1898:xlix and 258–63.

29. Clements 1976:55. This is partly because, according to Smart (1967:17), Duhm cannot accept that the passages that speak of redemption in purely spiritual ways (i.e., salvation achieved by the suffering and death of the Servant) may be compatible with the passages that describe salvation presented in the political and material terms (e.g., national restoration by Cyrus and the transformation of the world). Also see Skinner's view on this.

30. Maass 1967:157.

31. Such as Elliger (1928), Pfeiffer (1941), McCullough (1948), and Kessler (1960), et al. For McCullough (1948:36), TI precedes DI in date. Sekine 1989:11, 13, and 14; Pfeiffer 1941/1966:458; McCullough 1948:27, 30; Kessler 1956.

32. Such as Skinner (1898/1917) and Volz (1932:197–201). Cheyne (1895:xxx–xxxiii) and Skinner (1898:xv–xxxi) also support the multiple authorship of TI, although Cheyne maintained the literary unity of chs 56–66. See also Sekine 1989:4, 6, 10.

33. Skinner 1898:xxxi and xlv.

34. Skinner 1898:xlv–lxvii. However, for him (1898:xx–xxi), the theological difference of chs 1–39 and chs 40–66 signifies the different authorships. It includes the view of God, the concept of remnant, mission and destiny of Israel, Messianic king vs. the Servant.

the theology of chs 40–66 (DI and TI) under the categories of salvation, YHWH, Israel as the Servant of YHWH, and Israel and the nations.[35]

The concept of salvation includes both external reality of salvation of Israel and Israel's internal renewal. The former will be the restoration of the nation which includes the returning of YHWH to Zion, guidance and protection of the redeemed people by YHWH, and the change of the wilderness to the paradisiacal garden. The latter is the spiritual restoration of the people, which is portrayed especially as the re-establishment of the relation between YHWH and His people through the people's repentance.[36]

The view of God is also similar in DI and TI. YHWH is the Creator of the universe and the true and only God, to whom any other gods are not comparable. God is transcendent and immanent and is thus both exalted on high and related to the world. The portrait of YHWH as shepherd and warrior is also shared by both DI and TI.[37]

The mission of Israel as the Servant of YHWH is consistent in these chapters in that she is "*elect for the sake of mankind.*"[38] He considered that "to some extent, the two views of the Servant—the national and the individual—tend to coalesce in the fulfilment contemplated by the prophet."[39] So, the character of the Servant of YHWH remains the same in two fundamental affirmations about YHWH, that is, he is elected by YHWH and commissioned for His service. Israel is called to be an instrument for the execution of the divine purpose of world-wide salvation. The concept of the Servant of YHWH is applied to the concept of the New Israel which is composed of servants.[40]

The Gentiles are not excluded from salvation although the nations are to serve Israel, since the redemption of Israel consequently implies the universal salvation for all the nations. The understanding of salvation of the nations (and Israel as well) in TI may be different in emphasis from that in DI in that salvation in TI may be less idealistic and more materialistic than in DI, but this does not mean negation of the salvation of the nations since the concept of salvation has a moral and spiritual dimension in TI as well as in DI.[41]

35. Skinner 1898:lxv–lxvii.
36. Skinner 1898:xlvi–l.
37. Skinner 1898:l–lv.
38. Skinner 1898:lvi. Italics his.
39. Skinner 1898:lxii.
40. Skinner 1898:lv–lxvi.
41. Skinner 1898:lxiii–lxv.

Consequently, the theology of TI is "of too little independence or originality" compared with that of DI, although immediate salvation and the Servant figure are distinct in DI.[42] Even though Skinner's theological discussion is more weighted on DI, the categories for his theology based on the main characters may provide insight into the theology of TI. However, in this work more theological themes need to be identified for the eschatological theology. It is suggestive that for Skinner salvation in DI and TI included both a physical return and the spiritual reformation of the people and also the portrait of YHWH as shepherd and warrior is common to both DI and TI. This is because there is a coherent idea of salvation and its eschatological fulfilment in chs 40–66. Although Skinner was interested in an integrated theology of TI and its themes and conceptions such as the future salvation and restoration of Jerusalem, he did not think of them in terms of the unifying category of eschatology. However, his theological themes such as salvation, the restoration of Zion, judgment and salvation of the nations etc., may be incorporated into a broader category of eschatological theology as a coherent whole.[43]

While Skinner maintained the theological unity of DI and TI despite assuming different authors thereof, Volz rejected the theological unity of TI and argued for multiple authors.[44] Volz considered that the historical, stylistic, and theological disparities were so great even in a single pericope that the unity of TI was impossible. For him, the fundamental differences in the view of God in TI make the theological (as well as the authorial) unity of TI absolutely impossible. The cruel portrait of YHWH in 63:1–6 is incompatible with the portrait of YHWH who dwells with the contrite and lowly spirit in 57:14–21.[45] A unified theology or authorship is also impossible because the people are treated sometimes as a closed whole (63:7—64:11[12]) and sometimes as separated groups. There is a separation of the pious people from the apostates in Jacob (59:20) and thus there are two cultic groups—the old YHWH-faithful and the new mystic and syncretistic groups (65:3–5). Other incompatibilities include the contrasts between the people who lament the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple (63:7—64:11) and those who complain against the evil officers (56:9–12); between the people who want the internal construction of the community (56:1–8) and those who have no internal problems but hope for salvation (chs 60 and 62); and between the people who are like prostitutes (57:6–13), those who

42. Skinner 1898:lxv, lxvi.
43. Skinner 1898:xlvi–lxvi.
44. Sekene 1989:10; Schramm 1995:14.
45. Volz 1932:199.

are contrite pleasing God (59:9–14), and those who are fasting to please God (58:1–5). The objection to the construction of the Temple (66:1–2) and the lament over the Temple (63:18) or the praises on the precious stones of the sanctuary (60:9, 17) can also not form a consistent theology.[46] As for the nations, the idea of the nations as instruments to serve the glory of Zion and that of the Gentiles who are converted and accepted to the community may not comprise a unity.[47] Volz's understanding of the concept of salvation in TI is material wellbeing.[48] The break between 63:1–6 and 63:7—64:11[12] is further evidence of disunity of TI.[49] For Volz, different theological views indicate different authors. However, other writers discern in these seeming contradictory portraits of YHWH and the people a rich theology that is coherent at a higher or deeper level.

Volz also sees a sharp break between the theology of DI and TI.[50] For him, TI is based on an entirely different foundation from DI. While DI focuses on the glory of YHWH, TI emphasizes the glory of Jerusalem. DI always refers to the whole nation of Israel, although the sense of Israel is sometimes reinterpreted to denote a spiritual nature. But TI does not mention the people or Israel as a whole, but always as a special group within the whole, which is faithful to YHWH.[51] Although he admits "cultic universalism" in TI, it is distinct from the "absolutely free universalism" of DI (45:22–25) because it is not eschatological as it will be realized in the near future in this world (56:7).[52] The concept of salvation in TI is different from that in DI as it is described as more materialistic and external. The nations are just spectators of the salvation and glory of Jerusalem (56:1–6 are excluded in this aspect), and do not participate in the salvation, while the salvation of DI is universal. As for eschatology, while everything is connected to the eschatological hope in DI, eschatology in TI is related only to part of the text.[53] For Volz, because TI does not reflect a unified theology or

46. Volz 1932:199.

47. Volz 1932:199.

48. Volz 1932:197.

49. Volz 1932:198.

50. Volz 1932 and Zimmerli 1950/1963.

51. Volz 1932:197–98. 63:7—64:11[12] are excluded in this evaluation. This becomes a self-contradiction.

52. Volz 1932:207. The cultic universalism may be defined as a view that all the nations will participate in the Jewish YHWH-cult; the (free) universalism as a vision that all the nations will (also) be saved.

53. Although the words of DI recur in TI as literal quotations, their meaning is sometimes distorted in TI. The quotation of 40:3 in 57:14 is eschatologically understood, signifying the removal of obstacles hindering the arrival of salvation, as it

authorship, its eschatology does not form a coherent and consistent whole.[54] So, for Volz, the literary and theological break between chapters 55 and 56 is undoubted.[55]

Meanwhile, another movement in the critical study of TI has been a suspicion of the division of chs 56–66 from chs 40–55.[56] König (1926) found no case for the division because of the common theme of comfort in the two parts.[57] Torrey (1928) rejected the long-standing "Babylonian setting" assumption, because for him the "Cyrus" and "Babylon-Chaldea" passages such as 45:1, 44:28, 43:14, 48:14, and 48:20 were "interpolation."[58] Thus, he was able to argue for the unity of Isa 40–55 and 56–66 (including chs 34–35), because theories of TI generally assume a change of historical setting. The discrepancy in the subject matter of the two blocks is not great enough to undermine literary unity.[59] He worked out his theological approach to these parts, arguing, inter alia, that the Messianic figure of the Suffering Servant in DI is still present in the passages in TI such as chs 62, 61, and 63:7ff. and that the seemingly contradictory attitudes towards the foreign nations, i.e., very hostile on the one hand and sharing the salvation on the other hand, may be harmoniously understood in the two parts, by delineating a new line between the people of YHWH and His enemies.[60] Glahn (1934) also supported the unity of chs 40–66, though in a slightly different way from Torrey, because he believes DI wrote both Isa 40:1—56:8 and 56:9—66:24 in Babylonia and Jerusalem, respectively.[61] For Kissane (1943), the whole of chapters 40–66 were composed by a single mind and thus presented a unity, as the alleged distinct and independent fragments actually show a logical sequence in view of the thought of the book.[62] Even though Kissane

suggests a reading in the framework of tradition (Volz 1932:217–218). The portrait of YHWH armed with divine armor in 59:17, which has a connection to the Divine Warrior tradition in 42:13 and 52:10, refers to the eschatological coming of YHWH, while the promise of the 'spirit' in 59:21 is apocalyptic (Volz 1932:238, 240). The references to the cosmic bodies in 60:19–20, the New Heavens and Earth in 65:17–25, the sudden birth of the God's people in 66:7–9, and the eternal judgment of the sinners in 66:24 are apocalyptic, too.

54. Volz 1932:241, 281, 296, 297, 300.

55. Volz 1932:197–98.

56. Sekine 1989:9.

57. König 1926:536–49.

58. Torrey 1928:38–52.

59. Torrey 1928:7–8.

60. Torrey 1928:112–26, and 140.

61. Glahn 1934:118–78; Sekine 1989:9. According to Sekine (1989:10 and 13), The Glahn's thesis is repeated in Fisher 1939 and Penna 1958.

62. Kissane 1943:v–vi, xlvi–lxi. For him, chs 40–66 and chs 1–39 are a unity not

regarded the theology of chs 1–39 as continuous with chs 40–66,[63] he does not try to systemize the theology of TI (or, DI-TI), but just summarizes the message of each block of the text.[64] Torrey's position was followed by Smart (1967), who may be a precursor of the canonical approach (see below). In these discussions we can see theology, rather than history, coming more to the fore in the discussion of the character of TI.

In summary, because of the multiplication of sources, theological discussion of TI has been thin or extremely selective; theological interests have been subordinate to historical concerns. The history of source criticism of TI has focused on the closely related issues of the unity, authorship, historical setting, and dating, so it is a story of fissile debate between one-author and multiple-author hypotheses.[65] Some have followed Duhm's hypotheses for authorial and theological unity but others have challenged his one-author and unity hypothesis. A few have even pursued the unity of the DI and TI and so have fundamentally questioned Duhm's hypotheses. With Duhm, however, a firm break was made between chs 55 and 56, involving a geographical shift from Babylonia to Palestine and a temporal transition from exilic to post-exilic times. Theological discussion has generally been associated with DI rather than TI (or at best the relation between the two), mainly owing to the focus on historical matters. The conclusions of historical-critical investigation have proved sensitive to the subjective assumptions and opinions of scholars.[66] Because such historical approaches fragment the text, there is relatively little consideration of the significance of the canonical literary context. As Childs comments, this approach is "so concentrating on a level behind the text as to miss the text's own theological witness."[67] Occasionally, the external presumption of the Babylonia/Palestine and ex-

only in the theological aspect but also in the authorial one, in that the ideas of chs 40–66 are Isaiah's even though the compiler of the whole book may be his anonymous disciple, who might have modernized the master's idea. His categories for exegesis of TI are: the sins of Israel (56:9—59:21), the new Zion (60:1—63:6), and the purpose of exile (or, apostates and faithful) (63:7—66:24).

63. Kissane 1943:lvi–lxi.

64. Kissane 1943:xxxii–xxxiii and xlii–xlvi. He categorized theological ideas of chs 1–39 as corruption (religious and ethical abuses), chastisement (the Day of YHWH, YHWH's agent Assyria, ruin of Judah, and the remnant), and restoration (conversion, restoration, the Messiah and His kingdom, and overthrow of Assyria). Kissane 1941:xxxviii–xlvii.

65. Sekine 1989:24; Schramm 1995:11. Brief history of the study of TI is presented especially in Maass 1967:151–63; Harrison 1969:765–95; Hanson 1975:32–46; Sekine 1989:3–27; Schramm 1995:11–52; Smith 1995:1–6; Fitzgerald 2003:1–34.

66. Smith 1995:30.

67. Childs 2001:101.

ile/post-exile split tends to suffocate the theological synthesis of the text's message. Theological similarities and continuities are neglected due to giving priorities to the alleged time and place. Even though there have been some attempts to pay more attention to theological issues, it is still the case that source-critical issues have attracted more attention. A more coherent and complex theology may be possible if attention is focused on the text as a complex unity, rather than the disparate sources behind the text. On the other hand, it is for fortunate that there has been another stream that has continuously doubted the historical assumption of the general scholarship and insisted on the authorial or theological unity of chs 40–66 or the book of Isaiah.

Redaction-Criticism

Redaction-historical approach, focusing on how variegated materials came to reach the present form of TI, has dominated TI research more recently. While this approach shares the historical concerns with the previous approach, it is distinct in that it focuses more on the final form of the text. This approach often identifies authorial voices as authors or redactors.[68] If the common layers of pieces according to authors and dates are identified, the critics arrange them chronologically or discuss how and why they are put together to reach the present form. This approach often maintains a break between DI and TI, but their relation to the rest of Isaiah is of increasing interest.

According to Koenen, there are three models of this redactional approach: the unity hypothesis, the fragment hypothesis, and the supplementary hypothesis.[69] The first assumes a single authorship of TI, but with some later additions or emendations of the text. The second supposes that TI is made up of a series of independent units from different authors at different times, which were then collected to form the present text. The third assumes a core layer that grew through addition and a reworking process over time. The unity and supplement hypotheses tend to emphasize theological continuity, while the fragmentary hypothesis tends to highlight the diversity of the material.

68. This approach characteristically adopts the concept of redactor/compiler rather than author, although the concept has been suggested already in the source-critical approach.

69. Koenen 1990:1–7. The unity hypothesis is represented by Bonnard (1972); fragment hypothesis by Pauritsch, Whybray (1981), Sekine, and Koenen, Emmerson; and supplement hypothesis by Westermann, Vermeylen, Steck, Beuken, and Lau. According to Smith (1995:7), Koenen is included in the group of fragment hypothesis.

Although, for Pauritsch (1971),[70] TI displays no original unity, the unity of the redactional intention is still acknowledged, as presented in the introductory passage of 56:1–8.[71] Even though he admits that there is no "Trito-Isaianic theology" in that TI has not tried systematically to treat the religious ideas of the time, he briefly elaborates a more or less systematic approach to the theology of TI mainly in terms of 'the images of God,' 'condition of man,' and 'nature of faith.' For him, God is a God of promise/future hope and of the covenant; humanity is in darkness and without hope; faith arises from hope through prayer. The theology of TI is similar to that of DI and is deuteronomistic and eschatological in nature. Even though his analysis is brief (since theology is not the primary focus of his study), he affirms the theological unity of the message(s) of TI.[72] His eschatology, although not systematized, includes topics such as final judgment theophany (ch 66), cleansing the people (ch 59), glorious divine appearance, and the New Heavens and Earth (chs 65, 66).[73] Apocalyptic color is added at several places (63:1–6; 65:25; 66:24).[74] If theological rather than redactional unity is assumed, these theological concepts and eschatological (or apocalyptic) ideas may form a coherent eschatology at a higher level as they pervade the whole TI.

Some attempt to incorporate theology as a way of overcoming the limits of historical approaches. Sekine (1989)[75] adopts thirteen theological concepts to supplement the traditional redaction-critical methodology. These are used as criteria for determining the similarity and discrepancy of the pericopes, thus aiding a judgment about authorship.[76] However, Sekine's

70. According to Sekine (1989:18), Pauritsch set a new stage of the redaction-critical study of TI with his 1971 writing, because he thoroughly applies the literary-, form- or Gattung-critical methodology to the investigation of the units of the text.

71. For him (1971:219–26), TI texts come from several authors who lived at the end of 6C BC. See also McKenzie 1971:489. For Emmerson (1992:58 and 15–20), too, TI should be ascribed to the multiple authorships due to the inner inconsistency of the material, even though TI may be arranged in a logical way to show a symmetrical structure.

72. Pauritsch 1971: 226–41.

73. Pauritsch 1971:223, 221, 230, 231.

74. Pauritsch 1971:222, 223, 224.

75. The starting point of the study of Sekine (1989:25) is the assumption that chs 56 and 66 are the redactional layers and chs 60–62 are to be ascribed to the prophet TI. He (1989:27) assumes the multiple authors hypothesis in advance as is typical in the fragmentation model. Consequently, not only chs 60–62 but also 57:14–19; 65:16b–23, 25; and 66:7–16 are the work of TI (Sekine 1989:68–104, 182).

76. Sekine 1989:26 and 183–216. The complete list of the theological concepts is: salvation, grace, blessing, covenant, justice (righteousness), holiness, sovereignty, God, sin, good/evil, the nations, history, and eschatology. The last two concepts are not

theological concepts are not only subordinate to his historical interests, but they also fail to address the theology of TI as a whole. His theological concepts are also extremely specific. While Elliger suggests a theological correspondence and thus the authorial unity of 57:4, 58:1 and 59:20 because of פשע, Sekine argues that the occurrences in singular and in plural may reflect different sources.[77] If the theological unity of TI is assumed, these differences would enrich rather than limit the theological discussion of פשע. For him, chs 60–62, 65:16b–23, 25 and 66:7–16 have no reference to faith in God, rebellion against God, or seeking God, while 59:15b–21; 65:1, 24; 66:5–6, 17, 18–24 often mention the relation between YHWH and the people, so the two groups of the text belong to different authors and theologies. In 56:3, עם refers to the group of people in which there is no distinction between the Gentile proselytes and the Israelites (this implies universal salvation), while it refers to the whole of Israel, who are exclusively saved in 63:7—64:11[12] (63:7, 8, 14; 64:8[9]). It also denotes the people under judgment in 58:1. So the different senses of עם indicate different sources.[78] The conceptual differences in the nations (ה]גוים[, ה]עמים[) indicate authorial differences.[79] In addition, salvation, which forms the central theme of chs 60–62, is particularistic and thus relates to Israel alone (60:16b), and is concrete and materialistic (60:1–16a, 17a, 18a, 19–20).[80] Conversely, salvation in 59:15b–21 is universalistic and includes the salvation of the nations (59:19a), which implies a different authorship or editorial hand in the passage.[81] For the same reason, Sekine ascribes 56:6–8 and 66:17–24 to the redactor, who is universalistic. As a rule, for Sekine different theological concepts are due to the different authorship, resulting in fragmentation. However, Sekine's theological approach may provide a possibility of integration in theology, so a coherent eschatology.[82]

directly applied to the pericopes, as there are no Hebrew equivalents. He separately discusses the concept of community. Sekine 1989:234–37.

77. Sekine 1989:249.

78. Sekine 1989:206.

79. The peoples (ה)גוים) are neither saved (60:3, 5; 62:2) nor judged (60:10) in chs 60–62. But they are positively mentioned (i.e., salvation) in 66:18–20 and negatively (i.e., judgment) in 64:1. So the different use of ה)גוים may determine sources as well. The peoples (ה)עמים) are also neutral (i.e., subject to neither salvation nor judgment) in chs 60–62 (61:9; 62:10), while they are positive in 56:7 and negative in 63:3, 6.

80. Sekine 1989:188.

81. Sekine 1989:189.

82. If we admit that salvation and praise are the fundamental concepts of the nature of the saved community (as implied in 60:18b; see 4.3), the distinct above-mentioned two concepts of salvation may be integrated. This may be justified, as salvation and praise are contrast to violence as well as ruin and destruction, which are judgment due

Sekine considers that the eschatology of TI is apocalyptic. For him, the Divine Warrior Hymn in 59:15b–21 presents apocalyptic eschatology, but it lacks interest in the earth and portrayal of the change of nature, contrary to chs 60–62. So the passage shows a different stage of development from that of ch 60–62, which is at the same stage of development as 65:17–25, portraying cosmic change.[83] Because of his assumption of the theological as well as authorial differences in TI texts, Sekine, like Hanson, considers that TI displays a wide spectrum of apocalyptic eschatology.

In brief, although Sekine adopts a theological scheme in his redactional approach to TI, he thinks that a redactor might include contradictory sources and not be bound by a concern for unity. So, for him, a unified theology is impossible. However, if ways are found to integrate his distinct theological concepts, his work may point to a coherent eschatological theology.

Koenen (1990) points out that the fundamental limitation of the redactional approach is the subjectivity in deciding redactional matters.[84] To minimize the subjectivity of the methodology, he proposes not only three theological criteria for deciding different authors, but also three verification criteria.[85] However, the application of these criteria does not add up to a harmonized theology of the whole text. Although Koenen considers that the theology of TI is primarily eschatology (as the title of his monograph implies), his theology is not integrated because his redactional presumption divides the material in TI into two main groups, i.e., the works of TI and those of redactors. Theology is subordinated to redactional analysis.[86]

to the sins. Where Sekine finds an apparent theological and authorial difference, an attempt to harmonize the different theology at a higher level may facilitate a coherent overall theology.

83. Sekine 1989:211, 213. Although he usually follows Hanson, he differs at several points. While Hanson excludes 60:19–20 as an interpolation, Sekine keeps them. Both scholars see the verses as reflecting the radical transformation of nature and so apocalyptic.

84. He (1990:7–8) considers that the task of his redactional study is two fold: to decide which texts belong to one/same author and which texts to different authors; and to determine when, where, and from whom the individual layers were written with what theological intention.

85. Koenen 1990:7–8. Koenen's three criteria are content tensions; linguistic and stylistic differences; and discrepancy in the historical and spiritual-historical context. To affirm the same author in the two texts, there should be no tensions and differences (congruence criterion). The authorial agreement of the texts is to be based on what are already known as typical of an author (significance criterion). Even the significant parallelism may not form a single authorship as it may result from, e.g., the same historical situation or theological tradition (explication criterion).

86. Koenen 1990:215–40.

Koenen sees the entire theology of TI as eschatology, although his eschatology is to be understood in relation to the ethics of the people. For him, TI is the precursor of apocalyptic eschatology. He identified a negative view of the present world order—darkness, misery, and need, etc.—as a characteristic of apocalyptic. The portrait of the New Jerusalem in the future and that of the New Heavens and Earth (65:17) are also apocalyptic, since they exist in a new dimension entirely different from the present world order. In addition, the antithetical confrontation between the present and the future, such as 'no more will be x, but y' (60:18; 62:4, 8; 65:19, 20) and 'instead of x, it becomes y' (60:15, 17; 61:3), may be considered apocalyptic. Furthermore, an imminent eschatological expectation and quick beginning of salvation (62:1) may also be apocalyptic.[87] However, his eschatological theology of TI is fragmented because he treats the works of TI and redactors separately.[88] Although he sees an apocalyptic eschatology in TI, Koenen fails to construct a comprehensive and integrated theology, in part because of his redactional interest but also because of his acceptance of a radical social division.[89]

Meanwhile, sometimes there also has been an attempt to pursue the redactional integrity of the book of Isaiah as a whole. Ackroyd (1978; 1982) argues for the unity of the book of Isaiah with the assumption that chs 1–12 are connected to the rest of the book. For him, the "Holy One of Israel" is a link that connects the two parts (and even chs 56–66) and 9:6–9 is connected to 65:25.[90] Clements (1982; 1985) also argues for the unity of the book as a whole from the redactional perspective, even though there is more than one author for the book.[91] He shows the continuity between chs 1–39 and chs 40–66 because of the common themes of blindness/deafness and divine election.[92] Also for Sweeney (1998), the book of Isaiah is unity, TI functioning as a conclusion to the whole book.[93] Thus, chs 56–66 also present the goal of the book, i.e., to persuade the people to join the re-established covenant community of YHWH. For Rendtorff (1993), the book of Isaiah is a redactional unity, with chs 40–55 being the actual core of the redactional development, even though this view is peculiar from other scholars.[94] For

87. Koenen 1990:220–21.
88. Koenen 1990:224–29.
89. Koenen follows Hanson in the view of the social division of the TI community.
90. Ackroyd 1978:16–48.
91. Clements 1982:120.
92. Clements 1985:100–101.
93. Sweeney 1988a:88–89.
94. Rendtorff 1993a:167.

Williamson (1994), the book of Isaiah may be a redactional unity.[95] DI, being influenced by PI, is responsible for the edition of PI plus DI corpus, which TI has been developed from the combined PI and DI corpus by another editor who is responsible for the whole book. This movement has challenged the general trend of the redactional approach dividing the book into sections according to the historical or theological assumptions.

To be brief, redactional research on TI has been characterized more by divergence than consensus. The results range from the unity of the whole book of Isaiah, via unity and single authorship of TI, one main author and multiple redactors, to many authors and several redactors. There seem to be the two reasons for this. First, TI provides insufficient evidence for specific historical events or situations, so determining stages of the text is extremely subjective. Even the redactional critics are sceptical of their results: "[I]t may be that anything approaching a precise dating of this material will forever remain an impossibility."[96] Smith asks, "how much does the development (or, difference) of theology determine the differences of the author or date?"[97] Differences in style, language, and theological notions cannot determine date and authorship because even in one author such diversity can happen, especially if composition takes place over an extended period. Second, redactional research seems highly dependent on the critic's theological understanding. A critic's presupposed theology often determines the allocation of a passage to a particular date or author.[98]

From a theological perspective, as Smith points out, this approach characteristically emphasizes the incoherence and diversity of the pericopes, although some have attempted to explore the redactional/theological unity of TI or a larger corpus.[99] This approach assumes that Isa 56–66 is composed

95. Williamson 1994:20–21; 240–41.

96. Schramm 1995:52.

97. Smith 1995:147.

98. We can see this, for example, in the interpretation of the speaker in 61:1–3. Redaction critics typically identify an authorial/redactional figure. Yet Vermeylen (1977–78:471–89) does not find a prophetic figure; rather it is the community of the faithful that speaks (also see Smith 1995:23). For Emmerson (1992:75–78), it is TI that speaks not only in 61:1–3 but also in 62:1 and 6–7. For Hanson (1975/79:65–69), 61:1–3 is a reiteration of the earlier message spoken by the visionary group, it being either an individual or a group. Smith (1995:24 and 25) is confusing, because he says that the "I" in the passage is "most likely" TI, the author of chs 60–62, but also that 61:1–4 is "more likely" to refer to the Jerusalem community. These divergent views suggest that redaction-criticism is highly dependent on subjective assumption rather than on objective methodology.

99. Although the historical approach has theological concerns in TI, 'historical' concerns are still dominant as is typical in case of Whybray (1981:38–43). He considers that the community of TI confronts with the major three theological problems: (1) the

of diverse materials from multiple authors located in a wide time span.[100] The more sources are suggested, the thinner theology becomes. However, the theological concern in this approach is valuable. Sometimes theological considerations as well as other synchronic aspects are incorporated into the methodology more systematically to supplement the weaknesses of the redactional approach.[101] But the fundamental weakness is this: the critics tend to subordinate theological concerns to historical ones. When redactional critics have tried to elaborate the theology of TI, the results have not been satisfactory. According to Seitz, the lack of theological development in this approach is due to the absence of an agreed reconstruction. At best, theology in this approach is a theology through redactional intentionality, based on a redactional reconstruction.[102] The redactional approach does not bring theology as a center in the theological discussion of the final form of the text. If the literary and theological unity 'at some level' of the text is assumed, then theology may be the central interest of theological enterprise.

Canonical Approach and Its Precursors

There has been another movement in the critical study of TI condemning the separation of chs 56–66 from chs 40–55.[103] While the redactional approach may focus on the final form of the text with a historical interest, the canonical approach emphasizes the theological unity of the final form.[104]

relationship of the returned exiles to the people already resident in Palestine; (2) the huge gap between the real situation of the Palestine and the glorious promises of DI; and (3) the disputes about the rebuilding of the Temple in Jerusalem. His approach belongs to the fragmentation hypothesis.

100. Smith 1995:3. Especially fragmentation hypothesis tends to emphasize theological diversity, as in Grace Emmerson, who considers that such theological differences are based on different authorship. For her (1992:55–56), the ritualistic and ethical charges against the leaders and the people in chs 56, 57, and 58 cannot be congruent with the promises of unconditional salvation in chs 60–62 and the generous attitude towards the Gentiles in chs 56 and 66 cannot stand side by side with the gloomy report of the annihilation of the nations in 63:3–6. For her (1992:35–37, 40), even though DI and TI, being situated in the exilic and postexilic periods, respectively, have much of similarity in themes and forms of expression, TI is distinctive in the shifts of theological meaning. For the rejection of this view, see 2.2.

101. For example, Sekine—theological methodology; Koenen—theological methodology; Smith—rhetorical methodology; and Hanson and Schramm—sociological methodology, etc.

102. Seitz 2001:541.

103. Sekine 1989:9.

104. The term 'canonical approach' is suggested by Childs as highlighting the synchronic view of the final form of the Bible as well as the normative role of the canon in

Smart may be understood as a precursor of the canonical approach, since he explored the present form of the text not from a diachronic approach but from a synchronic perspective. Contrary to the previous interpreters, who have read the book based on the predetermined historical situation, he suggests a new reading: "to begin the exposition with the fewest possible assumptions, to read ch 40 as though we knew nothing of the prophet except what he himself tells us in the text of the chapter, then to read ch 41 in the light of what we have learned in ch 40, ch 42 in the light of chs 40 and 41, and so on throughout the twenty-eight[*sic*.] chapters."[105] This implies that the passages are to be understood primarily in the literary context of the book. Following Torrey (1928), Smart thought that chs 35 and 40–66 were a unity (see above). So, for him, the discrepancy in the subject matter of the two blocks (40–55, 56–66) is not great enough to undermine literary unity.[106] Nor were the references to Babylon and Chaldea in 43:14, 48:14 and 20 proofs of the prophet's residence thereof.[107] The Babylon residence of the prophet DI was hardly convincing, because the prophet's address to the exile did not require him to be among the exiles in Babylonia. But the prophecy was spoken not to the local community but to the widely dispersed people in the four corners of the earth. As the title of his monograph implies, Smart paid more attention to the theological aspects than previous scholars.[108] For him, the theology of these chapters of "DI" (chs 35 and 40–66) is "eschatological." The prophet was "projecting himself into the future to describe vividly the anticipated events," in that the nature of the salvific hope of the chapters is a future intervention of YHWH in the history of Israel and of the world.[109] In these discussions we can see theology, rather than history, coming more to the fore in the discussion of the character of TI.

Smart's approach has been recently supported by Childs' (1979; 2001) canonical approach and also by Seitz (1992; 2001).[110] Childs (1979) suggests

the faith community, as the predominating historical approach may not do justice with the literary point of view. Childs 1979:51, 65; Barton 1984:79.

105. Smart 1967:9. Torrey may be included in this category, because he (1928:53) assumes that the twenty-seven chapters of Isa 40–66 are written down by DI in their present order.

106. Torrey 1928:7–8.

107. Smart 1967:20–22. Smart (1967:18) did not commit himself to the "interpolation theory," unlike Torrey. So, for him (1967:9), it is not necessary to delete the Cyrus and Babylon-Chaldea passages as did Torrey.

108. See Smart 1967:18–19. For example, he sees the "highway" in 40:3 is not the physical road from Babylonia to Jerusalem, but an element of theophany, through which YHWH returns to His people. Smart 1967:22.

109. Smart 1967:37–39.

110. Seitz 1992:502.

that the canonical approach concerns primarily the final form of the text itself. Its aim is not to reconstruct a history of religious development but to investigate the religious text in relation to its role within the historical community of faith in ancient Israel.[111] This approach may share with historical critical methods an interest in doing justice to the integrity of the text, but differs from them in that it interprets the texts in consideration of their theological authority in the faith community. It also focuses on the theological shape of the canonical text rather than on a historical reconstruction.[112]

For Childs, Isa 40–66 (and thus Isa 56–66 as well) should be understood ultimately not against the historical background of Babylonian exile but against the canonical setting that the present form of the book of Isaiah provides.[113] This is also supported by the fact that there are no specific references to the historical context, no superscription, no date formulae, etc., in these chapters (the historical background is 'subordinated').[114] He understands the relation between the first and second half of the book through the scheme of prophecy-fulfillment, as indicated by the contrast between the "former things" and "latter things."[115] TI is dependent on DI and there is no radical tension at all between the two from the canonical perspective. Thus, TI should be interpreted primarily in the canonical context of the book of Isaiah.[116] He rejects Zimmerli's hypothesis that TI was spiritualized from DI.[117] Even though he did not elaborate the independent theology of TI, his commentary presents theological insights that might be the basis for a systematic theology of TI.

Seitz (2001) says that the conventional separation of chs 40–66 from the first part causes contradictory and conflicting views of origins, arrangement, editing, and integrity of the chapters.[118] He argues that the entire corpus of the book of Isaiah should be treated as a single volume in relation to other prophets in the canon.[119] He supports Childs' view that the historical setting of chs 40–66 is not clearly reflected within the context of the larger part of the book. These chapters work without necessarily foregrounding

111. Childs 1979:73.

112. Childs 1979:74.

113. Although he does not explicitly deny the multiple authorship of the book of Isaiah, historical matters are not primary concern for him.

114. Childs 1979:325–27.

115. Childs 1979:328.

116. Childs 1979:333–34.

117. Childs 2001:442.

118. Seitz 2001:311.

119. Seitz 2001:313.

their socio-historical background as the historical scholars intend to do. The mention of Cyrus in 45:1 is not intended to inform us of the text's precise dating, but rather it functions as a typology of "second pharaoh" in the "second exodus" theme. The text and the knowledge of Cyrus do not necessarily suggest that the author or audience were in Babylonia. Indeed, the audience is regarded as being dispersed over the whole earth. From the point of view of the literature, as Duhm noted, the perspective is Jerusalem-oriented, since 52:11 (48:20[*sic*.]) denotes Babylon as "there."[120] For him, a Zion-orientation is the text's intention, so an overemphasis on an exilic historical setting is a misinterpretation. In addition, a division of the book according to an alleged geographical setting is inappropriate.[121] As for authorship, he argues for the single authorship of the book of Isaiah, not necessarily in terms of a historical figure, but in terms of the authorized voice of the literature. The servants in TI are the disciples of the Servant of DI. They are actually responsible for the authorial voice in TI as well as being successors of the Servant in various ways. Since the servants firstly appear in ch 54, TI starts there and not in ch 56.[122]

In summary, the canonical approach sees the TI text against the context of the book and the canon as received (*tradiert*) in the faith community. It presupposes the theological unity and sometimes even the authorial unity of the book. It has an inclination to downplay the alleged historical setting in chs 40–55 and in chs 56–66. The theological rather than historical viewpoint becomes central, as the literary and theological unity is secured in the text of the canon.

Conclusion

Because source critics have tried to identify the sources and separated TI from DI due to the alleged geographical and historical setting, they have fragmented the text and have only been able to set out a thin theology. In redactional studies, there has never been an agreed redactional process, which makes a thick theology impossible. Although theological factors have sometimes been considered, the historical and redactional interest has still dominated theological concern. As a counter to this stream, some scholars

120. Here, Seitz distinguishes the actual setting of the author and the literary or imaginary setting that is presented in the text. We need to appreciate the latter rather than the former for the sake of interpretation of the text as the text presents. Seitz seems to confuse 52:11 with 48:20, as 52:11 reads, "סורו סורו צאו משם."

121. Seitz 2001:315–16.

122. Seitz 2001:316–21.

have assumed the unity of the second part of the book, and challenged a sharp break between DI and TI. It is especially canonical theologians that assume the theological unity of chs 40–66 (and the book of Isaiah). They see the text primarily in the context of the canon, and thus historical concerns are subordinated to theological interests. A theological continuity between DI and TI will be assumed for the study of TI in this dissertation, which may bring a possible construction of a deeper eschatological theology.

What is meant by such an eschatological theology is our next concern.

1.3 Excursus: Eschatological Setting of the Study

I have surveyed the history of the interpretation of TI in the book of Isaiah in the previous section to show that TI needs to be seen in the canonical context of the book and that it is reasonable to assume the theological unity of TI and the book. I have also proposed that the theology of TI is eschatology. In this excursus, several important terms used in the book will be defined by identifying eschatological and apocalyptic issues in general in the OT. They include eschatology, apocalyptic, and mythical. This section also sets out assumptions for the eschatological study of TI. Mythical thinking is at work in the concepts and the development of both eschatology and apocalyptic.

The term 'eschatology' at first signified in systematic theology the doctrine of the "last things," especially for an individual.[123] In OT research it may refer to the idea of the *end* of history (or the universe) in a narrower sense. But in a broader sense it signifies the general future hope as presented in, e.g., the prophecies of the OT.[124] The definition of eschatology has been related to other issues such as its existence before the prophets and the source of eschatology. It is also related to the definition of apocalyptic as well as the relation between history and eschatology.

Gressmann in *Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie* argued for the pre-prophetic existence of OT eschatology, considering that the prophetic pattern of the alternating doom and salvation and curse and blessing originated from Babylonian thought.[125] However, Mowinckel rejected his view, because it is difficult to find evidence of eschatological

123. Fiorenza 1984:271.

124. Jenni 1982:126.

125. Gressmann 1905:250–59. Sellin (1912) also acknowledged the pre-prophetic eschatology, although he rejected Gressmann's Babylonian influence, since for him OT eschatology originated from the message of Moses.

prophecies in Babylonia and Assyria.[126] Mowinckel argued that the question of the existence of eschatology in the prophetic books should not be confused with that of the authenticity of the eschatological sayings.[127] For him, such eschatological phrases as 'at the end of the days' were inserted at later times,[128] and thus there is no eschatology in or before the prophetic books.[129] Eschatology should be distinguished strictly from the "future hope" and is about the last things, the end of the present world order and the creation of a new order.[130] He looked for a possible source of eschatology in cultic thought.[131] Although there is an element of "hope" in the election and covenant tradition of Israel, which he called "natural, buoyant optimism," it is different in nature from what is called "eschatology," which is of a universal and cosmic character. "Eschatology" arises directly from the hope of national restoration, and thus presupposes the destruction of the nation. There is a crevasse between traditional hope and eschatological hope. The post-exilic cult, rather than the element of future hope in earlier traditions, provided the matrix for eschatology.[132] The "Day of YHWH" was originally a reference to the day of cultic festival and was later eschatologized when it lost the realistic connection with the world.[133] Thus, in Mowinckel eschatology is a new element to the traditional hope about the future.

However, according to Clements, Mowinckel's view of eschatology, being understood as about the end of the world and the inauguration of a new world order through universal disruption, reflects a narrow definition.[134] For Clements, eschatology in a broader sense is related to the Biblical idea of God's purpose in history: eschatology is Israel's hope based on the faith of YHWH, who has elected, and covenanted with, Israel. This hope has two features as its foundation. First, YHWH's purpose has a universal scope and is centered on the covenantal relationship. Second, His purpose is realized in the arena of history.[135] Vriezen as well considers that eschatology should not be limited to the dramatic cosmic change of the universe. The expression

126. Mowinckel 1959:126–27, 129.

127. Mowinckel 1959:130.

128. Mowinckel 1959:131.

129. Mowinckel 1959:130.

130. Mowinckel 1959:125. His view of definition of eschatology is "apocalyptic," as will be discussed later.

131. Mowinckel 1959:125–54.

132. Mowinckel 1959:133–34.

133. Mowinckel 1959 150.

134. Clements 1965:104.

135. Clements 1965:104–5. Clements personally adopts a broader sense.

אחרית הימים signifies not only the last days, but also the general future, and "things to come" do not distinguish between the future as the limit of the personal horizon and the absolute future in a modern sense.[136] Those who define the term "eschatology" broadly generally accept the presence of a pre-prophetic eschatology.[137] Those who tend to define eschatology more narrowly generally do not accept a pre-prophetic eschatology. Therefore, the question of dating eschatology is linked very closely to its definition, whether it is pre-prophetic or not, and whether it is broader or narrower. I prefer the broader definition, since not only is this generally accepted but there also is a strong doubt about the radical discontinuity between the post-exilic hope of national restoration and the traditional hope of Israel in her election and covenant.[138]

Mowinckel's view of the source of eschatology may be challenged as well. Firstly, contrary to his argument for a post-exilic cultic origin, cultic theology dates back to the early monarchic period, as he concedes.[139] If cultic theology reflects or projects eschatology, then it indicates a pre-prophetic origin of eschatology. Secondly, his understanding of the cultic elements does not seem persuasive, and thus his conception of "myth" is also questionable. In the New Year's Festival (*the festival of YHWH's enthronement* is his term), the coming of YHWH, His combat, His victory, and even His enthronement are dramatized.[140] These motifs are "mythical" elements, which re-enact the primordial creational events.[141] In the "myth," which *theologizes* the change of the seasons, the Deity battles against chaos and death, wins the victory, and is enthroned as a divine king. The victory and enthronement of YHWH in fact refers to the new season overcoming the old, which ensures prosperity of the community in the next year and brings confirmation that YHWH will not abandon Israel and will rule her forever, which constitutes eschatology.[142] But in the theologizing of the change of the nature, Mowinckel seems to confuse between the theological reference

136. Vriezen 1953:202.

137. Vriezen, Jenni, and Linblom, etc., are included in this category. Jenni 1982:127–28.

138. Contrary to Mowinckel (1959:125), Vriezen (1953:202), Clements (1965:104), and Reventlow (1997:170) adopt the broader definition.

139. Mowinckel 1959:139.

140. Mowinckel 1959:140. Through, for example, the procession of the Ark, and the proclamation יהוה מלך, etc.

141. Mowinckel 1959:143.

142. Mowinckel 1959:139–43. While in Canaanite myth, the change of the seasons is a symbolism of the divine struggle, in Mowinckel, the battle and victory of YHWH is a symbolism of the change of the seasons.

and the vehicle of the myth. For him, "myth" is a metaphor theologizing the natural phenomenon. However, we understand that the enthronement or victory of YHWH in the cultic drama is a re-enactment of the past event and refers to the divine action in the heavenly realm, which defines "myth" (see below). For example, the future divine salvation is portrayed as the new exodus, i.e., the re-application of the exodus in 51:9–12. The mythical description of YHWH in 59:15b–21 is understood as divine action in the heavenly realm.

Alternatively, von Rad in his *Old Testament Theology* considers that the driving motive of eschatology derives from the very nature of the view of time and history of Israel, which has been formed by the experience of God since the early stages of Israel. Israel always knew only time as containing events. For Israel, time is linear, and history is controlled by the Deity. Time/history is thus inherently "eschatological," in a sense that it moves towards the ultimate fulfilment.[143] In the prophets, a new element of the perspective of the world history was added and an orientation towards the future was even more emphasized, to accelerate eschatologization.[144] For von Rad, the ideological center of (prophetic) eschatology is the Day of YHWH, the climax of which is the coming of YHWH in person.[145] The Day of YHWH is the day of the battle of YHWH and His victory, as it has been shaped against the background tradition of the Holy War.[146] By this, it is evident that von Rad, suggesting implicitly a wider view of eschatology, sees the source of eschatology in the past tradition of YHWH's people, whether it is the Holy War tradition, or more broadly the view of history moulded by divine salvation in the past. However, the role of mythical materials in the formation of eschatology does not seem to be fully considered. For example, the description of the divine action of eschatological salvation in 59:15b–21 is not only a re-application of the past Divine Warrior tradition, but it also develops the actions of YHWH in the heavenly realm, which reflects mythical thinking (see below).

Cross attempts to combine von Rad (*Heilsgeschichte* school) and Mowinckel (Myth and Ritual school) in his understanding of OT eschatology, trying to show that cultic tradition, formed in the period of the kings, and

143. von Rad 1965:100–101, 106.

144. von Rad 1965:112–13.

145. von Rad 1965:119.

146. von Rad 1965:119–24. Von Rad has found the Holy War traditions in Judg 7 (cf. Isa 9:4), 2 Sam 5 (cf. Isa 28:21), 1 Sam 7:10, Josh 10:11, Exod 14 & 15, etc. It is strange for him not to try to elaborate the concept of the Day of YHWH starting with, and based on, these passages. He just started from the prophetic passages. See von Rad 1959:97–108.

the older Holy War tradition, a heritage of tribal amphictyony, do not conflict with each other. Mythical elements have been included together with historical elements in the covenant renewal cult in the earlier stage of Israel, which re-enacted the exodus and conquest events.[147] The Day of YHWH is at the same time both the day of victory of YHWH in holy warfare and the day of enthronement in YHWH's festival.[148] Cross' idea forms an enhanced basis for the understanding of eschatology in that it combines the two distinct elements—myth and salvation history. However, his elaborations do not solve the problem of the role of the cult in relation to eschatology, in part because he reiterates the tension between Gressmann's view of foreign influence of eschatology and Sellin's view of indigenous eschatology in that in his view of the cult, Israel has *shared* the Canaanite myth and *theology*.[149] But this is highly questionable because the polytheistic references in Canaanite myth were not accepted in Israel, although the mythical way of thinking (i.e., references to the heavenly/spirit realm) may be shared. So, although the issue of the source of eschatology requires further evaluation of the roles of the cult, myth, and creation theology,[150] Cross' integration may not be successful.

Von Rad's attempt to find out the source of eschatology in tradition has been modified or extended recently by Petersen. He argues that OT eschatology developed from a complex set of traditions, i.e., traditions of the promises to the patriarchs, David-Zion tradition, and Sinai tradition. These provided expectations which are essential elements of eschatology, although the 587 BCE fall of Jerusalem may have functioned as the catalyst to form a fully fledged eschatology. Patriarchal promises about the land and progeny, and becoming a great nation, provide a certain *expectation* for the identity and existence of Israel. The Davidic Covenant of a continuous reign of the Davidic line in 2 Sam 7 is linked not only to the patriarchal promise tradition but also to the notion of king on the throne and to that of Zion the Davidic city, in which the Deity also dwells. This tradition of the Davidic Covenant also produced the *expectation* of a future blessing of a secure Israel that the Davidic king rules. These expectations included both historical and cultic elements. The Sinai Covenant tradition inherently bears a *future orientation*, as it returns blessings or curses in the future according to the future

147. Cross 1966:12–13.

148. Cross 1966:30.

149. Cross 1966:21.

150. See Nickelsburg 1992; Aune 1992; Smith 1993; Clements 1965; Whitley 1963, etc.

obedience or disobedience of the covenant people.[151] For him, prophecies, in which the Davidic tradition and the Sinai Covenant are fused, present prophetic eschatology.[152] If this kind of future-oriented expectation, which is based on past traditions, is to be included in the category of eschatology, this must be in a broader sense, which in turn suggests a pre-prophetic, as well as prophetic, dating of eschatology. Peterson's understanding clarifies that a time element involved with the promise-fulfilment scheme is essential in the development of eschatology. However, the role of mythical language and thinking, crucial in the development of eschatology, is missing or neglected in his understanding, as it is in von Rad. For example, he does not acknowledge that the divine action of creation is repeated in the eschatological vision as in Isaiah 65:17.

In summary, issues of the definition, dating, and source of eschatology are related to each other. A broader definition is preferable, based on the purpose and salvific actions of YHWH in history. It has been observed that the religious traditions of Israel have eschatologizing momentum. Especially the covenant traditions including patriarchal promises provide the expectation for the future. The promise-fulfilment scheme is the pivotal element for the development of eschatology. The role of mythical thinking that the transcendental YHWH is working in history and that the divine action in the heavenly realm is re-applied in the eschatological future has not been appropriately considered as possible a matrix from which eschatology develops.

The role of mythical thinking is more clearly exhibited in the concept of apocalyptic, which is the next issue for our discussion. The term 'apocalyptic' originally refers to the theological/literary features of the Jewish apocalypses in late Judaism.[153] Because apocalyptic usually addresses Israel's future hope, eschatology in the broader sense includes the theology of apocalyptic literature, i.e., apocalyptic eschatology, as a particular form of eschatology.[154] The definition of apocalyptic [or, apocalypse] is related to the understanding of its major features. Authors may differ in the theological implications of the term apocalyptic, partly because they have different

151. Petersen 1992:576–77. He does not suggest these three sources are exclusive to each other.

152. Petersen 1992:577.

153. Hanson 1984:29–30; Allen 1990:15; von Rad 1965:301. According to Travis (1979:54), it is widely accepted that "the designation 'apocalyptic' may properly be given to the Biblical book of Daniel, sixteen non-canonical books and a large number of the Qumran scrolls."

154. Vriezen 1953:202; Clements 1965:105; von Rad 1965:301.

interests and views on the core characteristics of apocalypses.[155] Theological positions about the issues of apocalyptic are dependent on each other. Before defining the term, therefore, we need to review the two major views on the source or origin of apocalyptic.[156]

Seitz, following von Rad, considers that apocalyptic originated from the wisdom tradition.[157] For Seitz, the eternal realities are "manifested through a revelation (apocalypse)" to those who have wisdom and the sacred texts to comprehend the eternal realities. So, for him, apocalyptic is defined as what is "*interpreted truly*" to disclose the eternal realities as an "appeal to the past (word of God) for the purpose of disclosing revelatory truth in the present."[158] So it is more related to the "exegetical" or interpretive process of the past word of God as exemplified in the new creation account in 65:20–23 or the citation of 11:6 in 65:25, than to a set of the theological features of a certain genre (the apocalypses). Thus, for him, prophetic eschatology and apocalyptic eschatology are not distinguished in terms of theology, but only in their mode of revelation. While prophecy is an inspired address, apocalypse is a wise interpretation of the inspired texts.[159] For him, the social location of TI's prophecy is found within the cult, as the prophets progressively preached in the context of Israel's cult in the postexilic period.[160]

Seitz's idea of the re-application of the previous revelation of divine plan as the new revelation of the future divine salvation illuminates the eschatological/apocalyptic development, suggesting mythical thinking at

155. Wright (1992:280–82) suggests two main characteristics of apocalyptic: the disclosure of the secrets of the eternal reality (esotericism) and the cataclysmic change of the universe (cosmic dimension of the vision). Aune et al. (Aune, Geddert, and Evans 2000:48) suggest eight features of apocalyptic. According to Travis (1979:58–60), apocalyptic is generally understood as having the four (alleged) general features such as a clear distinction between the present, which is evil, and the coming world; the imminence of the end of the world; pessimism about the present world; and predetermined course of history. However, he argues that, of the four, the last two are not necessarily characteristics of apocalyptic.

156. There may be another view of origin, i.e., a view of the Babylonian origin. But the main ideas of this will be rejected later, so this view is not discussed at this stage. See Russel 1964:19.

157. Seitz 1999:74–76; von Rad 1965a:301–8.

158. Italics his. As it were, the 'apocalyptic' denotes the involvement with "the disclosure of truth with reference to prior testimony in texts or tradition or teaching."

159. Seitz 1999:74–76.

160. The cultic use of TI as well as PI/DI may be suggested because TI is included in the larger corpus of the book of Isaiah, the materials from DI and PI are included in TI, and similar languages and expressions of DI and TI are included in the Psalter. Seitz 1992:504.

work. However, his proposal for a cultic location of apocalyptic hardly supports the view of wisdom tradition as its origin. Rather, mythical thinking is more appropriate as a direct source of apocalyptic than the cult itself, although the latter may be the major locus for the former. The proclamation of divine action may have developed and continuously been re-applied to the life of Israel in the thought of the prophets and the addressees of the proclamation even outside the cult. Besides, it may be difficult to distinguish between the materials in the canon as direct revelations in the past and those as re-applications of the past words to the present. In addition, it is questionable to identify 'mantic wisdom,' by which eternal reality is revealed, e.g., when Joseph and Daniel have interpreted dreams, and the 'proverbial wisdom' of the sages.[161] Furthermore, contrary to von Rad, an apocalyptic view of history is not necessarily pessimistic and deterministic, as Travis observes.[162] In relation to determinism, von Rad comments, "God sees events twice. In the first instance he sees them in their primeval, predetermined state and then once again when they have appeared in history 'in their time.'"[163] This may also suggest mythical thinking since the protological event is applicable to history at multiple times (see below).

For Hanson, on the contrary, apocalyptic developed from the prophetic tradition.[164] Hanson defines apocalyptic as the disclosure (usually esoteric in nature) of the cosmic vision of the sovereign salvific will of YHWH. In this disclosure, "the visionaries have largely ceased to translate [their visions] into instrumentality due to a pessimistic view of reality growing out of the bleak post-exilic conditions within which those associated with the visionaries found themselves."[165] For him, there is an essential continuity

161. Aune, Geddert, and Evans 2000:48.

162. Travis 1979:58–60. See below for the discussion of dualism.

163. Von Rad 1972/75:265. He (1972/75:273) adds, "this act of revelation is a non-recurring one; it lies at the beginning and concerns the whole of history right through to its eschatological conclusion. . . . [T]he end erupts abruptly into a world of history which is growing darker and darker, and the benefits of salvation which have long been pre-existent in the heavenly world—'until time comes to an end'—(Son of Man, the New Jerusalem) makes their appearance."

164. Hanson 1975:6 ; Carroll 1982:48; Aune 1992:595. For him (1975:6), "[T]he apocalyptic literature of the second century and after is the result of a long development reaching back to pre-exilic times and beyond, and not the new baby of second-century foreign parents." Travis (1979:61) argues for the theological continuity between prophecies and apocalyptic, contrary to von Rad, who rejects the connection between apocalyptic and prophecies.

165. Hanson 1975:11. Aune, Geddert, and Evans (2000:47) summarized Hanson's apocalyptic features as: (1) esoteric disclosure of the secrets of the universe to the chosen, (2) cosmic scope of the divine action, (3) disconnectedness with plain history (no translation into plain history) of the vision, (4) pessimistic view of history, and (5) 'the

between prophetic and apocalyptic eschatology in that both are revelation originally from YHWH. Hanson's term "apocalyptic eschatology" in contrast to "prophetic eschatology" facilitates "both elements of continuity and change in the development."[166] Prophets unfold the divine plans as displayed in the divine council and announce them to the nation; visionaries disclose the cosmic vision of the salvation of sovereign YHWH.[167] However, while the prophets translate the plans of divine council into the terms of plain history (e.g., real politics of the nations and human instrumentality), the visionaries [i.e., apocalypticists] do not.[168]

For Hanson, the eschatological message of TI (early apocalyptic) has a strong connection with that of DI (proto-apocalyptic), especially in chs 60–62, but it is not limited to the message of DI.[169] TI's apocalyptic eschatology developed due to the sociological struggle between hierocratic priests and the prophetic visionary group in 'the gloomy post-exilic situation.'[170] As the prophetic group lost their political hegemony in the community, being defeated by the hierocratic priests, they ceased to translate their cosmic vision into the plain language that portrays history.[171]

For Hanson, DI adopted (Israel's version of) the conflict myth, which inaugurates the apocalyptic development (so, 'proto-apocalyptic'). The mythical element in DI represents the cosmic dimension of the divine actions, "which had been absent in prophecy."[172] Hanson considers that the original home of the Divine Warrior Hymn (59:15b–20) was "the cosmic realm of myth."[173] The hymn reflects mythical thinking, celebrating the work of YHWH in the past, but becomes eschatologized to present the divine work in the future.[174] By the adoption of the hymn, prophetic eschatology was transformed into apocalyptic eschatology, becoming detached from plain history and universalized to cover the nations as well as Israel and even to embrace the entire cosmos.[175] "The influence of myth, with its

bleak post-exilic conditions.'

166. Hanson 1975:10.

167. Hanson 1975:11.

168. Hanson 1975:11.

169. In this, Hanson follows G. von Rad, although for von Rad (1965:279–81) TI is not apocalyptic.

170. Hanson 1984:32.

171. Hanson 1975:11.

172. Hanson 1975:126–27.

173. Hanson 1975:118, 126.

174. Hanson 1975:124–25.

175. Hanson 1975:126.

dualistic imagery of a conflict between the warrior god and the insurgent foe, ultimately would lead to a picture of judgment in apocalyptic eschatology which construed the enemy increasingly in terms of absolute evil."[176]

Hanson's view needs to be appreciated for several points. He acknowledges the "mythopoeic" or mythical elements, i.e., the realities in the heavenly realm in both prophecies and apocalyptic. He recognizes the literary function of the Divine Warrior Hymn. Childs criticizes Hanson's "the history of religion's approach," commenting that "such a concern for historical origins does not aid greatly in understanding the passage according to its literary function in chapter 59."[177] However, in my judgment the Divine Warrior Hymn is understood as presenting a prophetic description of the divine (apocalyptic) revelation of the heavenly realities, and not as history. Hanson detects the heavenly realm and the two-tier world-picture as reflected in the hymn, which is the basis for the mythical thinking. Mythical thinking may be defined as a way of thinking that takes into consideration realities and activities in the heavenly realm based on a two-tier-world picture.[178] The vision of YHWH's salvific action in the heavenly realm is expected with certainty to be realized ultimately in historical reality. Often the reality in the heavenly realm, e.g., YHWH's victory over the mythical monster, is applied in the historical world at multiple times. Due to his understanding of the hymn he considers that the divine actions involve a cosmic dimension.

However, Hanson's idea that prophecy and apocalyptic have introduced mythical thinking and the cosmic dimension by the adoption of mythical materials needs to be reconsidered. For him, the adoption of the conflict myth by DI is a "new" movement, assuming that mythopoeic thinking belongs to the (royal) cult alone.[179] However, mythical materials have been ever present not only in the cultic message, but since ancient times

176. Hanson 1975:207.

177. Childs 2001:489.

178. For the sense of myth, we accept the Levenson's conception in that myth is the symbols expressed in the timeless languages although myth is originally from the protological time (the ultimate past) while apocalyptic languages are not necessarily protological (Levenson 1985:102). See below in the main text.

179. Hanson understands that although Israel's ancient literature reflects mythopoeic thought, prophetic religion lacks the mythical elements, and it is in the royal theology of the Jerusalem court that the ancient myth and ritual pattern was combined with "the archaic league tradition of the ritual conquest." Here, Hanson tends to put prophets essentially against the royal cult of Jerusalem, since the latter keep the mythical vision untranslated into historicality, while the former do this. However, it is suspicious whether the ancient mythical element and the theology of the royal cult are sharply separated from the Deuteronomistic History. Mythical materials are included in Exod 15, Judg 5, and Josh 10 as well as in the royal cult or prophecies, presenting the heavenly realm as related to the earthly realm.

in Israel as witnessed by the Song of the Sea (Exod 15:1b–18), as he concedes.[180] The mythical materials express a mythopoeic thinking in Israel's religion. But, it is not by the introduction of a mythical element (such as the Divine Warrior Hymn) but by mythopoeic thinking that the eschatology of DI and TI develops, although the two are closely related. Mythical material is part of mythopoeic thinking; mythopoeic thinking is not brought about by the introduction of mythical material. This is because the divine actions of creation and exodus and other salvation actions of YHWH are already mythical. It is strange that only the prophets avoid mythical thinking, while others (such as the ancient people, those who had cult, and post-exilic visionaries) have a mythopoeic mind. The prophets also frequently refer to the heavenly realm. Furthermore, Hanson's assumption on the sociological struggle in the post-exilic situation is not clearly supported by the text of TI (see 5.2).[181] In addition to this, the assumption of pessimism is also rejected by Travis (see below).

Keeping in mind the two views of apocalyptic, I define "apocalyptic" as "the heavenly languages ('mythical patterns' is Seitz's term[182]) revealing the eternal realities, often involving the (cataclysmic) cosmic vision of the last things."[183] In this definition, three main theological features of apocalyptic may be suggested: (1) the apocalyptic or mythical representation of the eternal realities; (2) apocalyptic duality (distinction between the present age and the age to come) and the consequent discontinuity with the present world; and (3) the cosmic scope of the vision, i.e., cataclysmic change of the universe.

180. For Hanson, while DI has maintained the tension between cosmic dimension of YHWH's action and the historical reality, TI could not so do and focused on the cosmic dimension of the divine action without relating it to the history. But the disconnectedness widened in apocalyptic should not be over-emphasized. It should be thought of in connection with the mythical thinking in common in both DI and TI. Both prophecy and apocalyptic develop by the mythopoeic thought of Israel—although DI and TI may have different emphases.

181. His methodology that borrowed from Max Weber is questionable. Hanson 1975:20–21; Childs 2001:444; Seitz 2001:525. Hanson's view of 'the bleak post-exilic conditions' as the origin of the apocalyptic in TI may be unwarranted because the historical conditions are not the primary concern of the TI text and this may be an *eis-egesis* in the interpretation of TI.

182. Seitz 1999:74.

183. For the distinction between apocalypse, apocalyptic (eschatology), and apocalypticism, see Hanson 1975:8–12.

Apocalyptic or Mythical Representation[184]

Hanson considers that apocalyptic language may refer to transcendental realities in the heavenly realm, while some consider the language as metaphor of the historical reality. For the cosmic scope in apocalyptic visions, Hanson understands cosmic imageries as 'literal' since the new heaven and earth replace the old ones and eschatological judgment involves the whole creation.[185] Here, "literal" means "straightforward descriptions of heavenly reality," as Wright observed.[186] For Hanson, mythical languages refer to the heavenly realm as in the Divine Warrior Hymn (59:15b–21), and apocalyptic is also mythical. However, Wright argues that a "'literalist' reading" of this change of the universe is not warranted in Jewish thought, if this includes the destruction of the universe.

For Wright, apocalyptic language such as the cataclysmic change of the universe is metaphorical and refers to events within history,[187] although he recognizes the possibility of metaphysical representation of such language.[188] For him, some of the apocalyptic visions are concerning the heavenly realm itself, as "intended to be taken 'literally,' that is, as straightforward description of heavenly reality."[189] For him, "the heavenly and the earthly realm belong closely with one another," and apocalyptic language "sometimes make[s] use of the metaphysical correspondence between the earthly and the heavenly."[190] However, for him, within the Jewish worldview of the first century, the real end of the space-time universe is not known.[191] Thus, "when they used what we might call cosmic imagery to describe the coming new age, such language cannot be read in a crassly literalistic way without doing it great violence."[192] Wright's understanding of the heavenly realm is very limited, since 'heaven' is "God's dimension of present reality" alone.[193] He

184. That is, representation in the heavenly realm. 'Metaphysical representation' is Wright's (1992:290) term.

185. Hanson 1975:155, 207.

186. Wright 1992:284.

187. Wright 1992:280–85. According to him, "apocalyptic language uses complex and highly coloured metaphors in order to describe one event in terms of another, thus bringing out the perceived 'meaning' of the first."

188. Wright 1992:284, 290.

189. Wright 1992:284.

190. Wright 1992:291.

191. Wright 1992:285.

192. Wright 1992:284–85. For him, literal reading of the cosmic imageries is as if historians would understand the metaphorical language 'earth-shattering event' referring to the fall of the Berlin Wall as a real earthquake several centuries later.

193. Wright 1999b:13; n.d.:9.

does not consider that the apocalyptic language in Dan 7 and Mark 13 may go beyond the historical and literary contexts to refer to the ultimate future or heavenly aspect.[194] So, he tends to downplay the transcendental aspects of the apocalyptic language. For Wright, "the [cosmic] events, including the ones that were expected to come as the climax of YHWH's restoration of Israel, remained within (what we think of as) the this-worldly ambit."[195] Thus, for him, apocalyptic is about the historical world and is to be understood as metaphor and the cataclysmic imagery has "nothing to do with the world itself coming to an end."[196] For Wright, the 'literalist reading' of the change [i.e., the end and recreation] of the universe "belongs closely together" with a moral/theological duality. That is a radical dualism, which incorporates three kinds of dualities: "the distinction between the creator and the world (theological/cosmological duality is his term), the distinction between the physical and the non-physical world (cosmological duality is his term), and the distinction between good and evil (moral duality is his term)."[197] I doubt, however, whether a literalist understanding of apocalyptic language necessarily "belongs closely together" with these three dualities, since the destruction of the universe does not necessarily require an inherently evil universe (see below).

Wright's understanding of the apocalyptic languages is to some extent dependent on Caird's view of myth and mythical thinking/representation. For Caird, providing Wright with a theoretical background about the metaphoric understanding of the apocalyptic/mythical languages, "myths are stories about the past which embody and express a people's traditional culture."[198] For Caird, myth is the universal instinctive center of reference or the universal type of the stories or events or places or persons. So, myth is "emblematic," and he emphasizes the literary function of mythology ($Myth^{L}$ [literary] is his term).[199] It is a specialized kind of metaphor, which has a historical referent. "It tells a story about the past, but only in order to say something about the present and the future. It has a literal referent in the characters and events of the vehicle story, but its tenor referent is the situation of the user and his audience."[200] He does not consider the "vehicle story"

194. Wright 1999a:265.

195. Wright 1992:285.

196. Wright (1992:285) supports Caird, Glasson, and Borg rather than Schweitzer on the matter of apocalyptic representation.

197. Wright 1992:285.

198. Caird 1980:220.

199. Caird 1980:223.

200. Caird 1980:224.

to form a self-sustained world, whether a thought world or spirit/heavenly world (these two being closely related). For him, the mythical language in Isa 51:9–11 and Col 2:15 refers to the events of the exodus and the cross, which happened in real history. These passages represent the conviction that God is Lord of history.[201]

Caird's understanding of mythical representation may however be challenged. First, Caird does not seem to acknowledge the spiritual world or heavenly realm.[202] He tends to neglect or misunderstand the existence of spiritual beings.[203] Second, Caird does not appear to pay attention to the nature of the "vehicle story," but only to its literary function. Although, as Caird observed, mythological language or God-talk may point to reciprocal

201. Caird 1980:209, 213.

202. Caird 1980:213, 224. For Caird (1980: 224), to understand the tenor of the myth as a transcendental reference is allegorization. The 'powers and authorities' in Col 2:15 are personifications of the structures of the political, social, and religious power. In Col 2:15 or Isa 51:9–11, the idea that mythological language may be involved in the 'spirit world' and thus to interpret the verses into (or, in the framework of) the 'spirit world' (in his term) is 'nonsense,' for him. However, we also need to take notice of the 'so-called' vehicle, which does not belong to this world. Only after the literal understanding of the myth (vehicle is his term) as a literary complex that refers to the things in the mythological world (as he accepts that myth has a "literal referent in the characters and events of the vehicle story"), can we come to understand the sense (tenor is his term) of the mythology in the narrative, which tells about the historical world. The two-tired world-view (i.e., heavenly world vs. earthly world) has been justified as the Biblical thought, as Wright (1992:252–59) already assumes in his theological/ontological (theological/ cosmological is our term) duality.

203. Caird 1980:238, 213, 238–39, 241–42. (1) For Caird (1980:238), demons are not realities, but ones which occur only in the fantasies, although he admits that they occur in the gospel narratives. (2) Caird (1980:213) considers the 'powers and authorities' in Col 2:15 as the *personifications* of the political, social and religious structures of power, because mythologicalL language has (only) a historical referent. The term personification implies that the powers and authorities are this-worldly realities. They do not tell anything above the historical world, for him. (3) In understanding the powers, authorities, sovereignties, thrones and lordships in Pauline letters, he (1980:238–39) concedes that Paul's idea is in line with Deut 32:17, in which demons are associated with the pagan religion. He admits that "these terms denote 'heavenly beings,' which represent the power structures of the old world order." But what he means by 'heavenly beings' is not certain. They are different from demons but only *represent* earthly realities. It is not entirely obvious why and how demons and the heavenly beings are different in Caird's categorization. (4) Caird (1980: 241–42) accepts that Paul's claim that the law was ordained through angels in Gal 3:19 is linked to Deut 33:2, in which YHWH comes with myriads of 'holy ones.' But, for him, these 'angels of Sinai' are "the symbols of a derivative and provisional authority, and are therefore in the same category as the sons of God who preside over the destinies of other nations." The "spiritual beings" (in his term) *stand for* the political, social, economic and religious structures of power. For him, however, the spiritual beings do not belong to the spiritual realm, but are *immanent* within the physical world.

interaction with the human or natural world (in a metaphoric way),[204] they are basically understood to describe their own world, i.e., a mythological world (as directly related to the thought world of the vehicle story), which is distinct from this world, before they are applied to the historical events of this world in the narrative.[205] In this understanding, contrary to Caird, the relation between myth and the present is not linear (at the same level) but direct, not horizontal but vertical, as timeless time is linked directly with every moment of historical time. Myth primarily belongs to the heavenly realm. Third, Caird does not accept that Biblical man has "the mythopoeic mind", i.e., mythical thinking, because mythopoeic/mythical thinking is so primitive that it had already disappeared before the earliest document of the OT was written.[206]

Levenson, however, has observed that there is in both the OT and the NT language that requires "mythical" thinking.[207] His view is that mythical language refers primarily to the realities in the heavenly realm, although these are in turn connected to the earthly realities. For him, myth is defined as the protological events that happened in mythical time (i.e., timelessly) and carry the continuing relevance in every moment of history (Myth^{P} [protological] after Caird's terminology).[208] In this definition, myth is a legitimate theological way of understanding the world that does not belong to this world: the other world or heavenly world.[209] While myths^{L} (for Caird)

204. Caird 1980:177–78.

205. See below, for the sense of 'myth.'

206. Caird 1980:193, 197.

207. Levenson 1985:102–10. According to Levenson (1985:105, 106), the reference to David in Ezek 34:23 requires a mythical thinking as it does not fit the historical thinking of David's death (1 Kgs 2:10). The Biblical statement that 'YHWH' built the Temple 'before' the election of David in Ps 78:69–70 may be contradictory to the historical facts that 'Solomon' has built the Temple 'after' David's death (1 Kgs 6:1) and thus displays the deeper meaning of the poet in his mythical thinking. For Levenson, historians' perspective and mythical perspective are coexistent in the Hebrew Bible. Caird (1980:210) also admits that Isa 51:9–11 and Col 2:15 reflect the language of myth. In Isa 51:9–11, "[T]he prophet declares his conviction that this initial cosmic victory over the forces of chaos, darkness and evil was repeated at the exodus, when the waters of the sea were cut in two to provide Israel with a path to safety . . . ." The mythological language in Col 2:15 signifies "God (or Christ) won a victory over the cosmic powers."

208. Levenson 1985:103; Childs 1962:20. For the various meanings of myth, see Caird 1980:220–23. Myth^{P} in Caird's term is Myth (Pragmatic), which is different from Myth (Protological) above.

209. According to Caird (1980:219), Bultmann argues in effect that mythology is 'theological use of metaphor.' As it were, myth is theological language or 'God-talk', i.e., any sentence containing the word 'God' is myth (Myth^{T} (theological) in Caird's term). "Mythology is the use of imagery to express the otherworldly in terms of this world and the divine in terms of human life, the other side in terms of this side." (Quotation

are stories about *the past*, myth^{P} (for Levenson) concerns the *protological* events.[210] By definition, myth^{L} is inherently confined within this world and history, because it is formed from, and functions to describe, the historical world (the past and the present/future, respectively). However, the tense of myth^{P} is not the past, according to Levenson, but timeless time, which is different from historical time but still closely related to it.[211] Levenson seems to balance representation of the apocalyptic in the heavenly realm and its earthly counterpart.

If we follow Caird's view of apocalyptic representation, then we are forced to follow the view that there is no 'real' cataclysmic change of the universe that the apocalyptic language (cf. 65:17, 25) refers to.[212] Besides, we are liable to reject the heavenly realm, or at least to neglect the ultimate future aspect of heavenly language (as Wright does in Mark 13), because the language (either prophetic or apocalyptic) refers only to historical realities as metaphor. In fact, Wright suggests that the first-century Jewish world-view does not support such a 'literalist' reading of the apocalyptic language, because the Jews only longed for the imminent restoration in the historical arena. But it is not certain whether the OT and the first-century Jewish world-view really exclude the literal view of (destruction and) recreation. The Biblical texts often seem to suggest far-reaching visions that are not necessarily confined to the immediate historical and literary contexts (see 5.3 on 65:17–25). I will assume that there is a heavenly world which is related to this earthly world,[213] and some language may refer to it (so Wright). But I also assume that the heavenly language may involve the ultimate future beyond the historical context (pace Wright). While (Wright and) Caird tend(s) to neglect the mythical representation, Hanson concedes that apocalyptic may refer to the heavenly realm, so

originally from Bultmann 19xx:16). Considering this, myth^{P} and myth^{T} are identified if we limit our primary concern on the mythology of the OT since Levenson in fact does not think that the term mythical is necessarily related to the protological (i.e., creational) events as in the above examples, because mythical time does not distinguish between the past, the present, and the future (Childs 1962:74). (Creation myth of the ANE has no way to validate the 'content'/theology of mythology in ANE while mythology in the OT is authentic for the purpose of OT theology.)

210. Caird 1980:220.

211. Caird 1980:220. Also see Childs 1962:74.

212. Wright (1992:299, 300; 1999:265; 2007:107, 133–34) tends to share this view. Although in places he (2007:116, 173, 175) mentions "the renewal of the entire cosmos," or "a great act of new creation," or even "a new heaven and a new earth," these phrases do not imply the destruction of the universe, but something dramatic in this physical world, so eventually metaphoric.

213. How they are related precisely to each other may be beyond this dissertation.

the cosmic imagery of apocalyptic may be 'literal.'[214] So, I accept Hanson and Levenson's view of mythical representation of the 'heavenly' languages, based on the two-tier-world picture, assuming that the 'heavenly' language not only is divine perspective of the present reality but also may have an ultimate realization in the future.

Apocalyptic Duality of the Two Ages

Traditionally, apocalyptic has been considered to be influenced by the radical Persian dualism, having a pessimistic view of history. For Hanson, in apocalyptic, the world to come is totally distinct from the present world as the present world order is so evil that it will be entirely destroyed.[215] However, Hanson's dualistic understanding of apocalyptic and the 'pessimistic view of history' (these two are closely related) may be over-emphasized. For Wright, Jewish apocalyptic does not include a moral/cosmological dualism.[216] Travis also persuasively argues that the apocalyptic view of history is not necessarily pessimistic because there was a positive view of history, especially in earlier apocalypses such as Daniel. The negative view of history reflects the desperate circumstances of their particular periods, and the saving actions of God are recognized in the past as well as in the future.[217] Although the last two scholars recognize a distinction between the present age and the eschatological time (this may be called 'eschatological [or apocalyptic] duality'), they do not consider that apocalypses presume a radical dualism. For them, the present world is not *inherently* evil.[218] The apocalyptic view of history is not

214. For the sense of 'literal,' see above on page 33.

215. Hanson 1975:158.

216. Wright 1992:297. The moral/cosmological dualism (cosmological dualism is his term) is a distinction between the Platonic good world and the physical evil world as related to ethical quality. For him, neither included in the Jewish apocalyptic are the moral/anthropological dualism (distinction between good soul and evil body; anthropological dualism in his term) and moral/theological dualism (distinction between a good god and a bad god; theological/moral dualism in his term), which, together with moral/cosmological dualism, form the proper sense of '(radical) dualism.'

217. Travis 1979:58–61.

218. (Radical) dualism is the view that moral quality is inherently associated with the structure of the universe (moral/cosmological duality is my term), so that the physical world is *inherently* evil and has to be destroyed while the heavenly world (or the Platonic universe) is *inherently* good. The destruction of the universe and the death of the human body do not necessarily imply that the universe and human body are inherently evil in Biblical thinking. Human body is not inherently evil in Biblical thinking but needs to be resurrected (or recreated) after all, because it became to involve sinfulness *a posteriori* but not inherently. Likewise, although the universe and materials are not ontologically evil, they need to be recreated with the cataclysmic change if they are

necessarily ontologically pessimistic (so Travis), although an apocalyptic text may still have an eschatological/apocalyptic duality.[219] Thus the influence of the ancient Iranian Zoroastrianism is not compelling and I do not assume apocalyptic a moral/cosmological duality (i.e., dualism).[220]

The apocalyptic duality forms a discontinuity between the two worlds, as often the coming world is presented as the New Heavens and the New Earth. Apocalyptic also has theological/cosmological duality (a distinction between the heavenly world and the earthly world; theological/ontological is Wright's term), which is distinguished from a moral/cosmological dualism, which implies that the two worlds are inherently involved with moral quality.

Cosmic Scope

Since Hanson assumes a two-tier-world picture (i.e., heavenly/cosmic realm vs. earthly world) and the mythical/apocalyptic representation, he takes a 'literalist' reading of the cosmic vision.[221] If we accept the mythical representation of apocalyptic, the cosmic change of the universe is 'literal' [i.e., a straightforward description] based on the dual-world picture. Although prophetic eschatology also has an eschatological duality, which is characterized by the discontinuity between the two ages before and after the start of eschatological era, in apocalyptic eschatology this discontinuity becomes extended to the cosmic level.

In summary, I suggest by apocalyptic three outstanding features: (1) apocalyptic representation (i.e., mythical representation) refers in a more or less direct way to the heavenly realm, which is ultimately related to the earthly realm, (2) apocalyptic/eschatological duality is characterized by discontinuity between the apocalyptic world (i.e., world to come) and the present world (i.e., history), and (3) a cosmic scope of vision is often involved. Apocalyptic representation requires an understanding of a two-tier-world view.

a posteriori associated with the evil as the earth is cursed by the Fall (Gen 3:18; Rom 8:18–25). If the 'negative view of reality' does not involve the cosmological implication, then it does not distinguish apocalyptic from prophecies.

219. I do not assume that eschatological duality does necessarily involve with (moral/cosmological) dualism, which is the term implying that the present world is ontologically evil. Duality is distinguished from dualism, the former being *a* feature of the universe, while the latter being an ideology to see the universe.

220. Wright 1992:297.

221. Hanson 1975:134. It appears that Wright also admits a two-tiered world picture judging by his terminology 'theological/ontological duality' (theological/cosmological is my term), which distinguishes between the heavenly world and the earthly world , although he differs in the view of linguistic usage of apocalyptic representation from Hanson.

As regards the relation between the present and the eschaton (eschatological future) or between history and eschatology, the final issue of eschatology and apocalyptic, there are several views that differ from Mowinckel's. However, scholars do not always distinguish between the horizontal or temporal aspect of eschatology (eschatology$^{(H)}$) and the vertical or spatial aspect of eschatology (eschatology$^{(V)}$). This distinction is facilitated by mythical thinking. There is a clear break in Mowinckel between history and eschatology/the eschaton or between this world and the world to come (Model A; discontinuity in terms of timeline), since eschatology (eschatology$^{(H)}$) is to bring a new world order by the end of the present.[222] For Clements (Model B), however, YHWH's purpose, which leads to eschatology, is fulfilled in the arena of history.[223] So Eschatology (eschatology$^{(H)}$) and history are continuous.[224] However, because discontinuity is not part of this understanding, it does not fully explain the divine action that makes history eschatology not only in the process of time (horizontally) but also here and now (vertically). For example, he who responds to the invitation of eschatological salvation in 56:1 joins the eschatological salvation here and now.

For Schunck (Model C=A+B), Israel's thought does not distinguish between internal-temporal (*innerzeitlich*) and final-temporal (*endzeitlich*) actions, which suggests continuity between the present and the eschaton (Model B). He considers that, for the prophets, there is a critical break only between what is now and what is to come, which may display some discontinuity between history and eschatology (eschatology$^{(H)}$; Model A). The one is to be destroyed; the other has not even the slightest continuation of the present, which forms proper eschatology, as the word אחרית presents.[225]

222. Mowinckel 1959:154. Whitley (1963:202) also follows Mowinckel in arguing that the new world order is essentially different from the present world order.

223. Clements 1965:104–5.

224. For Uffenheimer (1997:209–11), too, there is continuity between history and eschatology (eschatology$^{(H)}$) in both DI and TI. The actual events at present are interpreted in view of, and related to, eschatology in DI and TI. The eschatological expectation of the coming of the nations to Zion is understood as a real historical event in 60:5–22 and 61:5–9. The land of Israel is understood as an eschatological reward in 58:14. He (1997:200–217) tries to categorize four types of eschatology: (1) eschatology as the imminent continuation of contemporaneous history; (2) the detachment of eschatology from history; (3) the eschatological interpretation of current events; (4) eschatological activism. But it is not certain whether these four form distinct stages of a development or whether these four are different aspects of a consistent eschatology. For Freedman (1960:153), too, history and eschatology are not distinguished as eschatology is the result of history and history is the background of eschatology. History contains eschatological elements in that salvific divine intention is realized in history. So for him, history is eschatological (continuity).

225. Schunck 1964:320. He follows Boman (1952:109) in the view of time in Israel.

Eschatology includes not only the non-historical final phase (eschatology$^{(H)}$) but also history. However, the break resides with the judgment of God, which creates things completely new.[226] So Schunk notes some discontinuity, although he admits continuity between history and eschatology$^{(H)}$.[227] So, "discontinuity (former/new) is embedded in continuity."[228] However, according to Oswalt (1981), the God of the prophets both works immanently in the cosmos and is transcendental, above and beyond it, at the same time. The promise of salvation will be fulfilled within the framework of human experience, but which goes far beyond it as well. Prophecies are projected into a wider plane to form eschatology.[229] Therefore, a more nuanced elaboration for the continuity/discontinuity between history and eschatology may be possible by the introduction of mythical thinking.

So, he seems to put a break between the present and the combined future and eschatology. But he replaces the word final-temporal (*endzeitlich*) with extra-temporal (*außerzeitlich*/*außergeschichtlich*, *transzendental*) in his later article (Schunck 1974:119).

226. Schunck 1974:119–120. See note above. "*Wo der Bruch mit dem bisherigen, unter Gottes Gericht stehenden sündigen Sein vollzogen wurde und ein ganz neues Sein nach Gottes Willen und in Gemeinschaft mit ihm begonnen wurde, da ist das Eschaton bereits da, dort steht der betreffende Mensch bereits im Eschaton.*" ["Where the break with the present sinful being standing under God's judgment was carried out and quite a new being has begun by God's will in the community, then the eschaton is already there, and there the person in question stands already in the eschaton." (My translation).]

227. Lindblom (1952:58) emphasizes continuity and discontinuity of historical world in understanding eschatology.

228. Leene 1997:228, 231.

229. Oswalt 1981:293–94.

For Vriezen (Model D), there is no fundamental distinction between the general future and the eschatological future (eschatology$^{(H)}$). The Hebrew אחרית הימים refers both to the future in the prophet's horizon (i.e., near future) and the last days in the eschatological sense (i.e., eschaton, or distant or ultimate future).[230] For Vriezen, the new thing, i.e., eschatology, is "*the* renewing act of *the* historical drama" (italics his). Even though it takes place within the framework of history, it changes the world into something definitely different.[231] However, he considers that there is a sharp break between history and supra-history (i.e., eschatology$^{(V)}$) rather than between the present and the future and thus that there is continuity between prophecy and apocalyptic.[232] For Vriezen, the eschatological salvific expectation will be achieved in "an absolutely decisive new situation in the world," as Jerusalem will be the center of interest, bearing universal and supra-natural features in 65:15–25 and 66:5–24. So for him eschatology is "historical and at the same time supra-historical" and the eschatological renewal "takes place within the framework of history but is caused by forces that transcend history, so that what is coming is a new order of things in which the glory and the Spirit of God (Is. xi) reveals itself."[233] Here, mythical thinking may be detected that needs to be developed. Vriezen's conception requires a distinction between horizontal and vertical aspects of eschatology, the latter especially being called supra-history or eschatology$^{(V)}$. However, Vriezen's view seems to lack a sufficient emphasis on the introduction of an entirely new element in the history, as what is to come indicates in Schunck, which makes history and eschatology distinct. I suggest that in mythical thinking, a supra-natural description of reality (eschatology$^{(V)}$), which is discontinuous with history, is realized in reality (eschatology$^{(H')}$), although this eschaton is in continuation of history. This brings a discontinuity between history and eschatology$^{(H')}$ as well as continuity (eschatology$^{(H)}$) (Model E).

In conclusion, there is both continuity and discontinuity between history and eschatology. A distinction between vertical and horizontal aspects is needed to describe eschatology. Mythical thinking is needed to understand eschatology.

230. Vriezen 1953:202.

231. Vriezen 1953:218.

232. Vriezen 1953:224, 219. As it were, Vriezen sees that the future and the eschaton (i.e., eschatology$^{(H)}$) are continuous (in terms of [the process of] time) while history and eschatology (eschatology$^{(V)}$) are discontinuous (in terms of the quality of time). History includes the past, the present, and the future.

233. Vrizen 1953:218–19, 222.

Methodology in Approaching Eschatological Issues

In the study of eschatological theology, many issues are cross-linked to each other. This is why tackling a particular issue in isolation cannot be a complete solution. A position on one issue influences the position on other issues. Scholars are often influenced by their own content and beliefs. What they assume is often what they discover in the texts. For example, their own metaphysical pre-understanding of the world (i.e., world-view) influences their understanding of Israel's view of time and history, which in turn influences their understanding of eschatology, which then fits into, and supports, their assumption. Therefore, we need to be very careful not to impose our metaphysics or theology upon the Biblical texts.

We need to adopt a holistic approach to understand the eschatological issues in relation to other theological concepts and thoughts in TI. As Nickelsburg has suggested, because of this variety in eschatological issues, we need to focus on a particular text, i.e., TI in our case, in order to obtain an integrated solution.[234]

In order to investigate the eschatology of TI, I select four particular themes and the passages that correspond to them: the covenant (56:1–8), the coming of YHWH (59:15b–21), Zion (60:1–22), and the New Heavens and the New Earth (65:13–25). These four themes/texts are considered to epitomize the 'story' of the eschatological plan of YHWH in TI. Other themes and issues may be included in these categories.

Conclusion

Eschatology is understood broadly as the future hope of Israel. Its investigation is our aim, in particular in TI. Prophetic eschatology refers to the eschatology of the prophets. Apocalyptic eschatology refers to eschatology in apocalyptic literature or eschatology of theological features thereof. Apocalyptic is considered to have three particular theological features: apocalyptic/mythical representation, eschatological/apocalyptic duality and discontinuity, and cosmic scope of the vision. We have seen that eschatological issues are interrelated not only to each other but also to the wider framework of theology and metaphysical assumptions as well. So we need a holistic approach to deal with all the eschatological issues and focus on a particular (section of a) book, i.e., in our case TI, rather than tackling each issue individually.

234. Nickelsburg 1992:592.

1.4 Conclusion and the Plan of this Book

This book attempts to sketch a systematic and integrated theology of TI on the assumption of theological unity, as required by the survey of the study of the theology of TI. According to the survey, largely due to the fragmentation of text and theology, it has proved difficult to construct an eschatological theology through a historical methodology. This is mainly because of an excessive interest in historical matters, which may not be pivotal for theological construction of the text. But on the basis of a theological unity as assumed in a canonical approach, the alleged historical diversity of DI and TI can be otherwise viewed and there emerges the possibility of constructing a coherent theology. This theological perspective also invites a reading of TI in the context of the previous parts of Isaiah.

I have assumed that eschatology is at the heart of a unified theology of TI. So I want to explore the nature of eschatology (i.e., eschatological theology) as presented in TI. This includes the relationships between the covenant, the coming of YHWH, Zion, and the New Heavens and the New Earth. The continuity and discontinuity between past/present and future and between history and eschatology also emerges at various points in the study of the eschatology of TI. An eschatological approach also allows the integration of other key theological themes such as salvation and judgment, justice and righteousness, and cult, as well as key characters such as Israel, the nations, and the Messianic figure. These topics and themes cannot be pursued exhaustively but will be described in the framework of the theological interpretation of several key texts.

Chapter 2 as an exposition of Isa 56:1–8 tries to show that the covenant concept is pivotal in understanding the eschatology of TI. Chapter 3 exposits Isa 59:15b–21 and shows that the coming of YHWH is the decisive eschatological event (as it inaugurates eschatology), through which YHWH not only cleanses Israel but also judges the nations to form the new people of YHWH and bring about the eschatological era. Chapter 4, the study of Isa 60, portrays Zion, the eschatological temple-city, to which the nations/kings flow, and the eschatological people of YHWH, being formed from the nations as well as Israel. Investigating 65:13–25, chapter 5 presents the New Heavens and the New Earth, in which the New Jerusalem is restored. Chapter 6 will summarize the key themes that recur in the exegetical sections.