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

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" ( ) 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, *Readin* (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-centu

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 familrpls,wheo

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 p0030044>4<004F004F>-23<00 1 7Tmh (c)4p(e)4(c)4(onomi-4(a-9

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

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 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

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]

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]

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

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

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, a

Chapter 2

dictates that they must still show themselves 'worthy' ( ) of Jesus. The fact that Matthew omits Q's from his text points to the possibility that Matthew regarded 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.

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 definitively 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

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.”

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-

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 exclusively in contrast to the ancient Greek word for love, .

Fitzmyer declares: "From Luke 16:13 one learns that *misein*, "hate," is the opposite of *agapan*, "love."[81] To understand the use of 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 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 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, , 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, , ("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 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 can be found are in: Genesis 19:31-

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 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 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.*

> 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

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

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 w

that the papyri 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 ( ) to the laws, most learned lord advocate.[96]

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

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 .

The inactive mode of understanding 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 that was addressed in

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" (in Luke 14:26) in the same way as Matthew's "worthy" (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 agr

to their earthly family that could ever stand in the way of them following Jesus. Michel goes on to refer to the use of 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 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 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

In order for Michel's analysis of how 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]

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 , 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 , 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 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

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

Chapter 3
Reconstructing a House in Capernaum

1. Introduction

What has been shown in the previous chapter is that 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 . 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 ( ). 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

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 k

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 sapiental 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 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 ς 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,

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]

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; t

> 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; . 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

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 G

4. Theorizing the Structure of Family/ies

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

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]

immediately family was tasked with managing the funeral procession and ceremony; as Josephus

key themes of marriage come together: procreation, allocation of wealth, and the preservation of honour. The social function of marriage manifested in

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

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 *μισε*

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,

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 , 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.

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 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.

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 m0iy their emotG6nd

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*

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.

_____.

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* (

Michel, Otto. "μισέω," 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. (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