

# The promise that scripture holds for informing economic thought – Investigation of the parable of the talents

Mario J Miranda, Victoria University, Australia

## Abstract

Bible Literature has been largely ignored by those writing comprehensive studies of wealth and poverty. The Parable of the Talents has some western interpreters relishing the profit-making elements of the parable and seeing in it nothing less than praise for a homespun capitalism. The parable engages with several economic concepts at various stages of its narrative. The approach to taking *risk* in managing assets in a conceivably *market economy* is central to the moral of the story with the intention of *growing* the portfolio. The standout message is that *profit* arising from *productivity* is to be *rewarded*, while *opportunity costs* arising from lack of *enterprise* will inevitably be *punished*. The emotion of *fear* (the *risk of losing*) as a driving motivation of *investment in enterprise* is palpable. *Recognition of ability, equitable allocation of resources, expectation and performance appraisal* of the stewardship of the assets by the *owner of the capital* are key factors in the parable's instruction. In a world obsessed with material possessions some success in a Scripture based approach to the management of resources and creation of value to "feed more sheep" might have a redeeming effect on the economic ills that riddle society.

KEYWORDS: scripture, economics, Jesus, master, talents

## Introduction

It is indeed intriguing that little attempt has consciously been made to relate Scripture to the discipline of economics. Scripture has been largely ignored by those writing comprehensive studies of wealth and poverty. One would imagine the collapse of Communism inspired by Marxist economics and the vile of Capitalism that almost bought the world to financial ruin would be a strong motivation to consider reconfiguring economic thought from time tested Scriptural wisdom. Perhaps there is a suspicion that matters relating to wealth are a direct antithesis of what Christ preached. Prospecting any cues that his teaching could provide for prudent money management would be a case of matters easy on the heart but hard on the mind.

Nevertheless, at the risk of proffering opinion profoundly at odds with what is generally accepted, this paper intends to examine the prospects of Scripture providing prudent cues to the economic discipline for the creation and management of value, namely, the performance of actions that increase the worth of goods and services to significantly larger number of people.

The Parable of the Talents is overwhelmingly viewed by a majority of commentators as an eschatological allegory. According to Rohrbaugh (1993), piquantly the parable has also some western interpreters relishing the profit-making elements of the parable and seeing in it nothing less than praise for a homespun capitalism on the lips of Jesus. This paper having no predicated deference to this point of view will proceed to investigate the Parable of the Talents with regard to its application to the management of resources and creation of value in contemporary living (as opposed to an eschatological approach).

**The Parable of the Talents** - Matthew 25:14-30 English Standard Version (ESV)

<sup>14</sup> “For it will be like a man going on a journey, who called his servants<sup>[a]</sup> and entrusted to them his property. <sup>15</sup> To one he gave five talents, to another two, to another one, to each according to his ability. Then he went away. <sup>16</sup> He who had received the five talents went at once and traded with them, and he made five talents more. <sup>17</sup> So also he who had the two talents made two talents more. <sup>18</sup> But he who had received the one talent went and dug in the ground and hid his master's money. <sup>19</sup> Now after a long time the master of those servants came and settled accounts with them. <sup>20</sup> And he who had received the five talents came forward, bringing five talents more, saying, ‘Master, you delivered to me five talents; here I have made five talents more.’ <sup>21</sup> His master said to him, ‘Well done, good and faithful servant. You have been faithful over a little; I will set you over much. Enter into the joy of your master.’ <sup>22</sup> And he also who had the two talents came forward, saying, ‘Master, you delivered to me two talents; here I have made two talents more.’ <sup>23</sup> His master said to him, ‘Well done, good and faithful servant. You have been faithful over a little; I will set you over much. Enter into the joy of your master.’ <sup>24</sup> He also who had received the one talent came forward, saying, ‘Master, I knew you to be a hard man, reaping where you did not sow, and gathering where you scattered no seed, <sup>25</sup> so I was afraid, and I went and hid your talent in the ground. Here you have what is yours.’ <sup>26</sup> But his master answered him, ‘You wicked and slothful servant! You knew that I reap where I have not sown and gather where I scattered no seed? <sup>27</sup> Then you ought to have invested my money with the bankers, and at my coming I should have received what was my own with interest. <sup>28</sup> So take the talent from him and give it to him who has the ten talents. <sup>29</sup> For to everyone who has will more be given, and he will have an abundance. But from the one who has not, even what he has will be taken away. <sup>30</sup> And cast the worthless servant into the outer darkness. In that place there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.’

### Problem

The Parable of the Talents as related by Matthew 25: 14-30, is confusing because the central message appears to severely contrast with the moral pathway to God. The moral conflict arises when the master admonishes the servant with whose performance he is displeased “---- “You knew that I reap where I have not sown and gather where I scattered no seed? Then you ought to have invested my money with the bankers, and at my coming I should have received what was my own with interest”. The lack of attention to the problematic material in the Parable of the Talents in major studies of wealth and poverty is a serious deficiency. It is important to still deal with the economic problems that lie in the surface details of this parable and not think that allegorizing excuses one from attending to the issue. According to Mimier King (2013), we simply cannot leave unaddressed how it is that Jesus can condemn Mammon as a rival God and at the same time use mammon-acquisition as a model for the kingdom, or how the same Jesus can say at one time “some are last who will be first, and some are first who will be last” (Lk 13:30) and at another time “to all those who have, more will be given; but from those who have nothing, even what they have will be taken away.” (Lk 19:26)

### Background

The master had entrusted to each of his three servants, five talents, two talents and one talent respectively after recognising the ability of each. Commentaries on the Parable of the Talents variously represent talents as “opportunities” presented to the servants while emphasising that opportunities are not the same as “abilities”. Opportunity is a time or set of circumstances that makes it possible to do something and ability is the possession of the means or skill to do it. However the parable harps on the *numeric* outcome of cultivating the talents. While productivity of talents may result in further opportunities, it is hard to see how these resultant opportunities can be ascribed numerals (*five* talents more, *two* talents more). It appears reasonable therefore that “talents” as referred to in the parable are represented as productive assets that naturally lend themselves to be quantified.

### Areas of Intrigue

The story is silent about the wealth of the master who entrusted his property to his servants before he went away. We are not told the business of the man and where he was going and for how long. We are not aware if the property was inherited, or was largely earned and if the portfolio of the property was distributed over land and other possessions. We are not made aware of the number of servants the man had and therefore we are unable to make out whether

his substantive possessions included more than three human assets or slaves as servants were likely to be his bonded labour.

While all the facts referred to as missing in the parable may not be immediately relevant to the moral the parable intended to convey, this information is germane to the mindset or the expectation of the master of his servants when appropriating the property to them and also the accompanying emotion of each of the three servants when the property was parcelled to each of them for their stewardship.

For instance if the man had earned a significant part of his property, behavioural economists will assert that it is likely that that the master is aware of the *risks* of different methods to maximize the return on his assets having personally evidenced his changing fortunes arising from approaches that were more successful than others. On the other hand if all or significant part of his property portfolio was inherited, the man's management of his property portfolio could possibly be very different from a manner if he himself built up his assets.

Moreover the approach to different elements of the master's property that may have included land, material possessions and human assets would warrant different strategies for growing his wealth. Based on the master's objectives for each asset class, he would decide how much of the return to put back into each asset category and grow his wealth and how much to take as income. Further different times would give different levels of return on each asset class. There are years for instance when the harvest is not large simply because of the inconsistencies in the weather; also political and economic conditions might be differently conducive to turning in the best of returns in some of the times that the master was away. Therefore in order to manage fluctuating fortunes it would be relevant for the servants to know the time span over which the asset returns is calculated.

## Discussions

### Allocation of Talents

The master knew the abilities of each of his servants and accordingly entrusted the talents to them to different extents. *Recognition of ability* and *equitable allocation of resources* are key factors in the parable's instruction. The apportionment of talents based on the servants' natural inequalities though ostensibly fair can foreshadow a meaning other than what is often conventionally believed when one considers what Dunoyer (1845), one of the early proponents of economic cycles, asserted about unequal abilities: "superior abilities ---- are the source of everything that is great and useful --- Reduce everything to equality and you will bring everything to a standstill". One sometimes hears the same thought expressed today in the idea that resources in the hands of the most talented individuals will be increase their productivity many times over. This argument is often used to justify extreme inequalities and to defend the privileges of the winners without much consideration for the losers.

## Productivity of the Talents

It is notable that the *owner of the capital* does not specify his *expectation* of the *assets' productivity*. Importantly none of the three servants to whom the property was appropriated for stewardship were given any background of the history of asset behaviour and were therefore left to their ingenuity to manage them. While the value given to each is specified we are not told the quality or character of the talents given to the servants. It is reasonable to assume that each servant would bring a relevant approach to grow the talent (s) in the manner and style of their master.

Nonetheless when away, it appears that the master expected the mechanisms of the market place to direct his servants to increase his asset value. Since market mechanism, in conventional economic thinking, is regarded as similar to natural law arguably no ethical aspersions can be laid on the master's expectation of his servants' performance. However Max Weber (1920) calls this sort of masterless slavery the quintessence of capitalism. According to Weber, in this slavery, without slave owners being present, into which capitalism ensnares workers---- prescribed behaviour is foreshadowed for them (in all essentials) on pain of punishment by objective situations, and has the character of slaves labouring to serve their owner for an impersonal *material goal*. Therefore explicit edict or directions from the master to his servants for achieving an expected return on assets put under the servants' stewardship was not considered necessary when he was going away (p.264).

It is against this background the three servants are required to deliver to their master what would warrant the master's accolades "Well done, good and faithful servant. You have been faithful over a little; I will set you over much. Enter into the joy of your master" or the severe retribution "You wicked and slothful servant! --- And cast the worthless servant into the outer darkness." The parable makes it clear that *profit* arising from *productivity* is to be *rewarded*, while *opportunity costs* arising from lack of *enterprise* will inevitably be *penalised*.

There is likely to be sympathy for the third servant for the punishment meted out to for not multiplying the one talent that was reposed to him. After all he was considered to have the least of the abilities of the three servants. Arguably he was a cautious person, with perhaps a conservative character who took his role literally as simply being a custodian of his master's wealth- something he probably was doing as caretaker as long as he was bonded to his master and under his supervision and he continued doing what he knew he did best. Being a venture capitalist was a new deposition to the third servant. On one hand it seems that that there is not enough information in the parable to allow us make a true assessment of each of the servants' efforts. However given that Jesus narrative emphasises that the master's judgment of his servants' performance is unequivocal, we must accept that the background is lucid enough to instruct us the moral of parable.

Inherently life presents each of us with different levels and character of wherewithal. Similarly nature has also bestowed different countries with different competencies to make their assets productive; just as in the Lord's house where there are many rooms (and if it were not so the Lord would have told us - John 14:2). Implicit in what Jesus says is that everyone one of creation is bestowed with some resource. Hence there was no need for the master to explain to his wards or to bring to attention the character and quality of the talents which the servants are required to make productive. There is however an undeniable expectation on the servants to *grow* the master's wealth. Growth is a fundamental precept of any economic system. It is only the approaches to growth that economists will differ (Adam Smith, Keynes, Ricardo etc).

Motivation to grow the productivity of assets is invariably driven by *fear* and greed. In this parable fear is clearly the driver of each of the servants' efforts. In the case of the servants who doubled their talents they were obviously driven by the risk of falling out of favour with their master. These two servants had however read their master's work ethic correctly. When working with the master these two servants had instructed themselves, had warranted the master's trust and knew what his parameters of success were. Naturally their master was quick to compliment them as *good* and *faithful* servants for emulating his work ethic when found to have doubled the talents put under their stewardship. Referring to them as "good" is the ultimate compliment that the master could pay his two servants, because Jesus qualifies in Mark 10:18 when he was referred to as good master that "No one is good--except God alone" denying himself this ultimate accolade.

*Greed* which is often quoted as the driving motivation for humans to grow their wealth (and considered the bane of all economic systems) is an emotion that is not contended within the parable. The servants were only custodians of the master's property and all the productivity dividends were to be attached to the master's estate. Having no claim to any gains from the talents apportioned to them, the servants had no need to hanker for this indulgence. Unfortunately there is no generally accepted research on the biochemistry of greed except that greed is a hedonistic emotion exogenous to human nature and like a barnacle can easily be cauterised and prevented from spreading even though it may feed into situations that often trigger fear of the unjust gain as cautioned in Proverbs 15:27.

The third servant who also worked closely with the master to have warranted his trust did not appear to have understood his master's approach to his asset management. The servant suggested that his master work ethic as being unfair and expectant of unreasonable outcomes ("--- a hard man, reaping where you did not sow, and gathering where you scattered no seed,---"). The servant claimed that it was his master's exploitative approach that filled him with a *consuming* fear that impelled him to take a conservative approach and *protect* his asset rather than risk losing it. When playing for safety, the servant unwittingly absolved himself of planning and other effort that is required to prospect making the asset productive. The third servant unfortunately allowed his behaviour to be regulated by fear and allowed his character to morph

---

into one of degeneracy. Obsessed with the anxiety of negative outcomes of losing the little he had, the third servant did not even deposit his limited asset in a risk free strategy that would at least have given some return albeit small ( like keeping the asset with the bankers). At the time of assessment he was therefore called wicked and declared slothful. It is intriguing that the servant is referred to as slothful. It is not as if he did nothing – he actually “dug in the ground and hid his master's money.” The term sloth is defined as reluctance to work or make an effort and it appears that lack of enterprise is also considered as slothful. The *cost* of inefficient economic behaviour and sloth is truly evidenced in the punishment meted out to the third servant.

Risk associated with enterprise is an essential element of creating wealth. In other words risk management is fundamental to making the best use of an asset by either extracting cash from its intrinsic value, using the productive proceeds of the asset to diversify or expand the productive capacity of the asset or even borrowing against the asset to grow the portfolio. The third servant consumed by fear did not quite see the upside of taking a risk management approach to the asset under his care. He had not absorbed the ethos of his master to manage his asset in his manner. Evidently the servant did realize that the talent when cultivated in the name of God and for God, the asset is bound to be productive for it is promised that *whatsoever shall be asked in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified* (John 14:13). The other two servants apparently grew the asset manner and style of their master and were justifiably honoured as good and faithful. In view of the two servants have shown evidence of delivering while they were *apprenticed* (“You have been faithful over a little”), their master justified reposing in them a bigger remit and an invitation to share his privileges (“I will set you over much. Enter into the joy of your master”--- “For to everyone who has will more be given, and he will have an abundance.”).

On the other hand the servant who had not risked the investment in a manner most uncharacteristic of his master but ascribed fear of punishment if lost was severely admonished (“-from the one who has not, even what he has will be taken away. And cast the worthless servant into the outer darkness. In that place, there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth”). When making his *appraisal* of his servant’s performance the master intends to make the offending terms of reference very clear by repeating his servant’s disparaging remarks as the premise for securing the talent (“You knew that I reap where I have not sown and gather where I scattered no seed? ) And then appends *causality* to his servant’s argument, viz, “Then you ought to have invested my money with the bankers, and at my coming I should have received what was my own with interest.” Matthew 7:2 appears to have resonance in the master’s assessment of his servant’s performance, namely, “The standard you use in judging is the standard by which you will be judged.”

There is a strong suggestion in the parable that the heavy lifters will be rewarded accordingly. There is no gainsaying that posting equivalent growth rates from a bigger base is more challenging than when growing from a smaller base. It is then reasonable for the master to show greater regard for the servant who was able to double the talent value from five to ten as

against the servant who grew the talent value from two to four. Accordingly the servant who was reposed with five talents to start with was given the additional talent that was taken away from the slothful servant (“So take the talent from him and give it to him who has the ten talents).

It is not clear from the parable what would have been the first servant’s fate if he had not doubled<sup>1</sup> the talents considering that he was considered to be the most capable of the three servants and therefore was given the stewardship of a larger number of talents. Would his performance of anything less than double be as celebrated?! Perhaps one can get a cue from Luke 12: 48 “From everyone who has been given much, much will be demanded; and from the one who has been entrusted with much, much more will be asked.” This seems to be an economic prescription to people and countries bestowed with natural competencies to maximise their asset productivity. It is a fundamental economic principal that after meeting obligatory costs of an enterprise, the profits, ensuing from the productivity of a resource, are best utilised if *ploughed back* to add to existing resource capital. The augmented resource is inevitably then available to improve its productive capacity in future. In other words, productive resources beget additional resources- a reward as it were for being able to increase or add value. So it no surprise that the master averred that the (one) talent be taken from the slothful servant and given to him who has the ten talents, rationalising that to everyone who has will more be given, and he will have an abundance. The expectation of the “abundance” is however that for those who have been given much, much will be demanded; and from the one who has been entrusted with much, much more will be asked. Here again basic accounting principle instructs that resources will languish as a *liability* until and unless the resource is appropriately *applied* as a (productive) *asset* in order that the ledger is balanced. On the other hand attempts to simply retain/protect the implicit value of the resource are counterproductive because costs of doing so will-nilly depreciate the resource value. Small wonder then that the servant who simply handed back the conserved value of the talent he was entrusted with was severely reprimanded for being *inefficient*. This servant by his action of not being *enterprising* resulted in not making productive use of the talent/resource thus exemplifying inefficient economic behaviour.

### Talents as an Indulgence

On the other hand, is there an implied suggestion that those with lesser talents are not expected to be productive anywhere as near to those endowed with a greater number of talents (To one he gave five talents, to another two, to another one, *to each according to his ability*)?! In the Parable of the Sower (Matthew 13), Jesus seems to imply that quantity and quality of talent that one possesses is *random* endowment not unlike the outcome from the unwitting *felling* of the sower’s seeds, drawn by pure gravity, on different terrain. It appears that various amounts of

---

<sup>1</sup> The parable uses the terms “made five talents more” and “made two talents more” and stays away from the term “double” which is in my view is a language of aggrandisement.



seed may not find their place on fertile ground having being *felled* on paths, shallow soil or thorns. A strong suggestion is that just like *felled* seed drawn by gravitational force on indifferent land thus ordaining suboptimal outcomes, contextual situations and genetic proclivities *conspire* to consign all people to some suboptimal coordinates we occupy in life leaving us only marginal quantity of seed *left to fall* on fertile ground. The continued use of the term “fell” on fertile ground leading to thirty fold, sixty fold or even a hundred fold crop gives a sense that the *extent* of germination in fertile ground *may* be a random attribute of the *leftover* seed to fall on good soil. *The random yield of thirty, sixty or one hundred crop epitomises the talents that are by chance occurrence reposed to us, with which we are expected to productively engage and maximise their dividend.* Some are fortuitously ordained with more talent than others to which essentially they have no claim to and the corollary that none can be blamed for having less or boast for having more.

The Parable of the Sower is an acknowledgement of the indulgence for (whatever quantity of) seed being *fell(ed) on good soil, where it is ordained to produce a crop* (and manifest as our “talents”), for less than or no marginal effort from our part. Inevitably some will have more talents and some others will have different or less but nevertheless the love, education, good health and family support we may have received are not a result of having *deliberately* sowed seed of good strain quality or quantity in good soil. Notably much of life’s bundle ineffectually gets dropped without retribution or cost!

Herein lays the sheet anchor of the what Jesus thought of his own Christhood when He declares after his sojourn in the desert for six weeks in Luke 4:18: “The Spirit of the Lord is on me, because he has *anointed* me to proclaim good news to the *poor*. He has sent me to proclaim freedom for the prisoners and recovery of sight for the blind, to set the *oppressed* free”. The Hebrew term for “poor” and “oppressed” is the same. Conditions of poverty and of being shackled, feelings of oppression and states of health invariably have no causality. The Quaker view of the economics of social justice is inspired from Jesus’ Messianic purpose to redress life’s incongruities especially those that preordain some to be poor, oppressed, shackled and sick. Several business propositions have thrived for decades from the Quaker principle that endowments are *random* and every person is of equal worth. Such ideology till today remains the leitmotif of Quaker commerce. The principle that underlies the economics of these businesses is that despite delinquencies (invariably for contextual reasons), God does not confer judgements on matters that conspire beyond one’s control. His grace is never far away -- ---some seed, regardless of their strain quality or quantity still fall on good soil to “produce (ordain) a crop — perhaps a HUNDRED times what was sown”. And that is the great mystery of God’s Amazing Grace -- “So the last will be first, and the first will be last” (Matthew 20:16).

Just a word of cautious celebration! While the Parable of the Sower is an instruction of God’s infinite mercy to unsuspecting wantonness, Galatians 6:7 is unequivocal: “God cannot be mocked - a man reaps what he sows”. The Parable of the Talents (Mathew 25, 14-30) makes it abundantly clear that wilful productivity will be rewarded and wanton sloth will be punished and thrown where there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.

Interestingly none of the servants appeared to envy the others for the different amounts of talents that they were given and did not ascribe the unequal productivity outcomes of the talents to the differences in their character or quality. Once again our attention is drawn to John 14:2 that in the Lord's house there are many rooms and it is up to us to cultivate our own garden around it.

### **Accounting Period**

It is perhaps deliberate that the master does not disclose to his servants when he would return. He may have never wanted his servants to consider the long term when managing the talents he put in their care. They operated such that the master's return was imminent. The nearness of the date of the master's homecoming is epitomised by the servants who doubled the talents "went *at once* and traded with them". Even the servant who received the one talent *went* and dug in the ground and hid his master's money; there is a suggestion that this servant attempted to secure the talent on receipt *almost immediately*. Jesus consistently alluded in his teaching that judgement day is never to going to be preannounced and it is important therefore to be ready for the Son of Man is coming at an hour that you do not expect" (Luke 12:40). Economic thought also wrestles with making long term plans that may transpire very differently than what is intended. The illustrious economist John Maynard Keynes suspicious of long term solutions declared that in the long run we are all dead!?

### **The Conundrum**

The main character in this parable is the absentee master who expects profits from his capital. This master's perversity is made apparent when he acknowledges that he is harsh and takes things that do not belong to him. On his return he appears to demand profit from the talents given to his three slaves. Two that have made enormous gains find themselves rewarded with governing authority in a blissful kingdom. One that returns only what was given is chided for not becoming a usurer to make at least some profit from interest. The whole emphasis is on the return of more money. The talent is taken from the third slave and given to the first, and we get a reprise of the apophthegm, seen earlier in the gospel, "For to everyone who has will more be given, and he will have an abundance. But from the one who has not, even what he has will be taken away." It is spoken expressly in relation to money, and the master comes out looking like a classic robber-baron. This certainly looks like bad news for the poor, and seems to completely counter many of the teachings of Jesus. How can the same Jesus who warned people against striving for earthly wealth now tell a parable with a protagonist who is completely obsessed with wealth and power, even to the detriment of his own workers? Piquant as it may appear but this conundrum has encouraged some western commentators to suggest that Jesus is exemplifying the profit motive of free enterprise. Rohrbaugh (1993) however negates this view when he suggests

that peasants — who made up more than ninety percent of the populace — would have had a drastically different understanding of these words. They lived in a world characterized by the concept of limited good, a world in which all goods were limited and had already been apportioned. To make a gain necessarily meant taking from someone else. He draws on ancient thinkers, including Aristotle, Jerome, and Plutarch, to bring home the point that profit-making was generally considered evil and immoral in the ancient world. Thus, while the standard interpretation may have seemed like good news to the rich, or to modern western interpreters, to ancient peasants it could have only been received as a “text of terror.” On this account, Rohrbaugh (1993) questions whether the parable originated with Jesus at all, or whether it was developed later to protect the position of wealthy persons in Christian communities

Building on Rohrbaugh’s (1993) work, Herzog (1994) paints a vivid picture of the social and economic realities of masters, retainers, and peasants like the ones described in this parable. According to him, wealthy landowners depended upon intermediaries, like the three (or ten) slaves of this parable, to squeeze wealth out of the peasants and dispossess them of their land while at the same time deflecting displeasure with these actions away from the master, who had the most to gain. In the process, these retainers stood to gain a great amount as well. Peasant hearers of this parable would have understood immediately the actions of the master and the first two slaves, and identified it easily as the sort of exploitation they had grown accustomed to. The actions of the third servant, on the other hand, would have seemed very strange. Nevertheless, he is the hero of the story. By taking the master’s money out of circulation, he ensures that it will not be used to exploit others. Furthermore, he blows the whistle on the deceitful practices of the master, and for this he must be silenced. The master effectively does this in his judgement of the third servant.

As Kitchen (2004) shows, the traditional interpretation of this parable is simply not consistent with the character of Jesus that we get from the rest of the gospel. And as Rohrbaugh (1993) notes, it is all too easy for us to slip into an interpretation that Jesus overtly preaches the capitalistic acquisition of wealth, an interpretation that has been explicitly made by at least one scholar. On the other hand it is likely that Jesus intends to exemplify his instruction to his disciples in the Parable of the Talents by what he told them (in Matthew 9:35-38) “Therefore said he unto them, The harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few: pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth labourers into his harvest”. Jesus knew full well that few were prepared to engage with the harvest in the eschatological sense. All three of the master’s servants had an opportunity to work the *harvest* (sent by the Lord of the harvest) and one of them took a conservative view. In the context that workers, engaging with the harvest, were in short supply, it was indeed important they be given appropriate resources to deliver expected outcomes. If done well their *behaviour* would merit handsome *reward* (normal in demand - supply transactions) which the master did to his two servants who had doubled their talents while punishing the behaviour of one servant who had incurred an *opportunity cost* of forgoing options

---

of increasing his talent. It appears from Jesus teaching that he considered the outcomes of the appointed task (engaging with the harvest) as very important as is seen when he repeatedly (three times) instructs his most favoured disciple Simon Peter (anointed by Jesus with the talent as 'Peter' meaning 'Rock' who would build Jesus' church) in John 21:15-17 to, "Feed my sheep". Jesus' responses to Peter was a sequel to Peter affirming his love three times for Jesus – "The third time he said to him, "Simon son of John, do you love me?" Peter was hurt because Jesus asked him the third time, "Do you love me?" He said, "Lord, you know all things; you know that I love you." Jesus said, "Feed my sheep"." It seems that Jesus believed that the master reposed confidence in those who loved him by resourcing them with appropriate number and character of talents. The master consequently did not expect his servants from renegeing to "Feed my sheep" as it were in a field where the harvest was plentiful. Happily the master did not perceive an environment of dwindling supplies or shortage of arable land, fresh water, energy and minerals – essential for the production of food, but rather a plentiful harvest. Anything that suggested that those who professed love for him would **NOT** go the distance of engaging with the harvest to feed his sheep would only therefore incur the *wrath* of the master.

### Economic Implications

It cannot be ignored that the parable as is presented nevertheless engages with several economic concepts at various stages of the parable's narrative. The approach to taking *risk* in managing assets in a conceivably *market economy* is central to the moral of the story with the intention of *growing* the portfolio. Because the nature of the storyline being a parable (and therefore pithy), major inferences from the imperfect information presented cannot help being conjectural. Also, it is possible that some of the representation of elements of the parable might not be in sync with its intended meaning to the audience of the Roman era as pointed out by Rohrbaugh (1993).

Nonetheless Jesus' teaching about the talents being a parable and not an allegory, the single standout message is that *profit* arising from *productivity* is to be *rewarded*, while *opportunity costs* arising from lack of *enterprise* will inevitably be *punished*. The emotion of *fear* (the *risk of losing*) as a driving motivation of *investment in enterprise* is palpable. *Recognition of ability, equitable allocation of resources, expectation and performance appraisal* of the stewardship of the assets by the *owner of the capital* are also key factors in the parable's instruction. It may not be an unrealistic reason to expect that these universal and time invariant economic axioms addressed in the Parable of the Talents to spur continued effort in prospecting the promise of Scripture for deriving economic wisdom. In a world obsessed with material possessions some success in a Scripture based approach to the management of resources and creation of value to "feed more sheep" (including those from where the master reaps where he has not sown and gathers where he scattered no seed) might have a redeeming effect on the economic ills that riddle society.

## Works Cited

- Dunoyer, C. (1845). Ou, simple exposé des conditions dans lesquelles les forces humaines s'exercent avec le plus de puissance, *De la liberté du travail*, Paris, Guillaumin.
- Herzog, W. R. (1994). *Parables as subversive speech: Jesus as pedagogue of the oppressed*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press.
- Mimier King, D.D. (2013). The perplexing problem of the parable of the pounds as pertaining to a preferential position for the poor. *International meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature session on Synoptic Gospels: Issues of Poverty*, St. Andrews, Scotland, United Kingdom.
- Kitchen, M. (2002). Rereading the parable of the pounds: A social and narrative analysis of Luke 19:11-28. D. Neville (ed.) *Prophecy and passion. Essays in honour of Athol Gill*. Hindmarsh SA: *Australian Theological Forum*, 225-246.
- Weber, M. (1920). *The Sociology of Religion*. p. 264. Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press, 1993.
- Rohrbaugh, R. L. (1993). A peasant reading of the parable of the talents/pounds: A text of terror? *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 23, 32-39.

---

\*Direct correspondence to: Mario Miranda ([Mario.Miranda@vu.edu.au](mailto:Mario.Miranda@vu.edu.au)), Victoria University, School of Economics and Finance, Ballarat Rd, Footscray VIC 3011, Australia.