

E x e g e s i s   o f   L u k e   1 4 : 2 5 - 3 5

by

Luis Fidel Mercado

April 1962

Course: New Testament 125. The Gospel of Luke

Professor: Dr. Helmut Koester

Harvard Divinity School

Cambridge, Massachusetts

### EXEGESIS OF LUKE 14:25 - 35

This short discourse of Jesus on discipleship has been arranged by Luke himself from various materials at his disposal. Its present position is also his own creation.

The segment as a whole stands in contrast to the preceding section. In the latter through the parable of the Great Supper, the universal reach of God's offer is put forth. The former presents the stern conditions that must be fulfilled by those who indeed would follow Jesus. The parable of the Great Supper speaks of God's election; the passage under consideration, of discipleship. The latter is the counterpart of the former. Election is for discipleship. This is one of Luke's leading theological themes.

Verse 25. This is an editorial note composed by the evangelist as an introduction to a new discourse which he himself has arranged from originally independent materials. Concerning the *συνεπορεύοντο δὲ αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί*, Creed (193)<sup>1</sup> says: "The gathering of the multitudes answers to the universalistic note of the last parable, and forms the background of the stern sayings which follow." In Matthew the words which follow

<sup>1</sup> In order to avoid the monotonous repetition of ibid., op. cit., and the like in footnotes, we have followed the general practice used in exegetical commentaries of giving the name of the author and the page in the text of the exposition. All works quoted or alluded to are included in the bibliography.

immediately (Lk. 14:26-27) are found in his great discourse in chapter 10 and are addressed to the twelve disciples exclusively (Mt. 10:37-38). Therefore the setting given by Luke to these sayings may be due to an intentional contrast to vss. 21-23. God certainly calls men freely everywhere but His call presents supreme demands.

Verses 26-27. These verses are paralleled in Matthew 10:37-38. Both evangelists depend on Q here for their source.

Verse 26 is considered generally more original than its parallel in Matthew (10:37). Dibelius (MJC 67-68) classifies this saying as an authentic prophetic saying of the Lord about decision and considers the original form to have been thus: "Whosoever comes to me, and hates not father and mother, he cannot be my disciple." Bultmann (174) is more restrained in his judgment and only concedes that the saying is a variant of an original saying of Jesus. In comparing the verse with the Matthew parallel he says (172-173):

Sicher ist das οὐ μισεῖ des Lk primär gegenüber dem φιλῶν... ὑπὲρ ἐμῆς des Mt; denn jenes kann nicht wohl aus diesem entstanden sein; auch ist durch das ὑπὲρ ἐμῆς die Beziehung auf die Person Jesu verstärkt, was nach den Analogien das Secundäre ist. Endlich ist auch das εἶναι μαθητῆς des Lk primär gegenüber dem ἅγιός μου εἶναι des Mt; es ist etwas Konkretes als das "Jesu würdig sein", was doch wohl nur christliche Terminologie sein kann.... Im übrigen wird Lk durch Verwischung des Parallelismus und pedantische Ergänzung der Verwandtenliste geändert haben.

This analysis by Bultmann seems to us to be faithful to the evidence afforded by the verses. Obviously the Matthean wording presents a more advanced stage in the development of the tradition.<sup>1</sup> This is shown especially in the substitution of <sup>ἀγαπᾷ</sup><sup>2</sup> for φιλεῖ and in the stronger connection with the person of Jesus. On the other hand, Luke has expanded the list of relatives. This may be due to Luke's peculiar idea of election. He seems to believe that Jesus is the one who freely elects and also the one who cuts his ties with his own relatives and country. (Cf. Luke 4:16-30; 8:19-21). So also the disciple must be willing to cut all blood and family ties if he would but be his disciple. It is an entirely new relationship and demands total commitment.

If this saying is an original word of Jesus or a variant of an original utterance, the question immediately comes to the fore as to the connection of Jesus' announcement of the nearness of the kingdom of God and his own person. The question is no longer merely one of accepting his message about the kingdom but of following him. Lagrange has the following to say in this respect (409).\_\_\_\_\_

<sup>1</sup> The same tendency to tone down the radicalness of the original utterance of Jesus is seen in a still more advanced stage in Mark 10: 28-31 and parallel passages (Lk. 18:28-30; Mt. 19:27-30).

<sup>2</sup> Jeremias (141) observes that ἀγαπᾷ as an antithesis to ἀγαπᾷ in Semitic very often means to "love less" or "not to love". It is in this sense that Matthew has interpreted the saying.

Holtzmann a noté avec raison que la personne de Jésus remplace ici le règne de Dieu. Être son disciple ou entrer dans le royaume de Dieu, son deux expressions qui se valent. En fait et pratiquement, il est le centre, c'est en s'attachant à lui qu'on arrive au royaume, et on ne peut le suivre qu'en renonçant même la vie et en portant la croix.

This is not the place to pursue further this matter, but the issue of the relationship of the kingdom to the person of Jesus is undoubtedly raised by this verse and the following. The *ἐτι τε καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν*

has been added by Luke, probably from the saying which followed his source as it does still in Mt. 10:39: *ὁ εὐρὼν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀποδέσσει αὐτὴν κτλ.*

The *οὐ δύναται.. καθῆναι* is stronger than the Matthean *οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος*.

Verse 27 is one of the most difficult passages to interpret in the Gospel tradition. The direct parallel is found in Matthew 10:38. Both evangelists have drawn it from Q. However, there is another variant of the same saying that has come down to us through Mark 8:34 // Lk. 9:23; Mt. 16:24. Both Matthew and Luke have incorporated the two traditions in their respective gospels.

Dinkler (111) in agreement with Bultmann (173) considers the Q tradition the more original in comparison to the Markan. He says:

Vergleicht man die Markus- und Q-Überlieferung, so ist zunächst die ursprünglichere Tradition bei letzterer zu erkennen, da hier die negative Fassung des Wortes vorliegt und auch neben dem *ὁπίω μου ἔλθει* bzw. *ἔρχεσθαι* das *ἀπαρνεῖσθαι ἑαυτοῦ* fehlt, ferner das zusätzliche *ἀκολουθεῖν*. Gewiss hat Bultmann darin recht, dass bei Markus "die 'Nach-

folge' nicht mehr nur Bedingung ist, sondern schon den Glanz des Eigenwertes hat."

Dinkler (111-112) also accepts Bultmann's judgment (173) that the Lukan wording of the Q-tradition is more original than the Matthean with the exception of the verb *παράγειν*, which he thinks Luke has substituted for the more original *λαμβάνειν*. He says: "Das Verb *παράγειν* war bereits griechische 'Redeform' geworden und ist freier dem aramäischen Urtext gegenüber als Matthäus." And he proceeds: "Das *ἐρχεσθαι ὀπίω μου* des Lukas zeigt noch deutlich den semitischen Hintergrund, ist aber von ihm anscheinend als für griechische Leser nicht mehr voll verständlich erkannt und deshalb durch das Wort vom 'Jünger werden' interpretiert worden."

This is as far as one can go in the analysis of the wording of these variant traditions. Both the Markan and Q traditions seem to go back to an original underlying saying of Jesus in Aramaic (Dinkler 112). It is not the matter here either of a "Gemeindebildung" nor of an "Ich-Worte des Auferstandenen" (Bultmann 173-174).

However, having determined that the Lukan form with the exception of the word *παράγειν* is the most original does not carry us very far in respect to the meaning of the saying. The difficult phrase to interpret is the *λαμβάνειν τὸν σταυρὸν*. If Jesus actually pronounced these words, what did He mean by them?

For obvious hermeneutical reasons, we are assuming that Jesus was not referring to his own cross. However, Dinkler (112) points out that the evangelists themselves take the words as referring to the historical event of the cross.

Bultmann (173-174) raises the possibility that *σταυρός* might have been already before the time of Jesus a traditional figure for suffering and sacrifice. "Darf man das annehmen," he says, "so scheint mir Lk 14,27 so wenig wie 14,26 notwendig das Berufsbewusstsein von Worten wie Mt 11, 5 f.; Lk 6,46; 12,8 f. zu überschreiten."

This is a possible interpretation but one that does not satisfy Dinkler (113). He poses the question of the lack of evidence for such a usage in the old rabbinic and Jewish literature. He then advances his own line of approach for the interpretation of the phrase

We shall present the main thread of his argumentation because it seems to us to give new meaning to the phrase and at the same time to place it within the historical development of the Old Testament, Jewish, and early Christian literature.

Dinkler's key is the concept "Versiegelung" which he finds in the Old Testament (Gen. 4:15; Is. 44:5; I Kings 20:21; and especially Ez. 9:4 ff. = *LXX σφραγισμός*), rabbinic literature, early Christian sources and Gnostic literature and even in archeological excavations. In a summary statement of the evidence he presents, he remarks (124):

Die altkirchliche Literatur seit Mitte des II. Jh's. spricht deutlich über die Taufe als Versiegelung mit einem Eigentumszeichen und verbindet damit den Ideenkreis des Guten Hirten, der seine Schafe am Zeichen erkennt. Der Gedanke der Versiegelung ist ferner sowohl alttestamentlich jüdisch wie gnostisch, er ist für die Zeit vor Christus und besonders für das ganze I. Jh. vor und nach Christus literarisch und archäologisch als lebendiger Brauch belegt. In der jüdischen Linie folgt man besonders dem Gedanken einer Jahwe-Eigentum-Versiegelung, eines Schutzzeichens, das auch in der rabbinischen Literatur für die Priesterweihe weiterlebt. In der gnostischen Literatur--ob jüdisch oder nichtjüdisch--ist der magische Charakter eines apotropäischen Initiationsritus im Vordergrund. Das Versiegelungszeichen ist dabei jeweils als Kreuz, als Tav oder als Chi, also als  $\chi$  oder x Zeichen zu verstehen.

On the basis of this evidence Dinkler (127) proposes the following reconstruction of verse 27, which he thinks gives the original meaning of the saying of Jesus:  $\delta\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\ \lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \epsilon\eta\mu\epsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \xi\acute{\rho}\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \acute{\omicron}\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\omega\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\upsilon\ \delta\upsilon\lambda\omicron\upsilon\alpha\tau\alpha\iota\ \xi\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\ \theta\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma.$

Hierbei--he says (127)--würde mit  $\tau\omicron\ \epsilon\eta\mu\epsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon$  an Stelle von  $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\omega\varsigma$  in der Linie der LXX das hebräische  $\aleph\aleph$  oder  $\aleph$  wiedergegeben sein, Worte, mit denen im AT und im Judentum die Forderung eines Eigentumsiegels und eschatologischen Zeichens adäquat umschrieben wurde.  $\Delta\alpha\eta\mu\epsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon$  sowohl  $\epsilon\phi\ \rho\alpha\gamma\iota\varsigma$  wie  $\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  umfasst, ist für beide Ausdeutungen Spielraum gelassen und vor allem die synoptische interpretatio christiana auf das Kreuz Jesu verständlich.

The meaning of the logion Dinkler (128) expresses thus:

Zunächst im Zusammenhang der Tradition besagt das Logion: Nimm dein Tav auf, nimm dein Eigentumsiegel auf, mache das von Ezechiel geforderte Kreuz auf deine Stirn! In der Sache ist dies eine Variante zur Forderung des  $\kappa\epsilon\tau\alpha\upsilon\alpha\tau\epsilon$ . Aber es ist doch noch mehr gefordert, insofern im Zusammenhang der Endzeit-Verkündigung nicht nur Rückkehr zum radikalen Gehorsam, Rückkehr ins Eigentum Gottes, sondern betont Preisgabe der Selbstbehauptung vor Gott und Preisgabe der autonomen Freiheit, die sich gegen Gott richtet, hier von Jesus gefordert ist.



From this understanding of λαμβάνειν τὸν σταυρόν  
i.e., λαμβάνειν τὸ θεμέριον, Dinkler (128) sees the  
Mark and Q traditions as understandable developments. The  
Markan tradition presents, on the one hand, the interpre-  
tatio christiana in its αἶψιν τὸν σταυρόν, and on  
the other, the original concept of θεμέριον in its  
ἀπαρνησάσθαι ἑαυτόν. And he concludes:

Auf Grund unserer Quellen ist es somit wahr-  
scheinlich, dass Markus und Q verschiedene Über-  
setzungen ein- und desselben aramäischen Textes  
bieten und dass dabei Markus sowohl dem histo-  
rischen Sinngehalt wie der geschichtlich sich  
bietenden Interpretation Rechnung getragen hat,  
während Q grössere Worttreue und geringere Sach-  
treue zeigt.

This hypothesis, if it can stand the test of further  
research, obviously illuminates the saying about cross-  
bearing. It places the saying of Jesus in a historically  
meaningful context and allows for further developments in  
the Christian tradition. However, it has to be examined  
rather carefully, especially since the evidence that  
Jesus required such a sign is dependent on the saying  
under consideration. If Jesus demanded such a sign from  
his disciples with all its eschatological implications,  
why is the synoptic evidence so slim? If an interpreta-  
tion of this type does not hold, we have to go back to  
the one given by Bultmann.

However, it must not be forgotten that the saying as  
it stands was undoubtedly understood by the evangelist as  
a summons to martyrdom on the part of the disciple. Its

Sitz im Leben, in this case, is to be found in the suffering and persecutions and even death to which the Christian church was exposed in the first century. The example of Jesus has become the measuring rod of discipleship. Indeed, the way of the cross leads home.

It is along this line that Creed (194) takes the saying. Although granting that the sight of criminals carrying their crosses would have been a familiar sight and might be supposed to have provided Jesus with a metaphor, he maintains that apart from its association with Jesus' cross the metaphor would not have been appropriate. The saying, therefore, he believes, must have taken shape in the community. "The disciple must, through great tribulation, enter the kingdom of God (Acts 14:22) following Jesus without the camp, bearing his reproach (Heb. 13:13)." This is another possible line of interpretation. In this case Jesus never uttered the saying.

*What do you think?*

Verses 28-32. The Twin Parables of the Tower Builder and the King Preparing for War.

These twin parables have the ring of genuineness and are considered to be authentic parables of Jesus (Dibelius, 152; Bultmann, 184). They are peculiar to Luke and are examples of those clean parables that the evangelist has given us from his own independent source without any allegorical interpretations (Jeremias, 68-69). Their original setting and application is no longer recoverable (Bultmann, 216; Gilmour, 261). We owe to the evangelist

their present position in a context of discipleship.

Probably they were originally uttered by Jesus as a pair, for the numerous occurrences in the Gospels of parables and metaphors in pairs points to the fact that Jesus himself favored this method as a means of emphasizing a point. Also the fact that our parables form a natural comparison of the great and the small favors their classification as an original pair. (Jeremias, 71).

Both parables lack a "Vergleichungspartikel" and begin with rhetorical questions (Bultmann, 184). The *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν* (vs. 28) and the *τίς βασιλεὺς* are significant for the impression they create on the hearers. This *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν* in the New Testament is regularly introduced when the emphatic answer, "No one!. Impossible!" or "Everyone, of course," is expected (Jeremias, 118). In the English translation of Jeremias' book the *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν* is rendered into English as "Can you imagine that any of you could".

The answer expected in our parables is the emphatic: "No one! Impossible!", that is, no one in his proper senses would expose himself to ridicule by starting to build a tower that he cannot finish, neither would a wise king expose his realms to utter destruction by fighting a superior enemy. We get the impression that the parables are admonishing the hearers to be prudent and wise, to ponder whatever course of action they are to follow on account of the consequences. Epictetus has a similar wis-

dom advice in Discourses III 15:1:

In every affair consider what precedes and follows, and then undertake it. Otherwise you will begin with spirit; but not having thought of the consequences, when some of them appear you will shamefully desist. . . Consider first, men, what the matter is and what your nature is able to bear. (Quoted by Gilmour, 261).

The parabolic form that Jesus employs is of course superior as a teaching or preaching device. Furthermore, Epictetus sets his discourse within an individualistic framework. Jesus presents his teaching in this case with a social context.

*how do you know the context?*

If men in worldly affairs consider the cost of an enterprise before embarking on it, making sure that they have the ability to carry it to a successful completion, in a similar manner the disciple must consider the cost of discipleship before following Jesus. This seems to be the way in which Luke intends us to take the parables. The parables are connected to what precedes by the particle  $\gamma\epsilon\rho$  and to what follows by  $\sigma\upsilon\tau\omega\ \sigma\upsilon\upsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \epsilon\varsigma\ \upsilon\mu\hat{\omega}\nu$ . Both links are Luke's own creation. Verse 33 is entirely editorial. It does not bring out the thought of the parables. The point of the parables is self-testing before undertaking a task and does not have anything to do with the renouncing of possessions. The idea of renouncing the possessions is not even present in verses 26 and 27, although it can be a legitimate inference. Creed (193), following Jülicher, suggests that

if the parables are to be brought into line with the word which is deduced from them, they should rather run: A man who has begun to build a tower must, if he would escape ridicule, throw all reserves into completion. A king who is about the encounter another and more powerful king must strain every nerve to make his army fit for battle. So also he who would be my disciple must bid good-bye to all his possessions.

However, the point of the parables is the need for careful calculation before undertaking a given task so as to avoid the awful consequences. Its immediate purpose is to discourage hasty enthusiasm.

It is interesting to note that the risk and cost of building a tower (whether it be a simple structure for a vineyard or a more elaborate one--the *θελὸς αὐτοῦ θανάτου*) suggests the latter as the more likely interpretation--is small in comparison with the risk and cost involved in waging a war where the fate of the kingdom is at stake. In either case the point of the parables is the same, yet the second parable brings out more forcefully the point at issue. Many of the details of the parables should not be given special meaning, making the parable an allegory. The main point is what counts. All details form part of the whole and should not be judged as to morality, for example, deriving a justification for war when one is sure to win or condemning the king, and therefore Jesus, of lack of patriotism for not fighting till the very end. These matters are just not there.

Verses 34-35. The Salt Saying.

This logion is classified by Bultmann (82) as a wisdom saying in a question form. It has the ring of a proverb and it is likely that if Jesus used it, he is drawing from the popular wisdom of his time. It also may have been taken over by the Christian community from the reservoir of Jewish wisdom teaching. Dibelius (TG 246-247) does not include wisdom sayings in the message of Jesus, maintaining that if Jesus used them, he certainly did not originate them.

The saying has come down to us in the Markan (9:50) and Q traditions (Mt. 15:13; Lk. 14:34-35). Each one of the evangelists puts it in a different context, which fact shows that it has been transmitted as an independent logion and that its original meaning, in case it was used by Jesus, is no longer recoverable. However, the setting provided by Matthew and Mark has to do with discipleship. This may point to the possibility that Jesus might have used the saying originally in a discipleship context, although it also remains possible, since the saying was used in rabbinic circles, as referring to Israel, that Jesus might have uttered it as a judgment saying against Israel (Jeremias, 125). If this is the case, the discipleship context is a later creation. Luke, therefore, may have kept a semblance of the original context by having the saying addressed to the crowd. This is done, however, in

the most artificial way and not much weight should be given to it as a basis for interpretation for the first two sayings are about discipleship.

The Markan saying (9:50) may have been put in its present setting on account of the preceding saying: "For everyone will be salted with fire." The link, however, is totally artificial since the purpose of salt in 50 is to season and no longer describes an experience to which the disciples are subject. Mark has *καλὸν τὸ ἅλως* which the Lukan version also has. His *ἀνάλω* may be considered more faithful to the original Aramaic than the Matthean and Lukan *κωρανθῆ*. In Aramaic ܣܕܢ can signify both unsavory and foul (Taylor, 414). Mark also shares *ἁρτίω (ἁρτύεστε)* 'to season' with Luke *ἁρτυθῆσεται*, while Matthew employs *ἁλίζω (ἁλισθῆσεται)* 'to salt'. The *ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἅλα καὶ ζήνησθε ἐν ἀδελφοῖς* is probably an editorial note by the evangelist. In this context salt seems to be an undefinable quality that the disciples should possess to have peace among themselves; perhaps it is just common sense (Taylor, 415). The comment may have been made in view of the dispute among the disciples (9:33 ff).

In Matthew (5:13) the saying is allegorized: *ἔστε τὸ ἅλως τῆς γῆς*. This takes the place of the Lukan and Markan *καλὸν τὸ ἅλως*. The disciples are identified with the salt; they are indeed the salt

of the earth, that is, that which keeps the world from decaying or being savorless. This allegorization is the creation of the evangelist to suit his own purposes, as the following saying clearly shows: Ὑμεῖς ἐστε τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου. In both cases the allegorization is secondary.

The second part of the Matthean saying (εἰς οὐδὲν ἰσχύς καὶ εἰς κηὶ βληθὲν ἔξω καταπατεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων) --sounds secondary

to the Lukan wording: οὐτὲ εἰς χηὶ οὐτὲ εἰς κοπρίαν εὐθετόν ἐστιν· ἔξω βάλλουσιν αὐτόν.

^ Luke, says Easton (233-234), "is more original with its concrete and homely 'land...dunghill'... And neither the asyndeton after ἔσθω nor the impersonal plural βάλλουσιν is in Lk's style." If this is the case, Matthew seems to have rephrased the clause but to have kept the original meaning. Salt that has lost its taste no longer has any reason for existence, and, therefore, it is good for nothing but to be cast outside to be trodden underfoot by men. In a similar manner, disciples who have become tasteless and savorless, i.e. that no longer keep mankind from becoming insipid and corrupt, are useless. They have lost their distinctive characteristics and are good for nothing but to be cast out. There is a veiled note of judgment here. As savorless salt is cast out to be trodden underfoot by men, likewise the disciple who becomes useless will be judged. No inferences as to the



nature of the judgment can be drawn from the saying. Perhaps it is judgment enough not to fulfill the purpose of the call to discipleship.

Luke's setting for the logion is entirely his own creation. The ~~o<sup>3</sup>~~ is an artificial link. But the author intends thereby to relate the saying to what has preceded. It may be considered as a second conclusion to the parables in order to give them wider application. In this case it might have been the foolishness element-- ~~αωραυθ<sup>2</sup>~~ -- that prompted Luke to place this saying here as a sort of second application to the twin parables. Just as no one would be so foolish as to expose himself to ridicule by undertaking to build a tower that he cannot finish, nor would again a king be so foolish as to invite disaster for his kingdom, in the same manner the disciple will not be so foolish as to become worthless, inviting as a consequence judgment upon himself. This is a possible line of approach. It assumes that Luke understood the parables to refer to self-testing before entering on the path of discipleship. The parables themselves do not reveal to what kind of self-testing Jesus was referring. If the salt saying was originally applied by Jesus to Israel (Jeremias, 125), in this context, however, it is applied to those who would be his disciples. In Matthew and Mark the sayings are addressed to those who already are disciples.

/ n.b.

The οὐτὲ εἰς γῆς οὐτὲ εἰς κοπρίαν ἐὼθιτοῦ  
 ἔστι· ἔγω βάλλομαι αὐτῷ as said above is more original  
 than the Matthean version. There is no point in asking  
 what is the meaning of γῆ and κοπρία. They do not  
 symbolize anything. There are many things which when  
 they deteriorate are good as manure or to mix with  
 manure. Salt that has become saltless is not good even  
 for this. It is entirely useless. In the same way, a  
 disciple that lacks the spirit of commitment and surrender  
 of the self even unto death is worthless. He is a good-  
 for-nothing human being but not a disciple of Jesus.

It should be noted that we are now interpreting the  
 saying more in line with verses 26, 27, and 33 than with  
 the parables. It is difficult to see a consistent pattern  
 here, since the discourse is composed of originally inde-  
 pendent materials. The parables, as said above, do not  
 have the same point as the sayings in 26, 27, and the edi-  
 torial comment of 33. Perhaps Luke himself understood  
 the salt saying as related on the one hand to the say-  
 ings in 26 and 27, and to the parables. on the other;  
 hence, the possibility of a double interpretation of the  
 saying arises in this context.

The statement ἔγω βάλλομαι αὐτῷ, as in  
 Matthew, shows a veiled threat of judgment. Commenting  
 on this verse Rauch says (195):

Das Hinauswerfen auf die Strasse (ἔγω)  
 wohin man im Orient Wertloses wirft, scheint  
 Ausdruck völliger Geringschätzung und ver-

hüllte Andeutung des Gerichts. Eindruckswoll bildet diese Warnung die den Jünger an Gottes Gericht über ihn erinnert, den Schlüsselpunkt.

Verse 35c.

This saying has been placed here by Luke himself. Neither the Markan nor the Matthean salt saying has this conclusion. Apparently this is just a formula that may have been used by Jesus to warn the hearers about the necessity of understanding what he was saying. Luke probably has taken it from Mark 4:9. He has paraphrased it in 8:18, where his source is Mark. It is a fitting conclusion to a discourse that Luke intends to present as a challenge to those who would be disciples of Jesus. It is necessary to hear and understand before taking any stand.

*What is its original purpose?*

Concluding Remarks

Before bringing this exposition to a close, we should like to present some of the conclusions that one is led to reach through this type of study.

1. This short discourse of Jesus (Luke 14:25-35) is obviously the creation of the evangelist. He has drawn his materials from different sources. This is the pattern that we have found:

14:25 Editorial; narrative.

14:26 A logion about discipleship from Q material with some editorial retouching. It is either an original word of Jesus or a variant of an original. Generally speaking, Luke has pre-

served the more original form as against Matthew. The tradition reveals a general toning down of the original saying.

14:27 A logion about discipleship from Q material with only slight editorial touches. Luke has preserved the original wording better than Matthew. There is a Markan tradition for this saying. Both Markan and Q tradition seem to go to an original underlying word of Jesus in Aramaic. In the Q tradition the Christian interpretation is already present but is more faithful to the original saying in wording over against the Markan. The Markan tradition, on the other hand, has kept closer to the meaning of the original saying and at the same time has taken up the Christian interpretation.

14:28-  
32 Twin parables about self-testing from Luke's peculiar source. They have every sign of having come from Jesus, and bear no editorial touches. Their original context is no longer recoverable.

14:33 Completely editorial. A saying about renunciation of possessions created by Luke as a not too happy conclusion to the parables.

14:34-  
35ab A wisdom saying from Q about the uselessness of savorless salt. It also has a Markan tra-

dition. Each of the three evangelists has it in different contexts. Jesus may have used these words but it is impossible to determine in what connection. Again Luke has preserved the more original form over against Matthew and even Mark.

14:35c A short saying that Luke draws from a different context in Mark.

From all this one can only conclude that the discourse is a mosaic with the pattern of discipleship woven into it but by very loose threads. The pattern is Luke's own. The two discipleship sayings bear him out but not the parables. The salt saying can either be tied up with the discipleship saying or the parables. The crowd is present at Luke's own bidding and seems to be used in order to create a contrast to the preceding parable.

2. This discourse shows the evangelist at work as an author and redactor. Some of the observations appropriate under this point have been given above but the following ones can be added.

a. The evangelist creates his own links to join these materials--vs. 28;  $\gamma\alpha\rho$  (28);  $\text{oú'tws oú}$  (33);  $\text{oú}$  (34).

b. He provides conclusions to the twin parables (vs. 33; vss. 34-35).

c. He adds words that express his point of

view (vs. 26 expansion of the list of relatives).

d. Above all we observe how careful Luke has been in not introducing changes in the material he has received. He has preserved the tradition in its most original form in the two discipleship sayings (26,27) and in the salt saying as well. The two parables he has apparently handed to us as he received them.

This speaks well for Luke as a redactor.

e. The author uses the principle of contrast to introduce his new material. The whole discourse (14:25-35) is to be seen in the light of the preceding parable.

3. Another observable phenomenon in this passage is the toning down process to which the sayings of Jesus have been subjected in the tradition. This is especially noticeable in the tradition surrounding the logion about hating one's kinsmen. When the tradition stops, one wonders whether any sacrifice is really demanded. (See Mk. 10:28-31 // Luk. 18:28-30; Mat 19:27-30).

4. Our study has also shown that it is almost impossible to recover the original Sitz im Leben of the sayings and parables of Jesus, at least in this context.

a. It is obvious that verse 25 is an editorial note and therefore does not provide any inkling as to the original group to which Jesus addressed these sayings (vss. 26, 27). The setting of the discourse in contrast to the preceding section is equally secondary.

b. We have no way of telling under what circumstances Jesus uttered the twin parables of the Tower Builder and the King Preparing for War. We cannot even tell to what kind of self-testing he is talking about.

c. It is also equally hard to determine to whom Jesus addressed them. We may suppose that he was speaking a word of judgment against Israel but this is just a supposition.

5. However, the Sitz im Leben in the primitive church to which the sayings and the parables spoke in a meaningful way is more obvious. Verse 26 has to be seen against the backdrop of a situation undoubtedly very common in the primitive church: the division that Christianity created in many Jewish families. Verse 27 speaks of a situation that was common in the early days of the Christian faith: the suffering, persecution and death on the part of the disciple for the sake of Christ. In view of all this, it was necessary to count the cost before starting on the path of discipleship. Thus the twin parables are a word of admonition, a warning against rash, hasty decisions on the part of would-be believers. The salt saying is a word of judgment directed against those who have the marks of discipleship and dare to surrender them. They are useless; and therefore will be cast out. There were, indeed, many who had started on the so-called Way, only to retrace their steps. This was undoubtedly true of the primitive church. Whoever, therefore, has hears, let him hear.

*Jewish families only?*

## B i b l i o g r a p h y

- Bultmann, Rudolf. Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition. Göttingen: Vondenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957.
- Creed, John Martin. The Gospel According to St. Luke. London: Macmillan & Co., 1950.
- Dibelius, Martin. From Tradition to Gospel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Message of Jesus Christ. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939.
- Dinkler, Erich. "Jesu Wort vom Kreutztragen," in Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolph Bultmann. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1957.
- Easton, Burton Scott. The Gospel According to St. Luke. New York: Charles Scribners, 1926.
- Eltester, W. (ed.) Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolph Bultmann. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1957.
- Gilmour, S. MacLean. The Gospel According to St. Luke. Vol. VIII: Interpreter's Bible. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952.
- Hauck, D. Friedrich. Das Evangelium des Lukas. Leipzig: A. Deicherstsche, 1934.
- Jeremias, Joschim. The Parables of Jesus. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955.
- Johnson, Sherman E. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. Vol. VII: Interpreter's Bible. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951.
- Legrange, Le P. M.-J. Evangile selon Saint Luc. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie., 1948.
- Smith, B. T. D. The Parables of the Gospels. London: Cambridge University Press, 1937.
- Taylor, Vincent. The Gospel According to St. Mark. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1953.