

# INCARNATION AS COLLECTION CALL

(Matthew 21.33-39)

## Abstract

In the “parable of the tenant farmers” (as it is known), Jesus described the Pharisees and chief priests as tenant-vintners who refused to pay their rent to the owner of the vineyard (Mt 21.33-39), abusing and mistreating his rent-collectors. In this parable he portrays himself as the owner’s son, sent as a final resort to collect that rent.

## Contents

The Nature of Metaphor

    Self-Referential Metaphors

    Metaphors of the Incarnation

The Parable

Some Suggestions

Readings

## Appendices

I. Matthew 21.33-41 (Greek & English)

II. Matthew 21.33d-g & Isaiah 5.1b-2e (LXX)

## INCARNATION AS COLLECTION CALL

(Matthew 21.33-39)

### THE NATURE OF METAPHOR

Although developed independently of theirs, my approach to metaphor is fully consonant with that of the cognitive approach to metaphor popularized by Lakoff, Jackson, Turner, Fauconnier, Kövesces, *et al.* I am thus using the term “metaphor” to refer to any utterance by which we attempt to understand and thus describe or explain one aspect of reality in terms of another—whether we are describing and explaining it to ourselves or to someone else.

Lakoff and Turner say in *Metaphors We Live By*, “[a] metaphor, after all, is *not a linguistic expression*. It is a *mapping from one conceptual domain to another, ...*” (Lakoff & Turner 1989, 203; emphasis added). This means that metaphors are not linguistic flourishes—embellishments or ornaments “added” to the text for rhetorical effect—nor is their purpose to make an utterance seem more “literary” or “polished”, or even to make it more “memorable”. They are instead oral and textual representations of how we think, of how we try to make sense of and discuss what we experience or encounter.

The term “metaphor” therefore encompasses the various comparing tropes that we were taught to identify as “metaphors”, “similes”, and “hypocatastases” in various courses on literary interpretation. The individual expressions that we use in speaking or writing make “sense” because they are built on, grow out of, or assume<sup>1</sup> what are called “conceptual metaphors” (following Lakoff & Johnson, 1989), “basic” metaphors that lie under or behind—or are the root or foundation of—the tropes that we see in the text.<sup>2</sup>

These conceptual metaphors say that “A is B”, in which the “A” element is something abstract or foreign to our experience and the “B” element is something common to our experience or understanding. For example, in discussing our lives we use the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY (among many others), which underlies such expressions as these:

“His life’s at a crossroads.”  
 “That’s a dead-end job.”  
 “She’s living in the fast lane.”  
 “He’s an accident waiting to happen.”  
 “Their marriage is a train wreck.”  
 “Where do you think you’ll end up?”

Apart from the last, which could be a literal question about an actual journey, we recognize that these are all metaphors. Marriage is not a train ride, nor is a job a street. The pattern of life, however, is difficult to grasp, but the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY lets us understand and interpret it, since we understand journeys and trips.

This same conceptual metaphor pervades Scripture. LIFE IS A JOURNEY describes what it means to be faithful to YHWH in the covenant, the prophets, and the teachings of Jesus and the apostles, and describes the manner of one’s life in the book of Proverbs.

Walk before me and be blameless. (Gn 17.1)  
 You shall therefore keep the commandments of YHWH your God *by walking* in His ways and by fearing Him. (Dt 8.6)  
 The *way* of the wicked is an abomination to YHWH, but he loves whoever *pursues* righteousness. (Pr 15.9)  
 All a man’s *ways* are clean in his own eyes, but YHWH weighs the motives. (Pr 16.2)  
 Why do you say, Jacob, and assert, Israel, “My *way* is hidden from YHWH, ...?” (Is 40.27)

<sup>1</sup>All three of these metaphors are attempts to describe an as-yet ineffable relationship.

<sup>2</sup>The actual tropes are also called “verbalizations” or “manifestations” (Forceville 1998, 412-413).

Enter through the narrow *gate*; for wide the *gate* and broad the *way* that *leads* to destruction, and many *enter* through it, for small the *gate* and narrow the *way* that *leads* to life, and few *find* it. (Mt 7.13-14)

Whoever *follows* me *does not walk* in darkness ... (Jo 8.12)

... as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we too *might walk* in newness of life. (Ro 6.4)

Let us *walk properly* as in the day, ... (Ro 13.13)

Therefore as you have received Christ Jesus the Lord, *walk* in Him, (Col 2.6)

I was very glad to find your children *walking* in truth, just as we have received a commandment from the Father. . . . And this is love, that we *walk* according to his commandments. This is the commandment, just as you have heard from the beginning, that you should *walk* in it. (2 John 1.4-6)

The conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY thus helps us understand our own lives, as well as the biblical teaching about life and God's expectations.<sup>3</sup> It is assumed by the biblical authors, just as we assume it in everyday language.

### Self-referential Metaphors

The phrase "self-referential metaphor" refers to metaphors by which we describe our inner state. Here are a few examples.<sup>4</sup>

"I'm sick of meetings."

"I'm dog-tired."

"I'm beat."

"I'm whipped."

"I'm pretty up today."

"I'm on top of the world."

No one takes the first statement to mean that the speaker is physically ill; the conceptual metaphor is perhaps MEETINGS ARE POISON or DISEASES. The next three describe tiredness of either body or spirit (or both) using the conceptual metaphors PEOPLE ARE WORKING ANIMALS(?) and WORK IS PUNISHMENT(?) (or the like). The last two statements depend on the conceptual metaphor GOOD IS UP.

We use metaphors such as these because our emotional state is invisible<sup>5</sup> and so, in order to answer the question, "How are you?" briefly and efficiently, we describe how we feel by means of a metaphor that describes our otherwise unknowable condition.

We also use self-referential metaphors to describe more general circumstances that we suspect will not be obvious to others by saying, for example,

"I'm working myself to the bone."

"I'm busy as a dog."<sup>6</sup> (PEOPLE ARE WORKING ANIMALS)

"I'm up to my eyeballs in work."<sup>7</sup> (WORK IS DEEP WATER)

"I'm keeping my nose above water." (WORK IS DEEP WATER; LIFE IS DEEP WATER)

<sup>3</sup>It may be popular to think that something as common as this is a "dead" metaphor, but that supposition misses the point, which is that we invoke conceptual metaphors unconsciously, and that the more powerful the conceptual metaphor, the more deeply it is buried in our thought, so that we may even consider some of these statements to be literal.

<sup>4</sup>I encourage you to think of others; being aware of how we tend to describe ourselves and our situation(s) is a step toward self-understanding.

<sup>5</sup>It is, of course, invisible to us as well, since it is abstract, but we have direct access to our thoughts and feelings in a way denied to others. (Cf. Proverbs 14.10.)

<sup>6</sup>The more common phrase "busy as a beaver" tends to be used as a compliment rather than to describe one's own situation.

<sup>7</sup>Being "up to my eyeballs" seems to be a heightened form of the more usual "... up to my ears".

“I’m trying to keep my chin up.” (GOOD IS UP, WORK/LIFE IS DEEP WATER)

At the moment when we are asked, we are not actually “busy”, deep in the water, or raising our chins, but rather walking down a hallway or in the parking lot, sitting down to a meal, waiting for or leaving a meeting, or exchanging the phatic pleasantries that initiate many conversations.

Finally (in this brief sketch), we use self-referential metaphors to describe the general state of our lives, referring to “things” or “life”, as in these expressions:

“‘Things’ are [Life is] pretty crazy right now.”

“‘Things’ are [Life is] going good.”

“‘Things are on their way up!’”

We can also use the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY self-referentially, as in these examples:

“I’m on my *way*!”

“I’m at a *crossroads*.”

“I’m thinking of *switching* careers.” (Think of a railroad track.)

Again (and not to labour the point), we use what we know to understand and explain what is abstract or otherwise difficult to discuss or describe.

In the same way, biblical speakers and authors use self-referential metaphors to describe their circumstances. Many of these are explicit, usually in the form of a statement that begins “I am ...”

“I am a *na’ar*; I do not know ...” (1 Kgs 3.7)

“I am your servant and your son” (2 Kgs 16.7); Ahaz to Tiglath-pileser

“I am a worm, and not a man” (Ps 22.7)

“I am poured out like water” (Ps 22.15)

“I am poor and needy” (Ps 40.18; cf. 109.22)

“I ... am like a sparrow alone on the housetop” (Ps 102.7)

“I wither like grass” (Ps 102.11)

“I pass like a shadow when it turns” (Ps 109.23)

“I am a joke ...” (Jb 12.4)

“I am a stranger in their eyes” (Jb 19.15; cf. Ps 69.8)

It is just as common to find implicit self-referential metaphors, in which the person describing himself or herself

### Metaphors of the Incarnation

Jesus used a number of explicit self-referential metaphors, perhaps most famously the seven “I Ams” found in the Gospel of John.

“I am the bread of life” (John 6.35, 48, 51); PEOPLE ARE PLANTS; LIFE IS FOOD

“I am the light of the world” (John 8.12); LIFE IS LIGHT

“I am the door of the sheep” (John 10.7, 9); GOD IS A SAFE PLACE

“I am the good shepherd” (John 10.11, 14); GOD IS THE PERSON IN CHARGE; PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS

“I am the resurrection, and the life” (John 11.25); LIFE IS WAKING UP(?)

“I am the way, the truth, and the life” (John 14.6); LIFE IS A JOURNEY

“I am the true vine” (John 15.1, 5); PEOPLE ARE PLANTS

He also used a number of implicit self-referential metaphors to describe the purpose of what we have come to call the incarnation when he made statements such as the following, all of which indirectly compare his purpose to some familiar or tangible aspect of human life.

The healthy do not need a physician, but those who are sick. (Mt 9.12; INCARNATION IS DOCTOR'S HOUSE-CALL)  
 If I ... then the kingdom of God has come upon you. (Mt 12.28; INCARNATION IS A HERALD'S MISSION)  
 The Son of Man came ... to sow seed (Mt 13.37; INCARNATION IS GOING OUT TO THE FIELD; GOD IS A FARMER)  
 ... the Son of Man [came] to give his life a ransom for many. (Mt 20.28; Mk 10.45; INCARNATION IS REDEMPTIVE MISSION)  
 For the Son of Man came to save what is lost. (Lk 19.10; INCARNATION IS SEARCH-AND-RESCUE MISSION)  
 For God did not send the Son into the world to judge the world, but that the world might be saved through Him. (Jo 3.17; INCARNATION IS RESCUE MISSION)  
 Or how can anyone enter a strong man's house and take away his property, unless he first binds the strong man? And then he will plunder his house. (Mt 12.25-30; INCARNATION IS INVASION)<sup>8</sup>

All of these statements use the conceptual metaphor THE INCARNATION IS A JOURNEY, a journey undertaken for a specific purpose.<sup>9</sup> In the simplest declaration of this principle, Jesus said, "I *came* from the father and I *came into* the world; I *am leaving* the world again and *going to* the father" (Jo 16.28).<sup>10</sup>

#### THE PARABLE (Mt 21.33-41)<sup>11</sup>

Jesus told a parable about his coming that revolves around the familiar image of a vineyard.<sup>12</sup> This parable, however, is not concerned with working in the vineyard or with its productivity, but rather with the character of its tenants. He said,

"A landowner planted a vineyard, put a wall around it, dug a winepress in it, built a tower, rented it out to vintners, and went on a journey. When the time for harvest approached, he sent his slaves to the vintners to receive his produce. But taking his slaves, the vintners beat one, killed another, and stoned a third. He sent another group of slaves, larger than the first; and they did the same to them.

"But afterward he sent his son to them, saying, 'They will respect my son.'

"But when the vintners saw the son, they said among themselves, 'This is the heir. Come, let us kill him and seize his inheritance.' They took him, and threw him out of the vineyard and killed him.

"Therefore when the owner of the vineyard comes, what will he do to those vintners?"

<sup>8</sup>This became one biblical source of *Christus Victor*, a major metaphor in the Church's understanding of the incarnation (cf., e.g., Robert Southwell's poem, "A New Heaven, A New War" (1561-1595)).

<sup>9</sup>This is the conceptual metaphor whether Jesus Christ is described as "coming" (all but Jo 3.17) or "sent" (Jo 3.17).

<sup>10</sup>This paper does not address either the starting- and ending-points of this journey, nor its path.

<sup>11</sup>Cf. slightly different versions of this parable in Mk 12.1-9 and Lk 20.9-19.

<sup>12</sup>Parables were not built around agricultural situations as a form of cultural accommodation, but because these situations invoked conceptual metaphors that offered insight into the situation or state of affairs that the speaker—usually Jesus—wanted to address.

They said to Him, “He will bring those wretches to a wretched end, and will rent out the vineyard to other vintners who will pay him the proceeds at the right time.” (Mt 21.33-41)<sup>13</sup>

For a few decades—including the time of my seminary studies—the “fashion” in hermeneutics said that parables made only one point, and that any details were there merely to help make that point. Once one figured out the main point, the details could be ignored. In the case of this parable, “the chief priests and the Pharisees ... understood that he was speaking about them” (Mt 21.45), i.e., that they were the wicked tenants, as their response shows (below). Since Jesus did nothing to dispel or correct their conclusion, we may safely conclude that they indeed got the parable’s main point.

Parables, however, are better thought of as “conceits”—extended metaphors—in the form of short stories<sup>14</sup> that invoke metaphor complexes (Fauconnier & Turner 2002, *passim*) or webs (Putnam 2008). Textlinguistic and narrative theory suggest that details are not merely ancillary to a story’s main point, but rather are necessary to the story itself, included in the other “kinds of information in discourse” (Grimes 1971),<sup>15</sup> chosen and used by the narrator to shape the story.

In this parable, for example, only the first and last action in the opening list of events (“... planted a vineyard ... rented it out to vine-growers”) are necessary to the plot. The other activities (“... put a wall around it, and dug a winepress in it, and built a tower”) allude to the “song of the beloved” in Isaiah 5.1-2,<sup>16</sup> thus creating a strong link between pre-exilic Israel and Judah and the Jews of Jesus’ day, some 700 years after Isaiah.

Both parables present Israel under the image of a vineyard built and owned by YHWH, Israel’s covenantal god. There are, however, significant differences between them, namely the source of the problem and the divine response. In Is 5 the *vine* fails to yield the right kind of grapes, and the *vineyard* itself is *destroyed*.<sup>17</sup> In Mt 21, the vineyard’s yield is not at issue, but rather the tenants’ rebellion, which leads to *their* destruction and replacement, the vineyard being (apparently) untouched.

Invoking this familiar “frame”,<sup>18</sup> Jesus represents God the Father as the landowner and himself as the landowner’s son, the heir, whom the father sent as a last resort, saying, “Surely they will respect my son.” (Mt 21.37c) He sent him so that he could collect the rent for the vineyard from tenants who had already mistreated, abused, and even killed his father’s servants who had earlier been sent for the same purpose.

Christ therefore portrays himself as the last of the prophets, whose mission was the same as theirs.

What was that mission?

When we study the prophetic message we find again and again that YHWH’s servants the prophets exhorted Israel and Judah to fulfill their moral and religious obligations to YHWH their god by obeying the requirements of his covenant with Israel.

What were those obligations, and on what were they based?

As this parable states, Israel existed as a nation on land that YHWH had created (Gn 1) and that he owned, but had prepared and set aside for them. This is the same point made in the covenant itself, in the laws of the redemption of land:

As for the land, it shall not be sold permanently, for *the land is mine*; for you are aliens and settlers with me. (Lv 25.23; italics added)

Since the land belonged to him, Israel was a tenant who owed him rent. And this rent was not merely in the form of the firstfruits and tithes of their crops, but also lay in their upholding the standards of justice, mercy, and righteousness which were established in their rental “contract”, i.e., in the covenant found most especially in the book of Deuteronomy.

<sup>13</sup>For the Greek text, see Appendix I.

<sup>14</sup>This is why so many parables begin “The Kingdom of God is *like* ...” (e.g., Mt 13.24, 31, 33, 44, 45, 47, 52).

<sup>15</sup>The word “other” refers to information beyond the main sequence of events.

<sup>16</sup>For a textual comparison of the Greek text of Matthew 21 and the LXX of Isaiah 5, see Appendix II.

<sup>17</sup>This raises at least two questions: (1) Wasn’t the vintner responsible for the failed crop, since he chose the vine to plant—did he not know what type of grapevine it was? and (2) Why could the vintner not replace the worthless vine with another?

<sup>18</sup>On the concept of cognitive “frame”, cf., i.a., Fauconnier & Turner 2002, 120-122, 140-145 (*et passim*).

The prophets, in other words, did not come merely to announce the future or pronounce condemnation and judgment. They came instead to collect what the ancient Israelites and Judahites owed YHWH, namely, their covenantal obligation to “love YHWH their god with all their heart, soul, mind, and strength” (Dt 6.4) and to “love their neighbours as themselves” (Lv 19.18); “upon these two commandments”, Jesus would soon say, “hang the Law and the Prophets” (Mt 22.40). They could pay their rent, in other words, by “loving justice and mercy, and by walking humbly with their god” (cf. Mi 6.8). This was what their lease called for (along with a list of proscribed activities).

The prophets came to require Israel and Judah to pay their landlord, YHWH, the rent that they owed him in exchange for living on his land. They came, not to give, but to receive.

But *not* in order to get on their own behalf.

A rent collector picks up the silver or wine (or whatever the lease specifies) on behalf of the landlord who sends him. The prophets did not seek obedience because it would help or benefit them; they demanded obedience because it was right and just for Israel and Judah to fulfill the promises that had been made at Sinai (Ex 20-24) and renewed at various points in their history.<sup>19</sup>

Israel’s lease agreement (the covenant) required her to love YHWH, from which the rest of the rent—their covenantal obedience—would follow as a matter of course. The particular sins for which they were excoriated by the prophets—violence, injustice, neglect of the covenant—while wicked in themselves, merely illustrated their lack of love for their god.

And Israel had not paid the rent for hundreds of years.<sup>20</sup> This failure was not because of inability (due, e.g., to a poor harvest), but rather—as the parable describes it—a deliberate refusal to fulfill their covenantal obligations, even to the point of killing the rent collectors.

Now the prophets were not sent in order to redeem Israel, either by offering a sacrifice or by offering themselves as sacrifices on Israel’s behalf. Nor, in the world described by this parable, was that the purpose of the incarnation. The parable uses the conceptual metaphor INCARNATION IS RENT COLLECTION to explain Christ’s mission.

Jesus did not come to give anything to the tenant vintners, or to act on behalf of those to whom he was sent, but as the last prophet, the last rent collector, in order to receive from them that which they owed his Father and therefore him as his father’s heir and representative, since they were (still) living on land that was (still) owned by God.

The rent, in other words, would have been paid had they believed in and obeyed Jesus Christ, as he said: “This is the work of God: that you believe in him whom he has sent.” (John 6.29) But they chose to reject their obligation and to destroy this rent collector so that they might (as they thought) become the owners of their own land.

The Pharisees and scribes “got” the point. Jesus was telling them that they—who thought that they of all people were actually meeting their obligations to God with exquisite precision—were not merely failing to fulfill those obligations, but were instead, by rejecting him and the message of his words and miracles, *rebelling* against God by *refusing* to pay their rent. This message so enraged them that they responded by determining to trick him into condemning himself (Mk 12.13), which would lead to his destruction (as the parable predicts).

## SUGGESTIONS

1. First, I do not intend to suggest or imply that the salvific understanding of the incarnation of Christ, taught widely in Scripture, is in any sense wrong, misguided, or unhelpful. Nor am I suggesting that we replace the conceptual metaphor INCARNATION AS RESCUE MISSION with the metaphor INCARNATION AS RENT COLLECTION. Both are biblical, and both are not only therefore valid, but necessary to our ability to understand the incarnation.

---

<sup>19</sup>This covenant was renewed with the nation by Moses on the plains of Moab (Dt 1-33), by Joshua before his death (Josh 24), by Samuel when Saul was confirmed as king (1 Sam 11.14-12.25), and in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah (Ne 9.5-10.1).

<sup>20</sup>There were a few brief exceptions, such as the time of Joshua, and under some of the judges and a few of the kings.

2. I do intend to encourage us to include this dimension in our discussions of the purpose of the incarnation: Christ came in order to ask for—to demand—the obedience that was the price of the Jews’ being allowed to live on land that was God’s.
3. Perhaps that (#2) allows us to infer that the purposes of God are complex and multi-faceted, and encourages us to be wary of “single-purpose” explanations of theology (as we are of simplistic explanations of history). The purposes of God are completely beyond our understanding or finding out.<sup>21</sup>
4. This interpretation of the incarnation implies that all nations are “tenants” who owe their divine landlord, who has planted them in their lands, the debt of obedience. What may thus underlie Paul’s speech in Athens (Ac 17.26-31) is the idea that God had been a patient landlord, knowing that they were ignorant of their tenancy, and therefore of their debt. With the incarnation, however, came the day on which their “rent” was “due”: they were to turn from idols to the true and living God and Jesus Christ, whom he had sent.
5. This reading of the incarnation suggests that evangelism entails both good news about the free gift of God—salvation and life and hope in and through Christ—and the bad news that all are debtors who owe God our obedience as those who enjoy the fruits of his goodness in allowing us to live in and on his property.
6. And, finally, this understanding of the incarnation (and of this parable in particular) reminds us that because we are merely tenants on land that is not ours, we shall give an account of our stewardship when the same son comes again in great glory to claim his inheritance.

*fcj*  
Epiphany MMXI

---

<sup>21</sup>This is the point of the divine speeches in Job 38-41; we are all, in that sense, like Job in our inability to comprehend the infinite purposes of God.

## Readings

Fauconnier, Gilles, & Mark Turner

2002 *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic.

Grimes

1971 "Kinds of Information in Discourse", in *Kivung* 4, 64-74.

Lakoff, George, & Mark Johnson

1989 *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: U. of Chicago.

Lakoff, George, & Mark Turner

1989 *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Literary Metaphor*. Chicago: U. of Chicago.

Putnam, Frederic Clarke

2008 "Biblical Metaphor as Theology: YHWH is a Farmer", Evangelical Theological Society [ETS] Eastern Regional Meeting.

2004 "The Deceit of Metaphor and the Revelation of the Divine Name"; ETS, Eastern Regional Meeting.

APPENDIX  
I: Matthew 21.33-41

33a	Ἄλλην παραβολὴν ἀκούσατε	2p AAV	Narr. Frame	
33b	ἄνθρωπος ἦν οἰκοδεσπότης	3s eII	main	
33c	ὄστις		rel	
33d	ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα	3s AAI	main	
33e	καὶ φραγμὸν αὐτῷ περιέθηκεν	3s AAI	main	
33f	καὶ ὥρυξεν ἐν αὐτῷ ληνὸν	3s AAI	main	
33g	καὶ ὠκοδόμησεν πύργον	3s AAI	main	
33h	καὶ ἐχέδετο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς	3s AAI	main	
33i	καὶ ἀπεδήμησεν	3s AAI	main	
34a	ὅτε δὲ ἤγγισεν ὁ καιρὸς τῶν καρπῶν	3s AAI	temp.	
34b	ἀπέστειλεν τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς γεωργοὺς	3s AAI	main	
34c	λαβεῖν τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτοῦ	AAN	telic	
35a	καὶ λαβόντες οἱ γεωργοὶ τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ	mnp AAPtc		
35b	ὃν μὲν ἔδειραν	3p AAI	main	
35c	ὃν δὲ ἀπέκτειναν	3p AAI	main	
35d	ὃν δὲ ἐλιθοβόλησαν	3p AAI	main	
36a	πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν ἄλλους δούλους πλείονας τῶν πρώτων	3s AAI	main	
36b	καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτοῖς ὡσαύτως	3p AAI	main	
37a	ἕστερον δὲ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ	3s AAI	main	
37b	λέγων	mns AAPtc	speech	
37c	ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱὸν μου	3p FMI	main	
38a	οἱ δὲ γεωργοὶ ἰδόντες τὸν υἱὸν εἶπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς	mnp AAPtc		
38b	οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος	3s ePi	main	
38c	δεῦτε	2p AAV	coh	
38d	ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτὸν	1p AAC	main	
38e	καὶ σχῶμεν τὴν κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ	1p FAI	main	
39a	καὶ λαβόντες αὐτὸν	mnp AAPtc		
39b	ἐξέβαλον ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος	3p AAI	main	
39c	καὶ ἀπέκτειναν	3p AAI	main	
40a	ὅταν οὖν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος	3s AMS	Narr. Frame	protasis
40b	τί ποιήσει τοῖς γεωργοῖς ἐκεῖνοις	3s FAI	Narr. Frame	apodosis
41a	λέγουσιν αὐτῷ	3p PAI	Narr. Frame	
41b	κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει αὐτοὺς	3s FAI	main	
41c	καὶ τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἐκδώσεται ἄλλοις γεωργοῖς	3s FAI	main	
41d	οὔτινες ἀποδώσουσιν αὐτῷ τοὺς καρποὺς ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν	3s FAI	rel.	

[Jesus said, “Hear another parable:]

“A landowner planted a vineyard, put a wall around it, dug a winepress in it, built a tower, rented it out to vine-growers, and went on a journey. When the time approached for harvest, he sent his slaves to the vintners to receive his produce. The vintners took his slaves and beat one, and killed another, and stoned a third. Again he sent another group of slaves larger than the first; and they did the same thing to them.

“But afterward he sent his son to them, saying, ‘They will respect my son.’

“But when the vintners saw the son, they said among themselves, ‘This is the heir; come, let us kill him and seize his inheritance.’ They took him, and threw him out of the vineyard and killed him.

“Therefore when the owner of the vineyard comes, what will he do to those vintners?”

They said to Him, “He will bring those wretches to a wretched end, and will rent out the vineyard to other vintners who will pay him the proceeds at the right time.” (Mt 21.33-41; cf. Mk 12.1-12; Lk 20.9-19)

## II: Matthew 21.33d-g &amp; Isaiah 5.1b-2e (MT &amp; LXX)

MT/BHS	Is 5	LXX
בְּרֵם הָיָה לִידֵי בְּקָרְן בֶּן־שָׁמוֹן:	1b	ἀμπελῶν ἐγενήθη τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ ἐν κέρατι ἐν τόπῳ πίονι
וַיַּעֲזְקֵהוּ	2a	καὶ φραγμὸν περιέθηκα
וַיִּסְקְלֵהוּ	2b	καὶ ἐχαράκωσα
וַיִּטְעֵהוּ שֶׂרֶק	2c	καὶ ἐφύτευσα ἄμπελον σωρηχ
וַיִּבֶן מִגְדָּל בְּתוֹכוֹ	2d	καὶ ὠκοδόμησα πύργον ἐν μέσῳ αὐτοῦ
וְגַם יָקַב חֶצֶב בּוֹ	2e	καὶ προλήνιον ὄρυξα ἐν αὐτῷ

MT (BHS)			LXX	
1b	vineyard he-was to-my-beloved on-horn-of son-of oil	≈	vineyard it-became to-the beloved-one in horn in place fat	
2a	&-he-dug-him	≠	and hedge he-put-around	
2b	&-he-cleared-him-of-stones	≠	and he-fenced-in	
2c	&-he-planted-him vine	≈	and he-planted vine of-Sorek(?)	
2d	&-he-built tower within-him	=	and he-built tower in middle of-him	
2e	&-also wine-vat he-hewed in-him	≈	and wine-vat he-dug in him	

Isaiah 5			Matthew 21	
1b	ἀμπελῶν ἐγενήθη τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ ἐν κέρατι ἐν τόπῳ πίονι	≈	33d	ἄνθρωπος ἦν οἰκοδεσπότης ὃστις ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα
2a	καὶ φραγμὸν περιέθηκα	≈	33e	καὶ φραγμὸν αὐτῷ περιέθηκεν
2b	καὶ ἐχαράκωσα	x		
		2e≈	33f	καὶ ὄρυξεν ἐν αὐτῷ ληνὸν
2c	καὶ ἐφύτευσα ἄμπελον σωρηχ	≈33d		
2d	καὶ ὠκοδόμησα πύργον ἐν μέσῳ αὐτοῦ	≈	33g	καὶ ὠκοδόμησεν πύργον
2e	καὶ προλήνιον ὄρυξα ἐν αὐτῷ	≈33f		

1b	vineyard he-became to-the beloved-one in horn in place fat	≈	33d	man he-was homeowner who he-planted vineyard
2a	and hedge he-put-around	≈	33e	and wall to-him he-put-around
2b	and he-fenced-in	x		
		2e≈	33f	and he-dug in him wine-vat
2c	and he-planted vine of-Sorek(?)	≈33d		
2d	and he-built tower in middle of-him	≈	33g	and he-built tower
2e	and wine-vat he-dug in him	≈33f		