EGYPTIAN VITICULTURAL PRACTICES AND THE CITATION OF ISA 5:1-7 IN MARK 12:1-9

by

JOHN S. KLOPPENBORG VERBIN
Toronto

A key problem in the interpretation of the Parable of the Tenants in Mark 12:1-12 is the question of whether Isa 5:1-7 is integral to the fabric of the parable. The stakes are high. If, for example, the allusion to Isa 5:1-7 is fundamental to the construction of Mark's parable, it is natural—virtually inevitable—to read the parable's characters intertextually in relation to Isaiah's vineyard: the owner is God, the vineyard is Israel or some part of it, and the fruit is some behaviour, response, or virtue that God expects of Israel. This will be the case whether the parable used a Hebrew text of Isaiah and derives from the historical Jesus, or whether it used the Septuagint and is an early Christian creation placed on Jesus' lips. If on the other hand, the Isaian allusions are secondary, the result of later tradents importing biblical allusions, we are left with two questions: how to interpret the parable in the absence of an explicit allusion to Isaiah; and how to account for the connection of the parable with Isaiah 5:1-7 in the Synoptic stream of tradition.

The issue of the parable's relationship to texts of the Tanak became a pressing one with the discovery of the *Gospel of Thomas*, whose version of the parable (saying 65) lacks any allusions to Isa 5:1-2, 5.[1] What is more puzzling about the *Gos. Thom.* is that while the parable proper has no reference to Ps 118:22, the very next saying (66) alludes

---

[1] *Gos. Thom.* 65. "He said: 'A [usurer] owned a vineyard. He gave it to some farmers so that they would work it (and) he might receive its fruit from them. He sent his servant so that the farmers might give him the fruit of the vineyard. They seized his servant, beat him (and) almost killed him. The servant went (back) (and) told his master. His master said: 'Perhaps <they> did not recognize <him>'. He sent another servant, (and) the farmers beat that other one as well. Then the master sent his son (and) said: 'Perhaps they will show respect for my son'. (But) those farmers, since they knew that he was the heir of the vineyard, seized him (and) killed him. 'Whoever has ears should hear'."

to the Psalm: "Jesus says: 'Show me the stone that the builders rejected. It is the cornerstone'." What is different in the *Gos. Thom.* is that Ps 118:22 is presented as an entirely separate saying, having no grammatical or logical relationship to the previous saying. The existence of this alternate version of the parable naturally raises the questions of whether the Synoptic or the Thomasine version is the earlier one, and how the quotation of Ps 118:22 related to the original form of the parable.

But the relationship of texts of the Tanak to the Markan Parable of the Tenants in fact arose quite independently of any knowledge of the *Gos. Thom.* Even before the discovery of this gospel, critics had observed both the poor fit between the quotation of Ps 118:22-23 and the parable proper and that the details in Mark 12:1 that are drawn from Isaiah 5 are irrelevant to the plot of the parable. That the owner built a palisade and a tower, and dug a vine vat has no real bearing on the plot or the outcome of Mark's story. Indeed, Luke omitted most of them, perhaps precisely because they are irrelevant.

A generation ago it was standard to observe that the Isaiah allusion in Mark 12:1 was Septuagintal and undoubtedly secondary. In the first editions of *Die Gleichnisse Jesu* (1947; 1952; 1954, ET 1955) Jeremias already seems to have regarded the quotation of Isa 5:2 as secondary, since he suggested that Luke 20:10-12, which lacks most of the Isaian elements, retained "the features of a simple story."[2] In the later editions of *Die Gleichnisse Jesu* ([8]1970, ET 1972), after Jeremias had taken the *Gospel of Thomas* into account, his conclusions were bolder: as it stands, the parable is a pure allegory. "The connection with Isa 5 must therefore be due to secondary editorial activity."[3] The main ground for this conclusion was Mark's use of περιέθηκεν φραγμόν, in agreement with the LXX's φραγμὸν περιέθηκα, a feature that is completely lacking in the MT of Isa 5:1-2.

Recently the wind has shifted and more critics are inclined to see the Isaian allusion as basic to the architecture to the parable. The fact of the Septuagintal nature of Mark 12:1 has been mitigated variously.

---

[2] J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (London: SCM; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955 (from *Die Gleichnisse Jesu* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, [3]1954]) 56. Jeremias, however, later seems to imply that the Isaian allusions are original (*Parables*, 124).

[3] Thus J. Jeremias, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, [8]1970) 68; ET: *The Parables of Jesus* (Rev. ed.; London: SCM; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972) 71. Similarly, H.-J. Klauck, *Allegorie und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexten* (NTAbh NF 13; Münster: Aschendorff, 1978) 287; U. Mell, *Die "anderen" Winzer: Eine exegetische Studie zur Vollmacht Jesu Christi nach Markus 11,27—12,34* (WUNT 1/76; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994) 80-81 and others.

It is pointed out, for example, that the MT of Isa 5:5 mentions "its hedge (   ); thus the element that the LXX shares with Mark is not completely unanticipated in the MT. And it could be imagined that pre-Markan tradents of the parable merely assimilated the "original" Isaian allusions to a Septuagintal form. Still others argue that in the early first century Isa 5:1-7 was already being construed in much the same way that Mark 12:1 does, that is, with reference to the Temple and its administration. This being so, there is no reason to think that the Isaianic allusions are not primary and basic.[4]

From the point of view of logic, the final point is a *non sequitur*. The fact that the parable, with its Isaian elements, would be intelligible to a first-century audience does not decide the issue of whether the Isaian elements are primary or secondary since in any event, they are intelligible at the Markan level. The discovery of a first-century allegorizing interpretation of Isa 5:1-7 only shows that any stipulative argument apropos of Mark 12 fails. For example, an argument that Mark 12:1-9 cannot originally have used Isaiah in an allegorizing fashion because allegorical interpretations of Isa 5 are "late" obviously runs aground on 4Q500.[5] But these are not in fact the main grounds for thinking that the Isaian citations are secondary.

There are several bases for concluding that Isaiah is secondary to the parable. I have argued elsewhere on the basis of an examination of the legal and horticultural aspects of ancient viticulture that the scenario presented by Mark is economically and legally incoherent and that this incoherence is principally a function of the Isaian elements in Mark 12:1. By contrast, the version of the parable in the *Gospel of Thomas* is consistent with what we know of the operation and management of ancient vineyards.[6]

---

[4] K.R. Snodgrass, *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants* (WUNT 7; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1983); T. Schmeller, "Der Erbe des Weinbergs: Zu den Gerichtsgleichnissen Mk 12,1-12 und Jes 5,1-7," *MTZ* 46 (1995) 183-201; C.A. Evans, "God's Vineyard and its Caretakers," in *Jesus and his Contemporaries: Comparative Studies* (AGJU 25; Leiden, New York, and Köln: E.J. Brill, 1995) 381-406; R.D. Aus, *The Wicked Tenants and Gethsemane: Isaiah in the Wicked Tenants Vineyard and Moses and the High Priest in Gethsemane* (University of South Florida International Studies in Formative Judaism and Christianity 4; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996), esp. 4-6; W.J.C. Weren, "The Use of Isa 5,1-7 in the Parable of the Tenants (Mark 12,1-12; Matthew 21,33-46)," *Bib* 79 (1998) 1-26.

[5] See 4Q500 and the comments on the text by J.M. Baumgarten, "4Q500 and the Ancient Conceptions of the Lord's Vineyard," *JJS* 40 (1989) 1-6, and G.J. Brooke, "4Q500 1 and the Use of Scripture in the Parable of the Vineyard," *DSD* 2 (1995) 268-94.

[6] J.S. Kloppenborg Verbin, "Isaiah 5:1-7, the Parable of the Tenants, and Vineyard

In this paper I wish to argue the case in detail that the Isaian elements in Mark 12:1, 9 are Septuagintal. The argument has primarily to do with the LXX's reconceptualization of Isaiah's parable of the vineyard and, in part, the influence that Egyptian viticultural practices have exerted on the LXX's rendering. It is this reconceptualization and these influences, and not those of the MT, that are found in Mark. Hence, there is no reason to think that there are subterranean elements of a Hebrew or Aramaic citation lying beneath the Septuagintal surface. If one adopts the reasonable supposition that the historical Jesus spoke mainly Aramaic (and, conceivably, Hebrew) and *if* the parable is authentic, it is doubtful that the original parable alluded to Isaiah 5 in the manner that Mark's version does. Of course, it is possible that the parable is nonauthentic, as many critics have argued, but pre-Markan. But in that case too, the Septuagintal allusions and citations can only have been attached as the parable circulated in Greek.

Isaiah 5:1-7 in the MT and the LXX

In both the MT and the LXX, Isaiah's song of the vineyard has the form of a juridical parable.[7] As in the case of Nathan's parable of the ewe (2 Sam 12:1-12), the force of the juridical parable rests on its realism, a realism that provokes the hearers to render a judgment in the case cited, unaware that in so doing they condemn themselves.[8] Isaiah's song, as Yee has persuasively argued, is addressed to a Jerusalemite audience. Its story of a non-productive vineyard and its eventual destruction is a thinly disguised reference to the destruction of the Northern Kingdom by Tiglath-pileser in 734-32 B.C.E. As Yee notes, it is a reasonable supposition that the audience would immediately identify the vineyard with Israel, the Northern Kingdom, since at the time of Isaiah of Jerusalem, the vineyard had been a metaphor predominantly associated with Israel (Hos 9:10; 10:1; 14:8; Psalm 80). But Isaiah's application of the parable in v. 7—"for the vineyard of YHWH is the house of Israel, and the *men of Judah* are its delightful planting"

Leases on Papyrus," in *Text and Artefact: Religions in Mediterranean Antiquity: Essays in Honour of Peter Richardson* (ed. S.G. Wilson, and M. Desjardins; Studies in Christianity and Judaism / Études sur le christianisme et le judaïsme 9; Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2000) 111-134.

   [7] G.A. Yee, "The Form-Critical Study of Isaiah 5:1-7 as a Song and a Juridical Parable," *CBQ* 43 (1981) 30-40.

   [8] U. Simon, "The Poor Man's Ewe Lamb: An Example of a Juridical Parable," *Bib* 48 (1967) 220-21.

extends the metaphor of God's vineyard to the Southern Kingdom and thus threatens Judah with the same judgment that they had just seen visited upon their northern neighbours.

Isaiah's song exists in two significantly different forms, one in the Hebrew Bible (MT), and another in the Septuagint (LXX). Since there are important differences between the two, it is possible to determine whether Mark's reference to the text is to the MT or the LXX. (Significant departures of the LXX from the MT are underscored).

Isaiah 5:1-7 (MT)	*Isaiah 5:1-7 (MT)*
	1 Ἄισω δὴ τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ
	ᾆσμα τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ τῷ ἀμπελῶνί <u>μου</u>.
	ἀμπελὼν ἐγενήθη τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ
	ἐν κέρατι ἐν τόπῳ πίονι.

----------	2 <u>καὶ φραγμὸν περιέθηκα</u>
----------	<u>καὶ ἐχαράκωσα</u>
	καὶ ἐφύτευσα <u>ἄμπελον</u> σωρηχ
	καὶ ᾠκοδόμησα πύργον ἐν μέσῳ αὐτοῦ
	καὶ προλήνιον ὤρυξα ἐν αὐτῷ·
	καὶ ἔμεινα τοῦ ποιῆσαι σταφυλήν,
	ἐποίησεν δὲ <u>ἀκάνθας</u>.
	3 καὶ νῦν, <u>ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Ιουδα</u> καὶ <u>οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες</u>
	<u>ἐν Ιερουσαλημ</u>,
	κρίνατε ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀμπελῶνός μου.
	4 τί ποιή<u>σω</u> ἔτι τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου
	καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησα αὐτῷ;
	διότι ἔμεινα τοῦ ποιῆσαι σταφυλήν,
	ἐποίησεν δέ <u>ἀκάνθας</u>.
	5 νῦν δέ ἀναγγελῶ ὑμῖν
	τί ποιή<u>σω</u> τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου·
	ἀφελῶ <u>τὸν φραγμὸν</u> αὐτοῦ
	καὶ ἔσται εἰς διαρπαγήν,
	καὶ καθελῶ τὸν τοῖχον αὐτοῦ
	καὶ ἔσται εἰς καταπάτημα,
	6 καὶ ἀνήσω τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου
	καὶ οὐ μὴ τμηθῇ οὐδὲ μὴ σκαφῇ,
	καὶ ἀναβήσεται εἰς αὐτὸν ὡς <u>εἰς χέρσον</u> ἄκανθα·
	καὶ ταῖς νεφέλαις ἐντελοῦμαι τοῦ μὴ βρέξαι
	εἰς αὐτὸν ὑετόν.
	7 ὁ γὰρ ἀμπελὼν κυρίου σαβαωθ οἶκος τοῦ Ισραηλ
	ἐστίν
	καὶ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Ιουδα νεόφυτον ἠγαπημένον·
	ἔμεινα τοῦ ποιῆσαι κρίσιν, ἐποίησεν δὲ ἀνομίαν
	καὶ οὐ δικαιοσύνην ἀλλὰ κραυγήν.

The Hebrew Version (MT)

General Structure

Isaiah's song of the vineyard in the MT consists of three stanzas, vv. 1-2, vv. 3-6, and v. 7, with constantly shifting grammatical perspectives. The first stanza is particularly complex. It begins in the first person as Isaiah's declaration of his intention to sing to or for his friend: "I will sing to my friend (   )." The song itself, however, seems to be his friend's song, for it is introduced as "my beloved's song for his vineyard" (   ). One might therefore expect that what follows would be framed as a first person speech of the friend to his vineyard. Instead, v. 1b offers a third person narrative: "my friend had a vineyard" and this perspective continues throughout the rest of vv. 1b-2, which describes the friend's preparation and planting of the vineyard and his disappointment at its unexpected unproductivity.

In the second stanza (vv. 3-6) the fictive vineyard owner, Isaiah's friend, steps out of his story and, as it were, addresses the inhabitant of Jerusalem and the "man" of Judah directly:

> And now, you who dwell in Jerusalem and you man of Judah,
> judge between me and my vineyard.
> What more can I do for my vineyard?
> And what did I not do for it?

After restating his case in the briefest terms—"I expected it to produce grapes, but it produced stinking grapes"—, the speaker then describes his remedy: he will abandon the vineyard, destroy its hedge and walls, and cease to tend it, with the result that it will be overrun by thorns and become a wasteland. Isaiah himself returns in the final stanza (v. 7) and offers in third person perspective the interpretation of the key elements of the parable: the vineyard is Israel and Judah; the expected produce were justice (*mišpāt*) and righteousness (*sedāqāh*); and the actual results were bloodshed (*miśpāḥ*) and an outcry (*se'āqāh*).

Isa 5:1-7 thus comprises three levels of discourse: Isaiah's introduction (v. 1a) and interpretation (v. 7); a story of the vineyard owner's efforts and expectations (vv. 1b-2); and embedded in this, the owner's direct address to Israel and Judah (vv. 3-6). Even before Isaiah's own unequivocal interpretation of the parable's key elements in v. 7, the hearer would guess that Isaiah's "friend" was in fact YHWH. The description of the destruction of the vineyard in vv. 5-6—the removal of its hedge and wall, apparently metaphors of God's protection, and

its being overrun by thorns—would in the context of late eighth-century Judah evoke the destruction of Shechem and the Northern Kingdom. Isaiah's interpretation (v. 7) confirms this identification, but extends the application of the parable to Judah.

Notes

5:1:   (on a fertile horn): The MT describes the location of the vineyard as   , "on a fertile horn." The precise meaning of *qeren* (   ) is unknown, since it is used only here in the Tanak in relation to a topographical formation. Budde suggests "spur" (of a mountain), which appears to suit the context well,[9] since vineyards were normally located on terraced hillsides.[10]

5:2:   (and he broke up the clods and cleared the stones): The MT uses the two verbs $y^{e‘}azz^eq\bar{e}h\hat{u}$ (   ) and $way^es aqq^el\bar{e}h\hat{u}$ (   ), probably best rendered respectively "to break up"[11] and "to clear of stones."[12] As such, the two verbs describe the initial labour required to transform a plot of land from a previously uncultivated state into a state suitable for the cultivation of vines.

5:2:   : After the plot has been prepared it is planted with soreq, probably a red varietal grape.[13]

---

[9] K. Budde, "Zu Jesaja 1-5," *ZAW* 50 (1932) 38-72, 55; KB 1068: "Ausläufer eines Berges."

[10] A. Ben-David, *Talmudische Ökonomie: die Wirtschaft des jüdischen Palästina zur Zeit der Mischna und des Talmud* (Vol. 1; Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1974) 107.

[11] KB 766 (*hapax legomenon*): Qal: "aufhacken, umgraben," From Ethiopic[G] *‘azaqt*, "cistern"; Akkadian *esēqu*, "einritzen"; Piel "umgraben, behacken, jäten" ("hoe," "weed"); Marcus Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York: Judaica Press, 1985) 1062: Piel "break up clods, level ground, till" (*b. Men.* 85b; *m.’Ohol.* 18.5; *t.’Ohol.* 17.9).

O. Borowski (*Agriculture in Iron Age Israel* [Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1987] 104), citing Puchačevsky ("Explanation of Biblical Words Relating to Agriculture," *Sefer hashana shel Eretz Israel* [Tel Aviv: Agudat Hasofrim Ha‘ivriyim and Dvir, 1924] 43-45), suggests that the most logical meaning is "clear of brambles," basing this on the Arabic name *‘ajjaq* for the mastic or lentisk (*pistacia lentiscus*), a common bush in the Judaean mountains.

[12] KB 725: Piel: (1) "mit Steinen (be)worfen" 2 Sam 16:13; 16:6; (2) (a) "von Steinen säubern" Isa 5:2; (b) "Steine wegräumen."

[13] This grape is mentioned also in Gen 49:11 and Jer 2:21. That the soreq is red in colour is suggested by Zech 1:8, where the word appears in parallel with *’adom* (red), and by Gen 49:11, where it stands in parallel to the phrase *bedam-‘anabîm*, "blood of grapes." According to Judg 16:4 Delilah came from the *Nahal Soreq* (LXX: Αλσωρηχ), presumably a grape-growing valley. For a discussion of other grape varieties, see G.H. Dalman, *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina* (Deutsches evangelisches Institut für Altertumswissenschaft des Heiligen Landes zu Jerusalem, Schriften 3/1-2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10; Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1928-42) 4:320; Borowski, *Agriculture in Iron Age Israel*, 104.

5:2: Pressing installations: The vineyard is also furnished with a watchtower (*migdal*) and "even" (*gam*) a winepress (*yeqeb*). The use of "even" (*gam*) draws attention to the fact that a vineyard need not have a press. The building of a press, which involved the excavation of the vats from hard limestone and the construction of a pressing mechanism, represented a considerable investment of effort and capital and would be unnecessary if commercial or communal presses were available nearby. The term *yeqeb* has a variety of connotations: it can refer to the vat or trough that holds the must or to the entire winepress, which includes an upper vat for treading (Amos 9:13; Isa 63:2), a lower vat for collection of the must (connected by a *ṣinnor*, a groove), and the pressing equipment.[14] Since *yeqeb* is the object of the verb   , "to quarry," the substantive must refer to the treading or collecting vat, which is excavated from stone. But since the phrase
stands in parallel to the description of the building of the watchtower, the other main structure of a vineyard, it seems likely that the "vat" refers by metonymy to the entire pressing installation.

The particulars of vv. 1b-2 touch on the motifs of fertility, expense, permanence, and the expectation of high productivity. The location of the vineyard was ideal for viticulture, on a hillside, presumably with good drainage; and the area was fertile, which probably meant well-watered. It was, nevertheless, still uncultivated and therefore required a good deal of preparatory labour on the part of the owner. Vv. 1b-2a thus underscore the efforts that the owner expended in creating a vineyard from where there was none. The permanent and expensive structures mentioned in v. 2b emphasize the owner's high expecta-tions. Instead of erecting a temporary hut (*sukkah*, Isa 1:8; 4:6) or cre-ating a small shaded area (*melunah*, Isa 24:20), the owner built (   ) a stone tower. Instead of relying on local presses, the owner built his own. Such elements imply that the owner expected to create a stable and productive vineyard that merited permanent installations.

5:2:   (stinking [grapes]): All of these elements of preparation and expectation combine to enhance the contrast with the actual result, the production of *beʾušîm* rather than of grapes. The term has some-times been translated as "wild grapes," but this is hardly appropriate. A good quality domestic varietal of *vitis vinifera L.* never produces a non-domesticated variety. *Vitis vinifera L.* appears to have been domes-

---

[14] For descriptions of the pressing mechanisms, see R. Frankel, *Wine and Oil Production in Antiquity in Israel and Other Mediterranean Countries* (JSOT/ASOR Monographs 10; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).

ticated in Northern Syria and the Aegean and is found in Early Bronze sites (3200-3000 B.C.E.) in Jericho, Arad, Lachish, Taʿannek, Bab edh-Dhraʿ, and Numeira.[15] No remains of the wild grape (*vitis silvestris*) have been found in Canaan.[16] Hence *beʾušîm* cannot be rendered "wild grapes" but should be translated as "stinking (or diseased) grapes."[17] It is not a matter of the contamination of a plot of land with some foreign plants, but of the corruption of what had been planted.

5:5:   : The viticultural metaphor is maintained throughout vv. 4-6, where several other features of the construction and care of vineyards are mentioned. V. 5 notes the presence of a hedge (*meśûkkāh* or *mesûkkāh*),[18] probably an enclosure made of thorns. Such hedges are still used by Beduin for creating rough enclosures around sheepfolds. The MT also mentions a wall (*gadēr*), probably constructed at least in part from the stones removed from the field.

5:6: Verse 6 adverts to the activities of pruning (   ), normally done twice, immediately after the harvest and during the summer,[19] and hoeing (   ) to keep down the thorns (*šamîr wāšāyit*).[20] Both are essential activities if yields are to be maximized. And of course, rain (   ) is essential.

5:7: Only in v. 7 does the author's application of the parable appear. Isaiah's interpretation depends on a double word play: God sought for justice (*mišpāt*) but found only bloodshed (*miśpāḥ*), and for righteousness (*ṣedāqāh*) but found only an outcry (*ṣeʿāqāh*). These themes are major preoccupations of Isaiah of Jerusalem, who complains of the oppression of the poor by the rich and of avaricious practices of the élite (Isa 3:12, 13-15; 5:8-24; 10:1-4). *Miśpāḥ* (   ) is a *hapaxlegomenon* in the Hebrew Bible but seems to mean "bloodshed."[21] *Ṣeʿāqāh* ("outcry,"

---

[15] Borowski, *Agriculture in Iron Age Israel*, 102.

[16] M. Zohary, *The Plants of the Bible* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982) 55; Borowski, *Agriculture in Iron Age Israel*, 102.

[17] D.J.A. Clines, ed., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (8 vols.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993-) 2:88, "stinking," in reference to worthless grapes. Aquila translates it as σαπρίας, "rotten."

[18] The Qumran Isaiahª scroll reads   , cf. Mic 7:4, where   stands in parallel with   , briers.

[19] Borowski, *Agriculture in Iron Age Israel*, 109-10.

[20] The phrase   appears to be a hendiadys (Zohary, *Plants of the Bible*, 153). Compare Isa 7:23-25 for a similar threat of land being overrun by thorns (*šamîr wāšāyit* for lack of hoeing. The pair of *šamîr* and *šāyit* is also seen at Isa 9:17; 27:4.

[21] Thus H. Wildberger, *Jesaja* (3 vols.; BKAT 10/1-3; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972-82) 1:172-73 and J.D.W. Watts, *Isaiah* (Word Biblical Commentary 24-25; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1985-7) 2:56 relate   to the root . . and to the Arabic *safaḥa*, meaning "to shed blood."

), the word play on *ṣedāqāh* ("righteousness,"   ), occurs only
here in Isaiah, but appears in other contexts in the MT having to do
with complaints against injustice (Gen 27:34; Exod 3:7, 9; 11:6).

Accordingly, Isaiah's parable of the vine in the MT concerns God's
expectations for Israel and Judah, that they would produce a society
characterized by justice and freedom from abuse, but that it had just
the opposite results.

The Septuagint (LXX)

Although the translators of the LXX refrained from effecting major
rearrangements, additions, or deletions, their choice of Greek terms
and a few free adaptations significantly transformed the parable.

General Structure

The MT displays confusing shifts in perspective, from the first per-
son (v. 1b), to the third (vv. 1b-2), then back to the first (vv. 3-6), and
finally to the third (v. 7). Some of these shifts are due to the basic
rhetorical structure of the speech: Isaiah's speech (vv. 1a, 7) contains
a "parable" told in the third person (vv. 1b-2), followed by the fictive
owner's challenge to the audience to judge the situation outlined in
the parable (vv. 3-4) and then the owner's response (vv. 5-6). A sim-
ilar structure is seen in 2 Sam 12:1-12, which moves from a parabolic
story told in the third person (2 Sam 12:1b-4), to David's reaction
to the story (2 Sam 12:5-6), and then to Nathan's oracle, delivered in
the first person (2 Sam 12:7-12).

The LXX translators rationalized the speech, presenting it as first
person discourse throughout, except in v. 1b where the MT's third
person is preserved: "(my) beloved had a vineyard on the horn (of a
hill) in a rich place." The LXX's shift to the first person in the fol-
lowing cola entailed the conversion of the verbs in v. 2 (περιέθηκα,
ἐχαράκωσα, ἐφύτευσα, ᾠκοδόμησα, ἔμεινα) and 7 (ἔμεινα). But it also
meant that the structure of the juridical parable is effaced. The speaker
(Isaiah) still sings his beloved's song, introducing the song with a paren-
thesis about the vineyard (v. 1b). But the remainder of the unit (vv.
2-7) now becomes the beloved's song, including what in the MT had
been the friend's address to Jerusalem (vv. 3-6) and Isaiah's interpre-
tation (v. 7). The first verse, nonetheless, remains rather confusing.
Rather than "I will sing to my beloved, (my) beloved's song for *my*
vineyard; *my* beloved had a vineyard," one might more reasonably

expect τῷ ἀμπελῶνι αὐτοῦ ("for *his* vineyard") and ᾧ ἐγενήθη ἀμπελών ("who had a vineyard").

Notes

5:1: ἐν κέρατι ἐν τόπῳ πίονι: In the LXX the vineyard is located on a κέρας or "horn,"[22] which seems generally to correspond to the MT's *qeren*. The MT's "fertile" (, lit. "son of fatness") is rendered ἐν τόπῳ πίονι, "in a rich (or fertile) place."

5:2: καὶ φραγμὸν περιέθηκα (and I surrounded it with a palisade): A more significant alteration concerns the description of the labours of the owner. While the MT stresses the initial labour required to convert virgin hillside into a productive vineyard, the LXX takes the initial preparations for granted. Like the MT, the LXX indicates that the "vineyard" was already in the speaker's possession (ἀμπελὼν ἐγενήθη τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ). But the LXX, by dispensing with the verbs having to do with the breaking and clearing of the ground, implies that the plot had already been prepared for planting. What was required, however, was a palisade (φραγμός)[23] and furnishing the plot with stakes or props for the vines. Thus the LXX seems to envisage the conversion of existing agricultural land into a vineyard.

Such conversions, it might be noted, probably reflect practices in Egypt, where agricultural lands were often redesignated from one use to another, owing to the desires of their owners or to the availability of water through the maintenance of a system of dikes and canals. The failure of the irrigation system might mean that certain plots, once used for irrigation-intensive crops (e.g., vines, melons), might have to be converted for grain growing or pasturage. Alternatively, the creation of a dike system allowed owners to re-seed dry or marginal lands with high-yield crops. In Palestine under the Ptolemies, the conversion of plots for field crops into vineyards and olive and fruit orchards was driven by an interest in export crops and in maximizing the yield of the land.[24]

---

[22] LSJ 941, V.6 "mountain peak," "spur" (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 5.6.7; Lycophron 534: προύχουσα χερσαίου κέρως, "Mazusia jutting from the horn of the dry land").

[23] Vulgate: saepivit, "surround with a palisade, enclose."

[24] On the Ptolemaic occupation and exploitation of Palestine, see in general, G.M. Harper, "A Study in the Commercial Relations Between Egypt and Syria in the Third Century Before Christ," *AJP* 49 (1928):1-35; V. Tcherikover, "Palestine Under the Ptolemies," *Mizraim* 4-5 (1937):9-90; X. Durand, *Des Grecs en Palestine au IIIe siècle avant Jésus Christ: Le dossier syrien des archives de Zénon de Caunos (261-252)* (Cahiers de la Revue biblique 38; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1997). M. Hengel ("Das Gleichnis von den bösen Weingärtnern, Mc 12:1-12 im Lichte der Zenonpapyri und der rabbinischen Gleichnisse,"

Where the MT names digging and stone-removal as the preliminary activities of vineyard preparation, the LXX mentions the building of a palisade (φραγμός). Two issues are of importance here: first, the meaning of the LXX's term, and second, the significance of its mention as an initial activity.

1. While the MT makes no mention of a hedge in 5:2, it emerges from v. 5 that a hedge had been present, where *meśûkkāh* appears in poetic parallelism with *gadēr* (wall, LXX: τοῖχος). While *meśûkkāh* is probably a hedge formed of thorny bushes, the φραγμός of the LXX (5:2, 5) is more likely a wooden palisade or a low stone wall. To be sure, the context of Isa 5:5 LXX indicates that the φραγμός is less substantial than the τοῖχος (stone wall):[25] the φραγμός is merely "taken away" or "removed" (ἀφίημι), while the wall is "taken down" or "razed" (καθαιρέω).[26] This corresponds generally to the MT's *meśûkkāh*, which is removed (   ), and the wall (*gadēr*), which is destroyed (   ).[27] But an examination of other instances of φραγμός, both in the LXX[28] and in contemporary Greek literature, indicates that the word normally referred to a wooden fence or palisade.[29] In Egyptian papyri and a

---

ZNW 59 [1968] 15-16) suggests that this new economic situation in Palestine produced various tensions: "The new—typically hellenistic—revenue-intensive kind of management, in which agents charged with achieving delivery quotas certainly did not act with special deference, aroused the indignation of the Galilean farmers, who apparently refused to pay the rent" (referring to *PCairZen* 59 018 (258 B.C.E.).

[25] For τεῖχος in connection with vineyards, see *PRyl* II 157 (135 C.E.); *PRossGeorg* II 19 (141 C.E.); *PStras* VI 539 (290/91 C.E.); *PVind Sal* 8.r.31 (325 C.E.).

[26] See Xenophon, *Hellenica* 4.4.13 (ἔγνω Πραξίτας πρῶτον μὲν τῶν τειχῶν καθελεῖν ὥστε δίοδον στρατοπέδῳ ἱκανὴν εἶναι, "first Praxitas decided to pull down the walls to make a passage wide enough for a passage for the soldiers"); Plato, *Menexenus* 244C (καὶ τείχη καθελόντες ἀνθ' ὧν ἡμεῖς τἀκείνων ἐκωλύσαμεν πεσεῖν, "and they demolished the walls as a recompense for our saving their walls from ruin").

[27] Similarly, Ps 80:13:   , "Why did you destroy its [the vineyard's] walls?" Note, however, that the LXX renders this as ἵνα τί καθεῖλες τὸν φραγμὸν αὐτῆς. The same translation of *gadēr* is given at Ps 89:14 (καθεῖλες πάντας τοὺς φραγμοὺς αὐτοῦ).

[28] In all cases where the connotation of φραγμός can be determined, it is used of solid enclosures, either palisades around vineyards, or city walls: Num 22:24 (wall of a vineyard, solid enough to pin Balaam against it); 1 Kgs 10:22 (walls of Jerusalem); 11:27 (walls of the city); 2 Esdras 9:9 (wall of Jerusalem); Ps 61[62]:4 (a tottering fence); Ps 79[80]:13 (destroying [καθεῖλες] a vineyard wall); Ps 88[89]:41 (city walls); Prov 24:31 (stone fences); Isa 58:12 (city walls); Mic 4:14 (city wall?).

[29] φραγμός: Theocritus, *Idyll* 5.108 (a fence around a vineyard); Lycurgus, Frag. 10-11.14 *apud* Harpocration, *Lexikon* [I C.E.] 215.14: ὁρκάνη· μήποτε φραγμός, τουτέστι τὸ περίφραγμα καὶ ἡ αἱμασία, οὕτω καλεῖται, παρὰ τὸ ἐρύκειν ἢ παρὰ τὸ ἔρκος εἶναι, "*horkane*: perhaps a palisade (*phragmos*), that is the fence and (stone) wall, so called from 'to hold in' (*erukein*) or from 'fence'" (*herkos*); Philo, *Det.* 105 (ἀντὶ τείχους φραγμοὺς εἶναι, "to be a fence as [strong as] a wall"); *Agr.* 19 (a palisade of wood); *Moses* 1.271 (αἱμασίαι καὶ

few other texts φραγμός refers specifically to a palisade that surrounds
an agricultural plot or a vineyard.[30] The choice of φραγμός to render
meśûkkāh in v. 5 was probably motivated by the fact that the LXX
translators, with Egyptian agricultural practices in view, assimilated
Isaiah's vineyard to vineyards more familiar to them in Egypt.[31]

2. The second issue concerns the reasons for the LXX mentioning
the building of a palisade in the initial stage of preparing a plot for
vines. This probably has to do with the likelihood, noted above, that
the LXX envisages the conversion of an *existing* agricultural plot in an
intensively cultivated area into a vineyard rather than the MT's con-
ception of the breaking of virgin hillside. The palisade was a key part
of a vineyard, for both legal and practical reasons. In areas of inten-
sive cultivation, the palisade served as a boundary marker used in sur-
veys and land registers (e.g., *P.Ness* III 31 [VI C.E.]), marking off one
plot falling under one tax regime from contiguous plots that might be
taxed quite differently. The palisade, moreover, protected a newly
planted vineyard from damage by humans and animals, which might
use the plot for grazing or as a short-cut.[32] Finally, the palisade pro-
tected the maturing fruit from ravages by animals, especially foxes and
boars, and (along with a guard in the watchtower) from theft by
humans.[33] In later Palestinian agricultural practices, the palisade had

---

φραγμοί, "[stone] walls and palisades" that are strong enough to repel an attack); Strabo
13.4.14 (a fence of stone); Plutarch, *Pericles* 9.2.6 (τῶν τε χωρίων τοὺς φραγμοὺς ἀφαιρῶν,
describing the removal of palisades around an orchard); Plutarch, *Cimon* 10.1.4 (τῶν τε
γὰρ ἀγρῶν φραγμοὺς ἀφεῖλεν, describing the removal of palisades around fields).

[30] *BGU* IV 1119 (6/5 B.C.E.) (palisade around a vineyard); *PGiss.* 56 (V C.E.) (pal-
isade around a vineyard); *P.Ness* III 31.11, 16, 31, 51, 55, 60 (VI C.E.) (palisades mark-
ing vineyards). M. Schnebel (*Die Landwirtschaft im hellenistischen Ägypten. Erster Band: Der
Betrieb des Landwirtschaft* [Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechts-
geschichte 7; München: C.H. Beck, 1925] 244) doubts that Egyptian φραγμόι were
made of wood, since wood was relative rare and expensive, and suggests that they
were (stone) walls.

[31] This explanation seems preferable to that given by J. Fischer (*In Welcher Schrift lag
das Buch Isaias den LXX vor? Eine textkritische Studie* [BZAW 56; Giessen: Töpelmann,
1930] 20), according to whom φραγμὸν περίθηκα was a "free" translation which took
          to be related to   , "ring" (which however, appears only as a proper name in
the Hebrew Bible).   ("signet") is attested only in Aramaic (Dan 6:18). R. Gundry
(*The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic
Hope* [NovTSup 18; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967] 44) rather implausibly suggests that the
LXX, Peshitta and Vulgate understood   as "to build a (stone) fence" and argues
that this is unrelated to the   of v. 5. But as I have argued above, this is more
likely a hedge of thorns. See below, n. 38.

[32] Cf. *PMich* V 229 (48 C.E.), a complaint about damage to a vineyard caused by
ass-driver.

[33] Prov 24:31 treats the stone wall (, LXX: οἱ φραγμοὶ τῶν λίθων) as an

an additional function: since Deut 22:9 prohibited the intercultivation of vineyards with other (cereal or vegetable) crops, care was taken to demarcate the vineyard from adjoining fields that were sown to other crops. A wall (   ) or reed fence (   ) served as a valid way to divide one area from another so as to comply with the laws of mixed seeds.[34]

5:2: καὶ ἐχαράκωσα (and I staked it): What is completely new in the LXX is the use of χαρακόω, used in Ptolemaic- and Imperial-period papyri in connection with the staking of vines.[35] This may be another

---

essential part of a vineyard, as does Sir 36:25: οὗ οὐκ ἔστιν φραγμός, διαρπαγήσεται κτῆμα, "wherever there is no fence, the property is plundered." Damage to vineyards from animals and humans is noted in Ps 80:13-14: "Why did you destroy [the vineyard's] walls, so that every passerby plucks its fruit, wild boars gnaw at it, and creatures of the field feed on it?"; Cant 2:15: πιάσατε ἡμῖν ἀλώπεκας μικροὺς ἀφανίζοντας ἀμπελῶνος, "catch us little foxes, that spoil the vineyards"; Theocritus, *Idyll* 1.45: "And but a little removed from master Weatherbeat there's a vineyard well laden with clusters red to the ripening, and a little lad seated watching upon the fence [τις κῶρος ἐφ' αἱμασιαῖσι φυλάσσει]. And on either side of him two foxes; one ranges to and fro along the rows and pilfers all such grapes as are ready for eating, while the other sets all his cunning at the lad's wallet"; Theocritus, *Idyll* 5.112-13: μισέω τὰς δασυκέρας ἀλώπεκας, αἳ τὰ Μίκωνος αἰεὶ φοιτῶσας τὰ ποθέσπερα ῥαγίζοντι, "I hate the brush-tail foxes, who ever come creeping to their vintaging amid Mikon's vines." For the fable of the Fox and the Grapes, see Babrius 19; Phaedrus 4.3.

[34] Two biblical prohibitions lead to concern over the space that must be allowed between crops of different kinds, and the types of partitions that validly separate two crops. Deut 22:9-11 (from D) speaks specifically of vineyards: "You shall not sow your vineyard with a second kind of seed, else the crop—from the seed you have sown—and the yield of the vineyard may not be used [lit.: becomes holy]. You shall not plow with an ox and an ass together. You shall not wear a mingled garment, wool and linen together." A later text (from P) speaks more generally: Lev 19:19: "You shall not let your cattle breed with a different kind; you shall not sow your field with two kinds of seed; you shall not put on cloth from a mixture of two kinds of material."

These prohibitions are explicated in the Mishnah. In *m. Kil.* 4.1, a space of 12 cubits (16 according to Beth Shammai) must be allowed between the outer row of a vineyard and a seeded crop. A wall, however, formed a valid partition between plots of land. Hence, the Mishnah assumes both that walls are a normal part of a vineyard and that vines could extend up to the wall, thus occasionally trailing over the wall and infringing on a neighbour's grain crop (*m. Kil.* 7.4). According to *m. Kil.* 4.3, a wall of ten handbreadths high constitutes a valid partition. Likewise a reed fence is a valid partition: "A partition of reeds (   )—if between reed and reed be less than three handbreadths sufficient for a kid to enter,—counts as a valid partition [and one can sow seed on the other side]. And a palisade that is breached up to a space of ten cubits is considered as an entrance, if it be more than this, opposite the breach is forbidden [to sow seed]" (*m. Kil.* 4.4).

[35] *PCairZen* 59 229 (253 B.C.E.); *PSI* VI 595 (III B.C.E.): ὑπόμνημα Ζήνωνι παρὰ Νίκωνος εἰς τὴν μὲν σκαφὴν καὶ χαράκωσιν, ὥσπερ καὶ σὺ ἐγδέδωκας, προσδέξομαι; *PZenPestman* 64.14, 18 (= *PSI* VI 624; III B.C.E.); *POxy* IV 729.23 (Oxyrhynchus; 137 C.E.):]τι κεχαρακωμένας καὶ τὰ [το]ῦ κτήματος χώματα ἐστεγασμένα καὶ ὑδροπεφυλακημένα, ". . . staked and the embankments of the vineyard firm and watertight"; *PRyl*

instance of the influence of Egyptian viticultural practices on the LXX translators,[36] but the training of vines on trellises, palisades, and trees is also attested in early Israelite agriculture.[37] In any case, the LXX translators have reconceived the scenario imagined by the MT, shifting the emphasis from the labour of making virgin soil suitable for agriculture, to the particular preparations characteristic of viticultural practice, namely, the erection of a palisade or wall and the staking of the land with trellises.[38]

5:2: ἄμπελον σωρηχ (a vine of soreq): In the description of the planting of the vines, the LXX also differs from the MT. Whereas the MT specifies a particular variety of grape, *soreq*,[39] a term unattested outside the Hebrew Bible,[40] the LXX uses the phrase ἄμπελον σωρηχ ("a vine of soreq") as the object of ἐφύτευσα. Although the LXX preserves

---

II 427 (II/III C.E.); *POxy* XLIV 3205.41 (Oxyrhynchus; 297-308 C.E.); *CPR* XVIIA 25.22 (307 C.E.); *CPR* VII 38.11 (V C.E.); *PHamb* I 68.5 (549/50 or 654/55 C.E.).

[36] On the staking of vines, see C. Ricci, *La coltura della vite e la favvricazione del vino nell'Egitto greco-romano* (Studi della Scuola papirologica 4/1; Milano: Hoepli, 1924) 23, 27, 34 and *BGU* IV 1122 (13 B.C.E.); *PLond* III 1003 (562 C.E.). Pliny (*Hist. naturalis* 17.35.164-166) describes 5 methods of vine-training: (1) on the ground; (2) as a self-supporting bush; (3) training on vertical posts; (4) training on horizontal yokes; and (5) training on an overhead trellis ("on four bars in a rectangle"). There is also considerable evidence for the training of vines on trees: Columella 5.6; Varro 1.8.3. See K.D. White, *Farm Equipment of the Roman World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975) 19-23.

[37] See Borowski, *Agriculture in Iron Age Israel*, 107-108; Frankel, *Wine and Oil Production*, 35. Vines were trained on the ground (Ezek 17:6,   ; *m. Men.* 8.5; *m. Kil.* 4.7; 6.4) or on a fence (Ezek 17:8:   ). *t. Men.* 9.10, *m. Kil.* 6.6-9 adds the term   , apparently a type of trellis (Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim*, 671).

[38] Jastrow (*Dictionary of the Targumim*, 1062) thinks that the LXX's rendering of   as χαρακόω is influenced by the Aramaic   ("clap," "ring"). A more usual, albeit adventuresome, explanation is that the LXX translators mistook   as   . The LXX renders   ("ramp") as χάραξ (palisade) four times: Isa 37:33; Jer 40(33):4; Ezek 4:2; 26:8. See Fischer, *In Welcher Schrift*, 20-21.

[39] See above, n. 13.

[40] As a geographical designation, the term appears only in Eusebius, *Onomasticon*, 160, where Eusebius suggests that Σωρηχ (Judg 16:4) was located in the vicinity of Eleutheropolis. The standard Christian exegesis of the term follows Symmachus and interprets it to mean "elect": Origen, *Homiliae in Jeremiam* 12.1: 1 ἡ καλουμένη ἄμπελος Σωρήκ. Ἐκλεκτή τις οὖσα καὶ Θαυμαστή. Cf. also Basil, *Enaratio in prophetam Isiam* 5.142; Basil, *Asceticon magnum* (MPG 31:1136): Σωρηχ, ὅ ἑρμενεύεται ἐκλεκτή; Cyril of Alexandria *Commentarius in Isaiam Prophetam* (MPG 70:137): Σωρηχ, τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν ἐκλεκτήν; John Chrysostom, *Fragmenta in Jeremiam* (MPG 64:768): Σωρηχ, τοῦτεστιν ἐκλεκτήν; and Theodoret *Commentaria in Esiam* 2.475 (*Théodoret de Cyr, Commentaire sur Isaïe* [ed. J.N. Guinot; 2 vols.; SC 276, 295; Paris: Cerf, 1980-1982] 1.230). In *Interpretatio in Isaiam Prophetam* 5 (MPG 56:58) John Chrysostom interprets Soreq as well bred: Sorec autem hic significat veram, generosam, non malis nec inferioris notae propaginibus instructam, sed probatis et praecipuis.

soreq through a simple transliteration, it seems probable that the term was not sufficiently well known in Egypt to be self-explanatory and so ἄμπελον was added to make its general meaning clear.[41]

5:2: προλήνιον (vat): Verse 2b describes the excavation of the *yeqeb*, which the LXX renders as προλήνιον (vat). The usual translation of *yeqeb* is ληνός and this normally refers to the entire pressing installation.[42] In a few instances it is rendered by ὑπολήνιον, that is, one of two vats (one for treading and the other to collect the must).[43] Προσλήνιον, the LXX's choice of translation, is unattested in Greek literature until fourth century Christian citations, where, commenting on the LXX Isa 5:2, Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodoret interpret Isaiah's προλήνιον as the altar before the temple.[44] In the context of Isaiah 5, however, προλήνιον must refer to a collecting or treading vat and is probably therefore equivalent to ὑπολήνιον.[45] It seems probable

---

[41] I.L. Seeligmann (*The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* [Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux," Mededelingen en Verhandelingen 9; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1948] 33), however, drawing attention to the sevenfold repetition of ἀμπελών in Isa 5:1-7 (and in 1:8 and 3:14), suggests that ἄμπελον is secondary. He also observes that "from 7.23 onward ἄμπελος is used with the same regularity (eight times in succession) as ἀμπελών previously."

[42] Num 18:27, 30; Deut 15:14; 16:14; 2 Kgs 6:27; Hos 9:2; Joel 2:24 (in all instances, paired with *goren*, threshing floor); Prov 3:10 (paired with *'asam*, barn); Jer 48:33 (LXX 31:30); Lam 1:15. Ληνός is used to translate *gat* at Judg 6:11; Neh 13:15 (= 2 Esdras 23:15); Isa 63:2; Joel 4:13. See further, J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen 12/3; Münster: Aschendorff, 1934) 179.

[43] Isa 16:10 (the treading vat); Joel 4:13 (treading vat or the collecting vat); Hag 2:16 (the collecting vat); Zech 14:10 (the king's winepress).

[44] Eusebius, *Commentaria in Psalmos* on Ps 8 (MPG 23:125): προλήνιον τὸ πρὸ τοῦ ναοῦ θυσιαστήριον. Athanasius, *Expositiones in Psalmos* on Ps 8 (MPG 27:80): πάλαι μὲν ἐν τῇ νομικῇ λατρείᾳ ἦν ἔν προλήνιον, τὸ θυσιαστήριον δηλονότι τὸ ἐν τῷ ναῷ; Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarius in Isaiam Prophetam* (MPG 70:137): ᾠκοδόμησα δέ, φησί, καὶ πύργον ἐν μέσω αὐτοῦ, καὶ προλήνιον ὤρυξα ἐν αὐτῷ . . . τέθειται δὲ θυσιαστήριον ἐν αὐτῷ; John Chrysostom, *Interpretatio in Isaiam Prophetam* 5 (MPG 56:58): et aedificavi turrim, et torcular in medio eius: quidam turrim interpretantur templum, et torcular altare; quia illic fructus virtutis cuiusque congregabantur; Theodoret, *Commentaria in Esaiam* 2.470 (ed. Guinot, 1.230). W.J.C. Weren ("The use of Isa 5,1-7 in the Parable of the Tenants (Mark 12,1-12; Matthew 21,33-46)," *Bib* 79 [1998] 9 n. 24) erroneously states that προλήνιον occurs also in Oda 10:2, not realizing that this is Isa 5:2.

[45] The distinction between ληνός and ὑπολήνιον is observed by the anonymous *Geoponica* (*Geoponica, sive Cassiani Bassi scholastici De re rustica eclogae*, ed. Heinrich Beckh; Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1895) 6.1.2-4: δεῖ τοίνυν τὴν ληνὸν πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος τῶν συγκομίζεσθαι μελλόντων καρπῶν οἰκοδομεῖν . . . ἔστω δὲ ἡ ληνὸς θερμή, καὶ ἐχέτω φῶς πλεῖστον πάντοθεν, τὸ δὲ ὑπολήνιον ἔστω πλατύστομον, καὶ μετὰ τὴν χρῆσιν πλυθήτω ἢ θαλλάσῃ ἢ ἅλμη θερμῇ. Ziegler (*Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta*, 179) suggests that *prolēnion* might refer to a special kind of wine press, "vielleicht eine "Vorkelter" im Gegensatz zur Hauptkelter (ληνός). In der Papyrusliteratur ist das Wort προλ. bis jetzt m.W. nicht aufgetreten; aber sicher war die "Vorkelter" dem alexandrinischen Leser bekannt."

that the choice of προλήνιον over ληνός is a function of the verbs,

("to hew")/ὤρυξα ("to dig"), which suggest the excavation of a vat rather than building of the entire pressing installation.

5:2: ἄκανθα (thorns): The LXX dramatically reconceives the failure of the vineyard. Whereas the MT contrasts the owner's expectation of grapes (*'anabîm*,   ) with the actual produce, "stinking grapes" (*be'ušîm*), the LXX introduces a new contrast, using ἄκανθα ("thorns") as the second member of the pair.[46] The contrast of grape/thorn is neither a fixed parallel pair in Hebrew nor does it appears in the MT or elsewhere in the LXX. The pair in fact is barely attested in the Hellenistic period, appearing only in Matt 7:16[47] and *Gos. Thom.* 45[48] and, much later, in *b. Pesaḥ.* 49a.[49]

The LXX's choice of "thorns" seems to be a function of two factors. First, the focus of the LXX has shifted from the vine to the vineyard. While the MT repeats the term "vineyard" (*kerem*, vv. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7), the complaint is about the vine itself, which produced rotten fruit. In the LXX, by contrast, the focus has shifted from the vine (despite ἄμπελος σωρηχ) to the vineyard (ἀμπελών), which yielded thorns instead of grapes. Second, the LXX's choice may be a function of other texts of the Tanak which indicate that thorns were a constant encroachment on agricultural lands, signalling neglect (Isa 7:23-25; 32:13) and presenting a danger of fire (Exod 22:6 [LXX 22:5]).[50] Thus where the MT locates the failure in the unexpectedly corrupted growth of a good quality vine, the LXX thinks of the failure as that of the

---

[46] The word   appears only twice in the MT (Isa 5:2, 4), while   ("stinking") is found three times: Isa 34:3 (LXX: ἡ ὀσμή, smell), Joel 2:20 (LXX: ἡ σαπρία, stench) and Amos 4:10 (construed by the LXX as   , ἐν πύρι).

[47] Matt 7:16: μήτι συλλέγουσιν ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν σταφυλάς. The IQP reconstructs Q mainly following Luke rather than Matthew: μήτι συλλέγουσιν ἐξ ἀκανθῶν σῦκα ἢ ἐκ τριβόλων σταφυλ άς,. W.D. Davies and D.C. Allison (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Matthew* [3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988-97] 1:707) suggest that Matthew may have altered Q (= Luke) under the influence of Isa 5:2 LXX.

[48] *Gos. Thom.* 45.1: Jesus says: "Grapes are not harvested from thornbushes, nor are figs picked from thistles, for they do not produce fruit."

[49] *b. Pesaḥ.* 49a: "Let a man always sell all he has and marry the daughter of a scholar, and marry his daughter to a scholar. This may be compared to [grafting of] grapes of a vine with grapes of a vine [which is] a seemly and acceptable thing (   ). But let him not marry the daughter of an *'am ha-'areṣ*; this may be compared to [grafting of] grapes of a vine with berries of a thorn bush [which is] a repulsive and unacceptable thing (   )."

[50] Ἄκανθαι is also used of acacia trees, often found on the embankments of vineyards: see *POxy* VI 909 (225 C.E.), an agreement to uproot and sell the acacia trees (ἄκανθαι) in a vineyard, and *PLond* II 214 (270-75 C.E.).

plot itself and, presumably, of those who should have cared for it. Good and well-tended land should have produced a valuable crop; instead it produced only worthless thorns. The LXX apparently already has in view the failure of human subjects who tend the vineyard, in distinction from the MT, which studiously maintains its focus on the vineyard itself until the identification with Israel and Judah in v. 7.

5:3-6: There are several modifications and adaptations of the MT by the LXX in these verses, but not all are consequential for the issue of Mark's relation to Isaiah 5. The addressees of v. 3 are reversed in the LXX: the MT has "the one who dwells in Jerusalem" (   ) and then "man of Judah" (   ) (both, curiously in the singular), which the LXX reverses: "man (ἄνθρωπος) of Judah" and "inhabitants (οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες) of Jerusalem." The LXX renders the MT's idiom   ("judge between me and *x*") rather woodenly as κρίνατε ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀμπελῶνός μου (judge with me and in the midst of my vineyard).[51]

5:4: In v. 4 the LXX translates the MT's impersonal idiom   ("what more is to be done") as a first-person future: "what more shall I do?" The word-pair σταφυλή/ἄκανθα is repeated in v. 4, again modifying the MT's *ʿanabîm* ("grapes") and *beʾušîm* ("stinking grapes").

5:6: καὶ ἀνήσω (I will abandon): The influence of Ptolemaic agricultural practice is again visible in v. 6, where the LXX translators have rendered the MT's   (I will make [it] a waste [?]),[52] as καὶ ἀνήσω τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου (I will abandon my vineyard). As Ziegler notes, the LXX's verb ἀνιέναι is a technical term used in Ptolemaic papyri used in connection with land left untilled.[53]

5:6: ὡς εἰς χέρσον (on a dry plot): In the same verse the phrase   ("and thorns and brambles will grow up") is translated as καὶ ἀναβήσεται εἰς αὐτὸν ὡς εἰς χέρσον ἄκανθα ("and thorns will spring

---

[51] The LXX often renders the idiom   as κρίνειν ἀνὰ μέσον NN καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον NN (Deut 1:16; Judg 11:27; 1 Sam 24:16) or more simply as κρίνειν ἀνὰ μέσον NN καὶ NN (Gen 16:5).

[52] The meaning of   is suggested only from the context. The etymology is unknown. See KB 159.

[53] *PTebt* I 60.81-81 (118 B.C.E.): καὶ τοῦ ἀ[ν]ειμένου εἰς νομὰς καὶ | χο(ρτο)νο(μὰς) κδʹ, "and 24 (arourai) of land left untilled for pasturage and grassland"; *PTebt* I 72.35-36 (114/13 B.C.E.): καὶ τῆς ἐν τῶι νγʹ (ἔτει) προσαχθείσης ἐν Ἀλεξαν|δρείαι ἀνεῖσθαι εἰς νομάς. See also *PTebt* III/2 827.4 (170 B.C.E.). Ziegler notes that the LXX of Isa 27:10 renders   (homesteads deserted) with τὸ κατοικούμενον ποίμνιον ἀνειμένον ἔσται.

up on it as on a dry plot").[54] The use of χέρσος also points to an Egyptian agricultural context, where the term regularly designates land once used for agricultural production but which had become unproductive. Such failures were normally due to a collapse of the irrigation system or to low levels of the Nile inundation.[55] But the term means more than "dry land." Χερσός implies that the land was economically unproductive, since in Egypt it was exempt from taxation.[56] Vineyards were particularly susceptible to failure because they depended on a constant supply of water. So common in fact was the failure of a vineyard that the term χερσάμπελος was coined to refer to vineyards that had become unproductive.[57] The LXX's use of χερσός fits the context, since the next colon refers to God's stopping up of the clouds so as to withhold moisture. Hence, in addition to the MT's general image of a field being overrun by thorns, the LXX employs a term that would be recognized immediately by the Egyptian reader as referring to a specific class of unproductive agricultural land.[58]

5:7: νεόφυτος: In the concluding verse, the LXX has rendered the MT's *neṭaʿ* ("planting") by νεόφυτος, a technical term used in Egypt for newly-planted vineyards.[59]

5:7: κρίσις, ἀνομία, δικαιοσύνη, κραυγή (justice, lawlessness, fairness,

---

[54] The LXX uses a similar translation at Isa 7:23: εἰς χέρσον ἔσονται καὶ εἰς ἄκανθαν (   ), 24 ὅτι χέρσος καὶ ἄκανθα ἔσται πᾶσα ἡ γῆ (   ), 25 ἔσται γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς χέρσου καὶ ἀκάνθης εἰς βόσκημα προβάτου καὶ εἰς καταπάτημα βοός (   ).

[55] Cf. *POxy* XII 1475 (267 C.E.), detailing the sale of a now-dry orchard (τὸ . . . πωμάριον νυν ἐν χέρσῳ, l. 20) and mentioning a cistern and water wheel, "now in disrepair." The term can also refer to land that normally reached by the Nile inundation, but which the flood missed in particular years: *PPetr* III 99 (Fayûm; III B.C.E.); *PRyl* II 207a (Hermopolites; II C.E.). See Schnebel, *Landwirtschaft*, 9-24.

[56] Schnebel, *Landwirtschaft*, 16, quoting *PLond* II 401 (II, p. 12) (Pathyrites 116-111 B.C.E.); *PLond* II 267.149, 276 (II, p. 129) (Fayûm, II B.C.E.).

[57] For example, *PSI* III 240 (I/II C.E.); γῆς χερσαμπέλου σιτο[σπο]|[ρουμέν]ης; *PSarap* 103 (125 C.E.); *SB* VI 9190 (131 C.E.); *POxy* IV 729 (137 C.E.); *PRossGeorg* II 19 (141 C.E.); *POxy* III 506 (143 C.E.): τὸ πρὶν ἀμπελικο<ὖ> κτήματος νυν{ε}ὶ δὲ χερσαμπέλ[ου]; *PRossGeorg* II 42 (II C.E.); *PThmouis* 1 (170/71 C.E.); *PRyl* II 222 (II C.E.); *PRyl* II 427 (II/III C.E.). Dry vineyards could, however, be used for the raising of grain and other crops less demanding of water (and would, of course, be subject to taxation).

[58] Similarly, Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta*, 1934, 181: "Der letzte Begriff [χέρσος] ist besonders aus dem Vorstellungskreis des alexandrinischen Bauern heraus zu verstehen; denn χέρσος bedeutet nicht nur das Ödland, sondern im besonderen Sinne das Brachland, das unbebautet Land, das vorher Fruchtland war . . . So hat der Übers. ein neues Bild gebracht, das zwar nicht genau die hebr. Vorlage wiedergibt, aber doch für den griech. Leser recht anschaulich ist."

[59] *PSI* IV 371.11 (250/49 B.C.E.); *PLond* I 131.3.42, 4.83 (I, p. 166) (78 C.E.); *POxy* VI 909 (225 C.E.).

outcry). It proved impossible to replicate the MT's wordplays *mišpāṭ/mišpāḥ* and *ṣedāqāh/ṣeʿāqāh*. Instead, the LXX simply used the standard renderings of *mišpāṭ* as κρίσις, *ṣedāqāh* as δικαιοσύνη, and *ṣeʿāqāh* as κραυγή. The *hapax legomenon mišpāḥ* may have presented the translators with a problem, but they rendered it with the vague term ἀνομία (lawlessness).

A close examination of the text indicates that the translators of the LXX adjusted the imagery of Isa 5:1-7 in a variety of ways. Most obvious is the conversion of the entire unit into a first-person speech; less obvious is the reconceptualizing of the types of labour needed to create a productive vineyard, the shift of focus from the individual vine to the vineyard as a whole, and the pervasive influence of terminology that reflects the agricultural practices in Hellenistic Egypt.[60]

Mark 12:1, 9 and Isaiah 5:1-7

It is clear that Mark 12:1 (9) alludes to Isaiah 5. What remains to be decided is whether Mark knows Isaiah via the MT or the LXX. (Significant agreements with the LXX are underscored).

Isa 5:1-7 MT	Mark 12:1, 9	Isa 5:1-7 LXX
ἀμπελῶνα ἄνθρωπος ἐφύτευσεν,		ἀμπελὼν ἐγενήθη τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ ἐν κέρατι ἐν τόπῳ πίονι.
καὶ περιέθηκεν φραγμὸν		2 καὶ φραγμὸν περιέθηκα καὶ ἐχαράκωσα καὶ ἐφύτευσα ἄμπελον σωρηχ
	καὶ ὤρυξεν ὑπολήνιον καὶ ᾠκοδόμησεν πύργον	καὶ ᾠκοδόμησα πύργον ἐν μέσῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ προλήνιον ὤρυξα ἐν αὐτῷ·
	. . . .	καὶ ἔμεινα τοῦ ποιῆσαι σταφυλήν, ἐποίησεν δὲ ἀκάνθας. . . .
4	9 τὶ οὖν ποιήσει ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος; ἐλεύσεται καὶ	4 τί ποιήσω ἔτι τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησα αὐτῷ;

---

[60] Similarly, Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta*, 178.

Isa 5:1-7 MT	*Mark 12:1, 9*	*Isa 5:1-7 LXX*
	ἀπολέσει τοὺς γεωργούς, καὶ	διότι ἔμεινα τοῦ ποιῆσαι
	δώσει τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἄλλοις.	σταφυλήν, ἐποίησεν δὲ ἀκάνθας.
5		5 νῦν δὲ ἀναγγελῶ ὑμῖν <u>τί</u> <u>ποιήσω</u> τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου·
		ἀφελῶ τὸν φραγμὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔσται εἰς διαρπαγήν,
		καὶ καθελῶ τὸν τοῖχον αὐτοῦ
		καὶ ἔσται εἰς καταπά-τημα . . .

Despite attempts to trace Mark 12:1, 9 to a putative Hebrew or Aramaic version of the parable, it seems likely that Mark is dependent exclusively on the LXX.

First, Mark's phrase, ἀμπελῶνα ἄνθρωπος ἐφύτευσεν, continues the tendency, already visible in the LXX, to focus not on the vine but on the vineyard as a whole. It was this refocusing of the imagery of the MT that allowed the LXX to imagine thorns rather (ἄκανθαι) than rotten grapes (*be'ušîm*) as the product of the vineyard (5:3, 4). In Mark the object of ἐφύτευσεν (planted) is not ἄμπελος (a vine), but ἀμπελών (a vineyard) and in this respect, Mark's story intersects more closely with the LXX of Isaiah 5 than it does with the MT.

Of course, the trope of the vineyard functions quite differently in Mark; Mark's account introduces the idea of a tenancy agreement, which is foreign to both forms of Isa 5:1-7. It should be noted, however, that in indicating that the failure of the vineyard was its being overrun by thorns, the LXX implies that neglect was involved, probably a failure to hoe and weed. Egyptian vineyard contracts regularly state that the tenant is to stake the vines, perform the hoeing, trenching, and pruning, and insure that the vines are watered properly.[61]

----

[61] E.g., *BGU* IV 1122 (Alexandria; 13 B.C.E.) *POxy* IV 1692 (Oxyrhynchus; 188 C.E.) lists as duties of the tenant: the cutting and transporting of reeds (for supporting the vines), sweeping up cut reeds and transporting them outside the walls, hoeing around the vines, and trenching, planting (extra) vines in the necessary places, cutting of the new reeds for the reed-work, the arranging of the reeds, breaking up the ground, picking off the shoots, pruning the leaves, disposal of the pruned shoots, thinning the foliage, and stationing guards in the field. *POxy* IV 1631 (Oxyrhynchus; 280 C.E.) provides a similar list of duties.

Invasion by thorns can only mean that the vineyard suffered extreme neglect from those appointed to care for it.[62] Hence the LXX, without expressly naming tenants, has human failure in view even before v. 7. We are still, however, far from Mark's scenario of revolt.

One could hypothesize that Mark's parable extrapolates developments in the LXX, reconfiguring the addressees of Isa 5:3 LXX (the "person of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem") or those of 5:7 ("house of Israel, person of Judah") as the rebellious tenants of the vineyard, this despite the facts that both the MT and the LXX conclude that Israel and Judah *are* the vineyard and neither suggests that a rebellion is at stake. Or, one might suggest that a tenancy story concerning a vineyard and the rebellion of its tenants attracted the Isa 5:1-7 LXX, because it offered Mark (or some pre-Markan tradent) the interpretive possibility of construing the vineyard as Israel (or God's domain), whose first tenants refused God his due. In any case, there is no contact with the specifics of the MT in either regard.

Second, Mark shows no knowledge of what is unique to the MT's presentation of the preparation of the land, namely, the two initial verbs of digging (   ) and clearing the land of stones (   ). On the other hand, his reference to the building of a palisade (καὶ περιέθηκεν φραγμός) reflects a specifically Septuagintal addition to the MT and mirrors the Egyptian viticultural practice that influenced the LXX translators.[63] The fact that the MT has *meśûkkāh* in v. 5 does not help an attempt to derive Mark from the MT, since Mark still reflects the LXX's choice to render *meśûkkāh*, probably a hedge of thorns, as φραγμός, a wooden or stone fence. Dependence on the LXX is here a virtual certainty.

It is true that Mark has effected some alterations to clause and word order: he combined the initial statement of ownership (LXX: ἀμπελὼν ἐγενήθη τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ) with the mention of the planting of the vines/vineyard (LXX: καὶ ἐφύτευσα ἄμπελον σωρηχ) into a single clause (ἀμπελῶνα ἄνθρωπος ἐφύτευσεν), and inverted the order of the building of the tower and the digging of the vat. Moreover, in the final three clauses, he standardized word order: where the LXX has φραγμὸν περιέθηκα,

---

[62] See *POxy* IV 707 (Oxyrhynchus; 135 C.E.) for an account of legal proceedings in regard to vineyard that was neglected by its former tenants.

[63] M. Miller ("Scripture and Parable: A Study of the Function of the Biblical Features in the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen and their place in the history of the Tradition" [Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1974] 62) suggests that the LXX's καὶ χαράκωσα "may simply have been felt to be redundant."

ᾠκοδόμησα πύργον and προλήνιον ὤρυξα, Mark consistently places the verb first. It should be noted, however, that Mark is no closer to the MT in this respect, which lacks entirely the enclosing of the plot with a palisade and like the LXX has the object-verb order in the clause concerning the digging of a vat (   ). Neither the LXX nor Mark has any equivalent to the emphatic *gam* of the MT.

Finally, Mark agrees with the LXX in using a more particular term in connection with the excavation of the vat. As suggested above, the MT's "he hewed out a *yeqeb*" treats the excavation of a vat as a metonymy for the building the entire pressing installation. The LXX's phrase is also metonymic, but rather than adopting the customary rendering of *yeqeb* as ληνός, the LXX translators interpreted it as a particular vat in the press, the προλήνιον. As also noted, the LXX's word is unattested until the fourth century C.E. and even then it appears only in commentaries on Isa 5:2 LXX rather than in more general discussions of pressing installations. Mark's choice of ὑπολήνιον appears simply to be the substitution of a more common term for vat and another Septuagintalism used to render *yeqeb*.[64]

The combination of Septuagintalisms that appear in Mark 12:1 and the lack of agreement with any of the particulars of the MT make the conclusion highly probable that Mark depends on the LXX. Some resist this conclusion. In defending a case that the parable is authentic and that the Isaianic allusions are original, Gundry asserts that Mark's ὑπολήνιον is closer to the MT than the LXX's προλήνιον, arguing that the latter is ambiguous (presumably, like *yeqeb*/ληνός).[65] But it is hardly ambiguous: προλήνιον with ὤρυξα must refer to a vat, even if προλήνιον is otherwise unattested in Greek literature of the period. The prefix προ- suggests that it is a collecting vat in front of the press. Mark's ὑπολήνιον, moreover, is dependent on a specifically *Septuagintal* rendering of *yeqeb*. In the end, Gundry seems to agree: "in its text-form this quotation is primarily Septuagintal."[66]

Aus strains to avoid the conclusion that Mark depends on the LXX.[67] He makes four points. First he stresses that the use of third person singular verbs in Mark 12:1 are closer to the MT than to the LXX.

---

[64] Above, n. 43. For other uses of ὑπολήνιον see Julius Pollux, *Onomasticon* 10.130; *POxy* XIV 1735 (IV C.E.).

[65] R.H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope* (NovTSup 18; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967) 44.

[66] Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament*, 44.

[67] Aus, *The Wicked Tenants and Gethsemane* (n. 4), 4-6.

This is technically correct (though the LXX's τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ in v. 1b betrays a third person) but hardly a convincing point, given the MT's constant shifts from the first (v. 1a) to the third (vv. 1b-2) to the first (vv. 3-6) to the third person (v. 7). And at 12:9, Mark is just as distant from the LXX as from the MT; while they use the first person, Mark has the third. If Mark displayed a complexity similar to that of the MT, *that* might evidence the influence of the MT; but he does not.

His second point is built on an elaborate conjecture: first, that Jesus borrowed *gadēr* from Isa 5:5 and used this to "paraphrase" Isaiah's   ; then a "Hellenistic Jewish Christian" translated *gadēr* with περιέθηκεν φραγμός, employing a phrase of the LXX. But one hardly needs so elaborate and hypothetical a solution when the LXX itself accounts for both Mark's verb and his substantive.

Aus's third point is that ὑπολήνιον in Mark demonstrates Mark's independence of the LXX.[68] There is a subtle *non sequitur* here: Mark's independence of the LXX indicates dependence on the MT. But this is precisely what Aus fails to show—that Mark is *dependent* on the MT, which clearly he is not. As noted above, ὑπολήνιον is itself Septuagintal.

The final point concerns Mark 12:9/Isa 5:4-5. Aus notes that whereas Mark and the LXX use the future, the MT puts the speaker's question in the present (   ). But, he argues, the MT intended the future. It is difficult to see how this amounts to a compelling argument for Mark's use of the Hebrew version over the Greek, since whatever the MT's intent, Mark agrees with the future of the LXX, both in 5:4 and in 5:5. Aus claims, further, that the use of ("to be destroyed") in 5:5 may have influenced Mark's ἀπολέσει in 12:9. This, however, is an argument that works only in English: (or the idiom   , to be [destined] for destruction) is nowhere rendered by ἀπολλύναι. Thus Aus's conjectures appear to be baseless. Despite his special pleadings, the LXX is closer to Mark than the MT.

Weren makes three points:[69] that Mark agrees with the third person verbs of the MT rather than the LXX, the point already made by Aus.[70] Second, Weren makes much of the fact that Mark inverts the word order of the LXX (above, p. 155). But this, like Aus's third point, is a *non sequitur*: deviation from the LXX does not amount to an argument for the influence of the MT. This is especially the case,

---

[68] Similarly, Evans, "God's Vineyard and its Caretakers" (n. 4), 401 n. 42; Weren, "The Use of Isa 5,1-7" (n. 4), 9.
[69] Weren, "The use of Isa 5,1-7," 9-12.
[70] Similarly, Evans, "God's Vineyard and its Caretakers," 401 n. 42.

since the MT lacks an equivalent for περιέθηκεν φραγμόν; Mark departs
from the object-verb order of the MT = LXX in the case of the
phrase concerning the excavation of the vine vat, and the verb-object
order in the phrase concerning the planting of the vineyard; and Mark
agrees with the LXX *and* the MT in the phrase concerning the tower.
There are no agreements with the MT *against* the LXX.

Finally, Weren suggests that Mark agrees with "some nuances in
the Hebrew text which are absent in the LXX": 'I will make it [the
vineyard] a waste' and 'bloodshed'" as well as the question of Mark
12:9.[71] As I have already argued, the final point about the question
of Mark 12:9 is vacuous, since Mark agrees with the future of the
LXX. The conjecture that   is reflected in Mark's ἀπολλύναι
fares no better than Aus's suggestion concerning   : since the mean-
ing of   in v. 6 can only be guessed at,[72] it is baseless to claim that
Mark here stands closer to the MT. The same goes for the *hapaxle-
gomenon miśpaḥ*, which perhaps means "bloodshed."[73] Obviously, the
killing of the son in Mark is a case of bloodshed. But Mark does not
use the term αἷμα (blood), the usual term associated with bloodshed
in the Bible.[74] It is hard to see, then, how Mark's story is closer to
the MT than the LXX, which uses terms no less appropriate to Mark's
story—but terms also not actually attested in the story—, ἀνομία (law-
lessness) and κραυγή (outcry).

For his part, Snodgrass concedes the similarities of Mark 12:1 to
the LXX, but tries to mitigate their force with the claim: "that some
LXX wording was used is no proof at all [of the secondary nature of
the quotation] since this may reflect only an assimilation to the LXX
in either the oral or written period."[75] Secondary assimilation of a quo-
tation to the LXX is, of course, a possibility. But in order to render

---

[71] Weren, "The use of Isa 5,1-7," 11. Similarly, Evans, "God's Vineyard and its
Caretakers," 401 n. 42.

[72] See above, n. 52.

[73] See above, n. 21.

[74] In the more obvious phrases having to do with bloodshed, the LXX regularly
renders them with αἷμα: e.g., Isa 1:15:   , LXX: αἱ γὰρ χεῖρες ὑμῶν
αἵματος πλήρεις; 4:4:   ; LXX: καὶ τὸ αἷμα ἐκκαθαριεῖ; 26:21:
          ; LXX: καὶ ἀνακαλύψει ἡ γῆ τὸ αἷμα αὐτῆς.

[75] Snodgrass, *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants* (n. 4), 47. Compare Schmeller, "Der
Erbe des Weinbergs" (n. 4), 194: "Sowohl am Anfang wie am Ende des Gleichnisses
finden sich deutliche Bezugnahmen auf Jes. 5. An beiden Stellen begegnen Anklänge
an LXX, die auf eine sekundäre Bearbeitung schließen lassen. An beiden Stellen begeg-
nen aber auch gewisse Anklänge an MT, die zeigen, daß Bezüge auf Jes 5 wohl schon
zum ursprünglichen Gleichnis gehörten und sekundär verstärkt wurden."

likely the possibility of assimilation, one should be able to appeal to at least *some* elements in the text that are unassimilated, i.e., elements which agree with the MT against the LXX or which are closer to the MT or some textual development of the MT. The difficulty with the arguments of Snodgrass and Weren is that Mark fails to agree with the MT against the LXX *at any point*. There is then little basis for the conclusion that the Isaian allusions existed in a putative pre-Markan Aramaic or Hebrew version of the parable.

To conclude. A careful comparison of the MT of Isa 5:1-7 with the version in the LXX shows that the LXX has reconceived the scenario of Isaiah's vineyard in various ways. For the LXX the vineyard was not created from virgin soil but probably transformed from existing agricultural land, reflecting the intensive agricultural exploitation of the Ptolemaic period. Correspondingly, the fate of the vineyard is to become χέρσος, unproductive agricultural land. For the LXX, the failure of the land has not so much to do with the initial planting going bad but with the infiltration of the vineyard by weeds and thorns. This in turn points to neglect by its caretakers. Hence, the LXX has modified the discourse of the MT, for which the vineyard *is* Israel and Judah; the LXX implicitly distinguishes the vineyard from its caretakers. Finally, the LXX has introduced terminology that reflects distinctively Egyptian viticultural practices: the building of a φραγμός and the staking of the plot as initial tasks, and the use of such technical terms as νεόφυτος and χέρσος.

In comparing Mark with the two versions of Isaiah, what is clear is that Mark agrees with the LXX against in the MT, both in the use of φραγμός and in locating (implicitly or explicitly) the failure of the vineyard in the activity or inactivity of its caretakers. Moreover, Mark and the LXX lack any indication that the vineyards in questions are newly broken plots; that is, they reflect Ptolemaic and post-Ptolemaic agricultural patterns rather than those of eighth-century B.C.E. Judah assumed by the MT. In brief, Mark agrees with the LXX, but never with the MT *against* the LXX. If one adopts the reasonable supposition that the historical Jesus spoke mainly in Aramaic or Hebrew and *if* the parable is authentic, it seems doubtful that the original parable made an explicit allusion to Isaiah 5. The allusions now in the text of Mark are purely Septuagintal.