

The Authenticity of the Parables of Jesus

Philip Barton Payne

Tokyo, Japan

The parables, which include approximately one third of Jesus' recorded sayings, are the most distinctive form of his teaching. All together there are at least fifty recorded narrative parables of Jesus in which a realistic story with plot conveys a deeper spiritual message. From a critical point of view the parables of Jesus form the bedrock of tradition about him. There is almost unanimous agreement among scholars that the parables as recorded in the gospels are substantially authentic to Jesus. The two basic reasons for this consensus are the historical and literary distinctiveness of Jesus' parables.

The Historical Distinctiveness of Jesus' Parables:

In the OT, although there are quite a few allegories and fables (in which animals or plants speak), narrative parables are rare. Only The Ewe Lamb (2 Sam 12:1-4), The Vineyard (Isa 5:1-7), The Farmer (Isa 28:24-29), The Useless Vine Wood (Ezek 15:1-5), The Cedar of Lebanon (Ezek 31:2-9) and possibly a few others might be included as similar in form to Jesus' parables.

There are many Rabbinic parables with formal similarities to those of Jesus. Of the almost 3000 recorded Rabbinic parables, none of the extant records seem to be before the time of Jesus, and the date of origin and original form of Rabbinic parables is almost never traceable with certainty. But the continuity of *mašal* patterns throughout the Rabbinic period in Palestine¹⁾ and the conservative nature of Rabbinic tradition would suggest that some of them went back in some form to Jesus' day and that parables following similar patterns were current then. *Sop.* 16,9 (41b) records that Hillel (shortly before Jesus' time) was fond of parables. There are several Rabbinic parables which are strikingly parallel to Jesus'²⁾, and it would be safe to say that Jesus drew from and added to a common pool of Jewish wisdom, including parables.

Both Jesus' and Rabbinic parables make use of identical introductions such as, "I will give you a parable: To what is this comparable? To the conduct of a king of flesh and blood ..."³⁾ Both employ indirect reference to God.⁴⁾ They display similar stylistic characteristics: transference of the point of

comparison (as the Kingdom being like a pearl but expressed "like a merchant ..."), mention of the background and occasion of utterance, succinct introductory and concluding comments summarizing the application of the parable, individual concrete / examples rather than generalized statement, illustrations from ordinary daily life combined with improbable situations, apparent discontinuity, paradox, enigmatic or non-self-evident meanings, vividness, hyperbole, direct speech, questions, ellipsis, stereotyped expression, pleonasm, and parallelism.⁵⁾

For both Jesus and the rabbis, parables had a teaching function (*Cant. Rab.* 1, 1, 8; Mark 4:2). Clarity in the teaching of both is aided by the use of commonly recognized OT symbols⁶⁾ such as: a king, judge, or father for God; sons, servants, or a vineyard for Israel; harvest or reaping for judgment; a feast or wedding for the Kingdom of God and its joys; and servants for the prophets.

Although paralleling Jesus' parables' freedom of form, characteristics of style, teaching function, and use of symbolism, the Rabbinic parables, generally speaking, are not as vivid, realistic, or natural as those of Jesus. Furthermore, Jesus' parables convey a distinctive message. While Rabbinic parables are typically commentary on puzzling Scriptures, the parables of Jesus focus on the reign or Kingdom of God. Many of his parables have a distinctively eschatological and messianic, even apocalyptic, character. Jesus treated the relations between God and men more frequently and more seriously. It is generally agreed that Jesus was sharing his own deep concerns through the parables: his vision of reality (N. Perrin), his faith (A. Wilder), his experience of God (E. Fuchs, J. Crossan), and his understanding of existence (J. Kingsbury, D. Via).⁷⁾ In comparison, the Rabbinic parables are lacking in spiritual depth and insight.

Typical of Jesus' parables is their implicit challenge to their hearers to pronounce a judgment on a situation or attitude, a judgment which will lead them to a personal decision. This is evident in Jesus' parable introduction which has no Rabbinic parallels, "Which of you ...?"⁸⁾

A unique characteristic of many of the parables of Jesus is the way they function as an invitation, explicit or implicit, to enter the Kingdom of God, to live under the reign of God. Sometimes the very words of the parable story echo Jesus' invitation to enter the Kingdom:

"Come!" The Great Supper (Luke 14:16-24)

The Marriage Feast (Matt 22:1-14)

"Be ready!" The Doorkeeper (Mark 13:33-37)

The Men Awaiting their Master's Homecoming (Luke 12:35-38)

The Burglar (Matt 24:43-44; Luke 12:39-40)

The Ten Virgins (Matt 25:1-13)

"Rejoice with me!" The Lost Sheep (Luke 15:4-7; implicit in Matt 18:12-14)

The Lost Coin (Luke 15:8-10)

The Prodigal Son (Luke 15:11-32)

Often the challenge to enter the Kingdom is implicit in the portrayal of two people or groups, one entering into the joy of the Kingdom, the other left out, as in:

The Servant Entrusted with Supervision (Matt 24:45-51; Luke 12:42-48)

The Talents (Matt 25:14-30)

The Pounds (Luke 19:12-27)

The Closed Door (Luke 13:24-30)

The Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31)

The Pharisee and the Publican (Luke 18:9-14)

A similar challenge is implicit in the parables which portray two situations, one representing entry into the Kingdom, the other rejection from it:

The Sower (Mark 4:3-8; Matt 13:3-8; Luke 8:5-8)

The Two Houses (Matt 7:24-27; Luke 6:47-49)

The Tares Among the Wheat (Matt 13:24-30)

The Dragnet (Matt 13:47-48)

The Tower Builder (Luke 14:28-30)

The King Contemplating a Campaign (Luke 14:31-32)

Some parables implicitly urge acceptance of the way of the Kingdom by picturing the consequences of rejecting it:

The Wicked Tenants (Mark 12:1-11; Matt 21:33-44; Luke 20:9-18)

On the Way to the Judge (Matt 5:25-26; Luke 12:58-59)

The Return of the Unclean Spirit (Matt 12:43-45; Luke 11:24-26)

The Rich Fool (Luke 12:16-21)

The Barren Fig Tree (Luke 13:6-9)

Still other parables by indicating that the way to the Kingdom is open implicitly invite the hearer to enter:

The Treasure (Matt 13:44)

The Pearl (Matt 13:45-46)

The Good Employer (Matt 20:1-16)

The Two Debtors (Luke 7:41-43)

The Friend Asked for Help at Night (Luke 11:5-8)

The Shrewd Steward (Luke 16:1-8)

The Unjust Judge (Luke 18:1-8)

The use of parables to offer or invite entry into the Kingdom of God seems

to be unique to Jesus, and as such is evidence in favor of their authenticity. Such an offer, intensified by the eschatological tenor of many of the parables, presupposed Jesus' authority to invite people into God's Kingdom. In fact, the validity of this invitation depended on Jesus' authority to offer them entry.

Particularly striking is that Jesus' parables express something about himself and his activity, his role in the Kingdom. This kind of personal involvement, the author depicting himself in a parable, seems to be completely absent from Rabbinic parables. The character of Jesus' involvement in his parables is also unique.

He regularly depicted himself in the parables through images which in the OT were symbols for God.

Thus, we see that the parables of Jesus exhibit features which distinguish them from the parables of the rabbis. Several of these features are unique to the parables of Jesus and as such are weighty evidence for their authenticity. Taken as a whole, the parables of Jesus form a distinctive and original collection which stands out as the literary pinnacle of a long tradition of Palestinian parables.

The Literary Distinctiveness of Jesus' Parables:

The parables of Jesus are literary masterpieces. Going beyond the position of J. Jeremias that "the parables of Jesus are not — at least primarily — literary productions",⁹⁾ there is now a surge of interest in the parables as literary gems seen in the work of G. V. Jones, A. Wilder, D. Via, J. D. Crossan, E. Jünger, R. W. Funk, N. Perrin, S. TeSelle, and *Semeia* 1 and 2. Only a few scholars have played down the parables' artistry,¹⁰⁾ due primarily to the fact that the parables were prophetic extemporaneous utterance. Artistry, however, is not incompatible with spontaneity or functionality.¹¹⁾

The poetic artistry of Jesus' parables has become widely recognized.¹²⁾ This is seen in their metaphorical qualities:¹³⁾ vivid realistic use of nature and daily life (as in *The Children in the Marketplace* and *The Rich Fool*), use of the unexpected twist (as in *The Generous Employer* and *The Shrewd Steward*), thought-provoking irony (as in *The Mustard Seed* and *The Leaven*¹⁴⁾), imagination (as in *The Treasure* and *The Pearl*), creativity (as in *The Sower* and *The Two Houses*), depth of meaning through simplicity (as in *The Lost Sheep* and *The Lost Coin*), irreducibility to prose¹⁵⁾ (as in *The Seed Growing Secretly* and *The Prodigal Son*), opening up new ways of seeing life (as in *The Good Samaritan* and *The Unforgiving Servant*), and involvement of the hearer (as in *The Servant Entrusted with Supervision* and *The Two Sons*).

Jesus' choice of imagery and symbolism has such a universal appeal that it could be called archetypal: seed, planting, growth, harvest, and the depiction of such fundamental human relationships as father and son, servant and master. The parables reflect Jesus' insight into "an inward affinity between the natural order and the spiritual order."¹⁶⁾ They can open up a whole new field of perception, thought, experience, and action.¹⁷⁾

The potential of Jesus' parables to create a "language event" has been increasingly appreciated. They created a new possibility by communicating Jesus' offer of participation in the Kingdom of God.¹⁸⁾ Sometimes this involved a shattering of the hearers' old way of looking at the world, as in *The Good Samaritan* and *The Prodigal Son*.¹⁹⁾ But they go on, as many of Jesus' parables, to present a new way, the way of the Kingdom. They function as a bridge offering entry to the Kingdom, giving access to a new way of looking at and living in the world.²⁰⁾

A further level of the event-character of Jesus' parables is that at least some of them seem to create a new state of affairs by offering the hearer a new possibility. The seminal work on speech events which actualize a new situation (called "performative utterances") is by J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962). He defines "performative utterances" as those which create a new state of affairs and which require for their effective performance a) the appropriate authority of the speaker, b) the appropriate situation of utterance, and c) the appropriate content of the utterance. Austin has demonstrated that in order to actualize what it promises, a performative utterance requires the appropriate authority of its speaker.

The parables presuppose Jesus' authority to offer what is announced: participation in the Kingdom, God's forgiveness or grace, or an eschatological promise. Typical is the parable of the Sower, which, according to many interpreters, implies the claim that the hearers' response to Jesus' message will determine their destiny. Accordingly, the Sower offers fruitful life to receptive hearers of Jesus' message. This claim and offer seem to imply that Jesus had an authority which is Messianic or even divine.²¹⁾ By what a parable offers or announces it may imply that Jesus had a specifically Christological or divine self-understanding. And insofar as the parables do offer a new possibility or announce a new situation, their effective performance depends on Jesus' authority.

In the light of the authority that Jesus' parables presuppose, their literary artistry, and their unique features distinguishing them from the parables of the Rabbis, the substantial authenticity of the parables of Jesus is beyond

reasonable doubt. They cannot be convincingly attributed to the early church. They show the mark throughout of a creative genius with a strong sense of personal authority, the mark of their author, Jesus.

The Authenticity of Allegorical Elements in Jesus' Parables:

At one crucial point the authenticity of the parables of Jesus has been seriously questioned, that of their allegorical elements. This is no small exception, since, as M. D. Goulder has shown,²²⁹ allegorical elements are found to a greater or lesser degree in most of Jesus' parables as recorded in the gospels. Yet since the time A. Jülicher defended the position that the parables of Jesus did not originally contain allegorical elements, allegory and allegorical elements in the parables of Jesus have been widely discredited.

Jülicher's definition of parable came straight from Aristotle (384-322 B. C.), allowing only one major point to a picture; but it must be considered improbable that Jesus formed his parables after Aristotle's rules. Even in classical writing the precise distinctions of Aristotle's rhetoric were by no means always followed. Quintilian (A. D. 30-96) said that allegory was popular and understood by even simple people (*Instit. Orat.* VIII, 1, 51) and the most beautiful *genre* of discourse is that which mixes the qualities of similitude, allegory, and metaphor (*Instit. Orat.* VIII, 6, 48f.). In fact, Jülicher contradicts his own sharp dichotomy between authentic parable and inauthentic allegory by an example he cites, the allegory of Ebrard, *Cheirisophos' Reise durch Bötien*. It is interesting both for the one who takes it as a literal description of Boeotia in the year 400 B. C. and the one who recognizes it as a commentary on Bavaria.²³⁰

Jülicher's Aristotelian definition of parable turned out to be "*une faute de méthode qui eut des conséquences désastreuses*,"²⁴¹ for as rabbinic studies developed it became evident that Jesus' parables are far more closely related to the Jewish *mašal* than the classical Greek *παραβολή*.²⁵¹ Within the Jewish *mašal* there is no sharp distinction between parable and allegory.

The Rabbis made no distinction in category between comparison, common saying, parable, allegory, riddle, and mixed form.²⁶¹ Often Rabbinic parables had only one clear lesson, but many are "*Parabeln mit Beimischung von Allegorie*," combining significant with decorative traits, as in OT and other traditional Israelite literature.²⁷¹ Their parables exhibit a literary freedom and lack of concern for logical consistency, unlike the approach of Aristotle.²⁸¹ Similarly, the parables of Jesus do not fit into Jülicher's Aristotelian categories of pure comparison.

Concerning Jülicher's extreme position that Jesus' parables could not have contained allegorical elements or been given allegorizing interpretations by him,

W. Michaelis said, "*Doch, das ist ein allzu theoretisches Schema.*"²⁹¹ J. Wellhausen added, "*Das Allegorische grundsätzlich auszuschliessen und noch damit zu prahlen, ist nicht sein.*"³⁰¹ It became more and more recognized that there were various degrees of allegory and that a mixing of parable and allegory was entirely appropriate in the Semitic world.³¹¹ A growing number of scholars have affirmed that Jesus did use allegory.³²¹

Such a sharp distinction between parable and allegory, unfortunately, is often still made today, with allegory being defined as though every point of the story must have a distinct counterpart in the meaning, as though allegory cannot be true to life, as though the relationship between story and meaning must be artificial, or as though the meaning cannot compose a coherent whole. Such misconceptions had led many to think that "pure allegory is generally discredited, even today . . . it is for the most part sheer rubbish."³³¹

Many with Dodd claim that "in an allegory . . . each detail is a separate metaphor, with a significance of its own."³⁴¹ But even in *Pilgrim's Progress* there are many details which seem to have no particular significance, such as the wicket gate. Dodd calls allegory untrue to life and follows Bultmann's statement that "allegory does not involve . . . transference of judgement, but is concerned with disguising some situation in secret or fantastic forms."³⁵¹

D. Via claims that allegory does not have internal coherence and is artificially constructed, and it has artificial internal logic. Similarly T. W. Manson regarded allegory "as the means for conveying correct information or true doctrine about matters with which the story as such has no apparent connexion [*sic*]."³⁶¹ But there is no less connection between the Slough in *Pilgrim's Progress* and despondency than between leaven and the Kingdom, and both depict one situation through another. Manson continued by saying that parable, unlike allegory, "is meant to create trust in God and love to man by an appeal to conscience and insight."³⁷¹ Yet *Pilgrim's Progress*, which he had just mentioned as an allegory, *was* meant to create trust in God and love to man by an appeal to conscience and insight.

These approaches to definition of allegory are far too mechanical, in effect dismissing it as an unworthy form. I. A. Richards' comment on hearing such descriptions of allegory on 11 Dec., 1974, was, "Oversimplified! Artificial in the extremest degree . . . I am sure that no one actually choosing allegory could possibly think of it as this."

Furthermore, the evidence from the gospels supports the view that Jesus used allegorical elements in his parables freely and that allegorical features in the gospels should not be held in automatic suspicion. The highest degree of allegory is found, not in the latest gospels to be written, as one would

expect if the church had gradually allegorized the parables, but in the earliest gospels, Mark and Matthew. Luke has far fewer allegorical elements and the *Gos. Thom.* the least of all. The earliest evidence we have shows the parables to contain various degrees of allegorical elements. Even Jeremias, who is of the opinion that "the allegorical interpretations can be recognized as almost entirely secondary,"³⁸ has to admit the "strange result: the discourse-material in Matthew and Luke, the Marcan material, the special Matthaean material, the gospel as we have it in Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, all contain allegorical interpretations, but the Lucan special material and the Gospel of Thomas have none."³⁹ There seems to be no solid evidence that Jesus did not use allegorical features freely in his parables. As is common in Rabbinic parables allegorical features added to the clarity of the parables, helping the hearer to "see through" to the parable's spiritual message. Such helps are particularly appropriate when the reality referred to is largely unknown to the hearers, as was the Kingdom as Jesus was proclaiming it.

We conclude then that the substantial authenticity of the parables includes their allegorical features. These parables, with their allegorical elements, stand out as the most profound and distinctive contribution to the long history of Semitic parables. As Shakespeare to the sonnet or Basho to haiku, so Jesus is to parables.

Notes to: "The Authenticity of the Parables of Jesus"

- 1 Cf. J. Krengel, "Mashal", *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* (New York: KTAV, 1969) 7, 395, "the Palestinian teachers use such figures freely; the Babylonian teachers did so very seldom."
- 2 Note *b. Šabb.* 153a and *y. Ber.* 2, 8, 5c. Further examples are given by P. Fiebig, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu im Licht der rabbinischen Gleichnisse des neutestamentlichen Zeitalters* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1912), especially 267-69; R. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (3d ed.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1972) 201-4; I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* (2 vols.; Cambridge University, 1917-24) 1, 90-107; C. G. Montefiore, *Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teaching* (London: Macmillan, 1930).
- 3 R. Gamaliel, *Mekilta tractate Bahodesh*, quoted from J. Z. Lauterbach, *Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael* (Jewish Publication Society of America, 1933-35) 3, 245, line 113; cf. *b. Ber.* 7b and 31b, and for further examples, R. Pautrel, "Les canons du mashal rabbinique," *RevScRel* 26 (1936) 8.

- 4 Cf. *Str-B* 2, 220; T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1949) 293.
- 5 Cf. Fiebig, *Gleichnisreden*, 222-78; Pautrel, "Les canons," 45; C. A. Bugge, *Die Haupt-Parabeln Jesu* (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1903).
- 6 Cf. J. Z. Lauterbach, "Parables," *Jewish Encyclopedia* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1905) 9, 513; J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (3d ed.; London: SCM, 1972) 88.
- 7 N. Perrin, "The Modern Interpretation of the Parables of Jesus and the Problem of Hermeneutics," *Int* 25 (1971) 137-38; A. Wilder, "The Parable of the Sower: Naïveté and Method in Interpretation," *Semeia* 2 (1974) 134-51 and *Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel* (London: SCM, 1964) 80; E. Fuchs, *Studies of the Historical Jesus* (SBT 42; London: SCM, 1964) 35-38, 155-57; J. D. Crossan, "The Seed Parables of Jesus," *JBL* 92 (1973) 265; J. D. Kingsbury, "Ernst Fuchs' Existential Interpretation of the Parables," *LQ* 22 (1970) 389, 391; D. Via, *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967).
- 8 H. Greeven, "Wer unter euch...?" *Wort und Dienst: Jahrbuch der Theologischen Schule Bethel* (1952) 86-101; cf. Jeremias, *Parables*, 103; G. Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1960) 70.
- 9 *Parables*, 21.
- 10 Cf. A. T. Cadoux, *The Parables of Jesus. Their Art and Use* (London: James Clark, 1930) 11, "It is not art in the highest form because it is harnessed for service and conflict"; Jeremias, *Parables*, 21; Fuchs, *Historical Jesus*, 73; V. A. Harvey, "The Historical Jesus, the Kerygma, and the Christian Faith," *Religion in Life* 33 (1964) 440 n 31.
- 11 Cf. E. Käsemann, "Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie", *ZTK* 57 (1960) 174 n 2; Wilder, *Early Christian Rhetoric*, 89.
- 12 Cf. N. Perrin, "Historical Criticism, Literary Criticism, and Hermeneutics: The Interpretation of the Parables of Jesus and the Gospel of Mark Today," *JR* 52 (1972) 362; Via, *Parables*, 88-93.
- 13 The following have affirmed parables to be extended metaphor: Wilder, "the Sower," 137; Perrin, "Historical Criticism," 370; J. D. Crossan, "Parable as Religious and Poetic Experience," *JR* 53 (1973) 349; D. Via, "The Relationship of Form to Content in the Parables: The Wedding Feast," *Int* 25 (1971) 183; W. G. Doty, "The Parables of Jesus, Kafka, Borges and Others, with Structural Observations," *Semeia* 2 (1974) 170; R. W. Funk, *Language, Hermeneutic, and the Word of God* (London: Harper and Row, 1966) 133-62, although not using the expression, "extended meta-

- phor"; E. Jüngel and P. Ricoeur, *Metapher. Zur Hermeneutik religiöser Sprache* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1974); S. TeSelle, *Speaking in Parables: A Study in Metaphor and Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975); N. Perrin, *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom: Symbol and Metaphor in New Testament Interpretation* (London: SCM, 1976); P. B. Payne, *Metaphor as a Model for Interpretation of the Parables of Jesus with Special Reference to the Parable of the Sower*, Ph. D. Dissertation (Cambridge University, 1975).
- 14 Cf. R. W. Funk, "Beyond Criticism in Quest of Literacy: The Parable of the Leaven," *Int* 25 (1971) 149-70.
- 15 Cf. Payne, *Interpretation of the Parables*, 52-57, 86-87.
- 16 C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London: Nisbet, 1935) 21-22; cf. J. Danten, La révélation du Christ sur Dieu dans les paraboles," *NRT* 77 (1955) 476; C. Barry, "The Literary and Artistic Beauty of Christ's Parables," *CBQ* 10 (1948) 382; W. Arnot, *The Parables of Our Lord* (London: T. Nelson and Sons, 1865) 26.
- 17 Cf. Wilder, "the Sower," 143; W. J. Harrington, "The Parables in Recent Study (1960-71)," *BTB* 2 (1972) 228; Doty, "The Parables of Jesus, Kafka," 176.
- 18 Cf. above, pp. 3-5; Via, *The Parables*, 52-53; Wilder, "the Sower," 93-95; C. Mellon, "La parabole. Manière de parler, manière d'entendre," *RSR* 61 (1973) 63; E. Linnemann, *Parables of Jesus: Introduction and Exposition* (London: SPCK, 1966) 18-23, 30-33; Fuchs, *Historical Jesus*, 114; E. Jüngel, *Paulus und Jesus* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1972) 125; Funk, *Language, Hermeneutic*, 128-32.
- 19 Cf. Funk, *Language, Hermeneutic*, 213; J. D. Crossan, "The Good Samaritan: Towards a Generic Definition of Parable," *Semeia* 2 (1974) 82-112 and much of the rest of *Semeia* 2 (1974).
- 20 Cf. Linnemann, *Parables of Jesus*, 22, 27; Doty, "The Parables of Jesus, Kafka," 176-77; Via, *The Parables*, 53; Fuchs, *Historical Jesus*, 113-20.
- 21 On this understanding of The Sower cf. Payne, *Interpretation of the Parables*, 231-34; and on Jesus' implicit divine claim in the parables cf. *ibid.* 33-34, 234.
- 22 M. D. Goulder, "Characteristics of the Parables in the several Gospels," *JTS* 19 (1968) 51-69.
- 23 A. Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* (2d ed.: Tübingen: Mohr, 1910) 1, 59-60; criticized by M. Hermaniuk, *La parabole évangélique: enquête expérimentale et critique* (Louvain: Bibliotheca Alfonsiana, 1947) 47, 60-61.
- 24 Hermaniuk, *La parabole évangélique*, 44-54; cf. M. -J. Lagrange, "La parabole en dehors de l'évangile," *RB* 6 (1909) 200-12; F. E. Torm, *Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1930) 114; Fiebig, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, 129; B. T. D. Smith, *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels: A Critical Study* (Cambridge University, 1937) 24, 27; G. V. Jones, *The Art and Truth of the Parables: A Study in their Literary Form and Modern Interpretation* (London: SPCK, 1964) 19; R. M. Grant, *The Letter and the Spirit* (London: SPCK, 1957) 42-43.
- 25 Cf. G. Minette de Tillesse, *Le secret messianique dans l'évangile de Marc* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1968) 202-3; A. M. Hunter, *Interpreting the Parables* (London: SCM, 1960) 38-39.
- 26 Cf. Bugge, *Die Haupt-Parabeln Jesu*, 35; J. Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Marci* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1903) 31; Fiebig, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, 252-54; P. Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1912) 289; O. Eissfeldt, *Der Maschal im Alten Testament* (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1913) 7-44; *Str-B* 1, 653-55, 671; Torm, *Hermeneutik*, 116-17; M. Albertz, *Die Botschaft des Neuen Testaments* (Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag Ag. Zollikon, 1947) I, 1, 98-99; Hunter, *Interpreting*, 38; A. George, "Parabole," *DBSup* 6, 1167; V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (2d ed.; London: Macmillan, 1966) 249-50; Jones, *Art and Truth*, 21; and the examples of detailed allegorical interpretations listed in *Str-B* 1, 664-65; *contra* Bultmann, who denies that the Rabbis used allegory (*Synoptic Tradition*, 198).
- 27 P. Fiebig, *Altjüdische Gleichnisse und die Gleichnisse Jesu* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1904) 31-33, 42-43, 98-99; cf. Wellhausen, *Marci*, 30-31; Lagrange, "La parabole," 364; W. Bacher, *Die Agada der Tannaiten* (2 vols.; Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner, 1884-90) 1, 364; 2, 135; Albertz, *Botschaft*, I, 1, 99; George, "Parabole," 1155; Hermaniuk, *La parabole évangélique*, 163-69.
- 28 Cf. Fiebig, *Altjüdische Gleichnisse*, 95; *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, 131; Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism*, 1, 98; I. Heinemann, *Altjüdische Allegoristik* (Breslau: Fraenckesche Stiftung, 1935) 85; A. E. J. Rawlinson, *St. Mark* (London: Methuen, 1942) 52; N. A. Dahl, "The Parables of Growth," *ST* 5 (1951) 138; C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (Cambridge University, 1959) 408; J. Schniewind, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (8th ed.; *NTD*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958) 78; E. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Markus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953) 84.
- 29 W. Michaelis, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu: Eine Einführung* (Hamburg: Furche, 1956) 15.

- 30 Wellhausen, *Marci*, 31; cf. Jones, *Art and Truth*, 19; Smith, *Parables of the Synoptic Gospels*, 24, 27; cf. Bultmann's refusal to let allegory dictate the question of authenticity in *Synoptic Tradition*, 187, though he does use allegory as a test of authenticity on pp. 197-99.
- 31 Cf. all the works listed in the next note and L. Fonk, *Die Parabeln des Herrn im Evangelium* (Innsbruck: Felician Rauch, 1902) 17; *Str-B* 1, 137, 664-65, 671; P. Fiebig, "Der Erzählungsstil der Evangelien im Lichte des rabbinischen Erzählungsstils untersucht," (*UNT* 11; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche, 1925) 53; *Rabbinische Gleichnisse* (Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche, 1929); Torm, *Hermeneutik*, 115; V. Taylor, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (2d ed.; London: Macmillan, 1935) 103; M. Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel* (London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1934) 256; Smith, *Parables of the Synoptic Gospels*, 23-24; Albertz, *Botschaft*, I, 1, 99; Dahl, "Parables of Growth," 136-37; Grant, *The Letter and the Spirit*, 42-43; George, "Parabole," 1167; A. M. Hunter, "Interpreting the Parables," *Int* 14 (1960) 101, 442-43; "The Interpretation of the Parables," *ExpTim* 69 (1957-58) 95-96; G. E. Ladd, "The *Sitz im Leben* of the Parables of Matthew 13: the Soils," *SE* II/1 (*TU* 87)/203 (1964); Jones, *Art and Truth*, 24-25, 29-30, 78; Wilder, *Early Christian Rhetoric*, 81; Linnemann, *Parables of Jesus*, 24-25; Jeremias, *Parables*, 18-19, 88-89; Goulder, "Characteristics of the Parables," 51-69.
- 32 Cf. Fonck, *Die Parabeln*, 92-104; P. Fiebig, "Jesu Gleichnisse im Licht der rabbinischen Gleichnisse," *ZNW* 13 (1912) 198-99, 203; *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, 252-54; A. H. McNeile, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London: Macmillan, 1915) 186, 195, 202; E. Fascher, *Die formgeschichtliche Methode* (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1924) 120; Hermaniuk, *La parabole évangélique*, 217-24; J. J. Vincent, "The Parables of Jesus as Self-Revelation", *SE* I (*TU* 73) (1959) 82-86; Cranfield, *Mark*, 111, 159, 366-68; M. Black, "The Parables as Allegory," *BJRL* 42 (1959-60) 284; J. A. Baird, *The Justice of God in the Teaching of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1963) 27-28, 63-73; R. E. Brown, "Parable and Allegory Reconsidered," (in *New Testament Essays*: London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1965) 254-64; C. F. D. Moule, *The Gospel According to Mark* (Cambridge University, 1965) 33, 36; "Mark 4:1-20 Yet Once More," (in *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969) 109-10; Taylor, *Mark*, 249-50, 472; Via, *The Parables*, 4-7, 13-15, 19, 24-26; F. Hauck, "παραβολή," *TDNT* 5, 747.
- 33 G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woolcombe, *Essays on Typology* (*SBT* 22; London: SCM, 1957) 32, while primarily concerned with allegorical interpreta-

tions of Scripture rather than allegory as a literary form, this statement does reflect current opinion.

- 34 C. H. Dodd, "The Gospel Parables," *BJRL* 16 (1933-34) 397, 401-2; cf. *Parables*, 15, 20, 23, 126, but he is more cautious on pp. 19, 21 and gives allegorical interpretations himself on pp. 130-31, 190-91; cf. M. Black's criticism in "The Parables as Allegory," 283. Also claiming that each detail of an allegory has separate significance are Via, *Parables*, 5, and D. E. Nineham, *The Gospel of St. Mark* (London, Adam & Charles Black, 1968) 129-30.
- 35 Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 198; Dodd, *Parables*, 23.
- 36 Manson, *Sayings*, 35; for further examples of misunderstanding of allegory, E. J. Tinsley, "Parable, Allegory and Mysticism," (in *Vindications: Essays on the Historical Basis of Christianity*, ed. A. Hanson; London: SCM, 1966) 153-92.
- 37 Manson, *Sayings*, 35.
- 38 Jeremias, *Parables*, 88.
- 39 *Ibid.*

Annotated Bibliography for further reading on the Parables' Authenticity

- R. E. Brown. "Parable and Allegory Reconsidered," pp. 254-64 in *New Testament Essays*, by R. E. Brown. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1965. A solid defence of the presence of allegorical elements in the parables of Jesus.
- M. Black. "The Parables as Allegory," *BJRL* 42 (1959-60) 273-87. A solid defence of the presence of allegorical elements in the parables of Jesus.
- M. D. Hooker. "Christology and Methodology," *NTS* 17 (1970-71) 480-87. Exposes many unproved or improbable assumptions of form criticism.
- J. Jeremias. *The Parables of Jesus*. 3d ed.; London: SCM, 1972, pp. 11-12, 230 gives a general defence of the authenticity of the parables. Throughout this work, however, Jeremias uses a form-critical approach freely to deny their authenticity at many points, including most of their settings, allegorical elements, interpretations and comments in the gospels about the parables.
- C. F. D. Moule. "Mark 4:1-20 Yet Once More," pp. 95-113 in *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*, ed. E. Ellis & Max Wilcox; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969. A cogent defence of

the authenticity of the interpretation of the parable of The Sower.

P. B. Payne. *Metaphor as a Model for Interpretation of the Parables of Jesus with Special Reference to the Parable of The Sower*. Ph. D. Dissertation, Cambridge University, 1975. A detailed defence of the parable of The Sower and its interpretation, dealing extensively with the various sorts of critical issues that have been raised against the authenticity of the parables.

E. J. Tinsley, "Parable, Allegory and Mysticism," pp. 153-92 in *Vindications: Essays on the Historical Basis of Christianity*, ed. A. Hanson; London: SCM, 1966. Develops a good understanding of the character of allegory and the use of allegorical features as a valid literary form authentic to Jesus.

イエスの譬え話の真正性

P. B. ペイン

譬え話はイエスの語録の約3分の1を占めているが、それは彼の教えのうちで最も特色のある形式である。福音書に記録されている譬え話が、実質上、確実にイエスによるものであることは、学者の間でほとんど例外なく受け入れられている。この意見の一致が存在する2つの基本的な理由は、イエスの譬え話の歴史的特徴と文学的特徴にある。

イエスの譬え話は、ラビ文書中の譬え話に見出される形式上の自由や、文体上の特徴や教育的機能および象徴の使用法などと類似しているが、前者は、神の国に焦点を合わせた明確な使信を伝達している。イエスの譬え話の多くは、かくべつに終末論的でメシア的な性質をもっており、黙示的でさえある。

イエスの譬え話の多くのものに特有である1つの特徴は、それらの譬え話が、明示的もしくは暗示的に、神の国に入ること、すなわち、神の支配のもとに生きることへの招きとして働いている点である。イエスの譬え話が聴衆に決断をせまる、その程度の強さは、ラビ文書の譬え話の中には類似点のない、「あなたがたの中で……だれが……」という導入表現のうちに明らかに認められる。

特に、顕著なのは、イエスの譬え話が、イエス自身と御国における彼の役割について、何らかのことを表現していることである。この種の *personal involvement*、すなわち、著者が自分のことを譬え話の中で描写するということは、ラビ文書の譬え話の中には全く見られない。イエスは、旧約聖書で神を表わすシンボルであるイメージを用いて、いつもご自分のことを譬え話の中で描写された。イエスが人々に御国に入るように招かれたのは、彼が人々を神の国に招く権威を持っていたことを前提としている。

イエスの譬え話は、非常にすぐれた文学的傑作であるので、それらを単に初代キリスト教の伝承に帰すのは、事実上不可能である。その詩的技巧は、その比喩的な特色のうちに見られる。すなわち、自然界や日常生活

のことがらを生き生きと現実的に用い、意外と思われるような言葉のひねりを使用し、思考をひき起こすようなアイロニー、想像力、創造力、単純さのうちに表現されている意味の深さ、散文に削減することができない表現、人生に対する新しい見方等々を用いて、聴衆をとりこにしていけるのである。彼の譬え話は、自然界の秩序と霊界の秩序との間にある内的な類似性に対するイエスの洞察力を反映している。

イエスの譬え話が「言語の出来事」を創造する可能性をもっているということは、ますます正しく認識されてきている。彼の譬え話は、神の国にあずかることをイエスが提供しているという事実を伝達することによって、新しい可能性を造り出したのである。それは、新しい生きる道を開く。それは、終始、個人的な権威に対して強い意識を持つ1人の創造的な天才がもっている徴候、すなわち、その著者イエスの特色を示しているのである。

譬え話の中のアレゴリー的な要素が、本来、イエスのものではないという見解は、その根拠が弱い。旧約聖書とラビ文書の中の譬え話は、ともに、いろいろな程度のアレゴリー的特色をもっている。さらに、アレゴリーがいちばん強く表われているのは、最後に記録された福音書の中——もし教会が徐々にアレゴリー化していったのであるなら、そう予想するであろうが——にではなく、マルコやマタイのごとき最も初期の福音書のうちにある。従って、我々は次のように結論する。譬え話の実質的な真正性がイエスに帰されるということは、それらの譬え話のアレゴリー的な特徴もイエスに帰されるということを含んでいるのである。