

Reading Q 14:26 in Capernaum: Examining the Social and Economic Implications
of the Imperative to Hate

By

Savoula Stylianou

An Essay submitted to the Graduate Program in Religious Studies
in conformity with the requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts

Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada

August 2015

Abstract

The intention of this study is to ask questions about the initial reception of Q 14:26. In this logion, Jesus instructs his listeners to “hate” (*μισεῖν*) members of their families if they want to be his disciples. Previous scholarship has minimized the severity of the verb, *μισεῖν*, and, on the whole, offers incomplete readings of the verse that accept “hate” to be a shift in mental capacity instead of social, economic, or professional action. This study “reads Q 14:26 in Capernaum” by outlining features of a typical household in first-century Capernaum and then exploring how various members of this household might have responded differently to this logion. Scholarship needs to be self-reflexive in its reading of Q 14:26 in order to shed light on these kinds of active ramifications of hatred – the ones discussed in this study being consequences for education practices, burial rituals, divorce rights, and fiscal matters.

Acknowledgements

The version of this Master's Research Paper without the assistance, encouragement, and enthusiasm of Dr. Richard Last would have been a poor display of scholarship indeed. I am grateful I enrolled in Dr. Last's first class at Queen's only to have been bitten by the bug of New Testament studies, due in no small part to the way he taught the material. I have no doubt that any future endeavour on an academic path will have to do with the positive and enriching experience I have had working with Dr. Last. It was a first time collaboration of this nature for us both, and I am quite proud of the end result as presented in this study.

Thank you to Dr. Callie Callon for being the second reader of this study, and for always being available with a kind word or piece of advice.

I have found this same kindness in the entire Religious Studies department, who have my appreciation for a wonderful five years at Queen's University filled with immeasurable growth. I specifically want to thank Dr. Richard Ascough for his warmth, and the other members of the Early Christian research group, including Dr. William Morrow, for their insight into the field.

I was lucky enough to have three strong female role models to admire and learn from in this department in Dr. Pamela Dickey Young, Dr. Mari Rethelyi, and Dr. Forough Jahanbakhsh. Thank you for your individual guidance, which has meant a great deal to me, especially this year.

The Religious Studies department also afforded me the opportunity to become a teacher, an experience that turned out to be one of the most rewarding of my life. Thank you to Dr. John Young and Dr. Aditi Sen for supervising my expedition into teaching, and providing prudent guidance and a great deal of fun along the way.

Having fun was an unexpected, but treasured outcome of this program, and I could not have gotten by without the fun had with my friends Ryan Amez and Elizabeth Guthrie. They have had to listen to my taste in music in the office and my grousing outside the office. Ryan, my partner in mediocrity, thank you for laughing with me and consistently ensuring I did not take myself too seriously. Liz, it was my lucky day when you decided to sally out of Victoria and come do a Master's at Queen's – your calming influence has been all too necessary on my most manic days.

This frenzy was experienced most arduously by my family, who are my pillars of strength. The completion of this project was largely contingent on the conquering of oftentimes crippling self-doubt, and no two people have helped me more this year than my parents. They talked me down from the proverbial ledge and convinced me that joining the circus instead of finishing this program was not a feasible option, no matter where I insisted my talents lay. Baba and Mom, thank you for your faith in me. Yaya and Papou, knowing I am making you proud is reason enough to have overcome the hurdles and successfully made it through this program.

To everyone else who has shaped my journey this year in any small part, thank you.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	2
Acknowledgements.....	3
Introduction.....	6
1. Introduction.....	6
2. Theory and Methodology.....	9
3. Overview of Chapters.....	10
I. Chapter 1: Rethinking Ethnicity and What Makes up a Group.....	14
1. Introduction.....	14
2. Overviewing the Case of Ethnicity in Galilee.....	15
3. Emphasizing Ethnicity and Groups.....	22
4. Narrowing the Focus to Communities and Households.....	25
II. Chapter 2: Exploring the Semantic Range of <i>μσεῖν</i>.....	29
1. Introduction.....	29
2. Reviewing Previous Scholarly Interpretations.....	30
3. Looking to the Use of <i>μσεῖν</i> in Ancient Inscriptions and Papyri.....	40
4. Highlighting the Incompleteness of Previous Interpretations of <i>μσεῖν</i>	47
III. Chapter 3: Reconstructing a House in Capernaum.....	54
1. Introduction.....	54
2. Situating the Q People as Village Scribes around Capernaum.....	55
3. Creating a Picture of a House in Capernaum.....	59
4. Theorizing the Structure of Family/ies.....	65
5. Understanding <i>μσεῖν</i> in Light of Education.....	67

6. Understanding *μισεῖν* in Light of Burial Practices.....70

7. Understanding *μισεῖν* in Light of the Institutions of Marriage and Divorce.....72

8. Understanding *μισεῖν* in Light of Economic Standing.....76

9. Applying Brubaker and Stowers’ Theories to Families in Capernaum.....82

Conclusion.....84

Bibliography.....89

Introduction

1. Introduction

Among the questions surrounding the Q Gospel are queries about the author(s)' intended audience and their reaction upon hearing the words attributed to Jesus in the Sayings Gospel. After overviewing William Arnal's identification of the Q people as Galilean village scribes, this study will examine Q 14:26 in order to glean information about how the verse was heard and applied in the individual lives of members of a household.¹ This study will deal specifically with family life in first-century Galilee, where Q was likely composed. Q 14:26 can be found in the "sapiential" or "formative"² stratum of Q, which includes six wisdom speeches.³ John S. Kloppenborg proposes a compositional history of Q that involves "two sets of Q materials," namely "Q¹ or the 'formative stratum' and Q², 'the main redaction'."⁴ In this particular verse that is found in the sapiential layer, Jesus instructs that those who do not "hate" (*μισεῖν*) father, mother, son, and daughter cannot be his disciples. The IQP translation of the Greek reads:

"The one who, does not hate father and mother cannot be my disciple; and the one who, does not hate son and daughter cannot be my disciple."⁵

The verse has parallels in the *Gospel of Thomas* 101 and 55:1-2. The Q text itself can be found in redacted forms in Matthew 10:37 and Luke 14:26.

¹ In support of Kloppenborg's suggestion that the author(s) of Q were *κοιμογραμματεῖς* (village scribes), see William E. Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes: Galilean Conflicts and the Setting of Q* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2001), 41, in which he argues that the composite document of the Sayings Gospel had the stylistic tendencies to be written by a literate and fairly educated man living in antiquity.

² For Kloppenborg's differentiation of "formative" and "main" redactions of Q, see John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2000), 145.

³ Kloppenborg's list of instructional material that he places in the first stratum of Q can be found in *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 342-5. For a more recent analysis of the compositional history of Q, see Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 112-53.

⁴ Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating*, 145; cf. pp.143-65.

⁵ Editorial Board of the International Q Project, "The Sayings Gospel Q in English Translation," n.p. 2001. Online: <http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~kloppen/iqpqet.htm>.

Following the research of John Kloppenborg, William Arnal, Giovanni Bazzana, and Sarah E. Rollens, this study identifies the Q people as a network of village scribes from Galilean villages.⁶ As Arnal suggests, public scribes would meet certain requirements for textual authorship, such as their levels of education,⁷ which would have equipped them with the abilities to create an “instructional” document focused on Jesus.⁸ Arnal’s description of the Q authors provides an alternative to the itinerancy model first articulated by Gerd Theissen in the 1970s.⁹ A brief overview of both the itinerancy hypothesis and the opposition to that hypothesis as presented in the argument for the Q authors being village scribes will be presented in the first section of Chapter Three of this study.

Arnal has suggested that during the earliest days in which the Q document was being written (the 40s and 50s CE),¹⁰ the village scribes would have been reacting against increasing debt and the restructuring of village administrations that was occurring in various Galilean villages at the time.¹¹ In this vision, the authors were faced with experiencing a new social order

⁶ For further exploration into the placement of the Q author(s) as (a) village scribe(s), see John S. Kloppenborg, “Literary Conventions, Self-Evidence and the Social History of the Q People,” *Semeia* 55 (1991): 77-102; Giovanni Bazzana, *Kingdom and Bureaucracy: The Political Theology of Galilean Village Scribes* (Leuven: Peeters, 2014); and Sarah E. Rollens, “The Identity of Q in the First Century: Reproducing a Theological Narrative,” in *Failure and Nerve in the Study of Religion* (eds. William Arnal, Willi Braun, and Russell McCutcheon; London: Equinox, 2012), 177-191.

⁷ Arnal observes that Q authors “are educated and who think of themselves as – and are – learned beyond the ancient norm but who, at the same time, do not occupy the pinnacle of the learning antiquity had to offer.” They, in the least, had familiarity with teaching situations and the mechanisms of law courts and had the writing abilities to be able to stylize male and female couplings, for example. For more on education and the Q people, see Arnal, *Village Scribes*, 170-1.

⁸ For a description of this genre, and for an identification of Q¹ as instructional material, see Kloppenborg, *Excavating*, 154-59.

⁹ The itinerancy model of Q’s authorship has at its centre the Mission Charge found in both Q1 and Q2. It focuses on not only the author(s) traveling from place to place, but assumes the audience will do the same, without taking into account the social and economic impact of doing so.

¹⁰ The reasoning behind this is that the Q Gospel “betrays no overt awareness of the destruction of the Temple by Titus in 70 C.E.,” therefore Arnal argues for an earlier dating of Q before the war. His argument can be found in *Village Scribes*, 165-8; 172.

¹¹ With the creation of two new cities, Sepphoris and Tiberias, under Roman rule in Galilee, a culture of consumption instead of production became the norm in the area, leaving communities like the Q people to deal with difficulties such as the loss of local autonomy and the transfer and centralization of wealth and power to the two new

that was not only unappealing, but also unjust. It is prudent for those feelings to be taken into account in reading Q in order to be able to contextualize the words in a more effective manner.

Since it has been suggested that the Q people inhabited and worked in Galilean villages,¹² this study will use Capernaum heuristically to raise new questions about Galilean village *hearers* of Q 14:26. The study will place Q in a specific social and economic setting through a literature review of Q's provenance before moving on to use the lens of this setting in the inspection of this specific verse in the Q text.

It will then be possible to discover the ramifications of hearing Q 14:26 for different members of a typical household in first-century Capernaum. This study will examine households in that particular village because Q might have been written and heard in a Galilean village whose economic and social situation was similar to the one in Capernaum.¹³ Some observations will be proposed about inhabitation practices in Capernaum houses, and how Q 14:26 would have been understood differently by various different kinds of inhabitants in the typical first-century Galilean village house.

This study will also appeal to the work of Rogers Brubaker in order to rethink the makeup of a family unit. Brubaker's theoretical framework allows us to question how even the members of an ethnically coherent group, such as a household in first-century Capernaum, might have heard Q 14:26 differently. This will help to determine what it would have meant for each

cities. A detailed account of the negative impact of urbanization on the cities in first-century Galilee can be found in Arnal, *Village Scribes*, 146-155.

¹² For early contributions to this position that have set the stage for further analysis of Q's possible setting in the Galilee, see, for example, Jonathan L. Reed, "The Social Map of Q," in *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q* (ed. John S. Kloppenborg; Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity International Press, 1995), 17-36.

¹³ For the identification of Capernaum as a village, see David A. Fiensy, "The Galilean Village in the Late Second Temple and Mishnaic Periods" in *Life, Culture, and Society* (eds. David A. Fiensy and James Riley Strange; vol. 1 of *Galilee in the Late Second Temple and Mishnaic Periods*; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2014) 177-207.

person within the household (based on factors like gender, occupation, age, and social status) to “hate” their families, an action that would have functional, as well as emotive repercussions.

The traditional reading of Q 14:26 will be called an “emotional” interpretation of the verse. This typical reading is characterized by understanding Jesus to have called for an abnegation from the world’s earthly ties in favour of a spiritual connection to God and the promise of eternal salvation.¹⁴ This study will aim to discover what the social and economic repercussions of the command to “hate” (*μισεῖν*) the family were in households of first-century Capernaum.

2. Theory and Methodology

This study applies to Q Peter Oakes’ social-historical methodology for analyzing the earliest reception of Paul’s letter to the Romans.¹⁵ Oakes analyzed archaeological data from first-century Campanian towns, Pompeii and Herculaneum, in order to construct a range of typical living situations that Paul’s initial listeners in Rome might have shared. He then provided an innovative new analysis of how Romans might have been heard, informed by the material conditions of the people who heard it.

The present study will overview the social and economic context of the Galilean town, Capernaum. It will then explore typical housing conditions in this village. This will help me methodologically to gauge how Q 14:26 might have been heard by residents in Capernaum, particularly, how the social and economic ramifications would have been understood by a member of a household instructed to “hate” their families, taking into account what roles each

¹⁴ O. Michel, “μισέω,” *TDNT* 4: 683-694 (690)

¹⁵ See Peter Oakes, *Reading Romans in Pompeii: Paul’s Letter at Ground Level* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009).

individual played in the household and what their daily activities would look like if one person abandoned the family.

3. Overview of Chapters

A paramount feature of this study is the discussion of the makeup of a household in first-century Galilee. In order to try to understand how Galileans would have understood the implications of Q 14:26 to their individual lives, it is crucial to have a working description of the average Galilean village household, and how familial networks provided individuals with their needs for survival. Chapter 1 will first look to arguments for a largely mixed population in Galilee of both Gentiles and non-Gentiles before building upon Mark A. Chancey's argument that Galilee was dominantly, though not exclusively by any means, populated by Judeans.¹⁶ This will provide a basis in which to discuss the ethnicity of households in Galilee during the time Q was being written.

Theoretical contributions by Rogers Brubaker will also be examined in Chapter 1 for their assistance in thinking about ethnicity and coherence in groups, such as households. What is especially pertinent to this study is his work on what he calls *groupness* – arguing that not only do previous assumptions about how groups come together need to be called into question, but also arguing that identical ethnicities do not constitute identical goals, ideals, or relationships between members. Imagining groupness as variable leads the way for more to be discovered about the levels and consequences of groupness that can be applied to a specific instance, and

¹⁶ Chancey's contribution in *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee: The Population of Galilee and New Testament Studies* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002) engages with conclusions reached by scholars like Richard A. Horsley, someone who, while accepting that Galilee might have been Judean in population (at least to some degree) has also written that it is ultimately difficult to determine in any definite measure the presence of Judeans in Galilee in the first or second centuries. See Richard A. Horsley, *Archaeology, History and Society in Galilee: The Social Context of Jesus and the Rabbis* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996), 95.

this is “to treat groupness as an *event*, as something that ‘happens’,”¹⁷ rather than a predetermined factor. An example of this would be the verbalization of an instruction to a specific group in a household to figure out how that kind of group would have heard and understood the words. It is then possible to move the discussion to the grouping of families, who were ethnically coherent in the ancient world, but may not have had the same ideologies or aspirations. Moreover, the study will apply the work of Stanley K. Stowers to discuss groups in early Christianity and how they are related to one another.

Chapter 2 of this study will then go on to explore the semantic range of the ancient Greek word for “hate,” which is *μισεῖν*. This will be done by looking at different inscriptions and papyri in which the word was used during the time. In comparing the parallels of the same verse across the canonical books of Luke and Matthew, what can be observed is that the preservation of the verb “hate” from Q in Luke 14:26 specifically presents this particular condition of discipleship from Jesus in a much more radical view than it does in Matthew 10:37, which does not use the word “hate.”¹⁸ Lukan commentaries fairly consistently produce interpretations of the verse that recognize the way in which family and household were the basis of identity and status in the ancient world, but do not go into enough detail about what giving up those aspects would truly mean in the everyday lives of individuals.¹⁹ Delving further into the semantic range of *μισεῖν* will also allow the study to focus on a problem often related to not just the Q Sayings Gospel, but the

¹⁷ Rogers Brubaker, “Ethnicity without Groups,” *European Journal of Sociology* 43.2 (2002): 163-189 (168).

¹⁸ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (The Anchor Bible; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981), 1062.

¹⁹ For example, see John T. Carroll, *Luke: A Commentary* (The New Testament Library; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012), 307. Carroll addresses the crucial nature of households for the preservation of income and status, but sheds more light on the author of Luke’s priority of the realm of God, hence the need for his strong, hyperbolic language like the inclusion of the word “hate.” See also Sharon H. Ringe, *Luke* (Westminster Bible Companion; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 201. Ringe also acknowledges importance of family and the household with no mention of what a renouncement or forced detachment from these family members would mean in the functional sense of the daily activities of each member of the household.

study of Christian origins more widely. It will be demonstrated that previous interpretations of *μισεῖν* have been based in an apologetic incompleteness outlined in Jonathan Z. Smith's *Drudgery Divine* in which scholars attempt to protect the pristine origins of early Christianity, for example, by minimizing the use of words like "hate" in the New Testament.²⁰

Chapter 3 will see this study reconstruct a typical Galilean village household in Capernaum in order to apply this new "functional" reading of Q 14:26 to individual members of the family. This will shift the scholarly focus away from the interpretation of "hate" that has been lessened to be identical to Matthew 10:37's "love less,"²¹ and point out why this placement of a lighter temperament of the verb provides an incomplete picture of what it means to hate in the context of the first-century Galilean household. Four areas of village life will be discussed in particular for the possible ramifications that hating the family would have had on their practices: the matters of education, burial rituals, divorce rites, and monetary transactions. While a previous interpretation of *μισεῖν* has been interpreted as calling for a shift in devotion or allegiance, this final section will display the previously ignored active ramifications of hating the family. With respect to education, if parents hated the family, then both sons and daughters would be left without religious or academic teaching. If spouses hated one another or if children hated their parents, the individual would be left without the proper epitaph or burial service attributed to them in their passing. Interestingly, if a woman hated her husband she could divorce him, just as he could do the same to her, leaving the family with the loss of money and honour. Finally, if an individual hated the family, they could leave that family with a debt not originally

²⁰ Jonathan Z. Smith, *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 44.

²¹ Ian Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (The New International Greek Testament Commentary; Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1978), 592. For an expansion of the conception "to love less," in this particular context, see Craig Keener, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009), 330. Keener lists other pieces of Judean literature where this translation of "love less" can be found; in Rab 51:8, for example.

their own, or that individual could be forced to leave their trade guild and cut the social and economic ties that association membership provided, leaving the rest of the family potentially in turmoil. In these particular circumstances, stake would have been not only the monetary income for the household, but also the upkeep of the honour of the family within the household. These are examples of considerations for how Q 14:26 might have been heard that have not previously been accounted for, but are necessary to consider in order to glean information about the way the verse would have been heard in Galilee.

Chapter 1 Rethinking Ethnicity and What Makes up a Group

1. Introduction

Before delving into the question of how different members of a household would have heard and understood the same message, it is necessary to look at the makeup of a household. In this chapter, I will posit that although households in Galilee were mostly occupied by Judeans, this ethnic coherence would not have generated any sort of single experience of hearing and applying the instruction of Q 14:26. In the case of trying to reimagine Q 14:26 in light of its social and economic ramifications for listeners of the same household, it is crucial to examine the different social, occupational, and economic situations of each household member rather than to assume that an ethnically coherent household, by virtue of members' Judean identity, would experience the verse in an identical way.

Since the focus of this study is on village life in Galilee where Q was written, this section will show the largely Judean makeup of households in these Galilean villages, before looking at the way scholarship has conceptualized ethnicity in the past, and finally using the work of Rogers Brubaker and Stanley K. Stowers to begin to propose a re-imagination of social formations, like households, in which ethnic consistency did not translate to consistency in all other matters. In reference to how scholars read and understand Q 14:26, and Q in general, this study aims to show that factors such as economic and social standing have a direct impact on the *hearing* of the instructions in the verse, and placing Q in a specific context of an ethnically coherent village aids in the further understanding of the implications for people within the village upon hearing the verse.

2. Overviewing the Case of Ethnicity in Galilee

What first needs to be said is that ethnicity in the context of the ancient world is not a fixed and invariable point; rather, it is a fluid category. This is to say that Jewishness or Greekness are not bounded categories – a stipulation that is useful for the purposes of this study in regards to the ethnic makeup of Galilee. Michael L. Satlow recently contributed to the long debate over how the Greek word *Ιουδαῖος* has been used and translated, stipulating that prior to the third century, the term referenced ethnicity, and was best translated as “Judean,” while in other instances, the term has had a religious connotation, and the preferred translation becomes “Jew.”²²

Satlow’s contribution is to show that ethnicity (*ἔθνος*) was just as fluid and problematic a category as “religion” in antiquity. Applying a cultural understanding, Satlow again articulates how ethnicity both in the ancient world and in the modern day could not be thought of as a “static entity,” describing the case that “while ancient authors used the term *ἔθνος* to denote a specific territory, they also used it with a different meaning to indicate a group with a set of distinctive norms (*νομοί*) or customs (*ἔθνη* or *πατριά*). In this sense, too, *ἔθνος* becomes a highly flexible term.”²³ As Satlow conveys, and as modern scholarship has shown, ethnicity is a socially constructed category based on public performance, and an unstable category at that. Moving from the theorization of ethnicity to a direct application in the context of Roman Palestine, the question that needs to be addressed is what kind of relationship the Graeco-Roman world had with the Judean world and therefore what can be said about the ethnic makeup of Galilee in particular.

²² Michael L. Satlow, “Jew or Judean?,” in *“The One Who Sows Bountifully:” Essays in Honor of Stanley K. Stowers* (eds. Carolyn Johnson Hodge et. al.; Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2013), 165-175 (165-6).

²³ *Ibid.*

There is a large portion of scholarship that argues for a mixed presence of both Gentiles and non-Gentiles within Galilee. In her chapter titled “The Graeco-Roman Context of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine,” Catherine Hezser cites previous scholarship that has argued for “Hellenistic Judaism” (in the direct words of Martin Hengel) present in Galilee. Indicators of this “cultural infiltration” included Judean ownership of Roman-style bathhouses, Judean visits to Roman theatre performances, and Judean workers’ participation in the production of pagan statues and images.²⁴ Hezser cites Hengel and Saul Liberman’s work as being “instrumental” in proving the definitive influence that the Greco-Roman world had on daily Judean life, looking especially to the behaviour of Judean rabbis and their connection to the social and intellectual life of the Greco-Roman societies. One example of this is rabbis being familiar with the Greek language. Another example from rabbinic literature shows that rabbis were also familiar with pagan festivals and customs.²⁵ It can be seen historically that pagans did live in Galilee, in places like Magdala, which had a Greek hippodrome.²⁶ Furthermore, Isaiah’s reference to a “Galilee of the Gentiles” as seen in verse 8:23 (9:1) can attest to a presence of Gentiles in the late eighth century BCE, with further references to the “Galilee of the Gentiles” being seen in LXX Isaiah 8:23; LXX Joel 4:4; 1 Maccabees 5:15; and Matthew 4:15.²⁷

Historically, the argumentation for a predominantly non-Judean Galilee (as summarized largely by Chancey in his book *Myth of a Gentile Galilee*) dictates that as the Assyrians carried the Israelites away, Galilee was depopulated of its Judean presence and those that came to

²⁴ Catherine Hezser, “The Graeco-Roman Context of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine* (ed. Catherine Hezser; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 28-47 (37-8).

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 43.

²⁶ More evidence of a Hellenic influence during the time of Jesus can be found in the Gospels when Jesus refers to scribes, courts, and the *agora* in Matthew 5:21-26/Luke 12:57-59 and Matthew 11:16-17/Luke 7:32.

²⁷ Chancey, *Myth*, 15. The verse in Matthew is of particular significance for noting the existence of a large number of Gentiles living in Galilee in the time of Jesus.

inhabit the land were Gentiles. Furthermore, Josephus writes in *Antiquities* 13.318ff that Galilee remained outside of the Judean sphere until Aristobulus I conquered it in 103 BCE and began his attempts to make the area Judean again.²⁸ Further evidence for a mixed ethnic population in Galilee is especially shown in the divide between archaeological discoveries from Upper and Lower Galilee.²⁹ In his review of previous literature on the debate surrounding the ethnic makeup of Galilee in his book, Chancey references Martin Goodman's analysis of rabbinic texts that shows there was a large Judean presence in Galilee in the time after the Maccabean revolts, and that population would have had interaction with Gentiles if only for continued commercial purposes.³⁰ To that end, both Chancey and Sean Freyne acknowledge that even though the population in Galilee was still predominantly Judean, the fact that there was a Gentile presence in Galilee in the region's margins is also true. This shows a position that has been argued in previous scholarship, one that has been advocating for the presence of a mixed ethnic identity in Galilee in the first century, in which the Judean identity was linked to the Greco-Roman world.

Interestingly, Hezser makes note of one area in which Greco-Roman influence might not have reached Judeans living in Galilee: the domestic sphere. Looking at the cultural and religious traditions of the association groups and their related views of family life, it can be seen that they differ from those that governed the Judean household. For example, the two groups had conflicting views about slaves, wherein Judeans viewed manual labour in a positive light, while Greco-Roman communities saw slaves as having few to no real rights due to their low status in

²⁸ *Ibid*, 16.

²⁹ Eric M. Myers found in his work that due to the lack of Greek inscriptions or mosaics found in the American excavation in the 1970s, Upper Galilee largely rejected Hellenistic influence while Lower Galilee's evidence of inscriptions and mosaics written in Greek shows it was more likely to have been culturally influenced by Hellenism.

³⁰ Chancey, *Myth*, 23.

society.³¹ Chancey takes this position of difference further by making the claim that Galilee was not exclusively, but largely, non-Gentile.

The scholarly debate surrounding whether Galilee was populated mostly with Judeans or a mix of Judeans and non-Judeans can be addressed in one way by looking at how proximity to surrounding cities would have influenced the area, especially with respect to cultural, economic, and law systems. It is Chancey's position that "for the most part, Gentiles are low profile-even invisible-in the historical record of first-century Galilee."³² Using writings from the Gospels and Josephus, as well as archaeological data from areas both in Upper and Lower Galilee, Chancey puts forth that the evidence in favour of Judeans being the dominant presence in Galilee is quite strong. Consulting archaeological evidence, Chancey points out several features of the Judean identity that were discovered in Judea and Galilee in his article, "The Ethnicities of Galileans." The pieces of archaeological data Chancey cites support the vision of a major Judean presence in Galilee: two of these discoveries being the seventy *mikva'ot* found in Galilee in the Early Roman period and the twenty-five fragments or whole examples of ossuaries found at Galilean sites.³³ Furthermore, Chancey cites the presence of the basalt-made synagogue in Capernaum in Lower Galilee as an example of distinctly Judean architecture, revealing that "The Gospels imply that synagogues were common in Galilee by the late Second Temple period. As Matthew 9:35 puts it, 'Jesus went about to the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and proclaiming the good news of the kingdom, and curing every disease and every sickness'," (NRSV).

³¹ Hezser, "The Graeco-Roman Context of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine," 39.

³² Chancey, *Myth*, 62.

³³ Mark A. Chancey, "The Ethnicities of Galileans," in *Life, Culture, and Society* (eds. David A. Fiensy and James Riley Strange; vol. 1 of *Galilee in the Late Second Temple and Mishnaic Periods*; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2014), 112-128 (118-20). Chancey describes how the Judean ritual baths first appear in the first century in Sepphoris, Qeren Naftali, Yodefah, and the Golan site of Gamla. He goes on to discuss how ossuaries reached Galilee in the first century after being adopted from Judean neighbours who used ossuaries for secondary burial.

Arguments in favour of a dominantly Judean population in Galilea include Geza Vermes' case for a history of Galilee in which it originally had many Gentiles living there, which can again be seen in the textual references to "Galilee of the Gentiles," and the ensuing Assyrian conquest that caused the displacement of several Israelites, but also left members of the group to co-exist with the Assyrians. For Vermes, what marked the shift in Galilean population back to being largely Judean was the Hasmonean conquest and Aristobulus' endeavours to recreate the Judean identity after he conquered the area.³⁴ Chancey observes: "Perhaps no event is as significant for understanding Galilee's subsequent population as Aristobulus' conquest."³⁵ Slightly disagreeing with Vermes' position, Sean Freyne articulates his view that the Assyrian conquest did not displace as many Israelites as scholars previously thought and Aristobulus' conversion attempts with the citizens did not happen because they already identified as Judean. Freyne goes on to express that there is no evidence for Galilean villagers participating in rituals at pagan shrines, leading to the conclusion that they worshipped at their own Judean temple.³⁶

Chancey quotes Josephus in his effort to prove a dominant Judean ethnicity in Galilee when he discusses Josephus' comment in *Antiquities* 15. 328-330 in which he says that Herod did not build pagan temples or *gymnasia* in Judean areas once he conquered the land because the population was largely Judean. The population also received more migrating Judeans after people began to migrate after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE and the creation of Aelia Capitolina after the Bar Kochbah revolt.³⁷ Ed Parish Sanders describes how even with the influence of Hellenism, the social systems of education and law had Judean roots.³⁸ Speaking

³⁴ Chancey, *Myth*, 22-3.

³⁵ *Ibid*, 42. The passage from Josephus where he describes the endeavours of Aristobulus is *Antiquities* 13.318-319.

³⁶ *Ibid*, 25.

³⁷ *Ibid*, 60.

³⁸ Ed Parish Sanders, "Jesus in Historical Context," *Theology Today* 50 (1993): 429-448.

specifically about the presence of *gymnasia* in Galilee, or lack thereof, Sanders grants that there was a Hellenistic presence in the region, but articulates that the relationship might have been one based on shared trade and not a shared common culture, seeing as the staples of a Greek territory, the *gymnasia*, were not present. Even in the case of the city of Sepphoris, a city deemed to be an example of Gentiles and non-Gentiles living together, it did not have a *gymnasia* either, which Chancey declares shows a lack of definitive Hellenistic influence that would oust the idea of a largely Judean population since the *gymnasia* was a “hallmark” of a Greek city.³⁹

Going into more detail about Galilee’s two cities, Sepphoris and Tiberias, one of the strongest indications of a Gentile presence comes from the coins that were manufactured in both Sepphoris and Tiberias. That said, it is Chancey’s position that in an effort to placate surrounding Roman communities, the Judean leaders of the cities had pagan symbols put on the coins. Chancey continues by citing the historical record of the area provided by Josephus,⁴⁰ highlighting the fact that Josephus does not ever speak of Sepphoris as a non-Judean city anywhere in his writing, instead actually describing its refusal to participate in the Revolt as a betrayal of the temple “common to us all.”⁴¹ Finally, Eric Meyers’ excavation work in the area shed light on the fact that even though he called for the recognition of a Hellenistic influence in the multi-ethnic Lower Galilee, he does not directly stipulate that the population in Galilee in the first century was predominantly Gentile in population. Meyers outlines how cities like Sepphoris and Tiberias were in contact with Gentile neighbours to maintain trade relations, but also defends the position that the two cities were predominantly of Judean ethnicity.

³⁹ Chancey, *Myth*, 117.

⁴⁰ This includes Josephus’s account of the Maccabean campaigns in Galilee from *Antiquities* 13.158-162, his retelling of Aristobulus’s conquest and subsequent pursuit for the “Judaization” of Galilee in *Antiquities* 13.318-319, and his comment that under Herod’s Roman rule in Galilee he did not erect pagan temples or Greek gymnasiums as described in *Antiquities* 15. 328-319.

⁴¹ Josephus, *The Life*. 348. Also, there was no evidence found in Sepphoris of a Greek gymnasium, pointing to a lack of definitive Hellenistic influence in the city.

Chancey addresses the potential Gentile presence in Lower Galilee, and it is in the case of Capernaum, the focus of this study in particular, that the Gospels point to the predominant Judean ethnicity in Galilee. Capernaum is a very important place in the Synoptic Gospel texts as it was a key location of Jesus's ongoing ministry, though its specific importance varies from author to author. Chancey remarks that what can be claimed definitively is that "Capernaum had a sizable Jewish population."⁴² Moreover, the basalt structure that lies beneath the limestone synagogue at Capernaum from the first century CE, and the corresponding archaeological evidence of Judean materials in Early Roman contexts, is also a strong indication of the Judean influence in this village specifically.⁴³ The portion of the Synoptic Gospels thought to disprove this is the story of the centurion's servant, as it makes reference to the presence of Roman troops in Capernaum.⁴⁴ However, Chancey asserts that there are very few, if any, rabbinic materials or Roman histories that support this idea, writing that several other scenarios could explain the presence of the Roman troops – one instance being a situation where the soldiers were passing through Capernaum and were not stationed there.⁴⁵ Therefore, Chancey summarizes his point by stating: "Nothing in Josephus or the Gospels suggests that Galilee was primarily Gentile, or even that its population contained a large Gentile minority amongst a Jewish majority."⁴⁶

The above quote perhaps indicates an apologetic attempt on Chancey's part to use Judaism to shield early Christian origins from the greater Greco-Roman world. While it is true that Chancey admits to "various levels of contact between Galilean Jews and Gentiles from surrounding areas" (specifically in border regions) being an inevitability at the time, his position

⁴² Chancey, *Myth*, 101.

⁴³ *Ibid*, 118.

⁴⁴ The story can be found in Matthew 8:5-13 and Luke 7:1-10; it was also taken from the Q text.

⁴⁵ *Ibid*, 102.

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, 119.

remains that Judean roots were strong from the first century onwards. He argues that this is true even in the second century CE when there was a cultural shift in the city of Sepphoris as seen in its coinage which had illustrations of deities such as Capitoline Triad and Tyche.⁴⁷ Chancey goes on to deny a plausible way of knowing from the second century and beyond what an exact, or even approximate, ratio between Judeans and Gentiles would have looked like in Galilee, positing once more that even past the first century in Galilee, “Jews continued to flourish there.”⁴⁸ Chancey’s view might be in line with an apologetic position due to his incomplete consideration of the evidence for a Gentile, or Hellenistic, influence being prevalent in Galilee. The importance of this observation is to recognize the mix of ethnicities in Galilee and not be ignorant of the Greco-Roman presence in Galilee; instead distinguishing from Chancey’s argumentation that a predominant presence of Judeans in Galilee was a strong possibility.

In summary, the villages of Galilee seem to have been of mixed ethnicity, but as Chancey has presented with the help of other scholars, there is a strong case to be made that the population in Galilee, and in Capernaum in particular, was primarily Judean. When considering how Q 14:26 would have been heard by a family in first-century Capernaum, though, what leverage is actually gained by stressing that the family was Judean?

3. Emphasizing Ethnicity and Groups

Rogers Brubaker has done extensive research on ethnicity and conflict; and it is in his specific article titled “Ethnicity without Groups” that he hopes to further his previous work by addressing the specific instances of ethnic conflict. Before he delves into the causes and repercussions of ethnic conflicts around the world with a discussion of a particular case study, Brubaker decides

⁴⁷ Chancey, “The Ethnicities of Galileans,” 122.

⁴⁸ *Ibid*, 124.

to examine the ideas behind what makes a group in the hopes that those answers will lead to a more definitive opinion about the role groups play in ethnic conflicts. He begins his work by outlining the fact that groups have been under-scrutinized in the past. He describes how they have been taken-for-granted because there has been no previous need to question them.⁴⁹ In order to look at this, Brubaker decides to tackle an all-encompassing term as a starting point.

This is what I call groupism: the tendency to take discrete, sharply differentiated, internally homogenous and externally bounded groups as basic constituents of social life, chief protagonists of social conflicts, and fundamental units of social analysis. In the domain of ethnicity, nationalism and race, I mean by ‘groupism’ the tendency to treat ethnic groups, nations and races as substantial entities to which interests and agency can be attributed. I mean the tendency to reify such groups ... as if they were internally homogenous, externally bounded groups, even unitary collective actors with common purposes. I mean the tendency to represent the social and cultural world as a multichrome mosaic of monochrome ethnic, racial or cultural blocs.⁵⁰

Brubaker does recognize that a constructivist approach to ethnicity, as applicable to groups, has been widely used in past scholarship and it allows for groups to be seen as constructed, contingent, and fluctuated. What Brubaker is trying to avoid is defining ethnic conflict by common sense means; by this he means, for example, the assumption that an ethnic conflict is a conflict between ethnicities, something that is not always necessarily the case, just as a racial conflict is not always a conflict between races.

Brubaker’s goal is to re-examine the way that ethnicity has been accepted in the past. He declares that, “Ethnicity, race and nation should be conceptualized not as substances or things or entities or organisms or collective individuals...but rather in relational, processual, dynamic, eventful and disaggregated terms.”⁵¹ In this pursuit, Brubaker is hoping that the focus will switch

⁴⁹ Brubaker, “Ethnicity without Groups,” 163.

⁵⁰ *Ibid*, 164.

⁵¹ *Ibid*, 167.

from trying to pinpoint the identities of ethnic groups and instead focus on the processes of ethnic groups. Some of the qualifications that he enlists in his rethinking of the ethnic group are: practical categories, cultural idioms, cognitive schemas, discursive frames, organizational routines, institutional forms, political projects, and contingent events. Brubaker makes a key point when he highlights that racial and ethnic groups are not a prerequisite for the existence of race and ethnicity as discourses in the academic field, or for their reality in the world at large. Applying this to the considerations of how scholars have previously conceptualized what a group is allows them to think twice about marrying the subject of ethnicity and ethnic group, when really, what should be studied is the functionality and processes of the group.

Through the use of these new categories in thinking about how scholarship frames the functionality of a group, Brubaker argues for a change from thinking about the ‘group’ as an entity and instead thinking of ‘groupness’ as a fluctuating variable that is present in certain collections of people, and when it is, can mean have different applications depending on the situational factors present at the time. In regards to Brubaker’s inquiry about the consideration of groups in ethnic conflicts, he views this shift from thinking about groups to thinking about groupness as being an effective way to account for periods of extreme solidarity and cohesion among social groups, allowing scholars “to treat groupness as an *event*, as something that ‘happens’.”⁵²

Brubaker proposes key ideas in how to address ethnic conflict that refrains from using the same common sense logic as mentioned above that makes intrinsic connections between the categories of race and ethnicity and racial and ethnic conflicts around the world. He suggests that moving forward, scholars can focus on how categories become institutionalized in administrative

⁵² *Ibid*, 168.

routines and implanted in cultural myths.⁵³ By doing this, he hopes that this can shed light on the ways that ethnicity can exist in its own right without the existence of ethnic groups to be connected to, thus imagining ethnicity without groups, as the title of his article suggests. This postmodern view as articulated by Brubaker does a great service to the continued research into ethnicity, while also giving a specific view into the ways in which not just ethnicity is conceptualized, but also the notion of “group.”

4. Narrowing the Focus to Communities and Households

The focus can now be made more specific to wide-ranging applications of the conceptualizations of ethnicity group. Stanley K. Stowers builds upon Brubaker’s work on ethnicity in his article entitled “The Concept of ‘Community’ and the History of Early Christianity.” Here, Stowers applies previous scholarship about heterogeneity within groups to the picture of early Christian groups in an attempt to question the use of the word “community” in the area of Christian origins. In the article, he tries to get away from the idea that community means something intangible and insubstantial about a collection of people with similar ideas, and moves instead towards the definition of community in terms of its practices. Stowers presents his rejection of the use of the word as it has been laden with negative and historically incorrect connotations in nineteenth and twentieth century scholarship, and instead imagines a definition that is more physically substantive – not to be confused with making the conceptualization have more to do with physical or bodily characteristics. Stowers wishes to “break down these traditional social wholes such as society, community and identity into knowable patterns of human activity.”⁵⁴

⁵³ *Ibid*, 169.

⁵⁴ Stanley K. Stowers, "The Concept of ‘Community’ and the History of Early Christianity," *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion* 23 (2011): 238-256 (244).

Stowers argues that the key to being able to successfully envision the concept of a group is through the breaking down of larger categories of considerations in regards to social configurations. He observes how “a social formation that cannot be broken down into smaller units such as actions and practices that explain the larger formation is a metaphysical entity. Such comfortably useful holisms can stifle explanatory historical and social-theoretical thinking.”⁵⁵ It is the job of the scholar in the future to keep pushing the boundaries of not just the identification of these smaller groupings, like community, but to also question the nature of the groupings; their processes and their functions. Continuing forward and applying Stowers’ contributions to the motivation behind the creation of groups, it is possible to look at a “social formation” that he refers to above that comes in the form of the makeup of a household.

In his article from 2008 titled “Theorizing the Religion of Ancient Households and Families,” Stowers aligns himself with the Smithian argumentation for the comparative method. In his address of the trouble with grouping together the religion of the household and the family, he comments: “If religion of the family is defined as the religion that any member of the family might practice, then all religion is religion of the family, since in theory everyone belongs to a family of some sort.”⁵⁶ This is his basis for wanting a separation between the identity of a group and the functionality of a group, as he declares that due weight must be given to the varying levels of “actual” social relations within a household and within a family. Stowers rejects totalizing ideals like society and social structure in favour of looking at the processes within social formations and groupings, as he sees most of human life to be built upon the continued

⁵⁵ *Ibid*, 249.

⁵⁶ Stanley K. Stowers, "Theorizing the Religion of Ancient Households and Families," in *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity* (eds. John P. Bodel and Saul M. Olyan; Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Limited, 2008), 5-19 (5).

reproduction of learned practices, which he describes as “practical skilled assembled and linked in characteristic ways that are passed down from generation to generation.”⁵⁷

This being said, there is still a need to examine the interconnected nature of the identity of these practices, and how social economic practices within a household, like the different jobs each member of a household might have had, were effected by external economic and political systems. Specifically in antiquity, Stowers describes why it is important to recognize how “codes of hospitality and patterns of inclusion, exclusion, and differentiated participation defined degrees of membership and relatedness to the family,”⁵⁸ within the structure of the household and how determinants like gender, age, and social situation also impacted each individual member. The basis of what Stowers is saying about the way in which families and households need to be theorized in the ancient context is that questions of a comparative nature need to be asked to create a clearer picture of each individual member, i.e. what the political and strategic aims of each member, including women and slaves, was; and what the patterns of interaction between members within the household and within the family, and external to those structures looked like. To sum up, a comparative examination of the individuals within these structures would shed more light on the different ways that each person would react to different situations, such as hearing an instruction to hate the social formation that one is a part of. These considerations are important due to the nature of the argument that the Q people were village scribes that will be adapted and used in this study, as the economic changes that occurred under Roman rule had an indelible effect on the feeling of displacement among the Q people.

This review of previous considerations of ethnicity has provided a basis for how scholars can imagine how Q 14:26 might have been heard by members of a household. It has shown that

⁵⁷ *Ibid*, 9.

⁵⁸ *Ibid*, 11.

even in an ethnically coherent household, there are still differences in the beliefs and practices of each member within the household, and therefore there also would have been differences in the way members of a household experienced Q 14:26. Moving forward, this study will aim to display these different ways that the verse would have been heard and understood. The next section of this study will be able to go into more detail about how an ethnically coherent house in Galilee would hear the words of Q 14:26 in different ways by looking to the use of the verb *μισεῖν*. Now that it has been established that there was a variation in the practices of each member of a household, the study will look to previous interpretations of the verse to provide a basis for how and in what context the verse has been understood in the past, thus paving the way for the verse to be understood in a new way.

Chapter 2 Exploring the Semantic Range of *μισεῖν*

1. Introduction

Continuing on from the discussion of the ethnic makeup of Galilee, this study will now move forward to examine previous ways in which the word *μισεῖν* has been used and understood. As was discussed in the introduction, this study will adopt the premise that the Q people were village scribes in its placement of the Q authors in their social and economic context in order to understand how hearers of Q 14:26 might have reacted to the instruction to hate. The next chapter of this study will go into more detail about why the conception of the Q people as village scribes is more plausible (in the opinions of Kloppenborg and Arnal)⁵⁹ than the itinerancy model for placing the Q authors in their proper milieu, particularly in Capernaum. Before delving into that specific community, it would be prudent to provide a philological examination of *μισεῖν* in the broader setting of both modern scholarship on the use of the word and ancient writings that employ the word for hate.⁶⁰ The benefit of this examination is the consideration of the varied social and economic implications for each individual member of the household told to hate, which would be vastly different for a father, mother, child, or slave.

The use of *μισεῖν* in the setting of Q 14:26 has previously been understood in an emotional way – this means that commentators generally observe that in order to become disciples, one must not hate their family in the traditional sense of declaring outright animosity towards them, but simply love them less than they love Christ. What will become apparent in this

⁵⁹ See Arnal, *Village Scribes*, 101 for his articulation of the socioeconomic context of the Q authors.

⁶⁰ While both parallel chapters to Q 14:26 in the Gospel of Thomas (55 and 101) use the word *μισεῖν*, it is not within the scope of this study to delve into the interpretation of the two passages as they are found in chapters 55 and 101. For a fuller explanation of how the two Gospel of Thomas passages are dependent on the Lukan and Matthean verses discussed in the study, see Harry Fledderman, “The Cross and Discipleship in Q,” *SBLSP 27* (1988): 472-482 (480).

chapter's literature review is that previous scholarship on this particular verse mostly, though not unanimously, adopts this emotive rendering of the use of the word *μισεῖν* when interpreting Q 14:26. What is left to be desired is a more substantial explanation in the interpretation of the verse of what it means to hate the family in social and economic terms, beyond the instruction to place one's loyalties to the family to one side, and to have an allegiance to Christ exclusively.

This chapter will explore both inscriptions and papyri from the ancient world in an attempt to view the semantic range of uses of *μισεῖν* as it was employed by both elite and non-elite authors. The problem with the way that previous scholarship has interpreted the use of *μισεῖν* lies in its focus on the feelings the word evokes, rather than the social and economic consequences it would entail. It is through a survey of the semantic range of the verb *μισεῖν* that a possibility arises for an emphasis to be placed on potential incompleteness in past scholarship that has discussed the instructions in Q 14:26; and moving the focus to a new reading of the verse, taking into consideration these findings from ancient papyri and inscriptions, might be able to present a more complete picture of how Q 14:26 would have been heard.

2. Reviewing Previous Scholarly Interpretations

The study will first review previous scholarship on Q 14:26 as it appears in Luke and has been redacted by Matthew. In Matthew, verse 10:37 reads as follows:

Whoever loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and
whoever loves son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me (NRSV);

In Harry Fledderman's view, the verse should be read with the knowledge that the hearers of Matthew 10:37 are already considered to be disciples;⁶¹ however, the framing of the verse

⁶¹ Fledderman, "Cross and Discipleship in Q," 475. Arguing for the position that the audiences in Matthew were not restricted to Christ-believers based in Antioch, Richard Last argues that the literacy of the gospel writers in general would have connected the authors to a larger social network of fellow educated writers in the community, comprised

dictates that they must still show themselves ‘worthy’ (ἄξιος) of Jesus. The fact that Matthew omits Q’s *μισεῖν* from his text points to the possibility that Matthew regarded *μισεῖν* as too strong a descriptor for disciples’ ideal relationships with their biological families.⁶² Aubrey Argyle puts forth the interpretation that just as a sword divides, so too do the teachings of Jesus. Argyle posits: “Christ must come first. The disciple’s love of Christ must exceed his love even of his nearest relatives and lead him to brave self-denial.”⁶³ The commentator goes on to use the metaphor of a battle to describe the quest for Jesus’s truth, in which men will take sides and families will inevitably be divided. This imagery helps to create a picture of a tangible separation between family members, but does not provide a description of what that separation realistically entails socially and economically. It is unclear whether loving Christ more meant leaving the household permanently to live with Jesus from then on, or if loving Christ more simply indicated a change of heart and an increase in adoration for Jesus over the members of the family.

Ulrich Luz’s commentary on Matthew discusses the author’s confirmation of the importance of familial love, as also portrayed in Matthew 15:3-6 and 19:19,⁶⁴ but also stipulates that if a conflict were to arise that left a decision to be made between continued discipleship to Christ or devotion to one’s family, then the correct decision is again to love Christ more than the family, more than anyone else, and, finally, more than the self. Luz recognizes the verse as a radical instruction by Jesus but suggests that for him, discipleship and familial attachments were

of both Christ-believers and non-believers. See Richard Last, "The Social Relationships of Gospel Writers," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 37.3 (2015): 223-252.

⁶² Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Sacra Pagina; Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1991), 153. Harrington goes on to say that the content of the Matthew 10:37 verse comes from the preceding 10:34-36 verses that make the point of articulating how a decision for Jesus has the definite possibility of permanently tearing apart family ties. The use of the word “ties” in the commentary does not go into detail about how familial connections affected someone’s social or economic standing at the time, and the permanent rending of these ties, as Harrington describes, could have far more grave repercussions than loving the family less than Jesus.

⁶³ Aubrey William Argyle, *The Gospel According to Matthew* (Cambridge Bible Commentary; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 83.

⁶⁴ Ulrich Luz et al., *Matthew: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Press, 1989), 112.

irreconcilable.⁶⁵ In specific relation to men, Q 14:26 is typically read as a call to abandon the family, including one's wife and children, as they are deemed be a hindrance and a "comfortable solution" that a true disciple of Jesus cannot fall back on.⁶⁶ Luz goes on to say in his commentary that it is the belief of Jesus that there should be an internal willingness on the part of the disciple to follow him more than to love your family, and this abnegation is dependent "not so much in deed (*in actu*, as they say), but in intention (*in affectione*)."⁶⁷ This shows the way in which familial ties are undercut and made to be much less important in comparison to the ties to Jesus.

According to Luz, the most pure way to fulfill this command of denial of family and self is through the militant lifestyle of monasticism. On this path, it is deemed ideal for a male in the ancient world to live on his own and follow Jesus, which Luz explains is "characteristic of the perfect way;" while the man who is taken in by a wife and remains with the family is characteristic of "the secondary way."⁶⁸

What is missing from Luz's commentary is an explanation of the ramifications for a woman to enter into the radical lifestyle of monasticism. The commentary does not explicitly state that only men could become ascetic disciples, which was not the case at the time,⁶⁹ but it fails to contextualize what it would have meant for a woman to break away from the confines of the public and private dichotomy that ruled the ancient world, an action that would have

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* For other references to the irreconcilable nature of loyalty to God and loyalty to the earthly family, Luz points to Luke 9:60 and Mark 1:20.

⁶⁶ Turid Karlsen Seim, "The Gospel of Luke," in *Searching the Scriptures: A Feminist Commentary* (eds. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Ann Brock, and Shelly Matthews; New York: Crossroad, 1993), 743-760 (755).

⁶⁷ Luz, *Matthew*, 113 (emphasis in text).

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 113.

⁶⁹ While women did have the option available to them to also seek the path of ascetic discipleship, culturally speaking their perfect way of living would have been as a married woman, not a solitary disciple. The same cannot be said of men, because they were called to avoid divorce and remarriage because it was the men who decided whether to enter into marriage contracts or not. Rosemary Radford Ruether explains how "In the Greco-Roman world, for example, there was a misogynist tradition that saw wives as so great a burden that men were better off not marrying at all." See Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Christianity and the Making of the Modern Family* (Boston: Beacon, 2000), 21.

ultimately had more severe consequences for a woman than for a male. This is also true of children and slaves (who are not spoken of specifically in Luz's commentary when he is discussing the path of monasticism in the discipleship of Jesus), but are also able to follow the "perfect way" of monasticism. If they were to pursue that particular way of life, they would definitely need to consider the social and economic implications of not having a family structure to provide not only tangible support with respect to a house and an income, but also social support with respect to fulfilling the cultural requirement of maintaining honour in their individual place in society. It is through the lonely life that one can relate to the love of Christ in the truest fashion, but an emotional reading of the verse leaves several considerations unaccounted for in terms of the members of the household whose best interests may not have lain in the pursuit of abandoning the family.

John Nolland in his commentary makes note of the fact that Jesus can successfully claim to be responsible for the coming of the sword that directly causes the division in families. As a result, familial ties become "relativized in favour of a newly found, more fundamental tie."⁷⁰ This depicts the creation of a hierarchy of allegiance for Jesus's followers that propagates Matthew's same "love less" mentality wherein the individual still considering the family, but only relative to how much they love Jesus.

What is missing in these interpretations of Matthew 10:37 are any mention of what the shrinking of *φίλος* towards the family and the increasing of *φίλος* towards Christ translates to on a social and economic level. Moreover, what implications does the logion have for hearers who were not heads of household? Matthew's version of the Q logion is clearly inclusive of various ranks within the household, as Nolland comments on the fact that Matthew has included

⁷⁰ John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (The New International Greek Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 2005), 441.

mentions of cross-generational relationships, just as he has earlier in the chapter, in verse 35. With respect to verse 37, Nolland observes, “this time he includes cross-gender relationships (using ‘father and mother’ and ‘son and daughter’ as pairs) and views the one addressed in terms of the link to the generation above and the generation below.”⁷¹ Therefore, Nolland’s commentary is cognisant of the fact that familial ties are dependent on one another, but does not move to an explanation of how the relatedness of these pairings does not mean they will react to an instruction to hate in the same manner.

In his analysis of the use of language in Matthew 10:37, Stephen Barton describes how Matthew’s version employs the lessened version of the instruction of the verse when he states: “Whereas Luke’s version speaks of ‘hating’ one’s kinsfolk (Luke 14.26), Matthew has the apparently weaker form of not ‘loving [kinsfolk] more than [me]’ (v. 37).”⁷² The fact that there is a change from “*μισεῖν*-terminology to *φιλεῖν*-terminology,” in comparing the verse as it appears in Luke to the way it appears in Matthew is more than likely, according to Barton, a result of Matthean redaction. Here again, as was seen in Nolland’s commentary, it can be gleaned that Matthew as the author of the Gospel is following the hierarchy of emotion that Matthew 10:37 demands. Barton posits that this shift in terminology “conforms well with the evangelist’s overall concern to distinguish inadequate from adequate forms of love, where *φιλεῖν* is used of the former (cf. 6.5; 23.6; 26.48) and *ἀγαπᾶν* of the latter (cf. 5.43, 44, 46; 19.19; 22.37, 39).”⁷³ This analysis of the chain of allegiance almost firmly established in the reading of Matthew 10:37 shows how Luke 14:26’s “hate” has been read into Matthew’s 10:37 to now be a mark on a scale for loving less or more.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁷² Stephen C. Barton, *Discipleship and Family Ties in Mark and Matthew* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 169.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

Moving on to a discussion of the verse as it appears in Luke, the same conclusions can be reached regarding the incomplete interpretation and understanding of what *μισεῖν* means in the verse. Luke 14:26 reads:

Whoever comes to me and does not hate father and mother,
wife and children, brothers and sisters, yes, and even life itself,
cannot be my disciple (NRSV).

Although Luke's text more straightforwardly conveys social and economic implications of the saying, interpreters seem to follow exegesis of Matthew's version rather than explore alternative routes of interpretation.

For example, in Sharon H. Ringe's commentary, she recognizes the crucial nature of familial ties as they are the "baseline of one's personal security and identity, regardless of one's social position."⁷⁴ She goes on to deny that the use of hate in the verse is meant to describe the emotion that is typically associated with, or deemed to be in itself, hate. Instead, she dictates that the understanding of hate is meant to instruct a shifting of "priority" in the disciple. Furthermore, Q 14:26 is read by scholars like Ringe to have been directed to an audience primarily made up of men, since "husband" is noticeably absent from the text. This omission is due to several reasons, the foremost being that men had the most to gain from the honour of the household and were therefore the target audience for having to abandon said household.⁷⁵ For Ringe, hate means "not being so attached to them that their well-being, or even one's own survival, is one's first priority."⁷⁶ The sense of the word well-being as Ringe is employing it is unclear here, as it could refer to emotional or physical well-being (in terms of health), or it could possibly mean fiscal

⁷⁴ Ringe, *Luke*, 201.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.* Had women heard these words being spoken by Jesus, their social positions would have prevented them from being able to respond to the instruction of "hating," since it was the call of men to love their wives as Christ loves the church, wherein men are equated to Christ and their true love is God. See Rosemary Radford Ruether, "An Unrealised Revolution: Searching Scripture for a Model of the Family," in *Christian Perspectives on Sexuality and Gender* (eds. Elizabeth Stuart and Adrian Thatcher; Leominster, Herefordshire: Gracewing, 1996), 449.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

well-being and the family being in a safe position economically. Ringe's commentary here is not specific enough in its reference to the individual social positions of the members of the household, which is an important consideration depending on who is reliant upon who for the maintenance of individual "well-being," and who would suffer in what specific social or economic way if one individual decided to hate the family, and consequently place the "well-being" of that family at a lesser priority in favour of discipleship.

Joel B. Green, like Ringe, highlights the importance of the familial network in the world of the author of the Gospel of Luke, deeming those connections to be "otherwise paramount". However, if a decision is to be made between Christ and the family, then there must be a shift, and the commitment of the adherent must switch loyalties in what Green calls "a disavowal of primary allegiance to one's kin."⁷⁷ The specific nature of the use of the word "allegiance" is unknown here, and could refer to an allegiance as a promise to stand in battle, but remains unspecified here. The same phrase arises in John T. Carroll's commentary where he outlines the idea that the "hyperbole" of using the specific word *μισεῖν* is not to be understood in light of the "modern usage of the term 'hate',"⁷⁸ where disciples are being told to wish harm upon the members of the family. Instead, Jesus' followers are to "embrace a singular commitment and allegiance to him and to the divine realm into which he is inviting all who would follow him."⁷⁹ In Joseph Fitzmyer's commentary, he accepts the premise that the word "hate" is used only insofar as those who oppose Jesus and his teachings should be hated for the spiritual betterment of the disciple. The disciple must choose how much their loyalty to Jesus is worth, Fitzmyer

⁷⁷ Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (The New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1997), 565.

⁷⁸ Carroll, *Luke*, 307.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.* Carroll refers to Luke 9:59-62 for more information on this "divine realm."

observes, and the choice is one between “natural affection for kin and allegiance to Jesus.”⁸⁰ In his discussion of Q 14:26, Fitzmyer also addresses another key theme that is found repeatedly amongst Lukan commentary authors: the affective understanding of *μισεῖν* exclusively in contrast to the ancient Greek word for love, *ἀγαπᾶν*.

Fitzmyer declares: “From Luke 16:13 one learns that *misein*, “hate,” is the opposite of *agapan*, “love.”⁸¹ To understand the use of *μισεῖν* in this way is limiting because the pair of words for love and hate when put together in a verse as a couplet to exemplify opposing emotions points to an intangible understanding of both words. It is the common insistence of interpreters to see *μισεῖν* and assume its meaning based on its binary opposite word: love, which does not provide information into what the words for love or hate could imply socially and economically for the people performing actions associated with love or hate.

In his commentary on the Greek text, Ian Howard Marshall observes that the verb *μισέω* is said to have a Semitic sense and thus has its roots in several passages of the Old Testament as well.⁸² Marshall points to two other verses in Luke in order to point out the difference in the verbs used, where one has an emotional understanding and the other a social one. Luke 9:23 uses the Greek, *ἀρνέεσθαι*, for the English of “deny,” and as the word is a deponent middle/passive verb, a meaning can be garnered from its use that the sentence is to be comprehended in an inactive manner. On the other hand, Luke 18:29 uses the Greek, *ἀφεῖναι*, (“leave” or “leave alone”), where the action of leaving is seen in the verse as being a social action.⁸³ In the case of

⁸⁰ Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1063.

⁸¹ *Ibid*, 1063. Fitzmyer comments that Luke 6:22 and 27 also see the use of the verb *μισεῖν*. See Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (Sacra Pagina; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), 229, in which he points out this same binary between the Greek words for love and hate as they are often found together in the New Testament. For example, the word for love, or as Johnson pens it, *agapao*, is referenced in Luke 1:71; 6:23, 27.

⁸² Some of the other places in the Old Testament where *μισεῖν* can be found are in: Genesis 19:31-33; Proverbs 13:24; Isaiah 60:15; Malachi 1:2f; and Romans 9:13.

⁸³ Marshall, *Luke*, 592.

μισεῖν, it is clear that there is more than one way to interpret its meaning in a sentence, and in the particular verse of Q 14:26, either in a social or emotive way.

In Harry Fledderman's interpretation of the conditions of discipleship presented in the verses surrounding Q 14:26, he argues that Jesus' instructions to hate the family go so far as to not permit a disciple to leave to bury his dead father. According to the command to hate in Q 14:26, "discipleship must override every human obligation, even the most sacred, and every human bond, even the closest," which Fledderman deems to be carrying a hostility towards the family to an extreme.⁸⁴ By making note of the extremity of cutting all human bonds in specific reference to the disciples being prohibited from participating in communal family rituals like the burial of a family member, Fledderman takes into consideration the social impact of hating the family and abandoning them.

He goes further in his analysis to make the connection to the hatred experienced by the disciples of Jesus, something discussed several times in the Synoptic Gospels.⁸⁵ The understanding here is that each disciple's fate is to be hated, where their future holds an increase of hatred towards them due to their status as Jesus' disciples. Fledderman's interpretation of the demands of discipleship also shows the connection between the life and death of Jesus and the lives and deaths of his disciples. Just as Jesus faced opposition, persecution, and perhaps hatred as well, it becomes inevitable that the disciples will similarly have to face those obstacles. Therefore, what is being asked of the disciple when they are told to hate the list of family members is a requirement for the disciple to "break radically with this world, even to the point of hating parents and children,"⁸⁶ and this definitive separation from the world serves as a "radical

⁸⁴ Fledderman, "Cross and Discipleship in Q," 481.

⁸⁵ See Luke 6:22, 27 and 21:17; Mark 13:13; and Matthew 10:22, 24:9, and 24:10.

⁸⁶ Fledderman, "Cross and Discipleship in Q," 482.

clinging to Jesus,⁸⁷ in light of the fact that hating the family would mean giving up far more than just familial loyalty.

Ernest J. Tinsley's commentary describes how "discipleship means putting the closest family ties in the context of the demands of Jesus,"⁸⁸ but goes further by outlining the inextricable link that is created between Jesus and his followers once they become his disciples, outlining that they share a "common task and a common destiny."⁸⁹ Tinsley directs the focus of Q 14:26 to the inevitable connection between Jesus and his followers. If the logic behind hating the family is that they would inevitably become a distraction from Jesus, then there is an underlying logic that perhaps the family would hate Jesus or hate the family member who hates the family in favour of Jesus. This is why the use of the word *μισεῖν* needs to be understood in a social and economic sense for the tangible changes that disciples had to make in their lives after making the decision to hate the family – just as they hated their families, would they too be hated in the same way one day due to their decision to fulfill the requirements of becoming a disciple? If hating meant pursuing certain actions instead of shifting emotional feelings, then the commentaries on the use of *μισεῖν* in Matthew's and Luke's versions of Q 14:26 do not provide enough clarity about what kind of hatred disciples would face in the future due to the fact that previous scholarly commentaries have leaned towards an intangible and emotional reading of the verse. Moreover, what can be seen by looking specifically to the commentaries on the Matthean redaction of Q 14:26 in comparison to the commentaries on the Lukan version is that a subversion has happened between the two in which Biblical scholars have read Matthew's verse into Luke. They have taken the "love less" rhetoric of Matthew 10:37 and read Luke's "hate" to

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸⁸ Ernest J. Tinsley, *The Gospel According to Luke* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965).

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

have a similar, if not identical, message. Thus the path to an emotional reading of Q 14:26 was paved with not enough discretion used to consider historical context to read the verse for its social and economic ramifications, and that is what this study will aim to rectify.

It has been shown here how previous Biblical commentaries on the use of *μισεῖν* have been largely driven to an understanding of the word based on the feelings it evokes and not the actions that it perhaps requires. This chapter will now move on to look at examples of inscriptions and papyri that have used the word *μισεῖν* to discover a wider semantic range for the word than has been given to it in past Biblical scholarship.

3. Looking to the Use of *μισεῖν* in Ancient Inscriptions and Papyri

This section will expand its reach beyond Biblical literature and move towards other ancient writings that contained the word *μισεῖν* in order to create a more extensive scope for the way in which the word was used and understood. The study will look to passages from authors of both the elite sections and the lower strata of society to discover that “hate” was understood in both an emotional and a social and economic way.

As has been established above, a common perception of the meaning of hate is in direct opposition to the meaning of love, with both evoking feelings of the mind and heart, but not being directly associated to actions of the body. An example of this comes from Polybius’ *Histories*, which he wrote while in Rome and which describes the rise of the Roman Empire from 264-146 BC. In this passage, Polybius describes the wrongful behaviour of a tyrant, exemplified by Philip’s actions, in comparison to the rightful behaviour of a just king. The excerpt reads:

It is the act of a tyrant to inflict injury, and so to maintain his power over unwilling subjects by terror, - hated (*μισεῖν*), and hating (*μισεῖν*) those

under him: but it is the glory of a king to secure, by doing good to all, that he should rule over willing subjects, whose love he has earned by humanity and beneficence.⁹⁰

In the context of the sentence, the use of the word “hate” can be seen as being connected to the word “terror,” and therefore understood as a feeling. Polybius is describing for his audience the feeling of malevolence that their ruler experienced and consequently the fear that the citizens experienced in its wake. Hate here is also being shown as a direct opponent to love – tyrants hate and are hated, while kings love and are loved. This text displays an emotional understanding of *μισεῖν*, and it is pertinent to this study to note that this usage of the word was employed by a member of the elite in society.

In Josephus’ *Jewish War* 2.8, he details the requirements of someone who wants to join a sect of the Essenes. They are put on trial for three years before being allowed admittance, and must adhere to the standards of the sect before taking oaths to join. One excerpt reads:

And before he is allowed to touch their common food, he is obliged to take tremendous oaths, that, in the first place, he will exercise piety towards God, and then that he will observe justice towards men, and that he will do no harm to any one, either of his own accord, or by the command of other; that he will always hate (*μισεῖν*) the wicked, and be assistant to the righteous;...⁹¹

Writing in Rome in 75 CE, Josephus uses the word *μισεῖν* in the text above to show the inactive way in which he views hating. The phrases surrounding the word hate in the sentence project emotive meanings, from the passion of exercising piety to the compliance of observing justice. These are requirements of a moral code for a group member of the Essenes to have rather than commands for action, and so the phrase “hate the wicked” should be understood in the same responsive, but not physically reactive way. Josephus was part of the upper social strata and this

⁹⁰ Polybius, *Histories* 5. 11. 5-9 (Evelyn S. Shuckburgh, Macmillan).

⁹¹ Josephus, *Jewish War*. 2. 8. 7. 136-9 (Thackeray, LCL).

excerpt from his writing shows a trend amongst elite authors in the ancient world in which *μισεῖν* is understood as asking for an emotional reaction instead of a reaction of the body. This is, however, not always the case and there are certain passages from elite writers that can be examined in light of their potential for social and economic ramifications.

Plutarch was a historian writing in the first century from 46 to 120 CE and in his three-volume work titled *Parallel Lives*, he tells the story of the Roman politician Titus Quinctius Flamininus, brother of Lucius Quinctius Flamininus, who lived from 229 BC to 174 BCE and aided in the Roman takeover of Greece. One particular section of the work on Titus Flamininus describes an event where Cato was exiled after disgracing himself at a banquet and in response, his brother Titus became ashamed. Plutarch was writing this in Chaeronea, Boeotia, in Greece and this particular passage from him reads:

Titus, however, was so affected by the misfortune of his brother that he Leagued himself with those who had long hated (*μισοῦντες*) Cato, and after getting the upper hand in the senate, revoked and annulled all the public rentals and leases and contracts which Cato had made, besides bringing many heavy indictments against him.⁹²

In leaguing himself with those who also disapproved of what his brother Cato did, Titus did perform the deeds described above; however, in the context of the use of the word “hated” above, the verb can be read as a feeling of disgust towards Cato, not an action in and of itself against Cato. This shows a reading of the use of *μισεῖν* in the text above that points to the mental capacity towards the disrepute of Cato. This being said, what also needs to be considered in an interpretation of the above passage is the social repercussions of hating as described above. While the use of “hated” above could point to the feelings of Titus toward his brother, it could also be referring to the actions of removing Cato from the court and exiling him before taking the

⁹² Plutarch. *Greek and Roman Lives: Titus Flamininus*. 19. 3. 12-17 (Bernadotte Perrin, Harvard University Press).

actions described in the text, like bringing lawsuits against him. Plutarch was a respected historian and author in Greece and was also a member of the elite social stratum, and this example from the biography of Titus Flamininus shows that the reference to hate here can be understood in both an emotional and social way.

The study will now go from a discussion of pieces written by elite members of society to a discussion of excerpts written by non-elite authors. The passage from Plutarch has shown that it is possible the elites employed not only an emotional understanding of *μισεῖν*, but also potentially adopted a social construction, and the same can be said of the following association inscription, which was written on a slab of white marble in Philadelphia (Lydia, Asia Minor). On the inscription, instructions are written for how the household association dedicated to the god Dionysus should act in order to remain in favour with him and the other gods. The text is from the late second to early first century BCE. The instructions on the inscription include how both men and women should remain faithful to their spouses, because if they do not, they face the wrath of the gods. The inscription reads:

The gods will be merciful to those...who obey and will always give...
them all good things, whatever things gods give to people whom they love.
But if any transgress, the gods...will hate (*μισοῦντες*)...such people and
inflict upon them great punishments.⁹³

Here again what can be seen is the binary opposition of love and hate in a single phrase. In addition to reading the use of the words love and hate to describe the emotions of the gods, the inscription demonstrates the social repercussions of the gods' love or hate of a person.

In contrast to the inscription from Polybius discussed above wherein the dichotomy of love and hate was used to display feelings towards both kind and evil leadership, this inscription shows both that same emotional dimension, but also a further social and economic layer. In their

⁹³ Philip A. Harland, "Divine Instructions for the Household Association of Dionysios," AGRW 121. 31-33:82-84.

article about this specific inscription, Stephen Barton and Richard Horsley make note of the fact that the author, who they deemed to be a well-educated member of a Dionysian cult,⁹⁴ seems to be preoccupied with achieving salvation on earth, hence his commitment to ensuring the rules of the association are followed and the god Dionysus is worshipped in the right way. According to Barton and Horsley, the soteriological beliefs of the author of the inscription are also seen “in the nature of the rewards held out by the gods to those who are faithful in their adherence to the prescriptions, rewards which may be identified in the qualities underlying the names of several of the deities who are being venerated by the cult.”⁹⁵

Therefore, when the slab refers to “love” and “hate,” the meaning that can be gathered is those who follow the rules of the association receive tangible rewards, and those who disobey the rules receive tangible punishments courtesy of the gods. This is an example that stands in opposition to the previous excerpt from Polybius as it shows that the dichotomy of love and hate, or *ἀγαπήν* and *μισεῖν*, can be understood to refer to social implications and not just those tied to feelings.

Continuing on, there are examples of writings from members of the non-elite strata in society that solidify a social and economic construction of *μισεῖν*. By looking at papyri that come from the non-elite strata, and specifically papyri that come from non-elites who lived in the same approximate economic strata as the Q people, what can be seen is a material and active reaction to *μισεῖν*. *P.Oxy. VI 902* is a petition from a citizen named Aurelius Macarius to the advocate Flavius Isaac requesting punishment for a man who wrongfully stole his cattle and sent him to prison for an unproven debt he owed. The Egyptian papyri is from 465 CE and it can be gleaned

⁹⁴ In support of this, the authors discuss how the text on the marble slab lacks any spelling mistakes and is written in correct Koine Greek in an attempt to make it literate. See S. C. Barton and G. H. R. Horsley, “A Hellenistic Cult Group and the New Testament Churches,” *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 24 (1981): 7-41 (11).

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 27.

that the papyrus was written by the person petitioning the court for a judgement, who was a cultivator by trade. The portion of the text that discusses hating is as follows:

I present this petition to your wisdom, begging you to order him to be summoned, first of all bringing about the restoration to me by his excellency of my kine which he tyrannously seized, in the same good condition in which they then were; and for the rest directing that what seems good to your wisdom should be done, and that I be released from my bonds, since I am ready, as aforesaid, to discharge any debt secured in writing. For the perpetrators of injustice are hateful (*μισεῖν*) to the laws, most learned lord advocate.⁹⁶

An interpretation of the section above reads that the criminals hate the laws, and that is why they act in direct opposition to the word of the laws in the community. In the broader sense, perpetrators of injustice take direct action against the order of society in order to create chaos; in the case above, stealing from one man what does not belong to him in the first place. By acting in hatred in relation to the law, the criminals in the ancient world were brought to court in an attempt for justice against the perpetrators to be pursued. This excerpt from a member of the non-elite strata, therefore, exhibits a tangible ramification of hate in the act of committing the crime described in the papyrus above.

P. Oxy. VIII 1151 describes a Christian amulet that was used to ward off illnesses. It is not made clear who penned the Egyptian papyrus, but it is determined that it came from approximately the fifth century. The passage is a plea for the ailing handmaid Joannia to have the fever expelled from her body. The beginning of the excerpt reads:

‘Fly hateful (*μισεῖν*) spirit! Christ pursues thee; the Son of God and the Holy Spirit have outstripped thee. O God of the sheep-pool, deliver from every evil thy handmaid Joannia whom Anastasia also called Euphemia bare.⁹⁷

The specific use of *μισεῖν* in this passage shows an extremity in describing the effects of evils and illnesses invading the body. Having a fever or another kind of ailment was a state of

⁹⁶ *P. Oxy.*, VI, 902. 13-17 (Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, Egypt Exploration Fund).

⁹⁷ *P. Oxy.*, VIII, 1151. 1-14 (Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, Egypt Exploration Fund).

being ill for the individual, but it also had external ramifications as well. For example, someone with a fever might have been contagious and been forced to stay home and avoid going to work, thus losing wages. Another possibility is that a sick person would have had to be secluded in an extreme way and be ostracized from their community if they did not receive treatment – treatment which might have been an expenditure of the household’s funds. That is why the use of the word “hate” as it is read in this inscription is more than just a description of a poor state of mind for the ailing individual, but is also an indicator of the potentially severe social and economic consequences. The excerpt above shows how hating something or someone, in this case the spirit of evil, can account for ensuing active implications.

A final example of an understanding of *μισεῖν* that dictates tangible action instead of shifting emotions can be found in a papyrus from 325 AD in Egypt that details the presentation of a tax evasion case at law that involves an unregistered vineyard owned by a man named Theon. The section of the papyrus that addresses hating reads:

Meanwhile then, since he is introducing a malicious practice and so to speak to outright calumny which the laws and our lords hate (*μισεῖν*), we beg you to order that his attempt be without result for him and that the countercharges brought by him accomplish nothing.⁹⁸

Here, what is being hated is calumny and the text is saying that the law and the gods hate any form of slander. What can be done about this kind of slander comes in the material actions that the law has control over; if the law hates a particular deed, then social and economic repercussions can be handed down to the perpetrators of those evil deeds. This shows that hating in the excerpt above refers to a substantial punishment for tax evasion that goes beyond the social derision of hating, and should instead be understood as the active ramifications if one goes against the law and the gods. The author of this papyrus is not known, but was a member of the

⁹⁸ *P. Princ.* III. 119. 52-59 (A. E. Hanson, ZPE 8).

lower strata. Thus, the last three excerpts from ancient writings have been shown to have a common thread – those written by members of the non-elite strata, and specifically those who were living in the same economic strata as the Q people or people who would have been present to hear Q 14:26, all employ a social and economic understanding of *μισεῖν*.

The inactive mode of understanding *μισεῖν* comes from a background of texts written by the elite who used the word both in an emotional and social construction. That said, excerpts taken from non-elite authors did not seem to adopt the same emotional dimensions in their usage of the word. This points to the fact that the verb can be understood in different ways depending on who is hearing it, just as its understanding is varied depending on who was employing the word in their writing. This problem of a partial comprehension of *μισεῖν* that was addressed in the above section on previous Biblical scholarship's reading of the word can therefore be solved by looking to ancient writings from the non-elite and looking to an active and substantive interpretation of the word; thus proving that *μισεῖν* can be used to evoke the need for action over inaction.

4. Highlighting the Incompleteness of Previous Interpretations of *μισεῖν*

What can be seen in the interpretation of these inscriptions and papyrological sources is that the word *μισεῖν* can be found in a variety of writings from the ancient world; and in some cases it was understood emotionally, while in other cases, socially and economically. The study will now look to some problematic assumptions underpinning the way in which previous Biblical scholarship has tended to understand Q's usage of the word "hate" in an exclusively emotional framework. The fact that many Gospel scholars have interpreted Q 14:26 (and its reception in Matthew and Luke) narrowly might be indicative of a scholarly focus on the theological aspect

of Jesus' teachings. This model neglects the social and historical context from which the text comes.

Another potential assumption that lies at the root of scholarship's predisposition to read Luke's "hate" (*μισεῖ* in Luke 14:26) in the same way as Matthew's "worthy" (*ἄξιος* in Matthew 10:37) is the notion that early Christianity was a wholesome family religion in which families loved one another just as they loved Christ, simply with a hierarchy of that love put in place where biological family members are "loved less" than Christ. In this pervasive model, early Christianity was seen as being a beacon of morality, while antiquarian religions were viewed in the opposite manner; therefore, Christian homes and families were also viewed as the backdrop for virtue.⁹⁹

To refer back to Michel's entry in the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, his analysis of the word "hate" points to this same inclination to read "hate" as a feeling instead of an action. Michel observes: "The term 'hate' demands the separation of the disciple, and the warning not to love anyone or anything more is the test. This abnegation is to be taken, not psychologically or fanatically, but pneumatically and *christocentrically*."¹⁰⁰ The text of the entry agrees largely with what has been summarized above in the survey of Biblical commentaries on Q 14:26 in that the verse is asking for a rejection of all natural ties that the potential disciple has

⁹⁹ In his review of this scholarly proclivity towards viewing the Christian house as "a setting of moral purity," Richard Last cites Arthur Cleveland Coxe's argument that the family household was a symbol of Christian morality that cultivated the family values of members of the family, values which members of mystery cults did not have. These mystery cults were deemed immoral in comparison because while Christ groups met in moral domestic spaces, the mystery cults met in different places. Last goes on to discuss Robert Banks' study in which he makes the case for associations being morally inferior to Corinthian groups on the basis of the Christ groups' frequent employment of kinship metaphors to describe the close-knit familial ties between members. Finally, Roger Gehring also adopts the ideology that the familial connections apparent in the household were equitable to a moral superiority which the association groups of the time were lacking. See Richard Last, *The Pauline Church and the Corinthian Ekklesia: Greco-Roman Associations in Comparative Context* (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 164; Cambridge University Press, forthcoming); Chapter 3: "House and *Ekklesia*."

¹⁰⁰ Michel, *TDNT* 4: 691 (emphasis added).

to their earthly family that could ever stand in the way of them following Jesus. Michel goes on to refer to the use of *μισεῖν* in the verse as a command for “disowning, renunciation, rejection,”¹⁰¹ which are vague descriptions for a word that could have social and economic repercussions. For Michel, “hatred is a human impulse which can and should be transcended and vanquished.”¹⁰² This accurately depicts a comprehension of the use of *μισεῖν* in an emotional sense; as something intangible that can be easily extinguished, like a fleeting feeling. If hatred were to be understood as the abandonment of a person, place, or position (economic or social), then it could not be categorized in the same way as Michel has shown in his entry, as something to be transcended. The focus is instead placed on the emotional attachment to Jesus instead of the actions of cutting attachments to family on earth. The use of the word “christocentrically” above points to a Protestant apologetic partiality that Jonathan Z. Smith argues is prevalent in a significant portion of New Testament scholarship; the predisposition being described here lies in the scholar’s inclination to focus on a vision of the Jesus movement as originally untainted by pagan elements that would eventually lead to Catholicism.

In Smith’s *Drudgery Divine*, he describes the divide that has been created between Christianity and the antiquarian religions. He remarks that Protestant scholarship insist on a “lack of relationship”¹⁰³ between Christianity and Greco-Roman religions as the agenda in this paradigm is to keep Christianity *sui generis*. In Smith’s view, it is troubling that Protestant scholarship on early Christian writings desires to maintain the purity of the Christian origins

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 690.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 684.

¹⁰³ Smith, *Drudgery*, 44.

myth;¹⁰⁴ part of this myth being the promulgation of an image of the wholesome early Christian family that had higher morals than the mystery associations of the time.

This relates to the above discussion of the incompleteness in previous interpretations of Q 14:26 as scholars have attempted to maintain an image of the ideal moral Christian family that stands in direct contrast to the depicted depravity of the mystery cults in the ancient world. In the case of Q 14:26, this partiality of previous scholarship is also manifested in the interpretation of the verse in an affective way to mean love Christ more and the family less, as was seen in the scholarly interpretation of Matthew 10:37. This is done in order to shy away from the modern understanding of hatred as a reprehensible emotion that those who followed Jesus would never experience. Here, anything that is not Christianity is considered “other” in comparison, and Smith details how these issues remain “even when their apologetic context is less overt, when one term – the early Christian – is more highly valued than the other, as, for example, in the footnotes in biblical commentaries up to the present day.”¹⁰⁵

Therefore, it can be argued that in the case of Biblical commentaries, and commentaries on Q 14:26 specifically, there is a tendency to interpret the verse in such a way that the “christocentric” meaning is promoted instead of any interpretation that aligns itself with pagan or Hellenistic thinking, a lens that can be used to showcase the importance of the actions behind instructions like “hate” or “love.” As was shown in the inscriptions and papyri discussed above, what is missing from Michel’s discussion is an understanding of *μισεῖν* with active consequences and not “pneumatic” ones.

¹⁰⁴ In his response to *Drudgery Divine*, Burton Mack warns that scholarship should not assume the problem of the apologetic bias against pagan superstition is no longer a prevalent issue and provides two case studies with specific incidents where this occurs in the recent past: Hans-Joseph Klauck’s *Herrenmahl und hellenistischer Kult* (1982) and Walter Burkert’s book *Ancient Mystery Cults* (1987). See Burton L. Mack, “After *Drudgery Divine*,” *Numen* 39.2 (1992): 225-233 (230-1).

¹⁰⁵ Smith, *Drudgery*, 24.

In order for Michel's analysis of how *μισέω* is used and understood in the discipleship of Jesus and specifically in Q 14:26 to be rid of the potential Protestant preconceptions that Smith has pointed out, the author needs to be self-reflexive in his inclination towards further propagating an image of a pure Christianity with wholesome family structures. In reference to the portion of the text in which Michel describes the abnegation implicit in the instruction to hate, the family is to be understood not psychologically, but christocentrically, and Michel (like many other New Testament scholars) is applying a "stratagem of denial,"¹⁰⁶ whether knowingly or unknowingly.

This means to say that scholarship's evaluation of "hate" in Q 14:26 has generally neglected the socioeconomic factors that need to be considered if an individual were to hate their family, and this lack of contemplation on what not just Christian sources, but also Hellenistic papyrological sources, could have to say about the implications of hating in the ancient world in which Q 14:26 would have been heard has been purposeful in an attempt to maintain the unspoiled image of early Christian origins. How Michel could have and should have phrased his entry on *μισέω* when explicitly addressing the use of the word in the discipleship of Jesus in Q 14:26, then, is to account for the evidence provided from ancient Greek sources like the ones discussed earlier in this chapter. *Rather than continuing the trend in scholarship to read Matthew 10:37's "love less" rhetoric into Luke 14:26's "hate" because that allows for the continuation of a projected image of the Christian family that still loves one another, but simply has more love for Jesus than anyone or anything else, applying Smith's insights would allow for Michel's entry to depict a more all-encompassing image of the full range of what it would have meant for a hearer of Q 14:26 to hate, not just in an emotional sense, but in a social and economic way as*

¹⁰⁶ Mack, "After Drudgery Divine," 230.

well. In the pursuit of being as exact and specific as possible in a grasp of what it would have meant for people in the first-century Galilee to hate, the social and economic ramifications need to be weighted just as heavily as the possible emotional responses.

The result of this is a reading of Q 14:26 that presumes hearers of the verse responded emotionally, and not socially and economically. Previous scholarly interpretations of the verse need to be called into question for their potentially apologetically-reasoned interpretations if a new reading of the verse, taking into consideration the tangible ramifications, is to be disseminated throughout New Testament scholarship. This chapter has endeavoured to show the semantic range of the word *μισεῖν*, which allows for an understanding of the verb in a corporal way instead of a mental and spiritual way. This chapter has shown that in future interpretations of *μισεῖν*, scholars need to be self-reflexive about not reproducing this incomplete understanding towards an affective understanding of the word, and thus leave room for a new elucidation that gives *μισεῖν* a more clear and substantial meaning in its socioeconomic context in Q 14:26.

In the next chapter, a more full and clear picture of what a household in Capernaum would have looked like will be etched. Now that it has been shown how the verb *μισεῖν* has been used and understood in different contexts, it is possible to demonstrate a new way that the verb might be understood in future interpretations of Q 14:26, allowing for a reading that takes the focus away from the feelings of hating and towards the actions of hating. This is an important consideration in order to discover the actual ramifications of what hating would mean for someone living in first-century Galilee where the Q Gospel was being written. The next step is to discover the effects of the inclusion of the specific word *μισεῖν* in Q 14:26 and what repercussions that might have had for different members of a household in Capernaum. For example, the male and head of the household might have heard the command to hate and its

effect would have been him quitting his trade and no longer earning a living to support the members of the family. Alternatively, if a woman had heard the command to hate, she might have taken its requirement to mean not only abandoning the household in which the family lived, but also potentially leaving the children along with it. It is through a careful examination of the social and economic setting of the village of Capernaum in Galilee that these answers can be gleaned and those will be addressed in the next chapter.

Chapter 3 Reconstructing a House in Capernaum

1. Introduction

What has been shown in the previous chapter is that *μισεῖν* was used in a variety of sources in the ancient context, from both elite and non-elite authors. What has also been established is that while excerpts from authors of the higher strata exemplified an emotional and a social and economic understanding of hate, non-elite authors of papyrological sources largely emphasized a social and economic understanding of *μισεῖν*. This chapter will now apply an understanding of the command of Q 14:26 in a tangible way in order to seek out the active implications for members of a household in Capernaum upon hearing that they must hate their family members.

First, this chapter will situate the Q people as a network of village scribes living in the Galilee using the argumentation of John Kloppenborg and William Arnal to show the writers of the Sayings Gospel as educated and literate members of the non-elite strata, called village scribes (*κωμογραμματεῖς*). The study will then move on to paint a picture of Capernaum, a village in Lower Galilee that was possibly even one of the places in which the Q people were writing.¹⁰⁷ Furthermore, the chapter will go on to describe what a typical house in the village would have looked like in an attempt to place the words of Q 14:26 in the context of a the viewpoint of the household's various members. Consequently, the study will illustrate what the makeup of a family would have been in first-century Galilee, and specifically Capernaum, in light of the responsibilities of individual members of the household who would have each reacted in a different manner to the instruction to hate their families, depending on factors like gender, age,

¹⁰⁷ John S. Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 86. Kloppenborg argues that one village could not contain the whole Q group and says it is likely they flourished in a network of villages across Galilee, specifically in larger towns like Capernaum. More on Kloppenborg's hypothesis that the Q people were spread across Galilee will be discussed later in this chapter.

status of freedom, and economic standing. Finally, the largest portion of this chapter will deal with the active ramifications for members who hated their families in light of four different areas: education and religious upbringing, burial practices, the institution of marriage and divorce, and economic matters.¹⁰⁸ This chapter will conclude by reintroducing Rogers Brubaker's premise of the functionality of a group, and applying it accordingly to the group of the family in the first-century Galilean household in order to interpret and understand the instruction to hate in light of its effect on the functional roles of each member of the household. Thus, an alternative reading of Q 14:26 will be introduced that allows for an understanding of not only the cutting of emotional attachments evident in the command to hate, but also the shifting of actions and reactions for tangible attachments if one were to hate.

2. Situating the Q People as Village Scribes around Capernaum

As was established earlier in this study, Q 14:26 appears in the "sapiential" stratum of the Q Gospel. Arnal notes that even though an exact date for when this formative layer was written is not able to be unquestionably verified, placing the writing in the first century CE, and more specifically in the 40s or 50s CE, is "preferable" to placing the source in the latter half of the time period.¹⁰⁹ The social and political conditions of the time are especially important to consider in the background of how the Q text was originated. For Gerd Theissen, whom Arnal responds to directly in *Village Scribes*, the Sayings Gospel was a response to the oppression experienced by the Judean people, namely, the Roman ruler Caligula's effort to enforce his own deification.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ In the context of the study, this loose term will be used as inclusive of the status of association membership, trade relations, and debt repayment.

¹⁰⁹ Arnal, *Village Scribes*, 172.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 98. Theissen's reasons for arguing this can be found in *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition* (Translated by L. M. Maloney, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991) where he provides a three-fold hypothesis for why Caligula's attempt to erect in the temple of Jerusalem a statue of himself, thus providing temptation to Judean followers, can be deemed almost equitable to the story of the temptation of Jesus, as

Arnal disagrees and posits a differing vision for the backdrop of the creation of the Q document: the (re)foundation and expansion of Sepphoris in 4 BCE and the foundation of Tiberias in 17 to 23 CE in Galilee were a way for the Romans to start cities that were accessible to trade routes and siphon off the surplus products from tributes, taxes, rents, and interests and loans. Arnal illustrates that “This effect in turn was socially disruptive on a day-to-day basis, and, among other things, changed the character of rural social organization and hierarchy. It is against such a context that Q reacts.”¹¹¹

Further describing the unrest at the time, Kloppenborg says the rise of debt caused householders to default on their houses and become tenants of someone else’s house, showing how the “economic and social fabric was subjected to considerable stress.”¹¹² It is his position that the Sayings Gospel was not written by a single person, nor was it written in the confines of a single village, but instead by several people in a “network of villages”¹¹³ who were all experiencing the negative effects of Roman rule in the first century. The result of this is a social setting for why Q was created and a picture of the social circumstances that would have made the Q document attractive; these circumstances thus making the text a representation of the counter-culture of Palestinian society. There are several working theories for who these authors were and what place they occupied within society, and for the purposes of this study, it will support Arnal’s reasons for disagreeing with the itinerancy thesis as most popularly promulgated by Gerd Theissen, and furthermore, it will adopt the ideology that it is reasonable to view the authors of the Q Gospel as a network of village scribes.

told in the Synoptic Gospels. His reasoning is that the crisis that Caligula caused among the people in the greater Galilee between 40 and 55 CE would have been a reasonable context, with respect to the sociopolitical undertone of the text itself, for the Q authors to craft their Gospel.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 101.

¹¹² Kloppenborg, “Literary Convention,” 87.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 86.

Theissen's articulation of the itinerancy model for understanding the Q people highlighted the constant travel implied of both the Q authors and the Q hearers in the Mission Charge (as found in Q 10:1-16).¹¹⁴ This theme of disciples traveling in the Gospels to have a greater reach for their teaching is also present in the Gospel of Thomas, wherein the anti-familial language and encouragement to travel in order to follow Jesus is "characterised as the ethos of 'homelessness'."¹¹⁵ In his address of this anti-familial language in Thomas, Risto Uro brings up Theissen's "seminal" work in this area, citing that since Theissen's work, "it has become customary to speak of 'itinerant radicalism' as a distinctive ethos of the early sayings tradition (Theissen 1973:245-71 [or 1979:70-105]; see also Theissen 1978)."¹¹⁶ It is worth noting that Q 14:26 is used as evidence to support Theissen's position on the charismatic wondering supposedly advertised in Q where disciples being ready to hate mother and father shows a focus placed on homelessness and an ignorance toward the importance of familial ties.

Arnal presents several arguments against this depiction of the Q people, firstly pointing out that there was not a great distance for Galilean people to travel. Galilee was compact and Lower Galilee was only 15 by 25 miles; therefore, logistically speaking, any journey away from a person's domicile would have been brief.¹¹⁷ Louise Schottroff presents another reason why the

¹¹⁴ Expanding on a 1973 article on the subject, Theissen's book *The First Followers of Jesus: A Sociological Analysis of the Earliest Christians* (Translated by J. Bowden, London: SCM, 1978) goes into detail about his theorization of the members of the earliest Jesus movement being what he calls "itinerant charismatics," who were travelling disciples who moved from place to place to spread the message and be kin with sympathizers in each place who believed the same lessons they were teaching. The reason Theissen argues for this image of the earliest members of the Jesus movement is due to the radical nature of the Gospel texts; he puts forth that the disciples had to lead by example in order to affect any kind of real change in belief and attitude. Therefore, just as the Gospel texts asked for a renunciation of worldly goods in favour of a relationship with God, so too did disciples have to lead a radical wandering lifestyle with no earthly attachments to lead them away from the path to discipleship. For a fuller discussion of Theissen's argument, and subsequent scholarly responses to his hypothesis, see Arnal, *Village Scribes*, 23-45.

¹¹⁵ Risto Uro, "Asceticism and Anti-Familial Language in the *Gospel of Thomas*," in *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor* (ed. Halvor Moxnes; London: Routledge, 1997), 216-234 (217).

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁷ Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 89.

itinerancy model of the Q people would not have been, more than anything else, socially feasible due to the fact that this amount of travel and movement would have created conflict in the patriarchal household, taking away the power from the head of the household, the *paterfamilias*, to restrict and control the behaviour of family members from the head of the household.¹¹⁸

Arnal's most convincing evidence against Theissen's presentation of the itinerancy thesis is the hypothesis that the network of authors of the Sayings Gospel (the sapiential layer in particular) were village scribes, with a reasonably educated background and no calling to lead their lives as traveling wanderers.

Arnal's belief that village scribes were responsible for the origination of the Q Gospel comes from the fact that the *κομογραμματεῖς* would have been aware of the changes in the village's social and economic structure, and consequently been most affected by them due to the implications for village solidarity. This makes them the ones most likely to react to the changes in some manner; for example, creating a text representational of a counter-culture in society. The Greek word *κομογραμματεύς* translates to mean "village clerk," a necessary function in society due to the need for written proof of legal contracts for marriage, bills of sale, wills and other contracts. Furthermore, the low number of educated people meant these scribes could be found in the *agora* of any city. They were "middle-or lower-level administrators who dealt with local administrative infrastructures which saw to the collection and disbursement of various revenues and to the administration of justice."¹¹⁹

The literacy of these village scribes would have been matched best with someone from the non-elite strata of society, as evidenced by the fact that the writing in Q is sometimes

¹¹⁸ Arnal, *Village Scribes*, 41.

¹¹⁹ Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 85. This would have made the village scribes familiar with teaching situations (described in Q 6:39-49) and processes of courts (shown in Q 6:29, 37-38; 11:31a, 32a; 12:11-12, 57-59; 22:30).

primitive, but still more than functional. Writing duties did not occupy the scribes full-time, Arnal describes: “They were as engaged by agricultural production as their fellow villagers and were drawn from the local peasantry itself, with whom they probably, to some degree, identified.”¹²⁰ In imagining the context of the Sayings Gospel in this way, it is now possible to get a better grasp of the social situation in one of the areas in the network of villages that the Q people lived in: Capernaum, which Arnal suggests was an important location for the Q people. He suggests the following: “Capernaum thus presents itself as the most attractive single possibility for the location of the people responsible for Q at both major stages,”¹²¹ showing why it is a reasonable starting place for this study to attempt to create a picture of the typical Galilean household in the time of the Q authors.

3. Creating a Picture of a House in Capernaum

In his writing, Josephus estimated that there were 204 cities and villages in all of Galilee (*Life*, 235) and in David A. Fiensy’s estimation, if Galilee’s first century population rested at 175,000 and the only two major Galilean cities, Sepphoris and Tiberias, had 10,000 inhabitants each, then the population of the towns and villages of both Upper and Lower Galilee would have been between 135,000 and 160,000.¹²² In reference to the individual village of Capernaum, Josephus expresses that even the smallest Galilean village had over 15,000 people (*Jewish War* 3.43). But this number is questionable in light of archaeological data that suggests that Capernaum’s

¹²⁰ Arnal, *Village Scribes*, 152.

¹²¹ *Ibid*, 164.

¹²² Fiensy, “Galilean Village,” 177-8.

population was no more than 2,000.¹²³ Fiensy proposes that Capernaum was populated by 160 people per acre, given its status as a medium-sized fishing and agricultural village.¹²⁴

The village of Capernaum was described by Josephus in *Wars*, 3:519-20 in which he portrays it as “a highly fertile spring called by the inhabitants Capharnaum.”¹²⁵ According to Stanislaw Loffreda, Capernaum was situated by the lake and near the Jordan River.¹²⁶ He reasons that “literary sources make it clear that Capharnaum was already a town at the time of Jesus (first century AD) and that it was inhabited during the Roman and Byzantine periods.”¹²⁷ Fiensy articulates that there were two types of villages in Galilee: mixed agriculturalists who had industry and agriculture, and pure agriculturalists who only had the latter. Capernaum is an example of a pure agriculturalist village due to its nature of being dependent on luck and weather for their economy to be sustained.¹²⁸ Horsley notes that there was one product all areas of Palestine, including Capernaum had, which was wheat; Galilee specifically was usually able to supply itself with grain, as well as wine and oil.¹²⁹ In Ze’ev Yeivin’s recreation of a village in Galilee, he compares the facets of each village side by side, and his list of what Capernaum *did* have includes: a synagogue from the fourth century, perhaps the first century; olives; grain production; and wool (loom weights). On the obverse list, Yeivin stipulates that Capernaum *did not* have grapes; pottery production; other industry like dyeing; glass production; quarries;

¹²³ *Ibid*, 185. John Dominic Crossan and Jonathan Reed cited a population of 1,000 people over 25 acres in one instance, though Reed said in another publication the population number was closer to 1,700. Richard Horsley concurs that from the two excavation teams that worked in Capernaum, they both agreed on a population number of 1,000 at most in the first century CE village. See Horsley, *Archaeology*, 74.

¹²⁴ *Ibid*, 199.

¹²⁵ Michael Berenbaum and Fred Skolnik, *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2007).

¹²⁶ Referenced in Matthew 4:13, Eusebius, and the book of Daniel. Richard Horsley also attests to this location for Capernaum, saying it “was situated just to the west of where the Jordan River enters the Sea of Galilee from the north.” See Richard A. Horsley, *Galilee: History, Politics, People* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 1995), 193.

¹²⁷ Stanislaw Loffreda, *A Visit to Capharnaum* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1983), 14-5.

¹²⁸ Fiensy, “Galilean Village,” 200. Nazareth and Bethsaida were also examples of pure agriculturalist villages.

¹²⁹ Horsley, *Archaeology*, 74.

columbaria; an open space; tombs; ritual baths; a water reservoir; cisterns; or a public building.¹³⁰

Since the village was on the water, it comes as no surprise that what the village did have was a large fishing industry. The population of Capernaum lived off of farming, fishing, and trade, something shown by looking to the discovery of fishing hooks in an *Insula Sacra* within the village. In terms of trade and the economic system present in Capernaum, Arnal declares that papyri remains shed light on the rural village life in which business was done largely without coins, and instead with produce from the land. For example, rent was paid using livestock, while actual money was used to buy entire houses or fields.¹³¹ The reason for this is that the currency used and traded with in Palestinian villages was more tangible, due to the fact that “wealth as always in antiquity is land, and land in turn generates further wealth,”¹³² also showing how the household was the economic basis for a family’s wealth and success, which affected other factors like social standing.

In reference to the fishing industry, at least five of Jesus’ apostles came from Capernaum, and at least two were fishermen by trade, a job which they inherited from their father. Loffreda’s evidence from Capernaum assists in lending veracity to the uncovering of the House of St. Peter in Capernaum, as shown in inscriptions found there that had the names of Christ and Jesus written on them.¹³³ Furthermore, James and John came from Capernaum and their father owned a boat and workers (as described in Mark 1:18-20) and Levi was also from the village where he was a tax collector (shown in Mark 2:14). But what did the domiciles of these people who lived in Capernaum look like?

¹³⁰ Fiensy, “Galilean Village,” 194.

¹³¹ Arnal, *Village Scribes*, 135.

¹³² *Ibid.*, 139.

¹³³ Loffreda, *A Visit*, 33; 39. Textual evidence to support this can be found in Mark 1:21 and 1:23-28.

Fiensy stipulates that when speaking about a house, what is being discussed is “the total domestic area: the buildings under roof, the open-air courtyard, and the subterranean silos and animal stalls.”¹³⁴ Houses as they appeared in the Second Temple period had gone through a change from larger four-room houses for extended families in the Israelite period to the courtyard style houses of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods. Fiensy’s categorization of the different kinds of houses include the following: the simple house; the complex house (both urban apartments and rural farmhouses); the courtyard house (both side and central courtyard types and the peristyle house); the terrace house; the “Insula”; and miscellaneous types (i.e. caves, tents, fortress-palaces, villas-rural mansions, monasteries, etc.).¹³⁵ Eric M. Meyers states that “the most commonly found domicile in Roman-period Palestine is the single-roomed structure,” the size of which could have been from twenty to 200 square metres,¹³⁶ though in a village like Capernaum, it was likely on the smaller side of that range.

It was typical of the building of houses in the Middle East that they would come at no cost to the family (except for the land) because people would build the domicile themselves with the help of their extended families, though they may have decided to pay for a carpenter to supervise. In Horsley’s estimation that there would have been forty to sixty persons per acre in the area, he says that villages occupying two to five acres would have had less than 300 people within their limits.¹³⁷ Horsley provides a thorough depiction of a house from the area in the following passage:

¹³⁴ David A. Fiensy, “The Galilean House in the Late Second Temple and Mishnaic Periods,” in *Life, Culture, and Society* (eds. David A. Fiensy and James Riley Strange; vol. 1 of *Galilee in the Late Second Temple and Mishnaic Periods*; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2014), 216-241 (216). Houses also sometimes had outdoor courtyards or underground passageways leading to storerooms of goods or more places for livestock to be kept.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 217.

¹³⁶ Eric M. Meyers, “Aspects of everyday life in Roman Palestine with special reference to private domiciles and ritual baths,” in *Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities* (ed. John R. Bartlett; London and New York: Routledge, 2002), 193-220 (198).

¹³⁷ Horsley, *Galilee*, 193.

Both archaeological excavations and Mishnah texts indicate that the dwelling space or ‘house,’ where a family of five or six lived, generally consisted of a small room or two (3+ x4 +m, with 5x5m being ‘large’; *m. B. Bat.* 4:4; *m. ‘Erub.* 9:1, 4). An individual family and its room(s) generally shared a courtyard with other families and their room(s), and shared use of installations such as oven, cistern, and millstone in the common courtyard. Several such complexes of courtyards and rooms would open into a passageway or alley in larger villages or towns. Construction was usually crude, of undressed basalt stones without mortar. One can gain a sense of the living conditions as well as collective responsibilities in such villages from several of the case laws in the Mishnah tractate *Baba Batra* (*m. B. Bat.*).¹³⁸

In Fiensy’s view, the village house was likely 3,230 square feet in size with a courtyard shared with another house, the inhabitants of which were likely cousins. The Mishnah assents to the sharing of courtyards, specifically referring to the cluster of fourteen to fifteen one-room houses in Capernaum and Chorazin that shared a courtyard.¹³⁹ Fiensy asserts that most houses had one room divided up with an upstairs for living and storage space divided by a window-wall or elevated area.¹⁴⁰ Now that a broad picture of what a house in the late Second Temple period would have looked like, a closer look needs to be taken at the family that lived in the house.

According to Fiensy, there is still a scholarly debate over whether the typical peasant household had a nuclear family of six living there or an extended family living there.¹⁴¹ For Santiago Guijarro, he describes how “the basic family group living in the same house consisted of the father, the mother, the unmarried children, probably one or more married sons with their own wives and children, and other family members, to whom we have to add the servants and the slaves.”¹⁴² He agrees with the “nucleated families” side of the above question stating that the

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 192.

¹³⁹ Fiensy, “Galilean House,” 234.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 229. The living space was where the family ate, entertained, and slept.

¹⁴¹ David A. Fiensy, *The Social History of Palestine in the Herodian Period* (New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1991), 119.

¹⁴² Santiago Guijarro, “The Family in First-Century Galilee,” in *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor* (ed. Halvor Moxnes; London: Routledge, 1997), 42-65 (59).

household contained a single room, both in urban and rural areas, usually made of sun-dried brick, where a smaller family would have resided peacefully. Nucleated families were the most common in areas that encompassed the lower strata of society, Guijarro says, which is important because these lower strata in agrarian societies (like Capernaum) made up seventy-five per cent of the population in the village.

It is worth discussing in brief the gender dynamics of the household as described by Eric M. Meyers, who argues that the household was not an entirely gendered space as has been assumed in the past due to the promulgation of the public and private dichotomy in the ancient world. He argues that, “In the built environment of ancient Galilee, it is virtually impossible to construct a scenario whereby men and women could have avoided each other at home or outside the home.”¹⁴³ Negating the opinion that men were the only ones active in the courtyard, situated closer to the roadway, while women were allocated to perform their activities in the inner courtyard alone, Meyers says that the Sepphoris House Insula IV shows that courtyard D could not have been used just by women since it was also by a roadway. He further quotes evidence about the placement of *miqvehs* located off of the courtyard in such a place that both men and women could use them,¹⁴⁴ thus showing that Judean houses and households were not “areas of confinement or concealment for Jewish women.”¹⁴⁵ The study will now turn to further discuss the conceptualization of the family in the ancient world and the accompanying dynamics of the family household.

¹⁴³ Eric M. Meyers, “Roman-Period Houses from the Galilee: Domestic Architecture and Gendered Spaces,” in *Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and Their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina* (eds. William G. Dever and Seymour Gitin; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 487-500 (496).

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 497.

4. Theorizing the Structure of Family/ies

In the first century, the family was the single most important socioeconomic institution. In the greater context of the ancient world, the terms “family” and “household” function in very similar ways in that they are both understood in relation to people instead of physical aspects.¹⁴⁶ The result of this is the household being understood as being at the centre of familial, social, and economic relations. Halvor Moxnes says this is indicative of a trend where “the place of residence and subsistence takes precedence and defines the group that lives and works there.”¹⁴⁷ He goes on to say that because there is no word denoted for “family” in the traditional understanding of the term to mean a the group of people called husband, wife, and children, there is instead a word similar – household – “which includes a larger number of people.”¹⁴⁸ Horsley summarizes the connection between the household and the family succinctly when he says:

The family was the basic social unit, of production and consumption, of reproduction and socialization, of personal identity and membership in a wider community. And because, in an agrarian society, families could not survive without land on which they have at least some rights, the two went together. Thus, the purpose of both production and reproduction was to perpetuate the family on its land.¹⁴⁹

This shows how in the Galilean context, the sustainment of the family unit was reliant on the house in which they lived, which was then reliant on the land the house was built on.

David A. Fiensy encapsulates why the command in Q 14:26 needs to be further examined for more than its emotional meaning as the reach of the social and economic repercussions of

¹⁴⁶ Susan Ackerman, "Household Religion, Family Religion, and Women's Religion in Ancient Israel," in *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity* (eds. John P. Bodel and Saul M. Olyan; Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Limited, 2008), 127-158 (127). Though the author disagrees with the synonymous usage of “family” and “household” when “religion” follows either of them.

¹⁴⁷ Halvor Moxnes, “What is Family? Problems in Constructing Early Christian Families,” in *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor* (ed. Halvor Moxnes; London: Routledge, 1997), 13-41 (23). Evidence is found in Mark 10:29-31 that showcases the family being inextricably linked to the house.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 29.

¹⁴⁹ Horsley, *Galilee*, 195-6.

hating are great. He articulates: “We must not forget of course that many, perhaps most, of the inhabitants of a village would have been related by blood or marriage. This has been affirmed for village life in general in the ancient Mediterranean world...”¹⁵⁰ More than this, Q 14:26 needs to be read in light of the multiplicity and plurality of the experiences of different families in the ancient world. As Miriam Peskowitz articulates, family is a plural concept as can be seen by looking at the archaeological evidence. The varied experiences of different families and different members of each family are dependent on the location of their household in relation to their extended family, the tenants of land they own, or workers they hire for a specific purpose; whether the family was wealthy enough to have slaves or the male children had to learn a trade early in life; or how many wives were in the marriage.¹⁵¹ The wealth of experiences from each Galilean family is related specifically to the different social and economic factors that pertain to not only the household, but each individual member of the Judean family.

Further showing this point of differentiation between an emotional and a social and economic understanding of family relations to not only one another, but also to the community, Moxnes points out that the Gospels view the family as a group that lives and works together as a part of the greater social structure of the entire community, a connection that details how individuals relate to other members in the social sphere.¹⁵² Peskowitz says, “This working family was subject to and part of the social relations of the economies and polities of Roman Palestine. To replace the model of individual family units sheltered from social relations, the conception of socio-economic interrelationality acts as a starting point for reflections upon Judean families, and

¹⁵⁰ Fiensy, *Social History*, 135.

¹⁵¹ Miriam Peskowitz, “‘Family/ies’ in Antiquity: Evidence from Tannaitic Literature and Roman Galilean Architecture,” in *The Jewish Family in Antiquity* (ed. Shaye J. D. Cohen; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993), 9-38 (14-5).

¹⁵² Moxnes, “What is Family,” 23.

hence about Judean society, in Roman Galilee.”¹⁵³ It is this recognition of interrelationality that will be the starting point for the rest of this chapter as it goes on to discuss just a few of the ways in which the command to hate might have been heard by different members of a Galilean household in the first century.

5. Understanding *μισεῖν* in Light of Education

Upon hearing Q 14:26 and being told to hate the family, one relationship that might be largely affected is that between parent and child, as the IQP translation of the verse reads: “...and the one who, does not hate son and daughter cannot be my disciple.”¹⁵⁴ Especially in the case of younger children, the hatred of a parent might leave children without crucial care, and also without important knowledge for how to navigate their lives in the village. Moxnes describes this connection by stating that “relations between parents and small children are characterised by care and concern on the part of the parents. The most central concern is that of providing food (Luke 11:11-13).”¹⁵⁵ Therefore, if parents hated the family, then the children would be left with no care for their wellbeing. Another part of being responsible for their progeny means parents have an onus to provide them with an education, both a traditional education in books and languages and a practical education in household and religious practices. Catherine Hezser depicts how primary education for children was provided based on private donations and parental initiative, calling the parents’ role in the formal education of the child “paramount.”¹⁵⁶ What can be seen here is that whether a child received formal training was, in this ancient context, not only dependent on

¹⁵³ Peskowitz, “Family/ies,” 34.

¹⁵⁴ IQP Editorial Board.

¹⁵⁵ Moxnes, “What is Family,” 33.

¹⁵⁶ Catherine Hezser, “Private and Public Education,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine* (ed. Catherine Hezser; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 465-481 (467).

the family's social position and ability to afford an education, but also on the willpower of the family members to ensure their children receive some kind of education. In the case of young girls, whether they received an education or not (as infrequent as it was) was dependent on the attitude of the father towards the education of women.¹⁵⁷ What the father had to ensure was that he was held accountable for providing his son with the necessary Torah knowledge.

Larry Yarbrough explains: "The Talmud identifies three commandments in the Torah delineating obligations parents owe to their children. The father should redeem his son, circumcise him, and teach him the commandments."¹⁵⁸ If either father or son hated the family, they may then risk going against God's law if the son does not learn the commandments in order to practice them,¹⁵⁹ and the father lets the son go uncircumcised. Yarbrough states that the command for children to honour thy father and mother as it was manifested in the requirement for children to take care of their parents eventually in their later lives was directed to children of an adult age who are married, not young children before marriage.¹⁶⁰ Therefore, if an adult son or daughter hates their parents, they might be denying their parents assistance they need, or disrespecting them in a public way and shaming the family. In the area of a practical education, the lines between relationships are firmly drawn between what fathers must teach their sons, like Torah laws, and what mothers must teach their daughters, like how to run a household.

Tal Ilan outlines this issue and states that rabbinic literature automatically assumes that mothers will provide their daughters with the necessary training in order to run a household,¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid*, 478.

¹⁵⁸ Larry Yarbrough, "Parents and Children in the Jewish Family of Antiquity," in *The Jewish Family in Antiquity* (ed. Shaye J. D. Cohen; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993), 39-60 (42).

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid*, 44-5. Here Yarbrough discusses the continued debate in scholarship about the appropriate age for a father to begin to teach his children and for how long they are to be taught.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid*, 53.

¹⁶¹ Tal Ilan, "Gender Issues and Daily Life," in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine* (ed. Catherine Hezser; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 48-70 (59).

both the one they live in as a child and their marital household one day. If the mother hated the family, then the daughter would be left without the proper background knowledge in what society deems she should know in her status as a woman, which could lead to her being unable to marry as she will not have the familiarity with running a household that a potential husband would want. Another tie that mothers and daughters have is the responsibility of the mother to guard her daughter's virtue before marriage, a reality discovered because even though the daughter losing her virginity while unmarried would bring shame to her father, the mother in the village household has the job of protecting the purity of the daughter.¹⁶² Horsley also points out that the value of women was weighted largely based on their fecundity,¹⁶³ so it stands to reason that without the guidance of the mother, the daughter might be left vulnerable to losing her virtue and remaining unwed for the rest of her life.

Another interesting aspect of parents giving their children an education is the religious knowledge that not only fathers can pass on to their sons, but that mothers can also pass down to their daughters. Susan Ackerman describes the important role that women played in the practice of household religion when she states, "Indeed, women's role in preparing and allocating food and drink offerings within family religion is best illustrated, in my opinion, by a Hebrew Bible text – 1 Samuel 1-2 – that is arguably set at a local sanctuary, the shrine of Shiloh..."¹⁶⁴ The story in 1 Samuel also showed Hannah being cognizant of the religion's concerns with procuring sons, which shows why women were integral to the practice of household religion not just in the rudimentary sense of preparing food, but should also be understood as "the theologians who give voice to some of household and family religion's most constitutive beliefs," like giving birth to

¹⁶² Ross S. Kraemer, "Jewish Mothers and Daughters in the Greco-Roman World," in *The Jewish Family in Antiquity* (ed. Shaye J. D. Cohen; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993), 88-112 (105-6).

¹⁶³ Horsley, *Galilee*, 199.

¹⁶⁴ Ackerman, "Household Religion," 145.

children (preferably sons).¹⁶⁵ Mothers had a job to teach their daughters about their roles in the household, both in the social sense and in the religious sense of being part of the household's religious rituals.

What might be gleaned here is that the instruction of Q 14:26 would have been detrimental to the upbringing of the child, but might have given parents a freedom from their responsibilities. Of course, the opposite is just as likely to be true where the parents would face a severe backlash for abandoning a child. The relationship between parent and child is an integral part of another aspect of life in the Galilean village that might be affected if one or the other hated each other: burial practices.

6. Understanding *μισεῖν* in Light of Burial Practices

Firstly, the importance of how burials took place is exemplified in the fact that all Galilean villages must have had cemeteries, as attested by David A. Fiensy.¹⁶⁶ Familial ties had a lot to do with the process of what happens after someone dies, with the immediate family being the ones tasked with being chief amongst the mourners. As Ross S. Kraemer states, husbands and wives were the authors of epitaphs both for each other and the rest of the members of the family, stating: "Most ancient funerary dedications, Jewish and non-Jewish, were made by husbands for their wives, followed by wives for their husbands."¹⁶⁷ Funerary dedications were not just symbolic in nature, but were viewed as a marker of status, and if a husband or a wife decided to hate each other, then the epitaph of the deceased might not be done properly. Moreover, the

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 148-9. Another Biblical case of women being part of the religious rituals by preparing the necessary food and drink offerings is told in Jer. 44:15-19, 25.

¹⁶⁶ Fiensy, "Galilean Village," 193.

¹⁶⁷ Kraemer, "Jewish Mothers and Daughters," 95. The examples of epitaphs Kraemer refers to are from CIJ 108, 213, 678, and 1509.

immediately family was tasked with managing the funeral procession and ceremony; as Josephus reveals, “The funeral ceremony is to be undertaken by the nearest relatives, and all who pass while a burial is proceeding must join the procession and share the mourning of the family.”¹⁶⁸

The association made between Eve and evil is not uncommon to find in rabbinic texts and the association carries to Eve and death, bringing up gender issues in funerary practices. Tal Ilan expresses that “This is the reason why women lead the funeral procession (Gen. R. 17:8). This statement nicely conflates with others in rabbinic literature suggesting that professional mourners in Judean society were women (e.g. M. Ket. 4:4; M. M.Q. 3:9). Even the word ‘mourner’ (*meqoqenet*) is gendered and feminine.”¹⁶⁹ Without women as professional mourners at funerals because they have been told to hate their family, and therefore do not attend the funerary services at all, the passing of family members would not have been marked in the right way, potentially creating problems for the afterlife of the individual. Family members were the primary individuals who had necessary actions to take when a family member died. The Mishnah provides proof of this:

Mishnah Moed Qatan 1:5: ‘Further said Rabbi Meir (c. 150 CE): A person collects the bones of his father and mother [during the intermediate days of a festival], because it is gladness to him. R. Jose says a [time of]: It is a time of mourning for him.’ The Talmud Yerushalmi expands upon Rabbi Meir’s comment, contextualizing the manner of internment that the Mishnah takes for granted: ‘Further said Rabbi Meir: A person collects the bones of his father and mother [during intermediate days of a festival], because it is gladness to him (M. Moed Qatan 1:5); at first, they would bury them in mounds [of soil]. When the flesh had decayed, they collected the bones and buried them in secret. That day he would mourn, and the following day he was happy, for his fathers rested from judgment’ (y. Moed Qatan 1:5, 79d-80a).¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁸ Josephus, *Contra Apionem*. 2.205.

¹⁶⁹ Ilan, “Gender Issues,” 58.

¹⁷⁰ Steven Fine, “Death, Burial, and Afterlife,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine* (ed. Catherine Hezser; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 440-464 (450-1).

This shows that it was the duty of a child (the above excerpt does not specify whether it is male or female) to take care of the funerary arrangements of the parents – to collect the bones and bury them, and to finally rejoice in the fact that they have completed their requirement as a son or daughter. If children hated the family and hated their parents, there would be a question about who would take on the responsibility of ensuring the parents are buried and mourned for properly. With no family to claim the deceased parents, or people in general, the individuals may end up buried with no marker of who they were or how they lived their lives, including information about how they led their lives amongst their family members. In reference to sociological markers of relations between family members, another social and economic repercussion of hating occurs in the act of hating a spouse and petitioning courts for a divorce.

7. Understanding *μισεῖν* in Light of the Institutions of Marriage and Divorce

At its foundation, marriage is a contract between two people on an emotional, economic, and social level. As was described above, the traditional household had a husband, a wife, and children. On the subject of marriage, Moxnes says it “represented the start of one basic social function of the family: the formation of a group with the tasks of production and reproduction, sharing, social protection, worship, etc.”¹⁷¹ It is important to remember that first-century Galilee was very much a society where the honour/shame culture presided. This value system affected men and women in that men were representative of honour and women of shame. Among the responsibilities of the woman was ensuring the cultivation of her husband’s honour by being a modest and respectful wife, and most of all, producing children.¹⁷² Another aspect of marriages included monetary factors, such as the sharing of wealth. In the case of inheritance is where the

¹⁷¹ Moxnes, “What is Family,” 30.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, 20.

key themes of marriage come together: procreation, allocation of wealth, and the preservation of honour. The social function of marriage manifested in the process of giving and receiving an inheritance, or the transmission of wealth (or land) from one generation to another, which was also an important way to maintain the transmission of both status and honour.¹⁷³ That being said, if one hated their family, then they would hate their husband or wife since the marriage was the bedrock of sustaining the family. Hating the spouse would mean divorce, and it is a direct example of not simply a shifting of feelings from the dichotomy of love and hate, but instead has to do with questions of who could take the action of divorce and who would raise the children.

If a man was told to hate his family and consequently sought a divorce from his wife, she would also lose custody of her children. Ross S. Kraemer stipulates: “For a woman legally married, divorce normally meant separation from her children, since under Roman law, children from a licit marriage essentially belonged to their fathers.”¹⁷⁴ Enslaved mothers, whether married or not, also had very few rights to their children (if any at all) as those children became property of the slave’s owners. The only way for an unmarried woman to keep custody of her child was in the case of a woman who bore a child out of wedlock. “Free women whose children were born outside licit marriage were the only mothers whose children, in some senses, belonged to them, and who were not likely to lose their children as a result of the dissolution of a conjugal relationship.”¹⁷⁵ The loss of one’s child is the most extreme repercussion of divorce that would come about from the man being instructed to hate his wife.

Another kind of marriage that is briefly mentioned in the Hebrew Bible is a levirate marriage, which is a union between a wife and the brother of a deceased man who never had

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, 30.

¹⁷⁴ Kraemer, “Jewish Mothers and Daughters,” 103.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

children with his wife. It was explained in Deut. 25:5-10 that if a man died childless, the brother should marry the wife and any children that come as a result of that union should be ascribed to the deceased brother.¹⁷⁶ The widow would receive the benefits in this situation of fulfilling her duty to be a wife and a mother, and also the economic stability of being in a marriage. That being said, if the brother in the situation of a levirate marriage is told to hate the family, then he might not participate in this kind of marriage to his deceased brother's widow, and the woman would subsequently be left without the security of a husband, unmarried and unprotected. The termination of marriage contracts was seen to be in the realm of men, but what will be considered in this study is the impact of women hearing the instruction to hate, and thus making the decision to divorce their husbands.

Michael L. Satlow conveys the possibility that the process of divorce was not as typically male-centred as rabbinic law would lead people to believe. In fact, he declares that "It is possible that rabbinic law did not serve to limit this autonomy (of women) but to square the reality, mentally, with the ideals of an honour and shame culture. Men *should* have more power than they actually did. From this perspective the rabbinic laws can be considered to do cultural work."¹⁷⁷ More than this, there is actually documentary evidence from both ancient writings and Biblical texts that would seem to point to the idea that it was in the realm of possibility for women to divorce their husbands. Mark 10:12 and Josephus (*Antiquities* 15. 259) seem to attest to the fact that women could, and ultimately did in some cases, divorce their husbands.¹⁷⁸

In his examination of the papyrus Se'elim 13 (which was the subject of scholarly debate for over fifty years before eventual publication about its potential ramifications for the role of

¹⁷⁶ Michael L. Satlow, "Marriage and Divorce," in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine* (ed. Catherine Hezser; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 344-361 (355).

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid*, 349 (emphasis in text).

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid*, 353.

women divorcing men), David Instone-Brewer describes how even though rabbinic law stipulates only men can grant divorces, this papyrus in particular appears to describe a woman asking the courts to enact a divorce from her husband. After further scrutiny, it is possible that the wife was not the one who drew up the document for divorce, but rather that she asked a male scribe to compose this papyrus on her behalf. This would not be altogether surprising since in certain circumstances, like the man being impotent, the court was able to force the husband to divorce his wife.¹⁷⁹ In reference to the papyrus Se'elim 13, Instone-Brewer argues that what is more likely than the wife writing the papyrus asking her husband for a divorce is that the papyrus, again likely written by a male scribe, was evidence of the influence of Egyptian Judaism on Palestinian Judeans.

Instone-Brewer observes that Elephantine documents present evidence to support that “some Egyptian Judean women were able to divorce their husbands in the same way that their husbands divorced them, as far back as the fifth century BCE. It was written into their marriage contracts that they could divorce each other by publicly stating that they ‘hate’ their partner and paying them compensation.”¹⁸⁰ This quote is crucial to this study as it highlights that the ancient Near Eastern technical term for “divorce” had an explicit connection to hate.¹⁸¹ Raymond Westbrook sheds further light on this as he reveals, “The technical term for divorce without grounds – attested in Akkadian, Aramaic and Hebrew – is ‘hate (and) divorce’.”¹⁸² J.J.

¹⁷⁹ David Instone Brewer, “Jewish Women Divorcing Their Husbands in Early Judaism: The Background to Papyrus Se’elim 13,” *Harvard Theological Review* 92.3 (1999): 349-357. This is also seen in Mishnah texts like mGit. 9.8 and mArak. 5.6.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 8. The text of the marriage contract being referred to reads: “Tomorrow or (the) next day, should <the wife> stand up in an assembly and say: ‘I hated you; I will not be your wife,’ silver of hatred is on her head. She shall give to <her husband> silver 7 shekels 2 quarters and all that she brought in her hand she shall take out, from straw to string.” (C15=B2.6; K2=B3.3; K7=B3.8 with slight variations from Instone-Brewer)

¹⁸¹ See also Reuven Yaron, “On Divorce in Old Testament Times,” 117-119.

¹⁸² Raymond Westbrook, *Property and the Family in Biblical Law* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 155. Westbrook also describes the way in which the legal systems of the ancient Near East differentiated between a

Rabinowitz agrees with Westbrook on this account on the basis of the evidence of the Aramaic marriage contracts from Elephantine which seem to show how “hate” could be a technical term directly referencing “divorce.”¹⁸³ Ultimately, Westbrook acknowledges that as the verb for “divorce,” and its translation as the verb for “hate,” appears in ancient Near Eastern writings, it always appears in combination with a verb of action, thus providing a motivation for the action being taken.

Divorce was an action that was far more layered than just the displacement of feelings between two people. Upon hearing Q 14:26 and being told to hate one’s family, either the husband or the wife in the family might have taken the action to request the courts enact a divorce and the repercussions of that ranged from the husband repaying the wife’s dowry to the wife losing her children.

This chapter will now move on to the most varied and widespread ramification of hating the family – the effect on the household’s financial status.

8. Understanding *μισεῖν* in Light of Economic Standing

There are several interconnected areas that brought together create a picture of how the economic systems of the Galilean family worked. The first important piece of information to note is that according to Richard Horsley, most households in villages (not in cities), were self-sufficient. He articulates, “As in agricultural production proper, so in production of clothing and other crafts, the household members undertook most or all stages themselves.”¹⁸⁴ With the production of

divorce with grounds and a divorce without grounds. A man could divorce his wife at will, but if it was found to be without grounds, he would have to restore her dowry and more.

¹⁸³ Raymond Westbrook, “The Prohibition on Restoration of Marriage in Deuteronomy 24:1-4,” *Studies in Bible* 31 (1986): 387-405 (400). Divorce-money was also called “silver of hatred.”

¹⁸⁴ Horsley, *Archaeology*, 74-5.

clothing and other crafts by family members for family members, the result was trade not being a major factor in the Galilean economy. Being an agrarian village society, “the basic units of production were also the basic units of consumption, that is, households, which produced most of what they consumed and consumed much of what they produced.”¹⁸⁵ That being said, the insular nature of families in households making what they consume and consuming what they make might point to the conclusion that if one person hated the family and left, then the other family members would be left at a loss without the contribution of that individual to the household production system, who could not be replaced by someone from another household since that house would be responsible for itself as well.

Within the structure of the family, it was the responsibility of the father to not only teach his son Torah law, but to follow Torah law himself by teaching his son a trade since rabbinic law stipulates that a man has a paternal obligation to do so.¹⁸⁶ Fathers and sons would possibly join the same trade guilds, which were a feature of Roman Palestine even before Hellenization. Defining a guild as “associations comprising private citizens organized for mutual economic, social, and religious benefits,”¹⁸⁷ these trade associations would meet in synagogues which acted as the religious and economic hub of certain cities and villages. Ben-Zion Rosenfeld and Joseph Menirav report that rabbinic literature actually refers to synagogues built specifically in Palestine for members of particular occupations, like goldsmiths, silversmiths, bronze workers, or blacksmiths.

In the consideration of how these trade guilds were formed, Philip F. Venticinque takes into account the social and economic considerations in relation to how association ties and

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid*, 83.

¹⁸⁶ Yarbrough, “Parents and Children,” 45. Eccl. 9:9 also says that a man should teach his son a trade.

¹⁸⁷ Ezra Mendelsohn, “Guilds in Ancient Palestine,” *The American Schools of Oriental Research* 80 (1940): 17-21 (17).

familial bonds were connected. Arguing for the “complementary relationship between families and guilds, and the role guilds played in solidifying family structures and reinforcing social bonds between members, which had an economic benefit for the group as well,”¹⁸⁸ Venticinque confirms that sons often followed fathers into a particular trade and membership lists included a fair number of pairs of kinship ties between brother, father, or son. Relating to burial rites once more, it was common practice for all association members to also be part of the funerary processes, since association ties were equivalent to familial ties wherein “guilds provided a framework in which the economic success of one household was intimately related to that of another.”¹⁸⁹ However, if one member of the household leaves, that might create a problem with not only the family, but also with the association, whose successes rely on the interconnectedness of the familial and association structures. If one member decides to hate the family, and consequently his association as well, it might give him just one of many reasons that he might have for leaving the trade guild, and the rest of the members of the association and the household might crumble as an otherwise cohesive social and economic unit.

What is particularly interesting about the context of hating the family in Capernaum is the fact that at least five of Jesus’ disciples were originally recruited from Capernaum. Loffreda observes that Jesus enlisted Simon and Andrew the brother of Simon to become disciples, and further down the water also casting their nets because they were fishermen in the village by the sea were James (the son of Zebedee) and John his brother, who would also go on to follow Jesus.¹⁹⁰ They were in the same trade as their fathers because that is more than likely what

¹⁸⁸ Philip F. Venticinque, "Family Affairs: Guild Regulations and Family Relationships in Roman Egypt," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 50 (2010): 273-294 (277).

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 292.

¹⁹⁰ Loffreda, *A Visit*, 73. Pertinent New Testament passages of Jesus recruiting these disciples are: Mark 1:16-20; Mark 2:13-17; Matthew 17:24-27; and Luke 8:22-25.

skillset they were taught. Simon and Andrew actually shared the same house in Capernaum, according to Fiensy, while Peter and Andrew worked together to earn their living, just as James and John worked together with Zebedee on his boat. This shows evidence of “an extended family arrangement”¹⁹¹ in Capernaum and points to the fact that the men would have left their fathers to continue on in the fishing trade on their own once they began to follow Jesus. Hating the family in the case of the apostles from Capernaum was the same as any other individual who hated the family and in turn abandoned the family trade, leaving the household with less income.

Agreeing with the fact that fathers and sons sometimes entered into the same trade guilds, Alexei Sivertsev examines how, “Skills were often transmitted within families from one generation to the next. Literary and epigraphic sources indicate that several generations of the same family often pursued the same trade.”¹⁹² At the head of the family was the *paterfamilias* who, as the “ideal Mishnaic householder,” owned the land the family lived on and was the only one with real economic authority as the male figurehead, while “other members of the household serve as his agents, projecting the *paterfamilias*’ authority outside the family.”¹⁹³ If the *paterfamilias* decided to hate his family, what would become of them and their economic standing? As the bank manager of the household who received the profit made by all members of the household, his decision to hate the family would might lead to an economic deficit for the family which would be extremely difficult to escape from. In fact, the repayment and relief of debt is another area in which hating the family would have active consequences for how money

¹⁹¹ Fiensy, *Social History*, 132.

¹⁹² Alexei Sivertsev, “The Household Economy,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine* (ed. Catherine Hezser; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 229-245 (235).

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, 237. See Guijarro, “The Family,” 48, wherein he provides other examples of the authority of the *paterfamilias* in the New Testament, which include: Matt. 13:24-30; Mk. 12:1-12; Matt. 24:43-44; Matt. 24:45-41; and Mk. 13:34.

would be paid back and whose responsibility it would become if a member of the household heard Q 14:26, decided to follow its word, and became ignorant of the debt they owed.

The social setting in which Q originated, as Arnal has described it, painted a picture of citizen unrest in lieu of Roman rulers trying to take advantage of smaller towns in Galilee. Horsley describes the situation in the following manner: “Galilean producers were forced to meet the demands of three layers of rulers, the dues to temple and priests, tribute to Rome, and taxes for Herod, Antipas, and the Agrippas. Unable to meet these demands and still feed themselves, many peasants fell increasingly into debt.”¹⁹⁴ Therefore, hating the family might fall happily upon the ears of peasants, who would be able to ignore their debt in favour of this new path and ultimately resulting in the debt being left to be dealt with by the remaining members of the household. Another way in which an individual might be left with a large debt to pay was in the case of defaulting on payment to a landlord. Fiensy states, “the tenant-landlord relationship then was one in which the landlord exercised ‘an effective superior power...over the cultivator’ (tenant) which required the tenant to produce a fund of rent. There is a power imbalance...which results in the tenant having to furnish the landowner with not only his nutritional needs, but his wealth.”¹⁹⁵ What this excerpt shows is that if an individual hates the family and leaves without repaying their debt, then the remaining household members need to be concerned with not only their money being taken in an effort to repay the debt, but also their own products and food they worked for being taken away.

In his article, Giovanni Bazzanna addresses how rulers in the ancient world would forgive debts as a sign of good faith, arguing that this act of debt relief was not uncommon in places like Israel: “One should not consider the royal habit of conceding debts remittances as

¹⁹⁴ Horsley, *Galilee*, 221.

¹⁹⁵ Fiensy, *Social History*, 76.

something restricted to Egypt alone: a forgiveness of debts is part and parcel of an ideology present and effective not only in the Ptolemaic kingdom but in other areas of the eastern Mediterranean and in the land of Israel as well.”¹⁹⁶ Using the literary evidence of the Ptolemaic amnesty decrees, Bazzana says the “extreme” act of forgiving debts as shown by the king in an attempt to showcase care for the citizens in the ancient context would solidify an image of the sovereign as a “unique and paramount broker of divine providence in the world.”¹⁹⁷ Therefore, if a member of the household decided to hate his family, then there might have been a possibility for the repayment of that debt to be taken on by the ruler, but in looking at the language of the above quote, the family who is left behind after that individual hears Q 14:26 and decides to leave might be left in the hands of chance with the frequency of the action of debt forgiveness from kings not able to be determined or relied upon with certainty. If the ruler was not feeling benevolent or gracious that day, then the family would still be left with the remnants of a debt to be paid and the person who the debt originally belonged to not assisting in its repayment. It is also interesting to consider what would happen to an unpaid debt in Galilee in light of what has been discussed regarding the social situation of the Q people.

Discussing the Q people and their outlook framed by the backdrop of what was going on socially and economically at the time, Kloppenborg says the “countercultural nature of their vision, especially their views of debt and wealth, cannot have appealed to patrons and the local aristocracy upon whose benefactions the populace depended.”¹⁹⁸ Here he seconds the opinion that the lower stratas were sometimes reliant on the good will of the higher stratas and highlights

¹⁹⁶ Giovanni Battista Bazzana, “*Basileia* and Debt Relief: The Forgiveness of Debts in the Lord’s Prayer in the Light of Documentary Papyri,” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 73 (2011): 511-525 (517). Bazzana also details how in Israel, remitting debts when new rulers came to power was described in biblical texts like 1 Maccabees and Demetrius 1 when the new Seleucid king makes an offer of peace to the Israelites.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 525.

¹⁹⁸ Kloppenborg, “Literary Convention,” 96-7.

a very important idea: that the Q people existed as the countercultural alternative to the dominant social order at the time, for reasons that were discussed above in the writing on Q's provenance. Upon further examination, if the instruction in Q to hate was also perceived as counter-cultural, then hating the family in that context might mean ignoring the socioeconomic ties of the individual to the structure of the family and the household and leaving the family to deal with outstanding debt. This depicts a social and economic ramification for the hearer of Q 14:26 whose household might then be left in financial turmoil if one person follows the command of the verse, whether that person is the mother, father, child, slave, or extended family member. This is another way in which the economic standing of household members was dependent on the actions of the other individuals.

9. Applying Brubaker and Stowers' Theories to Families in Capernaum

This chapter has aimed to establish the vastly different ways in which each member of the household would have heard the instruction to hate in Q 14:26. While hate can be understood in an emotive manner, this chapter has shown the social and economic ramifications of hating the family that have previously not been shed under as much light as the side of hate that deals with feelings. That being said, it is important to now return to the work of Rogers Brubaker to apply his conception of the functionality of groups over the emotionality of them to the context of the ancient household and family. In his belief that groups have not been scrutinized enough in previous scholarship, he proposes groups be thought of in terms of their relations and processes instead of their definitional identity. Relating this to the conception of the household and what it would have meant for each individual member to hate their families, the family needs to be thought of in terms of the factors Brubaker lists, like practical categories; cultural idioms;

organizational routines; and institutional forms. Stowers is also helpful in this pursuit due to his declaration that traditional categories of community and family should be broken down into patterns of activity. By thinking about each member of the Galilean family in terms of their processes and functions, it can be seen that although the household may have been an ethnically cohesive unit, the members of the family are not necessarily cohesive in their beliefs, responsibilities, abilities, and ultimately, their reaction to being told to hate.

What was shown in the previous chapter was a fuller picture of the semantic range of *μισεῖν*, exemplifying how both an emotional and a social and economic understanding of the instruction to hate is necessary in examining the implications of hating on both the individual and the family. In answering the question of how Q 14:26 would have been heard by members of a household in first-century Capernaum when the Sayings Gospel was being written, this chapter has shown how each person would have heard and reacted to the command in different ways, depending on factors like age, gender, level of freedom, and socioeconomic standing. Four of the areas that would have been directly impacted if individuals made the decision to hate would have been: the transmission of education, burial practices, marriage and divorce, and the management of association membership, debt, and fiscal matters. Rogers Brubaker's conception of groups has proved useful in being able to examine the family in light of their functionality over their emotionality, a distinction that has been able to shed light on each individual member of the household's responsibilities and impact on the group as a whole, and how the renunciation of the family would mean a rejection of these functions leaving an impact much greater than just a shift in emotional feelings. Therefore, it has not been the goal of this study to refute an emotional reading of Q 14:26, but instead to focus more distinctly on the lesser discussed social and economic ramifications of the Q Gospel's words to hate the family.

Conclusion

Upon first reading of Q 14:26, an emotional interpretation might seem to be the natural reaction for several different reasons. The potency of the word “hate” in the verse draws out an emotional response, especially read in light of its origins as a statement that came from Jesus. Beyond the severity of the word itself, the instruction of Q 14:26 would appear out of place in Early Christianity as familial ties are consistently shown to be of great importance in Biblical texts. An instruction to hate would specifically go against Torah law’s commandment that one must honour father and mother above all else. Moreover, an image is projected of a morally pure and loving Christian family that stands in staunch difference to the immoral association groups of the ancient world. With these thoughts in mind, Q 14:26 has been shown in this study to be a verse that requires a much deeper examination into the contextual roots of how and when it was written, and most importantly, how the intended audience would have perceived and acted upon hearing the command to hate.

The first section of this study showed that even though Galilee, where the Sayings Gospel is thought to have been written, might have been largely, but not completely, homogenous in a single ethnic identity, that homogeneity did not translate to each individual member of the household and the family. In applying Rogers Brubaker’s conception of the functionality of groups that have a fluid identity constantly changing based sometimes on shared ethnic background and sometimes on similar social positions, this section has shown that ethnicity is a variable category that ebbs and flows in different areas. Therefore, a homogenous household would not have had an identical or even similar reaction to the instruction to hate.

The second section of this study first examined the way in which scholarship of the recent past has taken to interpreting the original Greek word for hate, *μισεῖν*, as it appears in Q

14:26 in an emotive manner, reading it for its ramifications of changing emotions and allegiances from one group of people to another person and leaving out mention of the social and economic implications for individuals and the families if they were to hate one another. This chapter then went on to examine how *μισεῖν* was used in ancient inscriptions and papyri to illuminate the fact that while members of the higher social strata exemplified an emotional and a social and economic understanding of hate, the lower strata exemplified a functional understanding of hate, thus highlighting the fact that while both readings of Q 14:26 are possible, a focus needs to be put on understanding the verse for its active repercussions, instead of simply its emotive ones.

The third section of this study has attempted to provide insight into the social and economic situation of the village of Capernaum in Galilee, one of the areas thought to have been where the Q Gospel was being written. In depicting the social and economic situation of Capernaum, the section was able to suggest four different areas connected to family life that would have been negatively affected if an individual were to hate their family. The areas that might have been adversely affected were education, marriage and divorce practices, burial rituals, and the wide-ranging field of economic and monetary issues. If an individual were to hate their family, depending on who the person was (i.e. what their age, gender, and social position entailed) they might leave a child with no religious or academic education, be forced to divorce their spouse, be left with an improper burial or epitaph upon death, or be forced to leave their trade association. It is these social and economic implications of hating that are largely not taken into account in scholarship in favour of a reading of hatred that relies on its emotional repercussions, and this last section of the study aimed to depict some of the ways in which hating the family would have left an indelible and material mark on the lives of the rest of the members of the household.

While this study has aimed to be both comprehensive and articulate in its discussion of these topics, there are certain areas that were left outside of its scope. Given Q 14:26's position in the sapiential layer of the Sayings Gospel, and therefore its attribution as being part of the wisdom speeches that Jesus gave during his ministry, a fairly immediate area that might be addressed in future scholarship would be the impact of this social and economic reading of Q 14:26 on the picture of the historical Jesus. While it is not possible to ascertain with any certainty the motivation behind the words of the verse, or if the words can even really be attributed to Jesus at all, changing the way this verse is read has an effect on how the speaker of the verse is viewed. For example, if hating the family was intended to have social and economic ramifications, then the question can be asked about Jesus' apocalyptic vision and where this verse, and other thematically-linked verses that had to do with the sacrifices of discipleship, would have placed Jesus as an eschatological figure.

Another possible avenue that could be examined further in reference to the implications of Q 14:26 on the quest for the historical Jesus is the questions surrounding the identity of his family. If disciples were to follow Jesus and act in his name, was Jesus also forced to hate his family? In specific reference to male disciples, who occupied the majority of Jesus' disciples, there is the connection drawn of man being made in the image of God, and as God's son, were Jesus' actions meant to be reflected in the actions of men? If true, which family would Jesus have hated – his earthly family or his heavenly family? This is an especially interesting quandary in light of the repetitive use of fictive kinship language in the New Testament where, again, familial ties seem to be glorified and deemed to be crucial to the success of any individual, but the instructions of Q 14:26 ask followers to seemingly perform the exact opposite actions. It was outside of the scope of this study to delve into possible implications of a new reading of Q 14:26

in light of the quest for the historical Jesus, but there are definitely areas in which future scholarship can continue to create a more complete picture.

What this study has aimed to do is shift the focus from an emotional reaction and understanding of Q 14:26 to a functional and active understanding. Having examined the ways that previous scholarship has strenuously leaned towards a Christ-centred grasp of the verse, this study has shown that what needs to be done instead is an examination of the verse keeping in mind the social and economic context in which it was written. To be concise, the verse has previously been analyzed to mean that in hating one's family, one must modify their emotions, allegiances, priorities, and concerns from one entity (the family) to another (Jesus and discipleship). The objective of this study has been to articulate how in hating one's family, one actually might have had to modify their actions and physical behaviours. Applying this reading of the verse allows scholars to gain a more complete picture of the ramifications of this extreme command that came from Jesus.

The broader implications of the work that this study has done are hopefully raising awareness for scholars to refrain from their sometimes apologetic, incomplete, and Christ-centred interpretations of the Q Gospel and instead opting for an understanding of the verses in light of the time and place in which they were written, as well as the intended audience who were hearing the words. This contextual understanding opens doors for gaining a better comprehension, not just of the audience who were hearing Jesus' words, but also a better comprehension of the network of village scribes that created the Q Sayings Gospel. It is through this contextualization of both authorship and audience that scholars can hope to garner a more extensive knowledge on the subjects at hand. The results of this study also hopefully have reach for future scholarship in its pursuit to be more self-reflexive in its endeavours in general. This

self-reflexivity in scholarship aims to somewhat rectify the ability to formulate incomplete analyses of the verses of the Sayings Gospel by relying on potential predispositions that lean towards a common threat to New Testament scholarship: the apologetic agenda of maintaining the purity of early Christian origins. While not true of all previous scholarship concerning Biblical interpretation, or interpretation of Q 14:26, this study has hoped to show the benefits of reading and elucidating the verses of the Q Gospel in light of their functional understandings and not solely their emotive understandings, though both are present and applicable, as has been shown in the case of Q 14:26. In summation, the meaning behind hating the family in the context of the ancient world could have been extremely varied and had far-reaching implications for the individual and the family, both emotionally and materially. It is the job of the scholar to continue to question previously accepted notions in order to create a clearer understanding of the subject at hand and hopefully build on that understanding while maintaining an application of self-reflexivity.

Bibliography

- Ackerman, Susan. "Household Religion, Family Religion, and Women's Religion in Ancient Israel," in *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity* (eds. John P. Bodel and Saul M. Olyan; Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Limited, 2008), 127-158.
- Argyle, William Aubrey. *The Gospel According to Matthew*, (Cambridge Bible Commentary; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963).
- Arnal, William E. *Jesus and the Village Scribes: Galilean Conflicts and the Setting of Q* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2001).
- Ascough, Richard S., Philip A. Harland and John S. Kloppenborg. "Divine Instructions for the Household Association of Dionysios." Translated by Philip A. Harland 31-33: 82-84, in *Associations in the Greco-Roman World* (Waco/Berlin: Baylor University Press/de Gruyter, 2012).
- Barton, Stephen C. *Discipleship and Family Ties in Mark and Matthew* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- _____ and Richard Horsley. "A Hellenistic Cult Group and the New Testament Churches," *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 24 (1981): 7-41.
- Bazzana, Giovanni Battista. "Basileia and Debt Relief: The Forgiveness of Debts in the Lord's Prayer in the Light of Documentary Papyri," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 73 (2011): 511-525.
- Berenbaum, Michael and Fred Skolnik, *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2007).
- Brubaker, Rogers. "Ethnicity without Groups," *European Journal of Sociology* 43.2 (2002): 163-189.
- Chancey, Mark A. "The Ethnicities of Galileans," in *Life, Culture, and Society* (eds. David A. Fiensy and James Riley Strange; vol. 1 of *Galilee in the Late Second Temple and Mishnaic Periods*; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014), 112-128.
- _____. *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee: The Population of Galilee and New Testament Studies* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Editorial Board of the International Q Project, "The Sayings Gospel Q in English Translation," n.p. 2001. Online: <http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~kloppen/iqqpqt.htm>.
- Fiensy, David A. "The Galilean House in the Late Second Temple and Mishnaic Periods," in

- Life, Culture, and Society* (eds. David A. Fiensy and James Riley Strange; vol. 1 of *Galilee in the Late Second Temple and Mishnaic Periods*; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2014), 216-241.
- _____. “The Galilean Village in the Late Second Temple and Mishnaic Periods” in *Life, Culture, and Society* (eds. David A. Fiensy and James Riley Strange; vol. 1 of *Galilee in the Late Second Temple and Mishnaic Periods*; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2014), 177-207.
- _____. *The Social History of Palestine in the Herodian Period* (New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1991).
- Fine, Steven. “Death, Burial, and Afterlife,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine* (ed. Catherine Hezser; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 440-464.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (The Anchor Bible; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981).
- Fledderman, Harry. “The Cross and Discipleship in Q,” *SBLSP* 27 (1988): 472-482.
- Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke* (The New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1997).
- Guijarro, Santiago. “The Family in First-Century Galilee,” in *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor* (ed. Halvor Moxnes; London: Routledge, 1997), 42-65.
- Harrington, Daniel J. *The Gospel of Matthew* (Sacra Pagina; Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1991).
- Hezser, Catherine. “Private and Public Education,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine* (ed. Catherine Hezser; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 465-481.
- _____. “The Graeco-Roman Context of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine* (ed. Catherine Hezser; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 28-47.
- Horsley, Richard. *Archaeology, History and Society in Galilee: The Social Context of Jesus and the Rabbis* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996).
- _____. *Galilee: History, Politics, People* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 1995).
- Ilan, Tal. “Gender Issues and Daily Life,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in*

- Roman Palestine* (ed. Catherine Hezser; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 48-70.
- Instone Brewer, David. "Jewish Women Divorcing Their Husbands in Early Judaism: The Background to Papyrus Se'elim 13," *Harvard Theological Review* 92.3 (1999): 349-357.
- Johnson, A.C., H. S. Gehman and E. H. Kase, Jr. "Memorandum." Translated by A. E. Hanson 119. 52-59, in *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri: Ezekiel (P.Princ.Scheide)* (Princeton University Studies in Papyrology, 1938).
- Josephus. *Jewish War* 2. 8. 7. 136-9. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926-1965).
- Kloppenborg Verbin, John S. Verbin. *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2000).
- _____. "Literary Convention, Self-Evidence and the Social History of the Q People," *Semeia* 55 (1991): 77-102.
- _____. *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987).
- Kraemer, Ross S. "Jewish Mothers and Daughters in the Greco-Roman World," in *The Jewish Family in Antiquity* (ed. Shaye J. D. Cohen; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993), 88-112.
- Loffreda, Stanislao. *A Visit to Capernaum* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1983).
- Luz, Ulrich et al., *Matthew: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Press, 1989).
- Mack, Burton L. "After Drudgery Divine," *Numen* 39.2 (1992): 225-233.
- Marshall, Ian Howard. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (The New International Greek Testament Commentary; Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1978).
- Mendelsohn, Ezra. "Guilds in Ancient Palestine," *The American Schools of Oriental Research* 80 (1940): 17-21.
- Meyers, Eric M. "Aspects of everyday life in Roman Palestine with special reference to private domiciles and ritual baths," in *Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities* (ed. John R. Bartlett; London and New York: Routledge, 2002), 193-220.
- _____. "Roman-Period Houses from the Galilee: Domestic Architecture and Gendered Spaces," in *Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and Their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina* (eds. William G. Dever and Seymour Gitin; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 487-500.

- Michel, Otto. "μυσέω," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament 4*, ed. Gerhard Kittel, Geoffrey William Bromiley, and Gerhard Friedrich (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964), 683-694.
- Moxnes, Halvor. "What is Family? Problems in Constructing Early Christian Families," in *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor* (ed. Halvor Moxnes; London: Routledge, 1997), 13-41.
- Nolland, John. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (The New International Greek Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 2005).
- Oakes, Peter. *Reading Romans in Pompeii: Paul's Letter at Ground Level* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009).
- P. Oxy.*, VI, 902. 13-17. Translated by Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt. (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1908).
- P. Oxy.*, VIII, 1151. 1-14. Translated by Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt. (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1911).
- Peskowitz, Miriam. "'Family/ies' in Antiquity: Evidence from Tannaitic Literature and Roman Galilean Architecture," in *The Jewish Family in Antiquity* (ed. Shaye J. D. Cohen; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993), 9-38.
- Plutarch. *Greek and Roman Lives: Titus Flamininus* 19. 3. 12-17. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921).
- Polybius. *Histories* 5. 11. 5-9. Translated by Evelyn S. Shuckburgh (London, New York: Macmillan, 1889. Reprint Bloomington 1962).
- Ringe, Sharon H. *Luke* (Westminster Bible Companion; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995).
- Ruether, Rosemary Radford. *Christianity and the Making of the Modern Family* (Boston: Beacon, 2000).
- Sanders, Ed Parish. "Jesus in Historical Context," *Theology Today* 50 (1993): 429-448.
- Satlow, Michael L. "Jew or Judean?," in *"The One Who Sows Bountifully: Essays in Honor of Stanley K. Stowers* (eds. Carolyn Johnson Hodge et. al.; Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2013), 165-175.
- _____. "Marriage and Divorce," in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine* (ed. Catherine Hezser; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 344-361.

- Seim, Turid Karlsen. "The Gospel of Luke," in *Searching the Scriptures: A Feminist Commentary* (eds. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Ann Brock, and Shelly Matthews; New York: Crossroad, 1993), 743-760.
- Sivertsev, Alexei. "The Household Economy," in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine* (ed. Catherine Hezser; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 229-245.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990).
- Stowers, Stanley K. "The Concept of 'Community' and the History of Early Christianity," *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion* 23 (2011): 238-256.
- _____. "Theorizing the Religion of Ancient Households and Families," in *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity* (eds. John P. Bodel and Saul M. Olyan; Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Limited, 2008), 5-19.
- Tinsley, Ernest J. *The Gospel According to Luke* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965).
- Venticinque, Philip F. "Family Affairs: Guild Regulations and Family Relationships in Roman Egypt," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 50 (2010): 273-294.
- Westbrook, Raymond. "The Prohibition on Restoration of Marriage in Deuteronomy 24:1-4," *Studies in Bible* 31 (1986): 387-405.
- _____. *Property and the Family in Biblical Law* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991).
- Yarbrough, Larry. "Parents and Children in the Jewish Family of Antiquity," in *The Jewish Family in Antiquity* (ed. Shaye J. D. Cohen; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993), 39-60.