

CLARIFYING
BAFFLING
BIBLICAL PASSAGES

CHAPTER THIRTY ONE

THE MISREADING WHICH LED
TO THE “HATE” IN LUKE
14:26–27

Thomas F. McDaniel, Ph.D.

©

2007

All Rights Reserved

XXXI

THE MISREADING WHICH LED TO THE “HATE” IN LUKE 14:26–27

INTRODUCTION

In the Torah, the Gospels, and the Epistles a number of texts can be collated into a litany of commandments to love one’s “neighbor” (רֵעִי¹ or עֵרֵךְ² or πλησίον³ or φίλων⁴ or ἀδελφούς⁵) and even one’s enemies (ἐχθρούς⁶). The litany would include

Leviticus 19:17

לֹא־תִשְׂנֵא אֶת־רֵעִיךָ בְּלִבְּךָ

You shall not hate in your heart anyone of your kin. (NRS)

Leviticus 19:18; Matthew 19:19, 22:39;
Mark 12:31; Luke 10:27; Romans 13:9; James 2:8

וְאָהַבְתָּ לְרֵעִיךָ כְּמוֹךָ

καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν
You shall love your kinfolk as yourself.

Leviticus 19:34

הַגֵּר הַגֵּר אִתְּכֶם וְאָהַבְתָּ לוֹ כְּמוֹךָ

The stranger who sojourns with you . . .
you shall love him as yourself.

Matthew 5:44; Luke 6:35

ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἐχθρούς ὑμῶν . . . ὅπως γένησθε
υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς
Love your enemies . . . so that you may be
sons of your Father who is in heaven.

John 13:34–35

I give you a new commandment, that you love one another.
Just as I have loved you, you also should love one another.
By this everyone will know that you are my disciples,
if you have love for one another.

John 15:12–13, 17

This is my commandment,
that you love one another as I have loved you.
Greater love has no man than this,
that a man lay down his life for his friends (φίλων).
You are my friends (φίλοι) if you do what I command you.
. . . This I command you to love one another.

Romans 13:10

ἡ ἀγάπη τῷ πλησίον κακὸν οὐκ ἐργάζεται·
πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη.
Love does no wrong to a neighbor;
therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.

Hebrews 13:1

Ἡ φιλαδελφία μενέτω.
Let brotherly love continue.

I John 3:11–4:21

This is the message which you have heard from the beginning, that we should love one another (ἀλλήλους) We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren (ἀδελφούς). He who does not love abides in death Beloved, let us love one another (ἀλλήλους), for love is of God, and he who loves is born of God and knows God. . . . He who does not love does not know God; for God is love. . . . If we

love one another (ἀλλήλους), God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us. . . . God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him. . . . If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother (ἀδελφὸν), he is a liar, for he that loveth not his brother (ἀδελφὸν) whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen? . . . And this commandment we have from him, that he who loves God should love his brother (ἀδελφὸν) also.

I Corinthians 13:13

νυνὶ δὲ μένει πίστις, ἐλπίς, ἀγάπη, τὰ τρία ταῦτα·
μείζων δὲ τούτων ἡ ἀγάπη.

And now faith, hope, and love abide, these three; and the greatest of these is love.

THE IMPERATIVE TO HATE

The affirmation by Jesus (Mark 12:29–34) that the commandment to love one’s neighbor (i.e., kith and kin) as one-self (Lev 19:18) is on par with the commandment to “love the LORD your God with heart, soul, and strength” (Deut 6:4), and that “there is no other commandment greater than these”—coupled with Luke 10:28 that these two commandments are the keys to eternal life—create serious problems for understanding Luke 14:26, which records Jesus’ imperative to hate everyone in one’s family. The problematic verse reads

τις ἔρχεται πρὸς με καὶ οὐ μισεῖ
τὸν πατέρα ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὴν
γυναῖκα καὶ τὰ τέκνα καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ τὰς
ἀδελφὰς ἔτι τε καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ,
οὐ δύναται εἶναί μου μαθητής.

If any one comes to me and does not hate
 his own father and mother and wife
 and children and brothers and sisters,
 yes, and even his own life,
 he cannot be my disciple.

It appears as if Pro 8:13, יִרְאַת יְהוָה שְׂנֵאתָ רַע “the fear of Yahweh is to hate *evil*,” was being restated by Jesus to mean יִרְאַת יְהוָה שְׂנֵאתָ רַע “the fear of Yahweh is to hate your *kith-and kin*”—which negates the entire litany of love.

CONJECTURES OF COMMENTATORS

Many commentators have appealed to “the less offensive but still accurate”⁷ parallel in Matt 10:37 to interpret Luke, which states, “He who loves father or mother more than me (Ὁ φιλῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ὑπὲρ ἐμὲ) is not worthy of me; and he who loves son or daughter more than me (ὁ φιλῶν υἱὸν ἢ θυγατέρα ὑπὲρ ἐμὲ) is not worthy of me.” Whereas in Luke 14:26 Jesus required a person to hate his own life (τὴν ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ), according to Matt 10:38, Jesus said “whoever does not bear his cross” (οὐ λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ) and follow me is not worthy of me.”⁸ The two phrases are not synonymous.

A sampling of scholarly conjecture reveals that no one thinks Jesus literally meant what he is alleged to have said in Luke 14:26. The following sampling of statements, cited in chronological sequence) are typical.

... Jesus is here regarding the well-beloved ones whom he enumerates as representatives of our natural life, that life, strictly and radically selfish, which separates us from God. Hence He adds: *Yea, and his own life also*; this word

forms the key to understanding of the word *hate*. At bottom, our *own* life is the only thing to be hated. Everything else is to be hated only in so far as it partakes of this principle of sin and death. . . . (Godet 1881:139)

In most cases these two [natural affection and loyalty to Christ] are not incompatible; and to hate one's parents *as such* would be monstrous (Mt. xv. 4). But Christ's followers must be ready, if necessary, to act towards what is dearest to them as if it were an object of hatred. Comp[are], Jn. xii. 25. Jesus, as often, states a principle in a startling way, and leaves his hearers to find out the qualifications. (Plummer 1922: 364)

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. (Michel 1967: 691)

. . . in this context 'hate' is not primarily an affective quality but a disavowal of primary allegiance to one's kin. In a way consistent with other teaching in Luke, then, Jesus underscores how discipleship relativizes one's normal and highly valued loyalties to normal family and other social ties. (Green 1997: 565)

Μισέω, 'to hate', is usually said to have its Semitic sense, 'to love less'. . . . it should be noted that the Hebrew *šānē*' has the sense 'to leave aside, abandon', and this sense may be present: cf. the use of ἀρνέομαι in 9:23 diff. 14:26, and the use of ἀφίμυ in 18:29 par. Mk. 10:29. The thought is not of psychological hate but renunciation. . . . Luke retains the hyperbolic form which is an authentic part of Jesus' teaching. (Marshall 1978: 592–593)

The Saviour, of course, does not mean that he who desires to follow him must hate his parents and other loved ones as such, but certainly that if loyalty to Him clashes with

loyalty to them he is to treat his loved ones in this connection as *though* they are persons whom he hates. But even when he acts thus towards them . . . he must continue to love them . . . in accordance with Christ’s law of love. (Geldenhuis 1979: 398)

To hate is a Semitic expression meaning to turn away from, to detach oneself from. There is nothing of that emotion we experience in the expression “I hate you.” (Craddock 1990: 181)

The statement by Marshall and by Craddock that Hebrew **שָׁנַע** /*šānē*’ has the sense “to leave aside, abandon, turn away” finds absolutely no support in the Semitic lexicons. The stem **שָׁנַע** / **שָׁנַע** (*šānâ* / *šānā*’) can mean “to change, to remove, to depart” (see below), not **שָׁנַע** / *šānē*’. In the Septuagint $\mu\iota\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$ “to hate” never translated **שָׁנַע** / **שָׁנַע**, although it regularly translated **שָׁנַע** (Hatch and Redpath 1954 2: 929). The sense of “abandon” or “forsake” can be recovered only if it is recognized that what Jesus said became garbled, thanks to normative Hebrew/Aramaic spelling which used the **ש** for the *s* (*š*) and the *sh* (*š*) sibilants, so that *šānē*’ “to hate” and *šānā*’ “to withdraw” were spelled **שָׁנַע**, automatically—though unintentionally—creating a garbled written record of a perfectly clear oral statement.

THE AMBIGUITY OF **שָׁנַע** AND **שָׁנַע**

Thus, the $\mu\iota\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$ “hate” in Luke 14:26 reflects the difficulties in interpreting some statements of Jesus once they were written in Hebrew or Aramaic. In oral tradition there could have been no confusion of *lo-yis-na*’ “he does not hate” and *lo-ye-shan-neh* “he does not forsake” (phonetic spellings).¹⁰

The Hebrew/Aramaic לִשְׂנֹא "לִשְׂנֹא" could have either meaning, with the reader being forced to interpret. Interpretations could be lexicographically correct *without* being true to the intent of the speaker. This is especially true with שְׂנֹא and שְׂנֹא.

The ambiguity of the שְׂנֹא and שְׂנֹא, much to the consternation of the interpreter, permits the following choices.

(1) שְׂנֹא "to hate," the cognate of Syriac ܫܢܐ (*sēnā*), Arabic شأ (*šanda*) "he hated" and شنيء (*šuni'a*) "he was hated," Aramaic שְׂנֹא / שְׂנֹא, Ugaritic *šn'* (Jastrow 1005, 1604; J. Payne Smith 1957: 382; Lane 1872: 1603; Gordon 1965: 492).

(2) שְׂנֹא / שְׂנֹא "to change" the cognate of Syriac ܫܢܐ (*šēnā*) "to change from one place to another, to remove, to depart . . . [as a metaphor] to leave, to fall off from, to desert," and Ugaritic *šnw* "to go away, to break out, to hasten" (Castell 1669: 3788; J. Payne Smith 1957: 382; Gordon 1965: 492; KBS 4: 1597; BDB 1039).¹¹

(3) שְׂנֹא "to repeat, to do again" and שְׂנִי "second," the cognate of Aramaic ܫܢܐ "to repeat, to teach," Syriac ܫܢܐ (*tēnā*) "to repeat, to tell" and Arabic ثنى (*tanaya*) "to fold, to double, to repeat"; שְׂנֹא "repetition" (BDB 1040; KBS 4: 1598; J. Payne Smith 1957: 616; Lane 1863: 356–360).

(4) שְׂנֹא / שְׂנֹא (a) "to glean, to sparkle, to shine, (b) to facilitate, to make easy," and (3) "to exalt, to promote, be of high rank," a cognate of Arabic سنو/سنى (*sanay*

/sanaw) “he ascended, he exalted” (see # 6, below) and שָׁנִי “scarlet” (BDB 1040; KBS 4:1599; Lane 1872: 1448–1449; Wehr 1979: 509).

(5) שָׁנָה / שָׁנָא, the cognate of Arabic شأ (šanaʿa) or شنى (šaniʿa) “he gave him his right or his due” (Lane 1872: 1603, not cited in BDB, KBS, or Jastrow).

(6) שָׁנָה / שָׁנָא, the cognate of Arabic سنو/سنى (sanay /sanaw) “he treated him with gentleness . . . behaved well with him in social intercourse . . . endeavoring to conciliate one” [form 3]; “he raised, exalted, or elevated, him” [form 4]; and “he sought to please, content, or satisfy, such a one” [form 5] (Lane 1872: 1449; Wehr 1979: 509; not cited in BDB, KBS, or Jastrow).

A clear example of the ambiguity of שָׁנָה / שָׁנָא is found in Ecc 8:1 where the MT reads וְעַז פָּנָיו יִשְׁנָא “and the hardness of his countenance is *changed*.” But the Septuagint reads καὶ ἀναιδῆς προσώπω αὐτοῦ μισηθήσεται “a shameless countenance will be *hated*.” Moreover, a Talmudic tradition in *Taʿ ānith* 7^b (Epstein 1948: 29; Jastrow 1604), seemingly in support of the Septuagint against the MT, stated: “Do not read יִשְׁנָא / *yʿshunne*” [changed] but יִשְׁנָא / *yissane* [hated].”

The שָׁנָא in Psa 127:2, כִּן יִתֵּן לִירֵדוֹ שָׁנָא “for [God] gives to his beloved sleep (= שָׁנָה)” has been translated by Emerton and Seybold (cited in KBS 4: 1595) as “He [God] certainly gives status/respect to the one whom he loves,” which draws upon definitions (4c) and (6), above. The שָׁנָה in Est 2:9, וַיִּשְׁנֶה . . . לְטוֹב “and he advanced her . . . to the best

place,” became in the Septuagint ἐχρήσατο αὐτῇ καλῶς “he treated her well” and in the Peshittā ܠܒ . . . ܠܡܢ ܥܘܒܐ “and he separated/distinguished . . . her above.” These reflect definitions (4c) and (6), above.

THE AMBIGUITY OF וְלֹא יִשְׂנֵא

A Hebrew *Vorlage* of the phrase καὶ οὐ μισεῖ τὸν πατέρα ἑαυτοῦ “and he not hate his father” (Luke 14:26a) would have been וְלֹא יִשְׂנֵא אֶת אָבִיו. But, whereas the Greek phrase is perfectly clear, the Hebrew phrase is clearly ambiguous. First, the וְלֹא need not be the negative particle לֹא. It could well be the emphatic וְלֵא “verily, truly, indeed” which appears in the Shem Tob Hebrew Gospel of Matthew in 19:22b, הַבְּחֹר, לְפִי שְׂלֵא הִיָּה לוֹ קַרְקָעוֹת רַבּוֹת [זַעֲרָף] “the young man went away (angry)¹² because he *indeed* had many properties” (Howard 1995: 94–95).¹³

The presence of the emphatic וְלֵא in Matt 19:22 suggests that it could also have been in the *Vorlage* of Luke 14:26. Assuming that יִשְׂנֵא in the *Vorlage* meant “hate,” Jesus may well have meant, “If any one comes to me and he *truly* (or *actually*) hates his father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, yes, and even his own life, he cannot be my disciple.” In this case the Greek text should have used the emphatic οὐν “really” rather than the negative οὐ “not” —with only a ν being the difference in Greek between “really loving” or “not loving”—similar to the difference in Hebrew between the וְלֵא being read as *lô*’ or *lu*’. Were the οὐ emended to οὐν, 14:26 could be added to the biblical litany of love.

On the other hand, יִשְׂנֵא in the *Vorlage* of 14:26 need not mean “hate.” Of the definitions listed above, וְלֵא (2) “to

change, to go away, to withdraw” would provide a reasonable alternative which would be compatible with the litany of love. Forsaking one’s own family for a new love has its roots in the creation story: “a man leaves / forsakes (יַעֲזֹב) his father and his mother and cleaves (יִדְבַק) to his wife, and they become one flesh” (Gen 2:24). The forsaking of kith and kin (saying “good-bye”) for a new love required no hate, just change, separation, new commitments and priorities. Jesus’ call for the forsaking of all others in order for one to become a disciple appears in Matt 19:29 and Luke 14:33, which support the reconstruction of the *Vorlage* of Luke 14:26 with שָׁנָא/שָׁנֵא “to leave, to forsake” rather than שָׂנֵא/שָׂנֵא “to hate.”¹⁴

Jesus’ response to the rich young ruler who inquired about eternal life included the commandment to honor one’s father and mother (Matt 19:19; Luke 18:20; Mark 10:19). Jesus severely chastised the Pharisees and scribes for circumventing this commandment, stating

God said, “Honor your father and your mother,” and, “Whoever speaks evil of father or mother must surely die.” But you say that whoever tells father or mother, “Whatever support you might have had from me is given to God,” then that person need not honor the father. So, for the sake of your tradition, you make void the word of God. (Matt 15:4–6)

In light of the emphasis on honoring one’s parents—which clearly includes financial assistance¹⁵—the שָׁנָא/שָׁנֵא in Luke’s *Vorlage* could be definitions (5) “to give someone their right or due” and (6) “to treat someone with gentleness, conciliation, and esteem.” Had Jesus said אִם יבֵּא אֵלַי אִישׁ וְלֹא יִשְׁנֵא אֶת אָבִיו, he could well have meant “if a man comes to me and *does not treat* his father with *gentleness*” or

“if he a man comes to me and does not *rightfully support* his father.” These definitions would apply equally well with all family members mentioned by Jesus, including oneself—validating self-esteem and self-support, as well as wife-support, child-support, and conciliation among siblings.

While on the cross, just before he died, Jesus made provision for his mother’s welfare after his death.

When Jesus saw his mother, and the disciple whom he loved standing near, he said to his mother, “Woman, behold, your son!” Then he said to the disciple, “Behold, your mother!” And from that hour the disciple took her to his own home. (John 19:26–27)

This was not an act of hate (ἔχθρα) on Jesus’ part, nor was the beloved disciple, in obedience to Jesus’ earlier command, likely to start hating Mary once she became “Mother.” To the contrary, Jesus and the beloved disciple were making it possible for Mary to receive what was her right and due (δικαίωμα). This interpretation brings Luke 14:26 into the biblical litany of love and into conformity with the family responsibilities spelled out in Pro 28:24 and I Tim 5:4 (cited in note 15).

LUKE 14:27

ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ
καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου,
οὐ δύναται εἶναί μου μαθητῆς

Whoever does not carry the cross
and follow me
cannot be my disciple.

Luke’s earlier quotation of Jesus’s similar statement in 9:23, “If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross daily (καθ’ ἡμέραν) and follow me,”

makes it certain that carrying/bearing a cross was something that could and should be done repeatedly. Consequently, it was not a call for martyrdom which could only be done once.

The Hebrew *Vorlage* of 9: 23 and 14:27 may well have had נִלְתָּ/הִלְתָּ —which was translated $\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\omega\theta\acute{\eta}\tau\omega$ “be hanged, impaled, or crucified” in Est 7:9. Once Jesus’ statements were interpreted in the light of his crucifixion, the נִלְתָּ/הִלְתָּ was understandably read as the synonym of צֶלֶב “a pole, stake, or cross” used for hanging, impaling, or crucifixion, even though, as Schneider (1971: 578) noted, “Cross-bearing in the sense of *patibulum ferre* finds no parallel in Semitic at all.”

However, if נִלְתָּ/הִלְתָּ was in the *Vorlage* used by Luke it was probably the cognate of (1) Arabic تَلَاء (*talâ*) “a bond, or an obligation, by which one becomes responsible for the safety of another, . . . responsibility, or suretiship, . . . the transfer of a debt, or of a claim by shifting the responsibility from one person to another” and اتلى (*atlay*) [form 4] “he gave him his bond, or obligation, by which he became responsible for his safety” and (2) Arabic تلا/تלו (*tilw/ talâ*) “follower, companion” and “he followed, or went, or walked, behind, or after. . . he imitates such a one, and follows what he does; and follows him in action” (Lane 1863: 313–314).

With these definitions in focus the original meaning behind Jesus’ statement, “whoever *does not carry the cross* and follow me cannot be my disciple,” may well have been “whoever *does not bear responsibility* and does not *imitate me* cannot be my disciple.” There may well have been multiple layers of meaning to the statement:¹⁶

- *to fulfill obligations* for the support of one’s parents,
- *to be lovingly responsible* for kith, kin, and sojourner,
- *to be a bonded imitator* of Jesus in *word* and in *deed*.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The enigmatic statement of Jesus in Luke 14:26 calling for his disciples to hate their family members and themselves is in stark disagreement with the biblical litany of love outlined in the *Introduction*. Therefore, a Hebrew/Aramaic *Vorlage* was reconstructed in order to see what options were available for an interpreter working with unpointed and unvocalized written sources of Jesus' sayings. The Greek οὐ μισεῖ “not hate” would easily have translated לֹא יִשְׂנֵא. But לֹא יִשְׂנֵא could also have meant οὐν μισεῖ “truly hate” if the verb were שִׁנְּא—meaning people who truly hated their family members could *not* become Jesus' disciples.

However, the verb שִׁנְּא (or its by-form שִׁנְּה) should have been read with a *sh* sibilant (שׁ) rather than the *s* (שׁ). By reading שִׁנְּה / שִׁנְּא at least five different definitions become transparent, three of which are contextually appropriate in light of the larger litany of love. It is my opinion that Jesus' use of שִׁנְּה / שִׁנְּא (rather than שִׁנְּה / שִׁנְּא “hate”) carried multiple layers of meaning which included:

- “to forsake, to say good-bye, to depart”
- “to rightfully support, to give what is due,”
- “to treat with kindness, respect, and conciliation.”

Therefore, it appears that Jesus' original oral statement meant “Whoever comes to me and does not say good-bye to father and mother, wife and children, brothers and sisters, yes, and his own life, cannot be my disciple.” But it was a *good* good-bye. The separation, grounded in love, carried responsibilities for those left at home. Kinfolk were to receive their due in kindness, conciliation, and support, as assuredly as Jesus cared for his mother by appointing a guardian upon his

impending death. While self-indulgence may be a symptom of self-hate, self-denial was to become an exercise in self-love.

To interpret Pro 8:13, **יראת יהוה שנאת רע** “the fear of the LORD is to hate a neighbor” would not be totally wrong, but it would not do justice to the context or to the intent of of personified Wisdom who was speaking. Similarly, the translation of **אם לא ישנא** as “if he does not hate” would not be totally wrong. But it appears to have been an early misreading of a saying of Jesus which did not do justice to the biblical litany of love, other teachings of Jesus, and the example he set in his responsible relationship to his own mother.

NOTES

1. **אָח** “a brother or half-brother born of the same mother or father” was also used for kinship in a wider sense meaning a “relative, kinfolk, fellow, equal” (BDB 26; Jastrow 38). As noted by Jastrow **אָח** could be gender inclusive, as in the Midrash *Canticum Rabbah* VIII: 1 where **שני אחים** “two brothers” is use for “brother and sister.” The Arabic cognate **أخ** (*ah*) can also mean “a friend, an associate, a fellow, or a companion” (Lane 1863: 33).
2. **רֵעַ** and its by-form **רֵעִי** mean “friend, companion, fellow, best man, loved one.” In Lam 1:2 **רֵעֵיהָ** appears as a synonym of **אֲהַבָּיהָ** “her lovers”; and in Cant 5:16 in appears in parallelism with **דוֹר** “beloved, loved one.” In Jer 3:20 **רֵעַ** has the meaning of “husband,” similar to the Ethiopic cognates **መርጵ** (*mā rē‘ā*) “marriage” and **መርጵዊ** (*mā rē‘ā wī*) “bridegroom” (Dillman 1955: 310; BDB 946).
3. In the Septuagint **πλησίον** translated **רֵעַ**, or a variant form thereof, 122 times and **אָח** four times, as well as twenty-three times

as the translation of nine other Hebrew words (Hatch and Redpath 1148–1149).

4. Φίλος “beloved, dear, friend, kith and kin” (Liddell and Scott 1939). In the Septuagint it translated אָהֵב , or a variant form thereof, thirty-seven times and אָהֵבָה ten times, as well as eight times for the translation of four other Hebrew words (Hatch and Redpath 1431).

5. Ἀδελφός “brother, kinsman, colleague, fellow, associate” (Liddell and Scott 20). In the Septuagint it translated אָהֵב over four hundred times, as well as fifteen times for the translation of five other Hebrew words, including the אָהֵב in Gen 43:33 (Hatch and Redpath 20–23).

6. The basic meaning of ἐχθρός [passive] is “hated, hateful (of persons or things),” [active] “hating, hostile,” and “enemy” wherein the active and passive meanings coincide (Lidell and Scott 747–748 *sub* ἐχθαίρω, ἐχθός, ἐχθρα). In the Septuagint ἐχθρός generally translates אָהֵב or אָהֵבָה “enemy,” but in nine texts it translated אָהֵב (Exo 23:5; Job 8:22, 31:29; Psa 9:13, 40:7, 80:15 [LXX 81:15], 118:7 [LXX 117:7]). The reading of Matt 10:36 in the Shem Tob Hebrew Gospel of Matthew (Howard 1995: 46–47) is of particular interest: $\text{וְהָאֹיְבִים לְהֵיוֹת אֲהוּבִים}$ “and the enemies are to become loved ones.”

7. Davies and Allison 1991: 221, where it is noted that “service to one’s teacher comes before service to one’s father” (*Baba M’tsi’a* 2.11). However, the Talmud required the father to be served first if he was a sage. The passage reads (Epstein 1935: 204–205):

But if his father is a sage, his father takes precedence. If his father and his teacher were [each] carrying a burden, he must [first] assist his teacher to lay it down, and then assist his father. If his father and his teacher are in captivity, he must [first] redeem his teacher and then his father, but if his father is a sage he must [first] redeem his father and then his

THE MISREADING WHICH LED TO “HATE” 331

teacher. (See also Goldschmidt 1933: 579–580, [2, 11, folio 33a].)

Davies and Allison cited Hill’s (1981: 195) conclusion, “This verse is not an attack on family relationships and natural attachments, but it is a clear insistence that following Jesus is more important than family ties”

8. The Gospel of Thomas Logia 55 retains elements common to Matthew and Luke. It reads, “Whoever does not hate his father and his mother will not be able to be a disciple (μαθητης/μαθητής) to Me,” and (whoever does not) hate his brethren and his sisters and (does not) take up his cross (υπερϋψος) in My way will not be worthy of Me.” The ϋψος here is an abbreviation of ϋψαρϋος = σταυρός “a cross, stake, or pale” used for crucifixion and used as a metaphor for voluntary suffering (Liddell and Scott 1635; Crum 1939: 546). (For Logia 55, see Guillaumont 1959: 30–31.)

9. Citing Luke 16:13 par Matt 6:24; Gen 29:31–33; Deu 21:15–17; 2 Sam 19:7; Pro 13:24; Isa 60:15; Mal 1:2f.; Rom 9:13; 1 John 2:9; SB I, 434.

10. There were, however, dialectal variations with the sibilants as in the *Sibboleth/Shibboleth* incident in Jud 12:6. Mistakes with sibilants could be costly. An analogy in English is the command (written in Semitic style with consonants only): *st yrslf!* It could mean “suit yourself!” or “shoot yourself!”

11. Note, for example, Matt 4:12 where ἀνεχώρησεν “he withdrew” was translated in the Peshitta as ܫܢܝܐ (*šani*). For the interchange of ܫܢܝܐ and ܫܢܝܐ compare II Kings 25:29 and Jer 52:33.

12. The זעף “angry” is missing in three, possibly four, of the nine available manuscripts of the Shem Tob Matthew.

13. Howard rendered the רבות רבנות שלא היה לו קרקעות “because he did not have much property.” But, in light of

(1) the Greek text reading ἦν γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα πολλά “for he had great possessions,” here and in Mark 10:22,

(2) the parallel passage in Luke 18:18 having ἦν γὰρ πλούσιος σφόδρα “for he was very rich,” and

(3) Jesus’ following this encounter with an aphorism about how hard it is for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven

the **ܢܠ** of 19:22 must surely mean “verily!” For bibliography on the emphatic **ܠܢܠ**, see Chapter XIV, note 10, and KBS 510–511.

14. When John 12:25, “He who *loves* his life loses it, and he who *hates* his life in this world will keep it for eternal life,” is read in the light of John 15:13, “Greater *love* has no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends,” the “hate” (= **ܢܠܦ**) of 12:25 may have originated in a misreading of **ܢܠܦ** “forsake / abandon” in the original. Brown (1966 1: 474) noted,

Underlying John xii 25 is an independent variant of a saying attributed to Jesus, a variant comparable in every way with the variants represent in the Synoptic tradition [Mark viii 35; Luke ix 24; Matt x 39; Matt xvi 25; Luke xvii 33]. Dodd even suggests that John’s form is in some ways closer to the original Aramaic saying than is any of the Synoptic patterns.

15. Davies and Allison 1991: 523, where attention is called to Prov 28:24 (“He who robs his father or his mother and says, ‘That is no transgression,’ is the companion of a man who destroys”); and I Tim 5:4 (“If a widow has children or grandchildren, they should first learn their religious duty to their own family and make some repayment to their parents; for this is pleasing in God’s sight”).

16. For a summary of six different traditional interpretations—from understanding it as the equivalent of ἄρατε τὸν ζυγὸν μου ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς “take my yoke upon you” to its being marked with a *Tau* (†) as a sign of protection and possession—see Schneider 1971: 578–579.