Durham University

Durham E-Theses

Women and their roles in the Gospels and Acts.

B. Witherington

How to cite:

Witherington, B. (1981) Women and their roles in the Gospels and Acts. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/1119/ is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

Academic Support Office, The Palatine Centre, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE
e-mail: e-theses.admin@durham.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
https://etheses.durham.ac.uk

WOMEN AND THEIR ROLES IN THE GOSPELS AND ACTS

by

Ben Witherington III, B. A., M. Div.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

A Thesis
submitted for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

University of Durham
Department of Theology
1981

17 MAY 1984

WOMEN AND THEIR ROLES IN THE GOSPELS AND ACTS

by

Ben Witherington III, B. A., M. Div.

Abstract

This thesis is an exegetical survey of the passages in the Gospels and Acts that reveal the attitudes of Jesus and/or the Gospel writers about women and their roles, or indicate what roles women actually assumed in Jesus' community during His earthly career and after His Ascension. After discussing in chapter one the roles women had in various non-Christian settings in the first century Mediterranean world for the purpose of historical comparison, chapter two examines matters of historical method and criticism in the New Testament for the purpose of establishing a means of approaching the relevant data in the Gospels and Acts. Chapters three and four discuss Jesus' attitudes toward women and their roles as they are reflected in His words and deeds. Evidence is produced to show that Jesus stood in contrast to His immediate Jewish surroundings and, to a lesser extent, to the views of the predominant Graeco-Roman culture in His attitudes about a woman's word of witness, and her rights to participate fully in the religious community and to be judged on equal terms with men in regard to her sins and her need for salvation. Jesus' rejection of sexual discrimination, of Old Testamental and rabbinic laws concerning uncleanness, of divorce, and of the duty of men to marry and procreate, and His affirmation of the higher claims of the family of faith over the physical family, gave women a more secure place in marriage and an opportunity to choose roles other than wife and mother. Evidence is produced to show that Luke and, to a lesser extent, the other Evangelists are interested in advocating the equality of male and female to their audiences by using male-female parallelism and male-female role reversal, and by presenting certain women in a favorable light at the expense of certain men. Chapters five and six explore the roles played by Jesus' female followers in His pre- and post- Resurrection community and the portrayal of these women as model disciples for the Evangelists' audiences.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration, Acknowledgements, Copyright iii
Endnote Abbreviations iv
Journals, Periodicals, Serials (Abbreviations) vii

Chapter I: Women in the Cultures of the Mediterranean World 1

A. Women and Their Roles in Palestine 1

B. Women and Their Roles in Greece, Macedonia, Asia Minor, and Egypt 11

C. Women and Their Roles in Rome 21

Chapter II: Principles for Interpreting the Gospels and Acts 47

A. Genre of the Gospels 47

B. The Synoptic Problem 50

C. The Relation of John to the Synoptics 53

D. Source Criticism 57

E. Form Criticism 59

F. Redaction Criticism 66

G. History and the Gospels and Acts 68

Chapter III: Women in the Teaching of Jesus 88

A. The Physical Family
1. Parents, Children, and Widows 88
2. Marriage, Adultery, and Divorce 97
3. Eunuchs for the Kingdom - Mt 19.10-12 112
4. Wives in the Resurrection - Mt 12.18-27 and parallels 116

B. Women in the Parables of Jesus
1. The Obstinate Widow and the Obdurate Judge - Lk 18.1-8 119
2. The Search for the Lost Coin - Lk 15.8-10 122
3. The Leaven and the Dough - Mt 13.33 and parallel 124
4. The Wise and Foolish Virgins - Mt 25.1-13 125

C. Women and Female Imagery in the Judgment Sayings 128
1. The Queen of the South - Mt 12.42 and parallel 129
2. The Final Separation - Mt 24.40-41 and parallel 129
3. The Mother and Daughters of Jerusalem
I. Mt 23.37-39 and parallel 130
4. The Mother and Daughters of Jerusalem
II. Lk 23.27-31 132

D. Jesus' Attitude Toward Women Reflected in His Words 134

Chapter IV: Women and the Deeds of Jesus 170

A. Stories of Help and Healing
1. The Lukan Anointing - Lk 7.36-50 170
2. The Woman at the Well - Jn 4.4-42 174
3. The Syrophoenician Woman - Mk 7.24-30 and parallel 180
4. Peter's Mother-in-Law - Mk 1.29-31 and parallels 184
5. Healing the Cripple on a Sabbath - Lk 13.10-17 186
6. Jairus and the Jewess - Mk 5.21-43 and parallels 189
7. The widow of Nain - Lk 7.11-17 193

B. Jesus' Attitude Toward Women Reflected in His Actions 196

Chapter V: Women in the Ministry of Jesus 217

A. Mother Mary, Jesus' Disciple
1. The Infancy Narrative of Matthew 217
2. The Infancy Narrative of Luke 224
3. The Wedding Feast at Cana - Jn 2.1-12 243
4. Mary in the Synoptics 248
5. Mary at the Cross - Jn 19.25-27 256
6. Mary in the Church - Ac 1.14 262
7. Conclusions 265

B. Mary and Martha
1. Hosts or Guests? - Lk 10.38-42 267
2. A Confession and a Proclamation - John 11 271
3. Another Anointing - Mk 14.3-9 and parallels 278
4. Conclusions 283

C. Women Who Followed Jesus
1. On the Road with Women Disciples - Lk 8.1-3 285
2. Women at the Cross - Mk 15.40-41 and parallels 288
3. The First Visit to the Tomb, The Burial
Mk 15.42-47 and parallels 293
4. The Second Visit to the Tomb, The Resurrection Narratives
a. Mark 16 295
b. Matthew 28 303
c. Luke 24 310
d. John 20 315

D. The Place of Women in Jesus' Ministry 325

Chapter VI: Women in the Primitive Church - The Book of Acts 374

A. Incidental References to Male-Female Parallelism, Role Reversal, and Female Prominence 374

B. Women as Prominent Converts and μητέρες συναγωγῆς 378
1. Mary, the Mother of John Mark 380
2. Lydia 383

C. Women as Deaconesses 386

D. Women as Prophetesses 389

E. Women as Teachers 392

F. Conclusions 397

Thesis Conclusions and Implications 412

Bibliography 421

Declaration

None of the material in this thesis in its present form has been submitted previously for a degree in any educational institution. All of the material in this thesis is solely the product of the author's own research.

Acknowledgments

My sincere thanks go to Professor C. K. Barrett whose extensive guidance at every stage in the preparation of this thesis has been invaluable. My appreciation also goes to Dr. Edmund Robb and A Foundation for Theological Education for providing the financial aid for my three years of doctoral studies in England. I also wish to express my gratitude to my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ben Witherington, Jr., and Mr. and Mrs. John Sherrill, whose kind assistance has greatly facilitated the completion of this project. Finally, my thanks and love go to my wife, Ann, who, like Tabitha, has been "full of good works", typing and making it possible in so many ways for this thesis to be completed in good time and order.

Copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Endnote Abbreviations

Greek and Hebrew Texts

BHK	R. Kittel and P. Kahle, eds. Biblia Hebraica (7th ed.; Stuttgart, 1951).
LXXR	A. Rahlfs, ed., Septuaginta (9th ed.; 2 vols.; Stuttgart, 1971).
NTGNA	E. Nestle and K. Aland, eds. Novum Testamentum Graece (25th ed.; London, 1971).
Synopsis	Kurt Aland, ed., Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum (8th ed.; Stuttgart, 1973).
UBSGNT	Kurt Aland, et al., eds., The Greek New Testament (3rd ed.; London, 1975).

English Translations

JB	The Jerusalem Bible, Reader's Edition (Garden City, 1968).
KJV	Holy Bible, King James Version (New York, 1957).
Moffatt	The New Testament, James Moffatt (New York, 1920).
NASB	New American Standard Bible, New Testament (2nd ed.; Carol Stream, Illinois, 1963).
NEB	The New English Bible, New Testament (2nd ed.; New York, 1970).
NIV	Holy Bible, New International Version (Grand Rapids, 1978).
Phillips	The New Testament in Modern English, J. B. Phillips (New York, 1972).
RSV	Harper Study Bible, Revised Standard Version (Grand Rapids, 1971).
Schonfield	The Authentic New Testament, Hugh J. Schonfield (Aberdeen, 1955).
TEV	Good News Bible, Today's English Version (New York, 1976).

General Reference Works

APOT	R. H. Charles, ed., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English (2 vols.; Oxford, 1913).

A-S	G. Abbott-Smith, A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament (3rd ed.; Edinburgh, 1937).
BAG	W. Bauer, W. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (4th ed.; Chicago, 1952).
BDB	Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford, 1972).
BDF	F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament (trans. R. W. Funk; Chicago, 1961).
CIG	A. Boeckh, ed., Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum. Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae (4 vols.; Berlin, 1828-1877).
CII	J.-B. Frey, ed., Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum (2 vols.; Rome, 1936).
CIL	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae (16 vols.; Berlin, 1863 ff.).
Danby	Herbert Danby, trans., The Mishnah (London, 1933).
DNTT	Colin Brown, ed., The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology (3 vols.; Grand Rapids, 1975-1978).
Gaster, DSS	T. Gaster, trans., The Dead Sea Scriptures (Garden City, 1964).
HR	Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, A Concordance to the Septuagint (2 vols.; Graz, 1954).
IG	Inscriptiones Graecae. Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae (14 vols.; Berlin, 1873-1972).
ILS	Hermann Dessau, ed., Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae (3 vols.; Berlin, 1892-1916).
LPGL	G. W. H. Lampe, ed., A Patristic Greek Lexicon (Oxford, 1961).
LSJ	H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon (9th ed.; rev. H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie with supplement by E. A. Barber {1968}; Oxford, 1940).
Metzger, TC	Bruce M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (London, 1971).
MG	W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, eds., A Concordance to the Greek Testament (4th ed.; Edinburgh, 1963).
MHT	J. H. Moulton, W. F. Howard, and N. Turner, A Grammar of New Testament Greek (4 vols.; Edinburgh, 1908-1976).

ML, Anthology	C. G. Montefiore and H. Loewe. A Rabbinic Anthology (New York, 1974).
MM	James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (Grand Rapids, 1930).
Moule, I-B	C. F. D. Moule, An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek (2nd ed.; Cambridge, 1959).
NTAp	Edgar Hennecke, New Testament Apocrypha (2 vols.; ed. W. Schneemelcher; trans. R. McL. Wilson; Philadelphia, 1963-1965).
Robertson	A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Nashville, 1934).
SIG	W. Dittenberger, ed., Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum (3rd ed.; 4 vols.; Leipzig, 1915-1924).
Str-B	Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck. Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (6 vols.; München, 1974-1975 repr.).
TDNT	Gerhard Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (10 vols.; trans. G. Bromiley; Grand Rapids, 1964-1976).
Vermes, DSS	G. Vermes, tr., The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (Harmondsworth, 1965).
Wettstein	Jacobus Wettstein, Novum Testamentum Graecum (2 vols.; Graz, 1752/1962).
Zerwick	Maximilian Zerwick, Biblical Greek (trans. J. Smith; Rome, 1963).

Journals, Periodicals, Serials
Endnote and Bibliography Abbreviations

AbrN	Abr-Nahrain
AER	American Ecclesiastical Review
AJA	American Journal of Archaeology
AJP	American Journal of Philology
AJT	American Journal of Theology
Ang	Angelicum
	Arethusa
ARW	Archiv für Religionswissenschaft
ATR	Anglican Theological Review
AusBR	Australian Biblical Review
BETS	Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society
	Biblebhashyam
	Bible Today
Bib	Biblica
BibLeb	Bibel und Leben
BJRL	Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester
BR	Biblical Research
BSac	Bibliotheca Sacra
BT	The Bible Translator
BTB	Biblical Theology Bulletin
BSNTS	Bulletin of the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas
	Bulletin du Centre Protestant D'Études
BZ	Biblische Zeitschrift
	Catholica
	Catholic World
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CJT	Canadian Journal of Theology
	Classical Journal
	Classical Philology
	Classical Review
	Classical Weekly
	Classical World
	Clergy Review

	Colloquium
	Commonweal
CTM	Concordia Theological Monthly
	Diakonia
	Dialogue
EspV	Esprit et Vie
EstBib	Estudios Biblicos
ET	Expository Times
ETR	Études Théologiques et Religieuses
EvQ	Evangelical Quarterly
Exp	Expositor
GL	Geist und Leben
Greece	Greece and Rome
Greg	Gregorianum
HeyJ	Heythrop Journal
HibJ	Hibbert Journal
	Histoire Sociale: Revue Canadienne
HR	History of Religions
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
IEJ	Israel Exploration Journal
Imm	Immanuel
Int	Interpretation
ITQ	Irish Theological Quarterly
JAC	Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JES	Journal of Ecumenical Studies
JETS	Journal of Evangelical Theological Society
JHS	Journal of Hellenic Studies
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
JR	Juridical Review
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
JTSA	Journal of Theology for Southern Africa
	Judaism
KG	Katholische Gedänke
LCR	Lutheran Church Review
LTJ	Lutheran Theological Journal
LV	Lumen Vitae

	Living Light
	Mnemosyne
	Month
MS	Marian Studies
MTZ	Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift
	New Blackfriars
NKZ	Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift
NovT	Novum Testamentum
NRT	Nouvelle Revue Théologique
NTS	New Testament Studies
NVet	Nova et Vetera
	The Other Side
PAAJR	Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research
	Population Studies
RB	Revue Biblique
RCB	Revista de Cultura Biblica
	Religion in Life
RevExp	Review and Expositor
RHE	Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique
RHPR	Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses
RSPT	Revue de Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques
RSR	Recherches de Science Religieuse
RTL	Revue Théologique de Louvain
RTP	Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie
RUO	Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa
Scr	Scripture
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology
SS	Sein und Sendung
TGl	Theologie und Glaube
	Theology
TQ	Theologische Quartalschrift
TS	Theological Studies
TSK	Theologische Studien und Kritiken
TT	Theology Today
TynB	Tyndale Bulletin
TZ	Theologische Zeitschrift
USM	Union Seminary Magazine
VD	Verbum Domini

VT	Vetus Testamentum
WayS	Way Supplement
WTJ	Westminster Theological Journal
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZEE	Zeitschrift für evangelische Ethik
ZkT	Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZTK	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche

CHAPTER I: WOMEN IN THE CULTURES OF THE MEDITERRANEAN WORLD

INTRODUCTION

When one embarks on a major discussion of women and their roles in the Gospels and Acts, it soon becomes apparent that the necessary prolegomenon to such a discussion is an examination of the roles women actually did take in the various cultures to which the Gospel message came in the first century A. D. Since it is proposed in this thesis to examine primarily Jesus' attitudes about women and their roles, and the Evangelists' views on these matters, this necessitates a discussion of women and their roles not only in Palestine, but also in the areas to which the first five documents of the NT probably were sent; i.e., the Mediterranean region from north of Palestine to Rome.[1] This investigation must be limited in scope to certain major issues or areas that shed light on the portion of the NT material under discussion - 1) women and their roles in marriage and the family; 2) women and their roles in religion; 3) women and their roles as witnesses, teachers, and leaders. It will be assumed that general attitudes toward women and their roles in the Mediterranean world during the NT era have been sufficiently indicated by others.[2]

A. Women and Their Roles in Palestine

In attempting to discuss first century Palestinian Jewish women, the problem of dating the possibly relevant material immediately confronts us. A considerable amount of material in the rabbinic literature is of an unknown date, since it is not identified with a particular rabbi or school. Thus, this essay relies primarily on Mishnaic information which was certainly in existence before the Misnah's codification around A. D. 200. Material from the Talmuds and Midrashes are used when they seem to summarize attitudes that prevailed throughout the era of rabbinic Judaism.[3] The Mishnaic material must, of course, be handled with care, but since in many instances it presents actual situations and issues (not merely hypothetical ones), and since even in the purely 'academic' debates it often reflects actual attitudes with which we are vitally concerned, it is not inappropriate to use such material. In any case, the material presented here has been selected as 'typical' of a way of thinking among Jewish leaders and rabbis from before Jesus' day through the Amoraic period. Thus, without glossing over crucial differences, we may expect our material,

even if it originates from a period somewhat after the NT era, to give us a reasonably clear glimpse of attitudes about women in Jesus' day among His countrymen. That this is not an unreasonable expectation is shown time and again when the attitudes found in such texts as Lk 24.11 and Jn 4.9, 27 are also found in Josephus, Philo, and material from the Mishnah and Talmuds of various dates.[4]

1) Women and Their Roles in Marriage and the Family

There can be little doubt that the family was almost the exclusive sphere of influence for Jewish women in the first century A. D. A glance at the titles of the subdivisions in the Mishnah under the heading Nashim (Yebamoth, Ketuboth, Nedarim, Nazir, Sotah, Gittin, Kiddushin) indicates to us that women were only of importance legally to the rabbis in the areas of marriage and divorce, inheritance and heredity, and the extremes of holiness (vows) and unholiness (Sotah). A woman's sphere of influence or importance in the legal sense was confined to her connection to her family, her faithfulness to her husband, and her domestic responsibilities.[5] This limiting of a woman's sphere of influence is partly attributed to Jewish marital customs of that day. One must bear in mind the extraordinary patria potestas a father had over his daughter, and a husband over his wife. The laws of inheritance, betrothal, and divorce were heavily biased in the male's favor with only a few checks and balances (such as the wife's ketubah, and a daughter's right of maintenance). A woman was passed from a father to her husband's sphere of authority usually without being consulted. Since a woman changed families when she married, she could not be expected to preserve the family name or keep property in the same family. For this reason, the laws stated that she was entitled to maintenance rather than inheritance in most cases.[6] That R. Ishmael can bemoan the poverty of Israel's women is perhaps an indication of how hard and rare it was for a woman to inherit property.[7]

While a girl was underage she had no right to her own possessions, and the fruit of her labor or anything she found belonged to her father.[8] If she was violated, compensation money for the indignity was paid to the father.[9] An underage daughter could not refuse a marriage arrangement made by her father, though she could express her wish to stay in the home until puberty.[10] She could, however, refuse any arrangement made by her mother or brothers after her father's death and before she was 12½.[11] Once she was of age she could not be betrothed against

her will.[12] A wife, like a Gentile slave, could be obtained by intercourse, money, or writ.[13] Considering the early age of betrothals and marriages, it would be rare indeed for a woman to have acquired an inheritance prior to marriage or to have refused a marital arrangement made by her family.

Though a woman usually had to be paid her ketubah even if the husband went into debt,[14] this requirement was not as strict as it might have been since a woman could be put away without her ketubah on certain grounds.[15] Further, we are told that a woman's ketubah is to be paid out of the poorest land one had.[16] A woman's security in her husband's family was attenuated further by the fact that the husband could divorce her if she caused an 'impediment' to the marriage. This privilege was not extended to the wife.[17] Unlike the case with a man,[18] a woman could be divorced without her consent for reasons ranging from unchastity only (School of Shammai), to burning a meal (School of Hillel), to finding another fairer than one's own wife (R. Akiba).[19]

A wife's security was threatened in some cases by the fact that polygamy was permitted in Tannaitic times as it was in the OT. S. Lowy draws the following conclusions after an extensive survey:
1) some sources presuppose a polygamist state of affairs, but this may be purely academic legislation as was common in the Mishnah;[20]
2) the Targum to Ruth 4.6 based on a Midrash says explicity, "I am not permitted to marry another", but this may reflect a minority opinion and may be late Amoraic material; 3) the polygamy of the royal families, such as Herod's, is not to be taken as typical; 4) Tosephta Yebamoth I.10, 13 says that high priests in Jerusalem had rival wives, but this is likely an instance of Levirate marriage (which is a form of polygamy, though due to a relative's childlessness); 5) the brother of R. Gamaliel took a second wife because the first was barren; 6) The Babylonian Talmud reveals no significant source pointing to widespread polygamy and in fact much of the terminology used for marriage ('pairing', 'she of the house') intimates that monogamy was the normal practice;[21] 7) possibly rabbis insisted on the legal rights of having more than one wife because various related religious groups (Christians and possibly Qumranites) insisted that monogamy was the only legitimate biblical practice;
8) thus, it is likely that monogamy for economic and moral reasons was the ruling practice, but that polygamy did exist in both Tannaitic and Amoraic times as more than a technical possibility.[22] In fact, the Mishnah records cases of and rules for a man betrothed to two women,

and there is no dispute over the issue.[23] Thus, the threat of lost security because of polygamy did exist for some Jewish women in rabbinic Judaism, however seldom it may have been realized. There were always some rabbis who for theological and moral reasons objected to polygamy.[24]

In spite of these limitations, it would be wrong to assume that a Jewish woman had no respect or rights in Jesus' era. The rabbinic literature reiterates in various places the OT maxim that the mother is to be honored equally with the father.[25] The command to honor father and mother was the epitome of filial piety, and since in Exod 20.12 the father is mentioned first, while in Lev 19.3 the mother comes first, it was deduced that they were to be revered equally, indeed revered as God is revered.[26] The Talmud instructs a man to love his wife as himself and to respect her more than himself.[27] While normally it was the man or the man's family who initiated the betrothal process, a woman is said to be able to betroth a man on her own initiative in some circumstances.[28]

In the family, the wife's duties involved grinding flour, baking bread, washing clothes, breast-feeding the children for 18-24 months, making the bed, working in wool,[29] preparing her husband's cup, and washing his face, hands, and feet.[30] The extent of a wife's household duties depended on how many servants she brought with her. If she brought four bondwomen she may sit all day in her chair, though R. Eliezer said that no matter how many servants she brought she still had to work in wool.[31] R. Johanan b. Baroka said that the commandment to be fruitful and multiply was incumbent on the woman as well as the man, though this undoubtedly was not the majority opinion. Usually we read that this commandment was required of the man alone.[32]

The husband's duties were equally extensive. A man had an obligation to provide for his wife, whereas he had a choice as to whether or not he would provide for his slaves.[33] Thus, a wife was not treated as property. The marriage contract bound the husband to provide food, clothing, and material needs for his wife,[34] and a woman could demand these things before a court. A husband's responsibilities also included fulfilling his connubial duty, redeeming his wife from captivity, and providing shelter.[35] Unlike a man, a woman was said to have a <u>right</u> to sexual pleasure.[36] The School of Hillel said that a man had not fulfilled Gen 1.28 until he had both a son and a daughter - the School of Shammai said that two sons would fulfill one's duty.[37] It was

rare for a father to prefer his daughters considering the importance of a son to a Jew who wished to preserve and pass on his name and heritage. Thus, it is significant that R. Hisda once said, "Daughters are dearer to me than sons."[38]

With rare exceptions, a woman could not divorce her husband,[39] while a husband could divorce his wife practically at will so long as he could afford to pay the ketubah. There were, however, situations and ways in which she could precipitate a divorce. If a husband refused to consummate the marriage, was impotent, had an unpleasant occupation, had leprosy, was unable to provide support, or if he was to be separated from her for a long time, then she could sue for divorce in the courts.[40] A woman could leave her husband and return to her parents' home, thus precipitating a divorce in most cases.[41] Though a woman normally could not pronounce the formula of divorce which finalized the act, she was able to write her own bill of divorce and its validity depended on her.[42] Thus, while technically only a husband could initiate a divorce, and a bill was only valid if written specifically for the woman,[43] a woman had means of legally precipitating the dissolution of a marriage. It should be added that divorce was frowned upon by many, if not most, rabbis. R. Johanan interpreted Mal 2.16 to mean that the man who divorces his wife is hateful to God. R. Eliezer said that the altar sheds tears over one who divorces his first wife.[44] M. Nedarim 9.9 makes clear that for a man to divorce was to dishonor his wife and children, and to disgrace his own character.[45] There were legal impediments that prevented a husband from extricating himself from certain difficult situations. A man whose wife had lost her mental capacity after they had been married was not allowed to divorce her, for it was feared she could not ward off illicit advances.[46] A woman who could not guard her Get could not be divorced.[47] Finally, in Jewish law, unlike early Greek and Roman law, a husband was never allowed to take the life of his wife if she was an adulteress.[48]

In regard to property rights, an Israelite woman was allowed to hold property in her own right, as discoveries at the Dead Sea have shown.[49] She was allowed to inherit property, though male heirs had precedence over her. Further, a married woman of age who loses her husband either through divorce or death (but not her misconduct) was allowed to keep her ketubah.[50] If she remarries then her property remains her own, though her husband has a right to the usufruct of it.

This was especially true of a wife's slaves.[51] Both the Schools of Shammai and Hillel agreed that a woman may sell or give away any of her inherited property prior to her betrothal. Shammai adds that she could sell it after betrothal as well.[52] R. Gamaliel says he is at a loss to see why a husband should gain any right to property a woman inherits either prior to or after her marriage. In addition to rights of inheritance, a woman also had a right to 'maintenance' from her father's or husband's resources. Indeed, if a man died leaving only a little property, his daughters had a right to maintenance before his sons could inherit, even if this meant that the sons had to go without.[53] This was also true of widows who remained with their former husband's household.[54]

A certain spiritual significance was assigned to a woman's presence or role in the home. For instance, R. Jacob says, "One who has no wife remains without good, and without a helper, and without joy, and without blessing, and without atonement."[55] Even more dramatic is the comment by R. Phineas b. Hannah that a woman has an atoning force not inferior to the altar if as a wife she remains within the domestic seclusion of her family.[56] Of a similar nature is the saying attributed to R. Joseph when he heard his mother's footsteps coming: "Let me arise before the approach of the Shekinah (Divine presence)."[57] The spiritual influence of the mother in the home perhaps is indicated by the fact that a child was considered a Jew by the rabbis only if his mother was a Jewess and regardless of his father's religious predilections.[58] Another indication of the rabbis' appreciation of a woman's potential spiritual influence is indicated by a midrash which points out that if a pious man married a wicked woman he will become wicked, but if a wicked man marries a pious woman, she will make him pious. "This proves that all depends on the woman."[59]

2) Women and Their Roles in Religion

The training which equipped Jews for participation in the synagogue or Temple services and, in the case of men, for religious leadership whether as a scribe, rabbi, or priest, began in the home. It was debated whether and how much a woman should teach or be taught Torah even in the home.

Although R. Eliezer says that teaching one's daughter Torah is teaching her lechery (or extravagance), his opinion is said to be a minority one by Jewish scholars.[60] Support for this verdict can be

found in several places. R. b. Azzai says, "A man ought to give his daughter a knowledge of the law..."[61] So too, M. Nedarim 4.3 reads, "...he may teach Scripture to his sons and daughters."[62] On the other hand, various negative remarks about wives cannot be ignored. In one place we are told that she is not to teach her children.[63] This is perhaps a result of the fact that women were exempt from studying Torah.[64] Women are said to be expected to know the holy language.[65] It was inferred from Exod 19.3 that women accepted Torah before men.[66] There are even cases of women being taught the oral law and being consulted on its fine points. R. Meir's wife, Beruriah, is especially well-known in this regard.[67] Possibly the maid servants of R. Judah the Prince received similar training, for there are instances where they gave some scholars enlightenment on rare Hebrew words in the Tanak.[68] Imma-Shalom, sister of R. Gamaliel II and the wife of R. Eliezer, was prominent enough to have some of her sayings recorded in Talmudic literature.[69] Finally, R. Nahman's wife was said to vex him continually because of her expertise in Halakic matters.[70] Though these examples are exceptional, they do show that even when Judaism was beset with the problems of foreign occupation and influences, and there was a tendency to protect and confine Jewish women and children to preserve important traditions, some women were able to become learned in both oral and written law and tradition.

According to various texts in the Mishnah, a woman may not be deprived of her right to eat the Heave offering even if her husband is a seducer, uncircumcised, or unclean.[71] Thus, she is not treated as a sub-heading under her husband as far as this cultic practice is concerned. Women took Nazaritic vows in Tannaitic times, as the example of Queen Helena shows.[72] We are informed that women could and did bring sacrifices; Miriam of Palmyra is mentioned as an example.[73] Even a suspected adulteress' offering is not refused.[74] M. Zebahim 3.1 says that women could legally slaughter the animals used for sacrifice, even those animals used for the "Most Holy Things".[75] There are cases recorded where women were allowed to lay hands on their sacrifice, despite the fact that M. Menahoth 9.8 says they cannot.[76] Even more significant is that some women were able, with the priest's aid, to wave their own meal offering.[77] A woman of priestly stock had certain priestly rights and privileges in regard to the offerings.[78] Women were obligated to light the candles at the Feast of Dedication

because they too benefited from the ending of the Seleucid persecution. Though women were limited to their own court in the Jerusalem Temple, it is not certain when the practice of having special galleries for women in the synagogues began, though apparently they existed in Trajan's time.[80] We know that such popular feasts as the Feast of Tabernacles took place in the women's court.[81]

B. T. Megillah 23a tells us that women were qualified to be among the seven who read Torah in the synagogue, though it appears that by Amoraic times and perhaps before that they were expected to refuse.[82] Further, there are no known examples of women reading in the synagogues during Jesus' time.[83] In the domestic observance of the Sabbath, women were responsible for preparing the dough offering and lighting the Sabbath lamp.[84] Women were required to say the Tefillah, the eighteen benedictions, the table blessings, and to maintain the Mezuzah on the doors of the houses.[85]

From the above evidence we may conclude that at least in theory a woman's position and privileges in regard to the Jewish cult during the Tannaitic and Amoraic periods differed little from their status and rights in OT times with two important exceptions - a separation of women and men in the Temple and synagogue was introduced after OT times, and perhaps women were not allowed to read Torah in the assembly by Tannaitic times. The OT's high regard for women's religious rights seems to have been preserved legally in the rabbinic literature with notable exceptions.[86]

In order to understand why a woman was restricted in regard to place and function in the Temple one must bear in mind the restrictions of Leviticus 15. Whatever one may think of the precepts found in Leviticus 15, it should be clear that a woman could not be a priestess in the cult because of the ordinance about her uncleanness during her monthly menstrual period, and not because of rabbinic prejudices. A priest must be clean and holy at all times in order to offer the sacrifice (Leviticus 21, 22). Further, it is because of the ordinances about a woman's uncleanness during her period that women were excused from those positive ordinances of the Law which were periodic in nature (certain feasts, daily appearance in the synagogue to make a quorum, periodic prayer). A woman could not be depended upon to be ritually clean on every occasion when these ordinances were to be observed, and thus she could not be depended upon to fulfill them. This is likely why we read in M. Kiddushin 1.7, "The observance

of all the positive ordinances that depend on the time of year is incumbent on men but not on women, and the observance of all positive ordinances that do not depend on the time of year is incumbent both on men and on women."[87] Thus, one should not argue or imply that it was due to rabbinic prejudices that women were not allowed to be among those who made up the quorum, recited the daily Shema, or made pilgrimages to Jerusalem at the feasts of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles.[88]

The evidence concerning Jewish women's roles in religion indicates that by and large the religious privileges and functions they had were those they could participate in in the home. The biblical injunctions in Leviticus 15 and its rabbinic interpretations restricted their participation in the Temple cults and certain views about propriety appear to have taken away a woman's theoretical right to read the Scriptures in the synagogue even in Jesus' day.

3) Women and Their Roles as Witnesses, Teachers, and Leaders

In regard to a woman's word of witness, her vows, or oaths, there was no unified opinion among the rabbis.[89] For instance, a woman may be paid her ketubah after swearing to her claim on oath, even if she has 'impaired' her ketubah or if a witness testifies she already has received it.[90] Thus, her oath carries more weight in this legal matter than the testimony of the witness, presumably even if the witness is a man. A woman's testimony about a death or her virginity normally is to be believed.[91] A woman's vow is binding on her husband's brother in regard to the duty of the Levir.[92] M. Nedarim 11.10 gives nine cases where a woman's vow is valid and binding.[93] This lets us know that women's vows were as valid as men's if the women were not under the control of father or husband, or if the father or husband did not revoke or controvert such an oath. M. Nazir 9.1 reveals that women are not in the same category as Gentiles or slaves in regard to Nazaritic vows (a Gentile cannot make this vow; a slave's vow cannot be revoked; a wife cannot be compelled to break the vow).[94] If a woman is independent (over 12½ and unmarried), neither her father nor her future husband can revoke her vow.[95] A woman's witness is counted equal to a man's witness in a number of cases, and though sometimes she is differentiated from a set group called 'witnesses', she nonetheless can give valid testimony.[96] Cases where a woman's uncorroborated testimony about herself is said to be unacceptable do not militate

against a woman's right to bear witness, since it is true of both men and women that usually a second party is required to verify a statement.[97] In view of the above evidence, and admitting that some rabbis did not accept women as valid witnesses,[98] it is going beyond the evidence to say that most rabbis considered women to be liars by nature. The evidence suggests that a woman's vow or oath generally was accepted, and that her word carried more weight than that of Gentiles or slaves in some cases. Thus, J. Jeremias probably is wrong in saying that a woman's word was accepted only in rare cases.[99] In practice her word was accepted even in some doubtful cases.[100]

Apart from the role of the woman in the home in giving her children some basic religious instruction (and even this was disputed), a woman had no educational functions except in very rare cases (for instance, Beruriah). There was an OT precedent for women to be prophetesses (Jdg 4.4, 2 Kg 22.14, 2 Chron 34.22) and such roles may have been assumed by a very few Jewish women in Jesus' day (cf. Lk 2.36-38), but the actual examples that can be produced are too few to lead us to assume that this role was a realistic possibility for the majority.

There were no 'official' leadership roles that Jewish women could assume, though on occasion women had roles that gave them de facto positions of authority. M. Ketuboth 9.4 reveals that women were entrusted with maintaining their husband's shops or being guardians, or even creditors.[101] The practice which became common among the rabbis was for their wives to maintain the family and business while the husband and possibly the older son studied the Law. R. Akiba credited his wife for his wisdom because she supported him for years while he studied.[102] This was long seen as an ideal of Jewish social practice.[103]

In conclusion, it is fair to say that a low view of women was common, perhaps even predominant before, during, and after Jesus' era.[104] Since many of the positive statements about women to which we have referred come from later Tannaitic and early Amoraic times, it is conceivable that a woman's lot in Judaism improved in some ways after the destruction of the Temple made impossible full observance of various precepts of the Law.[105] On the whole, we cannot agree with R. Loewe's overly favorable assessment of rabbinic Judaism's views of women. G. F. Moore's evaluation that women's legal status in Judaism compares favorably to other contemporary civilizations is also questionable, as we shall see.[106] On the other hand, the numerous positive statements made about women by the rabbis reveal that many Jews had a higher view

of women than Jeremias and J. Bonsirven seem to indicate in their books.[107] We will close this section by pointing out that there was no monolithic entity, rabbinic Judaism, in Tannaitic times and that various opinions were held about women and their roles, though it appears that by the first century of the Christian era a negative assessment was predominant among the rabbis. It is into this environment that Jesus came and, as we shall see, not only countered the negative evaluations of women, but also endorsed and extended women's rights beyond the positive evaluations we have mentioned.

B. Women and Their Roles in Greece, Macedonia, Asia Minor, and Egypt

Since it is possible that Luke-Acts was directed to an audience in Achaia,[108] and that John was directed to an audience in Asia Minor or even Egypt, and since we are dealing with women living in Philippi (Ac 16.11 ff.), a few points should be mentioned about women's familial, religious, and legal roles in Greece, Macedonia, Asia Minor, and Egypt. Within the general patriarchal framework which was present to a greater or lesser extent in all of Greece's city-states and colonies from Homeric times through the age of the Roman empire, one finds a diversity of roles and views of women that goes beyond the confines of rabbinic Judaism. There was a great deal of difference, however, between being a woman in Sparta and in Athens, and in Macedonia. Each area will be assessed on its own merits.

Women in Greece had varying degrees of freedom in their family situations, ranging from a very limited degree of liberty among upper class Athenian women (especially in classical times) to a considerable amount of liberty among Spartan women and especially those who had already raised their families. Consider first the lot of Athenian women.

Athens was a city of contrasts in regard to the status and roles of women. It is impossible to generalize about their positions because, apart from common prostitutes and slaves, there were three categories of women: Athenian citizens, concubines (παλλακαί), and 'companions' or 'foreign women' (ἑταῖραι).

Concubines are probably the smallest and least important group for our discussion. They occupied the middle ground between legal wives and companions. Their relationship to an Athenian male citizen was recognized by law, and if the concubine was an Athenian citizen her children would be free, though not legitimate members of the family

of her male partner. A man could legitimize his concubine's children if he chose to do so. Finally, concubines had no dowry and their main function was to care for the personal, especially sexual, needs of their male partners. In this way, a male Athenian citizen could limit his legitimate heirs without limiting his sexual activities.[109]

It is fair to say that although female Athenian citizens were respected as wives and mothers in the classical period and afterwards, their position on the whole was little better than that of Jewish women in Tannaitic times. Certainly the women of Attica led a more sheltered and subordinate existence than women anywhere else in Greece.[110] It appears that Athenian men of the classical period retained many of the attitudes toward women that were common in pre-classical Greece.[111] By Hellenistic and Roman times these views were still in existence, though less strongly held because of the liberalizing influence of Macedonian and Roman occupation.

Thucydides (c. 400 B.C.) spoke not only for his generation, but also for those succeeding in Attica, when he had his hero Pericles remark that the glory of the woman is greatest, "...of whom there is least talk among men, whether in praise or in blame."[112] Athenian citizen-women were married usually at fifteen or sixteen years of age, and up to this time they were said to have seen little of the world and inquired about nothing.[113] Once an Athenian citizen woman married she usually lived in a separate and guarded chamber, not unlike some upper class Jewish women in Tannaitic times.[114] It is doubtful, however, that Athenian matrons were never allowed out of those chambers.[115] Citizen women were appreciated chiefly as a proper means to a legitimate heir, and were shown little 'love' by their husbands. Herodotus tells us of an Athenian woman who preferred to save her brother over her husband or children because only he was an irreplaceable loved one.[116] Consider Euripides' portrayal of a matron's domestic plight: "Surely of all creatures that have life and wit, we women are the most unhappy, who first must buy...a husband...but gain for our lives a master!"[117] In contrast to Spartan practices, Athenians severly limited a matron's rights to acquire or retain any personal property apart from her dowry.[118] If one bases his views of a woman's position in Athens solely on the position of Athenian citizen women, one can well understand why Thales was grateful, "...that I was born a human being and not a beast, next a man and not a woman, thirdly, a Greek and not a barbarian."[119]

The ἑταῖραι being foreign or strange women, had no civic rights; however, this meant also that they had few civic restrictions. They were not allowed to manage public affairs, or to marry citizens, or to

usurp citizen women's positions in the cults. Beyond this they were allowed virtually a free hand.[120] It was common for an Athenian man to have a companion who was not his wife.[121] Donaldson informs us that this included Plato, Aristotle, Epicurias, Isocrates, Menander, and many others.[122] Because of the frequent sexual liasons involved in such a relationship, the term soon became synonymous with courtesan.[123] Yet it would be wrong to assume that these women were simply harlots. In order to be a good companion for intelligent and important men, many of them studied the arts, philosophy, and politics, and as a result they were said to be the "only educated women in Athens".[124] We know that one companion came to Socrates to learn how to obtain true friends in Athens, thus showing that at least some companions had access to the philosophical schools.[125] Aspasia of Miletus is said to have instructed Socrates in affairs of the heart, and also to have opened her house to Sophocles, Euripides, Phidias, and Socrates as a place for debate and discussion.[126] Perhaps we may detect Aspasia's influence on Socrates when he expresses his views of women: "Woman's nature happens to be in no respect inferior to man's, but she needs insight and strength."[127] Companions were not banned from all the cults, for there are known cases of some being initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries as early as the fourth century B.C.[128] This may be attributed to the fact that the Athenians tried to raise the Eleusinian cult to the status of the common cult of Greece.[129]

Plato's views on women are more than a little difficult to assess. On the one hand the material in The Republic must be treated with caution since some (if not much of it) is included purely for the sake of debate.[130] There are certain indications, however, that Plato did at some point hold a somewhat 'enlightened' view of women and their roles, for he allowed at least two well-known companions to study in his academy.[131] Plato's most famous pupil, Aristotle, is more outspoken in his negative views than his mentor. Aristotle says quite bluntly, "...the male is by nature superior and the female inferior, the male ruler and the female subject."[132] To this he adds, "...a man would be thought a coward if he were only as brave as a brave woman, and a woman a chatterer if she were only as modest as a good man; since even the household functions of a man and a woman are different - his business is to get and hers to keep."[133] It is true enough that in the latter remark Aristotle is referring only to citizen women, but the former statement is of a more categorical and all inclusive nature.

If we seek a reason why the Athenian matron was in such a subordinate position during and even after classical times, perhaps the

answer lies in the observation that at various points in its history Athens (as well as other parts of Greece and its colonies) was influenced in its social habits by the oriental customs of some of its eastern neighbors with whom it traded.[134] One must bear in mind that within its own social framework Athens was a city of contrasts in regard to women's positions and rights. On the one hand, we have seen that Athenian matrons who had the rights of citizens and the right to legal marriages were in most other regards disenfranchised. On the other hand, companions who had no civic rights or right to marry an Athenian citizen could be educated and become objects of much of the affections of Athenian men. It is not surprising then that in Athens there was a shrine built, not to the matrons, but to the companions and their patron goddess, Aphrodite.[135]

In regard to an Athenian woman's religious and legal status little can be said. The primary means of contact that a young woman had with the outside world was through her participation in various religious processions.[136] At seven she could carry the mystical box; at ten she could grind the flour for the patron goddess' cakes; and at fifteen she could carry the sacred basket.[137] None of this should cause us to overlook the fact that the practice of leaving unwanted daughters on a hill to die is known even into NT times.[138] Citizen women were allowed to participate in some of the cults but, as we have noted, so were the companions. The one important matter in regard to a woman's legal status that needs to be mentioned is this: so far as the evidence goes it appears that an Athenian citizen-woman was not allowed to be a valid witness in Athenian courts except possibly in homicide cases.[139]

If one takes a cursory glance at the references to Spartan women in Greek literature, it is possible to draw the erroneous conclusion that women were liberated to a great extent in that part of Greece. While A. Oepke is correct in saying that in comparison to Athenians, women in Sparta "...occupied a position of more freedom and influence in the Doric world," this is only a relative difference, for even Spartan women were not equal to their male counterparts.[140] Lycurgus set the pattern for the future of women's roles in Sparta when he set-up certain eugenic laws. Thus, J. Donaldson remarks, "All the legislation that relates to women has one sole object - to procure a first rate breed of men."[141] The Spartans felt it necessary to educate and train women to be strong, brave, and resolute so that their sons would have a similar character, ideal for military service. From the earliest

times, Spartan women were involved in gymnastics, wrestling, festivals, rudimentary educational schemes, offering sacrifices and, in general, they mingled freely and competed openly with men. This not only prepared them to be good mothers, but also afforded the men an opportunity to choose a proper mate.[142] The darker side of this selection process was that the weaker women would be detected in various contests and prevented from marrying for fear of weak children.[143] It is in light of the Spartan belief in eugenic principles that one should evaluate the relative freedom of Spartan women.

Women of Sparta often are praised in the inscriptions for their prudence, discretion, and true love of their husbands (Sparta having virtually a monogamous society).[144] Usually, Spartan women did not eat with their husbands, most of whom were soldiers and ate with their regiments. Further, a woman's sons were taken from her when they were of age and ready for military instruction.[145] This left mothers with a great deal of free time, and they were allowed to do whatever they pleased within legal and moral bounds.[146] For instance, some women, once they had been good mothers and with their husband's permission, occasionally played a role in public life.[147] That women of Laconia were involved in public building projects or activities in the general interest, and were known to have held public office, indicates that they had money and were able to avail themselves of what the law and their husbands permitted.[148] This is not to say that Spartan women were equal to Spartan men.

The divorce laws, for instance, gave men more freedom than women. Childlessness was a ground for a man to divorce his wife and take another.[149] Perhaps most representative of a Spartan woman's trué position and her famed fidelity are the following words spoken to a man proposing an illicit relationship. "When I was a girl, I was taught to obey my father and I obeyed him. When I became a wife, I obeyed my husband; if then, you have anything just to urge, make it known to him first."[150] The Spartan woman, like her Jewish counterpart, was subordinate to her father or husband, yet she had greater civil and property rights than a Jewish woman, and probably greater security also since polygamy was not a viable option in Sparta. In her freedom of movement and physical and educational training, she compared favorably to a Jewess, and also to an Athenian matron.

Little or nothing is known of Spartan attitudes about women as witnesses. In regard to their religious position, as elsewhere in

Greece. Spartan women often participated in the cults and had official roles.[151] Of the family life or legal status of Corinthian citizen-women, little can be said, but it is a reasonable conjecture that their position was even more significantly compromised than Athenian women since Corinth was infamous all over the Mediterranean as the city of courtesans and companions. Of the religious status of Corinthian women and women who lived elsewhere on the Grecian mainland (other than Sparta and Ionia) we have more information.

If companions were enshrined at Athens, they were incorporated into the very fabric of Corinthian public life. Heracleia and Timaeus tell us that many of these companions were dedicated to prayer in the temple of Aphrodite for the salvation of Corinth from Persia. They were present regularly whenever the city offered sacrifices to this goddess.[152] Being a port city, Corinth may have been more lax morally than other parts of Greece, but its difference from Athens in the freedom it bestowed on its companions was a difference of degree, not of kind. Both companions and free citizen-women were allowed to be devotees and administrants in some of the Corinthian cults.[153]

It appears that Corinthian citizen-women had greater freedom and earned greater respect than their Athenian counterparts. There were separate festivals involving sacrifices in which free-born Corinthian citizen-women participated and were honored.[154] These women were noted for their boldness as well, for at one point they defended a particular sanctuary against the attack of Spartan men.[155] It was not only Corinthian women who had vested interests and important roles in the religious cults. This was one of the few features of life that women from all over Greece shared in common.

On a small island off the coastal town of Troecenia in Argolis, a young girl served as an official in a temple of Poseidon. This is noteworthy because usually women were administrants only in the cults of goddesses.[156] Women were almost always the organs of divine inspiration and prophecy in Greece, and in the cult of Apollo only women were allowed to perform this office.[157] The prophetess of Apollo was called a Pythoness and was expected to be a free-born Delphian widow who faithfully had tended the fires and given oracles in her home region.[158] The mystery plays, and the agricultural and fertility rituals were almost entirely in the hands of women, since men frequently were excluded from such festivals.[159] Women also led the processions in the mysteries, though there was a male overseer.[160]

In the cult of Despoina there were apparently places, such as Megalopolis, where women had free access to the cult while men could enter only once a year.[161] Women were prominent particularly in orgiastic rites, such as the Bacchanalia, and served as maenads and thyads in the Dionysian cult.[162] Even young girls could be initiated into the Dionysian mysteries.[163] There were some cults, particularly of the male deities, where women were not given the same privileges as men. For instance, in the important cult of Zeus at Olympus women were allowed to ascend only to the 'prothysis', but men could ascend even to the altar.[164]

Despite all the above, Pseudo-Demosthenes, writing about 340 B.C.. seems to sum-up adequately the common view concerning Greek women from Homeric to Roman times when he says, "Mistresses (ἑταίρας) we keep for the sake of pleasure, concubines (παλλακὰς) for the daily care of our person, but wives to bear us legitimate children and to be faithful guardians of our households."[165] Though it is probable that Grecian women gradually gained more freedom during the Hellenistic and Roman periods, and it is likely that most Grecian women compared favorably to Jewish women in Tannaitic times, they compared poorly in status and position to women of neighboring Macedonia, Asia Minor, and Egypt.

The bulk of our evidence about the women of Macedonia and Asia Minor is inscriptional and relates mainly to women who were wealthy or of royal lineage. Nevertheless, the evidence is pertinent to our discussion because Lydia of Acts 16 was apparently a well-to-do business woman and she appears to have assumed an important role in the Christian community in her area. Such a social position and religious role was not uncommon for women in Macedonia or Asia Minor.

It is common knowledge among classics and NT scholars that many women in Macedonia from the Hellenistic period onward had a great deal of influence and prominence. The following statement is typical:

> If Macedonia produced perhaps the most competent group of men the world has yet seen, the women were in all respects the men's counterparts. They played a large part in affairs, received envoys, and obtained concessions from them for their husbands, built temples, founded cities, engaged mercenaries, commanded armies, held fortresses, and acted on occasion as regents or even co-rulers...(166)

This is substantiated in the pertinent literature and inscriptional evidence.

Macedonian men frequently would name cities after their wives because they admired and respected them. For instance, Thessalonica

was named by Casander after his wife, Thessalonice, daughter of Philip.[167] In the same area we have evidence of a woman being given inheritable civic rights in order to honor her.[168] There were women politarchs in Thessalonica and in some inscriptions a metronymic takes the place of the usual patronymic.[169] We find a similar phenomenon in inscriptions from Beroea and Edessa.[170] Both men and women in Macedonia could be money earners for there are cases of tombs erected for a husband and wife paid for out of their common earnings.[171] Not only private admirers, but also public bodies, erected monuments to γυναῖκα ἀρετῆς.[172] Often we find inscriptions to Macedonian wives in which they are referred to in deferential and warm terms. Consider the following: τῇ φιλάνδρῳ καὶ γλυκυτάτῃ συνβίῳ or τῇ συμβίῳ καὶ κυρίᾳ μνείας χάριν.[173] Women were permitted to eat at the same table with their husbands and share in their activities.[174]

One must take into account such Macedonian queens as Arsinoe II and Bernice who ruled with distinction in Egypt, as well as such queens as Eurydice or Olympias who ruled in the homeland.[175] Their rising status and importance is evidenced by the fact that from Arsinoe II onward the queen's head always appeared on the coins with her husband. These queens were noted for their love of culture and were known to have written poems to famous personalities and to have corresponded with scholars, such as the physicist Strato.[176] These women set a precedent which was followed by such royal figures of Greek blood as Apollonia who was spoken of as a model of womanly qualities.[177] Apparently, these Hellenistic queens also had an influence on Macedonian women who were not of royal blood, for we are told: "From the Macedonian courts (relative) freedom broadened down to the Greek home..."[178] Women, such as Epicurus' pupil, Leontion, were able to obtain not only an education but also fame.[179] Some women founded clubs and took part in various social organizations.[180] Freedom and education in Macedonia, though available to all women in theory, in fact could be grasped by only a few who could afford not to work. Undoubtedly, most women continued in their traditional roles without education or mobility, but at least the door was opened in Macedonia, and this had a great effect on Asia Minor and Egypt as Hellenization spread east.

Asia Minor and the nearby Aegean Isles bear more resemblance to Macedonia than to Greece in the roles they allowed to women. Whether one looks in records of public office, charities, or cults, women appear as regular participants in large cities and small towns, both on the mainland and on the islands. There were <u>hierodulae</u> serving

in the precincts of Artemis in Ephesus, and rigid rules of chastity were applied to them.[181] Stratonice, wife of Antiochus I, built and enriched many temples, such as the Temple of Apollos at Delos and Syrian Atargatis at Hieropolis.[182] As in Athens, women led the cult worship of Dionysus on the island of Kos.[183] On a shrine in honor of Agdistis in Philadelphia, Lydia, we read of "The commandments given to Dionysus by Zeus granting access to sleep in his own house both to free men and women..."[184] Nonetheless, even in the Dionysian cults of Asia Minor, the women who celebrated the rites had a male overseer to make certain that all was done properly.[185]

Women were allowed to hold public and cultic offices in Asia Minor which elsewhere were held only by men. There is an interesting statue of a woman official in Ternossos.[186] Aurelia Harnastia, according to one inscription, was priestess of Hera, demiourgos (a high magistrate), and at one point even a chief priest.[187] Aristodama, a priestess of Smyrna, was so well known that she was given honorary citizenship in Thessaly.[188] In regard to the disposing of property, a woman's dowry remained her own in Asia Minor, though a husband had a right to its use in a somewhat similar fashion to the Jewish practice. After her husband's death, a woman could do as she wished with her possessions.[189]

The prominence and rights of Asia Minor women are perhaps a result of the growth and spread of the cult of Isis into the region from Egypt, where women were allowed unprecedented freedom. A further factor was probably the Hellenization of Asia Minor during and after the time of Alexander. Donaldson is surely correct when he says:

> Especially in Asia Minor did women display public activity. Their generosity took the most various forms even to bestowing considerable sums on each citizen in their own cities. They erected baths and gymnasia...presided at the public games or over great religious ceremonies...and they paid the expenses incurred in these displays. They also held priesthoods and several of them obtained the highest priesthood of Asia - perhaps the greatest honor that could be paid to anyone. (190)

Marcus Barth begins his discussion of women in Egypt in this fashion: "The patron saint of the Egyptian women's movement was Isis. With the spread of the Isis cult and other mystery religions went the fact (and eventually, the right) that women gathered for worship without men."[191] This statement is supported by such sayings as: "Thou gavest to women equal power with men."[192] "I am Isis, I am she whom women call goddess. I ordained that women should be loved by men; I brought wife and husband together, and invented the marriage

contract. I ordained that women should bear children and that children should love their parents."[193] Here was a deity who understood the plight of women, for Isis had been both wife and mother and had suffered loss. This is why Isis, and not Athena or Artemis, could be called "the glory of women". It was in Egypt that this cult originated as but one manifestation of a general Egyptian attitude that a woman should be accepted as a man's equal in most respects.

We find evidence of this attiutde in the cult of Amon in which women had offices and were called 'god's wife' or 'god's worshipper'.[194] Diodorus remarks that because of the example of Isis, Egyptian queens had more honor than kings, and that among the common people wives ruled their husbands.[195] More likely, it is the general status of women in Egypt that accounts for the cult of Isis, not the converse. There is excellent evidence that even many centuries before Christ, Egyptian women were juridically equal to men for the most part, except during the periods when Egypt reverted to a feudal society.[196] Evidently, there was improvement in an Egyptian woman's legal rights as time went on, especially in the matter of marriage, divorce, and property rights.[197]

Greek women in Egypt still needed a guardian in most situations involving legal matters, whereas Egyptian women did not.[198] Of the numerous examples in the papyri of women in Egypt who were buyers, sellers, borrowers, lenders, or initiators of divorce,[199] it is likely that in most cases it is the affairs of native Egyptian women being recorded. Egyptian women were as liable as men to pay taxes and even Greek women could petition the government for support or help.[200]

We have mentioned the importance of the Macedonian princesses, Bernice and Arsinoe II, who ruled in Egypt.[201] These women were only the first in a long succession of Greek queens who ruled in that country. In 51 B.C. the most famous of all Egyptian queens, Cleopatra, came to the throne. She was capable and ambitious; she disposed of all her rivals and succeeded in winning both Julius Caesar and Mark Antony. In Egypt there had long been a tradition that a daughter, if she was the eldest child, was the only legitimate heir.[202] Thus, the existence of Cleopatra and the Hellenistic queens in general is not entirely a result of the influence of Macedonian ideas or Hellenism. Certainly the power of Egyptian women in royal circles during the decline of the Ptolemies is indicated by the fact that a daughter and sister could succeed to the throne by birth right.[203] Nowhere else in the Mediterranean was this possible during this era. The influence of this

growing presence of women in Egypt is evidenced in phenomena as diverse as the cults of Isis, Hellenistic queens, Egyptian marriage contracts, and perhaps some of the more misogynous writings of Philo who seems to be in reaction against his non-Jewish environment. It was especially the first of these phenomena that had such a dramatic impact on Rome and its women, as we shall see.

How then are we to evaluate the place of women in Greece and its Mediterranean settlements and neighbors? Clearly, the patriarchal framework continued to exist from antiquity through the Roman period in all the areas we have examined, though with decreasing male dominance as we move from Athens, to Sparta, to Macedonia, to Asia Minor, and to Egypt. When women were priestesses in the Greek world, it was usually in a cult of a goddess, not a god, and this perhaps tells us more about women's separation from men than about their autonomy or equality with men. For the most part in the Greek-speaking world, with some companions and rich or royal women as notable exceptions, Plutarch's statement that education is only for free-men holds.[204] It remains to be seen whether Greece offered women brighter hopes than Rome.

C. Women and Their Roles in Rome

J. P. V. D. Balsdon, in his important study on Roman women, remarks, "At no time did Roman women live in the semi-oriental seclusion in which women lived in Greece."[205] Nonetheless, this scholar adds, "Complete equality of the sexes was never achieved in ancient Rome because of the survival long after it was out of date of a deep-rooted tradition that the exclusive sphere of a woman's activity was inside the home..."[206] Both of these statements are fundamentally correct; thus, we would do well to remember that we are not measuring Roman women's freedom by any other yardstick than the relative one of how they fared in comparison to their female contemporaries in the Mediterranean world. To anticipate our conclusions, a Roman woman compared favorably to her Athenian or Palestinian counterparts; however, there is reason to question whether or not they were better off than women in Macedonia, Asia Minor, and Egypt.

Our examination of Roman women's roles in the family, the cult, and their status as witnesses, teachers, or leaders is crucial since it appears likely that the Gospel of Mark is addressed to a Roman Christian community,[207] and since the historical background helps to illuminate such texts as Mk 3.34-35, 5.33-34, [illegible] 10.12, and 15.41.

As was the case in various parts of Greece, one has to specify a class or group of Roman women when discussing whether or not Roman women were freer than Greek women. If one is discussing the Roman matron, then she appears in most regards to be freer, better educated, more highly respected, and more influential than matrons of the Greek mainland. On the other hand, though there were prostitutes in Rome, we do not find the phenomenon of educated companions in any significant numbers in the Eternal City. Because of the paucity of evidence, we will be able to say little about the women of the plebeian and slave classes. Thus, we will mainly be limited to an examination of Roman women of the patrician class and, as a result, the picture of Roman women we obtain from the evidence is not complete in depth or breadth. This material, nevertheless, will prove of some value to our study since it is possible that Priscilla (Acts 18) was a member of or had close associations with a patrician family.

In order to understand a Roman woman's position in a first century Roman family we must consider how the situation had changed since ancient times. In ancient Rome, the authority of the father was as great as or greater than that of a Jewish father in the context of rabbinic Judaism. A Roman father had the power of life and death over his children and wife, and his right to slay his child, particularly if it was a daughter, existed at least until the last century B.C.[208] During the Republic, the power of a husband or father was evident from procedures involved in a marriage arrangement. The father 'sold' his daughter into the hand (_in manu_) of her husband by a form of marriage known as _coemptio_.[209] Livy remarks that during the Republic, "Our ancestors permitted no woman to conduct even personal business without a guardian to intervene in her behalf; they wished them to be under the control (_in manu_) of fathers, brothers, husbands..."[210]

The _coemptio_ form of marriage began to be replaced even as early as 300 B.C. by a freer form of marriage. The woman remained primarily in the control of her father, and after age 25 was subject nominally to the supervision of her guardian or tutor. Legally, a woman could extricate herself from this looser form of marriage without grave difficulties. By the time of the Empire, the _coemptio_ form of marriage was non-existent having been replaced by the _sine manu_ variety; further, the role of the guardian had lost its importance. By Hadrian's time, the guardian was deemed to be totally unnecessary.[211] Both men and women were able to end a marriage on the flimsiest of excuses and

life-long marriage became the exception rather than the rule among the aristocracy by the end of the Republic.[212]

In upper class society, marriage was an obligation for all women except the Vestal Virgins and women over fifty.[213] Marriages frequently were made and broken for financial or political reasons in the aristocracy.[214] Women were allowed to initiate marriages from late Republic days onward, but not to refuse a marriage unless they could prove their proposed husbands were morally unfit.[215] It is unlikely that girls twelve to fourteen, the normal age for marriage, could or would refuse a marriage in any case.[216]

We know that matrons were well educated by the standards of antiquity. Even among the poorer families, both daughters and sons went to school, while in richer families both had tutors.[217] A girl's education ceased when she married; while a boy, who usually did not marry before seventeen to eighteen, went on to study with philosophers and rhetoricians outside the home for an additional three to four years. After this, the boys were expected to find a mate. Unlike many other cultures in the Mediterranean, Romans saw the education of women not as an extravagance, but as a way to enhance a woman.[218] Despite their education, women were not allowed to vote or hold public office even in the age of the Empire, though often they were deeply involved and highly influential in affairs of state and matters of law. For instance, we know that Sempronia was involved with her husband, Cataline, in the conspiracy to overthrow the government in 63 B.C.[219] There were two famous Fulvias, one of whom was involved in the Cataline conspiracy, while the other helped Mark Antony by being his agent in Italy and commanding one of his armies when Octavian besieged it.[220] Some matrons, such as Maesia, had special gifts for pleading a case and were acquitted on their own court testimony.[221]

Perhaps those matrons who had the greatest influence for good or ill in the political realm were the wives of the Emperors, such as Augustus' Livia, and Claudius' Messalina. Livia was consulted often when Augustus needed good advice and he discussed many crucial subjects with her.[222] She was known to be an excellent administrator in her own right, managing a personal staff of over 1000 and property holdings in Asia Minor, Gaul, and Palestine.[223] She was the first to be named Augusta and the first priestess in her husband's cult when it began after his death.[224]

In the home as well, matrons wielded great power and influence. They were not housewives in the ordinary sense; indeed, though they

bore sole responsibility for the home, usually they assigned tasks to the servants. Meanwhile, they went to market, to recitals and festivals, to the games, or stayed home and supervised their children's education.[225] Though in the Republic it was usual for a woman to nurse her children, by the time of the Empire it was not uncommon for a matron to allow a female servant to nurse or raise the children.[226] Most matrons did spend the majority of their time in the home, however, and even in the Empire they were expected to cultivate the time-honored domestic practices of spinning and weaving. Augustus was fond of wearing wool items made by his wife and daughters as an advertisement for his plan of reestablishing old fashioned ideas.[227] Until the second century B.C. matrons were required to bake bread, but by the time of the Empire it was a poor house indeed where a wife had to perform the household chores she would be expected to do in Greece.[228] When we consider how seldom the husband might be home, especially if he was in the army, we can understand why matrons were often the family's de facto head and business manager.

In order to discuss a Roman woman's role in religion we must first consider the most well-known examples, the Vestal Virgins. Though they were dedicated for thirty years to virginity and tending the sacred flame (which represented the health and salvation of Rome), they were not under the power of any man, not bound by oaths other than their sacred one, and not subject to the limitations of the Voconian law of 169 B.C. which prevented women from testifying without swearing an oath.[229] Vestals were women of property. At the beginning of their service (six to ten years old), they were given a dowry twice that of a rich matron because they had 'married' the state for thirty years.[230] They were required to attend certain religious festivals and were allowed to go to lavish dinners and to visit matrons if they were not on their eight-hour duty period.[231] They had the power to remit the sentence of a prisoner if they happened to pass one on the street.[232] The Vestals were considered to be so trustworthy and sacrosanct that statesmen would leave important documents and wills with them to guard.[233] They were also emissaries of peace for the state or imperial family. After an evil hit Rome (a plague or fire), the Vestals were called upon to do propitiatory acts.[234] There were only six Vestals at any one time, however, and thus they were not representative of the relationship of the average matron or freed woman to Roman society or to Roman religion.

What then was the relation of an average Roman woman to Roman religion? There were basically two types of Roman religion - native cults supported by the State, such as that of Vesta, and imported oriental cults such as that of Isis or the Eleusinian mysteries. The Romans, using their gifts for organization and categorization, had different native cults for different stages in a woman's life. Rome used these cults to promote socially desirable behavior. The goddess Fortuna Virginitis was patroness of young girls who, when they came of age, were expected to dedicate their togas to this deity.[235] Fortuna Primigenia was patroness of mothers and childbirth, as well as giver of virility and material success to men.[236] There was the cult of Fortunata Muliebris for women married only once; and the cult of Venus, Changer of Hearts, dedicated to encourage women to marital fidelity.[237] This latter cult began when several matrons were discovered to be adulterous and their husbands wanted to create a permanent warning against such infidelity.[238] In contrast, Fortuna Virilis was a prostitutes' cult in which such women met in the men's baths to worship a god of sexual relations.[239] Obviously, in his social reforms Augustus promoted the cults advocating chastity, childbirth, and strong familial bonds. Coupling this with Augustus' effort to legally force widows and divorcees to remarry, and the fine (uxorium) he placed on both males and females for remaining single past accepted ages, we can see how much Augustus desired to eliminate public and private situations where women were independent of men.[240] His attempts to recapture the morality of 'idealized' ancient Rome by legislation and other sorts of inducements appear to have failed on the whole;[241] however, his efforts did affect women and their relationship to the cults. Augustus could boast of having restored or built eighty-two temples in an attempt to rectify the neglect of traditional religion in Rome.[242] It is important to recognize that Augustus tried to assert the older views about male dominance through this building campaign. For instance, originally the shrine of Apollo stood in the shadow of the older shrine of the Sybil of Cumae, and originally the god Apollo was brought to the Roman scene as a deity connected with the prophetess and cult of the Sybil.[243] Augustus, however, built a new shrine for Apollo on the Palatine hill and transferred the books of Sybilline oracles to Apollo's new temple, thus subordinating the Sybil's shrine to that of Apollo. Even when Augustus did bring the temple of Vesta to the Palatine hill, this was to inculcate traditional values, not to liberate women.

Festivals and cults which formerly had been the exclusive domain of women were integrated, while male only public rituals, such as the sacrifice to Mars for the well-being of the herds, were retained.[244] Thus, women were not likely to find new roles in the traditional cults. As early as the second century B.C. these cults had been dying, and Augustus' attempts to revive them were too little, too late. It was the influx of eastern religions as the traditional cults began to fade which was to give women new religious roles as they worshipped Isis, Serapis, Cybele, or Attis.[245]

Symbolic of how much the matrons welcomed these new cults is the fact that when the cult of the Idean mother was introduced in 204 B.C. they went out of the city to welcome its arrival.[246] When the Bacchanalia was introduced in 186 B.C. it was open to women only and the matrons became its priestesses. The inclusion of men into the cult led to scandal and its suppression for awhile, though it sprang up again in the later Republic.[247] Gradually, these foreign gods won most of the female population so that in the first century A.D. Petronius bemoans the fact that Roman matrons no longer worshipped the traditional gods at all.[248] Tacitus records legislation attempting to eliminate certain Egyptian and Jewish rites.[249] Juvenal lampoons the chorus of the frantic Bellonia, and the women who break the ice on the Tiber, plunge in, and then crawl across a field naked on bleeding knees for the sake of Isis.[250]

It was Isis above all the others which Roman men rightly feared. The reasons why this cult had such a powerful impact on Roman women are several. Firstly, the only state cults allowing women even a limited role as priestesses were that of Vesta (six women) and that of Ceres, a goddess of fecundity, production, and procreation.[251] Secondly, the cult of Isis, unlike any of the previous cults, was not for the benefit of the state, but to meet the religious and emotional needs of individuals. Isis promised healing, blessing, understanding, and sympathy for her devotees' sorrow and pain, for she herself had lost her son. Thus, she was a goddess of loving mercy with whom women could identify and to whom men could become intimately attached as a compassionate mother figure.[252] She was all gods summed up into one personality and was said to have certain powers that usually only male deities possessed.[253] Finally, unlike other cults the rituals of Isis were flexible and her temples were at once a haven for prostitutes and a sanctuary where women could spend their nights dedicated to chastity. Thus, the cult of Isis had tremendous appeal

because it was open to all, it ignored class barriers, and both men and women could hold high office. Naturally, Isis most benefited lower class members for they held equal status with the upper class members of the cult.[254] From the extant inscriptions, we know that at least one-third of Isis' devotees were women but this figure probably underestimates the number of females since instead of being categorized, women were treated as equals with men. We read of at least six women priestesses in this cult including one of senatorial rank and one freed woman in Italy.[255] We should not think that this cult affected only a small minority just because the temples of Isis were not allowed within Rome's walls until A.D. 38.[256] On the contrary, there were a multitude of temples just outside the city wall long before the reign of Gaius Caligula. Five times during the Republic there were attempts to abolish this cult which honored only the individual and not the state. In 50 B.C. a consul thought it important enough to order a particular temple of Isis demolished. When no one would do the job, he himself began to take an ax to it.[257] In 28 B.C. Octavius and later Tiberius made attempts to abolish Isis' cult, all to no avail. It is certainly more than coincidence that the rise of the cult of Isis in the later Republic period coincided with the increase in women's liberation in Rome. It is likely that these two trends fostered and furthered each other, and it was perhaps in reaction against this that Augustus undertook his ill-fated attempts at moral and religious reform.

Little is known about the status and roles of freed women and slaves in Rome apart from comments made by upper class writers and politicians. What we know of customs and conditions in Rome does give us some additional indirect evidence. Most freed women were shop-keepers, artisans, or domestics; while some were known to be physicians, commercial entrepreneurs, brick makers, and perhaps even owners of brick making or ship building operations.[258] Financially, some freed women were apparently secure for they could afford a respectable burial place;[259] others remained in the service of their mistresses rather than become one of the free poor. In some regards it was better to be a slave than a free born poor woman, since slaves often were treated well, were secure, and often were educated in the essentials so that they could read to their matrons and their matrons' children. Cato tells us that it was the responsibility of the female housekeeper to keep the hearth clean, to hang a garland on the hearth at the kalends,

to keep a supply of cooked food on hand, and not to visit the neighbors too often.[260] Though the evidence is not vast, it is probably fair to say that freed women and female slaves in Rome were in a much better position than their counterparts in Greece, since Rome had the more liberal property laws and since a female slave of a Roman matron could acquire a rudimentary education, and even money, if she was a good worker.

Roman women had both more and less freedom than their counterparts in the Mediterranean world depending on which country and which aspect of a woman's life one uses as a basis for comparison. It is certainly true that Roman women had more political power than women in Greece or Palestine because, though they could not sit on the throne or hold elected office, they could be the power behind such positions. The fact, however, that women could not hold such offices in Rome makes clear that politically upper class or imperial Macedonian women had more freedom since they often did sit on the throne in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Roman women do not compare favorably in political rights with women in Asia Minor who often held public offices. Further, until the advent of the foreign cults into Rome, women there had fewer opportunities to be priestesses than women in Greece. On the other hand, educated women were more plentiful in Rome than elsewhere in the Mediterranean. A Roman woman's right to property and freedom in marriage (with the rise of the sine manu marriage contract) rivaled or surpassed all other Mediterranean women except native Egyptians. It is fair to say that Roman matrons had the opportunities to perform more than the functions of mother and wife, and this cannot be said of Greek citizen-women. Even a Roman freed woman was in a better position than many citizen-women in Athens. It is certainly to the credit of the Romans that they at least raised the question of the place of women in society, unlike many other Mediterranean cultures.[261] As elsewhere in the Empire, there is no denying that Roman society operated within a definite patriarchal framework. That many Roman women were able to lead full, informed, and satisfying lives perhaps testifies to the fact that patriarchy need not always lead to misogyny. Rome offered more to women than Greece, or Palestine, but Roman women had more disadvantages than some of their counterparts in Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Egypt until the advent of various foreign cults and certain Hellenistic and Egyptian ideas into the Eternal City.[262]

Chapter I: Endnotes

[1]This is assuming that the usual conjectures about the locale of the audiences of the Gospels and Acts are reasonably correct. Mark probably was written for a Roman audience; Matthew for an audience in Syria or that general vicinity; John to a community in Asia Minor or possibly even closer to Palestine; and Luke-Acts possibly to somewhere in Greece. But "...we can say for certain only that Luke was written outside Palestine." W. G. Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament (trans. Howard C. Kee; London, 1975) 151. It is not necessary that these conjectures be precisely accurate so long as the Gospels and Acts were addressed to audiences in the Northern Mediterranean region. Thus, it will be unnecessary to discuss women and their roles in areas north of the Mediterranean crescent, west of Rome, and south and east of Palestine. Egypt, however, will be briefly mentioned since John might have been written in Alexandria.

[2]G. F. Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era II (New York, 1971) 126, 131; R. Loewe, The Position of Women in Judaism (London, 1966); I. J. Peritz, "Women in the Ancient Hebrew Cult", JBL 17 (1898) 111-48. Cf. C. Klein, "Jewish Women in the Time of Mary of Nazareth", Bible Today 60 (1972) 746-52; Jacques Pirenne, "Le Statut de la Femme Dans la Civilization Hébraïque", in Receuils de la Société Jean Bodin, XI: La Femme (Bruxelles, 1959) 107-26; "Women", in Encyclopedia Judaica XVI (Jerusalem, 1971) cols. 623-30; S. Schechter, Studies in Judaism (1st ser.; Philadelphia, 1945) 313-25; S. W. Baron, A Social and Religious History of the Jews I, II (New York, 1952); J. Jeremias, Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus (trans. F. H. and C. H. Cave; Philadelphia, 1969); L. Swidler, Women in Judaism: The Status of Women in Formative Judaism (Metuchen, New Jersey, 1976); J. Donaldson, Woman: Her Position and Influence in Ancient Greece and Rome, and Among Early Christians (London, 1907); G. Delling, Paulus' Stellung zu Frau und Ehe (Stuttgart, 1931); J. Leipoldt, Die Frau in de Antiken Welt und im Urchristentum (Leipzig, 1955); J. P. V. D. Balsdon, Roman Women (London, 1962).

[3]Cf. relevant material from endnote 2 above.

[4]Material of extremely late date has been avoided. Of the passages used here with an author's name attached only the sayings of R. Phineas b. Hannah, R. Nahman, R. Joseph, and R. Hisda could be assigned to a period after the middle of the second century.

[5]We may well ask why the section on the suspected adulterer is nowhere to be found in rabbinic literature.

[6]M. Ket. 4.1-12, Danby, 249-51.

[7]M. Ned. 9.10, Danby, 277.

[8]M. Ket. 4.4, Danby, 250.

[9]M. Ket. 4.1, Danby, 249.

[10]M. Ket. 4.4, Danby, 250; M. Kid. 2.1, Danby, 323.

[11]M. Yeb. 13.1-2, Danby, 237-8.

[12]B. T. Kid. 2b, The Babylonian Talmud Nashim VIII, Kiddushin (trans. H. Freedman ed. I. Epstein; London, 1936) 2 ff.

[13]M. Kid. 1.1, Danby, 321.

[14]M. Ned. 9.5, Danby, 276.

[15]Cf. M. Ket. 7.6, Danby, 255, on loss of ketubah due to violation of rabbinic law or tradition. Also M. Sot. 4.3, Danby, 297-8, says that a barren, sterile, or old woman does not receive her ketubah upon divorce.

[16]M. Git. 5.1, Danby, 312.

[17]M. Yeb. 13.3, Danby, 238.

[18]M. Yeb. 14.1, Danby, 240.

[19]M. Git. 9.10, Danby, 321.

[20]M. Ket. 10.1-6, Danby, 259-60; M. Kid. 2.6, 3.9, Danby, 324, 326.

[21]S. Lowy, "The Extent of Jewish Polygamy in Talmudic Times", JJS 9 (1958) 129-30.

[22]Lowy, 115-6.

[23]M. Yeb. 3.10, Danby, 223.

[24]Aboth de Rabbi Nathan II, 5a, extra-canonical tractate, The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan ('Abot De-Rabbi Natan) (trans. J. Goldin; New Haven, 1955) 16-26; cf. Lowy, "Extent of Jewish Polygamy", 117 ff.

[25]M. Ned. 9.1, Danby, 275; Genesis Rabbah 1, 15, end, Midrash Rabbah, Genesis I (ed. H. Freedman and A. Simon; trans. H. Freedman; London, 1951) 14.

[26]M. Kerithoth 6.9, Danby, 572-3; cf. Mekilta Bahodesh 8, Mekilta de Rabbi Israel II (trans. G. Z. Lauterbach; Philadelphia, 1933) 257 ff.

[27]B. T. Yeb. 62b, The Babylonian Talmud Nashim I, Yebamoth I (trans. I. W. Slotki; 1936) 419 ff.

[28]M. Kid. 1.1, Danby, 321.

[29]M. Ket. 5.5, Danby, 252; M. Git. 7.6, Danby, 316; B. T. Ket. 60a. The Babylonian Talmud Nashim III, Ketuboth I (trans. I. W. Slotki, 1936) 356 ff., on breast feeding.

[30]B. T. Ket. 4b, 61a, The Babylonian Talmud Nashim III, Ketuboth I, 12-13, 364-5. Also, B. T. Ket. 96a, The Babylonian Talmud Nashim IV Ketuboth II (trans. I. W. Slotki; 1936) 610.

[31]M. Ket. 5.5, Danby, 252.

[32]M. Yeb. 6.6, Danby, 227; B. T. Yeb. 65b, The Babylonian Talmud Nashim I, Yebamoth I, 436 ff.

[33]M. Git. 1.6, Danby, 307-8.

[34]B. T. Ket. 77a, The Babylonian Talmud Nashim IV, Ketuboth II, 482 ff. Also B. T. Ket. 107a, 685 ff.

[35]M. Ket. 4.4, 8, and 9, Danby, 250-1.

[36]M. Ket. 5.6, Danby, 252; B. T. Ket. 62a, The Babylonian Talmud Nashim III, Ketuboth I, 279; B. T. Ned. 15b, The Babylonian Talmud Nashim V, Nedarim (trans. H. Freedman; 1936) 41-2; B. T. San. 75a, The Babylonian Talmud Nezikin VI, Sanhedrin II (trans. H. Freedman, 1935) 505 ff. These same references show that a woman had a right to marital union even beyond menopause, or if she was sterile. A woman was allowed to practice contraception if pregnancy endangered her health. Cf. B. T. Yeb. 12b, The Babylonian Talmud Nashim I, Yebamoth I, 62 ff.

[37]M. Yeb. 6.6, Danby, 227.

[38]B. T. Babba Bathra 141a, The Babylonian Talmud Nezikin IV, Babba Bathra II (trans. I. W. Slotki; 1935) 599-600.

[39]There is some evidence that women could occasionally divorce their husbands even in Palestine. Cf. R. Yaron, "Aramaic Marriage Contracts - Corrigenda and Addenda", JSS 5 (1960) 66-70. There is similar evidence from Murabbat and Elephantine papyri as well as some Karaite and Samaritan documents. Cf. Ernst Bammel, "Markus 10.11 f. und das jüdische Ehrecht", ZNW 61 (1970) 95-101. P. Sigal, "Elements of Male Chauvinism in Classical Halakhah", Judaism 24 (2, 1975) 226-44.

[40]M. Ned. 11.12, Danby, 280; M. Ket. 5.5, 7.2-5, and 7.9-10, Danby, 252, 254, and 255.

[41]B. T. Ket. 57b, The Babylonian Talmud Nashim III, Ketuboth I, 338 ff.

[42]M. Git 2.5, Danby, 308.

[43]M. Git. 3.1, Danby, 309.

[44]B. T. Git. 90b, The Babylonian Talmud Nashim VII, Gittin (trans. M. Simon; 1936) 439.

[45]Danby, 277.

[46]M. Yeb. 14.1, Danby, 240.

[47]M. Git. 6.2, Danby, 314.

[48]Cf. Aulus Gellius, Attic Nights 10.23 (LCL II; trans. J. C. Rolfe; London, 1927) 278-9, and the helpful survey by B. Cohen, "Concerning Divorce in Jewish and Roman Law", PAAJR 21 (1952) 3-24, especially 31.

[49]Y. Yadin, "Expedition D - the Cave of Letters", IEJ 12 (1962) 235 ff.

[50]M. Ket. 4.2, Danby, 249.

[51]M. Ket. 6.4 and 8.5, Danby, 253, 256.

[52]M. Ket. 8.1, Danby, 246.

[53]M. Ket. 13.3, Danby, 262.

[54]M. Ket. 12.3, Danby, 262.

[55]The quotation is from a Midrash on Gen 2.18 most conveniently found in Moore, Judaism II, 119. Cf. B. T. Yeb. 62b, The Babylonian Talmud Nashim I, Yebamoth I, 418.

[56]M. Tanhuma Wayyishlah sec. 36, most conveniently found in ML, Anthology, 508, num. 1434.

[57]B. T. Kiddushin 31b, The Babylonian Talmud Nashim VIII, Kiddushin 153.

[58]B. T. Yeb. 23a, The Babylonian Talmud Nashim I, Yebamoth I, 137.

[59]Genesis Rabbah 17.7, Midrash Rabbah I Genesis I, 138. Cf. Swidler, Women in Judaism, 214, n. 49.

[60]Sotah 3.4, Danby, 296; "Women", Encyclopedia Judaica XVI, col. 626; Freedman in The Babylonian Talmud Nashim VIII, 141, n. 1, says that R. Eliezer's statement probably refers to advanced Talmudic education only, because women had to have some instruction in Torah to say their prayers properly.

[61]M. Sotah 3.4, Danby, 296. This comment is given with R. Eliezer's.

[62]Danby, 269. In this case it is a permission to teach someone else's sons and daughters. The implication of this text may be that they could be taught Scripture but not Mishnah, etc.

[63]M. Kid. 4.13, Danby, 329.

[64]M. Sotah 3.4, Danby, 296. "May the words of Torah be burned, they should not be handed over to women." From Midrash Rabbah Numbers (Naso) 9.48, Midrash Rabbah V, Numbers I (trans. J. J. Slotki, 1951) 327.

[65]M. Sotah 7.4, Danby, 300.

[66]Midrash Tanhuma Mesora, end, Loewe, Position of Women, 49; cf. ML, Anthology, 510-11.

[67]On Beruriah, cf. Swidler, Women in Judaism, 97-104, and A. Goldfeld, "Women as Sources of Torah in the Rabbinic Tradition", Judaism, 24 (2, 1975) 245-56.

[68]Moore, Judaism II, 128.

[69]Cf. Loewe, Position of Women, 30; "Women, Rights Of", Jewish Encyclopedia XII (ed. I. Singer; New York, 1906) 556-9. This study will not attempt to treat such atypical figures as Alexandra Salome or Julia Bernice who, as Hellenized Jewish princesses, tell us little about the status of Jewish women outside certain royal circles. Cf. G. H. Macurdy, "Julia Bernice", AJP 56 (1935) 246-53.

[70]B. T. Kid. 70a, b, The Babylonian Talmud Nashim VIII, Kiddushin, 355 ff.

[71]M. Yeb. 7.5, Danby, 228-9; M. Yeb. 8.1, Danby, 229.

[72]M. Ned. 11.5, Danby, 279; M. Naz. 9.1, Danby, 291-2; M. Naz. 3.6, cf. 4.2, Danby, 284.

[73]M. Naz. 6.11, Danby, 289.

[74]M. Sotah 2.1, Danby, 295.

[75]Danby, 471.

[76]B. T. Hagigah 16b, The Babylonian Talmud Mo'ed VII, Hagigah (trans. I. Abrahams, 1938) 108-09. Cf. Moore, Judaism II, 130, n. 6.

[77]M. Sotah 3.1, Danby, 296; M. Kid. 1.8, Danby, 322.

[78]M. Sotah 3.7, Danby, 297.

[79]B. T. Shabbath 23a, The Babylonian Talmud Mo'ed I, Shabbath I (trans. H. Freedman; 1928) 98.

[80]Moore, Judaism II, 46, 130, for differing opinions on this matter. Also Jeremias, Jerusalem, 365; Peritz, "Women in the Ancient Hebrew Cult", 114; Baron, History of the Jews II, 240-1; M. Middoth 2.5, Danby, 592; B. T. Suk. 51b, The Babylonian Talmud Mo'ed VI, Sukkah (trans. I. W. Slotki; 1938) 245-6. E. L. Sukenik, Ancient Synagogues in Palestine and Greece (London, 1934) 47-8, cites Jerusalem Talmud Sukkah 51b, end, and 55b to prove that galleries existed in Trajan's time. He appears to have proved his point; however, his references are not correct and should read, p. Tal. Sukkah 5, 1, end f. Cf. Le Talmud de Jérusalem (trans. M. Schwab; Paris, 1933) Tome VI, 43-4. On the issue of when women began to be separated from the men, cf. Loewe, Position of Women, 44, 49. Cf. Jeremias, Jerusalem, 374, n. 78. One must also ask why women originally were separated from men in the Temple and in the synagogue. The separation may not have implied anything negative originally about a woman's nature or religious rights.

[81]Jeremias, Jerusalem, 363; Moore, Judaism II, 130.

[82]The Babylonian Talmud Mo'ed VIII, Megillah (trans. M. Simon; 1938) 140; Jeremias, Jerusalem, 374, n. 79 on Tosephta Meg. 4.11, 22b.

[83]Jeremias, Jerusalem, 374; Moore, Judaism II, 122 ff. on the relevant passages.

[84]M. Shab. 2.6, Danby, 102.

[85]M. Berakoth 3.3, Danby, 4. There was no uniform opinion on whether or not women should say benediction after a meal. M. Ber. 3.3, Danby, 4, Moore, Judaism II, 129, and Loewe, Position of Women, 43, say yes; however, M. Ber. 7.2, Danby, 7, says no.

[86]As Peritz, "Women in the Ancient Hebrew Cult", 115-9, has noted.

[87]Danby, 322. One must also remember the famous benediction recited by a Jewish man each day thanking God He has not made him, "...a heathen, a woman, or a brutish man." B. T. Menahoth 43b, The Babylonian Talmud Kodashim, Menahoth (trans. E. Cashdan; 1948) 264. It may well be that this blessing originally was said because a normal man, unlike any of these other groups, had the privilege of fulfilling all the positive ordinances of the Law and of full participation in the cult. This is a conjecture of Loewe, Position of Women, 43. In the context of other negative evaluations, it seems likely that whatever the saying may have denoted originally, it certainly connoted a negative view of women.

[88]M. Hag. 1.1, Danby, 211; M. Ber. 3.3, Danby, 4; cf. S. Lowy, "Extent of Jewish Polygamy", 115-35. Schechter, Studies in Judaism, 320, says that women could make up the quorum, if it is only comprised of women, in order to say the grace.

[89]Despite Jeremias' (Jerusalem, 374) statement that women, except in rare cases, had no right to bear witness since they were considered to be liars. Jeremias cites M. Sheb. 4.1 (Danby, 413-4) which refers specifically to the oath of testimony, a particular type of oath. But in M. Sheb. 3.10-11 (Danby, 413) we are told of laws which pertain to the oaths of both men and women. Further, in Sanhedrin 3.3 Danby, 385) the section of the Mishnah which tells us who is not qualified to be a witness or judge, women are not included. Cf. S. Mendelsohn, The Criminal Jurisprudence of the Ancient Hebrews (New York, 1968) 116.

[90]M. Ket. 9.8, Danby, 258-9.

[91]M. Yeb. 16.5, 7, Danby, 244; M. Ket. 1.6, Danby, 246.

[92]M. Yeb. 13.13, Danby, 239-40.

[93]Danby, 280.

[94]Danby, 291-2. I do not agree with Jeremias, Jerusalem, 375, that women were in general religiously on a par with minors and Gentiles. It is true that the three are often grouped together in distinction from Jewish males who could participate fully in the cult. This does not imply that distinctions were not made between these three groups (the stipulations for Nazaritic vows argue against such a view). Cf. J. Pirenne, "Le Statut de la Femme", 125, who says, "La femme n'est pas une perpétuelle mineure."

[95]M. Ned. 11.9, Danby, 279-80.

[96]M. Sot. 9.8, Danby, 304; M. Sot. 6.4, Danby, 299-300.

[97]M. Ket. 2.9, Danby, 247, reads, "None may testify of himself." M. Ket. 2.5-7, Danby, 247, makes clear that a woman's uncorroborated word about someone else might be accepted. Cf. M. Yeb. 15.1, Danby, 241.

[98]R. Akiba was of this opinion; M. Yeb. 16.7, Danby, 244-5. Cf. B. T. Babba Kamma 88a, The Babylonian Talmud Nazikin I, Babba Kamma (trans. E. W. Kirzner, 1935) 507.

[99]Jeremias, Jerusalem, 375.

[100]M. Ket. 1.8, Danby, 246; cf. M. Kid. 4.12, Danby, 329.

[101]Danby, 258; M. Ket. 7.8, Danby, 255.

[102]B. T. Ket. 62b-63a, The Babylonian Talmud Nashim III, Ketuboth I (trans. I. W. Slotki, 1936) 378-9.

[103]Loewe, Position of Women, 49.

[104]Genesis Rabbah 15.2, Midrash Rabbah I, Genesis I, 141 ff. Cf. "Women", Encyclopedia Judaica 16, col. 626; B. T. Kid. 49b, The Babylonian Talmud Nashim VIII, Kiddushin, 249; The Letter of Aristeas, sec. 250, APOT II (1913) 116; M. Aboth 1.5, Danby, 446; B. T. Shab. 152a, The Babylonian Talmud Mo'ed II, Shabbath II (trans. H. Freedman; 1938) 777; B. T. Kid. 82b, The Babylonian Talmud Nashim VIII, Kiddushin, 425. Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, question 27 (LCL Supplement I; trans. R. Marcus; 1953) 16; also question 29 (LCL) 17-18; Philo, On Drunkenness 58-59 (LCL III; trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker; 1930) 347; cf. Richard A. Baer, Philo's Use of the Categories of Male and Female (Leiden, 1970) 40 ff.; Philo, On the Special Laws III.169-171 (LCL VII; trans. F. H. Colson; 1937) 580-3; Josephus, Against Apion II.201-203 (LCL I; trans. H. St. J. Thackeray; 1926) 372-5.

[105]Philo, On the Special Laws II.24-25 (LCL VII) 321.

[106]Cf. endnote 2 above; Moore, Judaism II, 126, 131; Roland de Vaux, Ancient Israel, It's Life and Institutions (trans. J. McHugh; London, 1973) 40. In relation to the cult and the patria potestas Jewish women compare unfavorably to Babylonian women, though favorably to Assyrians. Cf. E. M. MacDonald, The Position of Women as Reflected in Semitic Codes of Law (Toronto, 1931) espec. 31-2, 48-9, 69-73. Cf. P. Cruveilhier, "Le droit de la femme", RB 36 (1927) 353-76. As a result of foreign influences, women in the Jewish colony at Elephantine and at Alexandria had certain civil rights not granted them in Palestine. Cf. W. A. Meeks, "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity", HR 13:3 (Feb., 1974) 176, n. 64.

[107]Cf. Jeremias, Jerusalem, 375, who says, "We have therefore the impression that Judaism in Jesus' time also had a very low opinion of women..." to J. Bonsirven, Palestinian Judaism in the Time of Jesus Christ (New York, 1964)100, who says, "Misogyny is another widespread characteristic in Israel." This is also the view of S. Zucrow, Women, Slaves, and the Ignorant in Rabbinic Literature (Boston, 1932) 74-84. For a more balanced treatment, cf. J. Hauptman, "Images of Women in the Talmud", in Religion and Sexism, Images of Women in the Jewish and Christian Traditions (ed. R. R. Ruether; New York, 1974) 184-212.

[108]Cf. for instance, Kümmel, Introduction, 151.

[109]F. W. Cornish and J. Bacon, "The Position of Women", in A Companion to Greek Studies (ed. L. Whibley; Cambridge, 1931) 615-6.

[110]A. W. Gomme, in his fine article, "The Position of Women in Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B. C.", in his Essays in Greek History and Literature (Oxford, 1937) 89-115, only succeeds in establishing that women 'in their place' were respected on the stage, in the poetry, and in the art of classical Athens.

[111]For an overview of a woman's position, primarily between the ninth and sixth centuries B.C. in Greece, cf. M. B. Arthur, "Early Greece: The Origins of the Western Attitude Toward Women", Arethusa 6:1 (1937) 7-58.

[112]Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War 2,45.2 (LCL; trans. C.F. Smith; London, 1935) 340-1.

[113]Xenophon, Oeconomicus 3.13 (LCL IV; trans. E. C. Marchant; London, 1923) 388-9; cf. also 7.5, pp. 414-5.

[114]Aristophanes, The Thesmophoriazusae 414-417 (LCL III) 166-7; also 790-800, 200-01. This sort of seclusion apparently existed only among aristocratic women. There are examples of middle and lower class citizen women being involved in various jobs and businesses outside the home. Cf. K. J. Dover, "Classical Greek Attitudes to Sexual Behavior", Arethusa 6:1 (1937) 59-73, espec. 69.

[115]Cf. the references in endnote 114 above that note that they went to the baths, theaters, and markets. Also, Cornish and Bacon, "Position of Women", 614-5, and D. C. Richter, "The Position of Women in Classical Athens", Classical Journal 67 (1971) 7 and notes. Citizen-women could be priestesses in some of the cults in Athens. Cf. Pausanias, Description of Greece, Attica 27.1-3 (LCL I; trans. W. H. S. Jones; London, 1918) 138-41, and L. R. Farnell, The Cults of the Greek States III (Oxford, 1907) 106-16, on their roles in the Attic Demeter festivals.

[116]Herodotus 3.119 (LCL II; trans. A. D. Godley; London, 1921) 146-9.

[117]Euripides, Medea 230-234 (LCL IV; trans. A. S. Way; London, 1912) 302-3. Cornish and Bacon, "Position of Women", 614-5, suggests that Euripides paved the way for the more tolerant views of women that we find in such later writers as Apollonius Rhodius and Theocritus.

[118]G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, "Some Observations on the Property Rights of Athenian Women", Classical Review 20 n.s. (1970) 273-8. It appears that the restrictions had been relaxed somewhat by the Hellenistic period and a great deal by the Roman era.

[119]Diogenes Laertius, Thales 1.33, Lives of Eminent Philosophers (LCL I; trans. R. D. Hicks; London, 1925) 34-5. Lactantius attributes this quote to Plato, but this seems unlikely in view of Plato's other sayings about women. It has been suggested that this saying is the source of the Jewish three-fold blessing. Cf. Meeks, "The Image of the Androgyne", 167-8.

[120]For a very interesting account of the 'companions', cf. Robert Flacelière, Love in Ancient Greece (trans. J. Cleugh; London, 1962) 115 ff., or H. Licht, Sexual Life in Ancient Greece (ed. L. H. Sawson; trans. J. H. Freese; London, 1932) 339-63, 395-410.

[121]Cf. for instance, Plutarch, Alcibiades 39.1-5, The Parallel Lives (LCL IV: trans. B. Perrin; London, 1916) 112-5.

[122]Donaldson, Woman, 59.

[123]Cf. Athenaeus, The Deipnosophists 13.591 (LCL VI; trans. C. B. Gulick; London, 1937) 190-1.

[124]Donaldson, Woman, 59.

[125]Xenophon, Memorabilia 3.11.1-18 (LCL; trans. E. C. Marchant; London, 1923) 240-9.

[126]Xenophon, Memorabilia 2.6.36 (LCL) 144-5. Socrates also is reported to have had another non-Athenian woman as his instructor in love, Diotima of Mantinea. Cf. Plato, Symposium 201.D (LCL; trans. W. R. Lamb; London, 1925) 172-3.

[127]As quoted in Xenophon, Banquet 2.9 (Budé; trans. F. Ollier; Paris, 1961) 43-6, my English translation, but cf. the context of this saying.

[128]Martin Nilsson, Greek Folk Religion (New York, 1961) 58 ff.

[129]Martin Nilsson, A History of Greek Religion (Oxford, 1925) 241.

[130]Plato, The Republic 455DE (LCL I; trans. P. Shorey; London, 1930) 446-7. For a balanced approach to Plato's view of women, cf. D. Wender, "Plato: Misogynist, Paedophile, and Feminist", Arethusa 6:1 (1973) 75-90. Cf. Plato, Timaeus 42.A-C, 91.A (LCL; trans. R. G. Bury; London, 1929) 90-3, 248-9, for his negative remarks on women. Also, Plato, The Republic 452-457E (LCL I) 436-55.

[131]Diogenes Laertius, Speusippus 2, Lives of Eminent Philosophers (LCL I) 374-5.

[132]Aristotle, Politics 1, 2.12 (LCL; trans. H. Rackham; London, 1932) 20-1.

[133]Aristotle, Politics 3, 2.10 (LCL) 193-5. Despite these two comments he says in Politics 1, 1.5-7 (LCL) 4-9, that only barbarians fail to distinguish between women and slaves.

[134]Cf. Cornish and Bacon, "Position of Women", 612, though the discussion here concerns the Greeks of Ionia.

[135]Athenaeus, The Deipnosophists 13.559 (LCL VI) 20-3.

[136]Richter, "Position of Women", 1-8, has successfully challenged the extreme forms of the seclusion thesis. Cf. M. Hadas, "Observations on Athenian Women", Classical Weekly 19:13 (1926) 97-100.

[137]Aristophanes, Lysistrata 640-650 (LCL III; trans. B. B. Rogers; London, 1924) 66-7, and note b.

[138]This widespread practice was known even in Egypt and other locations where women's status was considerably higher than in Greece or Italy. Cf. A. Oepke, "παῖs", TDNT V (1967) 639-41; B. A. Grenfell, A. Hunt, et al., eds. The Oxyrhynchus Papyri IV.744-749 (London, 1904) 243-4.

[139]R. J. Bonner, "Did Women Testify in Homicide Cases in Athens?" Classical Philology 1 (1906) 127-32. Bonner's arguments, however, are based on some indirect evidence in Demosthenes, Against Evergus 55-61, Private Orations (LCL; trans. A. T. Murray; London, 1936) 310-15. There is no indication that these views changed in the Hellenistic or Roman periods.

[140]A. Oepke, "γυνή", TDNT I, 777. R. Van Compernole, "Le Mythe de la Gynécocratie - Doulocratie Argienne", in Hommages à Claire Préaux (ed. J. Bingen; Bruxelles, 1975) 355-64, makes it clear that the known evidence on this matter, "...ne contient la moindre trace de la présence à Argos d'une gynécocratie..." (364).

[141]Donaldson, Woman, 26.

[142]Cf. Plutarch, Lycurgus 14.2-3, The Parallel Lives (LCL I; trans. B. Perrin; London, 1914) 246-7. Propertius, Elegies 3.14.1-30 (LCL; trans. H. E. Butler; London, 1912) 227-9. On Spartan marriage customs cf. Athenaeus, The Deipnosophists 13.555 (LCL VI) 4-5.

[143]Donaldson, Woman, 27 ff. Space does not allow a review of Greek wedding customs. Only citizens could marry and women were passed from the control of their fathers, or guardians (κύριος) to their husbands. In Athens, women had no claim on their husband's property. Cf. Harper's Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities (ed. H. T. Peck; New York, 1897) 1012-6, and Licht, Sexual Life in Ancient Greece, 38-56.

[144]CIG I, 1438, 1442, 1446, 1452 (1828) pp. 680-86.

[145]Donaldson, Woman, 33 ff.

[146]Plutarch, Lycurgus 14.1-2, The Parallel Lives (LCL I) 245-6; Plutarch, Sayings of Spartan Women 240, Moralia (LCL III; trans. F. C. Babbitt; London, 1931) 454-9. Plutarch, writing in the late first century A.D., praises Sparta as a place where adultery and polygamy are virtually unknown. It is hard to say how much is his idealization and how much reflects actual practice in pre-Roman times. It appears that Spartan women were more secure than in many other city-states in classical, Hellenistic, and perhaps Roman times.

[147] Delling, Paulus' Stellung, 19.

[148]CIG I, 1435-40, pp. 680-2.

[149]Herodotus 5.39-41 (LCL III; 1922) 42-5. Polygamy in Sparta is said by Herodotus to be virtually non-existent.

[150]Plutarch, Sayings of Spartan Women 242.23, Moralia (LCL III) 466-7, my English translation.

[151]Cf. Farnell, Cults IV (1907) 389, on Laconian women in the Dionysian cult. Various other cults, such as Magna Mater, had female ministrants. As Farnell, Cults II (1896) 639-40, reminds us, "In the native Greek cults it is usual to find the female ministrants in the ritual of the female deity." Cf. Pausanias, Description of Greece, Laconia 3.12.9 (LCL II; trans. W. H. S. Jones; London, 1926) 76-7, on a Spartan temple of Magna Mater.

[152]Athenaeus, The Deipnosophists 13.573 (LCL VI) 96-7. Pindar, For Xenophon of Corinth, Odes (LCL; trans. J. E. Sandys; London, 1915) 132-45. Xenophon, a native of Corinth, following established traditions, promised to render a troupe of prostitutes to Aphrodite if he won at the Olympic Games. Thus, Pindar calls him, "Kindly to strangers" (132-3).

[153]Donaldson, Woman, 56. Apparently for a long time ἑταῖραι not only were forbidden from participating in the Spartan cults, but also were banned from the whole region.

[154]Athenaeus, The Deiponosophists 13.574 (LCL VI) 100-03; Pausanias, Description of Greece, Corinth 34.11-35.2 (LCL I) 438-9, tells us of maidens and widows sacrificing to Aphrodite in Corinth.

[155]Pausanias, Description of Greece, Corinth 20.6-9. Cf. 22.1 (LCL I) 352-5, 362-3.

[156]Pausanias, Description of Greece, Corinth 33.1-3 (LCL I) 426-9. Cf. Farnell, Cults II, 639-40.

[157]Farnell, Cults IV, 187-9.

[158]Plutarch, Lycurgus 5.3, The Parallel Lives (LCL I) 216-7. Cf. Plutarch, Numa 9.6, The Parallel Lives (LCL I) 338-9.

[159]Farnell, Cults III, 106-16.

[160]Martin Nilsson, Die Religion der Griechen (Tübingen, 1927) 70.

[161]Cf. Pausanias, Description of Greece, Arcadia 8.31.8 (LCL IV, 1935) 62-3.

[162]Euripides, Bacchanals 1050-1060 (LCL III; trans. A. S. Way; 1912) 90-1. Cf. Martin Nilsson, The Dionysiac Mysteries of the Hellenistic and Roman Age (Lund, 1957) 4, 38.

[163]As the Villa Item in Rome shows; cf. K. H. Rengstorf, "μανθάνω", TDNT IV, 399.

[164]Pausanias, Description of Greece, Elis 1, 13.10-11 (LCL II) 456-7.

[165]Demosthenes, Against Neaera 122, Private Orations III (LCL; trans. A. T. Murray; 1939) 444-7.

[166]W. W. Tarn and G. T. Griffith, Hellenistic Civilisation (3rd ed.; London, 1952) 98. Cf. J. B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians (Grand Rapids, 1953) 56, and R. Martin, Philippians (New Century Bible Series; Greenwood, 1976) 8. For a good survey of Hellenistic women in general, and Macedonian women in particular, cf. Sarah Pomeroy, Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves (London, 1975) 120 ff.

[167]Strabo, Geography 7.21-24 (LCL III; trans. H. L. Jones; 1924) 342-7.

[168]IG IX. 2, 62, p. 20.

[169]CIG II, 1967, cf. 1968a, b (1843) pp. 52-3. Cf. IG IX.2, pp. xxiv, xxv, for a list of Thessalonian praetores.

[170]CIG II, 1957, 1997, pp. 50, 61.

[171]CIG II, 1958, 1977, pp. 50-1, 56.

[172]CIG II, 1973, p. 56.

[173]CIG II, 1965, 1977, pp. 52, 56.

[174]Thus, Alexander's plot works. Cf. Herodotus 5.19-20 (LCL III) 18-23.

[175]Cf. Tarn and Griffith, Hellenistic Civilisation, 56 ff., and Pausanias, Description of Greece, Attica 6.8-7.2 (LCL I) 34-5. Also Plutarch, Alexander 2.1-4, The Parallel Lives (LCL VII, 1919) 226-7. G. H. Macurdy, "Queen Eurydice and the Evidence for Woman Power in Early Macedonia", AJP 48 (1927) 201-14, shows there is no evidence to prove that before Eurydice women mingled in political affairs, and there are no traces of matriarchy anywhere in Macedonia.

[176]Diogenes Laertius, Strato 5.60, Lives of Eminent Philosophers (LCL I) 512-13.

[177]Plutarch, On Brotherly Love 489c, Moralia (LCL VI; trans. W. C. Helmbold, 1939) 258-9.

[178]Tarn and Griffith, Hellenistic Civilisation, 98.

[179]Meeks, "Image of the Androgyne", 172 ff.; Tarn and Griffith, Hellenistic Civilisation, 330.

[180]IG XII.3, 329 (1898) 80.

[181]This was true of mainland Greece as well as in Asia Minor; cf. Oepke, "γυνή", TDNT I, 786; Pausanias, Description of Greece, Arcadia 8.5.11-12 (LCL III; trans. W. R. S. Jones; 1933) 370-1.

[182]Lucian, The Syrian Goddess 17-19 (LCL IV; trans. A. M. Harmon; London, 1925) 360-5.

[183]Farnell, Cults V (1909) 159-60, 199.

[184]SIG III, 985 (1920) 113-4.

[185]IG XII.2, 499 (1899) 101. Cf. Nilsson, Dionysiac Mysteries, 8-9.

[186]Delling, Paulus' Stellung, 10; Pomeroy, 126. In Galatia alone we have the following inscriptions honoring wives and mothers: CIG III, 4058, 4061 (1853) 95; 4074, p. 98; 4079, p. 100; 4101, p. 105; 4108, p. 106; 4111-4112, p. 107; 4121, p. 109; 4129, p. 111, and espec. 4142, p. 114 on ἱέρεια.

[187]A. H. Smith, "Notes on a Tour of Asia Minor", JHS 8 (1887) 216-67, and espec. 256.

[188]IG IX.2, 62, p. 20.

[189]As is shown by the heir settlement which passed from a mother to her daughter; cf. Demosthenes, Against Boeotus 2.6, Private Orations I (LCL; 1936) 484-5.

[190]Donaldson, Woman, 124.

[191] M. Barth, Ephesians 4-6 (Garden City, 1974) 656.

[192]The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XI, 1380-1381, 214-215 (1915) pp. 190-220, espec. 200, 202.

[193]SIG III, 1267 (1917) 390-2. It is primarily in the Isis cult that the female deity is prominent in Egypt. Cf. R. E. White, "Women in Ptolemaic Egypt", JHS 18 (1898) 240.

[194] Leipoldt, Die Frau, 15-16, says, "...die Frau sich hier tatsächlich allerlei Freiheiten erfreut." Cf. Tarn and Griffith, Hellenistic Civilisation, 359 ff.

[195]Diodorus Siculus, Library of History 1.27.1 ff. (LCL I; trans. C. H. Oldfather; London, 1933) 84 ff. Sophocles, Oedipus at Colonus 337-340 (LCL) 178-9, makes a similar remark revealing that the liberty of Egyptian women was known widely. Diodorus Siculus, Library of History 1.17.3 ff. (LCL I) 55, says that Osiris turned over supreme power to Isis and this led to women's prominence in Egypt. Thus, he furthers the trend of giving an aetiological myth as the basis of a social phenomenon. One must add that once the cult developed there can be no doubt that it furthered the rights and status of women.

[196]This is the conclusion of Pirenne, "Le Statut de la Femme dans L'Ancienne Égypte", in Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin XI, 63-77.

[197]O. Rubensohn, ed., Elephantine-Papyri (Berlin, 1907) 18-22. B. Grenfell, et al., eds., The Tebtunis Papyri I.1 (London, 1902) 449-53. In the main, the Greeks appear to have avoided such forms of marriage as homology or synchoresis; cf. A. Oepke, "γυνή", TDNT I, 778.

[198]The commerical texts involving women are assembled and discussed conveniently in Claire Préaux, "Le Statut de la Femme à L'Époque Hellénistique Principalment en Égypte", in Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin XI, 127-75. Préaux sees an advance in social and commercial, but not political, rights in this era. She concludes, "La capacité de la femme grecque (avec κύριος) et celle de la femme égyptienne (sans κύριος) sont plus étendues que celle de la femme romaine." (145). Cf. Pomeroy, 127. In fact, the Greeks, horrified by Egyptian women in charge of property matters, added the rule that a Greek woman had to have a legal guardian's aid to transact business. On a Greek woman's κύριος, cf. B. Grenfell, ed., An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment, and Other Greek Papyri Chiefly Ptolemaic I.22 (Oxford), 1896) 62-6.

[199]On divorce (ca. A. D. 96), cf. The Oxyrhynchus Papyri II, 266 (1899) 238-43. On women as sellers and lenders, cf. An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment I.18-20, pp. 38-44. On women being ceded land (ca. 132-109 B.C.), cf. I.27, pp. 54-7. On land sold by a priestess and her husband (ca. 114 B.C.), cf. I.25, pp. 51-3. On a woman lending wheat without interest, cf. I.18, p. 38. On women selling and inheriting land, cf. I.21, pp. 44-8 and I.33, pp. 62-5. Herodotus, when he visited Egypt shortly after 460 B.C., reveals that even at this time Egyptian women were more liberated in comparison to their counterparts in Greece or Rome. He observed with some amazement, "Women buy and sell, the men abide at home and weave." Cf. Herodotus 2.35-36 (LCL I) 316-7. Herodotus tells us that this is the only place in the world where such peculiar things happen and we may take his word as accurate about the status of women elsewhere in the Mediterranean.

[200]The Tebtunis Papyri II.766 (1933) 207-09.

[201]Cf. Pausanias, Description of Greece, Attica 7.1-12.5 (LCL I) 34-63. R. E. White, "Women in Ptolemaic Egypt", JHS 18 (1898) 245 ff., comments on women's rise to power in Ptolemaic Egypt.

[202]White, "Women in Ptolemaic Egypt", 264-5, says this principle came not from Macedonia but was native to Egypt. This tradition may explain the brother-sister marriages in royal circles, which could be an attempt by the men to deprive women of some of their sole inheritance rights. The practice of deifying the queen apparently began with Arsinoe Philadelphus. Her cult existed as early as 267 B.C., and we read of priestesses ministering in this cult; cf. White, 251, n. 1, and 252. A. M. Blackman, "On the Position of Women in Ancient Egyptian Hierarchy", JBA 7 (1921) 8-30, has shown there were musicians, priestesses, high priestesses, and prophetesses even before Herodotus' time (4th Dynasty, old kingdom). White, 266, asserts that by Ptolemaic times there was a priestess in every cult of the Egyptian gods and goddesses. There was a parallel rise in the presence and privilege of women in the political arena as well, for, after Arsinoe, queens were deified as a regular procedure in Egypt and frequently their names take precedence over the kings' in the inscriptions. Cf. An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment I.25, 27, pp. 51-3, 54-7.

[203]Pomeroy, 124 ff.

[204]Cf. Plutarch, De Liberis Educandis (The Education of Children) 1.51, 1.8c, 1.9d, 1.14b, Moralia I (LCL) 22-3, 38-9, 44-5, 66-7 (written in the first century A.D.). Cf. Leipoldt, Die Frau, 12-16, 24-71.

[205]Balsdon, Roman Women, 45; Donaldson, Woman, 77-147; Pomeroy, 149-226. For a summary of a Roman woman's legal status, cf. R. Villers, "Le Statut de la Femme à Rome jusqu'à à la Fin de la République", 177-89, and J. Gaudemet, "Le Statut de la Femme dans L'Empire Romain", 191-222, both in Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin XI.

[206]Balsdon, Roman Women, 282.

[207]Cf. V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (2nd ed.; New York, 1966) 32, and C. E. B. Cranfield, The Gospel According to St. Mark (Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary; London, 1972) 9.

[208]J. Carcopino, Daily Life in Ancient Rome (London, 1941) 77; cf. Sallust, The War with Cataline 39.5 (LCL; trans. J. C. Rolfe; London, 1960) 68-9. Apparently, slaying a wife was no longer a right by the later days of the Republic, unless she was caught in adultery. However, cf. Valerius Maximus, Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium 6.3.9 (ed. C. Kempf; Stuttgart, 1966) 289-90; Donaldson, Woman, 145.

[209]Carcopino, 80 ff.; Donaldson, 87. Only the husband was allowed to divorce during the Republic - yet another indication of women's subordinate position. Though written in the late first or early second century A.D., Plutarch, Romulus 22.3-4, The Parallel Lives (LCL I; 1948) 160-3, probably reflects earlier practice. Cf. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Roman Antiquities 2.25, 4-7 (LCL I; trans. E. T. Cary; London, 1937) 382-5, on a woman's subordination (ca. 50 B.C.).

[210]Livy 34.2.11-12 (LCL IX; trans. E. T. Sage; London, 1935) 416-7. On the significance of this quotation, cf. F. H. Marshall, "The Position of Women", in A Companion to Latin Studies (ed. J. E. Sandys; Cambridge, 1910) 184.

[211]Carcopino, Daily Life, 83; Balsdon, Roman Women, 45. Families became increasingly reluctant to turn over their daughter's considerable assets to another family. Cf. Pomeroy, 154.

[212]Cf. the words of Q. Lucretius Vespillo, the consul in 19 B.C., "So long a marriage as ours ended by death and not by divorce is rare; it has been our lot to have it prolonged for 41 years without a quarrel." From the Laudatio Turiae in CIL VI.i, 1527 (ed. G. Henzen; 1876) 332-6.

[213]Suetonius, The Deified Augustus 24 and 89 (LCL I; trans. J. C. Rolfe; London, 1914) 176-9 and 258-9. Probably few of these women over fifty, except perhaps the diseased or demented, had gone through life unmarried. This dispensation simply allowed women not to remarry, a privilege likely given because they could no longer have children.

[214]Plutarch, Pompey 9.55, The Parallel Lives (LCL V; 1917) 134-7.

[215]There were various means women could use to initiate a relationship that led to marriage. Cf. Plutarch, Sulla 35.3-5, The Parallel Lives (LCL IV) 438-9.

[216]M. K. Hopkins, "The Age of Roman Girls at Marriage", Population Studies 18 (1965) 309-27; Pomeroy, 157.

[217]Cf. Balsdon, Roman Women, 252; and Pliny, Letters 5.16 (LCL I; trans. W. Melmoth; London, 1915) 422-3.

[218]Plutarch, Pompey 55, The Parallel Lives (LCL V) 260-1. F. E. Adcock, "Women in Roman Life and Letters", Greece and Rome 14 (1945) 1-22, says, "It may be suspected that most Roman women of the upper classes were accomplished rather than educated."

[219]Sallust, The War with Cataline 24.3-25.5 (LCL) 42-5.

[220]On the Fulvias, cf. Cicero, Philippics 2.5.11, 2.44.114, 5.4.11, 6.2.4 (LCL; trans. W. C. A. Ker; London, 1926) 76-7, 176-7, 266-7; 318-9. Also, Martial, Epigrams 11.20.3-8 (LCL II; trans. W. C. A. Ker; London, 1920) 252-3.

[221]Cf. Valerius Maximus, Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium 8.3.1, p. 378. When Maesia's trial took place, theoretically women were not allowed to plead cases.

[222]Suetonius, The Deified Augustus 84.2 (LCL I) 250-1. Seneca, De Clementia I,9,6-10, Moral Essays (LCL I; trans. J. W. Basore; London, 1928) 382-5.

[223]Cf. Balsdon, 93 ff.; Suetonius, Galba 5.2 (LCL II; 1914) 198-9.

[224]Tacitus, Annals 1.8.2, I.14.3 (LCL II; trans. J. Jackson; London, 1931) 256-7, 270-1.

[225]Tacitus, Agricola 4 (LCL; trans. M. Hutton; rev. R. M. Ogilvie; London, 1970) 30-3; and Dialogus 28-29 (LCL; trans. Wm. Peterson; rev. M. Winterbottom; London, 1970) 304-9.

[226]Plutarch, Tiberius Gracchus I, The Parallel Lives (LCL X; 1920) 144-7. Thus, Cornelia's example is seen as praiseworthy. cf. Tacitus, Dialogue 28.4-29 (LCL) 304-9.

[227]Suetonius, The Deified Augustus 73 (LCL I) 236-9. CIL I.2, 1211 (ed. T. Mommsen and C. E. Lommatzsch; 1918) 590.

[228]Pliny, Natural History 18.107 (LCL V; trans. H. Rackham; London, 1950) 256-7; cf. Natural History 9.67 (LCL III; 1950) 206-9. Petronius, Satyricon 37, 67 (LCL; trans. M. Heseltine; London, 1969 rev.) 64-7, 148-51.

[229]Gaius, Institutes 1.145 (Budé; trans. J. Reinach; Paris, 1950) 28; Gellius, Attic Nights 1.12.9-12 (LCL I; trans. J. C. Rolfe; London, 1927) 60-1, and Attic Nights 10.15.31 (LCL II) 252-3.

[230]Livy 1.20.3 (LCL I; trans. B. O. Foster; London, 1919) 70-1. Tacitus, Annals 4.16.6 (LCL III; 1937) 30-1.

[231]Matrons cared for the Vestals if they were ill; cf. Pliny, Letters 7.19 (LCL II; 1927) 46-53.

[232]Plutarch, Numa 10, The Parallel Lives (LCL I) 342-3.

[233]Cf. Tacitus, Annals 11.32.5 (LCL III) 302-3. Suetonius, The Deified Julius 83, The Lives of the Caesars (LCL I) 112-3. Plutarch, Antony 58.3-5, The Parallel Lives (LCL X) 268-71.

[234]Plutarch, Roman Questions 86, Moralia (LCL IV) 130-3.

[235]Pomeroy, 206.

[236]Pomeroy, 206-7.

[237]Cf. Valerius Maximus, Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium 8.15.12, p. 418.

[238]Livy 10.31.9 (LCL I) 478-9; cf. Pomeroy, 207.

[239]Pomeroy, 208 ff.

[240]Cf. Dio Cassius, Roman History 56.1-10 (LCL VII; 1924) 2-25, on the Lex Papia Poppaea of A.D. 9.

[241]Cf. Suetonius, The Deified Augustus 89.2 (LCL I) 258-9; Tacitus, Annals 3.24 (LCL II) 560-1.

[242]There can be little doubt that Augustus saw the neglect of religion as the cause of Rome's difficulties; cf. F. Altheim, A History of Roman Religion (trans. H. Mattingly; London, 1938) 355 ff.

[243]Altheim, 351-2.

[244]Cato, On Agriculture 83 (LCL; trans. W. D. Hooper and H. B. Ash; London, 1934) 86-7; Altheim, 351-2, 390-405.

[245]Carcopino, Daily LIfe, 128.

[246]Livy 29.14.10 (LCL VIII; trans. F. G. Moore; 1949) 260-1; cf. Livy 29.10.5 (LCL VIII) 244-5, and Donaldson, Woman, 94.

[247]Livy 39.8.5 - 39.9.7 (LCL XI; trans. E. T. Sage; 1936) 240-5; cf. Donaldson, Woman, 95.

[248]Petronius, Satyricon 44 (LCL) 84-7. For, "No one now believes the gods are gods...", see p. 87.

[249]Tacitus, Annals 2.85 (LCL II) 516-7.

[250]Juvenal, Satires 6.511-541, pp. 37-8. The translator also notes the prohibition of the Isis cult within Rome's walls (p. 246). Cf. Pomeroy, 221.

[251]Pomeroy, 214 ff. There are perhaps reasons to doubt this statement. Cf. Mohler, "Feminism in the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum", The Classical Weekly 25 (15, 1932) 116.

[252]On conversion to Isis, cf. Apuleius, The Golden Ass (Metamorphoses) (LCL; trans. W. Adlington; rev. S. Gaselee; London, 1915).

[253]Plutarch, Isis and Osiris 273e-f, 382c-d, Moralia (LCL V; trans. F. C. Babbitt; 1936) 128-31, 180-1. CIL X.1, 3800 (1883) 379.

[254]Balsdon, Roman Women, 246; Pomeroy, 224. Isis was endorsed officially from the time of Caligula onward.

[255]CIL VI.1, 2244-2248, p. 617; Pomeroy, 223.

[256]Pomeroy, 224.

[257]Pomeroy, 223. Cf. Valerius Maximus, Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium 1.3.4, p. 17.

[258]On women in shipbuilding in the time of Claudius, cf. Balsdon, Roman Women, 277. H. J. Loane, Industry and Commerce of the City of Rome (50 B.C. - A.D. 200) (Baltimore, 1938), mentions extensive inscriptional evidence proving the existence of women owners of fleets (23), of dye-making factories (76-7), of brick factories (103-4, 110-11). But cf. Adcock, "Women in Roman Life and Letters", 10. For a summary of the roles of slaves and freed women in rich or imperial homes, cf.

S. Treggiari, "Domestic Staff at Rome in the Julio-Claudian Period: 27 B.C. - A.D. 68", Histoire Sociale: Revue Canadienne 6 (1973) 241-55.

[259]Pomeroy, 198.

[260]Columella, On Agriculture and Trees 12, preface 9, De Re Rustica (LCL III; trans. E. S. Forster, E. H. Heffner; London, 1955) 178-9; Cato, On Agriculture 143 (LCL) 124-5.

[261]Pomeroy, 229.

[262]Cf. the conclusions of J. P. Hallett, "The Role of Women in Roman Elegy: Counter-Cultural Feminism", Arethusa 6:1 (Spring, 1973) 103-24, espec. 103-7. For helpful bibliographies, cf. S. B. Pomeroy, "Selected Bibliography on Women in Antiquity", Arethusa 6 (Spring, 1973) 125-57, and espec. L. Goodwater, Women in Antiquity: An Annotated Bibliography (Metuchen, 1974).

CHAPTER II: PRINCIPLES FOR INTERPRETING THE GOSPELS AND ACTS

INTRODUCTION

In a thesis which seeks to evaluate women and their roles in the Gospels and Acts and to ascertain the views of both the Evangelists and Jesus on this matter, it is necessary that the question of the relation of the Gospels and Acts to historical events be raised and given some sort of tentative answer as a working hypothesis. Since one's view of the historicity of the Gospels and Acts is partly determined by one's views of their genre, of the Synoptic problem, of the relation of the Synoptics to John, and of the criteria for determining authenticity, we will touch briefly on each of these matters before making concluding statements about the historicity of these books. Throughout this thesis the views still widely held by a large portion of the scholarly community concerning authorship will be accepted: that Mark and Luke/Acts were likely written by their namesakes, and that Matthew and John likely were not. In the case of Matthew and John, the conventional Gospel names will often be used for convenience sake without implying anything about authorship. The usual critical dating of these books in the last thirty or so years of the first century will also be accepted. These generalizations are, however, of only limited value and significance since the historicity of the particular incidents and sayings under scrutiny in this thesis will be discussed as our study progresses.

A. Genre of the Gospels

For many scholars who work with the Gospel material, it is axiomatic that the Gospels can no longer be seen as biographies of Jesus.[1] There are even those such as R. Bultmann, who consider the Gospels sui generis, their Gattung being determined by and developed out of the unique primitive Christian kerygma.[2] Granting that the Gospels contain the unique Christian message and that their form is partially determined by their content, it is not the case that the form of the Gospels is without analogy in certain types of biographical and historical writings of antiquity. While it is true that the Gospels are not biographies in the modern sense of the word (i.e., they do not reflect much interest in personal appearance, the sociological and psychological factors of character development, precise chronology), it does not follow that they were not intended or understood as biographies by the standards of antiquity. Some ancient biographies,

such as Tacitus' Agricola, reflect an interest in chronology in its broad outlines, but a concern for precise chronology is not characteristic of either Hochliteratur or Kleinliteratur.[3] Thus, the Gospels cannot be distinguished from ancient biographies on this basis.[4]

Further, depicting character development was not a sine qua non of ancient biography,[5] and only Luke among the Evangelists shows any trace of such an interest (cf. 2.52). In Xenophon's Memorabilia, no interest is shown in character development; rather, Socrates is presented as a mature character throughout. A common method of character portrayal in antiquity was the indirect method of allowing a person's actions and words to indicate his character (cf. Plutarch, Life of Alexander, or Theophratus, Characters) which is also the main technique of the Evangelists. Though the Gospels make little attempt to set their main character against the background of his times, this was not always characteristic of ancient biographies.[6] Further, description of a character's physical features was not a universal trait for it is not found in Roman literature until Sallust and only became conventional in Suetonius' day.[7] Ancient biographical and historical writing was often didactic or apologetic or eulogistic, but never purely historical in purpose.[8]

Bultmann's contention that ancient biographical writing lacks any link with myth or cult,[9] as well as the view that Mark's eschatological outlook would have precluded him from using the techniques and types of ancient literature, have been refuted by C. H. Talbert.[10] On the last point, the Qumran community, which was eschatologically oriented, produced various sorts of documents. Early Christian (unlike Gnostic) eschatology was of a world transforming, not world negating, nature (cf. Rom 8.18-25). If it is contended that while a Christian community might produce Qumran-like documents, they would not be interested in writing 'popular' biographies in a Hellenistic or Roman mold, it may be answered that Christianity's emphasis on missionary outreach might occasion just such documents.[11] It is reasonable to expect the Evangelists to use accepted literary methods.

In regard to the use of myth in ancient biographies, Talbert shows that certain historical figures (among them Alexander, Augustus, Empedocles, Apollonius) were written about employing both normal historical information and the myth of the immortals. "In attaching itself to clearly historical personages this mythology affected the literary genres of history and biography."[12] Talbert's arguments

that the Synoptics use this myth to show Jesus' significance are not nearly as convincing as his demonstration of mythical elements in ancient biographies.[13] It is undeniable that both the Gospels and various ancient biographies attribute supernatural births, deeds, and ends to their characters. The myth of the descending-ascending redeemer figure was also used in antiquity of historical figures and it could be said that we see this pattern applied to Jesus in John.[14] Talbert argues that this pattern does not appear in Hellenistic biography because the ancients could not conceive of an immortal putting on mortality. In any event, his case that myth was used of historical persons both in biography and other ancient literature not likely influenced by Christian ideas, seems established. Finally, when one examines such didactic lives as Diogenes Laertius' Empedocles, or Pseudo-Callisthenes' Life of Alexander, or the communities of followers of a particular ruler or philosopher (such as the cult of Alexander at Alexandria), myth seems to be used to inculcate or to further reverence or even worship of an historical person.[15]

Because ancient biographers wished to present a vivid and true picture of their character through a narration of his words and deeds, they were genuinely concerned to ascertain what their hero actually said and did.[16] This often involved consulting both oral and written reports, eyewitnesses, and the man himself if possible. Naturally, the amount of critical judgment applied to this material varied, but it was often applied satisfactorily enough for C. W. Votaw to affirm, "These Greek and Roman biographies of the ancient period from the fourth century B.C. to the third century A.D. achieve in varying manner and measure the biographical ideal."[17] Though neither the ancient biographers nor the Evangelists had an abstract or purely academic interest in the words and deeds of their subjects as historical phenomena, it does not follow from this that the Evangelists and at least some ancient writers were not deeply concerned about whether or not their hero actually said or did this or that.

It appears likely that many of the first recipients of the Gospels would have seen them as lives of Jesus, albeit episodic ones, written according to the conventions of ancient biographical and historical literature.[18] Certainly there are differences in tone and content between the Gospels and ancient Lives. The ancient Lives do not have the pervasive theological content we find in the Gospels. Then too the kerygma has affected the Gospels' form to some extent, though not

enough to warrant the claim that the Gospels are sui generis. But in the main, as B. H. Streeter rightly says, the difference between the Gospels and ancient biographical and historical works, "...lies in the subject treated, not in the historical ideal of the several writers."[19]

B. The Synoptic Problem

The solution to the Synoptic Problem adopted in this thesis is commonly called the four source hypothesis. In view of the revival of the Griesbach hypothesis by W. R. Farmer and others, it is worthwhile to state briefly some reasons for accepting this view. Out of the total of 661 verses in Mark, only 55 are not found in some form in the First Gospel. Luke has over half of Mark's material, but Mark's material makes up less than half of either the First or Third Gospel. Positing Matthean priority it is very difficult to explain why Mark would omit so much valuable material from the First Gospel (Infancy Narrative, Sermon on the Mount, nearly all the parables) "...in order to get room for purely verbal expansion of what was retained."[20] The same argument applies supposing Mark's dependency on Luke. If one posits Marcan priority, Matthean omissions are explainable in terms of his theological purposes and/or attempts to avoid repetition. Luke's 'great omission' (Mk 6.45-8.26) is more enigmatic, but then Luke exercises more independence from Mark than the First Evangelist and the 'great omission' may be further evidence of this fact.

Further evidence arises for Marcan priority when one notes how the First and Third Evangelists alter difficult Marcan constructions (τί οὗτος οὕτως λαλεῖ; βλασφημεῖ Mk 2.7, cf. parallels); omit or ameliorate potentially offensive texts (cf. Mk 3.21 and parallels, Mk 10.18 and parallels); or change a more colloquial and Semitic Marcan account into better Greek (e.g., Mk 2.4 κράβατος; Matthew κλίνη; Luke κλινίδιον).[21] Further, in the triple tradition Matthew and Luke agree in order only insofar as they agree with Mark. Wherever one deviates from Mark's order, the other supports it, with the sole exception of Mk 3.31-35 which is found in a different context in each Gospel.[22] The reproduction of 51% of Mark's exact words in Matthew, and 53% in Luke in their common material clearly points to interdependence and in combination with the factors mentioned above also favors Marcan priority.[23] Thus, in matters of content, sequence, and wording, the evidence all favors Marcan priority.[24]

What of the Ur-Marcus hypothesis favored by Bultmann and others? It is urged that Luke's 'great omission' is only explainable on the assumption that his Mark did not have 6.45-8.26. Luke's greater

freedom with Mark, in comparison with the First Evangelist, weakens this argument, as does the fact that some of Mk 6.45-8.26 is found in Matthew (thus requiring one to posit that Matthew's Mark and Luke's Mark were different). The minor agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark can be explained mainly in terms of stylistic improvements (changing Mark's historical present to an imperfect or aorist; using a different conjunction or preposition), or in terms of textual corruption (i.e., assimilation or scribal improvement - κύριε is likely original at Mk 1.40), and the few remaining examples do not warrant resorting to an Ur-Markus hypothesis. Far from some of these minor agreements arguing for an Ur-Markus, it may appear in some cases to be evidence of a less, not more, primitive text than our Mark.[25] In some cases it appears that the Q material and Mark overlap, and the First and Third Evangelists have chosen to follow Q. In others, one must reckon with the influence of the oral traditions still in circulation when the First and Third Evangelists wrote.[26] It must be remembered that the First and Third Evangelists were members of Christian communities and likely heard some of the Marcan narratives recited apart from their reading of Mark. M. Hengel urges us to bear in mind that the Synoptists are for the most part reducing and concentrating, rather than expanding, the considerable amount of source material available to them (cf. Lk 1.1, πολλοὶ).[27] Naturally, this view of supplementary oral or written sources cannot be invoked to account for every small addition or change - some are clearly theologically motivated. But such supplements or substitutes are assumed when it is argued that Q and Mark overlap, and there are other cases where sources parallel and sometimes more primitive than Mark appear to be evidence (e.g., in Mt 19.1-9, cf. Mk 10. 1-12).[28] The reason the First and Third Evangelists are so dependent on Mark is that they consider Mark their primary and most reliable, but not necessarily their only, source for all the Marcan material.

The Q hypothesis has arisen to account for the 200-250 non-Marcan verses found in both Matthew and Luke. It is a more viable hypothesis than the view that Luke is directly dependent on Matthew because: 1) the latter view fails to explain why Luke uses some of the Sermon on the Mount in his Sermon on the Plain and scatters fragments of the rest in various other chapters; 2) the latter view fails to explain why Luke never (apart from 3.7-9, 17) places the material he shares with the First Evangelist at the same place in the Marcan framework as does Matthew, and never takes over any of Matthew's distinctive additions.

The view that the First Gospel is directly dependent on the Third is no longer advanced. Because there are too many cases where the verbal resemblances between the Matthean and Lukan versions of a common passage are too inexact to posit a single common written source (whether in Greek or Aramaic), and the order in the large blocks of Q material agrees in Matthew and Luke only when they are following Mark's outline, it is best to speak of Q as a stratum of the Gospel material.[29] It is not possible to say with exactness what was not included in the Q material besides the Birth, Passion, and Resurrection narratives. Yet these omissions are sufficient to indicate that it never constituted a whole Gospel, though it must have included some narrative material along with numerous sayings (cf. Lk 4.2-13, 7.1-10, 7.18-23, 11.14-23, 11.29-32).[30] There seem to be enough examples to justify the view that Matthew and Luke, in addition to their common Greek sources, had at least one Aramaic source in common.[31] The strong linguistic differences between Mark and Q in the double tradition (cf. Mk 4.30-32, Lk 13.18 ff.) make the assumption of the literary dependence of Mark on Q or the converse unlikely.[32] The Q material appears to have been a multiplicity of sources, some written, perhaps some oral, that make up several short independent tracts or cycles of tradition focusing mainly on the sayings and teachings of Jesus.[33]

In addition to Mark and the Q material, the First and Third Evangelists had access to various other traditions, commonly called M and L, without implying that all uniquely Matthean or Lukan material necessarily came from one clearly defined written or oral source. It is simply impossible to say how much material we call M or L was actually drawn from the Q material and simply omitted by the other Evangelist. With Streeter we may recognize a certain Jewish flavor to M in comparison to L,[34] but that either M or L were coherent documents or,as Streeter held, were the traditions of two specific Churches (Jerusalem for M and Caesarea for L) is now difficult to accept.[35] Also, Streeter's view of the development of the tradition from isolated and definable segments (M, L, Mark, Q) to combined traditions (Proto-Luke), to Gospels as a linear or almost evolutionary process oversimplifies what was obviously a complex situation. It is more likely that since the earliest Churches appear to have been mostly independent of one another, in some locations the Gospel form arose at an early date, and in others Churches collected Jesus' logia for a long time, each developing and using its resources as the needs arose.[36]

With the above mentioned qualifications we can accept the four source hypothesis, though it is not problem free. Part of the problem is that it is misleading to speak of a four source hypothesis when the Q, M, and L materials are likely groups of sources or documents.[37]

C. The Relation of John to the Synoptics

Since the time of Streeter when most scholars held that the Fourth Evangelist used Mark, probably Luke, and possibly Matthew, a new consensus has arisen in the wake of the works of P. Gardner-Smith, C. H. Dodd, and others, favoring the independence of John from the Synoptics. Even C. K. Barrett, who rejects the new "critical orthodoxy" on this matter, does not assert that the Fourth Evangelist actually had any of the Synoptics before him when he wrote, only that he "...had read Mark and was influenced both positively and negatively by its contents...and that a few of John's statements may be most satisfactorily explained if he was familiar with matters peculiar to Luke."[38] No reference is made here to Matthew, for it is generally conceded that the case for dependence on Matthew is weak.

The fact that Luke and John share certain personal names not found in the first two Gospels (Lazarus, Mary and Martha, 'Judas, not Iscariot', Annas) is thought to point to the Fourth Gospel's dependence on the Third. Annas was a well-known Jewish figure, mentioned by Josephus. Certainly the Fourth Evangelist could have derived his name from someone other than Luke. The name Judas was a common Jewish name, and Luke identifies him as Judas of James, not 'Judas, not Iscariot'. Possibly both writers are independently relying on traditional list(s) of the Twelve. It is conceivable that the Fourth Evangelist borrowed the names of Mary and Martha from Luke but their pericopes are so different that it is more likely that we have different traditions about the same sisters. Neither the narrative in John 11 nor 12 could reasonably be said to be dependent on Lk 10.38-42. In Luke there is an implied critique of Martha's concern with 'much serving', which is not the case in John 12. The focus in John 12 is on the anointing and the resulting reactions (cf. 11.1-2); in Luke it is on single-minded devotion and Mary having chosen the good portion. Finally, the Lazarus in Luke is a pauper in a parable; while John's Lazarus is found in a narrative which tells us he was wealthy enough to be buried

in a tomb. Why would the Fourth Evangelist place Lazarus in such diametrically opposed circumstances if he was relying on Luke?

Certain details are thought to link the two Gospels. Since the similarities in the anointing stories will be dealt with later, it is sufficient to say here that the coincidences are best explained by cross-fertilization at the level of oral tradition rather than any sort of dependence of one Gospel on another.[39] Both Luke and John link Judas' betrayal to his possession by Satan but Luke has Satan enter Judas before he first seeks out the High Priest (Lk 22.3), while John associates the possession with the Last Supper (Jn 13.2, 27). The two traditions are not identical and both Gospels have a rather developed Satanology elsewhere (cf. Lk 10.19, 11.15, 13.16, 22.31; Jn 8.44,12.31, 16.11); thus, it is not unlikely that these two Evangelists would independently associate Satan and Judas.[40] There is no clear evidence of dependence in the fact that Luke and John record the note of the High Priest's servant's ear being severed since this is the kind of graphic detail often remembered when a narrative is passed on over a period of time by word of mouth (e.g., the remembrance that it was νάρδος πιστική in the anointing stories of John and Mark). The mention of two angels at the tomb by both Luke and John ... might point to dependence, but the traditions differ so much otherwise that it may be doubted. In John angels are possibly mentioned for a theological reason: they serve as a supernatural parenthesis emphasizing where Jesus' body was laid. In Luke they do not serve this purpose and he may mention two 'men' for quite a different reason: the requirement of two witnesses (Deut 19.15). Finally, while it is true that Jn 12.38 resembles Lk 22.34 more than Mk 14.30, it actually shows little affinity with either one.[41] The evidence used to support the view that John used or had read Luke is weak and the similarities are better explained by a variety of other means.

The case for John's dependence on Mark is more substantial and Barrett places particular emphasis on the argument from order.[42] His list includes: a) the work and witness of the Baptist (Mk 1.4-8/Jn 1.19-36); b) departure to Galilee (Mk 1.14f/Jn 4.3); c) feeding the multitude (Mk 6.34-44/Jn 6.1-13); d) walking on the lake (Mk 6.45-52/Jn 6.16-21); 3) Peter's confession (Mk 8.29/Jn 6.68f); f) departure to Jerusalem (Mk 9.30f, 10.1, 32, 46/Jn 7.10-14); g) the Entry and the Anointing (Mk 11.1-19, 14.3-9; transposed in John 12.12-15, 12.1-8); h) the Last Supper with predictions of betrayal and denial (Mk 14.53-16.8/Jn 18.12-20.29).

There appears to be no possibility that pericopes f-g ,h-j could be in any other order than their present one: Jesus must depart for Jerusalem before he enters it; the Last Supper must precede the arrest; the arrest must precede the Passion and Resurrection. There is room for rearranging the order of the Entry and the Anointing and significantly Mark and John differ at this point. Further, unlike the case in John, there is a considerable amount of material that separates Mark's Entry and Anointing stories.

The first half of the list is more problematic. Pericope a logically precedes b, c, d, and e, since John is the one who 'prepares the way' by appearing before Jesus and announcing His coming. This is true even in the Fourth Gospel (cf. 1.15 and 1.27 - ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος) though it is also true that John continues to play a part in the story after the inception of Jesus' ministry (cf. 3.22 ff.). Pericope b must precede c for all four Evangelists locate the Feeding of the Multitude in Galilee and Jesus must depart for Galilee before the Feeding can be recorded. Similarly, Jesus must finish His Galilean ministry before He makes His final trip to Jerusalem. Pericope f must follow a-e. The parallels in the sequence c, d, e are more impressive but even here there is room for doubt. In John's framework e must precede f. Peter's confession in John occasions a reference to Jesus' betrayal (6.70-71) and his not going up until His time had come (7.1, 6) both of which set the stage for Jesus' trip to Jerusalem. The order e-f can be explained in terms of the internal framework of the Fourth Gospel. Finally, the order c-d and d-e may be explained without the dependence theory. Dodd suggested that Mark had a general narrative framework that helped him order some of the pericopes about Jesus' Galilean ministry.[43] Presumably this framework did not come down to him from the same source as the pericopes he somewhat awkwardly inserted into this framework. If so, then it becomes possible that the Fourth Evangelist had access to this narrative framework but not to Mark. If one is willing to accept Dodd's view that "...there is good reason to believe that in broad outlines the Marcan order does represent a genuine succession of events,"[44] then it is even possible that while Mark had access to the framework, John, through another channel, had access to the actual sequence of events. In any case, the agreements in order in Mark and John are probably not extensive enough to require the view that John knew Mark's order.

The case for verbal dependence is also less than compelling. Of the twelve examples Barrett cites,[45] the longest is no more than 3½ lines in the Greek text - one average length sentence and one shorter (Mk 14.7-8, cf. Jn 12.7-8). We have word for word agreement in none of the examples, not even in the shortest ones (Mk 6.50/Jn 6.20, cf. Mk 8.29/Jn 6.69). Mk 6.50/Jn 6.20 can safely be set aside, for the phrases "It is I" and "Fear not" are too ordinary to require literary dependence, and in Mk 8.29/Jn 6.69 the titles ascribed are different, leaving only σὺ εἶ which might (but likely does not) reflect Johannine dependence on Mark. In Mk 11.9-10/Jn 12.13 it appears that both Evangelists are relying on Ps 118.25 for the texts differ significantly where the use of Ps 118.25 ceases. John's additional phrase καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ does not seem to derive from Mark's εὐλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δανίδ though similar traditions are likely being used here. Of the remaining nine examples, seven come from material clearly associated with the Passion narrative, which most scholars think circulated widely in a rather fixed and connected form earlier than most of the rest of the Gospel material. The title "King of the Jews" (Mk 15.26/Jn 19.19) is ascribed to Jesus in all four Gospels and the Evangelists could have used it here independently of one another. It was a well-known phrase especially among zealous Jews. Apparently Jn 11.2 indicates that the anointing story circulated early and possibly widely, and 1 Cor 11.23 likely indicates that the Last Supper traditions (Mk 14.18/Jn 13.21) did as well. 1 Cor 11.23 indicates that a statement about the betrayal was included in such traditions. Thus, again these examples do not require us to posit literary dependence.

The tradition about severing the slave's ear was apparently one that interested early Christians considerably, perhaps because it revealed Jesus' view of violence. In Mark it is not clear that a disciple had done the deed, unlike the case in Luke and John, who mention that the right ear was severed. Luke and John have various other graphic details not found in Mark or Matthew. There are no common rare words or awkward grammatical constructions to indicate that John depends on Mark here; in fact, there are significant differences in the use of verbs (Mark σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν/John εἵλκυσεν αὐτήν; Mark ἀφεῖλεν αὐτοῦ/John ἀπέκοψεν αὐτοῦ). The similarities are not strong enough to demonstrate dependence of John on Mark here.

The final three examples are part of important narratives in all three Gospels. In regard to the sentences about John the Baptist and the prediction of Peter's denial we have to deal with short, pithy, or interesting sayings that might well be remembered by different people, be passed on through independent channels and, because of their importance,have gained a wide circulation. Acts 18 and 19 indicate that the question of the relationship of the Baptist to Jesus was a live one for a considerable amount of time. As L. Morris notes, even in a short space of words, there are a number of noteworthy differences in Mark's and John's record of the saying about the Baptist.[46] In the denial narrative and feeding of the 5000 narrative there are differences between the accounts which do not seem to have any deep significance or theological motivations. Why should John omit Mark's reference to the cock crowing twice? Why should he have δύο ὀψάρια instead of Mark's δύο ἰχθύας in the feeding narrative? Gardner-Smith points out that "John's account of the miracle differs in almost every possible way from that of Mark....The words used are different, the speakers are different; the only point of contact is in the single phrase διάκοσίων δηναρίων ἄρτοι and even then it is in the accusative in Mark and nominative in John."[47] These points about verbal dependence are, of course, of somewhat limited value since Barrett is not maintaining that John copied Mark; however, some weight must be given to them because they show that the verbal similarities come not so much in unusual words, graphic details, or peculiar turns of phrase but primarily in ordinary words and phrases. This is surely significant since it is reasonable to expect that the unique or striking words or phrases would be primarily what the Fourth Evangelist would remember and reproduce from Mark. We thus conclude that the case for dependence of the Fourth Gospel on any of the Synoptics is not compelling nor even necessarily the most plausible explanation of all the relevant data.

D. Source Criticism

Having partially dealt with the sources of the Synoptic Gospels, it remains here to discuss the Proto-Luke hypothesis and make some general remarks about source criticism. The Proto-Luke hypothesis as advocated by Streeter, Taylor, Caird, and others, is probably to be rejected for the following reasons: 1) when one deletes the Marcan material from Luke, one is left with an amorphous assortment of passages most of which deal with Jesus' journey to Jerusalem (556 verses out of

706). This is too lopsided an arrangement to warrant calling Proto-Luke a primitive Gospel.[48] 2) The argument that Luke inserts four blocks of Marcan material (1.21-3.6, 4.1-9.40, 10.13-52, 11.1-14, 16) into his special source does not account for the fact that Luke omits Marcan sections (Mk 3.20-22, 9.42-10.12) from the Marcan sequence he takes over at precisely the places where the small (Lk 6.17-8.3) and larger (9.51-18.14) non-Marcan blocks are included. Further, when Luke inserts 19.39-44, the parallel section in Mk 11.1-14 is omitted.[49] 3) Luke separates the third Marcan passion prediction from the first two because of his placement of the 'great interpolation'. 4) Luke's genealogy appears to be inserted between items that belong together (Mk 1.9-11, 12-13).[50] 5) It appears the non-Marcan sections of Luke presuppose the present Gospel's context and order.[51] 6) Probably, the main reason Luke edits or omits a considerable amount of Marcan material "...is that no one document is really the foundation of the Third Gospel. All the sources are quarries from which the Evangelist selects and adapts material to serve his own end."[52]

Several words of caution are necessary concerning some suppositions often made about sources. The tendency in NT criticism is to suggest that Luke more often than Matthew preserves the original wording (and order?) of the Q material. There is, however, no way of objectively checking this theory and on the basis of the way Luke handles Mark,it appears he, just as much as the First Evangelist, makes his sources his own. Secondly, in regard to the matter of doublets one must reckon with four possibilities: 1) Jesus said and did similar things on various occasions, and the Evangelists may have chosen to present two similar traditions that were not variants of one original tradition; 2) the Evangelists are presenting variants of one tradition but their own redactional activity is the cause of the variation; 3) Variants of the same tradition are being presented and the variation arises through the use of different sources; 4) Similar traditions have interacted at the level of oral transmission, or one story has been assimilated into the pattern of another similar story to give it a 'conventional form'. Thirdly, redaction critics have shown that all four Evangelists were skillful editors and presenters of their material and thus one cannot be certain when stylistic change is a result of an author's deliberate purpose or the use of a different source (e.g.,in Luke 1-2?). If the scholar is unable to detect a source at various points in the Gospel narrative it may indicate no

more than that the Evangelist has successfully rewritten his source in his own language and style. It need not mean that the material is the Evangelist's own creation. The implications of both the extensive agreements between the Synoptics in substance and even at times in exact wording, and the significant differences in their common material, must be allowed to have their full weight. That Matthew and Luke frequently did not make significant alterations in their Marcan source material, indicates that they agreed with it and probably "...that they were concerned to preserve the received tradition and that they did not feel free to write the story of Jesus just as they pleased in accordance with their own theology."[53] The differences, however, clearly indicate that the Evangelists exercised a certain freedom in arranging and shaping their source material in accordance with their purposes. One must have a balanced approach to the Synoptic material, neither ignoring nor exaggerating either the extensive similarities or the significant differences. The Evangelists were both transmitters and presenters of the Gospel material.

E. Form Criticism

The form critical method of studying the origins of the Gospel material has been of immense value in helping scholars to focus on the oral traditions behind the Gospels and in demonstrating that many Gospel narratives came down to the Evangelists as isolated units with a specific form. There are, however, certain difficulties with the method at least as applied by Bultmann and to a lesser degree Dibelius that must be pointed out. As is well-known Bultmann claimed that the early Church did not perceive (or at least did not make) a distinction between the pre-Easter sayings of Jesus and the post-Easter inspired utterances of (anonymous?) Christian prophets which, it is claimed, were accepted as the words of the ascended Jesus, and were sometimes accidentally, sometimes deliberately, retrojected into settings in Jesus' ministry.[54] While Bultmann thinks that the tradition moved from general fluidity to general fixation, nonetheless, he posits about this sayings material that it was more freely handled in the middle (when a saying of a prophet was accepted as a saying of the ascended Lord) or near the end of the fixation process (when the saying of a prophet or the ascended Lord became a saying of the historical Jesus). As the Book of Revelation indicates, there were utterances of the ascended Christ spoken through prophets in the early

Church, but this does not prove either that such utterances were not distinguished from other utterances of Christian prophets, or that sayings of the exalted Lord became sayings of the historical Jesus. Indeed, the evidence from Revelation points in the opposite direction for there the sayings of the exalted Lord spoken through a Christian prophet (who is named) are identified precisely as that. If the Book of Revelation tells us anything, it indicates that such sayings were distinguished from the sayings of the historical Jesus.[55] Even more doubtful is Bultmann's appeal to Odes of Solomon 42.6 for it is still widely held that the Odes are to be dated after the Gospel material.[56] When one examines the non-Gospel material relevant to our subject (because it is methodologically improper to use any of the Gospel material as evidence of Christian prophets' activity when that is what must be proved) we find that Paul distinguished between his own authoritative utterances and the Lord's (1 Cor 7.10, 12 ,25, 40) and 1 Corinthians 14 indicates that the utterances of Christian prophets were to be weighed and tested (v 29), not to be accepted as of unquestionable authority as the Lord's words were to be (7.10, 12). Even when such utterances were approved , it is still not clear from this material that they were accorded the same status as (or were thought to be indistinguishable from) the words of the earthly Jesus. As Dunn has shown, in both the NT and other early Christian literature (the Didache, et al.), there is evidence that Christians, like their Jewish forbears, had a healthy suspicion about prophetic oracles and subjected them to close scrutiny ,inquiring about their source. Note that Luke carefully mentions the prophet's name when he cites an oracle (Ac 11.27, 28, 13.1, 2, 21.10-11).[57] If the utterances of Christian prophets were valued as highly as sayings of the earthly Jesus, the rationale for retrojecting such utterances back into Jesus' ministry is lacking.[58] Further, how has it happened, if the early Church retrojected prophetic material into a ministry setting, that we have little or no material dealing with some of the major crises of the early Church over circumcision , baptism, and the relation of Jews to Gentiles (including table fellowship, and the basis of acceptance among Jesus' people)? Can we legitimately assume that all these matters were settled when the Gospels were written?[59] While it is possible that the sayings of Christian prophets and/or the exalted Lord were at some point (accidentally?) attributed to the earthly Jesus, the evidence used to support this view is not convincing and cannot be used

to argue that the original Sitz im Leben of much of the Gospel sayings material is the post-Easter Christian community.

The contention that the Gospel tradition developed in a manner analogous to the growth of folk literature has rightly been subjected to close scrutiny. While comparisons of this kind are natural and needful, there is always the danger that similarities in form or content will be thought to prove that the origin and/or development of the two sets of material are the same. This is an especially dangerous assumption when comparison is made strictly on a selective basis, as is the case in Dibelius' and Bultmann's studies. As E. P. Sanders has shown, there was no systematic attempt to see how various sorts of folk stories developed over a period of time, perhaps because of the difficulties of finding, dating, and relating various versions of a story. It appears that the form critics derived their laws of transmission by assuming that purity of form indicates relative antiquity and by examining how Matthew and Luke use Mark and Q, and later Christian literature uses the canonical Gospels. Sanders notes, "...the form critics did not show, outside of the Synoptic Gospels, that there was a body of tradition which had at first existed in pure forms, but whose purity of form had been corrupted by the passage of time."[60] In fact, Dibelius derives his laws of development by analyzing the needs and activities of the Christian communities and positing that a certain need required a certain form of material. Any differences from that form indicated development. In practice then Dibelius denied that comparisons with folk literature revealed how Christian material developed, since folk literature did not grow out of the same kind of community with the same needs.[61] More consistently, Bultmann distinguishes between laws of formation and laws of transmission. The former he discovers by analyzing comparative literature, the latter almost exclusively by studying the Gospels and their inter-relationships. In the work of both Bultmann and Dibelius, "...the laws of transmission have not been established outside of the Christian material itself."[62]

The problem of selective use of examples arises again, even when Bultmann draws conclusions from his study of the Gospel's inter-relationships about how the Gospel material developed. For instance, Bultmann argues that details (names, places, etc.) tended to be added to the tradition as it developed. He does not explain why there are so many cases where Mark includes, and the parallels omit, such details. When he does suggest (infrequently) an explanation for such examples, it is usually by way of appeal to an Ur-Markus hypothesis that has its

own special difficulties. In fact, while the evidence is mixed, Sanders shows that Mark usually is more detailed than the parallels.[63]

The appropriateness of appealing to the 'laws of formation' of folk literature to explain the formation of the Gospel material is questionable for several reasons: 1) usually the material used as a basis for comparison developed over a much longer period of time than the Gospels' 40-70 year gestation period; 2) the folk literature appealed to is seldom dealing with historical events to the same degree (if at all) that the Gospels are; 3) various factors (eyewitneses, reverence for the historical figure being written about) likely acted as a restraint on the embellishment of the Gospel material, unlike the case with much of folk literature; 4) even in the rabbinic literature that provides the closest parallels there is nothing comparable to the Gospels' focus on, proclamation of, and belief in one man;[64] 5) it is more probable that the first disciples of Jesus and the earliest post-Easter community would have passed on His words and deeds in a way that showed as much respect for the tradition as Jewish students showed their teachers' words and deeds in the first century, than that they would allow the tradition to undergo radical transformations in the way the analogy to folk literature suggests.[65] It is plausible that Jesus' first disciples would have used the techniques of transmission common in their milieu - memorization, repetition, and even brief note-taking. There are certainly indications that Jesus used various mnemonic devices to help His listeners learn, which suggests that He sought to make his teaching not merely memorable but memorizable.[66] Yet, as H. Schürmann has pointed out, Jesus was more than a rabbi for it appears He intended His words to be seen as a revelation of God's eschatological plans. If so, then "Hier wird von Anfang an der Inhalt wichtiger gewesen sein als die Konservierung der Form."[67] The disciples were concerned to conserve, pass on, and apply to new situations what Jesus said and meant, more than the exact form of words He used (i.e., the material is dependent on the Sitz im Leben for its specific formulation). This factor, along with the Evangelists' theological purposes, may account for many, if not most, of the divergences in wording in parallel Gospel traditions.

At this point a few words about determining the Sitz im Leben of a pericope by an analysis of its Gospel and pre-Gospel form(s) is in order. Often the form of a saying or pericope will give only a clue to its original Sitz im Leben, and in some cases the same form was used

in different situations and for different purposes. The very variety of views about the original Sitz im Leben of most pericopes demonstrates that only in a minority of cases does form clearly indicate the Sitz im Leben. Form criticism has primarily been useful in the study of the pronouncement and miracle stories, but in the case of the rest of the Gospel material most of the form categories suggested (i.e., legends) tell us little if anything about a narrative's form, but rather deal with content and imply a judgment on the material's historical value.[68]

As Bultmann recognized, Dibelius' statement, "in the beginning was the sermon" was unduly restrictive as an attempt to encapsulate the situation and impetus that gave rise to various Gospel forms. A variety of activities led to a variety of forms of tradition. As Schürmann has shown, it is also unwarranted to restrict the potential Sitz im Leben of a Gospel pericope to the post-Easter community. The inner life of Jesus' community, as well as its outer life of going forth to proclaim the Kingdom message, provided the sociological conditions in which Jesus' words and deeds could have begun to take on a fixed form prior to Easter.[69] It is necessary to distinguish between the situation or event that gave rise to a tradition and the conditions in which a tradition was 'actualized', i.e., collected and given (or passed on in) a fixed form by Jesus' disciples.[70] In the case of a saying it is possible that Jesus Himself originated and formed 'the tradition', while in the case of a narrative (with the possible exception of some of the Passion events which Jesus may have foretold) Sitz im Leben Jesu means that the tradition arose out of the pre-Easter situation in which the disciples discussed and related Jesus' deeds, not that it came from Jesus' lips. Even if a narrative was not 'actualized' until after Easter, it does not follow that the early Church created the tradition out of non-historical material. To 'form' a tradition about certain events is not the same as inventing the circumstances narrated.

At this point a brief statement of our own view of the origins of the Gospel tradition is in order - a view based not on analogies with folk literature but on some of the earliest NT documents (Paul's letters to Thessalonica and Corinth). At various places in his letters, Paul uses the technical language used when the transmission and reception of authoritative traditions was being referred to in rabbinic Judaism (cf. 1 Cor 11.2, 23, 15.1, 3; 1 Thess 2.13, 4.1; 2 Thess 3.6). Paul also speaks of Christian traditions as παράδοσις (cf. 1 Cor 11.2; 2 Thess 2.15, 3.6). These facts do not allow us to assume that

Christian material was passed on in exactly the same manner as the Jewish material but it does establish one key point: "...early Christianity is conscious of the fact that it has a tradition of its own including many traditions which the Church teachers hand on to the congregations, which the congregations receive and which they then are to guard and to live after. In Paul's times there existed a conscious, deliberate, and programmatic transmission in the early Church."[71] What sort of traditions were being passed on in Paul's day? 1 Cor 11.2 would seem to indicate that several kinds of tradition were passed on. 1 Cor 11.23 ff. indicates that this included some narrative and sayings material involving the Last Supper (which would give support to the view that the Passion narrative was fixed relatively early). 1 Cor 15. 1, 3-4 indicates that these traditions included some credal statements and lists of witnesses to Jesus' appearances. 1 Cor 7.10-11 indicates that important sayings of Jesus were also being passed on in relatively fixed form from an early date. 1 Thess 2.13, 4.1, 2 Thess 2.15, 3.6, and Gal 1.9 indicate that certain ethical exhortations were also involved (not teachings of Jesus but exhortations to follow Jesus' example, Paul's example, or the Church's ethical teaching). What this shows is that not merely the sayings of Jesus but all sorts of other traditions - some ethical, some credal, some narrative - were being passed on by Paul and others to the early Church.

Another crucial point is that first century Palestine was a mixed language milieu. As long as it was assumed that translation of the Gospel material into Greek was something not undertaken for a considerable period of time after its proclamation in Aramaic, it was possible to assume that considerable changes and corruption took place in the material before it was ever rendered into Greek. This view and a related one (i.e., that we can readily distinguish between a Palestinian and Hellenistic milieu), have both been severely criticized by M. Hengel and others.[72] J. N. Sevenster and R. H. Gundry have shown that Greek was widely known and used in both Judea and Galilee in the first century. Galilee in particular was a frontier area with a great deal of contact with Greek-speaking people and Hellenistic culture, and had been for centuries. The archaeological evidence indicates Greek was used by both literate and illiterate Jews (both scribes and fishermen) because Greek had become the official language of commerce and communication, and was even used in Jewish graveyards and synagogues.[73] We find evidence of both good and clumsy Greek in various diverse settings

indicating that: "No matter how very superficial and sketchy that knowledge was, many from all layers of society understood it and were able to speak and write it."[74] While this does not lead us to the conclusion that Jesus mainly spoke Greek to His disciples and audiences, it does mean that it is quite plausible that Jesus spoke Greek on some occasions, (e.g., perhaps when He was in the Decapolis or when He spoke with the Syro-phoenician woman). One must also reckon with the possibility that Jesus' disciples were translating even before Jesus' death some of His sayings for the benefit of all sorts of people who lived in Palestine and whose language of public communication was Greek. It is still probable, however, that Jesus mainly spoke in Aramaic, thus retranslation back into Aramaic may show a saying's original form. What can no longer be claimed with assurance is that either the time factor or the language factor is necessarily as significant a barrier between the NT critic and the earliest stages of the tradition as was once thought. If translation took place while a significant number of (Greek-speaking?) eye-witnesses were still alive who may have even begun the translation process or at least lessened the margin for error by being sources or guarantors and correctors of the tradition, then the Greek translation of Jesus' sayings found in the Gospels may be in the main a faithful rendering of the original. But what of the Aramaic original?

The work of such scholars as Jeremias, M. Black, and M. Wilcox on the Aramaic background to the traditions embedded in the Gospel material and Acts has argued forcefully for the view that there was a substantial and fixed Aramaic tradition lying behind much of the sayings and teachings of Jesus, and that Luke had before him traditions of the words and deeds of many major figures in early Christianity when he wrote Acts. Consider Black's conclusions after pursuing the matter for many years:

> For the sayings and teaching of Jesus, however, there is little doubt that the bulk of Semitisms are translation phenomena, and have arisen in the process of translating and paraphrasing the *verba ipsissima* of Jesus....I have seen no reason to change the conclusions which I reached in my *Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* that an Aramaic tradition (oral or written) lies behind the sayings of Jesus (in the Fourth Gospel as well as the Synoptics). (75)

When one combines the above considerations with the results of Schürmann's work on the pre-Easter *Sitz im Leben* of much of the Gospel material, and Dunn's argument about the use of criteria to test and sift early Christian prophecy, a general picture emerges of a tradition that was relatively

fixed at an early date, especially in the case of Jesus' sayings. Even in the case of the narrative tradition two factors may have led to a rather conservative handling of the material: 1) the use of and interest in in Jesus' deeds in early Christian preaching as shown by Dodd and Stanton; and 2) the concern on Luke's part and manifested by some Hellenistic Christians to convey historical information accurately.[76] While it is probably true that Riesenfeld and Gerhardsson have gone too far in stressing the fixing process (and the fixed result) in early Christian transmission, W. D. Davies is right to stress that the Jewish milieu of the earliest tradition and a respect in the community for Jesus and His words and deeds probably exercised a considerable conserving influence on the tradition.

F. Redaction Criticism

N. Perrin defines the work of redaction criticism as follows: "It is concerned with studying the theological motivation of an author as this is revealed in the collection, arrangement, editing, and modification of traditional material, and in the composition of new material or the creation of new forms within the traditions of early Christianity."[77] This definition while it is correct in what it asserts, does not say enough, for it wrongly implies that the redaction critic's task is simply to study the Evangelists' theologies. Not every placement, modification, or use of material evidenced in the Gospels bears witness to an Evangelist's theological purpose; sometimes the placement or modification is a matter of necessity or pragmatism. It is possible to overtheologize small modifications or additions to the traditions, as for instance in the case of H. Conzelmann's study of Lukan geographical details.[78] Redaction critics also fall prey to equating 'redaction' with 'unhistorical theologizing' but, as S. S. Smalley points out,[79] it is possible to use a tradition with little modification or with modification that merely brings out something inherent in the source. It is possible to draw out the theological implications of an historical event by a certain amount of editing, shaping, and placing of a piece of tradition without significantly distorting the facts. It is also possible to deduce something about an Evangelist's views by noting what he preserves of the material he takes over. That the First and Third Evangelists preserve so much of their Marcan source without major alterations should tell us that they were not simply interested in theologizing about Jesus but also wished to pass on

historical tradition about Him. Indeed, it requires considerable attention to redactional summaries, certain details, and arrangement to get any clear hints about how the Evangelist's views differ from his source. This should warn us against assuming that the Gospels mainly reflect the history of early Christian experience rather than Jesus' history or that"...the evangelists and the tradition they represent are indifferent as to whether this experience is ultimately related to anything said or done in Galilee or Judea before the crucifixion."[80] Perrin claims that the experience of the living Christ made Christians indifferent about what actually happened during Jesus' ministry and further that people in antiquity did not have the historical judgment or at least the concern to distinguish between history and various myths, legends, or later embellishments of a tradition however erroneous.[81] An examination of ancient historiography does not bear out the latter claim, as A. W. Moseley has shown.[82] The former contention has also been seriously challenged by C. F. D. Moule among others. Moule notes how Luke demonstrates his concern for accuracy about the past as well as recognition of Christ's present work and presence by not having Jesus' contemporaries speak of Him during His ministry with lofty titles (with one or two minor exceptions),[83] in contrast to what we find in Luke's redactional comments (cf. 7.13) and in the post-Resurrection preaching in Acts. In Luke-Acts we have both sequence and development (Jesus is endowed with the Spirit in the Gospel, but does not bestow it until Ac 2.23), thus making it unlikely that he had no concern about whether present Christian experience related to anything said or done in Jesus' earthly ministry.

Redaction criticism has rightly rehabilitated a view of the Evangelists as theologians and skilfull writers but this should not cause us to overlook that they had a concern for history since it was Jesus of Nazareth who was confessed as Lord. For them history and theology belonged together, for they believed that in Jesus the Divine had broken into human history - a history which thus became salvation-history. While it is probably going too far to see the Evangelists as creators of the Gospel tradition to any significant degree, they are certainly shapers and interpreters of the tradition whose different viewpoints on the Christ-event the redaction critic can discern and study by a careful reading between the lines.

G. History and the Gospels and Acts - General Considerations

1. History and the Historical Critical Method

The historical-critical method, with all its limitations and capabilities, will be used in this thesis. It must be stressed that this method is incapable of producing absolutely certain results. The most one can reasonably expect is that it may demonstrate that there is a good probability that something did or did not happen. When the method is unable to accomplish even this, it does not necessarily mean that the events under scrutiny are of doubtful historicity. The evidence may be too scant or complex to come to a proper conclusion. In such cases, however, one cannot assume that the material is of historical value, rather the only safe and critical approach is to consider the history of the material to be doubtful until evidence is produced that tips the balance of probabilities in the other direction. Sometimes the methodology and its limitations may be the source of the difficulty. Methodology is not an indifferent net - it catches what it is designed to catch.[84] In such cases the historicity of the event(s) under scrutiny simply cannot be established by the method however real they may have been. Thus, the Jesus established by this method will necessarily be a figure with a less full portrait than the Jesus proclaimed in the Gospels.

Further, this method cannot and should not be used to pass judgment on the theological interpretations NT authors place on events, unless it can be shown that the event being interpreted did not likely happen. For instance, while the historian is capable of establishing beyond reasonable doubt that Jesus died on the cross, he is not capable of proving or refuting that Jesus' death was for the forgiveness of sins. It is also not the historian's task to pre-judge what can or cannot happen in history; rather, he is called to analyze the evidence for or against the historicity of the event and judge accordingly even if that event appears to be produced by supernatural causes. Moule rightly remarks: "Recent theological writing has tended to dismiss the importance of history in favor of the transcendental call to decision; or alternatively to dismiss the transcendent in favor of such history as can be confined within the categories of purely human comprehension. But I cannot see how a serious student of Christian origins can concur with either."[85] What the historian ought to do is seek out an adequate cause to explain the historical event he is studying. If the historian is convinced that only a supernatural event like the Resurrection can

adequately explain the formation of the Church after Jesus' ignominious death, then he may go beyond saying that the disciples believed Jesus rose, to an affirmation that something beyond the realm of natural causes must have happened to Jesus and His body after He died. He cannot, however, go on to say God raised Him from the dead for that is a theological interpretation of the event. He can only posit some unknown and possibly supernatural cause to explain the phenomenon.[86]

2. History and Ancient Historiography

Earlier in this chapter it was pointed out that some of the main concerns of modern historians were not the urgencies of writers dealing with historical material in antiquity. The crucial questions are, however, Could ancient historians distinguish between the clearly legendary and the factual? Were they able or concerned to sift their sources critically? R. P. C. Hanson has rightly pointed out that anyone who has read Lucian's essay on writing history must admit that some ancient historians knew what was entailed in good critical writing,however far short their efforts may have fallen from the ideal.[87] In fact, one can find writers both before and after NT times who had real concern for accuracy and the seeking out and sifting of sources whether one examines the works of Thucydides, Herodotus, Polybius, Lucian of Samosata, or Tacitus.[88] Even Josephus, despite his biases, was concerned for accuracy and impartiality, for he criticises other historians for showing no concern about such matters.[89] Thucydides is often quoted to show that even he felt at liberty to create speeches for his subjects but what he in fact says is: "It has been difficult to recall with strict accuracy the words actually spoken....Therefore the speeches are given in the language in which, as it seemed to me, the several speakers would express, on the subjects under consideration, the sentiments most befitting the occasion, though at the same time I have adhered as closely as possible to the general sense of what was actually said."[90] Thus, Thucydidean speeches may in some sense be 'typical' of the man or a general summary, but they are not the unrestrained inventions of the historian. What the evidence tends to show is that there were good and bad historians in antiquity as in modern times, and the good ones were both able and concerned to sift their sources with care. There was not in antiquity as much concern for details and chronological exactitude as in modern times, but this is a difference of degree not kind. The portrait of ancient historians as men who did not distinguish between legend and fact, between good

and bad sources, between reliable and unreliable witnesses is in many cases a misrepresentation. It is thus possible that the Evangelists even though their motives for writing were theological or apologetical could have followed in the footsteps of Thucydides in historical matters. Whether they in fact did so is only to be discovered by an examination of the contents of the Gospels and Acts.

3. History and Myth

The problem of myth in the NT is complex and cannot be reduced to the set of problems involved in assessing the NT miracles.[91] In our discussion of the Gospels' genre we noted that the Evangelists may have used a mythical pattern to order their presentation of the Gospel events in order to imply certain things about Jesus, e.g., that he was a Divine figure. But, as Dunn argues, "By applying the same sort of (mythical) language to a historical individual the NT writers in effect demythologize it."[92] Myth in this case is a narrative or narrative pattern, involving supernatural beings or events, which has religious significance for a group of people. This definition does not pre-judge the question whether or not we are dealing with historical or purely fictional phenomena - that must be decided on a case by case basis.

Bultmann,however, appears to define myth as a pre-scientific conceptual form or mode of expression which modern science has rendered meaningless, thus the need to demythologize the NT. On one level, this definition of myth is acceptable. The attempt to express divine transcendence in terms of spatial distance is one which modern man can accept only as a metaphorical way of speaking. God and heaven are not located just outside the earth's atmosphere.[93] Observational language about the sun rising and setting should be seen as a description by pre-Copernican writers of things as they appeared to be. Again, the Book of Revelation and other apocalyptic sections of the NT are full of mythical elements which are used in a fashion that indicates they are intended as symbols. Demythologizing in such cases is both helpful and needful. The difficulty arises when Bultmann and others attempt to classify various miraculous occurrences as nothing more than the product of pre-scientific thinking. While it is true that sometimes first century man explained natural diseases and other phenomena wrongly in terms of supernatural causes, one should probably not dismiss all the explanations of various infirmities and their miraculous cures as simply

a product of pre-scientific thinking. There are various miracles (such as raising the dead) that are not adequately explained in the terms of purely natural causes. To demythologize this sort of event requires one to dismiss the miraculous content of the story as well as the supernatural explanation of the source of the problem. Only if one argues that miracle (or myth) and history are mutually exclusive will one accept this sort of demythologizing in every case. The problem in part is that when one defines a miracle as a transgression of the laws of nature it sets God as a cause over against nature in a dualistic way and thus an 'act of God' is seen as a violation of the natural order which God established. This is unsatisfactory. Perhaps it is better to speak of that which goes beyond natural causes rather than that which goes against them.

In the NT there appear to be attempts (cf. 1 Tim 1.4, 4.7, 2 Tim 4.4, Titus 1.14, 2 Pet 1.16) to distinguish between 'myths' (in the sense of untrue supernatural stories) and salvation history (supernatural events that occurred in space and time). At times the NT writers will use mythical terms and symbols (e.g., in Colossians where it appears the author as part of his apologetic tactics uses the terms of his opponents infusing them with Christian content in order to refute the attempt to turn the Gospel into a Gnostic type of myth).[94] But the concept of divine intervention is history is a matter of supernatural content which is different from the use of mythical forms to explain that content, and it is this supernatural intervention in history that is at the very heart of the Gospel. Both the contingent facts of history and the supernatural are involved in the core of the kerygma.[95] This is why historical study is so crucial for the Christian faith and why also the historian, if he is to give Christianity a fair hearing on its own terms, must not exclude <u>a priori</u> the possibility of miracles or the presence of a genuine supernatural event or person in the midst of human history.

4. <u>History and the Criteria for Authenticity</u>

The criteria for authenticity as promulgated by Perrin, R. H. Fuller, and others have caused more than a little controversy among NT scholars. On the one hand there are those who agree with Jeremias' dictum, "In the synoptic tradition it is the inauthenticity, not the authenticity, of the sayings of Jesus that must be demonstrated."[96] Others reject this judgment claiming that "...a Gospel does not portray

the history of the ministry of Jesus from A.D. 27-30 but the history of Christian experience in any and every age. It is in other words, a strange mixture of history, legend, and myth."[97]

I do not quarrel with the use of these principles, but rather with how they are sometimes used. It may be questioned, for instance, whether or not the criterion of dissimilarity should be used as the main, much less sole, basis of one's approach to the Gospel material. When one has isolated the 'unique Jesus' it is not at all certain that one has discovered the characteristic Jesus, much less the true Jesus in any real sense of the word. This criterion serves to magnify one portion of the Gospel portrait at the expense of other elements and this magnification often leads to distortion rather than clarification. To use it as virtually a sole arbiter of authenticity also involves making the questionable assumption that we have an extensive enough knowledge about early first century Judaism, and the early Christian community, to be able to say that this or that saying of Jesus did not come from either of these sources. It is true that other criteria have been brought in to help clarify the matter and alleviate the problem. But too often the problem is simply magnified further because by accepting that which 'cohered' with the unique material we simply have a somewhat larger version of the unique Jesus. This is why Dunn has advocated that the criterion of dissimilarity be set aside as the primary critical tool in favor of a tradition criticism approach that accepts that there were various points at which Jesus was in agreement with either His Jewish background or His Christian followers or both.[98] The real value of the criterion of dissimilarity is that it allows the scholar to say that it <u>is</u> possible to know something from the Gospel tradition about Jesus' actual words and deeds, and thus it is appropriate to raise the question of the historical worth of the rest of the material that has not passed this most stringent test.[99] When used alongside the criteria of multiple attestation (which is more helpful in showing certain characteristic elements in Jesus' thoughts than the authenticity of a particular saying), of multiple forms, of Aramaic linguistic or Palestinian environmental phenomena, it is a helpful tool.[100] Obviously the criterion of coherence must only be applied at the end of the process so that there will be as much material as possible with which to assess the consistency and coherence of any remaining pieces of tradition with the material already accepted on the basis of the other criteria.

The real unanswered question is, What is the character of the Gospels? Few would question the sincerity of the Evangelists and we have already seen in this study reasons to question the assumption that men in antiquity were incapable of or uninterested in separating fact from fiction, historical material from legend, or bad reporting from good reporting.[101] If the Evangelists were in the main unconcerned about the historical Jesus and what He actually said and did, how has it happened that we have so many sayings of Jesus that were likely difficult for the Evangelists' audiences to accept or understand (cf. Mk 9.1, 10.18, 13.32)? Surely a writer mainly concerned to meet the needs of early Christians through proclaiming or theologizing Jesus would not have created so many difficulties for himself by including such material and failing to add any sayings about circumcision, baptism, and the charismatic gifts within the narratives about the earthly ministry of Jesus.[102] Why did the First and Third Evangelists both follow Mark as closely as they did if it was not part of their purpose to convey some reliable traditions about Jesus' words and deeds? The obstacles to the view that the Gospel writers were not or not very interested in conveying historical material are such that if another view could be advanced that better answers these difficulties it would probably be preferable even if it was not a problem-free view. That view would seem to entail a recognition that the Evangelists had as one of their main concerns, though by no means their only concern, conveying historical information about Jesus and what He said and did. If this is accepted, then it will be worthwhile here to outline in brief the approach to history found in the Synoptics, John, and Acts.

5. History and the Synoptics

To a large extent, one's assessment of the historical value of the material in the Synoptics will be determined by one's view of the intentions of the Evangelists. Those who view the Synoptics as merely kerygmatic in nature will argue that the authors did not intend for the most part to give us historical information and what fragments we do find are there as a by-product. This view, however, errs in mistaking the part for the whole. To be sure, any book which starts, "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the son of God..." is self-evidently not trying to present a bare bones report about an historical figure named Jesus. But if our discussion of the genre of the Gospels has taught us anything about how the Synoptics would have appeared and

have been judged by first century readers, it seems that apologetic or theological, or philosophical purposes would not have precluded an author from being viewed as attempting to present a character sketch about an historical person using historical information. Classics scholar A. N. Sherwin-White argues, "Taking the Synoptic writers quite generally as primitive historians, there is a remarkable parallel between their technique and that of Herodotus, the Father of History, in their anecdotal conception of a narrative."[103] Proclamation and information are not incompatible and it appears that in the Gospels the latter is used in the service of the former. This is why Moule argues of the Synoptics: "...even in the context of Christian worship or of the instruction and edification of Christians, they represent little more than the element of historical formulation - the explanation of 'how it all started'."[104] Moule conjectures there was a need for rehearsing for Christians an 'Acts of Jesus' in similar fashion to the Acts of the Apostles. This would explain why Luke definitely sees his second volume as part two of one work, the difference between the two volumes being in content, not in kind. But if we allow that the author of Luke-Acts has as part of his purpose conveying historical information, how is it that it appears Matthew and Mark are making the same sort of use of some of the same traditions, unless they too were interested in conveying some historical information? Certainly there would have been opportunities and situations where it would have been helpful and necessary to convey such material. Manson argues:

> To rebut Jewish and pagan criticisms and to establish Christian claims it was necessary to describe the ministry. It was not sufficient to do this in general terms, merely asserting that Jesus taught as one having authority, or that he went about doing good; it was imperative to produce specimens of those oracles which had drawn men and women to him and fastened their hopes upon him. To convince or convert the outsider detailed evidence in support of Christian claims was urgently required. (105)

Putting these points together along with the earlier reconstruction of how the Gospel traditions began to be collected and developed (in groups of sayings, miracle stories, testimonia, a Passion narrative, list of witnesses to appearances, and credal statements), we see that the Synoptists had the material, the necessary situation and, if the Gospels' genre and the Synoptists' technique are any clue, the intention to convey historical information. How well they fulfilled their intention can only be decided after examining the texts themselves.

6. History and the Gospel of John

The problem of the relationship of the Fourth Gospel to history is an acute one precisely because John is so different from the Synoptics. The problem becomes less complicated if, as we argued earlier, the Fourth Evangelist did not know the Synoptics. It helps if we recognize that like the Synoptists:

> ...John is not attempting to set forth an objective unbiased account of certain historical events. He is a convinced believer and he wants his readers to see the saving significance of what he narrates. He is not recording facts for facts' sake. We completely miss his purpose if we assess his work on narrowly historical lines. There is no question then as to whether John is giving us interpretation....The question is whether his interpretation is a good one and soundly based, or whether he allows his presuppositions to dominate the facts in the interests of buttressing up a dogmatic position. (106)

But the fact remains that though the Fourth Evangelist shares a Christian perspective and motivation with the Synoptists, his Gospel has turned out very differently from the Synoptics.

The explanation for these differences is not found in the suggestion that John is a 'theological Gospel' while the Synoptics are historical, since redaction critics have demonstrated how thoroughly theological are the Synoptics, and Dodd (and others) have shown that a considerable amount of historical material can be derived from John. This is why, despite disclaimers about John's interest in precise chronology or 'scientific' history, Barrett still affirms: "Yet at every point history underlies what John wrote."[107] But does John only have a substratum of history overlaid by a thick veneer of interpretation? John wrote that we might believe something about Jesus and he presents an interpretive character sketch by indicating some of Jesus' words and deeds. It appears that he is attempting to refute various docetic and proto-Gnostic arguments about Jesus' nature and life, and he seems to make his case both on the level of facts and on the level of their interpretation. While he is primarily concerned to bring out the important meaning of this or that saying or event in Jesus' life, he does not neglect to narrate the factual foundation of that meaning lest he himself be accused of docetism or a sort of mysticism for which historical contingencies are of little or no importance.

If we allow then that conveying some historical information is part of the Fourth Evangelist's purpose, the question of why John is so unlike the Synoptics becomes even more critical. As a tentative

hypothesis to explain these differences I would make two suggestions: 1) the Fourth Evangelist's purposes and intentions differ in certain significant ways from the Synoptists' and 2) because of his purposes, the Fourth Evangelist in the main drew on certain discourse traditions that the Synoptists either did not know or did not feel suited their purposes. In regard to the first suggestion, John seems to be writing to Christians (cf. 11.2), but has at least one eye on the non-believer. He intends to give Christians discourse material which they can use to foster belief in non-Christians. In the Fourth Gospel we find a veritable parade of non-Christians (the Baptist, Nicodemus, the Samaritan woman, various groups of Jews, the 'Greeks' in Jn 12.20), who come to speak to Jesus, and the Evangelist goes out of his way to demonstrate that Jesus has the answers and is the 'way' for all these varied sorts of people.[108] Possibly, as Moule suggests, John's evangelistic intentions are indicated at Jn 20.31, "which may be translated 'so that you may here and now begin to believe'",[109] but one should not build too much on this conjecture in view of the textual difficulties. Further, the stress on witness and testimony, and especially eye-witness testimony (19.35), fits into an attempt to equip the believer with material to use to convince the non-believer. This would also explain the stress on Jesus' right to various titles, His oneness with the Father, and His powers to perform stupendous miracles. The main point of including discussions about being born again, about the source of living water, about the nature of true worship, about Jesus' testimony being greater than John's, about Jesus as the bread of life, the true vine, the way, the truth, and the life, seems to be to give believers material to lead those in the position of Nicodemus, or the Samaritans, or the Greeks, to Jesus. It could be concluded from this that there is little historical kernel and a great deal of theological expansion in these discourses, but another suggestion, made by Riesenfeld, is perhaps a better explanation. He argues that the original Sitz im Leben in which these discourses first took a definite shape as tradition was "...in the discussions and 'meditations' of Jesus in the circle of his disciples such as certainly took place side by side with the instruction of the disciples proper, with its more rigid forms."[110] John has taken this authentic material over, making it his own, expressing things in his own words and style, expanding and shaping the material somewhat to suit his purposes.

As we have implied, the Synoptics were written primarily to confirm and inform an already existing faith (or a faith already on the way to being fully formed if any of the Synoptists were addressing proselytes). They used the shorter, more formed and fixed, and more easily remembered (or memorized) sorts of traditions because they were better suited to the purpose of confirmation in the faith than conversion to it. The tantalizingly short answers to various questions we find in the Synoptics are sufficient to remind believers of a faith already known, but insufficient to be used in a reasoned apologetic directed toward the unbeliever. The Johannine material is more suited to such purposes. It is more of a propaganda or missionary document than the Synoptics.[111] This in part appears to mean that the Fourth Evangelist exercised more freedom in arranging his material (e.g., the Book of Signs), and adapting and expanding his material than did the Synoptists who were somewhat constrained by the formal and concise nature of their sources. He likely departed more from the actual course of events than did the Synoptists. Undoubtedly, the arguments presented above are insufficient to account for all the various differences between the Synoptics and John, some of which may be put down to differences in personal interests and preferences. Some of the fundamental differences seem to be a result of the fact that John had significantly different purposes and used significantly different source material from the Synoptics. All the Evangelists, however, use historical information as a means to their theological ends. One cannot completely separate Historie from Geschichte in any of the Gospels.[112] But one can distinguish at various points between probably authentic material and probably redactional expansion and this we intend to do as we examine the relevant Gospel pericopes.

7. History and the Acts of the Apostles

The material from Acts dealt with in this thesis is not usually considered historically problematical except insofar as the miraculous is involved. We do not have to deal with the speeches of Acts, or Acts 15, or the Paul of Acts versus the Paul of the Letters. If, however, it could be shown to be highly probable that this material was so erroneous, or so tendentious, that it was an unreliable source for historical information, then this would necessarily cause one to question the historical value of the rest of Acts. There is, however, no consensus among scholars that the historical value of even the problematical portions of Acts is negligible. In fact, many scholars, both Biblical and classical (e.g., F. F. Bruce, W. M. Ramsay, Hengel, Sherwin-White),

in spite of the various problems Acts raises, have argued repeatedly that "For Acts the confirmation of historicity is overwhelming. Yet Acts is, in simple terms and judged externally, no less a propaganda narrative than the Gospels..."[113] What this means is that one must take into account the tendentious nature of the narrative resulting from the theological perspective and purposes of the author when one considers the historical value of the material in Acts, but it does not mean that Acts is nothing more than a Tendenzschrift, or that Luke's theological purposes caused him to desert or significantly distort history replacing it with free invention. As J. Munck argues: "As Luke had at his disposal an abundance of material both about Jesus and about apostolic times, the conception of Luke as an edifying author maintained by Haenchen, must be dropped...When Luke's work is compared with Aristeas, the difference between an account of events and an edifying story can be clearly seen."[114]

Since we must deal with one of the 'we' sections (21.8-9), it is necessary to explain why we think the 'we' sections reflect the eyewitness testimony of the author, not a literary convention. When Luke uses sources he casts them into the third person (e.g., Paul's journey to Macedonia and Greece after departing from Philippi, which the author must have heard about second hand), and it is reasonable to expect him to continue to do so even if he was taking over a diary or travel narrative from one of Paul's companions. The use of 'we' is simply not a stylistic feature of Luke's work in general, and it is hard to see why, if the 'we' is a literary convention, he would limit its use to the trips from Troas to Philippi, Philippi to Jerusalem, and Caesarea to Rome.[115] If, as Hengel suggests, Acts was written for a real individual, Theophilus, then "...the only way in which readers - and first of all Theophilus...could have understood the 'we' passages [is if]...the remarks in the first person plural refer to the author himself."[116] The most natural and satisfying explanation of all the data is that the 'we' passages indicate Luke's personal and eyewitness testimony to various events. If this is accepted, then one must also reckon with the fact that Luke had access to first hand testimony about many important matters that took place at the beginning of the Christian community and before from Paul, Philip, and various others in Jerusalem, Caesarea, Rome, and elsewhere. In his Gospel, Luke was heavily dependent on Mark and probably the Q material, and it is implausible to expect him to have treated his sources for volume two

in a radically different fashion if he had comparable sources.[117] We have two clues to Luke's intentions in the material itself: 1) his preface, Lk 1.1-4, which probably indicates that Luke is consciously casting himself in the mold of Hellenistic historiographers; and 2) Luke's Septuagintal style seems to indicate his desire to follow in the footsteps not only of good Hellenistic historiographers but more importantly Jewish-Hellenistic historiographers (such as the author of II Maccabees) and before them the OT writers of history (both the original authors, and translators of the LXX). That he shares with these writers a religious view of history and a concern for religious history accounts for a good deal of his approach and of his differences from ancient secular historians.[118]

How then are we to evaluate this sort of kerygmatic history writing in terms of its historical value? Hengel cautions: "New Testament scholars were therefore ill advised when they allowed themselves to be persuaded that history and kerygma were exclusive alternatives. The consequence was the suggestion that the earliest Christian authors as a rule did not mean to narrate history proper but simply to preach...In reality, the writers in the New Testament make their proclamation by narrating the action of God within a quite specific period of history, at a particular place, and through real men, as a historical report."[119] If this assessment is correct, then Acts cannot be reduced to the level of theology 'historicized' for the sake of conveying spiritual truth in the form of a historical narrative, nor can it be treated as bare facts reporting, nor as theologized history as if the theology were added to and did not arise out of the history. Theological or kerygmatic history would be a better term to use. With his theological purposes acting as the controlling factor, Luke uses information for the sake of proclamation. Since this particular kind of theology involves historical persons and events and not simply timeless ideas or ideals, then the theological purpose can only be served by conveying a certain amount of information. To be sure, like other ancient historical works we have in Acts highly selective reporting, episodic in nature, that focuses on crucial events or persons, and is not particularly concerned with character development or precise chronology. As Lk 1,4 indicates, Luke was interested in informing his reader about "the truth concerning these things", not in satisfying his pious curiosity, or entertaining him, or simply edifying him. He intends to set the record straight and write an authoritative account from and for

a posture of faith. He attempts "...to proclaim these events as a saving message in narrative form and to narrate them in the form of a proclamation."[120] Only a view that gives full weight to both the historical information and theological proclamation will do justice to the material found in Acts or in the Gospels, and to the Evangelists' intentions as they select, shape, and present their material.

Chapter II: Endnotes

[1]Cf. the typical remark in Kümmel, Introduction, 78-9.

[2]R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition (trans. J. Marsh; Oxford, 1963): "...the Gospels lack any interest of a scientific historical kind." (p. 372) They "...belong to the history of dogma and worship.: (p. 374).

[3]Cf. G. N. Stanton, Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching (SNTS Monograph 27; Cambridge, 1974) 116-35; C. W. Votaw, The Gospels and Contemporary Biographies in the Graeco-Roman World (FBBS No. 27; Philadelphia ,1970 repr.); A. W. Moseley, "Historical Reporting in the Ancient World", NTS 12 (1965-66) 8-26.

[4]Stanton, Jesus of Nazareth , 121.

[5]Kümmel, Introduction, 37.

[6]Stanton, Jesus of Nazareth, 123 , notes ,"Even when a writer such as Suetonius writes a series of lives of the Roman emperors, he does not weave closely his historical material into his account of the life and character of the emperors concerned. Suetonius does not attempt to set the emperors against the background of their own times; the fact that historical and biographical material is found side by side arises from the general interest in everything concerned with the Caesars."

[7]Cf. Stanton, Jesus of Nazareth, 124.

[8]Cf. Votaw, Gospels, 17.

[9]Bultmann, History, 372.

[10]Cf. C. H. Talbert, What is a Gospel? The Genre of the Canonical Gospels (London, 1978). On the effect of the eschatological outlook on the production of the Gospel, cf. M. Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel (trans. B. L. Woolf; 2nd ed.; London, 1934) 9.

[11]Talbert, What is a Gospel? 115-31.

[12]Talbert, 31, cf. pp. 25-89.

[13]In particular it is hard to find this 'myth' in Mark, though he may apply the 'theios aner' concept to Jesus.

[14]Cf. the discussion in Talbert, What is a Gospel? 53-89.

[15]Cf. Talbert, 91-113. The point here is not to suggest that the Gospels are romances like the work of Pseudo-Callisthenes, but that they both have cultic functions.

[16]Talbert, 103.

[17]Votaw, Gospels, 6-7.

[18]B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels. A Study of Origins (London, 1930) 365; cf. C. K. Barrett, Jesus and the Gospel Tradition (London, 1967) 4-6, and n. 10.

[19]Streeter, Four Gospels, 365; cf. M. Hengel, Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity (trans. J. Bowden; London, 1979) 4-18.

[20]Streeter, Four Gospels, 158; cf. N. B. Stonehouse, Origins of the Synoptic Gospels, Some Basic Questions (London, 1963) 58-71; Kümmel, Introduction, 52-80

[21]Kümmel, 60.

[22]Cf. Stonehouse, Origins, 63-4; G. M. Styler, "The Priority of Mark", in C. F. D. Moule, The Birth of the New Testament (London, 1966) 223-32.

[23]Cf. D. Guthrie, New Testament Introduction (Downer's Grove, 1970) 122, 133-5.

[24]For a detailed statistical analysis of all these factors, cf. A. M. Honoré, "A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem", NovT 10 (1968) 95-147.

[25]Cf. Streeter, Four Gospels, 180-1; F. C. Burkitt, The Gospel History and Its Transmission (Edinburgh, 1906) 40-58.

[26]Kümmel, Introduction, 63, cites Mt 26.68 = Lk 22.64 as an example; cf. Streeter, Four Gospels, 160-81; J. A. T. Robinson, Redating the New Testament (London, 1976) 94.

[27]Hengel, Acts, 11. That Mark's account is frequently longer than the Synoptic parallels points in this direction.

[28]Cf. Streeter, Four Gospels, 259. The 'apostle' of Marcan priority cites this very text as pointing to another and sometimes more primitive source used by the First Evangelist instead of Mark.

[29]Cf. C. K. Barrett, "Q: A Re-examination", ET 54 (1942-43) 320-3; D. H. Hill, The Gospel of Matthew (Greenwood, 1972) 25; E. E. Ellis, The Gospel of Luke (Greenwood, 1974 rvsd.) 22-4.

[30]Thus, it is closer to Pirke Aboth than the Gospel of Thomas in its Gattung. Cf. Stanton, Jesus of Nazareth, 128-9; W. D. Davies, "Reflexions on Tradition: The Aboth Revisited", in Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox (ed. W. R. Farmer, et al.; Cambridge, 1967) 127-59. The Q material comports in its form with what we would expect to arise out of a Jewish milieu in contrast to the Gospel form.

[31]Cf. the list in Barrett, "Q", 322.

[32]Kümmel, Introduction, 70.

[33]G. Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth (trans. I. and F. McLuskey with J. M. Robinson; New York, 1960) 217: "...Q is still relatively close to the oral tradition and remained exposed to its continuing influence." Cf. Ellis, Luke, 23-4; Dibelius, From Tradition, 234-5.

[34]Streeter, Four Gospels, 254-61.

[35]Cf. J. Drane, Jesus and the Four Gospels (Tring, 1979) 148-9.

[36]Cf. Drane, 149-50.

[37]On the proto-Luke hypothesis, doublets, means of distinguishing sources, cf. pp. 57-9 of thesis.

[38]C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John (London, 1955) 34; cf. The Gospel According to St. John (1978) 45.

[39]Cf. pp. 278-81 of thesis.

[40]Cf. L. Morris, Studies in the Fourth Gospel (Grand Rapids, 1969) 18.

[41]Ibid.

[42]Barrett, John (1978) 42-54.

[43]Cf. C. H. Dodd, "The Framework of the Gospel Narratives", in New Testament Studies (Manchester, 1953) 1-11.

[44]Dodd, 11.

[45]Barrett, John (1978) 44-5. These are probably the best examples that can be cited.

[46]Cf. Morris, Studies, 24-5.

[47]Cf. P. Gardner-Smith, Saint John and the Synoptics (Cambridge, 1938) 29-30; D. M. Smith, "John and the Synoptics: Some Dimensions of the Problem", NTS 26 (1980) 425-44.

[48]Contrast, Guthrie, NT Introduction, 180-1; to Streeter, Four Gospels, 201-17; V. Taylor, The Formation of the Gospel Tradition (London, 1933) 192.

[49]Kümmel, Introduction, 132-3.

[50]Kümmel, 134-5.

[51]Cf. Ellis, Luke, 26.

[52]Ellis, 27.

[53]D. Wenham, "Source Criticism", in New Testament Interpretation - Essays in Principles and Methods (ed. I. H. Marshall; Exeter, 1977) 139-49, here 146.

[54]Bultmann, History, 122-8. We are focusing on the work of Bultmann and Dibelius because their work has been the most influential.

[55]Cf. J. D. G. Dunn, "Prophetic 'I'-Sayings and the Jesus Tradition: The Importance of Testing Prophetic Utterances within Early Christianity", NTS 24 (1977-78) 175-98; W. Grudem, The Gift of Prophecy in 1 Corinthians (Ph.D. Thesis; Cambridge, 1978) 229-35; D. H. Hill, New Testament Prophecy (London, 1979) 160-85.

[56]Cf. Hill, NT Prophecy, 11 ff.

[57]Dunn, "Prophetic 'I'-Sayings", 179.

[58]Grudem, Gift of Prophecy, 230, points out that there is no evidence outside the Gospels of inspired prophetic speech being transformed into a historical narrative whether we examine the other NT documents or extant Jewish writings.

[59]Cf. C. F. D. Moule, The Phenomenon of the New Testament (London, 1967) 43-81; T. W. Manson, Studies in the Gospels and Epistles (Philadelphia, 1962) 7, points out: "The Pauline letters abound in utterances which could easily be transferred to Jesus and presented to the world as oracles of the Lord. How many are? None. It seems a little odd that if the story of Jesus was the creation of the Christian community no use should have been made of the...Pauline material."

[60]E. P. Sanders, The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition (SNTS Monograph 9; Cambridge, 1969) 22-6.

[61]Cf. Dibelius, From Tradition, 288-9; Sanders, Tendencies, 14-15.

[62]Sanders, 19, who adds (21-2): "To my knowledge this has never been done."

[63]Sanders, 151-83.

[64]Cf. R. E. Brown, "After Bultmann, What? An Introduction to the Post-Bultmannians", CBQ 26 (1964) 1-30; P. Benoit, "Reflexions sur la 'Formgeschichtliche Methode'", RB 53 (1946) 481-512; G. E. Ladd, The New Testament and Criticism (Grand Rapids, 1967) 141-69; E. E. Ellis, "New Directions in Form Criticism", in Jesu Christus in Historie und Theologie, Neutestamentliche Festschrift für Hans Conzelmann zum 60. Geburtstag (ed. G. Strecker; Tübingen, 1975) 299-315.

[65]The Gerhardsson theory has various difficulties not the least of which is that it is unsatisfactory to study the technique of transmission in isolation from a study of the actual changes the tradition underwent, but its attempt to see the earliest Christian community and its traditions in light of its Jewish background is of real value. Cf. H. Riesenfeld, The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginnings. A Study in the Limits of 'Formgeschichte' (London, 1957). B. Gerhardson, Memory and Manuscript - Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity (Uppsala, 1961); and B. Gerhardsson, Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity (Lund, 1964); and for a particularly valuable critique, cf. W. D. Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount (Cambridge, 1976) 464-80; and his "Reflexions on Tradition", 158, n. 1.

[66]Cf. for instance, C. F. Burney, The Poetry of Our Lord - An Examination of the Formal Elements of Hebrew Poetry in the Discourses of Jesus Christ (Oxford, 1925).

[67]H. Schürmann, "Die Vorösterlichen Anfänge der Logientradition - Versuch eines Formgeschichtlichen Zugangs zum Leben Jesu", in Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Synoptischen Evangelien (Düsseldorf, 1968) 39-65, here 65.

[68]So Taylor, Formation, 32; cf. Guthrie, NT Introduction, 188-219. Even in the miracle stories, it is hard to see how certain elements (such as a statement of the illness, the fact and nature of the cure, the proof or results of the healing) could be omitted and have a miracle story. If miracles did take place through Jesus, then one must be open to the possibility that the course of events necessitated that certain elements be included in the narrative.

[69]Cf. Schürmann, "Die Vorosterlichen", 39-65.

[70]The term 'actualized' is Gerhardsson's in Memory and Manuscript, 331-2.

[71]B. Gerhardsson, The Origins of the Gospel Tradition (Philadelphia, 1979) 28.

[72]The most thorough treatment is Hengel's two volume work, Judaism and Hellenism (Philadelphia, 1974).

[73]Cf. J. N. Sevenster, Do You Know Greek? How Much Greek Could the First Jewish Christians Have Known? (Leiden, 1968) 176-91; R. H. Gundry, The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel - with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope (Leiden, 1967) 178-204.

[74]Sevenster, Do You Know Greek? 185-6.

[75]Black, "Second Thoughts IX. The Semitic Element in the New Testament", ET 77 (1965) 20-23, here 21.

[76]Cf. pp. 69-70, 73-74, 77-80 of thesis.

[77]N. Perrin, What is Redaction Criticism? (Philadelphia, 1969) 1; S. S. Smalley, "Redaction Criticism", in NT Interpretation, 181.

[78]Cf. H. Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke (trans. G. Buswell; New York, 1957) 18-94. Even if some of the geographical details are not straightforward attempts to place a certain event in its proper location, it does not follow that the details of this sort are all theologically motivated. Some are likely part of the story teller's efforts to make the narrative more concrete and realistic and need not reflect even unconsciously the Evangelist's theological purposes.

[79]Smalley, "Redaction Criticism", 187-92.

[80]Perrin, What is Redaction Criticism? 74-5.

[81]Perrin, 72.

[82]Cf. endnote 88 below.

[83]Cf. Moule, Phenomenon, 57-61. Notice that even in John there are narrative references to Jesus as Lord (4.1, 6.23, 11.2), but none by the dramatis personae until after the Resurrection (cf. 20.13, 18).

[84]Cf. R. W. Funk, "Beyond Criticism in Quest of Literacy: The Parable of the Leaven", Int 25 (1971) 149-70, here 151.

[85]Moule, Phenomenon, 80.

[86]Cf. G. N. Stanton, "Presuppositions in New Testament Criticism", in NT Interpretation, 60-71; I. H. Marshall, I Believe in the Historical Jesus (Grand Rapids, 1977).

[87]Cf. R. P. C. Hanson, "The Enterprise of Emancipating Christian Belief from History", in Vindications: Essays on the Historical Basis of Christianity (ed. A. T. Hanson; London, 1966) 29-73, here 35-6.

[88]Cf. A. W. Moseley, "Historical Reporting in the Ancient World", NTS 12 (1965-66) 10-26.

[89]Josephus, Antiquities 20.8.3 (LCL IX; trans. L. H. Feldman; London, 1965) 472-3; Josephus, Against Apion 1.9 (LCL I; trans. H. St. J. Thackeray; London, 1926) 180-1.

[90]Thucydides 1.22.1-2 (LCL I) 38-9. Obviously he could only adhere to his source to the degree that he or his informants could remember what was actually said.

[91]Cf. J. D. G. Dunn, "Demythologizing - The Problem of Myth in the New Testament", in NT Interpretation, 285-307.

[92]Dunn, 294.

[93]Cf. F. F. Bruce, "Myth and History", in History, Criticism and Faith (ed. C. Brown; Downer's Grove, 1976) 94-5.

[94]Ibid.; cf. C. F. D. Moule, The Epistle to the Colossians and to Philemon (Cambridge, 1968) 30 ff., and 164 ff. ,on τὸ πλήρωμα (1.19 etc.), γνῶσις (2.3), and other possible examples.

[95]Cf. Hanson, "Enterprise", 70: "Christian belief cannot avoid the contingent facts of history, and should not struggle to do so."

[96]J. Jeremias, New Testament Theology, the Proclamation of Jesus Christ (trans. J. Bowden; New York, 1971) 37.

[97]Perrin, What is Redaction Criticism? 75.

[98]Cf. Dunn, "Prophetic 'I'-Sayings", 198.

[99]Cf. R. H. Stein, "The 'Criteria' for Authenticity", in Gospel Perspectives - Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels I (ed. R. T. France and D. Wenham, 1980) 225-63; R. T. France, "The Authenticity of the Sayings of Jesus", in History, Criticism, and Faith, 101-41; this author is in basic agreement with Hengel's methodological guidelines in Acts, 129-36.

[100]Some of these criteria are more useful than others and some of the remarks made earlier in this chapter reduce the historical significance of finding signs of Aramaic in a pericope.

[101]As F. F. Bruce, "History and the Gospel", in Jesus of Nazareth Saviour and Lord (ed. Carl F. H. Henry; Grand Rapids, 1966) 98, points out, there were many situations besides those in Jewish and Roman courts in which eyewitness testimony was highly valued.

[102]C. F. D. Moule, "The Intention of the Evangelists", in New Testament Essays in Memory of T. W. Manson (ed. A. J. B. Higgins; Manchester, 1959) 165-79, here 171, asks why Mark only alludes twice to Jesus' death as redemptive (10.45, 14.24) and seldom mentions the Holy Spirit in any characteristically Christian sense if he intended his Gospel to be mainly a tool for worship or a vehicle for later Christian theology. It is hard to believe such topics were not important in Mark's environment.

[103]A. N. Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament (Oxford, 1963) 193.

[104]Moule, "Intention", 167.

[105]Manson, Studies, 28.

[106]Morris, Studies, 70.

[107]Barrett, John (1978) 142.

[108]Cf. W. H. Brownlee, "Whence the Gospel According to John?" in John and Qumran (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; London, 1972) 166-94, here 174. That there is no specific mention of the Church in John may also favor our interpretation. Cf. D. Guthrie, New Testament Theology (Downer's Grove, 1981) 720 ff.

[109]Moule, "Intention", 168.

[110]Riesenfeld, "Gospel Tradition", 63.

[111]So Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge, 1953) 9; cf. Bruce, "History and the Gospel", 89-107.

[112]Cf. H. Weiss, "History and a Gospel", NovT 10 (1968) 81-94.

[113]Sherwin-White, Roman Society, 189.

[114]J. Munck, The Acts of the Apostles (Anchor Bible; Garden City, 1967) xii.

[115]Munck, xlii-xliii.

[116]Hengel, Acts, 66.

[117]Hengel, 61.

[118]Hengel, 51-2. Luke appears to treat Jesus' sayings as he does Scripture (cf. Ac 20.35 and Hengel, 62).

[119]Hengel, 43; cf. p. 34 where we have the term "kerygmatic historiography".

[120]Hengel, 34.

CHAPTER III: WOMEN IN THE TEACHING OF JESUS

INTRODUCTION

If we are to understand and explain the roles women took in the ministry of Jesus and later in the early Christian community, then it is necessary first to examine the attitude of Jesus toward women as reflected in His teaching and in His actions.[1] This will entail a discussion of His views on parenthood, childhood, and the single state, and on marriage, divorce, and adultery. Through this investigation, we should be able to begin to evaluate the way Jesus thought the new demands of the Kingdom would affect women in their roles as mothers, daughters, wives, widows, harlots, and believers. The second half of this chapter will be devoted to an investigation of women figures in the parables and judgment sayings of Jesus.

A. The Physical Family

1. Parents, Children, and Widows

At various times and for various reasons there has been a feeling of uneasiness among Christian believers about Jesus' view of the family. Some have been willing to say that for Jesus the claims of the family of faith necessarily supplant any claims of the physical family on Him and His followers. Yet there are clear indications in the Gospels that Jesus not only accepted but also strengthened the physical family's bond in some respects.

The Gospels reveal two separate instances where Jesus reaffirmed Exod 20.12, Lev 19.3, and Deut 5.16, thus indicating that honoring one's parents was an important part of His teaching. The first instance we shall examine comes in Mk 10.19 and parallels in the midst of Jesus' instructions to the rich man,[2] where He indicates that the keeping of certain of the Ten Commandments is crucial if one wishes to inherit eternal life. The command to honor parents is counted as part of the cost of discipleship which is necessary in order to obtain a place in the Kingdom.[3] It is significant that Mark, followed by Matthew, places this affirmation of Mosaic teaching after two other pericopes in which the physical family is reaffirmed in different ways.[4] Mk 10.19 (and parallels) is but one indication that there was a place for the physical family and the promotion of filial piety within the teaching of Jesus. In the placement and presentation of this pericope, Mark, Matthew, and, to a lesser degree, Luke, make their own affirmation of these values.

Passing on to Mk 7.9-13 and parallels, we find a saying that because of its conflict with Jewish attitudes of Jesus' day concerning the oral law, and because of the improbability that the Christian community would create a saying involving the matter of corban, has high claims to authenticity. In fact, Taylor says, "There can be no reasonable doubt that the words were spoken by Jesus and illustrate His attitude to the oral law."[5] Possibly, Mark has added this saying to the section in 7.1-8 (because of the connection between vv 8 and 9) and Dibelius argues that 7.14-19, 20-23 are secondary Christian additions.[6] In this passage we find Jesus affirming the same Mosaic commandment in the midst of a pronouncement concerning the traditions of men and the commandments of God. Jesus, with more than a little anger and irony, charges His audience[7] with "setting aside the commandments of God in order to keep your own traditions."[8] In this instance, Jesus is attacking the misuse of the practice of making something corban to someone. First, Jesus reminds His listeners that Moses said one was to revere both father and mother. This is significant since some rabbis taught that one should honor father more than mother.[9] In addition, Jesus also reasserts the negative enjoinder of Moses: ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα θανάτῳ τελευτάτω.[10] It is hard to imagine a more strongly worded way of enforcing the obligations of children to parents and, especially in this case, to dependent parents.

In Jesus' day it was possible to declare in a vow using the term κορβᾶν or κονάμ that one's parents were forbidden to benefit from one's property because that property was dedicated to other purposes (perhaps to the Temple). What originally had been intended as a means of setting aside property or even oneself for the purposes of God became a means of preventing others from having a claim on one's person or property.[11] Mark records the vow as follows: κορβᾶν...ὃ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφελήθης.[12] Because such vows often amounted to withdrawing things from the control of certain persons without dedicating them to God, Mark rightly explains that κορβᾶν means Δῶρον - that which is dedicated or given, but not necessarily that which is given to God.[13] Contemporary inscriptions and Mishnaic parallels suggest that such a practice was well-known in the era in which Jesus lived.[14] Such a vow might be taken in a moment of anger and thus might involve some hint of an imprecation.[15] If this is the case in Mk 7.11, then this may explain why Jesus makes reference to the commandment against cursing or speaking evil of one's parents. Certainly, the position of the

word corban in Mk 7.11 is emphatic.[16] The rabbis taught that by means of a legal fiction or because of the honor due to one's parents, such a vow could be circumvented or annulled in some cases if the vower wished to do so.[17] On the other hand, there is evidence from Jesus' time that in some instances a person could not repent of his oath even if it was taken in haste or anger because some rabbis believed that his life would be forfeit and he would stand in danger of the judgment of God against oath-breakers.[18] Apparently, it was against this last opinion that Jesus was inveighing, for in our text it appears that the vower wished, but was not allowed, to repent - οὐκέτι ἀφίετε αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ποιῆσαι τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρί.[19] The fault Jesus finds with the Pharisees' tradition is that they were not lenient enough in some cases to provide means of circumventing or annulling a vow[20] that conflicted with one's filial duty. Jesus' point seems to be that any vow that makes void the word of God must be annulled.[21] Because of their traditions, the rabbis had allowed one's duty to fulfill any vow to take precedence over (and in effect nullify) the duty to honor one's parents.[22]

Thus, in Mk 7.9-13, we have a strong affirmation of the traditional family structure with special emphasis on the obligation for a child to provide for his aging or indigent parents. This obligation is not to be overriden by any vows or oaths. Indeed, Jesus warns that anyone speaking evil of his parents faces dire consequences. Jesus, far from taking a less stringent view of filial duties than His Jewish contemporaries, actually intensified the demands placed on a Jewish son or daughter by disallowing any interfering vows. In this He makes clear His desire that both mother and father be honored in word and deed.

Some indirect evidence about Jesus' attitude toward women in their roles of child-bearer and mother may perhaps be derived from an examination of the two separate Synoptic incidents in which a very positive attitude toward children is in evidence - Mk 9.33-37 and parallels, and Mk 10.13-16 and parallels.[23] Considering the Gospel writers' selectivity, the very existence of two separate incidents of a positive nature about children in the Synoptics may intimate that the attitudes expressed in these pericopes were seen by the Gospel writers as characteristic of Jesus and His ministry,[24] and noteworthy because they stood in contrast to common attitudes of that era.

Even in the first century A.D. exposure of infants (especially

girls) was known in Roman and Greek contexts. As Oepke points out though, there was a gradually improving attitude toward children in the Graeco-Roman world from the early period of the Republic to the latter days of the Empire: "The promotion of the diminished rising generation only reached its climax from the 2nd cent. A.D."[25] It is true that children were valued more highly in Judaism than in first century pagan culture; nonetheless, generally sons were valued more highly than daughters even among Jews.[26] There is no evidence that children, either male or female, were considered as religious models by the rabbis for in rabbinic Judaism it was the wise and learned rabbi, not the child, who was set up as an example to disciples who wished to be great in the Kingdom.[27] Further, no rabbi is known to have so closely identified himself and his teaching about the Kingdom with children as the Evangelists portray Jesus doing.

The history of the tradition(s) found in Mk 9.33-37 appears to be complex. It is possible that these verses comprise a brief pronouncement story placed at the outset of a collection of sayings related to each other on the basis of catch-words or phrases (ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, cf. vv 37, 38, 39, 41).[28] The mention of Capernaum and the house in v 33 may point to Petrine reminiscence,[29] and both the wrangling of the disciples and Jesus' response (v 35) are historically credible.[30] Verses 36 and 37, however, may belong to a different circle of ideas altogether (cf. Mk 10.40, 42). Verse 37 (τοιούτων παιδίων) seems to presuppose some such incident as we have in v 36, and thus they probably belong together. In any case, the original and present form of this tradition is about children, not unimportant community members (contrast v 42) which speaks for its earliness.[31] Matthew, perhaps in an attempt to spare the disciples, omits Jesus' question about the disciples' dispute, and Mark's comment about their response to this query and includes at 18.3-4 sayings which do not derive from this section of Mark. Schweizer suggests that the saying in 18.3 in some form may go back to Jesus Himself as it bears a strong resemblance to other sayings having to do with a child or being child-like in the Gospel tradition (Mk 10.15, cf. Jn 3.3, 5). These examples begin, "Truly, I say to you, if (or who) does not...", and end, "...enter into the Kingdom of God (or, of heaven)."[32] Verse 4 is possibly Matthew's rephrasing of v 3 (cf. στραφῆτε καὶ γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδία...; ταπεινώσει ἑαυτὸν ὡς τὸ παιδίον...), or perhaps his adapting of Mk 9.35a, b which he presents in reverse order (18.4b οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ μείζων...corresponding

to ἐί τις θέλει πρῶτος... in Mk 9.35a; humbling self as a child corresponding to being last of all and servant of all). To sum up, there seems no significant objection to taking Mk 9.33-35, and perhaps separately vv 36-37, as authentic Jesus material. Concerning Mt 18.3, there may be some doubt and possibly 18.4 is purely redactional. Nonetheless, the ideas conveyed in Mt 18.3-4 may perhaps be said to be 'typical' of Jesus' attitudes (especially if Mk 10.15 is authentic) even if they were not actually spoken by Him.[33]

Mk 9.33-37 is set in the context of the disciples' dispute about who would be greatest in the Kingdom.[34] At v 36, which may begin a different saying, Jesus calls a παιδίον (a term usually used to denote those between the stages of infancy and young adulthood)[35] and puts him in their midst. Mark and Luke make the child an object lesson with only a concluding summary (Mk 9.37, Lk 9.48) which involves the rather remarkable assertion that whoever receives one of this sort of children in Jesus' name, welcomes Him.[36] The verb translated 'receive' here often is used to refer to hospitality, the welcoming of a guest.[37] The phrase ἐπι τῷ ὀνόματί μου likely means 'for my sake'.[38] It is not likely that Jesus is suggesting that the child is His representative (but cf. v 37b), though that is grammatically possible. Rather, Jesus is saying to the disciples who are His representatives, 'receive a child such as this for My sake'. He is identifying Himself with the helpless so that they may be helped by those who wish to serve Jesus. His disciples are to serve even children and in so doing they serve Jesus Himself.[39] If Jesus had held certain of the negative opinions about children that existed in the Roman empire, or if He had a low view of the family and its offspring, then it is not likely that He would so closely identify Himself with children.[40]

Few scholars would doubt the authenticity of the material found in Mk 10.13-16 and parallels.[41] Dibelius includes this narrative in the category of paradigm (or example-narrative) in a state of noteworthy purity.[42] There is some question, however, whether or not v 15 originally belonged to this pericope. Bültmann is right that v 15 cannot be seen as an editorial expansion of v 14 because the two verses make different points.[43] Possibly then v 15 was originally an independent logion and Matthew has presented his version at 18.3 rather than in this context. Notably, Matthew and Luke have amplified and modified Mark's narrative in subtle ways to suit their own purposes.

For instance, Luke, by saying that τὰ βρέφη were involved and by omitting the embracing of them at the end generalizes the story, and thus the point is about what is involved in becoming a disciple. In Mark and Matthew, however, we have a series of incidents intended to give Jesus' teaching on marriage, divorce, children, and possessions (Mk 10.1-12, 13-16, 17-31).[44]

The narrative begins with parents, and perhaps older children,[45] bringing younger children to Jesus so that He might touch them. Perhaps reflecting the typical attitude that children were less mature and thus less important than adults, the disciples rebuked those who were bringing children forward (all three Synoptics).[46] Jesus reacts to the disciples' action with anger: "Allow the children to come to Me and do not hinder them for τῶν...τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ." Though Plummer and others insist that τοιούτων refers not "to these children, nor all children, but those who are childlike in character",[47] it seems more likely that it refers to those children who come or are brought to Jesus as well as those adults who are 'of this sort'.[48] G. R. Beasley-Murray is right in remarking, "...many normal occasions of the use of τοιοῦτος are intended to denote a class, of which the one mentioned in the context is an example...it is impossible to make the primary reference of τοιοῦτοι a comparison with other individuals."[49] Thus, the term cannot refer only to adults who are or become like children.

After this saying there follows in Mark and Luke (cf. Mt 18.31) a word of Jesus: "Truly I say to you, unless you receive the Kingdom ὡς παιδίον you shall not enter it." The phrase ὡς παιδίον may mean 'as a child' receives the Kingdom, or 'as a child (in childhood)', or finally 'as a child (as though the Kingdom were a child)'.[50] The second possibility can be rejected outright since Jesus calls adults to follow Him and enter the Kingdom. The third possibility, while conceivable, is unlikely since Mk 10.13-14, 16 and parallels concern how Jesus received children and the place children have in the Kingdom; and Mk 10.15 and parallels appear to concern how disciples should receive the Kingdom. The point of this material seems to be that the Kingdom of God involves or is made up of children and those like them, not that the Kingdom of God is like a child.[51] In the context of Mark 10, the contrast between the ease with which children enter the Kingdom and the difficulty with which the rich enter is notable. In Mark (10.16), this pericope closes with an action of Jesus which indicates as clear an acceptance and affirmation of children and of the parents' intentions who brought them

as one could want. If children are received openly by Jesus and if they have a place in the Kingdom, this may imply that giving birth to children and being a parent are seen as good things.[52]

Far from setting up the family of faith as an alternative to the physical family, Jesus uses the smallest member of the physical family as a model for members of the family of faith and gives children a place in the Kingdom. This may say more about Jesus' gracious attitude toward children than about what He thought of their religious and moral potential. Jesus identifies Himself with children so they will be treated or welcomed as He would be welcomed, and His disciples are called to become like dependent children in order to relate properly to God. The evidence of Jesus' positive attitude toward children, their place in the Kingdom, and how they might serve as models for disciples and be served by disciples seems to imply a positive estimation of a woman's role as child-bearer and mother (as well as a positive estimation of the father's role). While it might be objected that this material tells us only about Jesus' attitudes toward the helpless who are already born rather than about the bearing of children per se (and thus about women's roles), at the very least it would seem that Jesus would have refrained from such remarks about (and actions for) children if he had not wished to implicitly endorse the continuance of the physical family with its parental and filial roles. These roles seem to have been affirmed by Jesus without reservation so long as they did not conflict with the priorities of the Kingdom of God.

At this point we must give attention to two passages (Mk 12.40 and parallels, Mk 12.41-44 and parallels) that may reveal something about Jesus' attitude toward widows. In regard to Mk 12.40 (cf. Lk 20.47), there are no significant critical problems or reasons to doubt that this saying goes back to Jesus' actual conflicts with and denunciations of the scribes. It is possible, however, that this saying is not in its original setting but has been placed here together with a collection of similar sayings. Taylor conjectures that the degree of opposition reflected in 12.37b-40 intimates that this passage derives from "...an advanced point in the ministry best associated with Jerusalem."[53]

Scribes were the scholarly lawyers of Jesus' day and their chief function was to give expert advice and interpretation concerning matters of the Law. It was forbidden that they be paid for their teaching and it appears that it was common for them to follow a calling of another

sort to support themselves. In the main, they lived on subsidies and were poor save for the few scribes employed by the Temple priests.[54] This (and the Temple setting, if it is authentic), makes it likely that Jesus is referring to the Temple scribes who had the status to wear fine robes and attend large and expensive banquets.

In this context we may understand Jesus' warning to His disciples to beware the scribes - οἱ κατεσθίοντες τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χηρῶν[55] καὶ προφάσει μακρὰ προσευχόμενοι. What are we to make of the first phrase of Mk 12.40 (Lk 20.47), and in what way is it connected to what precedes and follows? Though it is possible that we should place a comma only after v 39, and see vv 38b-40 of Mark 12 as one unit, it seems more likely that we have a casus pendens and should place a period after v 39.[56] Discerning the connection of Mk 12.40a (Lk 20.47a) to what follows depends on understanding what "those who devour the possessions of the widows" means.[57]

Most likely, this phrase connotes a sort of abuse of a widow's property. 'To devour a house' is a technical phrase in extra-biblical Greek sources for bilking someone of their funds or property.[58] How were the scribes doing this? The most common suggestion is that the scribes were taking advantage of the kindness and hospitality of well-to-do widows beyond all reasonable bounds.[59] This view sees no necessary connection between Mk 12.40a and 40b. Another view which does connect Mk 12.40a and 40b is that the scribes were extorting large sums by praying for these widows for a fee.[60] The third and most likely view, advanced by Derrett, holds that these scribes, as a trade, were legal managers of well-to-do widows' estates, and were taking more than their fair share of expenses for the task.[61] Derrett also suggests that they were advertising for such lucrative tasks by making a point of being seen and known for their long and pious prayers in the Temple.[62] This last view seems feasible whether we translate προφάσει and what follows in Mk 12.40b as either 'and (under) the pretense (pretext) of lengthy prayer', or, as Derrett suggests, 'and with a view to this (for this reason) praying lengthy prayers'.[63]

This saying presents us with a picture of widows of some means being taken advantage of by unscrupulous scribes who were their legal estate managers. The widows' trusting nature is contrasted to the scribes' deceitful and avaricious practices. Stählin remarks, "Perhaps the μακρὰ προσεύχεσθαι may also be interpreted as a highly charged plea for the cause of the widow."[64] Jesus certainly is stepping forward as a strong advocate of oppressed or abused widows.

The second passage of interest, Mk 12.41-44 (Lk 21.1-4), follows immediately after the verse just discussed in the Marcan outline probably because of its similar content. Luke follows Mark at this point and we have here a clear example of how Luke "...can considerably alter the wording of a Marcan narrative while preserving the element of discourse almost unaltered."[65] Perhaps the most significant difference between the two accounts is that Luke omits the summoning and addressing of the disciples, possibly in order to allow the message to be spoken directly to his own audience. Bultmann, because of Jesus' supernatural knowledge that the woman gave all, and because of certain Buddhist, Greek, and Semitic parallels to this narrative, regards this narrative as an ideal construction, while Dibelius conjectures that this pericope perhaps went back to a saying or parable of Jesus.[66] The argument from the parallels is questionable both because of problems of content and of dating. As Taylor remarks, "The story is not so distinctive that similar incidents, with differences, could not happen in the case of other teachers....Further, the story is in harmony with His teaching elsewhere (cf. ix.41, Lk xii.15) and the use of ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν is characteristic."[67] The possibility raised by Dibelius that a story by Jesus has become a story about Jesus cannot be ruled out. Jesus may well have used His own variation of a familiar parable to make His point about giving here. For our purposes it is irrelevant whether this is a story once told by Jesus and now transformed, or an actual incident in His life. In either case it will reveal to us something of His attitude about widows. Thus, we will treat the narrative as a literary unit following the progress of the story as it is given.

In the Marcan narrative Jesus is in a place in the Temple where He could see the crowds streaming in to pay their private offerings to the Temple treasury.[68] Particularly noticeable by their apparel and perhaps by the length of time they spent putting in their money, were the πολλοὶ πλούσιοι who ἔβαλλον πολλά.[69] Also noticeable by apparel was one poor widow wanting to make an offering to God out of devotion.[70] Her offering was two λεπτά, copper coins of the smallest denomination.[71] In Mark's account Jesus is portrayed as wishing to use this woman as a model for His disciples. Thus, He calls His disciples to Himself (Mk 12.43 only). It is not the amount given, but the attitude of self-sacrifice on which the narrative focuses. In a startling statement, Jesus says, "Truly I tell you,[72] this poor woman put more into the

treasury than all the others combined."[73] She gave ὅλον τὸν βίον αὐτῆς (Mark).[74] Even more significantly, the reason why Jesus says she gave more than all was that she gave out of her deficit, while the others gave out of their abundance. Her devotion and self-sacrifice was complete; she gave her whole 'living'. This is a clear model of devotion.

In these two sayings we may note certain obvious contrasts. In Mk 12.40 (Lk 20.47) there is the contrast between rich widows who trust their managers and the deceitful male scribes. In Mk 12.41-44 (Lk 21.1-4), a poor widow is set over against the rich men. In addition, the devotion and self-sacrifice of the poor widow stand out against the dark background of the self-indulgence and false piety of the scribes and the easy and ostentatious giving of the rich.[75] In the former case Jesus defends a group of women; in the latter one woman is His model of self-sacrificial giving. Jesus' special concern and admiration for women is perhaps nowhere more strikingly juxtaposed with His disgust over certain groups of privileged and supposedly pious men than here. The theme of reversal (the last being first, the humble being exalted, the exalted being humbled) comes to the fore. Jesus' choice of the widow as a model reflects His view of how the advent of the Kingdom means just recognition of the truly godly, and just judgment of those who oppress the poor and disenfranchised (the widow being a prime example).[76]

2. Marriage, Adultery, and Divorce

The matters discussed in Mt 5.27-32, Lk 16.18, Mt 19.3-9, and Mk 10.1-12 are of great importance for our understanding of Jesus' view of marriage, family, and women's roles. The sayings on marriage and divorce fall into two categories: isolated sayings (Mt 5.31-32, Lk 16.18) and the controversy dialogues (Mt 19.3-9, Mk 10.1-12).[77] We will deal with each group reserving our discussion of the Matthean exceptive clauses until our treatment of the controversy dialogues.[78]

The saying on marriage and divorce in Mt 5.31-32 is located in a larger section of the Sermon on the Mount (5.27-32) that deals with μοιχεία (cf. vv 27, 28, 32), and is presented in the familiar antithesis form: "You have heard that it was said...but I say to you." The saying which precedes the divorce discussion deals with the related matter of sexual sin; therefore, we must see how it sets the stage and relates to the content of what follows. First, however, a word on the critical problems raised by 5.27-30.

Verses 27-28 present few problems. Applying the criterion of dissimilarity, the antithetical parallelism and the first person address speak strongly in favor of its authenticity.[79] This is so not only because of the uniqueness of the form ("You have heard it said...but I say") in a Jewish context where rabbis were careful to build on past traditions (biblical and otherwise), but also because, "The evidence shows that the large number of cases of antithetic parallelism in the sayings of Jesus cannot be attributed to the process of redaction, and only in isolated examples is it to be seen as the work of the tradition."[80] This passage is not an exception to this rule, and Bultmann indicates that vv 27-28 are from the older stock of tradition.[81] In regard to vv 29-30, there are more difficulties. Here we appear to have a case where Matthew had two different sources for virtually the same saying (5.29-30 from M;[82] 18.8-9 from Mk 9.43-47). As Taylor indicates, Mk 9.43-47 is not in its original context but has been placed with a compilation of other sayings,[83] and clearly these verses are an insertion in Matthew for 18.10 would follow naturally on 18.7.[84] It is possible then that Matthew found 5.29-30 connected with 5.27-28 in his source, and if Derrett is correct about the meaning of vv 29-30, the connection would belong to the earliest stage of the formation of this tradition and be traceable ultimately to Jesus Himself. As we shall see, 5.29-30 could refer to punishments known in Jesus' day for sexual sins.[85] If the M version of this saying is the more authentic, then it follows that at some point the Marcan version was expanded to include a reference to the foot (9.45) at a stage in the tradition when the original sexual context and implications had been forgotten.[86]

Mt 5.27 opens with, "You have heard that it was said, 'οὐ μοιχεύσεις', but I say to you πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ. Two important questions need to be asked: 1) What is the meaning of μοιχεύω? and 2) How should γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν be translated? A great deal hinges on how one translates μοιχεύω in Mt 5.27-32. The word μοιχεύω and its cognates are used most commonly in the specific sense of extra-marital intercourse by a married man or woman with someone betrothed or married who is not his or her legal spouse. This word group can be used in a wider sense of various sorts of sexual misbehavior - feelings, thoughts, or acts that involve sexual sin. It appears that the term is used in its narrower sexual sense of adultery in 5.27, 32, and in a somewhat wider sense in 5.28.[87]

Traditionally, Mt 5.28 has been translated, "Anyone looking on a woman lustfully has already committed adultery with her in his heart."[88] K. Haacker rightly challenged this translation. First, it is questionable whether or not πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν should be translated adverbially so as to link the seeing and desiring as part of one act. The word πρὸς with the accusative, as in 2 Cor 5.10, may yield the sense 'in accord with' which would lead to a translation 'looks in accord with his lust for her'. This translation, however, does not take proper account of the infinitive and its relation to αὐτὴν. There is a further point to be considered - What shall we make of ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν? Despite the Decalogue, in rabbinic Judaism normally only the man initiated a marriage, and adultery was the act of an unfaithful wife. Usually, the phrase ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν is rendered 'commits adultery with her', or else the αὐτὴν is neglected entirely. Haacker suggests we translate 'has led her astray to adultery', which preserves the role distinctions. The word αὐτὴν can logically be the subject of ἐπιθυμῆσαι.[89] Perhaps we should translate with Haacker, "Anyone who so looks on a woman that she is (or shall become) desirous, has in his heart already led her astray to adultery."[90] If this is correct, then this is not the same idea that we find in rabbinic sources where men are warned against looking at women (or women looking at them) lest they, the men, be led astray.[91] Here we have the antithesis to such an idea, for what is being treated in our passage is not male instability in the face of a temptress, but male aggression which leads a woman into sin. Thus, the responsibility for such sin is placed on the male, and consideration is given to the woman, often the weaker and more suspected party in a male-oriented society. This saying is at one and the same time a reaffirmation of a man's leadership and responsibility for the community welfare, and an attempt to liberate women from a social stereotype.[92]

Consistent with this stress on restraint of male aggression is the radical remedy Jesus proposes for those unable to control themselves: "If your right eye causes you to sin, gouge it out and throw it away. It is better for you to lose one part of your body, than for your whole body to go into hell. And if your right hand causes you to sin, cut it off..." (Mt 5.29-30). While it is often assumed that this is Jesus' hyperbolic way of saying that we must sever ourselves from whatever causes us to sin,[93] in this context it is possible that sexual sins are being alluded to in vv 29-30. This becomes more likely

when we realize that loss of eyes was a well-known punishment for sexual misbehavior, and loss of hand was a punishment for stealing another's property, even his wife.[94] This is intended primarily as a preventive measure, eliminating the possibility of recurrence, and thus in this context saving a person from further temporal or even eternal punishment. "Thus, the whole passage...is speaking in terms of punishments actually known in Palestinian practice in order to throw light on the great difficulty of remaining effectively loyal to...the Kingdom of heaven."[95] Jesus' words would have sounded more like a threat than a dramatic hyperbole to the male listeners he addressed.[96] All of the above is like : : Jn 7.53-8.11 where men's motives are questioned in a similar way, and their failure to live up to their responsibilities in such a situation is pointed to. Perhaps then a brief digression into this Johannine material is in order at this point.

The story of the woman caught in adultery, while not likely a part of the earliest and best text of the NT, is still included in most modern translations, albeit often in the margins.[97] How are we to assess the historical value of this material in light of its textual history and problems of placement? There are several factors which point to the earliness of this narrative. Daube points out that the reference to stoning indicates that this story originated in the first century since strangling was substituted as a punishment soon thereafter.[98] Further, as Cadbury points out, "...its internal character, agreeing as it does with the Synoptic stories, bespeaks its genuineness as a tradition."[99] The external evidence seems also to demand an early date for this story.[100] It is difficult to explain how this narrative ever forced its way into any of the canonical Gospels unless there were strong reasons for assuming that it was authentic Jesus material.[101] It is plausible that because the story recorded ideas found elsewhere in the Gospel tradition and because it may have called into question the early Church's very strict disciplinary measures when sexual sin was committed, it was not originally included in any Gospel.[102] This last factor also argues against the view that this material is simply a Church creation. That the story "represents the character and methods of Jesus as they are revealed elsewhere",[103] favors the view that the portrayal here is an accurate description of Jesus' 'typical' attitude in such cases even if it is not a description of one particular historical incident. Thus, it seems reasonable to expect that by examining this material as a literary unit we can deduce something about what was characteristic of Jesus from Jn 7.53-8.11 though we shall not contend that this text records an historical occurence.

The setting for this encounter is the women's court in the Temple[104] where Jesus is teaching the people. Suddenly, into this court come the scribes and Pharisees with a woman caught in the very act of adultery.[105] There is no reason to doubt that a married woman is meant, as Daube and Blinzler have shown independently.[106] In order to have the proof required by the rabbis for this crime, the woman must be caught in coitu. Thus, the Evangelist depicts a highly suspicious situation: Where is her partner in crime? Did the husband hire spies to trap his wife? Did he wish to set aside his wife without giving her the ketubah, or did he want certain proof of her infidelity?[107] Why had not the husband utilized the usual practice of the 'ordeal of the bitter waters' if he had reason to suspect his wife of unfaithfulness?[108] Finally, why had not the witnesses warned the woman if she was seen in the very act?[109]

The scribes and Pharisees confront Jesus by saying that Moses prescribed stoning for such a woman, and by asking, "σὺ οὖν τί λέγεις?"[110] Thus, Jesus is invited to set Himself against Moses, and perhaps openly against the Roman law.[111] At this point Jesus appears to avoid the issue, for He stoops down and draws with His finger on the earth. There are many possible interpretations of this act, but since the Gospel writer does not think it important enough to tell us what Jesus wrote, it is likely that the gesture, not the words, are important.[112] The gesture implies that Jesus does not wish to be associated with the wickedness of this business ,or that He is as ashamed of their actions as of the woman's sin. If it is true that only Mosaic law opposed adultery, but only the Roman law could pass the death sentence ,then it seems that Jesus is caught in a trap. If He fails to pronounce judgment ,then He will appear to reject Moses; if He pronounces judgment, then He will appear to usurp the Roman jus gladii.[113] Jesus does not refrain from judgment; rather ,by implication He pronounces this woman guilty by saying, "If anyone of you is without sin, let him be the first to cast a stone at her." Here, ἀναμάρτητος probably means 'without serious sin' in the matter at hand.[114] Jesus has good cause to suspect the motives of these men (cf. the editorial note in v 6), but He does not render invalid their judgment on the gravity of this woman's sin.[115] He applies the principle, 'He who reproves others, must himself be above reproach in the case at issue.' It is the motives of the witnesses and their own culpability, not the woman's lack of sin, which decides the matter here. The witnesses

who must cast the first stone (Deut 17.7), though technically qualified, are not morally qualified. Neither are the scribes or Pharisees qualified, for they are guilty of trying to use God's law to trap the one man in this crowd who is morally qualified to pass judgment. Jesus effectively springs the trap that hovers over Himself and the woman by passing judgment in such a way that its execution is impossible

The Jewish leaders, who were supposed to be moral examples to the people, knew what Jesus was implying about them, and thus one by one beginning with the elders, they silently slipped away.[116] The hunters have lost not only their game, but also their bait. When the woman tells Jesus that no one has condemned her, Jesus says emphatically, οὐδὲ ἐγώ σε κατακρίνω. Perhaps He rejects implicitly the whole procedure that the scribes and Pharisees were following as inherently discriminatory against women in such a sin-tainted setting.[117] Jesus does not approve of a system wherein a man's lust is not taken as seriously as a woman's seduction. Jesus, by saying, "From now on do not sin",[118] does not pronounce this woman's sin forgiven since she has not repented; rather, He shows her the balance of mercy and justice calculated to lead one away from a sinful life to repentance and salvation.[119] As in Matthew 5, we see a critique of men who fail to live up to their responsibility of being examples of virtue for the community, and we see a rejection of certain stereotypes in which women are treated as scapegoats responsible for social ills.[120] This comports with the emphasis we find in some of the Synoptic material (notably Mt 5.32, 19.9) to which we must now turn.

The Synoptic divorce material is by no means easily handled for there is no broad consensus among scholars about any of the following questions: 1) Which of the isolated sayings (Mt 5.31-32, Lk 16.18) is the more primitive? 2) Which of the controversy dialogues (Matthew 19, Mark 10) is the more primitive? 3) Do the sayings and dialogues go back to one primitive saying or dialogue? 4) How are the exceptive clauses in Matthew to be understood? Only on the last question is there a somewhat general agreement that the exceptive clauses are serious qualifications of Jesus' teaching and are not original (though even this has been recently challenged). Even if they are later additions, whether these additions break the general rule prohibiting divorce, or simply make it applicable to a particular problem is open to debate, since the meaning of πορνεία here is uncertain and neither the context in Matthew 5 nor 19 favors an actual exception being introduced. In Matthew 5

the broadening of the meaning of adultery in 5.28 and the antithesis form used in 5.27, 29, 30 naturally leads one to expect an intensification of OT and rabbinic teaching in Mt 5.31-32. Verse 32 continues the unique stress on a man's responsibility (cf. vv 27-28) by saying that it is the male who causes the woman to commit adultery if he divorces her and she remarries.[121] Further, the second husband commits adultery if he marries the divorced woman.[122] In Matthew 19 we also run into difficulties if we take 19.9 to involve a genuine exception because then 19.10, in terms of the logic the Evangelist is trying to convey in placing 19.1-9 and 10-12 together, makes no sense. Thus, simply talking in terms of Matthean logic, we meet problems if we too quickly assume that the exceptive clauses are serious qualifications of an absolute prohibition of divorce. It should also be noted that the view that the exceptive clauses are later additions is partially based on the assumption that Matthew is following Mark here - an assumption that even the 'apostle' of Marcan priority, B. H. Streeter, had considerable doubts about. He posited that the First Evangelist was following in some detail a parallel version to Mark's divorce dialogue found in his own special source and that "...Matthew's account appears to be in some ways more original than Mark's."[123]

In terms of historical probabilities, there is much to be said for the suggestion that the First Evangelist here has more primitive material than the Second. For one thing it is much more probable that the Pharisees would ask Jesus about the grounds of divorce than about the rectitude of divorce <u>per se</u>.[124] Again, it is <u>a priori</u> more probable that the discussion would have proceeded as we find it in Mt 19.3-9 than in Mk 10.2-12 since it seems likely that Jesus would have spoken of a Mosaic <u>permission</u> to divorce (Mt 19.8) rather than a Mosaic <u>command</u> (Mk 10.3).[125] In the Marcan form of this debate Jesus is placed in the unlikely position of putting Himself between a rock and a hard place by speaking of a Mosaic command which He then shows is in opposition to God's creation plan as expressed in the first book of Moses! By contrast the Matthean form of the debate makes perfect sense. It is the Pharisees who speak of Moses' command while Jesus counters that it was only a permission and quite logically He is able to appeal to a higher and prior principle found in God's creation plan (vv 4-6, 8b). Further, the 'in house' motif in Mk 10.10 is characteristic (cf. Mk 4.34), and it is more natural that Jesus goes on to make the pronouncement in Mt 19.9 (Mk 10.11) in public,[126] and that the disciples reacted as we

find them doing in Mt 19.10. In the Marcan narrative the public discussion ends rather abruptly at 10.9 with no clear statement of what exactly the OT principle means for the practice of divorce. It seems somewhat ironic that many scholars will argue at some length that Mk 10.12 is Mark's expansion for a Hellenistic audience and yet not consider the possibility that he had recast the entire narrative for that audience. What the Gentiles (who lived in an atmosphere of much more widespread divorce than did the Palestinian Jew) needed to hear was not that there were legitimate grounds for divorce but rather that divorce was completely against God's intentions. Thus, in almost every regard the debate as we find it in Matthew 19 looks to be more primitive and genuine than Mark's debate.[127]

In regard to the more primitive form of the isolated logion (Mt 5. 31-32, cf. Lk 16.18) there are several difficulties. The differences between Mt 5.32 and Mt 19.9 suggest that the First Evangelist has not simply modified the saying in 19.9 and placed it in 5.32. It will be noted that Lk 16.18a is close to Mt 19.9 while Lk 16.18b is like Mt 5.32b. Mt 5.32a is unique. Thus, it may be that we should not too quickly equate Mt 5.32 and Lk 16.18 in their entirety as two forms of the same saying. This leads to the conclusion that the antithesis formula in Mt 5.31-32a may not be secondary.[128] The contrast between the statement from Deut 24.1 and Mt 5.32a tells in favor of the authenticity of this antithesis for it is unlikely that an Evangelist, who includes such sayings as we find in Mt 5.17-19, would create such an antithesis. Further, if Mt 19.7-9 is authentic tradition, then it appears we have evidence that Jesus made such a contrast between Deut 24.1 and His own teaching. Finally, perhaps the rather surprising 'causes her to commit adultery' speaks for the authenticity of at least 5.32a. We have already seen in Mt 5.27-30 how Jesus placed responsibility on the male for allowing a woman to go astray into sin. Mt 5.31a comports well with such teaching. Some tentative conclusions should be stated at this point: 1) In regard to the controversy dialogues, the Matthean form appears to be the more primitive and more authentic form with the possible exception of the exceptive clauses. This is not to be taken as an argument <u>against</u> general Marcan priority but <u>for</u> the use by the First Evangelist of a parallel version which he likely derived from his special material. 2) The Marcan discussion and particularly 10.12 appears to be a modification of Jesus' original teaching for a Hellenistic audience. 3) The antithesis formula found in Mt 5.31-32a may be original or at least modeled on the authentic contrast in Mt 19.7-9. 4) The

saying found in Mt 5.32b and Lk 16.18b appears to be an isolated logion possibly found in the Q material and likely quite primitive.[129] 5) Lk 16.18a is likely a saying found in Q and possibly more original than the form found in Mk 10.11.[130] We are now in a position to discuss the controversy dialogues, an isolated logion, and the exceptive clauses in greater detail.

In the pronouncement story presented in two different versions (Mt 19.3-9, Mk 10.2-12) Jesus is confronted by a group of rabbis who wish to ask Him a question about divorce in the hopes of trapping Him in His words.[131] Daube has isolated a specific familiar form of debate in the Marcan version of this pericope; namely, a question by an opponent (10.2), public retort sufficient to silence listener but stating only part of the truth (10.5-9), private elucidation demanded by followers (10.10), and private explanation given in a full and clear way.[132]

In Matthew the discussion begins with the Pharisees' question, "Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν?"[133] As the verb ἀπολύω indicates, the Pharisees are asking about divorce, not separation (the latter did not exist as a legal reality in first century Judaism).[134] Matthew and Mark differ as to how Jesus began to reply. The Matthean form (in which the Pharisees ask Him, "Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorce and to divorce?) is likely the more original response to Jesus' first remarks on divorce. Jesus answers their question with, "Moses permitted you to divorce your wife πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν" (Mt 19.7-8)."[135] The Mosaic permission referred to, Deut 24.1-4, required a bill of divorce be given to make clear that the woman was no longer married, in order to protect her from further charges or abuse.[136] Jesus intimates that Moses' provision was meant to limit a practice widespread at that time, but it was not meant to license divorce for any cause as some rabbis had deduced.[137]

In the Matthean account, Jesus quotes two different texts in response to the Pharisees' initial question. The phrase ὁ κτίσας ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (cf. 19.8)[138] prefaces the first text, "He made them male and female." (Gen 1.27, cf. 5.2). Then the text citing Gen 2.24 reads "Because of this (fact)[139] 'a man shall leave his mother and be joined to his wife,[140] and the two shall become one flesh.'"[141] The implication is that the one flesh union becomes more constitutive of a man and a woman's being than their uniqueness. Only two can become one, and when they do so they are no longer two. From these texts Jesus deduces that a man and a woman are no longer two, but σὰρξ μία.[142] What then

God συνέζευξεν, man must not χωριζέτω.[143] Jesus argues that because of the nature of mankind's creation in two distinct but complementary genders (a divine act) and the nature of marriage created by God between male and female (a divine act), no third human party is allowed into this relationship. Anyone[144] who seeks to divide those who share such a marriage and a one flesh union attacks not only the marriage and the two people united in marriage, but also the unifier, God.[145] Jesus has appealed to the intended creation order and the Creator, both of which undergird, not undermine, Mosaic law and its true intention even if it may seem to contradict a certain concession to sinfulness. Mosaic law was meant to be used as a tool to limit, not license, an existing evil.[146]

In the Matthean account of this discussion, Jesus goes on to say to the Pharisees that even though Moses permitted divorce, this was not God's original plan.[147] Thus, despite what Moses had allowed: "λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν,[148] whoever divorces his wife μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ, and marries another, commits adultery." As in Mt 5.31-32, the words of Jesus have built up to a point where one naturally expects Jesus to contrast His teaching with that of other rabbis, or even Moses. Certainly the λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν points in this direction. We are thus confronted with the Matthean exceptive clauses, and a full discussion of both phrases is now in order.

Nearly everything about the phrases παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας (Mt 5.32), and μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ (Mt 19.9), is in dispute.[149] Are these clauses intended to be inclusive or exclusive? Are the exceptive clauses original to the sayings, or Matthean or later scribal additions? What is the meaning of πορνεία in these clauses? Does it convey the same thing or something different from μοιχεία in this context? What is the relation of the exceptive clauses to the ʿerwat dabar of Deut 24.1?

Though some scholars have argued strongly for taking παρεκτὸς in an inclusive sense ('irrespective of'), there is little evidence to support this view.[150] The rare παρεκτὸς conveys the basic idea of 'outside of', 'apart from', or 'except for'. It points to something that is singled out from a larger entity.[151] While there is no instance in the NT where μὴ alone means 'except', it is possible that the clause μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ is somewhat elliptical and should be filled out by adding εἰ or ἐάν before μὴ.[152] Some scholars, while admitting that the meaning of παρεκτὸς is 'except', have argued that Jesus is saying 'setting aside (except) the case of πορνεία (which I am not here discussing)'.[153]

This seems to require an overly subtle nuance of παρεκτὸς. It is simpler to recognize that in Mt 5.32, as in Mt 19.9, we have a real exception, whatever the meaning of πορνεία might be.

The heart of the debate rightly centers around the meaning of πορνεία. It can mean 'fornication', though Bauer mentions it is used of "every kind of unlawful sexual intercourse",[154] and a variety of other sorts of sexual activity.[155] It may also be used in a more technical sense to refer to a marital bond or sexual union within the degrees of kinship prohibited in the OT (cf. Lev 18.6-16).[156] Finally, it is sometimes used in a transferred sense to refer to idolatry. There are difficulties with all the advocated views. For instance, if the First Evangelist means by πορνεία adultery or marital unfaithfulness,[157] then why has he confused the issue by using a different word (μοιχεύω/μοιχάομαι) in the same context to mean just that? Elsewhere (Mt 15.19, cf. Mk 7.22, 1 Cor 6.9), Matthew clearly distinguishes between these two words usually used to refer to adultery and unchastity. There is also the problem that the First Evangelist seems to be speaking of a practice which he equates with adultery but which normally would not be. He understands Jesus to be contrasting His position with that of His Jewish contemporaries and Moses, but if πορνεία means 'adultery' Jesus would simply be agreeing with the position of the School of Shammai and perhaps Moses as well.[158] In fact, some are willing to argue that παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας is simply the Greek rendering of 'a shameful thing' in Deut 24.1. However, ʿerwat dabar is also found in Deut 23.14 where it refers to uncovered excrement and could not possibly be translated λόγου πορνείας, which refers to sexual sin. In the LXX, the ʿerwat dabar of Deut 24.1 is translated by ἀσχημον πρᾶγμα not λόγου πορνείας.[159] It is not likely that harlotry or prostitution by an unmarried , betrothed, or married woman is in mind.since that is only unchastity or adultery in an extreme form (which already has been argued not to be the context of πορνεία here). By definition, if we are considering grounds for divorce, the woman must be married.[160] Despite A. Isaksson's arguments, there is little to commend the view that pre-marital unchastity is the meaning of πορνεία here. While betrothed and married couples under Judaism share some common legal ground, they are distinguished in certain important regards. The section of the OT that is at issue in Mt 19.3 ff. is undoubtedly Deut 24.1-4 where the bill of divorce is mentioned, not Deut 22.21 which treats the separate case of premarital unchastity.[161] Finally, the meaning of idolatry does not fit our context, since when

πορνεία is used in that sense in the LXX and NT it is usually in the context of Israel's corporate sin, not the sin of individuals (cf. Hos 6.10, Jer 3.2, 9, Rev. 19.2).[162]

Could Jesus or the First Evangelist (or both) have been referring to an incestuous or illegitimate marriage in these exceptive clauses? There is the fact that 1 Cor 5.1 and possibly Ac 15.20, 29, and 21.25 have used πορνεία precisely in this sense.[163] To cite one example from apocryphal literature, we find this same usage in Tobit 8.7.[164] J. A. Fitzmyer has presented first century A.D. Palestinian support from Qumran material for seeing πορνεία in Mt 5.32 and 19.9 in the specific sense of a zĕnût marriage.[165] From the historical context, further support can be marshalled for this view. John the Baptist was jailed in part for condemning the incestuous marriage of Herodias to Herod.[166] It appears the Pharisees are trying to catch Jesus in His words here in Mt 19.3-9 and parallels. As A. Mahoney remarks:

> Their insidious question was probably directed toward the then currrent and divisive cause célèbre in this matter, the affaire Antipas-Herodias. In the crowd there could have been disciples of John the Baptist, victim of the hate of Herodias; Herodians, supporters of Herod Antipas; devout Jews, angered by the flagrant violation of the Law; and especially if the question was posed in Perea...Nabateans, the daughter of whose King Aretas had been repudiated in favor of Herodias. (167)

Further, we know that the rabbis allowed an incestuous relationship to continue if it involved a proselyte who was converting to Judaism. Jesus' response could be directed not only to the Herodias situation, but also to this ongoing rabbinic practice.[168]

We thus have all the historical ingredients for Jesus to make a comment about incestuous marriages. In addition, one must take into account what Daube calls the prevalent view of rabbis concerning the Genesis texts to which Jesus refers.[169] It is well-known that the rabbis accepted both divorce and polygamy as viable and legal, if not always moral, options. They did not interpret the texts on which Jesus relies in terms of exclusive monogamy, but took them to forbid unnatural and incestuous intercourse. In B. T. Sanhedrin 58a, in the midst of a discussion by R. Akiba and others about the forbidden degrees of consanguinity and the problems created by proselytes, we have the following exegesis: "Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother" refers to the fact that one must not marry his father's sister or wife, or his mother and her sister. Further "And he shall cleave" prohibits pederasty.[170] The main thrust of this discussion is focused on the question of the

forbidden degrees of marriage, though other sorts of perversions are prohibited also. It is likely that the rabbis would have understood Jesus to be referring specifically to the discussion about incestuous marriage when He quotes these texts. If, as Daube asserts, Jesus deliberately is trying to reveal only part of the truth by these statements, He could not have chosen a better way of doing so. While the rabbis would be assuming that Jesus was discussing such aberrations as incestuous marriage, Jesus in fact was using these texts to argue for exclusive monogamy and against polygamy and adultery, the two most dangerous intrusions into the exclusive nature of the one flesh union. This would not be apparent until Jesus' pronouncement on divorce at the end of the discussion. Such a pleading for indissoluble monogamy is hinted at in Mt 19.6 (Mk 10.9). If the First Evangelists's record of the discussion is accurate in reporting that Jesus spoke 19.9 to the Pharisees, then it comes as the climactic remark that silences His opponents and settles the issue. The exceptive clause has been prepared for by Jesus' use of texts which were assumed to allude to incestuous marriage. Jesus uses these texts in a different manner, but He answers the question that such texts would raise in His listeners' minds by saying, "except in the case of incest." Thus, the exceptive clauses may be the original words of Jesus that the First Evangelist includes because of their relevance for his own audience.[171] This solution has numerous advantages: 1) it fits a specific historical situation; 2) it draws on and relates to known rabbinic views of certain key OT texts; 3) it allows the exceptive clauses to be true exceptions - Jesus does not think incestuous marriages are joined by God and He implicitly allows for their dissolution; 4) it draws on a known meaning of πορνεία that is found elsewhere in the NT and in other literature that circulated in Jesus' and the Gospel writers' time; 5) it does not confuse Matthew's use of πορνεία and μοιχεύω here which elsewhere he uses to refer to different things; 6) it comports with the contrast we expect in Jesus' teaching and have been prepared for by the antithesis formula and Jesus' appeal to God's original plan over and above Moses' concessions to hard-heartedness; 7) as Fitzmyer remarks, "...the exception for an illicit union...may be said not to render the prohibition of divorce less absolute."[172] Marriages which violate God's laws in regard to human relations are not true marriages, since God has not joined them together. Having said this, the relevant material in 1 Cor 7.10 and 11 seems to presuppose a form of the divorce saying without mention of any

exceptions. This argues strongly (and some will think decisively) for the view that the exceptions were later additions to the tradition.[173] Further, if the exceptive clauses were directed specifically against the Jewish permission of incestuous relationships involving a proselyte, then they are clauses the Evangelist could have added to answer a question raised by the Jewish-Christian portion of his audience about Gentiles entering the community. Even if this does prove to be the case, the meaning of πορνεία may still be as we have argued above, and the Evangelist will not have introduced an exception that breaks the absoluteness of Jesus' prohibition, but rather interprets it so as to deal with an exceptional situation or problem.

Before we conclude this section a few words about Mk 10.11-12 are necessary. There is a unique feature about Mk 10.11 that deserves attention. Normally μοιχᾶται ἐπ' αὐτήν is taken to mean commits adultery against her (the first wife). While this is grammatically possible, the Jews never spoke in terms of a man committing adultery against his own wife. This does not mean that Mark would not do so. N. Turner, followed by B. Schaller, have suggested that ἐπ' αὐτήν be translated 'with her' (with the second woman). This makes sense of the text because adultery by definition is committed by a married person with a third party. Further, this translation still means that the husband is labeled an adulterer, contrary to the common use of the word. It also implies there has been a crime against one's wife, but reveals that the crime itself was <u>with</u> a third party.[174] As we stated previously the ἐπ' αὐτήν appears to be Mark's addition intended to clarify the meaning of the basic teaching of Jesus which likely took the form we find in Lk 16.18a.

Mk 10.12 is said to be Mark's adaptation of Jesus' teaching on divorce to a Graeco-Roman setting.[175] It is a saying not included by Matthew. Despite its textual difficulties,[176] there is no doubt that it is referring to the act of a woman. The woman either 'separates from' or 'divorces' her husband (probably the latter). Most scholars argue that this is a Marcan formulation and not a word of Jesus since it is assumed that Jewish women could not divorce men in first century Palestine. Even though this is true in most cases, it is conceivable that Jesus could make such a remark either as a Semitic parallelism meant to complete and balance the saying in Mk 10.11, or as a pronouncement to place women on equal terms with men even in hypothetical legal matters. The statement need not have been hypothetical. E. Bammel has

shown that there is some evidence that even Jewish women in first century Palestine could not only write out their own divorce bill, but also pronounce the divorce formula. Some Jewish women of high rank, such as Herodias, and later Salome, were able to divorce their husbands (though in Herodias' case it may have been a matter of abandonment rather than divorce).[177] Without doubt most scholars will continue to see Mk 10.12 as Mark's own formulation meant to convey Jesus' basic teaching to a Hellenistic audience - and they may well be right. However, considering the remarks Jesus appears to have made elsewhere about Herodias (Lk 13. 31-32) and His commendation of John the Baptist, the possibility that Jesus Himself made an allusion to Herod's wicked wife by way of a general statement on women divorcing men is far from inconceivable and should be given more serious consideration than it has in the past.[178]

In conclusion, in Mt 5.27-30 Jesus places the burden of reponsibility for a woman being led into sexual sin on the man thus rejecting certain common stereotypes (cf. Jn 7.53-8.11). Lk 16.18 is an absolute prohibition against divorce and remarriage. The onus for divorce and its consequences is placed on the man in both Matthew 5 and Luke 16. While the First Evangelist speaks of the first man making his divorced wife an adulteress, and the second man who marries a divorced woman becoming an adulterer, Luke speaks of both the first husband as an adulterer (if he remarries), and the second man as the same if he marries the divorced woman. What is new in this teaching, besides making the man primarily responsible for sexual sin or divorce and its consequences, is the idea of a man committing adultery against his former wife by remarriage, or making his wife an adulteress by divorce.[179] In all probability this new thrust, because of its originality, goes back to Jesus.[180]

who . believed that the first one-flesh union, as the basis of marriage, was indissoluble.[181] Jesus opposed with vehemence both male aggression that led a woman astray (5.27-30), and the adultery that resulted from it. The net effect of such views is that various stereotypes of women as temptresses are countered, and at the same time a woman is given greater security in marriage by making the man responsible for its continued maintenance and by prohibiting the man from using his power to cause its dissolution. Jesus thus reaffirms and also reforms the traditional family structure. This resulted in giving women a more stable foundation on which to operate in their traditional roles.

3. Eunuchs for the Kingdom - Mt 19.10-12

The pericope on eunuchs in Mt 19.10-12 is uniquely Matthean and is perhaps to be traced to the First Evangelist's special source. The radical nature of the teaching expressed in v 12 as well as the fact that, "The saying is undoubtedly off the rabbinic line..."[182] probably favors the view that v 12 is to be traced back to Jesus Himself.[183] The phrase, "for the sake of the Kingdom", also relates this saying to other teachings in the Gospels generally accepted to be from a Sitz im Leben Jesu (cf. Mk 10.28-30).[184] Also favoring this is the fact that the first two categories of eunuchs mentioned reflect the common Jewish division between natural and man-made eunuchs.[185] The question remains, however, whether or not v 10 is a redactional connection to the marriage and divorce teaching fashioned by the Evangelist himself. Favoring this view is the fact that Mark has none of the material found in vv 10-12. Against this contention, however, is the fact that the First Evangelist frequently edits Mark in a way that spares the disciples (and v 10 could hardly be said to present the disciples in a favorable light). As Davies says, "...they virtually make the attractiveness of marriage contingent upon the possibility of divorce, and that on easy terms. Such an attitude as they express is historically possible, if not probable."[186] Thus, it is perhaps more likely than not that we have here both a genuine teaching by Jesus on eunuchs and the actual reaction of Jesus' disciples to His divorce teaching - a reaction which reveals that they had typically male Jewish attitudes about these matters. It is still likely that 19.10-12 relates part of a separate (authentic) discussion to that found in 19.1-9 and the juxtaposition is the Evangelist's. This is so because the dramatic pronouncement in Mt 19.9 nicely concludes the controversy dialogue and silences the opponents, and because the disciples were not mentioned at the introduction of this dialogue and play no part in the discussion.

The First Evangelist records that the disciples' reaction to Jesus' marriage teaching is both amazement and dismay - "If this is the case of husband and wife, then it is not profitable to marry!"[187] This may be called a typical reaction from a group of Jewish men used to having the freedom of both polygamy and divorce. That the First Evangelist places this reaction here is another indication that he did not intend the exceptive clause to mean that Jesus was siding with the School of Shammai in the rabbinic debate. The verb συμφέρω perhaps indicates the common Jewish view of marriage as essentially a property transaction

between the groom (including his father) and the bride's father in which both hoped to profit financially and otherwise (through the birth of children).[188] On the other hand, it may mean that the disciples were saying it is better not to marry in such a case because of the difficulties of remaining faithful to or keeping the loyalty of one's spouse.

The response, "Not all can accept (understand) this word but only to those to whom it is given" follows. Does the phrase "this word" refer to Jesus' teaching on marriage and divorce in 19.3-9, or the disciples' reaction to that teaching in 19.10? On the whole it seems likely that the Evangelist intends for "this word" to refer to Jesus' previous teaching and is implying that it is given only to some to follow His strict teaching on marriage and divorce.[189] The question then immediately arises - What of those to whom this word is not given? What other option is there to lifelong marital fidelity?

Jesus answers, "Some are born εὐνοῦχοι from their mother's womb, and some are made εὐνοῦχοι by other men, and some make themselves εὐνοῦχοι for the sake of the Kingdom." The eunuch was well-known in various oriental cults and often served in royal houses as a guardian of a king's concubines.[190] Jesus' disciples would be familiar with such men through contacts with people from Syria, Asia Minor, or Northern Africa. But it is more likely that they would have met or heard of the celibates of the Qumran community.[191] The attitudes toward sexuality and celibacy reflected in such cults and communities were not compatible with the mainstream of rabbinic thinking since most rabbis found castrated men abhorrent and viewed non-castrated celibates as violators of God's commandment to procreate.[192] It is likely that Jesus' teaching on eunuchs was as shocking to the disciples as His instructions on marriage and divorce.

There are some difficulties in regard to the meaning of εὐνοῦχος, The word ἄγαμος usually is used of someone who simply lives a celibate life. The selection of the word εὐνοῦχος is remarkable because for the Jewish, as well as the Greek, listener it has a very negative connotation. The man who is simply an unmarried single is never called εὐνοῦχος in classical literature; this appears first in Christian literature.[193] Normally, a person known as a eunuch was one incapable or unfit for marriage through castration, deformity, etc. Clearly, this is the subject in 19.12a and 12b. The Evangelist's audience would likely have understood the term literally in v 19c as well.[194] It is not likely, however, that Jesus or the Evangelist was advocating literal self-

mutilation, though Origen at first thought so.[195] The following arguments may be adduced against such a deduction: 1) In view of His Jewish background, it is likely that Jesus would have found literal castration abhorrent. 2) There is no evidence that Jesus had any sympathy with asceticism for its own sake; 3) the use of the term εὐνοῦχος in early Christian literature (Clement of Alexandria) of 'spiritual eunuchs', a sense unknown in classical or Hellenistic Greek, requires an adequate explanation.[196] It is doubtful that it is adequate to suggest that the usage simply derived from the three verses in Matthew 19 under present scrutiny since it appears in Clement's discussion about castrated household servants and their lust, not about abstinence for the kingdom's sake. 4) In regard to the Evangelist's view, it appears that his inclusion of the (likely authentic) phrase "for the Kingdom's sake" clarifies matters. It has also been suggested that the First Evangelist distinguished between the first two types of eunuchs and the last by the use of a paratactic καί before the third class. It may be that the phrase, "the one who can accept this should accept it" in 19.12 implies in itself that we are talking about a spiritual gift from God, and thus not a physical act undertaken by man on his own. Only those to whom it is given can accept such a calling.[197]

The structure of this saying on eunuchs from a Jewish perspective proceeds from least objectionable (eunuchs by nature) to more objectionable (man-made eunuchs whether by crime or as punishment for a crime), to most objectionable (self-made eunuchs). The saying builds to a climax, and the third group of eunuchs is marked out in a special way from the other two groups. When Jesus says, "The one who is able to accept this", He implies that His words are addressed to those who have an option, unlike the eunuchs of vv 12a and 12b. Blinzler suggests we should translate 19.12, "There are those who are born unfit for marriage from their mother's womb, there are those who are made unfit for marriage by men, and there are those who have made themselves unfit for marriage for the sake of the kingdom of heaven."[198] The key to understanding 19.12 is in the phrase "for the sake of the Kingdom". "The motivation for accepting the celibate life...was eschatological."[199] Jesus' views of this subject and those of the Qumran community are similar in this respect. But the reason for renouncing marriage or family in Jesus' teaching has nothing to do with ritual purity or the idea that sexual relations made one impure (as the Qumranites taught).[200]

As Jeremias points out, the phrase εὐνούχισαν ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν has no parallels in the language of Jesus' contemporaries, though it has some similarities to other parts of Jesus' teaching.[201] While there is a close connection between Mk 10.28-30 and the eunuch teaching, they are probably not the same in meaning. The word εὐνούχισαι is never used to refer to a disciple's past, once-for-all decision to give up everything to follow Jesus. Rather, in our text it refers specifically either to the giving up of the right to marry for the sake of the Kingdom, or less probably to the giving up of one's family for the sake of the Kingdom. In short, it is the decision to follow Jesus that precipitates the renunciation of marriage or family, but the two decisions are not synonymous.[202]

Jesus thus provides two alternatives for His disciples: some are given the gift to be joined by God as husband and wife and to live in exclusive monogamy to the glory of God; others are able to make themselves eunuchs for the sake of the Kingdom because God has enabled them to do so. In neither option is obeying God's word or following Jesus absent. Schweizer says, "Er kann ebenso vom Gehemnis der unauflöslichen Ehe wie vom Geheimnis der Ehelosigkeit reden und beide worte können echte Jesus worte sein."[203] Jesus thus rejected the rabbinic teaching that marriage and propagation were a divine imperative enjoined on all normal men (and all women, according to some rabbis). Possibly, it was Jesus' teaching on eunuchs for the Kingdom that allowed women to be present among the traveling company of disciples (Lk 8.1-3), and to remain single and serve the community of faith (Ac 21.9). In any event, it is clear that Jesus' reasons for giving such teaching were because of His view of the radical claims of the Kingdom, not ascetical tendencies in His thoughts. That Jesus offers two equally valid callings, either to life-long marriage or to being a eunuch for the Kingdom, is in itself evidence that Jesus did not have negative views about human sexuality or sexual relations in marriage. Nor did He accept the connection of holiness with abstention from sexual relations. There is no hint here that being a eunuch for the Kingdom was a higher or more holy calling than life-long marriage (unless one sees this teaching as a reply to the disciples' remark in 19.10).[204]

Jesus' teaching on marriage and the single life strikes an intriguing balance between old and new. His views remain patriarchal, but male headship for Jesus entails extra responsibility, not extra liberty (cf. Mt 5.27-32). . . . It is a vision where the creation order

and also the new demands of the Kingdom are appealed to in order to reform common misunderstandings in regard to God's will on divorce and marriage, children, and the family. It is a vision that Paul seems to have imbibed and implemented further some twenty years after the ministry of Jesus (cf. 1 Cor 11.2-9). In light of the broad-based feeling in the Mediterranean during the days of the Roman Empire and even earlier about the duty of procreation, one must adequately explain why, in the community of Jesus' followers, singleness was seen as a viable option. It appears that the acceptance of the authenticity of Jesus' teaching on eunuchs, combined with His teaching on the primacy of the call to discipleship and to join His community, provides the best explanation of the origin of the attitude of the primitive Church.[205]

. . . . . .

4. Wives in the Resurrection - Mk 12.18-27, Mt 22.23-33, Lk 20.27-40

It has been said by NT scholars that Mk 12.18-27 and parallels tells us that Jesus expected an existence without sexual differences, without marriage, and without reproduction in the life to come.[206] Ladd's remarks illustrate this approach: "Here is a truly inconceivable order of existence. There are no human analogies to describe existence without the physiological and sociological bonds of sex and family."[207] It may be questioned whether this is either the clear meaning or the implication of this text.

The possibility that this passage is a post-Easter community formulation seems remote despite the claims of Bultmann and others that it is.[208] Consider the following reasons: 1) "In sekundärer Traditionsbildung werden nie (ausser in red Bearbeitung von Tradition bei Mt) die Sadduzäer als Gesprächspartner Jesus eingeführt...";[209] 2) in the discussions in the early Church about Resurrection, the focus was not on the angel's state but on the resurrected Lord (Rom 8.29 ,1 Cor 15.49 , Phil 3.21); 3) the 'fact' of resurrection was grounded not in Exod 3.6 but in Jesus' Resurrection (1 Cor 15.12 ff.) in the early community;[210] 4) it seems most unlikely that a Church-formulated debate on resurrection would have used as its starting and focal point a discussion of Levirate marriage which even in Jesus' day was falling into disuse;[211] 5) the question raised by the Sadducees probably falls into the category of a boruth,[212] a puzzling or mocking question often posed by Jews of Jesus' day to ridicule or expose a belief of a rabbi or an erroneous popular belief;[213] 6) the mention of angels likely reflects special knowledge of Sadducean beliefs on Jesus' part for they rejected the

existence of such beings.[214] Both in form and in content this pericope is thoroughly Jewish as is the way Jesus uses Scripture in this debate and thus it may safely be assigned to a Sitz im Leben Jesu.[215] Luke, however, has made some additions to his Marcan source at Lk 20.34-36 (and 38b-39). The Semitic style of vv 34-36 might point to the use of another source at this point or oral tradition, but it is usually thought more likely that this material is an example of Lucan expansion for the sake of explanation.[216] These verses then will only be treated as reflecting the thinking of the Third Evangelist.

The Synoptic accounts of this story are divided into three sections: 1) the Sadducees' question (Mk 12.18-23 and parallels); 2) Jesus' response about the nature of the resurrection state (Mk 12.24-25 and parallels); and 3) Jesus' response about the reality of the resurrection (Mk 12.26-27 and parallels). Only the first two sections concern us here. The question the Sadducees pose seems to be purely hypothetical.[217] The fact that Levirate marriage was in general disuse in Jesus' day, and the use by the Sadducees of the number seven (which may be a way of saying ad infinitum in this case),[218] seem to point in this direction. Usually, the sole purpose of Levirate marriage was to preserve a family name by propagation - a deceased man's brother would 'raise up a seed' for him.[219] After performing this obligation, he was not required to treat his brother's wife in the same way he would treat his own.[220] In the case put forward by the Sadducees, six brothers had tried and failed to sire a child for their dead brother and, furthermore, the widow was single at death having outlived all her mates. The Sadducees' question is predicated on the assumption that in the life to come there would be a continuity with this life in regard to the existence of marriage.[221] With their logic, if this continuity existed, then resurrection was ruled out, since no doctrine can be believed which confronts man with such an impossible situation as one woman having to choose between seven partners.[222]

Jesus responds, "You know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God."[223] Luke omits this sentence and alone adds, οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου γαμοῦσιν καὶ γαμίσκονται, οἱ δὲ καταξιωθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν....[224] All three Gospels go on to say that in the the resurrection people will neither marry nor be given in marriage. This is important on several accounts. The use of the terms γαμοῦσιν and γαμίζονται reveals that at least the Synoptists and probably, in their view, Jesus, accepted the distinctive roles men and women assumed in

their society in pursuing a marital union. The men, being the initiators, marry (γαμιοῦσιν), while the women are given in marriage (γαμίζονται).[225] These terms also reveal that the act of marrying, not necessarily the state of marriage, is under discussion. Thus, the text is saying, no more marriages will be made,[226] but this is not the same as saying that all existing marriages will disappear in the eschatological state. As noted, Jesus grounded marriages in an indissoluble union and in the creation order plan.[227] The difficulty here is to have the proper understanding of both the continuity and the discontinuity between this age and the next. If Jesus is answering the Sadducees' question in a specific way, then He is arguing against a certain view of continuity between this age and the next.

The Sadducees are arguing about a case of marriage for the sake of propagation and the preservation of a family name. If we may take a hint from Luke's redactional expansion and explanation in v 36 (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι δύνανται) of Jesus' statement,[228] the point of Jesus' remark about marrying is that in the resurrection state believers, like the angels, will not be able to die. Where there is no death, there is no need or purpose either to begin or to continue a Levirate marriage. The question the Sadducees raise is inapplicable to conditions in the new age. On this interpretation Jesus is answering specifically the case in point without necessarily saying anything about marriage apart from Levirate marriage.[229] Perhaps, like many of the rabbis, Jesus distinguished between marriage contracted purely for propagation and name preservation, and the normal form of marriage. Since the first marriage of this woman was not a Levirate marriage, then perhaps it is not dealt with in this discussion. Elsewhere Jesus recognized that non-Levirate marriage had a more substantial origin, purpose, and nature than merely the desire to propagate and maintain a family name.

Jesus does say there will be no more marrying in the next age (probably of any sort for any reason). In this cessation of marrying we are ὡς ἄγγελοι (Matthew, Mark).[230] The meaning of this comparison is not elaborated upon except in Lk 20.36 (a redactional addition). Nowhere in the Synoptic accounts of this debate are we told that we become sexless, without gender distinctions like the angels, or that all marital bonds created in this age are dissolved in the next.[231] The concept of the <u>bodily</u> resurrection indicates that there is some continuity between this age and the next which leaves the door open for continuity in the existence of marriage.

J. Denney seems correct when he asserts that Jesus is concerned to deny "...that there will be any natural relation out of which the difficulty of the Sadducees could arise."[232] It is even conceivable that Jesus does not answer the Sadducees' question at all, but simply shows that because of the discontinuity of this age with the next, their question is meaningless and built on false presuppositions.[233]

In conclusion, our text argues that the act of marrying will cease in the life to come. It does not follow that Jesus or the Gospel writers envisioned the dissolution of all marriages in the resurrection, or that mankind will live a sexless, genderless existence in that age. Such ideas are imported into the text on the basis of the statement that we will be like the angels which, if Luke's addition is a correct interpretation, refers to the righteous attaining a deathless, not sexless, state. That Jesus is arguing for resurrection shows that He sees at least one point of continuity between the two ages - a body in some sense. Possibly, Jesus believed that death dissolved all marital bonds, as later Christian tradition argued, but this text does not say so explicitly. Jesus' handling of the Sadducees' question likely indicates a negative evaluation of Levirate marriage. This would further support His attempts to give a woman greater security and dignity in a normal marriage, and give her the freedom to feel that raising up a seed through Levirate marriage was not a necessity. More certainly, the Gospel writers and possibly Jesus had no objections to the patriarchal marital procedure in which the man initiates a marriage and the woman is given in marriage.

B. Women in the Parables of Jesus

1. The Obstinate Widow and the Obdurate Judge - Lk 18.1-8

Perhaps no form of Jesus' teaching has received closer scrutiny or more diverse treatment than His parables. The lack of uniformity, either in the means or in the results of parable interpretation, has not deterred scholars from trying to make sense of these vignettes which make up about one-third of Jesus' reported teaching.[234] If, as A. M. Hunter suggests, the parables were "Jesus' justification of his mission to the last, the least, and the lost", then it is not at all surprising that women figure prominently in some of them.[235] Lk 18.1-8, a parable unique to the Third Gospel, lends credibility to Hunter's assertion, and gives us occasion to explore further Jesus' attitude toward widows.

The parable of the obstinate widow and the obdurate judge is the first of two passages in Luke 18 which, according to the Evangelist, deals with prayer. Luke's penchant for male-female parallelism comes to the fore here in that Lk 18.1-8 has an oppressed woman, and 18.9-14 a despised man (tax gatherer) as prayer models. This procedure betrays much about Luke's purpose in writing his Gospel, since we find this male-female parallelism throughout his work, not just in the pairing parables.[236] "Other than as a pedagogical device for repetition, there is no apparent reason for stating the same message twice except to choose examples that would make the message clearly understandable to different groups - the female and male listeners."[237] What emerges is Luke's desire to show that women are equally objects of God's salvation, and equally good illustrations of God's dealings with mankind.

The critical problems this parable raises are two-fold and must be dealt with briefly at this point. It is sometimes argued that this parable was not originally or not mainly eschatological in its tenor. This view, while recognizing the clear eschatological statement in 18.8, treats it either as a later addition to the parable (which does not relate to its essential message),[238] or as a specific eschatological warning meant to enforce the more general message about persisting in prayer.[239] Against this view, however, is the fact that the theme of ἐκδίκησις, present throughout the parable and its application, points to an eschatological message as does the central theme of the widow prevailing after a long time (ἐπὶ χρόνον).[240] This favors seeing this parable as a unity. Further, a recent and thorough form-critical study of this pericope has demonstrated convincingly the inherent unity of 18.2-8,[241] and on the basis of linguistic considerations Jeremias no longer considers any of 18.6-8 secondary.[242] It is best to recognize the eschatological elements present in both parable and application, while realizing that 18.1 is probably only a general introduction created by Luke intending to stress the message of persistence in prayer, whether or not one is experiencing the Messianic woes.[243]

The second critical problem raised by the parable is that it is sometimes thought to be a variant or twin of Lk 11.5-8. Both passages do treat persistence in prayer and its efficacy, but in many other regards they are different: 1) Lk 11.5-8 is devoid of eschatological elements or context; 2) in Lk 11.5-8 a friendly neighbor is being asked, not an obdurate judge; 3) in Lk 11.5-8 the man asking is not being oppressed, nor is he asking for ἐκδίκησις for himself; 4) in 11.5-8 the problem is

not so much the neighbor's real unwillingness to help (unlike Lk 18.1-8), but the time he is asked. Thus, in Lk 11.5-8 persistence in prayer is inculcated primarily by comparison between the human and divine situation; whereas, in Lk 18.1-8 persistence in prayer is based on the contrast between the character of the unjust judge and God.[245] One must, however, bear in mind that the Evangelist is possibly shaping this parable in light of Sirach 35.12-18.[246]

Lk 18.2-8 is important for our study firstly because Jesus' choice of a <u>woman</u> in need of help as an <u>example</u> for His disciples perhaps indicates Jesus' sympathy and concern for this particular group of people in a male-oriented society, and secondly because the aspect of this woman's behavior that Jesus focuses on (her perseverance or persistence) is a characteristic that in a patriarchal society was often seen as a negative attribute in a woman (cf. Prov 19.13b M.T.).
The parable should be seen as a struggle between the widow and the judge. for the widow's real adversary (ἀντίδικος) plays no part in the story except as a necessary presupposition.[247] If Derrett is correct in holding that we are dealing with a case in an administrative, not religious, court, then it is probable that we are to understand that the widow's opponent has preceded her to the court in order to bribe the judge.[248] The judge, not being a righteous man,[249] not caring about God's or man's opinion of him,[240] was ruled only by self-interest and self-preservation. It is unlikely that the widow had anything to offer the judge, and so her case looked hopeless. Her only asset was her persistence; thus, she ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτὸν.[251] She did not ask for vengeance, but vindication of her claims to her own belongings, or perhaps protection from her oppressor.[252] The wicked judge successfully resisted her continual pleading for some time,[253] but finally she began to bother him. The judge feared the woman might εἰς τέλος[254] ἐρχομένη ὑπωπιάζῃ με. There are those who think that ὑπωπιάζω is to be taken literally - the judge feared the woman would give him a black eye and he wanted no such conflict or the disgrace that would follow from it.[255] Others believe it means 'to annoy', 'to wear out' - the judge did not relish being bothered continually and was worn out by her pleading.[256] Finally, Derrett believes it is a metaphorical phrase meaning 'to black the face', 'to disgrace',[257] but this presupposes that the judge did care what men thought of him. It is more likely that the judge was tired of being bothered by the widow and. to get rid of her, gives her what she desires.

The case of the widow is like the case of the disciples. Thus, Jesus says, "Listen to what the unrighteous judge says."[258] The disciples are continually (ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός)[259] crying to God. They are left alone in a world that oppresses and opposes them, but the attitude of God is not like that of the wicked judge. Jesus argues, if this wicked judge will vindicate this woman, how much more will the good God vindicate His own elect.[260] Jesus indicates that the disciples' only hope of attaining certain vindication is by being persistent at all times, pleading for God's coming and the faith to be ready. For this task, which they have during the interim, they are given only the model of a destitute, resolute woman.[261]

2. The Search for the Lost Coin - Luke 15.8-10

The second parable of importance to our discussion also comes from Lukan material in chapters 15-19, a section which Manson has labeled, "The Gospel of the Outcast".[262] Though brief, Lk 15.8-10 is an interesting example of a parable which involves a woman, since Jesus is drawing an analogy between the activity of a female and that of Himself or of God.[263] Although it is true that we have three parables in Luke 15, all of which have a similar point about God's redemptive activity and His joy over the repentance of the lost, Plummer is correct in noting that the εἶπεν δέ in 15.11 clearly separates the story of the prodigal son from the two preceding parables.[264] This is why Jeremias can call the parables of the lost sheep and the lost coin, twin parables - they "...play on the contrast between man and woman, and perhaps between rich and poor."[265] Indeed, they play on the contrast between the roles men and women assumed in Jesus' time. But this contrast is meant neither to disparage either role, nor to elevate one above the other as more important; rather, it illustrates in a pointed fashion that both the activity of the man and the woman are equally admirable and important, and may equally well serve as analogies to the activity of God in Jesus' ministry.[266]

For various reasons including the fact that Lk 15.8-10 is uniquely Lukan, it has been suspected that this parable has been created either by the Christian community before Luke gathered this material,[267] or by Luke himself.[268] Against this it must be pointed out, as Bultmann admits, that the doubling of parables or parabolic phrases with similar meaning is a very old and widespread technique found even in the OT (cf. Jer 2.32, Is 1.22) and is especially common in Semitic writings.[269]

Thus, it is not sufficient as a ground for alleging that vv 8-10 are secondary to note that we have twin parables in vv 4-7, and 8-10. Jesus could easily have been responsible for the duplication and in view of evidence we have examined elsewhere in this chapter that Jesus made a point of using male and female examples to teach the same point, it is quite plausible that we have another 'pair'formed by Jesus here. Favoring this view is the fact that, "The thought and situation in the parable are Palestinian."[270] There are, however, some signs of Lukan editing and stylistic retouching,[271] and the language of this parable is more Lukan than its immediate predecessor in chapter 15. The application in v 10 is possibly secondary; however, the parable does require some sort of application and we would expect it to end with something like, 'rejoicing over the finding of one lost sinner' rather than with ἐπὶ ἑνὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι (if v 10 was a later addition). Verses 8-10 then will likely reveal something of Jesus' and Luke's attitude toward women.[272]

At the beginning we are told of a woman who had ten drachmas but had lost one. Jeremias suggests that the ten coins were the woman's dowry and may have been worn by her on her headdress.[273] If so, she was poor and her diligent search for the coin is understandable. It may also mean that Luke wishes to contrast this poor woman with the preceding shepherd who, with his one hundred sheep, would have been financially comfortable. This woman would lose the equivalent of a day's wages if she did not find the coin;[274] thus, she commences a thorough search of her dark, windowless, oriental home. She seeks carefully, leaving no corner uninspected until she finds the coin. The woman's reaction to this discovery was joy so great that despite her impecunity she called her women friends and neighbors because she wished to share her joy with them, perhaps in a small celebration.[275]

To this point, Jesus has presented only His human analogy to the theological point He wishes to make. He concludes by making the point of comparison plain - γίνεται χαρὰ ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ ἑνὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι. Is Jesus intending to compare this woman's activities with those of God the Father or His own? While the last verse indicates that the rejoicing takes place in heaven, Hunter remarks, "...the three great parables of Luke 15...are all ripostes to scribes and Pharisees who had criticized Jesus for consorting with publicans and sinners."[276] Thus, it is better not to distinguish the work of the Father and the Son here. God's redeeming activity, especially of

'the lost', was manifested supremely in the person and ministry of Jesus - the fruit of His labor causes joy in heaven.[277]

Summing up what this parable has to say about women, we note that Jesus' choice of this housewife (perhaps a widow)[278] as an example showed that women (15.8-10), as well as men (15.1-7), and their work were considered by Jesus to be equally good points of analogy to describe the activity of the heavenly Father in finding the lost. It also reflects a concern on Jesus' part to convey the Good News in terms with which women could identify.[279]

3. The Leaven and the Dough - Mt 13:33 (Lk 13:20-21)

The Parable of the leaven follows that of the mustard seed in both Matthew and Luke, but not in Mark. The two parables may have been an original pair from which Mark (and the Gospel of Thomas) chose to use only one member. That Matthew and Luke have them together likely indicates that the mustard seed and the leaven parables were twins in the Q material. Matthew appears to have conflated material from Mark and Q while Luke shows no trace of influence from Mark except perhaps in the double introduction.[280] Kümmel argues that the reasons usually given for assuming that these two parables were not an original pair (that Mark omits a member and that the mustard seed and seed growing secretly are juxtaposed in Mark, and the new introduction) are insufficient and wholly formal.[281] This is probably a correct conclusion for it is quite possible that Mark created the juxtaposition of the two seed parables in question and an introductory formula was commonly used in Jewish circles to introduce any parable.

As we have them together in Matthew and Luke, these two parables draw analogies between the functions and roles of men and women, and the nature of the Kingdom. The former focuses on the external labor of a man planting a seed; the latter depicts the indoor work of a woman putting leaven in dough. The presence of this complementary male-female parallelism may favor the view that these two parables were told originally as twins since, as Jeremias says, "Jesus himself favoured the reduplication of similes as a means of illustration."[282] If such twins do convey the same message, then the reason for telling them would be related to the fact that a man is the focus in one, a woman in the other. This may imply that Jesus deliberately chose His illustrations so as to emphasize that the Good News was equally for men and women, and that their present roles and functions were equally good and positive points of analogy to His work.[283]

Beyond this only a few other remarks need to be made. Firstly, it is a γυνή who puts the leaven in the dough. This is not unexpected considering that it was 'woman's work' to make the bread.[284] Since Jesus is drawing a positive analogy between a woman's work and His own crucial work of preaching (leavening the whole world with the leaven of the Gospel), this would seem to indicate that Jesus presupposed the worth of such 'woman's work'.[285] Secondly, the leaven which this woman took is hidden in σάτα τρία ἀλεύρου. The last word refers to wheat flour or meal,[286] but the surprising thing is the amount of meal - no less than 0.5 bushel,[287] which could likely feed one hundred people.[288] This may be a case of comic exaggeration since normally no housewife would bake so much bread.[289] Jeremias argues that this is an eschatological touch added to the original parable at some point in the transmission of the tradition.[290] It is more likely that the three measures are part of the original parable because it is not the leaven (Kingdom agent) which is qualified here, but the dough, and this may be part of the comic effect.[291] Funk suggests that we see this as a baking for a festive occasion of significant proportions.[292] If Jesus is implying by the huge amount of dough that this is a baking for a special offering or occasion, then reversal of expectations may be intended by mentioning the leaven and the woman, for it is the priest who bakes the unleavened cakes for special offerings.[293] Thus, perhaps not only the dynamic action of the leaven,[294] but also the amount of meal and who prepares it may tell us something of the nature, the participants, and the results of the eschatological Kingdom. With this parable Jesus reassures His followers that however small and insignificant the Kingdom may appear now, God/Jesus/Kingdom, like the woman/leaven, will not cease working until the whole lump is permeated.[295]

4. The Wise and Foolish Virgins - Mt 25.1-13

If in Mt 13.33 (Lk 13.20-21) it is possible that a reference to a Kingdom celebration is implicit, then this celebration is explicit in Mt 25.1-13, and our discussion of women in Jesus' parables would not be complete without an examination of this uniquely Matthean text. Mt 25.1-13, from the point of view of a study of women and their roles, is somewhat anomalous - "It is the only place in the Gospels where Jesus utters any criticism either direct or in metaphorical language against women."[296] While this is not quite accurate, it is true that this parable is singular in both its commendation of some women (the wise) and its condemnation of others (the foolish).[297]

Mt 25.1-13 may be a twin to the parable of the talents (Mt 25. 14-30). If so, it involves the complementary male-female parallelism found in Luke, and it intimates the equality of male and female in regard both to God's blessings and banes, and to their ability to be included in or excluded from the Kingdom.[298] W. D. Ridley, remarking on these twin parables, notes the "...contrast between the man-side and the woman-side of human nature pervades the two parables, and appears to have a distinctive purpose."[299] In the talents parable, the interval is depicted as one of labor; in Mt 25.1-13 it is a period of waiting. "There, judgement comes to the slothful; here to those women who are not prepared. There the question is one of the outer life; here of the inner life....There of action; here of insight."[300] Thus, we see the Evangelist drawing on the common roles, joys, and anxieties which Jewish women had in his day in order to make a point to the followers of Jesus about the eschatological coming of the Bridegroom.[301]

A difficulty arises when one tries to determine what the original form of this parable was and whether any of it derived from Jesus Himself. The parable begins with the word τότε, a favorite of Matthew, which links this pericope back to the time framework in the preceding section and forward to the future coming of the Bridegroom.[302] Many difficulties are solved when one recognizes that v 1 is an introductory remark of the Evangelist explaining the theme of the parable and not an actual part of the narration itself.[303] Then too, one should perhaps see v 13 as the Evangelist's moralizing conclusion for his audience.

Klostermann and Bultmann argue that there is, "...in der vorliegenden Form eine völlig von Allegorie überwucherte Bildung..."[304] Bultmann claims that the allegory was constructed out of its application but that the creator misinterpreted Jewish wedding customs in doing so.[305] In regard to the latter point it appears that Jeremias has shown that the presentation of the wedding customs is accurate even in details.[306] In regard to the matter of allegory it can no longer be assumed that Jesus Himself did not allegorize some of the parables and stories he told. As R. E. Brown points out, "...there is no really sharp distinction between parable and allegory in the Semitic mind....Therefore, there is no reason to believe that Jesus of Nazareth in His <u>meshalim</u> ever made a distinction between parable and allegory."[307] Thus, "...there is no ground for denying on principle that these allegorizing features were Jesus' own."[308] In regard to the parable under discussion we do not wish to deny that later interpreters of this example may have attempted to add

allegorical features to it. Indeed, it appears that the addition of καὶ τῆς νύμφης is an attempt to conform this parable to a more conventional and allegorical mode that the Church would recognize. The absence of the mention of any bride in vv 5, 6 makes it likely that καὶ τῆς νύμφης is such a later addition.[309] The reference to the bridegroom in this parable, however, should probably not be taken as a sign that it is a later Church formulation, as Kümmel rightly points out (cf. Mk 2.19a).[310] It is entirely possible that Jesus would refer to Himself in a veiled way in this parable as the bridegroom.

The other major difficulty in seeing this parable in its present form as authentic Jesus material is its eschatological orientation. Dodd and Jeremias both maintain that parable was originally a 'crisis' parable which has been rewritten to speak to an eschatological problem, i.e., the delay of the Parousia.[311] This presupposes that Jesus Himself could not have foreseen an interval between the completion of His earthly ministry and the eschaton, a matter about which there is no consensus among scholars. Kümmel and Marshall are probably right that in order to adopt the view of Dodd and Jeremias, one must jettison the bridegroom imagery about a coming person and indulge in wholesale rewriting.[312] Yet this parable has certain features involving the bridegroom imagery that point to its earliness. Some weight must be given to the fact that it is the bridesmaids, not the bride, that are presented as positive and negative examples for the audience. One must also take seriously the likelihood that Mk 2.19a indicates that Jesus did refer to Himself as the bridegroom and that this self-identification led to the use in 2 Cor 11.2 and later tradition. Then too the joyful nature of the event does not fit in with the idea that the parable is simply warning against a coming crisis; rather, it is an encouragement to be prepared so that one may participate in the Messianic banquet and not be left out.[313] We conclude then that there are enough indications that this parable (minus the Matthean introduction and application, vv 1, 13) is authentic Jesus material about the coming bridegroom and may be examined to see if incidentally it reveals anything about Jesus' view of women.

The first matter of significance for our purposes is that Jesus chose virgin maidens to illustrate His point about the saints being prepared, a choice possibly made because these virgins actually played a crucial part in the nuptial celebration which constitutes His illustration. They were always given the role of torch-bearers[314] in the torch-light procession to the groom's own house, and the nocturnal torch-

light celebration dance held outside that house.[315] Considering this role, the virgins' knowledge that the bridegroom might come at anytime, and their marital status, if they are unprepared their negligence is truly inexcusable. Jesus likens their role to that of the joyous role of the saints meeting and celebrating with the Bridegroom in the Kingdom.

The message of preparation is brought home in the illustration because the women were the bearers of torches which could burn for only about fifteen minutes at a time,[316] and thus it was incumbent upon them to bring extra oil because no one knew when the bridegroom would arrive. They were to wait in full preparation at the bride's house until that time. There is no criticism of the fact that these women fell asleep, for that was true of both the wise and the foolish virgins.[317] But one group slept the sleep of those who are prepared to leave at a moment's notice no matter how long the wait; the other group did not.[318] The main criticism is that the foolish virgins failed to come prepared with enough oil. There have been many speculations as to what the oil symbolized, but perhaps this is to over-allegorize. Those who have the extra oil are prepared; those without are not. This meant that the foolish virgins had to go for more oil, and thus they arrived at the groom's house too late to perform the role expected of them as is indicated by the fact that all the others are inside at the feast and the door is closed.[319] Obedience through proper preparation and fulfilling ones appointed role is necessary if one is to enter the feast.

Finally, this feast is not pictured as an all male feast, but one at which both men and women, bridegroom and bridesmaids, attend. This is not in conflict with what we know of Jewish meals of celebration such as a wedding or Passover feast.[320] Nevertheless, the presence of men and women at this feast could symbolize the equal position men and women have and will have in the Kingdom which Jesus brings. Jesus used the foolish virgins as negative examples, and the wise virgins as positive examples for His disciples. The wise virgins' preparedness to perform their roles is to be emulated if one wishes to partake in the marital feast when the Bridegroom returns.

C. Women and Female Imagery in the Judgment Sayings

Our survey of Jesus' attitudes toward women and their roles as reflected in His teaching would not be complete without an examination

of how women or female imagery figure in His sayings about the Last Judgment and the judgment on Jerusalem. What is significant about these last days teachings is that they reflect the same male-female parallelism, and the same equality of men and women as objects of God's salvation and judgment that we have found elsewhere in Jesus' teaching.

1. The Queen of the South - Mt 12.42 (Lk 11.31)

As we have seen in Mt 25.1-13, Jesus did not hesitate to use women as both positive and negative examples of God's dealing with mankind.[321] In the course of the presentation of the sign of Jonah, there are two illustrations to punctuate this declaration - the men of Nineveh, and the Queen of the South.[322] Schweizer suggests that the whole group of sayings (Mt 12.40-42/Lk 11.29-32) was an original unity to be traced back to Jesus,[323] with the possible exception of Mt 12.42b (Lk 11.32b, καὶ ἰδοὺ...). They were found together in the Q material by Matthew and Luke.[324]

The βασίλισσα νότου,[325] because of what follows about Solomon, is clearly the Queen of Sheba of OT fame. She came to Solomon "to test him with difficult questions" (1 Kgs 10.1, 2 Chr 9.1).[326] Since Jesus was being tested, His choice of the Queen of the South and Solomon was most apt for this occasion. Because of the way Jesus presents His reply, His listeners as part of this generation are in the end the ones being weighed in the balance: "The Queen of the South will rise at the judgment with the men of this generation and condemn them."[327] She will appear in court on Judgment Day as a key witness for the prosecution against this generation.[328] More importantly, her witness will not be thrown out of that final court as it probably would be in rabbinic Judaism; it will be accepted as a decisive testimony condemning this generation.[329] Even a Gentile woman compares favorably to Jesus' audience for she recognized the favor of Yahweh in Solomon's wise words and ways; yet, this generation cannot understand the greater wisdom which Jesus reveals about the inbreaking Kingdom. Here again is an illustration of a repeated Gospel motif - a woman (in this case, undesirable and foreign) being praised as exemplary in the presence of those who ought to be the examples, the Jews.[330]

2. The Final Separation - Lk 17.34-35 (Mt 24.40-41)

The discussion of the final separation in Luke 17 (cf. Matthew 24), likely Q material which both Matthew and Luke have drawn on, provides evidence that the Gospel tradition is concerned to show how

eschatological events affect both men and women. Possibly, as Bultmann avers,[331] one Evangelist has changed the original text of the Q material for while both Matthew and Luke give three examples of what will happen on Judgment Day,[332] Matthew's examples involve two in a field and two at a handmill, while Luke has two in a bed and two at a handmill.[333] The First Evangelist may have assimilated his picture to Mt 24.18. There are several indications of the earliness of the Lukan form of this material: 1) there is a freedom from parenetic expansion about watchfulness in view of the coming Judgment; 2) ὁ εἷς...ὁ ἕτερος may be a Semitism;[334] 3) ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί is likely original[335] and reflects Jewish expectations of Jesus' day about the time of day the Judgment would come.[336]

Characteristically Matthew describes the time as τότε ('then'), while Luke has ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ ('in that night'). In Luke's account, the two examples fit a nighttime setting - sleeping in a bed, and grinding with a handmill (which in ancient as in modern times is done by Jewish women shortly before dawn).[337] Though both Matthew and Luke describe their examples in terms of the genderless δύο, Luke likely intends us to see here one pair of men and one pair of women. This is conveyed by his use of ὁ εἷς... ὁ ἕτερος for the former pair, and ἡ μία...ἡ...ἑτέρα for the latter pair.[338] Using complementary parallelism, Luke wishes to make clear here as elsewhere that "man and woman stand side by side before God. They are equal in honor and grace",[339] and also equal in dishonor and disgrace, as half of each example reveals. Jesus' reference to women grinding is merely a descriptive statement drawing on the common roles women assumed in His own day to illustrate His point - it should not be taken as a prescriptive or even proleptic announcement of what their roles will be in 'that day'.[340] It may, however, tell us that Jesus thought some division of labor between male and female was natural and acceptable both in His own day and in the future.[341] The point of these examples is that both men and women are accountable before God as responsible human beings, and there will come a day when a person will either be taken into God's presence or left behind to face the wrath to come.[342]

3. The Mother and Daughters of Jerusalem - Part I: Mt 23.37-39 (Lk 13.34-35)

A judgment saying of a very different sort is to be found in Mt 23.37-39 (Lk 13.34-35), and it is relevant for our discussion because it involves the "Mother" of Jerusalem. In this passage, the

role of Jesus is conceived of in terms of feminine, albeit female animal, imagery.

There are three opinions about the origins of this saying: 1) that it came from a Jewish source and is an utterance of a supra-historical being called Wisdom;[343] 2) that it is a Christian formulation based on Jewish wisdom material;[343] and 3) that it is a genuine Jesus saying and that He used wisdom terminology to express His feelings about Jerusalem.[345] Haenchen rightly points out that while a wisdom saying may be in the background (cf. Prov 4.20-33) it is difficult to argue for a wisdom persona here.[346] The wisdom word is about a future sending of prophets, but here the sending is a past act. Then too the imagery of a bird (not a wisdom persona) gathering in its young is often ascribed to God or the Shekinah in Jewish literature.[347] Bultmann himself admits that the surviving fragments of Jewish wisdom speculation that we have do not say that Wisdom as she departed referred to her coming judgment.[348] The wisdom view is partially based on the questionable assumption that Mt 23.37-39 is a continuation of Mt 23. 34-36. It is not usually Luke's practice to break-up his sources and we find the Lukan version of Mt 23.34-36 at Lk 11.49-51.[349] It is Matthew especially who is noted for grouping related material together on a topical or 'Stichwort' basis. Against the view that we have a late Christian formulation is the fact that Burney and Manson have shown that Mt 23.37-39/Lk 13.34-35 appears to be a reproduction of a saying originally in Aramaic with kina or dirge rhythm.[350] As M'Neile points out the third view has a certain advantage for, "...there is nothing which forbids the whole passage to be understood as an exclamation by Jesus Himself."[351] Even the identification of Jesus and the Coming One in v 35b is cryptic enough to discourage the suggestion that it originated in the Christian community rather than on Jesus' lips. It is possible, however, that in the Q material God was the subject of ἠθέλησα.[352] Apart from this it appears we have a saying of Jesus here that has come down to us with little alteration.[353]

The expression ὃν τρόπον ('in the manner which', 'just as') in both Matthew and Luke, makes clear that Jesus is speaking of a comparison of functions, not natures. He would have gathered in Jerusalem's children in the same manner as the mother bird gathers in her brood under her wings.[354] The expression by Jesus of His feminine role of gathering together the lost children of Israel and caring for them comes in the midst of His lament over Jerusalem. Matthew and Luke have placed this apostrophe in very different portions of their Gospel.[355]

When Jesus says, "'Ιερουσαλὴμ 'Ιερουσαλὴμ you who kill the prophets and stone those sent to you, how often I have longed to gather your children together as a hen gathers her chicks under her wings, but you were not willing,"[356] we are reminded of the lament of God over His wayward children in Hosea or, since feminine imagery is used here, Rachel weeping for her lost children.[357] It should not be overlooked that Jesus takes on a role normally performed by a Jewish woman of publicly and proleptically mourning for Jerusalem.[358] Also, Jesus chooses here one of the most proverbially gender distinctive and instinctive roles a woman or female animal takes when He describes His desires in terms of a mother's care and protection, which may tell us something of how He felt about a loving mother's role.[359]

4. The Mother and Daughters of Jerusalem - Part II: Lk 23.27-31

Lk 23.27-31, a passage unique to Luke, raises several critical problems which must be discussed before we exegete this material. It has been argued by Bultmann that vv 29-31 record a Christian prophecy placed on Jesus' lips. He appears to maintain that this prophecy came from an Aramaic speaking community and thus is old, though not authentic, Jesus material.[360] Since this is material peculiar to Luke it could also be argued that it is his own composition reflecting his interest in Jesus' attitudes toward women. Against the latter assumption are the various elements Bultmann points out that indicate an Aramaic original.[361] In addition, Taylor lists καὶ ὡς (temporal), the vocative θυγατέρες 'Ιερουσαλήμ ἐρεῖν; ἄρχομαι with infinitive, στραφεὶς κλαίειν (twice), and the impersonal plural ποιοῦσιν (which is likely an Aramaism) as elements that point to a pre-Lukan source.[362] Against the view that we have a Christian prophecy are several factors: 1) The conduct of Jesus and of the women in this incident may be described as true to Jewish life in Jesus' day and true to the characteristic way Jesus showed selfless concern for others.[363] 2) The saying in v 31 is most likely proverbial as it has certain parallels to other Semitic Jewish proverbs of a somewhat enigmatic nature.[364] The question then becomes, were early Christian prophets in the practice of citing or adapting enigmatic Jewish proverbs in their prophecies, and did the early Christian community place such enigmatic sayings on Jesus' lips? Against answering this last question affirmatively is the fact that many of the major concerns of the early Church are not addressed in the Jesus material. If the point of placing such

sayings on Jesus' lips was so that the living voice of Jesus could address current concerns clearly, then this text does not seem to fulfill that purpose. Thus, it appears that the objections to seeing this passage as deriving from a Sitz im Leben Jesu fall short of conviction. It must, however, be borne in mind that the saying in v 30 is based on the LXX version of Hosea 10.8 and it is possible that Is 54.1 in some form is in the background of v 29 (though if so, the meaning is considerably altered).[365] In regard to v 30, it is likely that Luke has conformed the quotation to the version of the OT with which he (and perhaps his audience) was most familiar. The allusions in v 29 and the proverb in v 31 could derive from Jesus Himself for He was well-versed in the Scriptures and traditions of His people.[366]

Jesus, who had lamented and wept over the fate of Jerusalem, now reaches the point on His own via dolorosa where the daughters of Jerusalem lament for Him. We are told that He was followed by πολὺ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ γυναικῶν αἳ ἐκόπτοντο καὶ ἐθρήνουν αὐτόν. These two groups are seen by Luke as distinct entities. It is the women alone who are said to be mourning and wailing, and it is to them that Jesus addresses His comments.[367] It was not uncommon for Jews to mourn prior to a death,[368] especially if they were relatives of the one mourned, or if he was a famous person whose death would mean a great loss.[369] But we know of no instance where professional mourners were called upon to perform their task proleptically. Also, it is unlikely that Luke intends us to think that they θυγατέρες Ἰερουσαλήμ are the women mentioned in Lk 8.1-3 as Jesus' traveling companions,[370] though it is conceivable that they were followers of Jesus who lived in the Jerusalem area and were with Him only when He visited the city. It has also been suggested that they were local women who traveled out to witness executions and provide opiates for the condemned man.[371] It seems most probable that these women were inhabitants of Jerusalem who were sympathetic to Jesus and grieved at His present plight. Their act was a spontaneous show of their feelings, but it was also a dangerous one, for the Jews did not permit such public crying and wailing for a criminal.[372]

Jesus addresses them as a group that will share the destiny of Jerusalem.[373] In view of what is about to happen to their homes and families, he suggests that they should weep for themselves and for their own children, not for Him. Jesus (perhaps drawing on Is 54.1-2), says

to these women, "Behold, the time will come when you will say 'Blessed are the barren women, the wombs that never bore, and the breasts that never nursed!'"[374] He is not saying that barrenness or childlessness is in itself a blessing, only that in 'that day' one's blessings become one's burdens, and thus those without children are better off.[375] Jesus knew well that for these daughters of Jerusalem their children were their greatest delight, and thus His address to them is dramatic and appropriate. The loss of their children will lead them to ultimate despair, to cry out for a speedy death. "They will say to the mountains, 'fall on us,' and to the hills, 'cover us.'"[376]

Jesus leaves these women, who represent the heart of the old Israel, with a question - If an innocent man cannot escape the judgment, what will happen to guilty Israel, a hollow, rotting tree fit only for a fiery consummation?[377] Even in the waning minutes of His earthly ministry, Jesus shows His concern for women by identifying with their plight, for they too must face suffering and judgment as He does now.

D. Jesus' Attitude Toward Women Reflected in His Words

Having completed our examination of the teaching of Jesus as it bears on women and their roles, we can draw some conclusions. Some of Jesus' teaching is provocative and stands in contrast to many commonly held views of His day. For instance, Jesus' teaching on filial piety, as it relates to the matter of corban, stands in contrast to what we know of rabbinic attitudes about vows and oaths. In this teaching Jesus rejects allowing vows to interfere with one's duty to honor parents, and thus rejects rabbinic tradition which would not permit the annulment of such vows. The effect of this teaching is to strengthen the traditional family structure and intensify a child's obligation to honor both mother and father. That Jesus affirms the mother's right to respect and material support from her children reflects Jesus' high estimation and appreciation of both the personhood and role of the mother. Further, there may be implicit in Jesus' unreservedly positive attitudes about children, a positive estimation of women in their role of child-bearer.

Further evidence of Jesus' appreciation of and desire to strengthen the physical family structure surfaces in Jesus' teaching on marriage, divorce, and adultery. In contrast to common rabbinic teaching, Jesus does not warn men against the wiles of loose women, but against their own lust and aggression that leads women into sin

(Mt 5.27-28). Both the responsibility and the onus for such sin is placed on the male, and consideration is given to the woman, the more often suspected party in a male-oriented society. What is intriguing about this teaching is that it is not only a reaffirmation of man's leadership and responsibility for the community welfare, but also an attempt to liberate women from a social stereotype. Jesus does not approve of a system where a man's lust is not taken as seriously as a woman's seduction. As in Matthew 5, we find in Jn 7.53-8.11 a critique of men who fail to live up to their responsibility of being paradigms of virtue for the community. The net effect of Jesus' teaching on marriage and divorce is that the traditional family structure not only is reaffirmed but also strengthened through the intensification of the demands made on a husband's fidelity and the rejection of divorce outright. This teaching gives women greater security in marriage. By appealing to the creation plan and the one-flesh union, Jesus equally rejects male and female promiscuity and freedom to divorce, thus requiring a standard of fidelity and life-long partnership that goes beyond much of the teaching of the rabbis on this subject. No other rabbi spoke of a man committing adultery against his former wife by remarriage.

While Jesus was countering stereotypes of women as temptresses and giving them a more secure basis from which to operate in their traditional roles, He also gave a teaching on singleness which allowed some believers to live and work in roles apart from those involved in the traditional family structure. It is not clear whether or not Jesus ever rejected specifically the rabbinic mandate that all (or at least all men) who are able must be fruitful and multiply; but clearly this teaching on eunuchs for the Kingdom and some of the more radical statements on the cost of discipleship reflect a new attitude toward the single person. We have conjectured that it was Jesus' teaching on eunuchs and the cost of discipleship that allowed some women to be present among Jesus' traveling company (Lk 8.1-3). It is also possible that the teaching in Mt 19.10-12 provided the precedent for women in the Christian community to be allowed to remain single and serve the community (Ac 21.9). It is true that Jesus' views remained patriarchal, but male headship for Jesus meant extra responsibility, not extra privilege (cf. Mt 5.27-32). Jesus appealed to the creation plan and the new demands of the Kingdom in order to reform common misunderstandings in regard to God's will about marriage, divorce, children, and the family.

Lest the impression be given that Jesus wished to strengthen the traditional family structure as an end in itself, it must be affirmed that all His teaching on such subjects is conditioned by the demands of discipleship. The physical family must be seen in light of the context of the higher priorities of the family of faith. As we shall see, the basis of the new Kingdom community is not kinship ties, but association between disciples and Master, disciple and disciple (cf. below on Mk 3.33-35). While some rabbis recognized that discipleship had higher claims than one's family for men, it is doubtful whether anyone before Jesus taught this principle to women (cf. below on Lk 10.38-42). That Jesus gave positive teaching on the physical family implies that He thought there was no necessary conflict between the demands of the family of faith and of the physical family so long as the latter was oriented to serve rather than to sever the former. All of this is most significant in its effects on women and their roles since it is clear that they are called to be disciples first and foremost, and their roles as wives or mothers then necessarily become subordinate, or at least oriented so as not to interfere with the demands of discipleship.

It is not clear whether or not Jesus thought that marital relations would cease in the age to come. Probably, He saw marrying and propagating as ceasing when the Kingdom was consummated, but this does not necessarily entail the dissolution of the marital bond in all respects. In any event, it is clear that Jesus rejected those views of the rabbis in which the age to come is envisioned as simply this age on a grander scale. Jesus' sayings involving widows give us a picture of His concern for a particular disadvantaged group of women. Jesus shows equal concern for the plight of widows with property as for those who were impoverished. It is perhaps fair to say that Jesus' concern for widows is not merely one facet of His concern for the poor and disenfranchised (Mk 12.40, Mk 12.41-44).

A more indirect source of information about Jesus' attitude toward women may be found in His parables, and the eschatological sayings. For instance, in the parable of the obstinate widow and the obdurate judge (Lk 18.1-8) we see manifested not only a concern for a widow, but also a desire to present even indigent (even nagging or annoying) women as models in at least one regard for the behavior of the disciples. We noted the elements of reversal of expectations or roles involved in such sayings. In addition, while Luke stresses male-female parallelism more than the other Evangelists, there are good reasons for thinking that Jesus Himself deliberately indulged in the pairing: of sayings with

a similar message - one directed to females, and the other to males. In this manner, both Jesus and especially Luke indicate their desire to see women as equally worthy to be examples, equally objects of God's grace, and equally an accepted part of their audiences. There are also parables and sayings where Jesus likens God's or even His own redemptive activities to the everyday activities of women (Lk 15.8-10) and even a female animal (Mt 23.37-39 and parallels). The parable of the lost coin and the leaven (Lk 15.8-10, Mt 13.33/Lk 13.20-21) show that Jesus took care to express His Kingdom message so that women would be able to identify with it immediately. The parable of the wise and foolish virgins uses women as both positive and negative examples for Jesus' disciples, and there is perhaps a hint of a woman's right to participate in the Messianic banquet when the Bridegroom returns for His own.

If women are envisioned equally with men as objects of God's grace and participants in the community of Jesus and the consummated Kingdom, then it is also true that such sayings as Lk 17.34-35 reveal that women are equally objects of God's judgment. Mt 12.42 and parallels indicates Jesus' readiness to refer even to a Gentile woman as a valid witness against men on the Day of Judgment, and His willingness to stress how God's ways are often the opposite of what men expect. What Jew would expect to be told that a Gentile queen would stand as a witness against his generation? Lk 23.27-31 may be meant as an example of how Jesus identified with a woman's plight (in this case, a future plight).

Jesus' teaching relating to women and their roles is sometimes radical, sometimes reformational, and usually controversial in its original setting. Even when Luke wrote his Gospel, it is likely that the very reason he felt a need to stress male-female parallelism and Jesus' positive statements about women was that his own audience had strong reservations about some of Jesus' views on the subject. The case for women being seen as equal objects of God's grace and equal examples for disciples, as well as being disciples, had still to be argued when Luke wrote his Gospel. All of this teaching prepares us for an examination of Jesus' actions, and His manner of relating to harlots, widows, small girls, foreign women, mothers, and women made unclean through illness or incapacitated through injury.

Chapter III: Endnotes

[1]For a general introduction to this subject, cf. the following: V. R. Mollenkott, Women, Men, and the Bible (Nashville, 1977); K. Stendahl, The Bible and the Role of Women (FBBS; Philadelphia, 1966); F. Leenhardt and F. Blanke, Die Stellung der Frau im Neuen Testament und in der alten Kirche (Zürich, 1949); Leipoldt, Die Frau; I. Brennan, "Women in the Gospels" New Blackfriars 52 (1971) 291-9; J. A. Grassi, "Women's Liberation: The New Testament Perspective", Living Light 8 (2, 1971) 22-34; C. F. Parvey, "The Theology and Leadership of Women in the New Testament", in Religion and Sexism, 117-49; J. Sanderson, "Jesus and Women", The Other Side 9:4 (July-August, 1973) 16-21, 35-6; L. Swidler, "Jesus was a Feminist", Catholic World 212 (1970-71) 177-83; S. Terrien, "Toward a Biblical Theology of Womanhood", Religion in Life 42 (1973) 322-33.

[2]Matthew adds to his Marcan source ὁ νεανίσκος (v 22), possibly in view of the fact that he includes (and wishes to make more relevant) the commandment about honoring parents (v 19). There are no real difficulties in taking the essence of the Marcan form of this story as authentic. Cf. Taylor, Mark, 424-5; Cranfield, Mark, 325. Dibelius, From Tradition, 50 ff. ,does assign vv 17-22 to the category of paradigm "of a less pure type"; however, the impurity (i.e., later accretions) he sees has to do with certain details that do not affect our assessment of v 19 as an affirmation by Jesus.

[3]Notice that Jesus speaks of 'following Me' (Mk 10.1-12 and parallels). Jesus is not talking about a Jewish requirement for obtaining eternal life.

[4]Cf. pp. 92 ff. of thesis on Mk 10.1-12 and parallels and Mk 10.13-16 and parallels. Luke also has the pericope on children before that of the rich man; but has omitted the discussion on divorce found in Mk 10.1-12 (but cf. Lk 16.18).

[5]Taylor, Mark, 339; but cf. Bultmann, History, 17-18.

[6]Dibelius, From Tradition, 220-21; Cranfield, Mark, 230 takes 7.1-23 as a single unit.

[7]In view of the content of this saying it is highly probable that in his original audience was a group of Jewish leaders, and possibly some Pharisees.

[8]It is possible that we should read στήσητε ('establish') here with D, W, Θ, among others, instead of τηρήσητε with ℵ, A, K, L, and others. So Metzger, TC, 94; Taylor, Mark, 339; W. Michaelis, "κρατέω", TDNT III, 911-12.

[9]Cf. M. Ker. 6.9, Danby,466. For Jesus, to honor one's parents is a commandment which involves providing them with financial support. Cf. J. Schneider, "τιμή", TDNT VIII, 178-9; G. Schrenk, "πατήρ", TDNT V, 982. This is what 'honoring' was commonly thought to imply. Cf. J. D. M. Derrett, KOPBAN, O ΕΣΤΙΝ ΔWPON, in Studies in the New Testament I (Leiden, 1977) 112-7 (cf. Prov. 28.24).

[10]The idea of speaking evil or reviling rather than cursing is probably what is being conveyed by this word. Cf. BAG, 298; Taylor, Mark, 340; C. Schneider, "κακολογέω", TDNT III, 468.

[11]Cf. K. H. Rengstorf, "κορβᾶν", TDNT III, 862; Danby, 794, "...the usual term introducing a vow to abstain from anything, or to deny another person the use of anything."

[12]Pace the accenting of ὠφελήθῇς by the third edition of UBSGNT, with E. J. Goodspeed, "The Greek Text of Mark vii.11", ET (1908-09) 471-2; Robertson, 233; Synopsis, 217. Note that Matthew simply has δῶρον ὃ ἐάν....

[13]Cf. Derrett, "KOPBAN", 113; F. Büchsel, "δῶρον", TDNT II, 166; BAG, 210; S. Zeitlin, "Korban", JQR 53 (2, 1962) 160-3. Zeitlin, "Korban: a Gift", JQR 59 (2, 1968) 133-5, probably is wrong to say that corban itself means vow rather than something dedicated. Contrast G. W. Buchanan, "Some vow and oath formulas in the New Testament", HTR 58 (3, 1965) 319-26 to Z. W. Falk, "Notes and Observations - on Talmudic Vows", HTR 59 (3, 1966) 309-12.

[14]For the ossuary inscription with κορβᾶν dating from the late first century B. C., cf. M.-E. Boismard, "Chronique Archéologique", RB 65 (1958) 400-23, espec. 409; J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Aramaic Qorbān Inscription from Jebel Ḫallet eṭ Ṭûri and Mark 7.11/Matt. 15.5", JBL 78 (1959) 60-5. The development of κορβᾶν into a curse formula seems to be later than the NT. Cf. Derrett, "KOPBAN", 115. For Mishnaic parallels, cf. M. Nedarim 5.6, Danby, 271; M. Baba Kamma 9.10, Danby, 345. Cf. Philo, On the Special Laws 2.16 (LCL VII) 314-7; Josephus, Antiquities 4.73 (LCL IV) 510-11; Josephus, Against Apion 1.167 (LCL I) 230-1.

[15]κορβᾶν is not an imprecation, but a technical term in an oath formula. Cf. J. Bligh, "Qorban!", HeyJ 5 (1964) 192-3; Falk, "Notes and Observations - on Talmudic Vows", 311-12.

[16]Bligh, "Qorban!", 193.

[17]Str-B I, 714; Rengstorf, "κορβᾶν", TDNT III, 865.

[18]Cf. J. H. A. Hart, "Corban", JQR 19 (July, 1907) 648-50; Philo, Hypothetica 7.3-5 (LCL IX; trans. F. H. Colson; 1941)424-5.

[19]Notice how Matthew (15.6) has altered Mark at this point, substituting μὴ τιμήσει for οὐκέτι ἀφίετε...ποιῆσαι.

[20]W. G. Kümmel, "Jesus und der jüdische Traditionsgedanke", ZNW 33 (1934) 105-30, espec. 122-4, says that such means of declaring a vow invalid probably were not known in Jesus' time, but cf. M. Nedarim 9.1, Danby, 275.

[21]But cf. Derrett, "KOPBAN", 115, and Falk, "Notes and Observations - on Talmudic Vows". It is oral tradition or Halakah that is being rejected by Jesus; cf. Jeremias, NT Theology, 210.

[22]On the basis of rabbinic interpretation of Deut 23.21, Num 30.2, and other passages. In some cases, such vows might be classified as vows of exaggeration and could be annulled. Cf. M. Nedarim 3.2, Danby, 266; M. Nedarim 9.1, Danby, 275. Also, C. G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels I (London, 1909) 165-6.

[23]Mt 21.15-16 will not be treated in this section as there is considerable doubt about its authenticity. It may simply be a creation of the First Evangelist out of the LXX of Ps 8.3. If so, it likely intimates that the First Evangelist wished to characterize Jesus as one who appreciated children and their qualities (cf. Mt 18.3).

[24]Taylor, Mark, 422, quotes J. V. Bartlet as saying, "Hardly anything is more characteristic of Jesus than his attitude to children." J. V. Bartlet, St. Mark (Edinburgh, 1922) 292.

[25]A. Oepke, "παῖs", TDNT V, 640, 642-3. On papyri examples of exposure of children in Jesus' age, cf. W. L. Lane, The Gospel According to Mark (Grand Rapids, 1974) 361; C. K. Barrett, New Testament Background: Selected Documents (New York, 1961) 38.

[26]Cf. pp. 4-5 of thesis.

[27]Oepke, "παῖs", TDNT V, 646. Apparently some rabbis did hold that children were innocent; cf. Str-B I, 773-4.

[28]Cf. Bultmann, History, 142, 149; Taylor, Mark, 403-4.

[29]Cf. Cranfield, Mark, 307-8; I. Howard Marshall, The Gospel of Luke. A Commentary on the Greek Text (NIGTC; Exeter, 1978) 394-5.

[30]On the disciples' wrangling, cf. Lk 14.8-10; and on Jesus' response, cf. Mk 10.13, Mk 10.31, Mt 20.16, Lk 13.30 and Marshall, Luke, 395.

[31]Bultmann, History, 147, believes that such sayings originated in Jewish statements about kindness to children. There is, however, no implausibility in supposing that Jesus adopted popular Jewish ideas, phrases, and proverbs for His own purposes.

[32]E. Schweizer, "Matthew's View of the Church in his 18th Chapter", AusBR 21 (1973) 7-14, here 9-10.

[33]Cf. Taylor, Mark, 404: "The teaching on true greatness (35), the indispensability of the attitude of childlike trust (Mt xviii.3), and the mind which esteems the lowly as in some sense Jesus Himself (37), are some of the most authentic and characteristic elements in His thoughts."

[34]In Mark and Luke there is evidence of an argument; cf. p. 91 on Matthew's modification at this point.

[35]Cf. Oepke, "παῖs", TDNT V, 637-8; W. K. Lowther Clarke, "Studies in Texts", Theology 16 (1928) 161-3. The word παῖs can mean 'servant' as well. Cf. M. Black, "The Marcan Parable of the Child in the Midst", ET 59 (1947-48) 14-16; T. F. Glasson, "The Marcan Parable of the Child in the Midst", ET 59 (1947-48) 166. The suggestions of Black and Glasson that involve a play on the Aramaic talya (servant/child) can only be maintained if vv 35-37 are originally a unity, relating one occurrence - this is uncertain and perhaps unlikely.

36

Luke, perhaps in an attempt to link the saying more closely to the example, is very specific. It is not 'a child of this sort' but 'this little child' (τοῦτο τὸ παιδίον). Mark's expression indicates that Jesus is referring to a certain kind of child as a model not just any child. Cf. L. Vaganay, "Le schématisme du discours communautaire à la lumière de la critique des sources", RB 60 (1953) 217-20.

[37]Cf. Mt 10.40, Lk 10.16. The obligation of hospitality to a guest in Judaism is well-known. Cf. Str-B I, 588 ff. One is to entertain his guest before going to learn Torah. Cf. M. Shabbath 18.1, Danby, 116. Further, there is the obligation to charity in the case of orphans; cf. Str-B I, 774.

[38]It could mean 'with my authority or power' or even 'according to my will' but the situation does not favor either of these as it would in the context of exorcism. A. Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke (Edinburgh, 1922) 258; A. H. M'Neile, The Gospel According to St. Matthew (London, 1965) 261; Marshall, Luke, 396; Hill, Matthew, 273, all favor something like 'for my sake'. If this is the meaning, then there is no need to see this phrase as a secondary Christological addition meant to focus on Jesus' person and power.

[39]Some have argued that Jesus sees the child as His representative here. Cf. Lane, Mark, 341; T. H. Darlow, "Divorce and Childhood, A Reading of St. Matt. xix.3-15", Exp 4th ser 7 (1893) 294-9. This overlooks the fact that the pericope is concerned with the behavior of the adult disciples to whom Jesus is speaking. There is no hint that the child is acting as Jesus' agent.

[40]It is not likely that the texts on little ones (Mt 10.42, 18.6, Mk 9.42) bear on our subject, for in these texts the least among the believers are meant by the Gospel writers. Cf. S. Legasse, Jésus et L'Enfant (Paris, 1969) espec. 337-41.

[41]Cf. Taylor, Mark, 421-2; Cranfield, Mark, 322; M'Neile, Matthew, 276. Otherwise Bultmann, History, 32, who considers this an ideal construction with its basis in the Jewish practice of blessing. J. Jeremias, Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries (London, 1960) 49-50, states that it was the custom for rabbis to bless children on Yom Kippur and argues (pace Bultmann) that this narrative indicates that Jesus likely did so as well. Cf. E. Lohse, "χείρ", TDNT IX, 432. Plummer, Luke, 421, says that rabbis blessed children on their first birthday but gives no references. Cf. Str-B I, 807-8.

[42]Dibelius, From Tradition, 43.

[43]Bultmann, History, 32.

[44]Cf. Marshall, Luke, 681. The catechetical arrangement in Matthew and Mark is noteworthy (cf. Mk 10.1-12, 13-16, 17-31 to Mt 10.1-9, 13-15, 16-30). Matthew also includes a short section on eunuchs (19.10-12) but, as if to indicate that the eunuch teaching did not rule out having children, returns immediately to the Marcan order and section on children. Cf. Hill, Matthew, 272-3.

[45]The αὐτοῖς of Mk 10.13 and parallels is significant for it indicates that it was not only mothers bringing their children, but also fathers or older children. Cf. Lane, Mark, 358-9, n. 22; E. Hampden-Cook, "Whom did the Disciples Rebuke?" ET 17 (1905-06) 192. The point of Luke's change to τὰ βρέφη is perhaps to bring out that here were persons totally dependent on God. Cf. Cranfield, Mark, 324.

[46]For typical Jewish attitudes about the immaturity of children, cf. M. Aboth 4.20, Danby, 455; M. Aboth 3.11, Danby, 451.

[47]Plummer, Luke, 421.

[48]Marshall, Luke, 682; M'Neile, Matthew, 277; C. Brown, "Child", NIDNT I, 284.

[49]G. R. Beasley-Murray, Baptism in the New Testament (Grand Rapids, 1962) 327.

[50]This last view is suggested by F. A. Schilling, "What Means the Saying About Receiving the Kingdom of God as a Little Child (τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς παιδίον, Mk x.15, Lk xviii.17)", ET 77,(2, 1965), 56-8; cf. A. R. C. Leaney, "Jesus and the Symbol of the Child (Luke ix.46-48)", ET 66 (1954-55) 91-2.

[51]So Cranfield, Mark, 323; Taylor, Mark, 423 (genitive of possession); but cf. MHT III, 214.

[52]This is not to say that children were considered the ultimate divine blessing by Jesus (cf. Lk 11.27-28), as they seem to have been by some Jews. Jesus also saw that in the Day of Judgment what would normally be a blessing would become a curse. Both of these sayings show how Jesus' eschatological teaching conditioned His teaching on other subjects. For Him, the physical family must live under the guidelines of the Kingdom ethic, always realizing that it was only part of a larger and more fundamental community - the family of faith.

[53]Cf. Taylor, Mark, 494; Cranfield, Mark, 383.

[54]Though the scribes could not charge for their teaching, they could accept hospitality or free-will offerings. Cf. Jeremias, Jerusalem, 111-6; M. Aboth 1.13, 4.5, Berakoth 4.5-6, Danby, 447, 453, 534.

[55]καὶ ὀρφάνων in D, W, f^{13}, and other mss., is likely a later addition. Cf. Metzger, TC, 111; Taylor, Mark, 495. Mt 23.13 is an interpolation based on Mk 12.40. Cf. Metzger, TC, 60.

[56]Cf. Cranfield, Mark, 384; Taylor, Mark, 495; Robertson, 1106, 1130; MHT III, 45. This does not mean that Jesus has ceased to discuss the characteristics of the scribes; rather, He is singling out a particular aspect of their behavior.

[57]οἰκία means 'house', but it can also mean 'possessions, property', as it likely does here. Cf. BAG, 560; MM, 441.

[58]Derrett, "'Eating up the Houses of Widows': Jesus's Comment on Lawyers?" in Studies in the NT I, 118-27; H. B. Swete, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London, 1898) 274; O. Michel, "οἰκία", TDNT V, 131, n. 3.

[59]Jeremias, Jerusalem, 114; Taylor, Mark, 495; Swete, Mark, 274. Cf. the description of the wicked scribes in The Assumption of Moses 7.3 ff., APOT II, 419-20. Also, Lk 8.3 and pp. 286-7 of thesis.

[60]Cf. Derrett, "'Eating up the Houses of Widows'", 119.

[61]Derrett, "'Eating up the Houses of Widows'", 120 ff.; M. Sotah 3.4, Danby, 296; Str-B II, 33; Josephus, Antiquities 17.34-47 (LCL VIII) 388-95; Antiquities 18.81 ff. (LCL IX) 58-9; Antiquities 13.400-404 (LCL VII) 428-33, may argue more for the view expressed by those in endnote 59 above. Frederick W. Danker, Jesus and the New Age, According to St. Luke (St. Louis, 1972) 208, argues that the scribes were seizing the widows' property because they could not pay their debts. This is possible since regulations about the seizure of property if one defaulted on a debt had changed since OT times. Cf. Baron, History of the Jews II, 270, 303.

[62]Even if we do not accept Derrett's explanation of Mk 12.40b, this does not affect acceptance of his view of the scribes as property managers.

[63]If προφασις means a pretext, then there is no necessary connection between the scribes praying and estate managing. Cf. BAG 729-30; LSJ 1539; MM, 555. It would imply simply that their prayers were hypocritical in view of their managerial conduct. Cf. Derrett, "'Eating Up the Houses of Widows'", 124-5; H. Greeven, "εὔχομαι", TDNT II, 802-3.

[64]Cf. Stählin, "χήρα", TDNT IX, 449; L. Simon, "Le Sou de la Veuve - Marc 12/41-44", ETR 44 (2, 1969) 115-26.

[65]Marshall, Luke, 750-1; J. M. Creed, The Gospel According to St. Luke (London, 1969) 251.

[66]Cf. Bultmann, History, 32-3; Dibelius, From Tradition, 261; Jeremias, Jerusalem, 109.

[67]Taylor, Mark, 496.

[68]It is not certain whether γαζοφυλακίου is meant to represent the treasury itself or one of the offering receptacles. Cf. Lane, Mark, 442, n. 83.

[69]Luke simply uses the collective πλουσίους and stresses the gift aspect (τὰ δῶρα αὐτῶν); while Mark speaks of χαλκὸν. Note the present participle in Luke (βαλλόντας) indicating an ongoing activity. Mark makes a strong contrast between the continual action of the rich and the punctiliar action of the widow (πάντες ἔβαλον - αὕτη δὲ ἔβαλεν). Cf. Robertson, 833, 838.

[70]Stählin, "χήρα", TDNT IX, 449, n. 81. Mark describes her as χήρα πτωχή; Luke, perhaps with his stress on the woman's plight, intensifies the description saying she is needy - πενιχρὰν. As Jeremias, "Zwei Miszellen: 1. Antik-Jüdische Münzdeutungen. 2. Zur Geschichtlichkeit der Tempelreinigung", NTS 23 (2, 1977) 177-80, points out, we are dealing with free will offerings and thus the widow's example is all the more striking.

[71]Cf. D. Sperber, "Mark xii.42 and its metrological background", NovT 9 (3, 1967) 178-90. Mark's mention of the Roman quadrans, not minted in the East, probably points to his Western audience. Cf. the debate between F. Blass, "On Mark xii.42 and xv.16", ET 10 (1898-99) 185-7, also "On Mark xii.42", ET 10 (1898-99) 286-7, and W. M. Ramsay,

"On Mark xii.42", ET 10 (1898-99) 232, also "On Mark xii.42", ET 10 (1898-99) 336. The assertion that giving less than two coins of the smallest denomination was not permitted is based on a misunderstanding of B. T. Baba Bathra 10b by Plummer, Luke, 475, et al. Cf. Marshall, Luke, 752; Str-B II, 45. Thus, the sacrifice is greater than it might have been.

[72]Luke has only two other sayings introduced by "Truly" - 9.27 and 12.44. He reserved the third to emphasize this woman's example. Cf. Danker, Jesus, 209.

[73]πλεῖον πάντων may mean 'more than any', or probably 'more than all combined'. So B. Reicke, "πᾶς", TDNT V, 889; Cranfield, Mark, 386. The point is that though the rich gave much, the widow gave all. Swete, Mark, 276. This may reflect Jesus' supernatural knowledge in the situation; or the amount of the widow's giving. (and this saying attributed to Jesus) may be a later addition intended to raise the Christological significance of the story. Finally, if this was originally a story told by Jesus there are no problems raised by this remark.

[74]Luke is more dramatic at this point - πάντα τὸν βίον ὃν εἶχεν ἔβαλεν. βίος indicates means of subsistence, property, living. BAG, 141; Str-B II, 46.

[76]Mark has πολλοὶ πλούσιοι; Luke, πλουσίους.

[77]D. R. Catchpole, "The Synoptic Divorce Material as a Traditio-Historical Problem", BJRL 57 (1974-75) 92-127.

[78]It is possible that the isolated logia and the controversy dialogues both go back to a common saying.

[79]There are some rabbinic parallels to the content of v 28 but they all appear to post-date Jesus' ministry. Cf. C. G. Montefiore, Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings (New York, 1970) 41-2; Davies, Sermon on the Mount, 252. Jeremias, NT Theology, 251, says, "We may take it as quite certain that in the antitheses we are hearing the words of Jesus himself...because this has neither Jewish nor early Christian parallels."

[80]Jeremias, NT Theology, 18.

[81]Bultmann, History, 131, gives 5.27-28 as an example of an older (i.e., non-redactional) formulation of the antithesis and admits the 'I' saying here can be historical (p. 147).

[82]So T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus (London, 1957) 157. The assumption of two sources is likely considering the differences in 18.8-9 and 5.29-30 in form and order and also in view of the fact that the Evangelist includes the same material twice.

[83]Taylor, Mark, 408-09.

[84]Davies, Sermon on the Mount, 227, n. 2.

[85]Cf. pp. 99-100, and endnotes 93, 94, p. 145 of thesis.

[86]For the view that Mt 5.29-30 is an edited and less authentic version of a fuller saying, cf. Bultmann, History, 311-12, and Hill, Matthew, 123. Manson, Sayings, 157, maintains that Matthew has reversed the order of the reference to eye and hand in 5.29-30 to improve a bad connection. But the order may have been more subject to manipulation in a catechetical collection of isolated sayings such as we have in Mk 9.37-50 than in Matthew's special source.

[87]Cf. LSJ, 1141; BAG, 528; A-S, 295; MM, 416; F. Hauck, "μοιχεύω", TDNT IV, 729-35. Derrett, Law in the New Testament (London, 1970) 367 ff., rightly notes that μοιχεία and πορνεία can both be used in the same context without πορνεία excluding μοιχεία. It is likely that the two terms are distinct here.

[88]Cf. NIV, KJV, NEB, RSV, NASB, Phillips, Moffatt.

[89]Cf. Lk 18.1 and Ac 3.19. Haacker's interpretation has the apparent support of several early scribes. Cf. the variant αὐτῆς at Mt 5.28 in ℵ', M, etc. Cf. K. Haacker, "Der Rechtssatz Jesu zum Thema Ehebruch (Mt. 5,28)", BZ 21 (1, 1977) 113-6.

[90]The ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ is perhaps awkward in this interpretation nevertheless, Jesus is talking about the initial act, the sinful gazing, which amounts to the man leading the woman astray to adultery in his heart (even if the act is never carried out). Possibly, we should translate 'Anyone who so looks on a woman that she shall become desirous has in his heart already committed adultery with her.' Jesus was not shy of speaking of a man's adultery (cf. Mt 5.32b, Lk 16.18).

[91]Cf. the related idea in B. T. Nedarim 90b, The Babylonian Talmud (trans. H. Freedman) 279; cf. Str-B I, 299 ff., and Swidler, Women in Judaism, 127.

[92]Jesus is advocating a reformation of patriarchal culture, but there is no indication that He advocated the abandonment of such a culture. In Jesus' eyes, male headship or authority was a call for male self-restraint and community responsibility, not a license for self-indulgence or sin. This view of purged and purified male headship and responsibility becomes more apparent in Mt 5.32.

[93]M'Neile, Matthew, 64 ff.; Hill, Matthew, 123 ff.

[94]Derrett, "Law in the New Testament: Si scandalizaverit te manus tua abscinde illam (Mk ix.42) and comparative legal history", in Studies in the NT I, 4-31, argues that 'eye' refers to giving bribes to women in exchange for illicit sex. Perhaps this is an overstatement. It is more plausible that the right hand reference would be to a man handling or forcibly taking another's wife. In Jewish circles, adultery and other sexual sins were considered sins, not so much because of the infidelity, as because of the theft involved. Cf. Hill, Matthew, 123. F. J. Leenhardt, "Les femmes aussi...à propos du billet de répudiation", RTP 19 (1, 1969) 31-40, suggests that Mt 5.28 concerns covetousness rather than lust and proposes to translate the verse, "He who looks at a woman for the purpose of possessing her..." The principle of punishing the offending member is well-known in Jesus' day. Cf. Str-B I, 302-3; G. Stählin, "ἀποκόπτω ἐκκόπτω", TDNT III, 853, 857, 859.

[95]Derrett, "Law in the New Testament...(Mk ix.42)", 25-6; M. Niddah 2.1, Danby, 746; cf. K. Weiss, "συμφέρω", TDNT IX, 75.

[96]It is crucial to remember that all of Mt 5.27-32 is directed toward the male who looks at (vv 27-29) or takes (v 30) or divorces (vv 31-32) a woman. So, too, Lk 16.18.

[97]That $p^{66, 75}$, ℵ, B, L, and others omit this pericope is fatal to any view that it was originally part of John's (or Luke's) Gospel. Cf. Metzger, TC, 219-22. This does not preclude that it is authentic Johannine or Lukan material. The case for Lukan authorship is impressive. Cf. H. J. Cadbury, "A Possible Case of Lukan Authorship", HTR 10 (1917) 237-44; F. Warburton Lewis, "The Pericope Adulterae", ET 29 (1917-1918) 138. In part, this view is based on the fact that f^{13} includes this pericope after Lk 21.38, and 1333^{c} includes it after Lk 24.53. For an argument for Johannine authorship, cf. A. F. Johnson, "A Stylistic Trait of the Fourth Gospel in the Pericope Adulterae?" BETS 9 (2, 1966) 91-6. Though D, G, H, K, Didascalia, Apostolic Constitutions, Ambrosiaster, and most mss. include this pericope in the traditional place after Jn 7.52, Jn 7.53 and the 'again' of 8.2 argue against this placement.

[98]D. Daube, "Biblical Landmarks in the Struggle for Women's Rights", JR (in press) 14.

[99]Cadbury, "A Possible Case of Lukan Authorship", 243 ,n. 12; cf. Barrett, John (1978) 590.

[100]Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History III, xxxix, 17 (LCL I) 298-9, indicates that Papias recorded a narrative that is likely the same as Jn 7.53-8.11 with small variations. The evidence of Apostolic Constitutions II, 24 also appears to point to an early knowledge and use of this story in the Christian community. Cf. Barrett, John (1978) 589-90; R. E. Brown, The Gospel According to John (i-xii) (New York, 1966) 335-6. Perhaps even earlier evidence of the existence of this narrative is found in the language and ideas in The Shepherd of Hermas, Mand IV.I.4, 11 (LCL Apostolic Fathers II; trans. K. Lake; London, 1913) 78-81. Cf. also IV.I.3.2, and 3.4 (LCL) 82-5. Cf. C. Taylor, "The Pericope of the Adulteress", JTS 4 (1902-03) 129-30.

[101]Cf. E. C. Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel (ed. F. N. Davey; London, 1940) II, 676-7.

[102]Cf. Brown, John i-xii, 335.

[103]Barrett, John (1978) 590; Leon Morris, The Gospel According to John (NICNT; Grand Rapids, 1971) 833 ff.; cf. Lk 7.36-50, Mk 12. 18-23.

[104]There was no other place in the Temple to which this woman could be brought without impropriety. Cf. G. Schrenk, "ἱερεύς", TDNT III, 236-7.

[105]ἐπὶ μοιχείᾳ κατειλμμένην. It is reasonably certain that ἁμαρτίᾳ is a later correction of μοιχείᾳ to conform this phrase with v 11. Cf. Metzger, TC, 222. It seems probable that the scribes and Pharisees were accompanied by the witnesses and perhaps a lynching mob. So Derrett, "Law in the New Testament: The Story of the Woman Taken in Adultery", NTS 10 (1963-64) 1-26.

[106]D. Daube, "An Attack on Discrimination Against Women; the Adulteress of John 8", unpublished essay of 25 pages, by permission of the author (an abbreviated form will appear in "Biblical Landmarks") 14-23. Since this may be a lynching mob, willing to take matters and stones into their own hands, one cannot insist that, since stoning is mentioned, a betrothed woman must be involved. Pace E. F. Harrison, "The Son of God Among the Sons of Men. VIII. Jesus and the Woman Taken in Adultery", BSac 103 (1946) 431-9. J. Blinzler argues persuasively that μοιχεία would not be used of a woman who was only betrothed and that the death penalty in Jesus' day generally meant stoning. Cf. his "Die Strafe für Ehebruch in Bibel und Halacha. Zur Auslegung von Joh VIII.5", NTS 4 (1, 1957) 32-47.

[107]Derrett, "Law in the New Testament...Adultery", 5 ff.

[108]M. Sotah 1.1 ff., Danby, 293 ff.

[109]This was a necessary prerequisite, as Derrett, "Law in the New Testament...Adultery", 5 ff. notes.

[110]The position of σὺ makes it emphatic.

[111]Cf. Barrett, John (1955) 492. Probably, it is not the case that this woman is being taken either to or from a court, since the only Jewish court which could try this woman was likely closed by this time. So Derrett, "Law in the New Testament...Adultery", 9 ff. Pace Jeremias, "Zur Geschichtlichkeit des Verhörs Jesu vor dem Hohen Rat", ZNW 43 (1950-51) 145-51. Further, the word 'condemn' in v 10 argues against Jeremias' case. The Romans would not try an adulterous woman.

[112]Cf. E. Power, "Writing on the Ground", Bib 2 (1921) 54-7. P. Humbert, "Jesus Writing on the Ground (John viii.6-8)", ET 30 (1918-19) 475-6; D. S. Margoliouth, "Jesus Writing on the Ground", ET 31 (1919-20) 38; Daube, "An Attack on Discrimination...John 8", 25; Barrett, John (1978) 592; R. H. Lightfoot, St. John's Gospel, A Commentary (Oxford, 1960) 347; Derrett, "Law in the New Testament... Adultery", 9 ff.

[113]Cf. Brown, John i-xii, 337-8.

[114]Daube, "An Attack on Discrimination...John 8", 6. This implies that Jesus suspects there is other serious sin involved (in addition to the woman's). On ἀναμάρτητος meaning 'without serious sin', cf. Josephus, The Jewish War 7.329 (LCL III) 596-7; Herodotus 5.39 (LCL III) 42-3.

[115]Derrett, "Law in the New Testament...Adultery", 25-6.

[116]πρεσβύτερος could be either 'elders' or 'older men'. Morris, John, 890, suggests both; Brown, John i-xii, 334, translates it as elders.

[117]This is Daube's main point - "An Attack on Discrimination... John 8", 23 ff. I endorse his view with some hesitation since it is conceivable that this is simply an attack on injustice, rather than discrimination. Cf. Barrett, John (1978) 590-1.

[118]As Morris, John, 890, says, "The form of the command implies a ceasing to commit an action already started..." Brown, John i-xii, 334, states that Jesus is saying 'avoid this sin'. If so, then His statement in 7b has a limited scope as well.

[119]Lightfoot, John, 348.

[120]Probably the narrative has been touched up by editors and/or the Evangelist to heighten the effect; for instance, by adding αὐτόφωρος in 8.4, and the second writing on the ground in 8.8, and the editorial comment in v 6. Cf. Bultmann, History, 63.

[121]ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι. In Lk 16.18 we have πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἑτέραν μοιχεύει. Again, it is the male who is the subject of the action, but here he is called the adulterer, a more radical statement for its day than Mt 5.32a (and there is no exceptive clause in Luke). Luke has juxtaposed this statement with one about the law not passing away, and thus Lk 16.18 is intended to indicate Jesus' intensification of the eternally valid law. It does not appear that Mt 5.32 implies that divorce itself is adultery; rather, the adultery that the woman is forced to commit comes if she remarries. Adultery is associated only with a further marriage union in Lk 16.18. Mt 5.32b and Lk 16.18b are both more radical statements than the rabbis were willing to make, since marrying a divorcee was frowned on but not prohibited in rabbinic Judaism. Cf. Str-B I, 320 ff., and Marshall, Luke, 630-2.

[122]D, it$^{a, b, d, k}$, and other mss. omit καὶ through μοιχᾶται in Mt 5.32b. Metzger, TC, 13-14, suggests that some scribes felt that if the divorced woman is made an adulteress by illegal divorce, then anyone marrying such a woman also commits adultery. Alternatively, this omission may reflect the tendency of the Western text to highlight and protect male privilege, while also relegating women to a place in the background. In this case, the omission here is of material that reflects badly on men. Cf. pp. 376-7 of thesis.

[123]Streeter, Four Gospels, 259. He allowed, however, that Mark's order of pericopes was still being followed by the First Evangelist and perhaps also his content at some points (260).

[124]It cannot be ruled out that some Jews might have asked Jesus about the legitimacy of divorce perhaps because they had heard that He opposed it, and they wished for Him to state this openly and so demonstrate that He was at variance with the mainstream of tradition. Thus, they could have asked this testing question as we find it in Mark, but it seems almost certain that someone would have asked Jesus the question about the grounds of divorce since it was part of the current debate, perhaps to force Him to show that He sided with the stricter view (and thus not with the majority of Pharisees).

[125]Even though the Mosaic legislation was given in the form of an imperative; cf. E. Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Markus (Göttingen, 1951) 199. It is also possible that ἐντέλλομαι/ἐντολή in Mk 10.3, 5 (cf. Mt 19.7) has the somewhat milder force of instruct(ion) (cf. Ac 17.15).

[126]The 'ἐπ' αὐτήν in Mk 10.11 also looks like an explanatory addition by the Evangelist.

[127]But cf. pp. 106-110 on the exceptive clauses.

[128]But cf. Jeremias, NT Theology, 225, 251-3; Bultmann, History, 134-5.

[129]Catchpole, "The Synoptic Divorce Material", 113.

[130]Manson, Sayings, 137.

[131]Cf. Mk 12.18-27, Jn 7.53-8.11.

[132]Cf. the parallels to this form in rabbinic sources in D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London, 1956) 141 ff. It may well be that Mark has modelled his discussion on this form as it gave him an opportunity (in 10.10) to use his 'in house' and private teaching motif again.

[133]This phrase means 'for any reason' and may reflect the Hillel-Shammai debate. Cf. B. Reicke, "πᾶς", TDNT V, 888; MHT III, 268. The Hillelites held that virtually any cause was grounds for divorce. Cf. M. Gittin 9.10, Danby, 321. Davies, Sermon on the Mount, 104, argues that the phrase is redactional, but cf. M. R. Lehmann, "Gen. 2.24 as the Basis for Divorce in Halakhah and New Testament", ZAW 72 (1960) 263-7, on its authenticity. The Marcan debate is centered on the lawfulness of divorce; the Matthean on the grounds (the lawfulness being taken for granted).

[134]Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Matthean Divorce Texts and Some New Palestinian Evidence", TS 37 (2, 1976) 211 ff.; and pp. 4-5 of thesis. The meaning of ἀπολύω must be constant throughout the pericope, since there is no external or internal evidence to lead us to think otherwise. Pace J. Dupont, Mariage et Divorce dans l'Évangile Matthieu 19,3-12 et parallèles (Bruges, 1959).

[135]On σκληροκαρδία, cf. K. Berger, "Hartherzigkeit und Gottes Gesetz. Die Vorgeschichte des antijüdischen Vorwurfs in Mc 10.5", ZNW 61 (1-2, 1970) 1-47. E. Haenchen, Der Weg Jesu (Berlin, 1966) 339, rightly points out that in the Marcan form of the interchange (where Jesus asks, "What did Moses command you?"), He places Himself in a difficult (and historically improbable?) situation since He is appealing to an authority that speaks against Himself.

[136]The wording on the Get was to read, "Lo, thou art free to marry any man." Cf. M. Gittin 9.3, Danby, 319.

[137]So B. W. Powers, "Marriage and Divorce: The Dispute of Jesus with the Pharisees and Its Inception", Colloquium 5 (1, 1971) 37: "...there might be dire consequences if she or her family wrongly believed divorce had taken place." Cf. D. Daube, "Repudium in Deuteronomy", in Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black (ed. E. E. Ellis, M. Wilcox; Edinburgh, 1969) 238. Contrast H. Greeven, "Ehe nach dem Neuen Testament", NTS 15 (1968-69) 377-8. Jesus' teaching implies that the bill of divorce does not lighten the husband's responsibility for his wife because by giving the bill to her he gives her opportunity to commit adultery. Cf. F.J. Leenhardt, "Les femmes aussi... à propos du billet de répudiation", RTP 19 (1, 1969) 34-5.

[138]Mark has ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως which in its explicitness in explaining the reference of ἀρχῆς may be later than the Matthean form. Lehmann, "Genesis 2.24", 263-7, argues that 'from the beginning' in Matthew refers to the pre-Noahic state of the Jews, and that there is no allusion to a mythical bisexual first human being. Pace P. Winter, "Genesis 1.27 and Jesus' Saying on Divorce", ZAW 70 (1958) 260-1. Hill, Matthew, 280, says it refers to the book of Genesis over the claims of Deuteronomy. A. Van Gansewinkel, "Ursprüngliche oder grundsätzliche Unauflösbarkeit der Ehe?" Diakonia 3:2 (1972) 88-93, points out rightly that the background to ἀπ' ἀρχῆς may be the Hebrew מֵרֹאשׁ in which case ἀπ' ἀρχῆς refers to the original (or fundamental) plan (or design). Cf. similarly G. Aicher, "Mann und Weib - ein Fleisch (Mt 19,4 ff.)", BZ 5 (1907) 159-65.

[139]Cf. Moule, I-B, 71. As A. Plummer, An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew (London, 1909) 260, says, the point of appealing to Gen 1.27 is that God originally did not create more women than men so as to provide for divorce.

[140]On the textual difficulty in Mk 10.7, cf. Metzger, TC, 104-5.

[141]Derrett, Law in the NT, 363-88, rightly argues that the irreversible and indissoluble one flesh union is the basis of Jesus' teaching on marriage. But it must not be overlooked that Jesus also says, "Let no man put asunder", implying that it is possible for a third party to put a marriage asunder. Powers, "Marriage and Divorce", 37, notes that the text says what God has joined together (i.e., the bond of marriage He has created between them), not those whom God has joined together. Cf. K. Barth, Church Dogmatics III, 4 (Edinburgh, 1961) 207; T. A. Burkill, "Two into One: The Notion of Carnal Union in Mark 10.8; 1 Kor 6.16; Eph 5.31", ZNW 62 (1971) 115-20; W. Brueggemann, "Of the Same Flesh and Bone (Gn. 2,23a)", CBQ 32 (1970) 532-42.

[142]I see no trace of the rabbinic idea of an androgynous Adam in Mt 19.3-12 and parallels. Pace Daube, NT and Rabbinic Judaism, 72 ff. Cf. R. Pesch, Das Markusevangelium II (Freiburg, 1977) 124-5. Jesus speaks of the two becoming one, but makes no reference to a one that was originally bisexual. It is not man's original unity, but their one flesh union that in Jesus' view disallows divorce and polygamy.

[143]This joining and separating refers to marriage and divorce, not the one flesh union and its dissolution. So G. Delling, "σύζυγος", TDNT VII, 748, n. 1; MHT I, 140; Str-B I, 803-4.

[144]ἄνθρωπος. Thus, both potential male and female intruders are warned.

[145]Cf. J. Murray, Divorce (Philadelphia, 1975) 33.

[146]There were various concessions in the OT to the fallen order and man's sinful nature (e.g., monarchy, 1 Sam 8.7). Cf. D. Daube, "Concessions to Sinfulness in Jewish Law", JJS 10 (1959) 1-13. Jesus implies that these concessions have come to a halt in the new covenant community. Jesus' demands are not new; rather, they are the old demands interpreted in light of God's original plan, not in the shadow of man's sin. As H. J. Schoeps, "Restitutio Principii as the Basis for the Nova Lex Jesu", JBL 66 (1947) 453-64, concludes, the appeal to God's original plan and order, which sees the end as restoring the original design and uses that truth as a hermeneutical key to the OT, likely derives from Jesus Himself, for the rabbis saw Mosaic law as fulfilling

pre-Sinai laws. The citation of Gen 1.27 in favor of monogamous marriage by the Qumranites is more a matter of proof texting than hermeneutics. Cf. CD 4.13-5.5, Vermes, DSS, 36-7, 101-2.

[147]Quite possibly Mt 19.8b (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς...) is the Evangelist's own addition based on v 4. Verses 8a and 9 go naturally together as an antithesis, and 8b is unnecessary.

[148]A modified form of the second half of the antithesis formula; cf. M'Neile, Matthew, 274.

[149]It appears an attempt was made in certain mss (D, B, and others) to conform the clause in Mt 19.9 to its counterpart in 5.32. Cf. Metzger, TC, 47-8. H. Crouzel, "Le Texte patristique des Matthieu v. 32 et xix.9", NTS 19 (1, 1972) 98-119, notes that no Ante-Nicene Church Father attests the present form of Mt 19.9, but rather a form analogous to Mt 5.32. Cf. T. L. Thompson, "A Catholic View of Divorce", JES 6 (1969) 53-67. J. P. Arendzen, "Ante-Nicene Interpretations of the Sayings on Divorce", JTS 20 (1918-19) 230-41 ,concludes that there is no evidence before Nicea that the exceptive clause authorized the breaking of the marital bond.

[150]Cf. TEV and the views of A. Ott as cited in U. Holzmeister. "Die Streitfrage über die Ehescheidungstexte bei Matthäus 5,32 und 19,9", Bib 26 (1945) 133-46. The inclusive view of 5.32 and/or 19.9 is refuted ably by J. Sickenberger, "Zwei neue Ausserungen zur Ehebruchklausel bei Mt", ZNW 42 (1949) 202-09, espec. 208.

[151]Cf. BAG, 630; LSJ, 1334; A-S, 344; MM 492; B. Leeming and R. A. Dyson, "Except it be for Fornication?" Scr 8 (1956) 75-82.

[152]So Zerwick, sec. 442, 148-9; Dupont, Mariage et Divorce, 102 ff. Even if the clause in 19.9 is not elliptical ,surely, 'not for πορνεία', means the same as 'except in the case of πορνεία'. Cf. J. Bonsirven, "'Nisi fornicationis causa' Comment résoudre cette 'crux interpretum'?" RSR 35 (1948) 453, n. 2.

[153]Cf. T. V. Fleming, "Christ on Divorce", TS 24 (1963) 106-20, and B. Vawter, "The Divorce Clauses in Mt 5,32, and 19,9", CBQ 16 (1954) 155-67.

[154]BAG, 699; MM, 529.

[155]It covers a wider scope of activities than μοιχεία. Cf. MM, 529; Derrett, Law in the NT, 368-71.

[156]An increasing number of scholars think this is the meaning in Matthew 5 and 19. So Ellis, Luke, 203; W. K. Lowther Clarke, "The Excepting Clause in St. Matthew", Theology 15 (1927) 161-2; H. Baltensweiler, "Die Ehebruchsklauseln bei Matthäus", TZ 15 (1959) 340-56; Baltensweiler, Die Ehe im Neuen Testament - Exegetische Untersuchungen über Ehe, Ehelosigkeit und Ehescheidung (Stuttgart, 1967) espec. 87-107; Bonsirven, "'Nisi Fornicationis Causa'", 442-64; Fitzmyer, "The Matthean Divorce Texts", 197-226; H. J. Richards, "Christ on Divorce", Scr 11 (13, 1959) 22-32; Zerwick, 43, n. 8.

[157]RSV, NEB, NASB, Moffatt, have "unchastity"; KJV, "fornication"; Phillips, "Unfaithfulness"; NIV, "Marital unfaithfulness"; TEV, "unfaithful"; Schonfield, "adultery". Cf. BAG, 700; LSJ, 1141. A. Isaksson, Marriage and Ministry in the New Temple: A Study with Special Reference to Mt. 19.13-12 [sic] and 1 Cor 11.3-6 (Lund, 1965) 134, shows that πορνεία does not usually mean adultery. Further, adultery, like premarital unchastity discovered after the marriage, was punished by stoning, not divorce.

[158]Cf. Fitzmyer, "The Matthean Divorce Texts", 209-10.

[159]Cf. LXXR I, 329; Leeming ,77 ff.; Str-B I, 312-21. Prof. Barrett has suggested to me that erwat dabar could mean something similar to 'abomination' in both Deut 23.14 and 24.1.

[160]Fleming ,"Christ on Divorce", 115 ff.

[161]Cf. Isaksson, Marriage and Ministry , 127-42. Whereas premarital unchastity might be punished by stoning if it was discovered after the marriage had taken place this was not the case for unchastity discovered prior to marriage. Cf. Mt 1.19 and note that shame, not stoning, is what is to be avoided.

[162]Cf. U. Nembach "Ehescheidung nach alttestamentlichem und jüdischem Recht", TZ 26 (3, 1970) 161-71; J. Moingt, "Le Divorce (Pour Motif d' Impudicité) (Matthieu 5 32; 19,9)", RSR 56 (1968) 337-84.

[163]The prohibition of incestuous marriages makes sense of the decree in Acts, since most Gentiles had no scruples against such marriages. Cf. W. J. Harrington ,"Notes and Comments - the New Testament and Divorce", ITQ 39 (2, 1972). 179, n. 5.

[164]Cf. APOT I, 224.

[165]Fitzmyer, "The Matthean Divorce Texts", 215 ff. It is significant that the technical term that the rabbis used for incestuous marriage (ערוה)also conveys the sense of fornication in some instances. Cf. F. Gavin, "A Further Note on πορνεία", Theology 16 (1928) 102-5. The objection that πορνεία is not simply a technical term for incest would be equally fatal to ערוה.

[166]Cf. Mk 6.14-29 and parallels; Josephus, Antiquities 18.136 (LCL VI) 92-3; Antiquities 18.240 (LCL VI) 144-7.

[167]A. Mahoney, "A New Look at the Divorce Clauses in Mt. 5,32 and 19,9", CBQ 30 (1968) 33. On the possibility that the original setting of this controversy was in Perea, cf. Taylor, Mark ,416; Cranfield, Mark, 318; M'Neile, Matthew, 271.

[168]Cf. F. Hauck and S. Schulz, "πόρνη", TDNT VI, 591; Nembach, "Ehescheidung", 165 ff.

[169]Daube, NT and Rabbinic Judaism ,81-2.

[170]B. T. Sanhedrin 58a, The Babylonian Talmud (trans. H. Freedman, 1935) 393 ff.

[171]His audience may have been either Jewish and Gentile Christians or simply Gentile Christians. Cf. pp.
In either case, his inclusion of the exceptive clauses would be relevant.

[172]Fitzmyer,"The Matthean Divorce Texts", 221.

[173]C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (New York, 1968) 162.

[174]N. Turner, "The Translation of Μοιχᾶται ἐπ' Αὐτήν in Mark 10.11", BT 7 (1956) 151-2, and B. Schaller, "'Commits adultery with her', not 'against her', Mk 10.11"; ET 83 (4, 1972) 107-08.

[175]Creed, Luke, 207; G. Delling, "Das Logion Mark X.11 (und seine Abwandlungen) im Neuen Testament", NovT 1 (1956) 263-74; J. J. O'Rourke, "A Note on an Exception: Mt 5.32 (19.9) and 1 Cor 7.12 Compared", HeyJ 5 (3, 1964) 299-302.

[176]For a good survey of the problem, cf. Taylor, Mark, 420-1, The divorce reading is probably the more original. So Swete, Mark, 206; Cranfield, Mark, 321-2; A. Plummer, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London, 1914) 230.

[177]Cf. E. Bammel, "Markus 10.11 f.", 95-101, and "Is Luke 16,16-18 of Baptist's Provenience?" HTR 51 (1958) 101-06. The evidence is admittedly not vast. Cf. pp. 5, and 31, endnote 39 of thesis.
Cf. Josephus, Antiquities 15.259 (LCL V) 122-3. Various rabbis recognized the validity of a pagan divorce instituted by a wife through a repudium. Cf. Cohen, "Concerning Divorce in Jewish and Roman Law", 4-13. Billerbeck (Str-B II, 23-4) suggests that Mk 10.12 is simply a strong way of saying a woman could forcibly end a marriage by separation or appeal to the courts.

[178]In which case the variant might be right. J. N. Birdsall in an unpublished paper presented at the Tyndale Fellowship (July, 1979) and in a personal communique has pointed out the following: F. C. Burkitt saw Mk 10.12 as an explicit reference to the adulterous relationship of Herodias and Herod. Burkitt noted the variant of the S^{sy} (supported by minuscule 1) which reverses the order of the declaration, thus placing the offence of the deserting woman first. Birdsall also points out that the related ms. 209 omits the male clause by homoioteleuton. W and the idiosyncratic Adis ms. of the Old Georgian also evidence the reversal. Burkitt argues that the true order was Mk 10.12, and then 10.11. Burkitt, Gospel History, 100-01, and n. 1. Some rabbis had declared that Gentiles had no divorce because the permission was given only to the Jews. Cf. Str-B I, 312; Lehmann, "Genesis 2.24", 264-6.

[179]As Cranfield, Mark, 321 says, "According to Rabbinic law a man could be said to commit adultery against another man, and a wife could be said to commit adultery against her husband, but a husband could not be said to commit adultery against his wife." Thus, Jesus equalizes matters.

[180]Cf. M. Sotah 5.1, Danby, 298. Catchpole ,"The Synoptic Divorce", 113, believes that a redefinition of adultery has been formulated: "...such a redefinition involves a higher estimate of the status of women than was current in his environment, but a considerable amount of supporting material, suggesting just such a revaluation of the role of women by Jesus, exists."

[181]Str-B I, 320, says that the provision 'he who marries a divorced woman commits adultery' was completely unknown in Judaism except in the case of remarriage to the original husband (cf. Deut 24.1-4).

[182]Montefiore, Rabbinic Literature, 269. As Hill, Matthew, 282 notes, however, the sectarian group that made up the Qumran community "...may have provided the spiritual milieu which nurtured the ideal of a self-consecration to a holy life and warfare which included celibacy." Cf. endnote 191 below.

[183]Bultmann, History, 26 ,calls 19.12 a 'dominical saying' in the midst of a Matthean transitional passage. Isaksson, Marriage and Ministry, 151 , argues plausibly that this tradition derives from Jesus in dependence on Is 56.3-5. On the authenticity of this saying , cf. Jeremias, NT Theology, 224.

[184]In the Lukan parallel to Mk 10.28-30 (Lk 18.29) note the addition of ἢ γυναῖκα perhaps reflecting Luke's interest in and concern for women. The addition of 'wife' may intensify the saying , since it would perhaps be conceivable to a Jew that a man might make an unconditional and possibly permanent commitment to leave his home, parents , cousins , and even children, but not the one person to whom he had a biblical obligation 'to cleave'.

[185]Cf. M. Yebamoth 8.4 ff., Danby , 230.

[186]Davies, Sermon on the Mount, 393, cf. pp. 394-5, 400.

[187]συμφέρω can mean 'to be profitable', 'to be better (of gain)'. Cf. BAG, 787-8; LSJ, 1686-7; K. Weiss , "συμφέρω", TDNT IX, 75, n. 13.

[188]Cf. Cohen, "Concerning Divorce in Jewish and Roman Law", 3 ff.; Davies, Sermon on the Mount, 393-5; and pp.

[189]It is probable that the solemn 'this word' refers to something Jesus Himself has said. Mt 19.22-26 should be compared to Mt 19.10-12, as J.-M. van Cangh, "Fondement évangelique de la vie religieuse", NRT 95 (6, 1973) 639-40, points out. In both pericopes Jesus does not answer the disciples' question directly but gives a further explanation of what He has said previously. In 19.22, τὸν λόγον τοῦτον or τὸν λόγον (Metzger, TC, 49-50) refers to Jesus' teaching. Robertson, 1190, remarks that the γὰρ in 19.12 is not causal but indicates that an explanation of 'not everyone, but those to whom it is given' is to follow. Thus, the eunuch saying explains why Jesus' marriage teaching is only given to some. The possibility cannot be ruled out that v 11 is the Evangelist's own addition (based on the end of v 12). If so, then it represents a qualification of Jesus' marriage teaching for His own community. To claim that the eunuchs in vv 10-12 are those having put away their wives for πορνεία is to ignore the likelihood that the juxtaposition of 19.1-9, 10-12 is the Evangelist's. Cf. Q. Quesnell, "'Made Themselves Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven' (Mt 19,12)", CBQ 30 (1968) 335-58.

[190]In both cases we are talking about someone actually castrated. A. D. Nock, "Eunuchs in ancient religion", ARW 23 (1925) 25-33, notes that eunuchs had no place in purely Greek or Roman cults, but are found in various fertility cults of Asia Minor and Syria. As Ac 8.27 indicates, eunuchs of royal courts could be place in charge of more than just concubines.

[191]The evidence of the Qumran scrolls, Josephus, and Philo is difficult to decipher, but it appears that at least some Qumranites were celibate as part of their service to Yahweh. It is unlikly that this entailed actual castration. Cf. J. Galot, "La motivation evangélique du célibat", Greg 53 (4, 1972) 731-57; T. Matura, "Le célibat dans le Nouveau Testament", NRT 97 (6, 1975) 481-500.

[192]Cf. Josephus, Antiquities 4.290-1 (LCL IV) 614-5. Paradoxically, Josephus, Herod, and others made use of eunuchs for teachers, chamberlains, etc. Cf. Josephus, The Life 429 (LCL I) 156-7; Jewish War 1.488 (LCL II) 230-1; J. Schneider, "εὐνοῦχος", TDNT II, 765-8; pp. 4-5 of thesis.

[193]Cf. J. Blinzler, "εἰσὶν εὐνοῦχοι - Zur Auslegung von Mt. 19.12", ZNW 48 (1957) 254-70, and particularly 258.

[194]While Jesus probably was not speaking in Greek, it is likely that He was using the Semitic equivalent of εὐνοῦχος - סריס (cf. Is 56.3, LXX, and MT). Cf. BDF, 710.

[195]Even Origen later changed his mind. Cf. J. Schneider, "εὐνοῦχος", TDNT II, 765-8; Blinzler, "εισιν εὐνοῦχοι", 258 ff. MHT I, 139, says that if εὐνούχισαν referred to a single event, then Origen's original interpretation would be correct. The single event could be the decision to renounce marriage or family for Jesus' sake. Cf. M'Neile, Matthew, 276. For the view that Jesus was giving a Mashal intending the third class of eunuchs to be understood physically, while Matthew later added "for the Kingdom's sake" to give a transferred sense to eunuchs of the third type, cf. H. Zimmerman, "μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ (Mt 19,9) - ein literarisches Problem - Zur Komposition von Mt 19,3-12", Catholica 16 (4, 1962) 295-6.

[196]Cf. Clement's paed. 3.4 quoted in Manson, Sayings, 215-6. Notice, however, that Clement finds it necessary to qualify the word εὐνοῦχος with ἀληθῆς.

[197]These last two suggestions were made by J. A. Kleist, "Eunuchs in the New Testament", CBQ 7 (1945) 447-9.

[198]Cf. similarly the NEB. Blinzler's suggested translation ("εἰσὶν εὐνοῦχοι", 259) is based in part on the fact that the Jewish classification of eunuchs was made to denote those unfit for marriage. Possibly, Jesus would have said that even real physical eunuchs can be given the gift of making their state a blessing, rather than a curse, by accepting the call to be a eunuch for the Kingdom. Cf. Isaksson, Marriage and Ministry, 148-52; Moingt, "Le Divorce", 370.

[199]J. Blenkinsopp, Sexuality and the Christian Tradition (London, 1970) 91.

[200]Blenkinsopp, 91-2; Galot, "La motivation", 142-3; J. B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon (London, 1879) 411-12. It is true that some Qumranites married, but there also existed in the Qumran community a sexual taboo and association of holiness with ritual purity. Jesus clearly rejected this connection in His teaching about clean and unclean, and in His repeated association and physical contact with harlots, lepers, etc.

[201]Cf. Jeremias, NT Theology, 32-3, 224.

[202], Blinzler, "εἰσὶν εὐνοῦχοι", 260 ff., is wrong to so closely identify the decision spoken of in Mt 19.10-12 and that mentioned in Mk 10.28-30.

[203]E. Schweizer, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. Das Neue Testament Deutsch (n.s. ed. G. Friedrich; Göttingen, 1976) 250.

[204]It is possible that Jesus gave this teaching originally to the Pharisees and/or the disciples as a justification of His own singleness for the Kingdom. Cf. Matura, "Le célibat dans le NT", 496. That Jesus' marital status is a non-issue in the Gospels probably indicates that He was never married, and that in His community marriage was not an obligation. Pace W. E. Phipps, Was Jesus Married? (London, 1970). Phipps' book makes the mistaken assumption that Jesus would not have differed with other rabbis about the obligation to procreate; however Mt 19.12 is evidence that He did differ with the common view.

[205]The belief in an obligation to procreate and thus the duty to marry was one shared by Jews (cf. pp. 4-5, and endnote 33, p. 31 of thesis) Greeks, and Romans (cf. p. 44, n.227). D. Daube, The Duty of Procreation (Edinburgh, 1977) 9 ff., has shown that in a Greek context it was common to emphasize the duty to marry and propagate. Cf. Plutarch, Lysander, 30.5, The Parallel Lives (LCL IV) 320-1; Plutarch, Lycurgus 15.1 ff., The Parallel Lives (LCL I) 246 ff.; Dinarchus, Against Demosthenes 99.71, The Minor Attic Orators (LCL II; trans. J. O. Burtt; London, 1954) 224-5.

[206]Cf. Swete, Mark, 264; Creed, Luke, 249; Plummer, Matthew, 306; and W. Manson, The Gospel of Luke (Moffatt NT Commentary; London, 1930) 225.

[207]G. E. Ladd, A Theology of the New Testament (Grand Rapids, 1974) 69. Oepke, "γυνή", TDNT I, 785: "holding out a prospect of sexless being like that of the angels".

[208]Cf. Bultmann, History, 26; Schweizer, Das Evangelium nach Markus. Das Neue Testament Deutsch (ed. P. Althaus and J. Behm; Göttingen, 1949) 140.

[209]Pesch, Markusevangelium II.2, 235, cf. p. 229.

[210]Ibid., Jeremias, NT Theology, 184, n. 3.

[211]By the time the Mishnah was written some were asking that it cease, and before this it was likely in disuse. Cf. M. Eduyoth 4.8, Danby, 429-30; M. Berkoth 1.7, Danby, 429-30; M. Berakoth 1.7, Danby, 531; M. Sanhedrin 2.2, Danby, 384.

[212]Cf. Daube, NT and Rabbinic Judaism, 158-69.

[213]Cf. the boruth on resurrection in B. T. Sanhedrin 90b, in Str-B I, 888-90. The popular belief seems to have envisioned a resurrection of only the righteous to a state without sin or death in which one will neither eat, nor drink, nor propagate, nor travel. Cf. B. T. Berakoth 17a, The Babylonian Talmud Berkot (trans. A. Cohen; Cambridge, 1921) 112; Str-B I, 888-91. There were, however, rabbis (notably R. Gamaliel) who believed women would bear children daily in the new age to come; cf. B. T. Shabbath 30b, The Babylonian Talmud (trans. H. Freedman; 1938) 137-8; Enoch 10.17; APOT II, 194.

[214]Ellis, Luke , 234; Creed, Luke, 249.

[215]Cranfield, Mark, 373; Taylor, Mark, 480.

[216]Marshall, Luke, 738; Ellis , Luke, 234.

[217]παρ' ἡμῖν, found only in Mt 22.25, may indicate that the First Evangelist thought otherwise. M'Neile, Matthew, 321.

[218]Rengstorf, "ἑπτά", TDNT II, 630. The possible background to this story in Tobit 3.8, 6.9-12, 7.12-13 ,suggests this as well. Cf. APOT I, 209 , 218, 222.

[219]σπέρμα is used in the general sense of a child, but usually the Levir was required to raise up a male. Swete, Mark, 262; S. Schulz, "σπέρμα", TDNT VII, 545. Perhaps there is an intended contrast between the Sadducees who believe in raising up a seed and Jesus who believes in raising up a body - two different means of immortality. Cf. Hill, Matthew, 304.

[220]G. Stählin, "χήρα", TDNT IX, 442, 447, n. 60, 457. Marshall, Luke, 739, is only partially correct in saying that Levirate marriage was intended as a means of keeping property in the family.

[221]Ellis, Luke, 234-7.

[222]J. Denney, "The Sadducees and Immortality", Exp 4th ser 10 (1894) 402. ἔσχον in Mk 12.23 and parallels may mean not just 'had' as a marriage partner, but 'had' intercourse with. Cf. MHT I, 145; Zerwick, sec. 289 , p. 98; H. Hanse, "ἔχω", TDNT II, 817, n. 5. This fits the Levirate marriage contract and the textual variant in Lk 20.34 (beget and begotten).

[223]Cf. Grundmann, "δύναμαι", TDNT II, 304-06; E. H. Blakeney, "A Note on St. Matthew xxii.29", ET 4 (1892-93) 382.

[224]The 'sons of this age' is a Semitic phrase with a similar connotation to the modern idiomatic expression 'a product of his time'. Cf. E. Schweizer, "υἱός", TDNT VIII, 365; Danker, Jesus, 205.

[225]E. Stauffer, "γαμέω", TDNT I, 651 , n. 15, states: "Jesus keeps closely to the traditional modes of Jewish thought and expression when here and in Mk 12.25 He uses the act. (γαμεῖν) for the man and the mid. (γαμίζεσθαι) for the woman..." Further (650), "The husband is the active partner in the conclusion and direction of marriage. This is self-evident for Jesus." This is a somewhat surprising statement since it is not likely that Jesus spoke Greek on this occasion. It is likely that the Gospel writers believed that on this point they were reflecting faithfully Jesus' views on marital customs in their own language.

[226]Jeremias, NT Theology, 225.

[227]Ellis, Luke, 204-5, 236-7, notes the possible conflict with Mk 19.6-8 and conjectures that Mark 10 must mean that marriage is intended to be indissoluble in this life. So Jeremias, NT Theology 225. There need be no conflict if Jesus is not speaking of the dissolution of marriages or the dissolution of all kinds of marriages here. Cf. pp. 103-7 of thesis.

[228]The γάρ indicates that here we have the reason why marrying ceases in the age to come. Plummer, Luke, 469; J. Reiling and J. L. Swellengrebel A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Luke (Leiden 1971) 654.

[229]Jesus and some rabbis rejected the idea that the age to come is just this age on a grander and more carnal scale; cf. Str-B I, 888-91.

[230]Luke coins a word - ἰσάγγελος. Ladd, Theology of the NT, 195, rightly remarks, "It is important to note that Jesus does not say that men will become angels - only that they will be like angels..."

[231]Plummer, Luke, 469, remarks, "They do not marry, because they cannot die; and they cannot die, because they are like angels; and they are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection."

[232]Denney, "Sadducees and Immortality", 403. Marshall, Luke, 741, says, "It is more likely, however, that the marriage relationship is transcended in a new level of personal relationships, and the basic point being made is that marriage as a means of procreation is no longer necessary."

[233]Cf. E. E. Ellis, "Jesus, the Sadducees, and Qumran", NTS 10 (1963-64) 274. The Sadducees have tailored their argument and its textual basis to fit their own purposes which is in itself grounds to reject their question. Cf. Deut 25.5-10; Taylor, Mark, 481; Swete, Mark, 262.

[234]I. H. Marshall, Eschatology and the Parables (London, 1963) 5.

[235]A. M. Hunter, The Parables Then and Now (London, 1971) 56.

[236]H. Flender, St. Luke - Theologian of Redemptive History (London, 1967) 9-10, notes that this parallelism is most often seen in special Lukan material. Note his list: Lk 1.11-20, 1.26-38, 1.46-55, 1.67-79, 2.25-38, 4.25-28, 4.31-39 (cf. Mk 1.21-31), 7.1-17, 7.36-50, 13.18-21, 10.29-42, 15.4-10, 18.1-14, 23.55-24.35, 17.34-35 (cf. Mt 24.40-41); and Ac 5.1-11, 9.32-42, 17.34. Flender (10) concludes, "Luke expresses by this arrangement that man and woman stand together and side by side before God. They are equal in honour and grace, they are endowed with the same gifts and have the same responsibilities..." J. Drury, Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel - Study in Early Christian Historiography (London, 1976) 71, argues that Jairus and his daughter, and the widow of Nain and her son make a "neat pair".

[237]Parvey, "Theology and Leadership", 139.

[238]Among others, D. Buzy, "Le juge inique (Saint Luc, xviii,1-8)", RB 39 (1930) 378-91.

[239]B. B. Warfield, "The Importunate Widow and the Alleged Failure of Faith", ET 25 (1913-14) 69-72, 136-9; Buzy, "Le juge inique", 378 ff.; Hunter, Parables, 80 ff.

[240]C. Spicq, "La parabole de la veuve obstinée et du juge inerte, aux décisions impromptues (Lc. xviii,1-8)", RB 68 (1, 1961) 69-70; G. Delling, "Das Gleichnis vom gottlosen Richter", ZNW 53 (1962) 11 ff.; Creed, Luke, 222.

[241]D. R. Catchpole, "The Son of Man's Search for Faith (Luke xviii. 8b)", NovT 19 (2, 1977) 81-104; Marshall, Eschatology, 45 ff.; W. G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment - The Eschatological Message of Jesus (London, 1957) 59.

[242]J. Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus (2nd rev. ed.; trans. S. H. Hooke; New York, 1972) 155-7; R. Deschryver, "La parabole du juge malveillant (Luc 18,1-8)", RHPR 48 (4, 1968) 355-66. Deschryver points out that the parataxis, sudden change of subject in v 4, the expression "in himself" in v 4, the "judge of unrighteousness" in v 6, and the general Aramaic tone all argue strongly that this parable is archaic and a literary unit (although he excepts vv 1 and 8b). Verse 8b perhaps is a later addition; cf. Bultmann, History, 189, 193, 199; Ellis, Luke, 213.

[243]The "crying" of the elect in v 7 may intimate a context of persecution or oppression. In any case, Luke intends us to see this parable in an eschatological light. Cf. Cranfield, "The Parable of the Unjust Judge and the Eschatology of Luke-Acts", SJT 16 (1963) 297-301; Stählin, "Das Bild der Witwe", 56.

[244]Delling, "Das Gleichnis", 23; Spicq, "La parabole", 86 ff.

[245]Possibly, the original audience was Jesus' opponents or some pious Jews; cf. Delling, "Das Gleichnis", 22. More likely, it was His disciples. Cf. Jeremias, Parables, 156, and n. 19; Cranfield, "Parable of the Unjust Judge", 298; Manson, Luke, 200; Plummer, Luke, 411. Luke's αὐτοῖς in 18.1 shows clearly whom he sees as the audience.

[246]APOT I, 438-9.

[247]The ἀντίδικος is a technical term for an opponent in a lawsuit. Cf. BAG, 73; LSJ, 155; A-S, 41. It can refer either to the defendant or to the plaintiff. Cf. Str-B II, 238; Derrett, "Law in the New Testament: The Parable of the Unjust Judge", Studies in the NT I, 32-47.

[248]Derrett, "The Unjust Judge", 32-5, 37, n. 1, is right in saying that it was common for Jews to go to civil courts because, unlike religious courts, they could act without trial, witnesses, or evidence, and thus they were used commonly to gain illegal advantage of another person. This is not the widow's motive here. Clearly, someone has gotten to the judge before her, for she would not have turned to a κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας if she had initiated the proceedings. It is probably not true that the judge was legally required to give precedence to a widow's case. Pace. Stählin, "χήρα", TDNT IX, 450, n. 86; and Marshall, Luke, 672. The example in B. T. Yebamoth 100a, The Babylonian Talmud (trans. Slotki, 1936) 684-5, is from the fourth century A. D. But cf. G. B. Caird, The Gospel of St. Luke (Pelican New Testament Commentaries; Harmondsworth, 1963) 203.

[249]ὁ κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας - a Hebraic genitive of quality. Cf. MHT III, 213; Jeremias, Parables, 45. For rabbinic parallels, cf. Str-B II, 239.

[250]The phrase, "neither fearing God, nor caring (about the opinion) of man" (pace Derrett, "The Unjust Judge", 45, n. 1) does not mean this judge was 'no respecter of persons' in the sense that no one could

influence his judgment. Rather, as in the extra-biblical examples, the phrase implies that he does not care what anyone thinks, and thus he does whatever best suits his own interests. Cf. Josephus, Antiquities 10.83 (LCL III) 202-03; Danker, Jesus, 184.

[251]The iterative imperfect likely indicates her persistence. Cf. Plummer, Luke, 412; Jeremias, Parables, 153, n. 4.

[252]Derrett, "The Unjust Judge", 41, says that ἐκδίκησόν με means 'be my advocate'; others prefer 'vindicate me'. Cf. Jeremias, Parables, 153; Spicq, "La parabole", 70; Warfield, "The Importunate Widow", 71, suggests "deliver or protect me".

[253]ἐπὶ χρόνον implies here 'for a long time'. Cf. Delling, "Das Gleichnis", 11.

[254]Does εἰς τέλος go with ἐρχομένη or ὑπωπιάζῃ? If the former, then it is to be translated 'continually (or perhaps finally) coming'. So Plummer, Luke, 413; Zerwick, sec. 249, p. 81. Spicq, "La parabole", 75, however, says εἰς τέλος usually is used in classical and Hellenistic literature to mean the completion of a process - she will finally ὑπωπιάζῃ. So Delling, "τέλος", TDNT VIII, 56; similarly, Jeremias, Parables, 154.

[255]Spicq, "La parabole", 76, citing examples from the papyri where a frustrated woman finally hits someone. Cf. BAG, 856; Delling, "Das Gleichnis", 12 ff.; Zerwick, sec. 249, p. 81..

[256]Jeremias, Parables, 154; Creed, Luke, 223; Buzy, "Le juge inique", 380; A-S, 463; LSJ, 1904; MM, 661; Plummer, Luke, 413; cf. 1 Cor 9.27.

[257]Derrett, "The Unjust Judge", 43-6; Marshall, Luke, 673. Plummer, Luke, 413, objects that for the meaning 'black my face', ἐλθοῦσα ὑπωπιάσῃ would be required.

[258]If we take εἰς τέλος as 'finally', as seems probable, and take seriously Jesus' enjoinder to listen to the judge's last remark, then Jesus is intimating not only vindication for God's elect, but also a delay in God's actions.

[259]This is in contrast to the normal Jewish practice of praying at certain times of day. Cf. Str-B II, 237.

[260]Thus, the argument is by contraries, or as C. Colpe, "ὁ υἱὸς", TDNT VIII, 435, n. 265, says, a peiore ad melius.

[261]There is possibly a hint of allegory here in that the widow may represent God's people in an oppressive and evil world. Cf. Stählin, "χήρα", TDNT IX, 458-9; Delling, "Das Gleichnis", 24. It is perhaps worth noting that God's people are characterized as one or another sort of woman depending on whether Jesus is present (bride, bride-to-be, or even bridesmaid, cf. Mt 25.1-13), or absent (widow). If it is true that the role of the community of faith is characteristically feminine, then perhaps women's roles and natures are better human models for Jesus' disciples then men's. Perhaps, Jesus intimates as much by His association with, teaching about, and His examples involving women.

[262]Manson, Sayings, 282. The title is particularly fitting for the material just discussed in Luke 18 since there we have a desperate widow (1-8) and a despised tax collector (9-14). Manson is right that one of the reasons this material has been chosen and so arranged is to demonstrate God's care for those whom man condemns or despises. Lk 15.1-2 shows that this is certainly part of the purpose in presenting the three parables that we have in 15.3-32 as well.

[263]This parable is intended to show God's love for and seeking of the lost, and His joy over their salvation. Thus, we should not see it as an analogy between a woman searching for a lost coin, and a person seeking the Kingdom (unlike Mt 13.44-45).

[264]Plummer, Luke, 371.

[265]Jeremias, Parables, 133.

[266]The analogy is between the seeking activity of God and these two human beings, and between the rejoicing activity of God and these human beings when they recover the sought after object. Thus, it is not correct to say that God is described as a man or woman in 15.3-10 (pace Swidler, "Jesus was a Feminist", 177-83).

[267]Cf. Bultmann, History, 194, though it is not clear in the end that Bultmann accepts this view.

[268]H. Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke (New York, 1961) 111; Drury, Tradition and Design, 158-9.

[269]Bultmann, History, 194.

[270]Marshall, Luke, 603; cf. Jeremias, Parables, 132-6.

[271]Cf. Jeremias, "Tradition und Redaktion in Lukas 15", ZNW 62 (3-4, 1971) 172-89, espec. 181-4. Cf. for instance the addition of οὖ after ἕως in v 8 (cf. vv 4, 7, 8, 10).

[272]Cf. Marshall, Luke, 603; Jeremias, Parables, 9; and contrast C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom (New York, 1961) 92. If Jeremias, Parables, 135, n. 12, is right about an Aramaic imperfect underlying γίνεται and that the reference is to God's future rejoicing at the eschaton, then perhaps we have here evidence that this application is not secondary, in view of Luke's eschatological viewpoint.

[273]Jeremias, Parables, 133-5; similarly, Hunter, Parables, 57. This has been challenged since the text reads simply ἔχουσα δέκα... ἀπολέσῃ δραχμὴν μίαν. Cf. Danker, Jesus, 169; Plummer, Luke, 370.

[274]BDF, sec. 5, p. 4; Ellis, Luke, 197; Manson, Sayings, 284, suggests that this is the woman's savings, not her housekeeping money.

[275]A, D, W, λ, φ, pm have συγκαλεῖται instead of συγκαλεῖ. Jeremias, "Tradition und Redaktion", 182-3, suggests συγκαλεῖ is pre-Lukan and reflects the incorrect use of the active in Luke's special source. Cf. BDF, sec. 316.1, 165. K. L. Schmidt, "συγκαλέω", TDNT III, 496, n. 2, suggests συγκαλεῖται is to be preferred.

[276]Hunter, Parables, 12; cf. Dodd, Parables, 93.

[277]Dodd, Parables, 92.

[278]That she has money at all may support the idea that she is a widow. Cf. pp. 5-6 of thesis.

[279]It is perhaps significant that this woman has lost this drachma. This woman could have been used as an example of carelessness. That Jesus chooses to use such an example in a positive manner indicates His desire to present even a fallible man (who loses his sheep) and a fallible woman (who loses her money) as equally good examples of God's activity.

[280]Cf. Marshall, Luke, 560; Streeter, Four Gospels, 246-8, appears to believe that Luke used solely Q material but the double introduction form appears only here in Lucan parables.

[281]Kümmel, Promise, 132, n. 98; cf. Bultmann, History, 195; Dodd, Parables, 154; J. Dupont, "Les paraboles du sénevé et du levain", NRT 89 (1967) 911.

[282]Jeremias, Parables, 92. Were this a uniquely Lukan pairing one might suspect that the connection was originally his.

[283]This is a secondary interest, since the main point concerns the nature of the Kingdom. It is probably wrong to overemphasize the fact that many or most parables have one or two main points. While this is true, there are probably no details given which are wholly meaningless and therefore entirely superfluous, though not all the elements in the picture are of equal value and over-allegorizing is to be avoided. Cf. O. T. Allis, "The Parable of the Leaven", EvQ 19 (1947) 255; R. W. Funk, "Beyond Criticism in Quest of Literacy: The Parable of the Leaven", Int 25 (1971) 149-70, rightly warns, "Methodology is not an indifferent net; it catches what it is designed to catch." (151).

[284]M. Ket 5.5, Danby, 252; Interestingly, sy^{c} labels this woman φρονίμη at Mt 13.33.

[285]We are not saying this is the main point of the analogy, but it is perhaps a reason why Jesus chose to draw an analogy between this woman's work and the working of the Kingdom and/or His own work. Cf. Hunter, Parables, 44-5; Jeremias, Parables, 149.

[286]A-S, 20; BAG, 35; MM, 21.

[287]Funk, "Beyond Criticism", 159; Str-B I, 669-70. Marshall, Luke, 561, remarks, "The quantity is surprisingly large but the figure is traditional (Gn. 18:6; cf. Judg. 6:19; 1 Sa. 1:24)."

[288]Jeremias, Parables, 147, n. 71; Marshall, Luke, 560; cf. M. Peah 8.7, Danby, 20. As Jeremias suggests, the proportions likely indicate a supernatural action is involved.

[289]Jesus seems to have used the technique of comic exaggeration elsewhere (workmen hired at the eleventh hour, amount of forgiving, etc.). Cf. Funk, "Beyond Criticism", 160.

[290]Jeremias, Parables, 147.

[291]Funk, "Beyond Criticism", 160.

[292]Jesus could have made a connection between Gen 18.6 and our passage; cf. Funk, "Beyond Criticism", 160; Jeremias, Parables, 31-2; M'Neile, Matthew, 199.

[293]It is true that in the Feast of Unleavened Bread, as apparently in the case of the Feast of Weeks, people baked their own bread; cf. Lev 23.5-8, 17.

[294]There is no mention of the amount of leaven in Matthew or Luke which militates against the idea that the point is simply the contrast between small beginnings and great results in the parable of the leaven. This may be implied by the verb ἐνέκρυψεν, or one may argue it was proverbial (1 Cor 5.6) but, if so, it remains an implication and probably not the main point. Cf. Dodd, Parables, 155; H. Windisch, "ζύμη", TDNT II, 905-6, n. 27.

[295]It is true that this phrase places a strong emphasis on results; however, note that it is a subordinate clause and it does not say, until the whole lump rises, but until the whole lump is leavened. If the emphasis is on the main verb and the woman's actions, then this parable is likely more of a growth or dynamic permeation parable than a contrast parable. Cf. H. Thielicke, The Waiting Father (New York, 1959) 61; Marshall, Eschatology, 28; and contrast Jeremias, Parables, 147. It appears that we have a complete process of taking and hiding until leavened. The word ὅλον, being a predicate adjective (cf. Robertson, 656), makes an additional point about the successful conclusion of the process.

[296]J. Massyngberde Ford, "The Parable of the Foolish Scholars, Matt. xxv.1-13", NovT 9 (1967) 107.

[297]There are the negative remarks in Mk 3.21, 33-35 about Jesus' mother and family, and we note Lk 11.27-28 among other possible texts.

[298]Now that we have found complementary male-female parallelism in both Matthew and Luke (and in uniquely Matthean and Lukan material), the probability that this male-female pairing (or at least the precedent for it) derives from Jesus Himself is greatly enhanced.

[299]W. D. Ridley, "The Parable of the Ten Virgins", Exp 5th ser 2 (1895) 342.

[300]Ridley, 343.

[301]Oepke, "γυνή", TDNT I, 784. Either Mt 23-25 or 24-25 is a unit; if the latter, then 24.3 indicates whom Jesus is instructing. The τότε, possibly v 5, and certainly vv 12-13 indicate that the Evangelist envisions this parable as relating something about the Parousia.

[302]Jeremias, Parables, 82, n. 52; M'Neile, Matthew, 360; Zerwick, sec. 65, p. 22.

[303]Jeremias, "LAMPADES - Mt. 25.1, 3f, 7f", ZNW 56 (1965) 198-9; Dodd, Parables, 19; Schweizer, Matthäus, 304.

[304]E. Klostermann, Das Matthäusevangelium (Vol. IV, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament; 2nd ed.; ed. H. Lietzmann; Tübingen, 1927) 199; Bultmann, History, 119.

[305]Bultmann, History, 176.

[306]Cf. Jeremias, Parables, 171-5; A. W. Argyle, "Wedding Customs at the Time of Jesus", ET 86 (1974-75) 214-5. Even the bridegroom's delay in v 5 is explicable because it was customary for the bridegroom and the bride's parents to haggle at length over the mohar to show the bride's worth.

[307]Raymond E. Brown, New Testament Essays (Garden City, 1968) 323. As Massyngberde Ford, "The Parable of the Foolish Scholars", 120-3 has shown, in rabbinic exegesis and illustration, the literal and allegorical went hand-in-hand and often the literal sense of a word or phrase was used to reinforce allegory.

[308]Kümmel, Promise, 55.

[309]Metzger, TC, 62-3; Jeremias, "νύμφη", TDNT IV, 1100-01; E. Hoskyns and N. Davey, The Riddle of the New Testament (London, 1958) 46-8. On the other hand, Prof. Barrett has pointed out to me that it may be questioned whether or not the later Christian scribes would have spoken of the coming of the Church (bride).

[310]Pace Jeremias, Parables, 52, n. 13; with Kümmel, Promise, 57, n. 123.

[311]Cf. Dodd, Parables, 136-7; Jeremias, Parables, 52-3. Similarly, Schweizer, Matthäus, 304, takes this parable without vv 5, 6 as authentic, speaking originally, "vom Himmelreich, nicht vom kommen des Menschensohns".

[312]Marshall, Eschatology, 40 ff.; Kümmel, Promise, 54-9.

[313]Marshall, Eschatology, 41.

[314]Jeremias, "LAMPADES", 200-01.

[315]Cf. H. P. Hamann, "The Ten Virgins: An Exegetical-Homiletical Study", LTJ 11:2 (1977) 68-72; Jeremias, "LAMPADES", 200-02.

[316]Jeremias, "LAMPADES", 196 ff.; Str-B I, 510, 969; M. Sukkah 5.4, Danby, 180; Stauffer, "γαμέω", TDNT I, 654, n. 42.

[317]Thielicke, Waiting Father, 172; R. Winterbotham, "The Second Advent", Exp 1st ser 9 (1879) 67-80.

[318]Thielicke, Waiting Father, 177.

[319]Hunter, Parables, 102, notes that in modern Palestinian weddings, once the bridegroom arrived and the door was shut, latecomers were not admitted. Perhaps this was the rule in Jesus' day as well. Theologically, closing the door means that all opportunities for participation in the Kingdom's consummation are over.

[320]Cf. B. T. Berakoth 51a-b, Cohen, 329; Jeremias, "LAMPADES", 200-01; F. A. Strobel, "Zum Verständnis von Mat. xxv.1-13", NovT 2 (1957-58) 199-227.

[321]Lk 17.32 is perhaps to be taken as an illustration created and added by Luke, with his interest in women, bringing out the force of the preceding illustration. If so, then it shows that Luke was not reluctant to use a woman as a negative example even though he is concerned to portray various women disciples of Jesus in a positive light. Cf. Marshall, Luke, 665.

[322]The order of these two illustrations differs in Matthew and Luke. The former has: 1) sign of Jonah (12.40), 2) men of Nineveh (12.41), 3) Queen of the South (12.42); and the latter has: 1) sign of Jonah (11.30), 2) Queen of the South (11.31), and 3) men of Nineveh (11.32, omitted by D). Plummer, Matthew, 184; remarks, "With improved chronology, and also with better rhetorical effect, Luke places the case of the Ninevites after that of the Queen of the South." But cf. Marshall, Luke, 486.

[323]Cf. Schweizer, Matthäus, 188-90.

[324]Cf. Bultmann, History, 112-3. Bultmann, however, is likely wrong that these sayings did not originally have an indirect reference to Jesus. Cf. Kümmel, Promise, 44, 84.

[325]Cf. Str-B I, 651, where the rabbis attempt to demote this queen to a royal envoy.

[326]Cf. 1 Kgs 10.8 and Lk 11.27-28 for an interesting contrast between blessed wives and blessed believers.

[327]J. Jeremias, Jesu Verheissung für die Völker (Stuttgart, 1956) 43, n. 170, argues that the word ἐγερθήσεται in both Matthew and Luke, with μετὰ τίνος, does not refer to resurrection but is a Semitism for 'join together with someone to plead before a court'. This may be so, though the context lends itself to speaking of resurrection since Jesus is speaking of a long dead person and future judgment, and since the example of Jonah and the Son of Man in Mt 12.40 implies resurrection. If Jeremias is correct, then this does not argue against taking ἐν τῇ κρίσει to refer to that Day of Judgment yet to come. That p^{45} and D omit this phrase in Luke is not decisive.

[328]After μετὰ Luke has τῶν ἀνδρῶν, unlike Matthew, which may be intended to draw a contrast with this Queen. This may reflect Luke's tendency to stress male-female reversal, or to feature prominent women at the expense of certain men. Cf. Marshall, Luke, 486, and endnote 330 below. The word κατακρίνω here means 'to give judgment against', i.e., to accuse and thus condemn. God alone is the Judge, but the Queen is the key witness for this age. Cf. Jeremias, Jesu Verheissung, 43, n. 171; A-S, 235; BAG, 413; Büchsel, "κατακρίνω", TDNT III, 951, n. 1.

[329]Cf. pp. 9-11 of thesis.
One woman's word against that of many men would have carried little if any weight.

[330]On the original audience, cf. Bultmann, History, 112-3. The most notable parallel is to Simon the Pharisee and the sinner woman (Lk 7.36-50). Sometimes it is the disciples, sometimes Jesus' opponents, that are the dark background to the light of a woman's faith, understanding, or witness. Cf. Ch. IV of thesis on Jn 4.27, LK 13.10-17, and Mt 15.21-28.

[331]Bultmann, History, 117, cf. 126.

[332]Probably not three in Luke. V 36 is likely a later addition attempting to harmonize with Matthew. It is supported only in D (pm, lat sy). Cf. Metzger, TC, 168. The arguments of Manson, Sayings, 145-6, do not outweigh the strong external evidence against including v 36. This evidence militates against (but does not rule out) the view that Luke (vv 34-36) is trying to depict the whole household - husband, wife, female and male servants. Cf. Marshall, Luke, 668.

[333]BAG, 531, may be correct in suggesting that we should translate 'with the handmill' not 'at the mill', since this was the common practice of the day. Cf. M. Shebiith 5.9, Danby, 45. A. Strobel, "In dieser Nacht (Luke 17,34) - zu einer älteren Form der Erwartung in Luke 17,20-27", ZTK 58 (1961) 20-1, argues for a metaphorical sense. Strobel mentions, however, the expectation of late Judaism was that the time of tribulation and judgment would begin at night (cf. 1 Thess 5.2, Mt 25.1-13).

[334]Marshall, Luke, 667.

[335]Kümmel, Promise, 43.

[336]Cf. 1 Thess 5.2, Mt 25.1-13; Strobel, "In dieser Nacht", 20-1.

[337]Strobel, "In dieser Nacht", 21; Str-B I, 966-7. To some rabbis, grinding was a despicable job to be left to slaves if possible. Cf. M'Neile, Matthew, 357, and Exod 11.5. There is no indication that servants are in view in our text, and in any case it was the wife in most homes that did this work. Cf. M. Ket. 5.5, Danby, 252. This argues against Manson's whole family view of Lk 17.34-36. Cf. endnote 332 above.

[338]It is possible that husband and wife are meant by ὁ εἷς... ὁ ἕτερος, since it is inevitable that both pronouns be masculine. Cf. Marshall, Luke, 667-8; Manson, Sayings, 146. It is conceivable that a father and son might sleep in the same bed (cf. Lk 11.7).

[339]Flender, St. Luke, 10.

[340]This is true of many of His statements about the roles men and women assume. His concern is more with which Master one serves, not how.

[341]It may be significant that Jesus did not argue against or refrain from using examples that relied on the traditional division of labor.

[342]Manson, Luke, 200.

[343]Bultmann, History, 114 ff.; similarly, Ellis, Luke, 191.

[344]Cf. the material discussed in Marshall, Luke, 574.

[345]Kümmel, Promise, 79-81; Marshall, Luke, 573-4; Manson, Sayings, 102-3.

[346]E. Haenchen, "Mätthaus 23", ZTK n.f. 48 (1951) 55-63.

[347]Cf. Is 31.5; Str-B I, 107, 929, 943. In our text the close association of God's and Jesus' presence or absence is implied. Cf. Daube, "Biblical Landmarks", 5-6; Is 66.13.

[348]Bultmann, History, 115.

[349]Manson, Sayings, 102-3; Kümmel, Promise, 80.

[350]Burney, Poetry of Our Lord, 146, cf. 137-46; Manson, Sayings, 126. There is no suggestion of Kina rhythm in Lk 11.49-51/M5 23.34-46, which supports our view that the two sayings were not originally together.

[351]M'Neile, Matthew, 341.

[352]Creed, Luke, 187.

[353]It may be, as Manson and Burney maintain (cf. endnote 350 above) that Matthew is closer to the original Aramaic form of this saying than Luke. Cf. endnote 356 below.

[354]Luke has τὴν ἑαυτῆς νοσσιὰν - 'her own brood' (collective); Matthew has τὰ νοσσία αὐτῆς - 'her chicks'. Cf. Deut 32.11, Ps 17.8, 36.7, Manson, Sayings, 127.

[355]Matthew's position seems more logical than Luke's It makes the ἀπ' ἄρτι refer to a future coming of Jesus (Parousia) and the ἐυλογημένος to a post-Resurrection response. Cf. E. Stauffer, New Testament Theology (London, 1955) 191. Luke has placed this saying much earlier in the ministry (in Galilee) and perhaps by omitting ἄρτι and having ἕως ἥξει ὅτε he means for us to refer the ἐυλογημένος at least in part to the Palm Sunday events. He has placed it at Lk 13.34 to connect it with 13.33. Cf. Ellis, Luke, 191; Kümmel, Promise, 79-82.

[356]Ιερουσαλήμ represents the Aramaic form of the name and probably represents very old tradition, for only here does Matthew keep this older form. Cf. Kümmel, Promise, 81; Lohse, "Σιών", TDNT VII, 327, n. 220.

[357]Cf. Hos 11.1-6, Jer 31.15. The children share the character of their mother, Jerusalem.

[358]Stählin, "κοπετός", TDNT III, 838, M. Ket. 4.4, Danby, 250.

[359]Otherwise, He would not have used this imagery to make a positive point about His own desires and role. This saying gives strong incidental evidence of Jesus' appreciation of a mother's role.

[360]Bultmann, History, 115-6.

[361]Ibid.

[362]V. Taylor, The Passion Narrative of St. Luke - A Critical and Historical Investigation (SNTS Monograph 19; Cambridge, 1972) 90.

[363]Cf. K. G. Kuhn, "ξύλον", TDNT V, 38, n. 7: "It may be seen plainly that the Gospel depiction of the conduct and saying of Jesus on His last journey corresponds in every point to what, on the basis of Rabbinic accounts, we should expect in such a situation of pious Jews aware of God's requirement. This is a strong point in favor of the historical fidelity of Lk."

[364]Cf. Str-B II, 263; Manson, Sayings, 343.

[365]Cf. W. Käser, "Exegetische und theologische Erwägungen zur Seligpreisung der Kinderlosen Lc 23:29b", ZNW 54 (1963) 240-54; Marshall, Luke, 864.

[366]Cf. France, Jesus and the Old Testament, (London,1971) 176-222.

[367]καὶ may mean 'including' here (Marshall, Luke ,863) ,but the ἁί separates the women from the rest (in that only they are weeping and mourning) ,as does Jesus' address to them. In the NT θρηνέω is used always of a general rather than a formal lament, thus, these were not likely paid professionals. Cf. Stählin, "θρηνέω",TDNT III,148-50.

[368]Josephus, Antiquities 8.273 (LCL V) 718-19; Antiquities 13.399 (LCL VIII) 428-9.

[369]Josephus , Jewish War 3.436 (LCL II) 698-9; B. T. Mo'ed Qatan 25a, in Str-B IV.1 ,599 O&R. All are to be mourners of a famous man , and it was customary to mourn him for thirty, not seven, days.

[370]Pace Manson, Luke, 258; with Plummer, Luke, 528. The OT background for the term 'daughter of Jerusalem' (Song of Songs 1.5, Is 37.22, Zeph 3.14), as well as the way Jesus addresses these women as one with Israel (not the family of faith) makes it more probable that they are not disciples of Jesus. For a similar instance of the daughters of Israel weeping over a beloved rabbi who had been sympathetic to their plight, cf. M. Nedarim 9.10, Danby ,277.

[371]Marshall, Luke, 864; Brennan, "Women in the Gospels", 297; Str-B I, 1037.

[372]M. Sanhedrin 6.6, Danby, 391; Str-B I, 1049; Str-B II, 686.

[373]Jerusalem and its fate are major themes in Luke's Gospel. Cf. Conzelmann, Theology of Luke, 132 ff., and Lk 19.42 ff. Probably, not the Day of Judgment, but an eschatological judgment as a foretaste and foreshadowing of that day is in view here. Cf. Danker, Jesus, 236-7; Ellis, Luke, 266.

[374]The imagery develops from the barren, to those who have never conceived (which could include virgins and single women), to those who have never breast fed a child. Käser, "Exegetische", 251, insists that στεῖραι must be taken metaphorically for spiritually barren, and the contrast is between a fleshly barren and spiritual Israel. This is to read the passage in light of later Christian interpretations. Cf. Marshall, Luke, 862.

[375]Thus, this saying has no significant bearing on Jesus' view of motherhood or children apart from such exceptional circumstances. The statement must not be isolated from its context of catastrophe. This is also true of Mk 13.17 (Mt 24.19, Lk 21.23). It is worth noting that this saying probably is not directed to disciples but to those who reject the Kingdom. It is thus not a radically new statement about the non-physical nature of the Kingdom and its blessings.

[376]This is not a desire to be hidden and protected, but a desire for a quick death in preference to such terror and misery. πέσετε here means 'fall down upon', and thus to crush and kill. Cf. Plummer, Luke, 529; Michaelis, "πίπτω", TDNT VI, 162; Oepke ,"καλύπτω", TDNT III, 557, adds that καλύπτω may mean 'to bury' ,not just 'to hide'.

[377]There are at least four possibilities for the meaning of v 31: 1) If the Romans treat innocent Jesus in this way, what will they do to guilty Israel? 2) If the Jews deal harshly with their Savior, what treatment shall they receive for destroying Him? 3) If the Jews behave in this way before their cup of wickedness is full, what will they do when they are completely rotten? 4) If God judges the innocent One now in this fashion, what will He do to the guilty Jews? Because of the similar proverb in Seder Elij. Rabbah 14 (65) (cf. Str-B II, 263), and the phrase ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ (Mt 3.10, 7.19), Delling argues that the dry wood is the Jewish people that will experience the fire of Judgment (not necessarily the Day of Judgment in this case) for rejecting Jesus. Cf. Delling, "βάπτισμα, βαπτισθῆναι", NovT 2 (1958) 110. Jesus, being the fresh wood, still goes through the fire of judgment for others. If Delling is right, then the 'they' of ποιοῦσιν is a more general reference to God (Lk 12.40). This view seems to be supported by Jesus' comparison between the daughters' fate and His own, though neither judgment nor fire is explicitly mentioned in v 31.

CHAPTER IV: WOMEN AND THE DEEDS OF JESUS

INTRODUCTION

Considerable space is devoted in the Gospels to Jesus' interactions with women from all walks of life. In some instances, a healing of a woman is involved; in others, Jesus helps certain women by revealing their sins, forgiving their sins, or healing their relatives. After a review of seven pericopes dealing with specific women in the Gospels, we can evaluate Jesus' attitude toward women as reflected in His actions toward them.

A. Stories of Help and Healing

1. The Lukan Anointing - Lk 7.36-50

Martin Dibelius in his brief discussion of Lk 7.36-50 contends that this narrative is a product of pious curiosity concerning secondary figures in the Gospel tradition. He believes that, "...the legendary character of the narrative cannot be disputed."[1] Nevertheless, most scholars have been willing to dispute this judgment at least in regard to a portion of Lk 7.36-50 and thus its character requires closer scrutiny. One of the minor difficulties this text presents is whether or not it may be pronounced a unified whole or a combination of various traditions and, if it is the latter, which of these traditions is the core to which later additions were made. Bultmann claims that the parable (vv 41-43 with 47a) was the original nucleus to which the remainder has been added at a later date.[2] Essentially the opposite view has been maintained also - that the story was original to which was added the two debtors parable.[3] The fundamental reason for arguing in either of these fashions is that it is thought that the message of the story and of the parable contradict one another. This conclusion, however, turns mainly on a point of exegesis in regard to the proper interpretation of v 47. J. J. Donohue has argued that even if the point of the parable is that much forgiveness begets much love, and that of the story that much love for Jesus leads to much forgiveness, the two ideas need not be mutually exclusive.[4] Even if this is so, it seems unlikely that either Jesus or the Evangelist would juxtapose two such potentially confusing messages together. A more viable approach is that which argues that even if the Evangelist or his predecessors have combined two different sources here, it is unlikely

that an author such as Luke would allow an obvious contradiction to stand in his narrative. It is even more unlikely that he would create such a difficulty. Thus, if there is a view that can show how the narrative could be perceived by the Evangelist as being a unified whole (without exegetical gymnastics), it would be preferable to any view that conceives of the author as inept in the handling of his sources. Such a view has been advanced by those who have argued that v 47 probably should be translated, "Because, I say to you, her many sins are forgiven, she loves much."[5] The question remains, however, what the historical value of this narrative is, even if it is presenting a unified whole. It is possible that Luke has radically revised the Marcan anointing story (14.3-9) and added a parable to suit his purposes. The view that there is only one original narrative behind all the anointing stories will be discussed in detail in our next chapter.[6] For now it is sufficient to say that a more probable view is that there are two different traditions about Jesus being anointed by a woman which may have interacted with one another in their language and details at the stage of oral transmission.[7] This would not be surprising since the two stories have certain similarities. In regard to Luke's contribution to the narrative, v 50 may be his addition of a 'typical' remark made by Jesus in such cases, or perhaps his own formulation indicating how he believed Jesus reacted in such circumstances.[8] Verse 48 may also be Luke's addition because he had not mentioned a previous encounter of Jesus or His message with this woman.[9] Further, Luke's ability as a descriptive writer shines through in this narrative.[10] Lk 7.36-47, 49 was probably an original unity which Luke derived from his special source and has presented in a context and in a way to illustrate the scandal of Jesus' love for sinners (cf. Lk 7.34) and to show how they reacted to His offer of forgiveness and healing.[11] Thus, we will examine the narrative as a literary unit, taking into account the above considerations and expecting that we may discern something about Jesus' as well as the Evangelist's views on women.

Simon the Pharisee, perhaps in order to discover for himself what kind of man Jesus was, invited Him to a banquet in His honor. The word κατεκλίθη (v 36) tells us that this is no ordinary meal.[12] At some point after Jesus arrived, an unnamed woman entered the house to perform a deed of loving devotion This is no ordinary woman coming into the house, but γυνὴ ἥτις ἦν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἁμαρτωλός. In this context, ἁμαρτωλός most likely means 'prostitute' (as vv 47-49 intimate).[13] We should not

be surprised that this woman enters the house uninvited. Considering the openness of Jewish homes and, more importantly, the feeling in Judaism that one should help the poor and hungry, it was not uncommon for a poor or disadvantaged person to come into a house during a banquet to beg or grab something to eat.[14] Thus, Simon is not surprised that the woman comes in during the banquet, but he is shocked at what she does. This woman is carrying an alabastron of perfume, much the same as that found in the Matthean and Marcan anointings. This was a common and well-known container for good perfume.[15] By mentioning the perfume at this point in the narrative, Luke intimates that it is the woman's intention to anoint Jesus.

If common banqueting customs were being followed,[16] then the woman probably is visible to Simon as she enters, but not to Jesus. His body is resting on the couch, with His feet turned away from the table toward the wall, and with His left elbow on the table itself. It is not until He later turns toward the woman (v 44) that Jesus clearly sees her.[17] Thus, this woman is standing behind Jesus' couch near His feet.[18]

Whether or not the woman has met Jesus previously is uncertain. The presentation of her unsolicited act of anointing and her emotional outburst, however, makes it inconceivable that she had not at the very least heard of Jesus' message of forgiveness. Her act is one of loving devotion and possibly gratitude, for she sees in Jesus acceptance, rather than rejection, despite her past life of sin. Just as her tears speak of remorse over sin, so too Jesus' silence speaks of His acceptance of her gift and, more importantly, of this woman herself.[19] She is overcome and weeps on Jesus' feet. In the midst of emotion, perhaps forgetting that it was improper, she quickly wipes Jesus' feet with her hair, a clear violation of rabbinic customs of propriety.[20] By the act of kissing Jesus' feet, she also violates the laws of clean and unclean.[21] There is perhaps an implied contrast between the way she used her perfume to anoint and honor Jesus, and the way she probably used her perfume previously to attract other men.

Simon's reaction is both typical and legally correct. This woman has defiled Jesus. Simon is portrayed as expecting Jesus, as not only a teacher but also a prophet, to know what sort of person this woman is. That Jesus passes over the woman's act in silence proves to Simon's satisfaction that He is not a prophet. The use of the term teacher is intended to show that Simon has some respect for Jesus, and enough

interest to invite Him to a banquet;[22] however, he has not performed for Jesus the supererogatory works of kindness (washing the feet, kiss of greeting, anointing with oil) which a gracious host would do or have done for a special guest.[23] This was so much a part of the system of hospitality Jesus was used to in His day, that He missed it when it was omitted. By contrast, the woman's deed was one of exceptional humility and love, for it was not common in Judaism to kiss someone's feet. Kissing the feet is usually the act of someone, such as a criminal, who has just been freed or whose debt was remitted, and in some sense this was the condition of this woman.[24] That the anointing was also on the feet means that the woman is assuming a servant's function.

The example of two debtors is given in order to lead Simon to see the woman as He sees her.[25] When Jesus asks, "Who will be more grateful to the money lender?"[26] Simon, not wishing to be trapped in his own words, responds, "I suppose that it will be the one to whom more has been remitted." Jesus affirms that he has judged properly. Only at this point (v 44), in order to apply His illustration to the immediate situation, does Jesus turn to the woman clinging to His feet and, as Marshall notes, "...three aspects of the woman's deeds are contrasted with three expressions of hospitality that Simon had not shown to Jesus."[27] Jesus says to Simon, "You see this woman: when I came to your house you did not perform for me the gestures of a gracious host - foot washing, the kiss of greeting, or the anointing of my head with oil. By contrast, this woman, whose sins are indeed many,[28] bathed my feet with her tears and wiped them with her hair. Since I came in,[29] she has not ceased to kiss my feet.[30] You did not anoint my head with oil, yet she has anointed my feet with perfume." Yet, as Jesus has indicated to Simon at the first of this comparison - εἰσῆλθον σου εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν.[31] Marshall adds, "...not only is Jesus willing to accept the touch of a sinful woman, but he even suggests that her action is more welcome to him than that of his host."[32] Here we see a clear example of reversal - a sinful woman is praised at the expense of and by comparison to a 'good' Jewish man.

Verse 47 may indicate that he who loves much is forgiven much,[33] but οὗ χάριν need not be merely logical; there is good evidence for seeing it as causal and translating 'because'.[34] We may argue also that ὅτι logically depends on λέγω σοι not ἀφέωνται - 'I can say with confidence that her sins are forgiven <u>because</u> her love evidences it.'[35] It appears that there are no substantial difficulties in seeing the

point of the parable and the story as one and the same.[36] Gratitude is the proof, not the ground, of forgiveness.

Jesus has violated the letter of the laws of clean and unclean in the presence of a Pharisee by transcending them because of His own priorities. He has implied that Simon, by not receiving Him with more graciousness, shows that he does not bear the same grateful and loving heart toward Him that the woman does. The Evangelist concludes this discussion by including a verbal pronouncement that the woman's sins are forgiven;[37] thus, Jesus demonstrates that He is indeed a prophet for He has supernaturally discerned the thoughts of Simon's heart and knows the condition of the woman. He has taken the part of a woman who was the object of scorn and scathing remarks. Possibly He has shown He was more than a prophet by indicating that He previously had forgiven her sin (v 47).[38] Jesus proclaims a Kingdom where the unclean are cleansed by forgiveness through faith. The breaking down of the barrier of clean and unclean and of social ostracism by forgiveness opened the door for a return of such women to a more normal life and perhaps even a place in His community. This is one reason why women often showed their gratitude and devotion to Jesus; they finally were treated by Him as fellow creatures of God without special restrictions. This same loving and liberating forgiveness is found in two other stories, that of the woman at the well, and that of the woman caught in adultery.

2. The Woman at the Well - Jn 4.4-42

In Jn 4.4-42, the author of the Fourth Gospel proceeds to develop his portrait of Jesus by presenting Him in a new and perhaps surprising setting, while still maintaining a certain continuity with the narrative in John 2 and 3 by drawing on some of the elements in those two chapters. In John 2, Jesus changes water into wine while interacting with a woman. In John 4, in an encounter with another woman, Jesus persuades her to exchange water for living water. Perhaps we see a contrast between Nicodemus of John 3, a teacher and representative of orthodox Judaism who fails to understand Jesus, and the common Samaritan woman who gains some insight into Jesus' true character.[39] The theme of Temple worship mentioned in 2.13-22 is now explained more fully in 4.1-26.[40] More significantly,

> The story of the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well (4:4-42) is in marked contrast to the negativism that surrounded those whose faith, if any, rested on signs in the latter part of chapter 2, and in chapter 3. This story deals precisely with the process of coming to faith, but in it faith is a response to Jesus' word, not to any sign. (41)

Finally, Jesus Himself, who has been shown to be the fulfillment of OT and Jewish expectation, makes clear in this story that though salvation is of the Jews, it is for all who believe and receive it.[42]

The story of the woman at the well raises various critical problems for the student of history. The narrative appears, with the possible exception of 4.31-34, 35-38,[43] to be an original unit,[44] and it appears impossible, "...to isolate a pre-Johannine nucleus,"[45] from the material in Jn 4.4-30. This does not preclude the possibility that there is such a nucleus since the Fourth Evangelist is a most skillful editor and adaptor of his source material. Nevertheless, some scholars, impressed with the unity of this composition, have deduced that it is almost exclusively a theological composition of the Evangelist or his predecessors.[46] It is argued that the Samaritan woman should be taken as a 'traditional figure' treated by the Evangelist as a symbol or representative type.[47] A further factor which seems to cast doubts on the possibility that this is an historical account is the fact that the central dialogue between Jesus and the Samaritan woman appears to happen without any disciples to witness it.

On the other hand, various factors indicate that we are dealing with an actual occurrence. The story betrays a considerable knowledge of Samaritan beliefs, local color, geographical factors, and Jew-Samaritan relationships that would seem to point us in the direction of an historical account.[48] Then too, the dialogue between Jesus and the woman seems very fitting for the occasion. It is quite believable that the woman would have understood Jesus' claims, "...against the background of the Samaritan expectation of the Taheb."[49] The difficulty of finding a plausible Sitz im Leben in which such a dialogue could have been preserved and passed on has perhaps been overcome by H.Riesenfeld who suggests that the Johannine discourses first took a definite shape "...in the discussions and meditations of Jesus in the circle of his disciples such as certainly took place side by side with the instruction of the disciples proper, with its more rigid forms."[50] It is plausible that Jesus would have had informal discussions with His disciples about some of His encounters and teachings. If this is the Sitz im Leben for this dialogue then the major obstacles to accepting the essential elements and discussion here as a record of historical events is removed. Nonetheless, one must make due allowance for the fact that the Evangelist has made the material his own and has shaped the narrative and dialogue in expert fashion.[51] In regard to the

contention that the Samaritan woman is a traditional or typical figure, the following factors must be said to militate against this view: 1) she cannot be seen as a personification of the Gentile world since the author presents her as a monotheist;[52] 2) she should not be seen as an allegorical figure representing the apostate and adulterous Samaritan nation since she plays an individual's role in summoning her fellow countrymen to Jesus (vv 28-30),[53] and more significantly, since it appears from 2 Kgs 17.30-31 that it was <u>seven</u>, not five, strange deities that were introduced into Samaria <u>simultaneously</u> (not in succession). "Again, the allegory would imply that the heathen deities had been the legitimate gods of Samaria while Yahweh, whom she came to worship, was not a true 'husband' at all..."[54] Thus, it is not implausible that we are dealing with an historical event in John 4. If such phrases as 'salvation is of the Jews' are any indication, then it appears we have here an early tradition that will yield some accurate information about the views of Jesus and the Fourth Evangelist on women.

Following our usual procedure we will first treat this passage as a literary unit. Various factors in our narrative may give us an indication of Jesus' attitude toward women. First, there is His request for a drink of water from the woman who is rightly surprised at this for two reasons: Jesus is both a Jew and a man.[55] John makes an editorial comment to explain why she was surprised - οὐ γὰρ συγχρῶνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρίταις.[56] It is hard to decide whether συγχρῶνται should be translated 'have dealingswith' or 'use together with', but probably the latter is preferable since in this narrative Jews <u>are</u> having dealings with Samaritans (the disciples are buying food in town).[57] The Samaritan woman is in a somewhat similar position to that of Martha (cf. pp. on Lk 10.38-42). She supposes that she is the hostess and it is Jesus who needs something; however, it is Jesus who has something to bestow - living water. Thinking on an earthly plane, she believes Jesus is referring to running water, rather than standing water, and thinks she might be saved repeated trips to the well.[58] Her Samaritan pride rises to the surface in this discussion when she asks if Jesus is saying He can give better water than Father Jacob, "Who gave us the well."[59] Jesus responds in the affirmative by saying that His water satisfies forever.[60] Despite her pride and "Unlike many of the other people whom Jesus encounters in His ministry, the Samaritan woman wins the reader's admiration because of her openness to the revealing word of Jesus even when she does not understand. Her attitude is one

of inquiry, not rejection, and it is this that makes her a suitable subject for faith."[61]

A second revealing statement is Jesus' command that the woman go and call τὸν ἄνδρα σου. The Evangelist likely intends to indicate at this point that Jesus, through His supernatural insight, knows this woman's life and wishes to bring her sins out into the light so that they may be forgiven. The woman's response is deliberately evasive - οὐκ ἔχω ἄνδρα.[62] Jesus' rejoinder may mean either that the woman had had five legal husbands (all now deceased or divorced from her) and she was now living with a man who was not her legal husband; or that she is now living with a man who, while legally her husband by Mosaic law, is not so according to Jesus' views (cf. Mk 10.11-12). Probably, the former is meant here. In the context of Judaism it was not the custom to have more than three marriages in a lifetime - legally, any number might be admissible, but morally more than three would be suspect.[63] If this woman was living with a man other than her husband, she would be ritually unclean, yet Jesus shows no signs of maintaining the distinctions of clean and unclean. He asks for a drink and continues to pursue His discussion so that she may believe, thus violating the well-known Jewish warning against speaking to a woman (especially a known harlot) in public.[64]

A third crucial factor in this interchange comes to light as the discussion turns to the matter of worship. The woman changes the subject from her own personal life to the old debate of whether Gerizim or Jerusalem was the proper place to worship. If Jesus says Jerusalem, then as a Samaritan she will reject the possibility that Jesus is the Messiah.[65] Rejecting her either/or, Jesus says that the crucial issue is not the place but the manner in which God is worshipped - in spirit and truth.[66] The Samaritans may worship the right God but ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε ὃ οὐκ οἴδατε. Perhaps it is this statement that leads the woman to assert, οἶδα ὅτι Μεσσίας ἔρχεται...ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν ἅπαντα.[67] The Jews by contrast know whom they worship because salvation is from them.[68] Jesus adds, "The hour is coming and now is" when the worship of God will depend neither on where one is nor who one is. Salvation may be from the Jews, but it is for all those who will worship God in spirit and truth. Thus, Jesus does not exclude this woman from those who may offer such worship. There is no hint of separation of male and female, and no hint of other special restrictions on women, as would apply in the Temple worship in Jerusalem.[69]

After the woman has expressed her belief about the Coming One, Jesus says ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι. It is possible that this is intended to be the theophanic formula, but more probably it means that Jesus is claiming to be the Messiah.[70] With this statement the Evangelist brings the first dialogue to a dramatic close, just as the disciples return from town.[71]

The disciples arrive to see Jesus talking to a woman and they probably overhear His last remark.[72] They are amazed that He would speak with this strange woman, but they are circumspect enough not to ask questions. The author indicates that they might have wanted to ask, "What are you seeking?" or "Why are you talking with her?"[73] The Evangelist, in typical ironic fashion, contrasts the woman who leaves her water jug (forsaking her original purpose at the well) to go into town and speak about Jesus, with the disciples who left Jesus to find mere physical sustenance.[74] He summarizes the woman's witness as follows: "Come see a man who told me everything I have done. Could he perhaps be the Messiah?"[75] Her witness, which appears to speak openly of her own notoriety, induces the townspeople to leave the village and go in the direction of Jesus and the well.

While this traveling scene develops in the background, Jesus has His second dialogue, this time with the disciples. It is possible, as Dodd argues, that this discussion has been culled from other source(s) in which case the Evangelist has inserted it here perhaps to contrast the disciples and the Samaritan woman.[76] The disciples offer food to Him, but Jesus remarks that He has a source of nourishment unknown to them, namely, bringing this woman to faith and to the point of sharing that faith (a particular example of doing the will of God).[77] The disciples, like the woman, misunderstand Jesus' remark about food by thinking merely on the physical level. Jesus then speaks metaphorically about teaching and witnessing and the fruit it bears when it leads people to faith in Him.[78] In v 35, Jesus tells them that they do not need to wait for the harvest time in order to do what they were sent to do. They are exhorted, "Open your eyes and look at the fields! They are ripe for harvest." Jesus clearly distinguishes between the reaper and the sower in v 37.[79] The disciples are to be the reapers Jesus has sent.[80] Who then are the ἄλλοι of v 38? Perhaps the most likely answer is, Jesus and the Samaritan woman. Jesus has sown the Word in her and, in turn, she has sown the Word in the other Samaritans. Thus, the disciples, the reapers, are not to suspect

the conversation He had with this woman, or her witness in the town. Rather, the sowers and reapers are to rejoice together.[81] The disciples must not begrudge Jesus His source of nourishment, or the woman the nourishment she has received. They must turn now and see the fruit of the evangelistic work of Jesus and the woman.

The Evangelist makes clear that this woman's witness was fruitful _ ἐκ δὲ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν τῶν Σαμαριτῶν διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς γυναικὸς μαρτυρούσης.[82] This should be compared to Jesus' prayer - περὶ τῶν πιστευόντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν εἰς ἐμέ (Jn 17.20).[83] This woman is presented as one of Jesus' witnesses, through whom others are led to Him. The Samaritans believed her, but it was necessary that they go further and believe in Him through their own contact with the Lord. The result of their encounter is that they are said to exclaim, "This man really is the Savior of the world."[84]

How are we to evaluate the material in John 4? There are several possible points of view. Some might maintain that it represents exactly what happened but that would seem not to take into consideration the evidence of redactional work and theological expansion by the Evangelist. If, as we have argued, John 4 has foundations in an historical encounter of Jesus with a Samaritan woman of ill repute, a claim which does not contend for the accuracy of every detail, then it would seem to indicate various things about Jesus' attitude toward women. It reveals that Jesus rejected various sorts of prohibitions that would have separated Him from those He came to seek and to save, such as the rabbinic warning against talking with women in public places, especially women who were known sinners. While the Evangelist is concerned to make the legal point that Jesus was willing to share a common cup with a Samaritan in contrast to the prevailing views, incidentally this text serves to reinforce what we found in Lk 7.36-50, that Jesus did not accept the Levitical distinctions between clean and unclean persons. If Jesus did in fact share a common cup with a woman he knew to be immoral and 'unclean' by Jewish standards, it says something to us about His attitude toward the Levitical distinctions in general (though not about female uncleanness in particular). Further, the discussion in John 4 suggests that Jesus rejected the distinctions that separated Jewish and Samaritan worshippers and perhaps those imposed in the Jerusalem cult that separated men and women. This is implicit in His affirmation of worship ('neither on this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, but in spirit and truth') and the fact that He would make such statements

to a Samaritan woman. Further, anyone willing to witness to and for Jesus is an acceptable witness. It may be the case that some of this portrayal of Jesus is more a 'typical' picture than an actual picture of what took place on this occasion. If so, then the Evangelist would still be intending to convey that these attitudes were characteristic of the historical Jesus. Finally, even if the narrative is wholly a creation of the Evangelist, it seems likely that the author is suggesting that the attitude described is theologically grounded in the attitudes and teachings of Jesus.

On the level of the Evangelist's intentions we may note the following: 1) if Jn 4.31-34 and 35-38 is an insertion from a traditional source, then it is the Evangelist who is portraying this woman as a 'sower' and the disciples as somewhat less spiritually perceptive and active in their faith than she. The Samaritans believed because of this woman's witnesss. With typical irony, the Evangelist paints a contrast between the disciples who bring Jesus physical food that does not satisfy, while a woman brings Jesus His true spiritual food by helping Him to complete God's work. Once again, the pattern of reversal of expectations and of expected male-female roles becomes apparent. 2) The language about Jesus as the 'Savior of the World' is perhaps the Evangelist's formulation, but this does not preclude the possibility that the woman's witness led some Samaritans to Jesus and that they made some sort of faith affirmation. 3) Some of the staging, the ironic contrast, and the presentation of Jesus as a supernatural figure may be the Evangelist's work. In the story Jesus' asking for water seems ironic, while in the actual encounter it may have been a simple request from a thirsty man. 4) What the Evangelist intends to convey by this literary unit may be summed up briefly. Jesus and the woman had discussed a more universal source of life and basis of worship. The witness of Jesus and this sinful Samaritan woman bore fruit in Samaria and led to the confession and acknowledgement of the presence of the universal Savior. "The hour is coming and now is" when even women, even Samaritan women, even sinful Samaritan women, may be both members and messengers of this King and His Kingdom.

3. The Syrophoenician Woman - Mk 7.24-30 (Mt 15.21-28)

The story of the Syrophoenician woman has long been recognized as presenting one of the 'hard sayings' of Jesus. It is most unlikely that the Church would have created this saying, given the flow of

Gentiles into the community and a growing devotion to Christ. "If the Evangelist were to yield to the temptation to reconcile his narrative with the current situation, it would certainly have been in this instance. The fact that he did not attests to his having kept faith with the tradition."[85] This story argues strongly against the view that the Gospel writers were substantive authors in the modern sense of the word. They were a great deal more constrained by tradition and their sources, like their predecessors were in Judaism, than many modern scholars would admit. Each Evangelist, however, has a certain freedom to rearrange and recast his material to stress certain points more or less than the other Gospel writers in accordance with his individual purposes. Even in this pericope there are certain obvious differences between Matthew and Mark which require explanation. Nevertheless, the argument of Derrett that Mark built up a story around a saying of Jesus using the OT, is unconvincing. One must explain first why someone writing at a time when Gentiles were already in the Church would create an apparently offensive story, and second why someone would choose a Syrophoenician woman who would be suspect to Jewish-Christians. Even the 'positive' conclusion of this story does not mitigate the harshness of the majority of the pericope.[86] Accordingly, we can examine this pericope with a certain conviction that it does reflect something of Jesus' own attitude toward Gentiles, especially Gentile women.

This pericope is the only example in Mark's (and perhaps Matthew's) Gospel where the healed patient is definitely a Gentile pagan.[87] It is apparently a story Luke found too offensive for his audience and thus does not follow his Marcan source at this point.[88] The Fourth Evangelist has a story that serves a similar purpose to Mk 7.24-30, i.e., the Samaritan woman in John 4. The following points of contact between the two should be noted: 1) In Mark's version of the Syrophoenician woman, Jesus appears to be withdrawing from a predominantly Jewish area because of misunderstanding and possible persecution at the hands of the scribes and Pharisees (7.1-23).[89] The withdrawal in Jn 4.1-3 is for similar reasons. 2) Both narratives may be seen as an illustration of Jesus' dismissal of distinctions of clean and unclean (reading Mk 7.24-30 in light of the teaching in 7.1-23, cf. Jn 7.7-42). 3) The attitude of the disciples in both stories is the typical Jewish reaction to non-Jews, and in the end it is their attitude that is challenged by Jesus' deeds of mercy to these two women and by the women's own deeds, and faith. 4) In both stories we learn that, though Jesus'

earthly ministry was directed to the lost sheep of Israel, He was willing to help those non-Jews who sought His aid.[90] If the Fourth Evangelist knew the Synoptic account, he has chosen not to include it. In any event, the similarities of these two narratives give confirmation to the supposition that there were certain types of narrative in circulation about Jesus' words and deeds, and that stories of the same general type tended to be related with certain common features.

Characteristically, Mark says that immediately after the woman heard Jesus was in the area,[91] she came to implore Him to exorcise an unclean spirit from her daughter.[92] She falls at His feet in a gesture of supplication.[93] Mark then stresses the woman's political and national identity (Ἑλληνὶς Συροφοινίκισσα τῷ γένει), while Matthew possibly may be referring to her religious affiliation (Χαναναία).[94] After her request, the Marcan narrative proceeds directly to the saying of Jesus about the children and their food, while Matthew relates a three-part response by Jesus.

Since the first two parts of the plea and response will at least tell us something of the First Evangelist's views of Jesus, this woman, and the disciples, it is important that we examine it here. First, when the woman says, "Have mercy on me Lord, Son of David," and then asks for exorcism, Jesus says nothing. Matthew appears to cast Jesus in an uncharacteristically unresponsive role (though cf. Jn 8.6). Possibly, we are meant to think that this woman was trying to curry favor with Jesus by using the title Son of David. Yet, it was precisely because he was the Son of David that she had no claim on Him. The silence of Jesus is perhaps to be understood as a means of testing the woman's faith,[95] or even a means of testing His disciples' character by giving them time to react to the situation.[96] If so, their response is ambiguous: ἀπόλυσον αὐτήν, ὅτι κράζει ὄπισθεν ἡμῶν (Matthew). This may mean, 'Send her away because she is crying after us', or 'Grant her request, for she is crying after us'. In either case, it appears they wish her to leave because she is a nuisance. The former translation. however, better reflects their attitude and the lexical probabilities.[97]

Jesus' second response in Matthew is directed primarily to the disciples and only secondarily (if at all) to the woman,[98] when He says, "I was sent only to the lost sheep of Israel." It may be a statement of Jesus' own view of His mission, but if so, then it seems cold comfort and uncharacteristic of Jesus when He is confronted with someone in need.[99] In any case, the woman is not put off, but pleads again, "Lord, help me."

This saying does not appear to be a Matthean creation even though it is a Matthean addition since the First Evangelist has well-known universalistic tendencies (cf. Mt 4.15 f; 4.24, 12.18, 13.37 f.).[100]

The response of Jesus found in both Matthew and Mark is even more harsh: "It is not good to take the food of the children and throw it to the dogs."[101] No matter how one interprets the word κυνάριον (as dog or puppy), it is an insult, especially when spoken by a Jew to a Gentile.[102] It is possible that there is a reference here to the practice common among Jews of giving bread not worth saving to puppies.[103] Despite the insult, however, the woman is not to be put off, perhaps because she is desperate and/or because she hears something in Jesus' tone of voice that indicates there is still hope.[104] Such a remark usually would produce a bitter rejoinder unless Jesus' tone or expression belied His words. Thus, she enters into the spirit of the test by accepting Jesus' judgment on her: ναὶ κύριε, καὶ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων...[105] She may be quoting a well-known proverb.[106] Whether or not the Jews kept dogs as house pets, they did feed them. By referring to them, the woman shows that even now, though it might only be a by-product, the 'dogs' can be fed.[107] In the end, the woman achieves her desire, not so much by a witty remark, as by a faith that goes on imploring even though it recognizes that it has no claim on the Master. She is similar to the persistent woman of Lk 18.1-8.

In regard to Jesus' views of women, we may deduce the following from this narrative. Jesus' willingness to talk with and help this foreign woman is proof of His rejection of certain rabbinic teachings concerning discourse with women and the uncleanness of Gentiles. Thus, Mk 7.24-30 both by its content and by its placement does draw out the implications of 7.14-23. In Mark, the woman's trust is indicated by the fact that she believes Jesus when He says her daughter is healed and leaves in full confidence. Matthew makes explicit what is implicit in Mark, "O woman, great is your faith." Only one other in the Synoptic tradition is praised in these terms, again a non-Jew (Mt 8.5-13, Lk 7.1-10). This woman serves as an example to the Evangelists' audiences. In Matthew her great faith contrasts with the disciples' great annoyance with her persistent pleading. How surprised Matthew's audience must have been to hear this Gentile woman's faith called great, when a characteristic description of Jesus' own disciples in that Gospel is that they have little faith (ὀλιγόπιστος, Mt 6.30, 8.26, 14.31, 16.8). We see that not only in Jesus' own words and deeds, but

also in the redactional activity of the Gospel writers, the theme of reversal of expectations brought about by the Gospel message is emphasized.[108]

4. Peter's Mother-in-Law - Mk 1.29-31 (Mt 8.14-15; Lk 4.38-39)

Jesus' ministry to diseased women is the subject of several pericopes in the Synoptic tradition. In each instance we are given further evidence of Jesus' outright rejection of various taboos inhibiting His ability to help those in need. In Mk 1.29-31 and parallels, we see Jesus' willingness to heal a diseased woman even on the Sabbath. That this healing is paired with that of a man (Mk 1.21-28, Lk 4.31-37) may be the Gospel writers' way of saying that Jesus was willing to perform such an act on the Sabbath for both men and women.

Mk 1.29-31 is the initial part of a section which V. Taylor calls "a historical unity".[109] Various scholars have remarked about the primitive character of this narrative and that it likely derives in its original form from one of the eyewitnesses of the event - Peter.[110] The grammatical awkwardness in Mk 1.29 is explained adequately by the supposition that it was changed by Mark from Peter's first person testimony to the third person.[111] Nevertheless, the narrative has apparently been molded and edited to conform to a pattern common in ancient miracle tales: 1) touch of the healer; 2) sudden cure; 3) action by the person cured confirming the result.[112]

It is in the context of the Sabbath that Jesus performs His first two miracles, as presented in Mark: the healing of the man with the unclean spirit in the synagogue, and the healing of Simon's mother-in-law in her home after the Sabbath service.[113] Matthew does not present this story as a Sabbath healing, perhaps in order to avoid creating unnecessary controversy for some of his Jewish-Christian (?) audience. Mark says that after Jesus preached and healed in the synagogue to the amazement of all, He immediately left and entered a house where Simon Peter's mother-in-law lay sick with a fever.[114] Mark and Luke tell us that some of those in the house speak to Jesus about her, probably asking Him to do something about her illness.[115] Jesus' response is immediate and dramatic.[116] Mark, in contrast to Matthew and Luke, does not say merely that the woman arises and serves, but that Jesus raises her up. This may point forward to more miraculous acts in Jesus' ministry, and to His own Resurrection.[117] Luke, stressing Jesus' confrontation with the effects of Satan as seen here in sickness,

states that Jesus rebukes the fever while standing over her.[118] In Mark there is the hint of Jesus' Resurrection power; in Luke the power of the King and His Kingdom over Satan; and in Matthew the awesomeness of Jesus' person in that He can heal by a mere touch.[119]

Though there were precedents for rabbis taking the hand of another man and miraculously healing him, there are no examples of rabbis doing so for a woman, and certainly not on the Sabbath when the act could wait until after sundown.[120] Indeed, a man could be suspected of evil desires if he touched any woman other than his wife. This was true even if it was a cousin, and more true if the woman was no relation at all.[121] At the very least, Jesus could be accused of contracting uncleanness and violating the Sabbath. Jesus, however, was willing to be misunderstood so that women such as Peter's mother-in-law might be healed.

Luke says that immediately[122] after she was healed, she rose, and served them.[123] There is no delay in recovery; Jesus' healing is complete, not only driving out the evil, but also restoring wholeness. Having been freed from servitude to disease, she is now free to serve her liberator and others.[124] What is interesting about her act is that women, according to some rabbis, were not allowed to serve meals to men.[125] It also appears that this may be a violation by the woman of the prohibition against working on the Sabbath. Perhaps she realized that if Jesus was free to heal her on the Sabbath, then she was free from the Sabbath restrictions preventing her from serving and helping others. In this act, she manifests a new freedom and courage similar to that of Mary and Martha in John 12, the women in Lk 8.1-3, or the sinful woman in Lk 7.36-50, all of whom took upon themselves the role of servant in gratitude to Jesus.[126] It is interesting that Mark and Luke tell us that others in the area cautiously wait until after the Sabbath to receive from Jesus healing and liberation (Lk 4.40, Mk 1.32).

Mk 1.29-31 and parallels, though brief, gives us important information concerning Jesus' attitude toward women. Just as He dismissed the idea that the touch of a sinful woman or non-Jewish woman was defiling, so too He rejected the idea that the touch of a sick woman was defiling. If we may accept Mark's and Luke's placement of this pericope as an indication that we are dealing with an incident near the beginning of Jesus' ministry, then we see that even from the first Jesus showed His concern for women and His

willingness to violate the common view of the Sabbath and the standing rules about the uncleanness of a sick person in order to help them. We have conjectured that Mark and Luke may be emphasizing Jesus' equal concern for men and women by placing an example of the healing of each at the beginning of His ministry. Marshall is probably right to say, "It is unlikely that the use of διακονέω is meant to indicate that this is the appropriate form of Christian service for women; it simply indicates the normal domestic arrangement."[127] Nonetheless, Jesus accepts such service and it is notable that Peter's mother-in-law is performing a task which some rabbis felt was inappropriate for women, especially the matron of the house. This may be an indication of Jesus' tacit rejection of the prevailing ideas about what was and was not appropriate work for a woman.[128] We will have occasion to say more on this subject when we discuss Lk 10.38-42.

5. Healing the Cripple on a Sabbath - Lk 13.10-17

Lk 13.10-17, a pericope unique to the Third Gospel, illustrates what precedes and prepares for what follows. The unfruitful fig tree(13.6-9), just like the unfruitful approach to the Sabbath (13. 10-17),[129] must be cut down, and fruitful attitudes which bring glory to God must be planted, just like the healthy growing tree in 13.19. It is the healed woman, like the growing tree,which gives succor to living things and life itself, that is the sign that the Kingdom and the final Sabbath is at hand. In this pericope Jesus is presented as teaching and healing in the synagogue Sabbath service in such a way that He rejects certain rabbinic understandings of the Sabbath. Not the absence of work, but the presence of a creative and healing peace is the essence of the Sabbath. Daube has noted a tri-partitite structure within this pericope that is used elsewhere in the Gospels - revolutionary action, protest, and silencing of the remonstrants.[130] Thus, Lk 13.10-17 is placed carefully in relation to its context, and presented carefully in its content and internal structure.

This pericope, like Mk 1.29-31 and parallels, Mk 5.21-43 and parallels, and Lk 7.11-17, raises certain problems for scholars because of its miraculous content. Dibelius and Bultmann have both maintained that an isolated saying (v 15) or paradigm has probably been expanded in novelistic fashion.[131] Verse 15, however,,could not have stood on its own but at the very least requires v 16 to explain how the

illustration is to be applied. While v 17 may be a Lukan creation, if one allows v 16 as original then some such healing or action as we find in vv 10-15 is required to make sense of vv 15-16. Lk 13.10-17 is an independent narrative probably written by Luke himself. Bultmann points to the fact that the healing precedes the discussion as proof that the story is an artificial composition meant to illustrate Jesus' attitude about the Sabbath. His verdict, however, seems to be predicated on the assumption that Gospel stories must fall into certain structured forms or else they cannot be an original organic unity.[132] The details of the story probably rule out the supposition that this narrative is a secondary variant to Mk 3.1-6.[133] Unless one is predisposed to reject a narrative's historicity simply because of its miraculous content, it is not improbable that we have authentic Jesus material here. At the very least we likely have authentic information here in the kernel of this story (vv 11-16) about Jesus' attitude toward the Sabbath and helping those in bondage.

The narrative opens with Jesus teaching in one of the synagogues on the Sabbath. A woman with a spirit of sickness of eighteen years duration,[134] enters the synagogue. We are not told the exact nature of the illness, except that she was bent over and unable to stand up - εἰς τὸ παντελές.[135] Apparently, this sickness did not render her unclean, or at least did not render her ineligible to attend the Sabbath service. There is no indication that she is coming to be healed by Jesus, though this is possible.[136] She possibly did not wish anyone to notice her as she slipped in, for often it was assumed by first century Jews that long sickness meant great sin.[137] Despite the fact that she is bent over and Jesus is sitting down, He sees her and interrupts His teaching to call her. Jesus says, "Woman, you are released from your sickness."[138] He not only heals her, but also lays hands upon her, and immediately she stands upright.[139] Now she truly has a reason to praise God on this Sabbath, and she does so then and there. The congregation no doubt would be stunned at this striking miracle wrought in such close quarters before their eyes on the Sabbath, but the ruler of the synagogue is not at a loss for words. Though he is angry because Jesus healed on the Sabbath, he directs his comments τῷ ὄχλῳ. His objection is not to <u>where</u> the miracle took place, but <u>when.</u>[140] "It is necessary (δεῖ) to work six days, but we should not on the Sabbath." In his mind, healing was a violation of the prohibition against work on the Sabbath; however, as Aquinas says,

> But the law has not forbidden all manual work on the Sabbath-day, and has it forbidden that which is done by a word or the mouth? Cease then both to eat and drink and speak and sing...But supposing the law has forbidden manual works, how is it a manual work to raise a woman upright by a word? (141)

Apparently, the objection is made on the basis of the rabbinic idea that such acts of healing should not be performed on the Sabbath unless life was in danger.[142] The woman who had suffered eighteen years clearly could wait one more day.

Jesus' reply shows that the coming of the Kingdom will not wait. He sees the hypocrisy in the ruler's remark and also condemns all who agree with him.[143] He argues from the lesser to the greater, "If it is acceptable to loose (λύει) your donkey from the manger and lead it to drink on the sabbath,[144] how much more proper is it for this one who is a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan has bound (in his stall)[145] for lo these eighteen long years. Was it not then necessary (ἔδει) that she be loosed (λυθῆναι) from this bondage on the day of the Sabbath?"[146] The synagogue ruler has appealed to the necessity of the rabbinic interpretation of the Mosaic law. Jesus appeals to the original purpose of the Sabbath and the fact that this woman is a daughter of Abraham. This nomenclature is used nowhere else in the Bible or in rabbinic literature of an individual.[147]

> By giving this woman this rarely-used title, Christ echoes the phrase 'son of Abraham' and in doing so asserts that this woman is a child of Abraham, a member of the people of God, and should be treated as such, instead of being valued less than a mere pack animal. The woman, then, is not only healed but restored to her true dignity. (148)

Jesus' use of the term or concept, son/daughter of Abraham, so far as we know was limited to the poor, despised (cf. Lk 19.9) and oppressed Jews (and perhaps Gentiles - Mt 8.11-12 and parallels) whom He especially came to liberate. It is these, rather than the religious elite, who are the rightful bearers of the title and who will gain the places of Abraham's physical descendants in the Kingdom. In our context, we may note the specific contrast between the label hypocrite that Jesus places on the synagogue ruler and those who agree with him, and the title of daughter of Abraham He gives to the woman.[149] Again we see a woman not only being used as a positive example as she praises God, and even given a positive title, but also being defended at the expense of the males and in particular the synagogue ruler who objects to Jesus' actions. The Gospel brings healing on the Sabbath

and a reversal of expectations. By using the title, Jesus implies that she is as worthy of His concern and healing as any Jewish man and has as full a claim to her religious heritage as anyone.

Thus, in the context of Lukan theology, 13.10-17 presents another example of the fulfillment of 4.18-19. The year of the Lord's favor has broken in and this woman is presented as an example of the oppressed set free. The Sabbath is to be a day of release from the effects of the fallen order. It is this which brings rest and peace to God's people, and glory to God. Insofar as this pericope tells us something about Jesus' attitude about women, it indicates that He thought they had an equal right with men to their religious heritage and it shows the lengths to which He was willing to go to help them. He risked outright rejection by religious leaders in order to heal a woman on the Sabbath in their presence in the synagogue.

6. Jairus and the Jewess - Mk 5.21-43 (Mt 9.18-26, Lk 8.40-56)

Mk 5.21-43 and parallels is a narrative that has been submitted to widely varying assessments in regard to its historical worth. Some scholars have argued that Mark is here drawing on Petrine reminiscences and thus there is a solid core of historical material in this narrative.[150] Others have argued that we have here a combination of two separate traditions each of which has been built up out of many features which are typical of miracle stories in antiquity.[151] In regard to the structure of the story we probably do not find the technique of the artificial interpolation of one narrative into another here for, as Dibelius followed by R. Pesch point out, the delay caused by healing the woman on the road is integral to the Jairus story.[152] It is probably not the case that only isolated, simple stories were originally handed down in the tradition for the examples of 'pure' narratives is in a decided minority in the Synoptics, and it is not proper to dismiss all complex narratives as later combinations or amplifications simply because they are complex.[153] Each narrative must be assessed on its own merits. Mk 5.21-43 has many distinctive characteristics: "...the vivid portraiture of Jairus and his agonized cry for aid, the incident of the woman on the way to his house, the skeptical attitude towards Jesus of the messengers...the command in Aramaic addressed to the girl, the compassionate regard for her welfare shown by Jesus."[154] We have evidence from some of the other sections of this chapter of the thesis that Jesus' passionate regard for women in need is an early feature of the tradition and authentically portrays the Jesus of history.

Further, Pesch has made a good case for the view that Jairus' name was originally in the story and later omitted by Matthew and the Western text of Mark.[155] We need look no further than Matthew's version of this story to see what later editors such as this Evangelist would often do to an original and vivid narrative: the name Jairus is omitted as is the Aramaic command; he uses the more general ἄρχων; he telescopes the whole by omitting the messengers altogether; he adds a typical general conclusion (v 26, cf. Lk 7.17); and he neatly summarizes Mark's description of the woman's illness with γυνὴ αἱμορροθσα. To be sure even Mark has shaped his narrative. The secrecy motif (5.43) may be his own addition and it appears that he has chosen to include those features of these two healings that were often regular components of such stories: mention of length of sickness (v 25), emphasis on fruitlessness of treatment (v 26), physical contact for healing (vv 27 ff.), the instantaneousness of the healing (vv 29, 42).[156] This may lead one to conclude that the narrative is merely composed of 'typical' elements, but more probably, in view of the reasons cited above for seeing the narrative as a unified whole and a vivid account of actual events, it shows us that Mark has edited and stylized his historical material in order to conform it to familiar patterns for such stories. If this is correct, while we must examine the small divergences in the three Synoptic accounts for theological significance, we may accept the nucleus of the story as revealing something of Jesus' views of women.

The story of Jairus and the woman with the twelve year flow of blood builds from the healing of one person to the raising of another, and there is an interesting contrast between the elicited witness of the woman and the command to silence of Jairus' family and the three disciples.[157] This pericope illustrates the progress of the Gospel reaching those at the bottom of the Jewish social ladder (the impoverished unclean woman) and those at the top (Jairus and his family).

The story opens with Jesus being approached by a synagogue president[158] named Jairus who, because of his desperate need, forgets his pride and position and falls at Jesus' feet begging His aid for his θυγάτριον.[159] The First Evangelist describes Jairus' act of imploring Jesus by the term προσεκύνει. This need not imply worship or special reverence, but rather respect and a sense of special urgency which he has made more explicit than his Marcan source.[160] The condition of the girl is described in three different ways by the Synoptic accounts, but they

all probably mean that the girl is dying or at the point of death.[161] Jesus is requested to lay hands on the young girl in order to heal her.[162]

As Jesus sets off to Jairus' home, the crowd pressed in nearly suffocating Him.[163] In the midst of this crowd, a woman with a twelve year flow of blood,[164] in hopes of a cure, touched Jesus' upper garment.[165] Miraculously, her flow of blood immediately dried up.[166] One must ask whether she showed little or great, weak or strong, pure or magic-tainted faith? Undoubtedly, there was an element of superstition in her belief that she might be cured by touching the healer's garment; but the point is that she did have faith enough to believe that Jesus might help her. Perhaps it is because of her ritual uncleanness or natural modesty that she tried to fade into the crowd again. She risked being restrained or cast out, yet she was approaching Jesus in faith.[167]

Instantly, Jesus knew He had been touched in faith and thus He asks, "Who touched my clothes?" (Mark and Luke only). It is probable that Jesus asks this question in order to educate and elevate the faith of the woman above the belief in a magical power in Jesus and His garments. He wants the unclean woman to bear witness to the crowd of her faith and cure through Jesus. He wishes to make an example of her, in the good sense of the word. Luke, with his special emphasis on the liberation and witness of women, says δι' ἣν ἀπήγγειλεν ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ὡς ἰάθη παραχρῆμα. Matthew, as he did in the case of the Syrophoenician woman, makes this woman an explicit example of faith when he presents only these words of Jesus as a climax: θύγατερ ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε.[168] Though the woman trembled[169] when she was found out, perhaps fearing Jesus' censure, Jesus reacts in a way she would never have expected. Not only was this woman no longer to be avoided, but now in fact she was set forth as a living example of faith for all to emulate. By contrast the disciples are shown to have little faith in Jesus and little understanding of why Jesus would ask who touched Him in such a mob. As was the case with the Samaritan woman and the Syrophoenician woman, Jesus' words mean more than His disciples' superficial interpretation led them to believe.[170]

It is at this point in the Marcan and Lukan accounts that the messengers arrive to report to Jairus, "Your daughter is dead...Why bother the Teacher any more?"[171] Jesus overhears[172] these messengers speaking to Jairus and, to prevent him from despairing, interjects μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστευε.[173] When Jesus arrived at the house He allowed only Peter, James, and John to enter with Him, leaving the remaining crowd and group of disciples outside.[174] These three serve as witnesses to the miracle and, as representatives of the disciples,

receive this special privilege perhaps in preparation for their leadership role and their commissioning to perform similar acts soon to follow this episode.[175] Already present in the house were mourners some of whom may have been members of the family. Matthew adds αὐλητάς, perhaps to make the narrative conform to Jewish customs.[176] The scornful or mocking response to Jesus' statement about the girl may indicate the bitter rejoinder of relatives who are grieved and would view such a remark as flippant. The meaning of Jesus' remark has been debated. The mourners clearly interpreted Jesus' τὸ παιδίον[177] οὐκ ἀπέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει to mean that He thought the girl was still alive. This interpretation is favored by the οὐκ...ἀλλὰ construction used. It is certainly possible that the Marcan narrative was not originally about a dead girl but one who was in a coma, despite Luke's clear indications that he views this narrative as a raising story (8.53 - εἰδότες; 8.55 - ἐπέστρεψεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς).[178] Mark probably is not using the word καθεύδει as a metaphor for death, since he is not saying, 'Yes, she is dead, but death is like a sleep.'[179] Probably, the explanation of the οὐκ...ἀλλὰ contrast lies in who Jesus is (the Lord of life) and what He is about to do (raise the girl). The girl is dead and her death is not merely like a sleep; in His presence it <u>is</u> sleep rather than death. It is not an end, but an interim condition from which she returns healthy and hungry.

In order to perform this act, Jesus casts out[180] all those in the house except the three disciples and the parents. Only those who are closely connected either to the girl or to Jesus can witness this act and interpret it properly through the eyes of faith. Perhaps it is not without significance that Jesus treats the mother as equally worthy as the father and the Apostles of witnessing this act. As in the case of Peter's mother-in-law, Jesus takes the girl by the hand and Mark and Luke record that He adds the command, "Girl, I say to you arise." It is Mark alone who records the words ταλιθὰ κοῦμ which are a transliteration from the Aramaic.[181] This probably reflects a Petrine remembrance of Jesus' actual words, not a later attempt by Mark to give the story local color.

To further a return to normalcy, Jesus commands a renewal of attention to the girl's physical needs. This was not magic but the power and word of God harnessed in the service of a young girl and of her family.[182]

If there was still room for doubt about Jesus' attitude toward the clean/unclean distinctions accepted in Judaism, an examination of

this pericope removes any remaining uncertainties. Bearing in mind Jesus' operative principle that it is only what comes out of a man's heart that defiles him (Mk 7.15, 21 - and thus the view that Jesus simply allowed Himself to be defiled on behalf of others seems unlikely), we have evidence here that Jesus treats neither the touch of the woman with the twelve year blood flow, nor the contact of a dead girl as defiling. Neither woman is viewed as unclean or as a source of uncleanness by Jesus, but rather is treated as a person in need of help. Though not worked out in our text, the implications of Jesus' views are important to this study. If a woman with a blood flow is not defiled or defiling, then the rabbinic reason for not requiring a woman to fulfill all of the Law's positive commandments, and not permitting her to be counted on for all the periodic feasts and functions of the faith is by implication rejected by Jesus' deeds in the first of these two stories. Thus, the way is paved for women to participate more fully in Jesus' own community. In both stories, faith is a key commodity, a commodity which the healed woman is as capable of possessing as Jairus. Since this is also the commodity which is the basis of association in Jesus' community, the woman and perhaps to a lesser extent Jairus, become examples to the Gospel writers' audiences. Certainly, the healed woman is made an example by Jesus when He calls her to center stage and speaks of her faith. In Mark's presentation of the event, the woman appears in a more favorable light than the exasperated disciples. The Jairus story is also significant in that it shows Jesus' desire to reunite a physical family despite the great obstacle of death. Here is further evidence that the family of faith and the physical family were not mutually exclusive alternatives in Jesus' mind. Indeed, it appears that Jairus' faith is in part the basis of the reunion of his physical family. Had he not believed in Jesus and His power he might not have approached Jesus in the first place. While an ordinary rabbi might have treated the loss of a daughter as less significant than the loss of a son, when one compares this story to that of the raising of the widow of Nain's son, Jesus exhibits an equal concern over the loss of either son or daughter.

7. <u>The Widow of Nain - Lk 7.11-17</u>

Lk 7.11-17, beyond all cavil, is a story about the raising of the dead. Perhaps it is significant that every example in the Gospels of Jesus performing such a miracle involves women either as the object

of the miracle (Mk 5.21-43 and parallels) or as those for whom the miracle is performed (Lk 7.11-17, John 11).[183] Luke, with his penchant for pairing male and female stories of similar content and intent, presents the healing of the centurion's servant (7.1-10) followed by the text at hand.[184] Lk 7.11-17 reflects Luke's general theme of the ministry of Jesus to women, and his special interest in the way the Gospel aided such disenfranchised groups as widows and the poor.[185]

Lk 7.11-17 creates various critical problems for the scholar. Not only does it involve the miraculous resuscitation of a dead young man, but also it is uniquely Lukan and thus falls under suspicion because it is not attested in any other strand of the Gospel tradition. Some have suspected that the Evangelist (or at least the post-Easter community) created this narrative using the pattern of various OT or even non-Biblical miracles.[186] Schürmann, however, argues that basically we have an old narrative coming from a Palestinian community.[187] Jesus is cast in this narrative as a great prophet, like but even greater than Elijah (cf. 1 Kgs 17.8-16) for he heals by a mere command. This sort of Christology cannot be described as 'Hellenistic Jewish Christian'. The context is clearly 'Jewish' as the outcry "God has visited his people" shows. Jesus is called προφήτης μέγας, not χρίστός or κύρίος by the crowd, and this too counts against seeing the narrative as a late Christian composition. Further, one may point to the abundant parataxis in this narrative that gives it an Aramaic flavor.[188] The name Nain is not found elsewhere in the NT and is perhaps derived from a local tradition.[189] The narrative should not come under suspicion simply because it is a raising story for we find these in many strands of the tradition and the multiple attestation creates a presumption that such events as applied to Jesus are not an invention of the post-Easter community.[190] To be sure this miracle story has been schematized so that it has the form of a typical miracle story. It is told in the light and the style of various other miracles particularly that found in 1 Kgs 17.8-16. But, "...eine Nachbildung... ist unsere Erzählung nicht."[191] The location of the Elijah miracle is outside Israel, the act is a private one, and the method is wholly different from Lk 7.11-17. The example in 2 Kgs 4.8-37 does not involve a widow (though it does have an only son) and again the act is a private one performed by means unlike Jesus' and without the significance of Jesus' act. Only the location is reasonably close to our narrative.[192] As for the example from Philostratus[193] besides the fact that if it is historical it likely post-dates the time of Jesus (Apollonius died

ca. A. D. 98), and was certainly written down after the Gospels were completed, Philostratus himself was skeptical whether or not a miracle had taken place. Further, in Philostratus' story, "Das Motiv der Lebensrettung...ist aber so sehr menschliches Desiderium, dass es immer wieder zum Fabulieren reizt und nicht traditionsgeschichtliche Abhängigkeit angenommen werden muss."[194] Thus, it is quite possible that we are dealing with an old Palestinian tradition cast in the light of similar OT stories but nonetheless bearing witness to an actual deed of Jesus, and to his compassion for widows. It is possible that v 17 is Luke's own addition to the story and we may probably also see his redactional work in v 11 and possibly in the use of κυρίος in v 13. Against Dibelius, however, v 13 is not Luke's novelistic expansion of the story for the use of σπαλαγχνίζομαι is a feature of his special source (cf. 10.30, 15.20), and he takes over none of Mark's occurrences (Mk 1.41, 6.34, cf. 8.2, 9.22).[195]

Luke sets the scene by indicating that Jesus went to Nain with His disciples and a huge crowd.[196] As they were entering the city gate a funeral procession was leaving. Luke indicates that this was the saddest sort of funeral by saying, "Behold, a dead person was being carried out - the only son of his mother, and she was a widow."[197] The mother was left alone and her family line was cut off. Luke says that Jesus felt compassion for this woman in her pitiful state and decided to perform an act solely on her behalf, as the details of vv 12-15 explain.[198] It is an act of mercy and does not involve forgiveness or faith.[199]

Jesus is so certain of the outcome of His actions that He first tells the widow, who would be walking in front of the bier, μὴ κλαῖε.[200] Next, He violates rabbinic practice by stopping the funeral procession and touching the σορός, an act which causes those carrying the bier to stand still.[201] Jesus needs only to speak to raise the young man and addresses him not as a body or soul, but as a person - Νεανίσκε σοὶ λέγω ἐγέρθητι.[202] The dead young man sits up, begins to speak,[203] and is given by Jesus back to his mother, thus defiling Himself in the eyes of some Jews. The mother immediately takes the young man back and "...they were all filled with fear (awe) and praised God."[204] The crowd interprets this raising as an act of God visiting His people through a great prophet. Luke rounds off his narrative by adding that the news spread ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ πάσῃ τῇ περιχώρῳ.[205]

Our pericope succinctly illustrates Jesus' concern for women, particularly widows. The raising is a deed of compassion - faith is

not a prerequisite, though the deed does engender the praise of Jesus as a great prophet of God. The act was also a practical one since it provided the woman with a means of support as well as a source of joy. It demonstrates Jesus' continual rejection of certain OT and rabbinic distinctions of clean/unclean, and certain Sabbath rules which prevented Him from helping women and others in need, i.e., those with whom according to Luke He especially chose to associate (Lk 4.18-19, 24-27, 5.30-32, etc.). Luke views this miracle as a demonstration of the inbreaking of the Lord's favor, and indicates both by his introduction (v 11) and his conclusion (v 17) that it did not go unnoticed or unreported. In a sense the Evangelist himself, by including this story, made certain that such would be the case.

B. Jesus' Attitude Toward Women Reflected in His Actions

Our study of Jesus' interactions with women has brought to light several fundamental principles which seem to have guided Him in His dealing with the opposite sex. Jesus' outright rejection of rabbinic ideas of sin and sickness leading to ritual impurity or defilement allowed Him to relate to many women He might not have reached otherwise. We have suggested also that Jesus' implicit rejection of the idea that a blood flow in a woman caused her to be defiled or to be a source of defilement removed the rabbinic basis for excluding women from synagogue worship and periodic feasts and functions of the faith. This was perhaps one of the factors which paved the way for women to travel with Jesus and to be full-time followers of their Master without special restrictions (cf. chapter five of thesis on Lk 8.1-3).

Jesus' rejection of certain rabbinic Sabbath restrictions also allowed Him to serve and to accept service at the hands of grateful women when normally such activities were forbidden (Mk 1.29-31 and parallels). In Jn 4.4-42 and Mk 7.24-30 and parallels, we see clear examples of Jesus' willingness to relate openly with women who were not fully Jewish or, in the case of the Syrophoenician woman, perhaps not Jewish at all. This abrogated numerous rabbinic warnings about foreign or Samaritan women, as well as the familiar prohibitions against talking with women, especially sinful women, in public, and opened the door for a more normal and natural basis of relationship. While it is true that Jesus' earthly ministry was directed to the lost sheep of Israel, He did not reject other lost sheep who encountered or sought Him, and perhaps this set a precedent for the acceptance of

non-Jewish women in the early days of the Gentile mission. It seems likely that one reason why Luke gives special prominence to women in his Gospel is to explain the influx of women into the Christian community of which he was a part and later wrote about in his book of Acts.

We noted a certain pattern in the Gospels of presenting women as examples of faith, and in one case of witness (John 4), often at the expense of either good male Jews or even Jesus' male disciples. We suggested that this pattern of reversal, while certainly owing something to the Gospel writers themselves, nonetheless is to be traced back to Jesus Himself as one manifestation of His teaching that the last and least shall be the first to be liberated as the Kingdom breaks into history with His ministry. We also detected a certain tendency on the part of the first three Evangelists to pair male-female healing stories perhaps to stress Jesus' equal concern for men and women. This tendency, though less obvious than the male-female pairings of the parables, is perhaps significant and may reflect the purposes of each Evangelist, since there is at least one example in each Synoptic Gospel of a male-female pair not found in the other two Gospels.

Throughout the pericopes we have examined, Jesus' concern for women as persons, rather than as sources of potential temptation or defilement, is obvious. It is significant that Jesus was willing to perform extraordinary miracles (raising the dead), and to violate the rabbinic Sabbath regulations even in the presence of rabbis and in the synagogue in order to help women. Jesus did not pass over a woman's sins, indeed, by bringing some women to confession and pronouncing their sins forgiven He revealed His desire to heal the whole person and His recognition that women were as capable of many sins as men (John 4, Lk 7.36-50).

All of this reveals Jesus' attitude that women were God's creatures, even daughters of Abraham, and thus as worthy as men to receive the benefits of God's love and salvation. If even a Samaritan woman, in contrast to His male disciples, could bear witness for Jesus and bring Him 'true food', who could dispute a woman's right to a place among His followers? On this note, we turn to an examination of those women most often mentioned in the Gospels as associates of Jesus - His mother Mary, His friends Mary and Martha, and His female traveling companions.

Chapter IV: Endnotes

[1]Dibelius, From Tradition, 114.

[2]Bultmann, History, 21-22.

[3]Creed, Luke, 109-110, and the authors cited in Marshall, Luke, 205.

[4]J. J. Donohue, "The Penitent Woman and the Pharisee: Luke 7.36-50", AER 142 (1960) 414-27.

[5]Cf. pp. 173-4, and endnote 36 below.

[6]Cf. C. H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge, 1963) 171-3.

[7]Cf. Marshall, Luke, 306; Brown, John i-xii, 450-2; Gardner-Smith, St. John, 48.

[8]Marshall, Luke, 307.

[9]Without some previous contact being presupposed with Jesus' message or person the woman's conduct in Luke 7 is inexplicable. Cf. Marshall, Luke, 306-7.

[10]Ellis, Luke, 121.

[11]Marshall, Luke, 306.

[12]κατακλίνω in the passive means 'to recline' at table; cf. BAG, 412; LSJ, 894. Jews at a normal daily meal would sit or squat, but at banquets they would recline in Graeco-Roman fashion. Cf. Str-B IV.2, 617-8; J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus (trans. N. Perrin; London, 1966) 48, n. 4; Josephus, Antiquities 6.163 (LCL II) 248-9.

[13]Cf. Str-B II, 162; BAG, 43; R. K. Orchard, "On the Composition of Luke vii.36-50", JTS 38 (1937) 243-5. The point seems to be that this woman was well-known in the city as a sinner ('a woman who was a sinner in the city'); Simon expects Jesus to know of her notoriety.

[14]Ellis, Luke, 122; Str-B IV.2, 615; Str-B I, 726.

[15]Thus, it may or may not be an indication of cross-fertilization; cf. Pliny, Natural History 36.23.60 (LCL X; trans. D. E. Eichholz; 1962) 48-9; Herodotus 3.20 (LCL II) 26-7; Alfred Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (Grand Rapids, 1971) I,565, n. 1, 566; Michaelis, "μύρον", TDNT IV, 801, n. 10; Josephus, Jewish War 4.561 (LCL II) 166-7.

[16]Edersheim, Life and Times I,564; Plummer, Luke, 211. Sandals are removed before the meal.

[17]Caird, Luke, 114, suggests that Jesus reads the progress of events in Simon"s shocked face.

[18]She is not under the table; but cf. the illustrations in E. E. Platt, "The Ministry of Mary of Bethany", TT 34 (1, 1977) 29-39.

[19]Edersheim, Life and Times, I,566.

[20]M. Sotah 1.5, Danby, 294, mentions the loosing of hair as a way of disgracing a suspected adulteress. Cf. Jeremias, Parables, 126, n. 56.

[21]A prostitute was considered defiled and thus ritually unclean, and her touch was in turn defiling. M. Sotah 1.3, Danby, 293.

[22]διδάσκαλος is a term of respect; cf. Marshall, Luke, 310.

[23]Str-B I, 427, 986; Str-B IV.2, 615; H. Schlier, "ἀλείφω", TDNT I, 230. On the ubiquity of the custom of the kiss of greeting, cf. Str-B I, 995-6. Feet washing perhaps was not customary in all situations but it was done frequently if the guest came off the highway. Cf. L. Goppelt, "ὕδωρ", TDNT VIII, 324, n. 63. Edersheim, Life and Times, I,568.

[24]Xenophon, Cyropaedia 7.5.32 (LCL II; trans. W. Miller; London, 1914) 272-5; Polybius, The Histories 15.1.7 (LCL IV: trans. W. R. Paton; London, 1925) 464-5. Cf. Str-B I, 996; Aristophanes, Wasps 605 ff. (LCL: trans. B. B. Rogers; London, 1924) 466-7: "Returning home at the close of day, O then what a welcome I get for its sake: my daughter, my darling is foremost of all, and she washes my feet and anoints (ἀλείφῃ) them with care, and above them stoops and a kiss lets fall..." Here the act is an attempt to extract money.

[25]On the Socratic form of this discussion (question and answer), cf. C. H. Dodd, "The Dialogue Form in the Gospels", BJRL 37 (1954-55) 59-60. The form may be a Lukan construction but it was in use among rabbis and Jewish teachers and may well have been used by Jesus. Cf. Ellis, Luke, 121.

[26]The harder word 'money lender' rather than 'creditor' is used here. Cf. W. M. MacGregor, "The Parable of the Money-Lender and his Debtors (Lk vii.41-47)", ET (1925-26) 344-7. ἀγαπάω in this context likely means an expression of gratitude or thanks, though love is involved. Cf. H. G. Wood, "The Use of ἀγαπάω in Luke vii.42, 47", ET 66 (1954-55) 319-20; Josephus, Jewish War 1.10.2 (LCL I) 92-3.

[27]ἅπτω in the middle means 'to cling to' or 'to lay hold of' in the NT and the papyri. In view of the present tense of the verb here, 'to cling to' is the proper translation. Cf. BAG, 102; A-S, 56; MM, 72; Marshall, Luke, 311.

[28]This is a statement of fact, not a disparaging remark. Jesus is not concerned with keeping His own skirts clean, as is Simon.

[29]ἀφ' ἧς is possibly an abbreviation for ἀφ' ἡμέρας ἧς ('since the time when') or more likely for ἀφ' ὥρας. Cf. Robertson, 717, 978. The εἰσῆλθον of L', Vulgate is a later improvement. Cf. Jeremias, "Lukas 7.45 εἰσῆλθον", ZNW 51 (1960) 131.

[30]The verb tense indicates continuous action. Cf. BAG, 184.

[31]Note the emphatic position of σου. Cf. Edersheim, Life and Times, I,568, n. 4.

[32]Marshall, Luke, 310.

[33]So Creed, Luke, 109-12; A. H. Dammers, "Studies in Texts", Theology 49 (1946) 78-80; Orchard, "On the Composition of Luke vii.36-50", 243-5.

[34]H. G. Meecham, "Luke vii.47", ET 38 (1926-27) 286, citing Papyrus Tebtunis 2.410 and 2 Maccabees 4.16. J. Dublin, "οὗ χάριν". ET 37 (1925-26) 525-6, says οὗ χάριν = χάριν τοῦ ὅτι ('in acknowledgement of the fact that'). Cf. other similar phrases such as ἀνθ' ὧν (Lk 1.20, Ac 12.23, 2 Thess 2.10) and οὗ εἵνεκεν (Lk 4.18, Gen 18.5 in the LXX) which mean 'because'. Cf. also Robertson, 647; BDF, sec. 456.4, 239; Conzelmann, "χάρις", TDNT IX, 391, n. 143; MHT III, 319.

[35]This has been argued well by Moule, I-B, 147; Zerwick, sec. 422, 144-5 and sec. 427, 147. For the traditional Catholic view, cf. M.-J. Lagrange, Évangile selon St. Luc (Paris, 1948) 230 ff. V 47b argues against this view as does the woman's conduct. The woman is said to be 'saved' by her faith, not her love (cf. Marshall, Luke, 306-7). Jesus' words are directed primarily to Simon to teach him a lesson, not to tell the woman about a forgiveness she had responded to already with great emotion. There is nothing improbable about the assumption that this woman had prior contact with Jesus or His message, though it is somewhat surprising that Luke fails to mention it. Such contact is the best explanation of her conduct.

[36]If we take οὗ χάριν as causal, we may read, "Because I say to you, her many sins are forgiven, she loves much." By this interpretation οὗ χάριν anticipates ὅτι. If the ὅτι is to be stressed, we may read with Moule, I-B, 147, "I can say with confidence that her sins are forgiven, because her love is evidence of it."

[37]This may be Luke's addition based on a deduction from v 47 or he may be adding a remark that typified what Jesus usually said in such cases.

[38]Jesus' listeners understood Him to mean that her sins had been forgiven by Him, which from their point of view was blasphemy since God alone can forgive sins. ἀφέωνται is in the perfect, and the act of anointing and the woman's tears point to a prior act of forgiving.

[39]Cf. Morris, John, 254; Marshall, "The Problem of New Testament Exegesis", JETS 17 (2, 1974) 67-73. R. E. Brown, "Roles of Women in the Fourth Gospel", TS 36 (4, 1975) 691, suggests a progression in chapters two to four from disbelief (2.18-20) to inadequate belief (2.23 ff.) to more adequate belief (4.25-29).

[40]Lightfoot, John, 120 ff.

[41]G. W. MacRae, Faith in the Word - The Fourth Gospel (Chicago, 1973) 38.

[42]Cf. Jn 1.31, 49, 3.14-15; Barrett, John (1955) 190. John may be consciously modeling his narrative on some aspects of several OT well stories (Genesis 24, 29, Ex 2.15-22). Cf. N. R. Bonneau, "The Woman at the Well, John 4 and Genesis 24", Bible Today 67 (1973) 1252-9.

[43]Cf. Dodd, Historical Tradition, 325-7, 391-405.

[44]R. Schnackenburg, The Gospel According to St. John, Vol. 1 (trans. K. Smyth; New York, 1968) 419.

[45]Barrett, John (1978) 229.

[46]So apparently C. M. Carmichael, "Marriage and the Samaritan Woman", NTS 26 (1980) 332-46. On 4.10-15 as the Evangelist's composition, cf. R. Bultmann, The Gospel of John: A Commentary (trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray; Oxford, 1971) 175.

[47]Barrett, John, 229.

[48]Cf. Morris, Studies, 146-51; R. D. Potter, "Topography and Archaeology in the Fourth Gospel", in Studia Evangelica (ed. K. Aland et al.; Berlin, 1959) I.329-37, here 331: "No passage could show better that our author knew this bit of Samaria well." Cf. endnote 65 below.

[49]Brown, John i-xii, 176.

[50]Riesenfeld, Gospel Tradition, 63.

[51]Probably the Fourth Evangelist exercised greater freedom with his material than did the first three Evangelists because his was an 'informal' rather than formal and relatively fixed tradition. Nevertheless, the evident skillful editing and assembling of this material "...is no reason for doubting the historicity of the narrative." (Schnackenburg, John I, 420).

[52]Morris, Studies, 147.

[53]Schnackenburg, John I, 420.

[54]J. H. Bernard, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John (ICC; Edinburgh, 1928) I.144.

[55]The woman identifies herself both by ethnic group and by gender. This leads one to suspect that she was sensitive about being part of both these groups (Samaritan and woman).

[56]The evidence for omitting this whole parenthesis is not strong enough to rule it out of the original text. Cf. Metzger, TC 206; pace BDF, sec. 193.5, 104.

[57]Despite the strong arguments of D. R. Hall, "The Meaning of συγχράομαι in John 4.9", ET 83 (2, 1971) 56-7 for the traditional view. Daube, NT and Rabbinic Judaism, 373-82, is more convincing in his plea for the translation 'use together with' and he has been followed by Barrett, John (1978) 232, Brown, John i-xii, 170; Morris, John, 259, n. 25. Cf. Jeremias, "Σαμάρεια", TDNT VII, 91, n. 25. For an example in the NT of a following dative being dependent solely on the συν-of the verb to which it relates, cf. Ac 13.31. In the Mishnah and Talmuds there are various views recorded on whether Jews would have dealings with Samaritans and whether Samaritans and their possessions and land were unclean. Cf. Str-B I, 540-1; M. Berakoth 7.1 Danby, 7, 9; M. Demai 5.9, 7.4, Danby, 25, 27; M. Shebiith 8.10, Danby, 49. The famous M. Niddah 4.1, Danby, 748, probably dates from A. D.

65 or 66, though such views probably were held widely in Jesus' day. As Jeremias, Jerusalem, 352-8, indicates, it is difficult to assess the data, though it is probably true to say that most good Jews considered Samaritans as ritually and cultically unclean many years before M. Niddah 4.1 was codified. The reaction of the disciples to Jesus' encounter with this woman perhaps is evidence of this fact. Cf. E. F. Harrison, "The Sons of God among the Sons of Men. VI. Jesus and the Woman of Samaria", BSac 103 (1946) 176-86, especially 179.

[58]The usual meaning of 'living water' is running water. Cf. L. Goppelt, "ὕδωρ", TDNT VIII, 326; Brown, John I, 170. The woman has no intimation of whom she is dialoguing with at first, as Jn 4.15 shows. The Evangelist is using his usual style of double entendre and irony to carry the discussion along.

[59]J. R. Diaz, "Palestinian Targum and the New Testament", NovT 6 (1963) 75-80 mentions a story which tells of Father Jacob removing the stone from a well and its overflowing for twenty years.

[60]This 'gift' is probably the Holy Spirit (in view of 6.63, 7.38), not His teaching. So Morris, John, 260-1; Barrett, John (1955) 195; Brown, John i-xii, 178-9.

[61]MacRae, Faith in the Word, 39.

[62]This may be the technical phrase for 'I have not had intercourse with a man.' Cf. Mt 14.4, 1 Cor 5.1. The phrase can mean, however, 'I have no husband.' Cf. Mt 22.28, Mk 12.23, 1 Cor 7.2. The latter meaning is more probable here in view of ὃν ἔχεις οὐκ ἔστιν σου ἀνήρ in v 18. Pace H. Hanse, "ἔχω", TDNT II, 817, n. 5.

[63]Cf. Str-B II, 437. The various suggestions about the five husbands standing for five false religions introduced into Samaria seem improbable. John gives no hint of allegory here. Cf. Brown, John i-xii, 171.

[64]Cf. p. 35, endnote 104.

[65]The Fourth Evangelist seems to reflect an intimate and accurate knowledge of the beliefs and practices of the Samaritans. Cf. J. Bowman, "Samaritan Studies", BJRL 40 (1957-58) 298-329. The Samaritans did not expect a Davidic Messiah, but rather a Taheb which means either 'the one who returns'(Moses redivivus) or 'the one who restores' (a prophet like Moses). For them, Moses was the only prophet and thus only of him or the expected one could it be said θεωρῶ ὅτι προφήτης εἶ σύ. Josephus, Antiquities 18.85-87 (LCL) 60-3, tells us that the Samaritans had Messianic expectations of the Taheb returning even during Jesus' day. Our scene and the discussion which ensues is not improbable as an event in the life of Jesus. For a possible Samaritan parallel to Jesus' statement about living waters, cf. J. Bowman, "Early Samaritan Eschatology", JJS 6 (1955) 63-72; Jeremias, "Μωυσῆς", TDNT IV, 862-3.

[66]The single preposition indicates we are dealing with only one concept. So Dodd, Interpretation, 314, n. 2; Brown, John i-xii, 180-1. True worship is determined by God's nature, not man's prejudices. This phrase then means true or proper worship as God would have it.

[67]οἴδαμεν may have been the original reading, as it has good support from p^{66c}, $\aleph^{c}$, L, Origen, Cyril, etc., but it is more likely that οἶδα would have been changed to οἴδαμεν considering ἡμῖν in 4.25b and the frequent use of οἴδαμεν in John (cf. 3.2, 4.42, 7.27, 9.20, 24, 29, 31). The woman reflects accurately the Samaritan expectation, for they viewed the Taheb as more of a prophet or revealer than a deliverer. Cf. Martha's confession in John 11. Bowman, "Samaritan Studies", 299 ff., notes that with the Samaritan tenth commandment is the discussion on the Taheb. Could this be why the Samaritan woman makes the statement about the Messiah at the point in the discussion she does?

[68]ὅτι seems to be causal (Morris, John, 270) but it could be result (Barrett, John [1955] 198). If it is the latter, then the meaning would be 'we were given insight into whom we worship in order that the Messiah might come from the Jews.'

[69]Brennan, "Women in the Gospels", 294.

[70]Perhaps the reason it is only here in John's Gospel that we have such a clear statement by Jesus of His Messiahship is that the idea would not connote a political kingship in a Samaritan context and thus could be used without fear of the sort of misconceptions such labels were liable to in Judea. Cf. Morris, John, 273; Brown, John i-xii, 172-3. The use of the emphatic pronoun is in the style of deity. Cf. BDF, sec. 277, 145; BAG, 216; Jn 8.58. For arguments favoring the theophanic formula here, cf. E. Stauffer, Jesus and His Story (New York, 1974) 186-8. J. Bligh, "Jesus in Samaria", HeyJ 3 (1962) 329-46, notes the dramatic shift in discussion from conventional expectation to self-revelation in Jn 11.24-25. This view, however, requires that Jesus' statement be unconnected to the immediately preceding remark of the woman.

[71]Note that the second dialogue also ends with people arriving from town (the Samaritans). Cf. M. P. Hogan, "The Woman at the Well (John 4:1-42)", Bible Today 82 (1976) 663-9.

[72]ἐπὶ τούτῳ may imply this; cf. Moule, I-B, 50; MHT III, 272.

[73]These two questions would be directed to Jesus though some variants show the first as addressed to the woman. As Brown, John i-xii, 173, points out (following Bultmann), "...they were more shocked because he was talking with a woman than because he was talking with a Samaritan." Cf. J. Foster, "What seekest thou? John iv.27", ET 52 (1940-41) 37-8; W. G. White, "St. John iv.27", ET 26 (1914-15) 180.

[74]Lightfoot, John, 125; Barrett, John (1955) 201 (following Daube) suggests that the jug is left so Jesus may drink.

[75]There is a natural amount of hyperbole in her first statement. Her question shows that her faith is not yet complete (μήτι probably introduces a hesitant question). Cf. MHT I, 170, n. 1, 193; Robertson, 917. The question here implies hope and expectation rather than tentativeness; cf. Dodd, Interpretation, 315.

[76]Cf. endnote 43 above.

[77]Lightfoot, John, 125.

[78]There may or may not be two traditional proverbs being used here. The point is the harvest is now - there is no interval between sowing and reaping and thus the disciples must get to work.

[79]The repetition of the article - ὁ σπείρων καὶ ὁ...θερίζων (v 37b, cf. v 36b) indicates the two actions are distinct. Cf. Robertson, 786; F. Hauck, "θερίζω", TDNT III, 133.

[80]ἐγὼ ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς probably does not refer to the great commission. More likely, the reference is a general one referring to the mission to the world. Cf. Lightfoot, John, 126; Barrett, John (1955) 203.

[81]Cf. Lightfoot, John, 126; L. H. Bunn, "John iv.34-42", ET 41 (1929-30) 141-2.

[82]There probably is not a contrast between λόγος and λαλία here since both words are used of the woman's witness. Pace Brown, John i-xii, 174-5. R. Walker, "Jüngerwort und Herrnwort, Zur Auslegung von Joh 4.39-42", ZNW 57 (1-2, 1966) 50, rightly says, "Der λόγος der Samariterin in 4.39 ist kein unverbindliches Menschenwort, keine private Mitteilung, sondern aüsdrucklich λόγος im Sinne des Zeugenworts." Cf. Barrett, John (1978) 243, who remarks, "To bear witness...is the task of a disciple. The woman joins with John the Baptist as witness, and in fact precedes the apostles."

[83]So Brown, "Roles of Women", 691.

[84]As Dodd, Interpretation, 371, notes, κόσμος for John means 'the world of human kind' (cf. 3.16, 17, 4.42). The term 'Savior of the World' was an imperial title especially under Hadrian but probably it is not used in this sense here. Cf. Morris, John, 285, n. 101.

[85]R. A. Harrisville, "The Woman of Canaan. A Chapter in the History of Exegesis", Int 20 (3, 1966) 274-87.

[86]Derrett, "Law in the New Testament: The Syrophoenician Woman and the Centurion of Capernaum", NovT 15 (3, 1973) 161-86. Cf. endnote 94 below. There was no love lost between Jews and Phoenicians, especially those from Tyre. Cf. Josephus, Against Apion 1.71 (LCL) 190-1: "...among the Phoenicians, the Tyrians are notoriously our bitterest enemies." This may explain the disciples' reaction to the woman, especially if they knew she was from Tyre.

[87]The Roman centurion (Mt 8.5-13) was possibly a God-fearer; the Gerasene demoniac (Mk 5.1-20, Mt 8.28-34) lives in a foreign country but his religion is not made clear. Cf. T. A. Burkill, "The Syro-phoenician Woman, The congruence of Mark 7.24-31", ZNW 57 (1966) 33.

[88]Dibelius, From Tradition, 261, and n. 1, maintains that Matthew and Mark are drawing on a common source and that possibly we have a case of a saying which was built up into a narrative (in two different ways). Bultmann, History, 38, and n. 3, toys with the possibility that Matthew used an older version than Mark but rules it out because of Jesus' dialogue with the disciples in Matthew. He maintains the some-what complicated view that Matthew derived 15.24 from a logion collection and that πρῶτον or all of ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα is a secondary addition to Mark's text (presumably after Matthew used Mark), a view

for which there is no real textual support. It is more likely that Matthew used the Mark we now have but expanded and edited it at certain points in order to emphasize on the one hand how great Jesus' charity was even to those that he was not purposely setting out to help (thus he omits ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα and includes 15.24) and on the other hand to emphasize the woman's great faith (by the three-fold pleading and the Ὦ γύναι μεγάλη σου ἡ πίστις in v 28). The source of these additions may be the Evangelist himself though in some cases other (oral?) sources seem to be involved (cf. endnote 97 below).

[89]It is not clear whether Jesus crossed the border or merely went to it (probably the former). So Hill, Matthew, 253; Lane, Mark, 260; Taylor, Mark, 348; Cranfield, Mark, 246.

[90]During the days of Jesus' earthly ministry and the earliest days of the post-Resurrection Christian community we can speak only of the 'reception of Gentiles' and not a 'Gentile mission'. Cf. J. Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations (trans. S. H. Hooke; London, 1958) 25, n. 2. It is not proper, however, to dismiss these narratives as simply exceptions that tell us nothing about Jesus' fundamental attitude toward a Gentile mission. Pace Jeremias, Jesus' Promise, 30-1. If Jesus was willing in the end to help this Syrophoenician woman in the presence of His disciples and in the face of their request to dismiss her, then the narrative tells us much about Jesus' present acceptance of non-Jews and His willingness to help them despite the fact that His earthly mission was directed intentionally to Jews. Some of His actions prepared the way for the Gentile mission that began after the Resurrection (whatever one makes of Mt 28.19). Burkill, "The historical development of the story of the Syrophoenician woman (Mark vii.24-31)", NovT 9 (3, 1967) 161-77, rightly says that Jesus' dealing with the Syrophoenician prefigures, not inaugurates, the Gentile mission.

[91] Both the woman's coming and her address to Jesus indicate that He was known widely for His miracles. Cf. J. Ireland Hasler, "The Incident of the Syrophoenician Woman (Matt. xv.21-28, Mark vii.24-30)", ET 45 (1933-34) 459-61; Taylor, Mark, 349.

[92]The ἀκάθαρτος in Mark here indicates the spirit's ritual effects as is appropriate in the Marcan discussion of clean and unclean. Mk 7.17-23 indicates that Jesus taught in terms of moral, not ritual, defilement.

[93]Only Matthew has προσεκύνει αὐτῷ, but even in his version this is not likely an act of worship, but rather a reflection of the woman's need. Pace K. Weiss,"πούς", TDNT VI, 630.

[94]Possibly Matthew differs here because he wants to point out that in spite of her religious background she has a great faith in Jesus. Mark seems to be contrasting the woman's Greek speech and her Phoenician extraction. So Swete, Mark, 148.

[95]F. G. Cholmondeley, "Christ and the Woman of Canaan", ET 13 (1901-02) 138; M'Neile, Matthew, 230.

[96]Cf. D. Smith, "Our Lord's Hard Saying to the Syro-Phoenician Woman", ET 12 (1900-01) 319-21; J. D. Smart, "Jesus, the Syro-Phoenician Woman - and the Disciples", ET 50 (1938-39) 469-72.

[97]The translation preferred here is ambiguous since 'send her away' could be with or without her request. Cf. BAG, 96; A-S, 53; LSJ, 208; MM, 66-7. It is very curious that Matthew ,who normally spares the disciples more than Mark by omitting some of the Marcan material that reflects badly on them, has here included this reaction when there is no trace of the disciples presence, much less their reaction, in Mark's account. This leads one to suspect that it is possible that Matthew , as a member of a community in which the Gospel stories were a living legacy, did occasionally have access to additional (oral?) information about some of his Marcan narratives. It should be noted that this is no novel conjecture since it is generally recognized that Matthew had more than one source on other occasions for the same material (i.e., where Mark and the Q material apparently overlapped). Mark ,however , is his primary and in many cases sole source ,or otherwise he would not have taken over 90% of Mark's material and well over half of his exact wording.

[98]B. Horace Ward , "Our Lord's Hard Sayings to the Syrophoenician Woman", ET 13 (1901-02) 48. Jesus' response explains why He does not grant her request. As M'Neile, Matthew ,231 says , He intends the woman to overhear though He is speaking to the disciples.

[99]Cf. Jeremias, Jesus' Promise, 34-5. Probably the lost sheep here are all Israel since they are being contrasted to all non-children.

[100]Yet precisely because it is a saying that the Church would not likely create, it has high claims to being an authentic Jesus word even if it is not in its original context here. Cf. Bultmann, History, 38, n. 3.

[101]The whole saying as recorded in Mark may reflect a Jewish proverb on the seniority system dictating who eats first in a Jewish house. Cf. Derrett , "The Syrophoenician Woman", 168.

[102]It is not clear that the diminutive softens Jesus' remarks. Pace Taylor, Mark, 350; Cranfield, Mark, 248. There are examples where κυνάριον is a diminutive of contempt. Cf. Smith , "Our Lord's Hard Saying", 319; Derrett, "The Syrophoenician Woman", 169. Diminutives are frequent in Mark and it is not certain that they really mean anything even in our passage (does θυγάτριον in v 25 mean 'little daughter' or ψιχίων in v 28 mean 'little food?). Cf. Zerwick, sec. 485 ,162.

[103] M. Hallah 1.8, Danby, 84; Derrett, "The Syrophoenician Woman" , 170; Jeremias, NT Theology, 164, n. 2. It is not clear that Jews domesticated dogs, though there are examples of Jews playing with puppies; cf. Str-B I, 726.

[104]That the woman is not crushed by these remarks seems to imply that more is happening than words can tell; cf. Smart, "Jesus", 472. This, however , may be to read more into the narrative than the Evangelist intended.

[105]The woman's response implies submission to Jesus' judgment and initial refusal. So Harrisville, "The Woman of Canaan" ,284; Jeremias , Jesus' Promise, 30. Her inventiveness is not so much her verbal play as placing herself in the dog category which allows her into the house. As W. Storch , "Zur Perikope von der Syrophönizierin Mk 7,28 und Ri 1,7", BZ 14 (2 , 1970) 256-7 points out , in Jesus' final

response to the woman (διὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον) it is what she says, not how she says it or the cleverness, that Jesus mentions as the reason she gains her desire. Is Judg 1.7 in the background here?

[106]Derrett, "The Syrophoenician Woman", 172; Smith, "Our Lord's Hard Saying", 321. The maxim in Philostratus, Life of Apollonius of Tyana 1.19 (LCL I; trans. F. C. Conybeare; London, 1912) 52-5, is of uncertain date. It is possible that it originated in the first century A.D., unless it is Philostratus' own creation which would place it in the second or third century A.D.

[107]Indeed, her faith is so great that she believes she can be fed now, not just second. Cf. Jeremias, "παράδεισος", TDNT V, 772, n. 63.

[108]Again, in this case it is a matter of male-female role reversal since the woman, instead of the disciples, is depicted as having great faith and serves as the model for the Evangelists' audiences (espec. in Matthew).

[109]Taylor, Formation, 40.

[110]Taylor, Mark, 178; Cranfield, Mark, 81.

[111]C. H. Turner, "Notes and Studies - Marcan Usage: Notes Critical and Exegetical on the Second Gospel", JTS 26 (1924-25) 226, suggests the original oral form - "We left the synagogue and came into our house with our fellow disciples James and John."

[112]Cf. Schrage, "τυφλός", TDNT VIII, 288; Dibelius, From Tradition, 74-90. That the form is conventional does not necessarily impugn the historicity of this incident, for facts as well as fiction can be presented in a popular pre-existing form. In the case of Mk 1.29-31 the pre-existing form probably only affects how the facts are presented, and perhaps which facts are included and emphasized.

[113]The setting in Luke, considering the non-Marcan sections on the birth and on the rejection in Nazareth preceding 4.38, is essentially the same as Mark. While it is intimated in Lk 4.3 that Jesus has performed miracles in Capernaum before, the first two Luke presents as a fulfillment of the paradigmatic speech in 4.18-21 are the same as the first two in Mark. Mark and Luke, by placing this healing between the time Jesus left the synagogue (Mk 1.29, Lk 4.38) and sunset (Mk 1.32, Lk 4.40), clearly imply that this is a Sabbath healing. The First Evangelist, grouping his material topically, presents this pericope as he sets forth examples of Jesus' healing miracles (ch. 8). Notably, he appears to have maintained a setting of Capernaum for this event. He also calls Simon by his Christian name of Peter. It is possible that this Evangelist is presenting Peter's mother-in-law as a type of a Christian who is healed, since her cure is grouped with the healing of a Jewish leper and a Gentile centurion's servant.

[114]πενθερά must mean mother-in-law. Cf. BAG, 648; LSJ, 1360; MM, 502; 1 Cor 9.5. We do not have enough information to identify the disease. In the first century A.D., fevers were viewed as diseases, not as symptoms of diseases. Cf. K. Weiss, "πυρέσσω", TDNT VI, 958-9.

[115]It is not clear who 'they' are in either Mark or Luke. Matthew records no consultation. Cf. Turner, "Notes and Studies - Marcan Usage: Notes Critical and Exegetical on the Second Gospel", JTS 25 (1923-25) 378.

[116]Cf. G. A. Chadwick, "Peter's Wife's Mother", Exp 4th ser 6 (1892) 357.

[117]ἤγειρεν αὐτὴν κρατήσας τῆς χειρός probably is referring to only one action; cf. Taylor, Mark, 179; Swete, Mark, 22; Lane, Mark, 77. On the possible preparation in this text for later events, cf. P. Lamarche "La guérison de la belle-mère de Pierre et le genre littéraire des évangiles", NRT 87 (1965) 515-26; Danker, Jesus, 62. Matthew may also be pointing forward by his use of the term ἠγέρθη.

[118]Chadwick, "Peter's Wife's Mother", 357, notes that Jesus' reaction to disease here is like that of Jn 11.33, 38. Luke may have included this remark to indicate Jesus' typical reaction to disease rather than His actual response in this case.

[119]Danker, Jesus, 62; Lamarche, "La guérison", 520-6.

[120]Cf. Str-B II, 2-3; B. T. Berakoth 5b, Cohen, 24-5 and Cohen's notes. It is possible that Peter's mother-in-law was in danger of dying before sundown, but even Luke's 'great fever' need not imply death was at hand (cf. Lk 8.42).

[121]Cf. Str-B I, 299; Hill, Matthew, 160.

[122]By παραχρῆμα Luke stresses that the cure is sudden and complete, and the woman's gratitude is expressed immediately; cf. Plummer, Luke, 37.

[123]Here διακονέω has its natural non-technical sense of 'waiting on a table', or to serve in the capacity of hospitality. This probably favors seeing this as its meaning in Lk 8.3 as well. This is significant if Luke's audience was primarily Greek or Hellenistic, for the Greeks saw such serving as demeaning and undignified for anyone but slaves; cf. H. W. Beyer, "διακονέω", TDNT II, 82. Luke's audience would likely see these actions (here and in Lk 8.3) as particularly self-sacrificial. Matthew with his Christological focus has διηκόνει αὐτῷ.

[124]X. Léon-Dufour, "La Guérison de la Belle-Mère de Simon Pierre", EstBib 24 (1965) 193-216, here 216.

[125]Cf. Str-B I, 480; and pp. 269, and 351, endnote 309 of thesis. Obviously, someone had to serve the Sabbath meal, so the woman's actions may not have been considered a Sabbath violation so long as the meal was prepared before the Sabbath, but due to illness, she probably was unable to make such preparations. There is no indication of any other woman or servants helping when she serves. The 'they' of Mk 1.30 (λέγουσιν) may or may not involve other family members.

[126]It is striking that these women all respond in ways that were conventional, and serve in capacities that were traditional for women or, in Mk 1.31, perhaps even 'beneath' the traditional roles for women who were not servants. Cf. K. Weiss, "πούς", TDNT VI, 631.

[127]Marshall, Luke, 195.

[128]Cf. pp. 2-6 of thesis on a wife's rabbinically prescribed tasks. Jesus seems to accept women in traditional roles but rejects the idea that these roles are the only tasks appropriate for them.

[129]Cf. Creed, Luke, 182. This contrast between 13.6-9 and 13.10-17 was noted often by the Fathers. Cf. Aquinas, Commentary on the Four Gospels Collected Out of the Works of the Fathers - Vol V. St. Luke Part II (Oxford, 1874) 479-87.

[130]Daube, NT and Rabbinic Judaism, 170-83, espec. 181-2.

[131]Cf. Dibelius, From Tradition, 97; Bultmann, History, 12-13.

[132]Marshall, Luke, 557.

[133]Ibid.

[134]The connection of sickness to demonic activity was common in Jesus' day, but as Marshall, Luke, 557, says, we probably should not give too definite a meaning to πνευμα here as it may mean simply an evil influence, in view of the cure not being described as an exorcism. Cf. Ellis, Luke, 186.

[135]The woman probably had a spinal disease which produces fusion of the joints. Cf. J. Wilkinson, "The Case of the Bent Woman in Luke 13.10-17", EvQ 49 (4, 1977) 195-205. The phrase εἰς τὸ παντελές may be taken with δυναμένη or ἀνακύψαι, but more likely goes with the latter since it follows it immediately. Thus, we translate 'not able to stand up fully'. Cf. MHT III, 266; Creed, Luke, 183.

[136]Plummer, Luke, 342.

[137]Cf. Lk 13.1-5. Jesus rejects this thinking and removes all excuses which might be advanced for discriminating against the sick by treating them as outcasts. Marshall, Luke, 559, suggests that perhaps this woman was being denied her status as a descendant of Abraham because her long sickness was taken as a sign of sinfulness.

[138]Note the perfect tense of ἀπολύω which prepares us for the play on words in 13.15-16. Cf. RS, Translator's Luke, 505.

[139]Perhaps speaking and laying on of hands are to be seen as simultaneous. Cf. RS, Translator's Luke, 505. If Danker, Jesus, 158, is correct that the woman would be suspected or regarded as ceremonially unclean, then Jesus' laying on of hands is all the more significant and unexpected.

[140]Some rabbis are said to have performed miracles but not on the Sabbath and not in the synagogue, though the latter would not violate Jewish custom as far as we know. Cf. W. Schrage, "συναγωγή", TDNT VII, 847 ff.

[141]Aquinas, Commentary V.2, 485. Though Jesus violates the rabbinic stipulations about healing a non-critical case on the Sabbath, it does not seem correct to say with Jeremias (NT Theology, 94-5, 208-9, 278, n. 8) that Jesus violated the Sabbath in this instance (as it was set up in the OT). Elsewhere it appears certain that He did violate the OT Sabbath laws.

[142]"...whenever there is doubt whether life is in danger this overrides the Sabbath." (M. Yoma 8.6, Danby, 172). Cf. Str-B I, 622-9.

[143]The plural (Ὑποκριταί) points not only to the ruler but also to those who agreed with him; cf. Plummer, Luke, 342.

[144]It was lawful to lead an ox or ass to water and to draw the water so long as one did not carry the water to the animal. Cf. Str-B II, 199-200; Edersheim, Life and Times II, 225. The Qumranites had the following rulings: "No one is to follow his beast to pasture for more than a distance of two thousand cubits from his city....If the beast be stubborn, he is not to take it outdoors. No one is to take anything out of his house, or bring anything in from outside... Even if it drop its young into a cistern or a pit, he is not to lift it out on the Sabbath." (Zadokite Document between x,14 and xi,18). Cf. Gaster, DSS, 89.

[145]This is Danker's (Jesus, 159) amplification.

[146]Jesus is refering to the divine necessity of His mission to bring in the Kingdom and conquer sin. (Lk 4.43, 9.22). Ellis, Luke, 186, says, "From the beginning the Sabbath was prophetic of the consecration of creation to its good and proper end...This will be accomplished by the deliverance of God's creation from Satan's power." Thus, the Sabbath was the perfect day to present an example of God's perfect will for His creatures.

[147]The examples in Str-B II, 200, are used of Israel as a community or in a general sense, but only here is it used of a specific individual. RS, Translator's Luke, 508, notes the emphatic position of 'this woman, a daughter of Abraham'. It may be significant that Jesus says a daughter of Abraham rather than, for instance, a daughter of Sarah (cf. 1 Pet 3.6), implying His acceptance of the idea of a patriarchal head and fountainhead of the Israelite community of faith. It may also imply that this woman should benefit as a rightful heir of Abraham and participate in such a patriarchal religious structure. Again, Jesus intimates not an overthrow of patriarchy, but a new and rightful place for women within such a structure. As N. A. Dahl, "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts", in Studies in Luke-Acts (ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; London, 1968) 150, says, the story with its use of the term daughter of Abraham illustrates "...how God's promise to Abraham was fulfilled to his children through the ministry of Jesus."

[148]Brennan, "Women in the Gospels", 296-7.

[149]Besides the contrasts between the woman and the hypocrites, we may note also the contrast in v 17 between Jesus' humiliated opponents and πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος who were delighted with Jesus' deeds.

[150]Cf. Cranfield, Mark, 182; Taylor, Mark, 285-6; Marshall, Luke, 341-2.

[151]Cf. Bultmann, History, 214-5, and to a lesser extent E. Klostermann, Das Markusevangelium. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament III (ed. H. Lietzmann; 2nd ed.; Tübingen, 1926) 58-9.

[152]Dibelius, From Tradition, 72; R. Pesch, "Jairus (Mk 5,22/Lk 8,41)", BZ 14 (2, 1970) 255-6

[153]Cf. Marshall, Luke, 341-2.

[154]Taylor, Mark, 285.

[155]Pesch, "Jairus", 255-6. The textual evidence strongly favors the name being original (p^{45}, ℵ, A, B, cf. Metzger, TC, 85-6). Pace Bultmann, History, 215; Taylor, Mark, 287. Cf. H. J. Cadbury's crucial admission in "Between Jesus and the Gospel", HTR 16 (1923) 89, n. 6. It is unlikely that the name is derived from the events in the story since Jairus is neither 'awakened' nor 'awakens'. Cf. Cranfield, Mark, 183.

[156]Cf. Bultmann, History, 214-5.

[157]The contrast could be explained perhaps by the fact that in the first story Jesus desires that the woman (and perhaps others) be led to understand that she was not healed by a magic trick but through faith in Jesus and His power. In the second incident, however, the miracle is performed in the presence of only a few people and is of such a startling nature that any report of the deed was bound to further the idea of Jesus as a great wonder worker, while overlooking the purpose of the deed. Perhaps, as Chadwick suggests, Jesus wished to preserve at least one place where the girl would be treated as a normal human being. Cf. G. A. Chadwick, "The Daughter of Jairus and the Woman with an Issue of Blood (Mt. ix.18; Mk v.22; Lk vii.41)", Exp 4th ser 8 (1893) 309-20. As we have stated above, however, v 43 may well be part of the redactional work of Mark as he adds the secrecy motif.

[158]ἀρχισυνάγωγος probably refers to the president of the local synagogue though it could be just an honorary title. Cf. B. Lifshitz, "Fonctions et titres honorifiques dans les communautés juives", RB 67 (1960) 58-9. Str-B I, 519 and IV.1, 145-6, point out that ἀρχισυνάγωγος has the same meaning as ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς (Luke's term) and he could thus be one of the ἄρχοντες (Matthew's less specific term). Cf. W. Schrage, "ἀρχισυνάγωγος", TDNT VII, 847, n. 26.

[159]Perhaps the age twelve is mentioned to clear up the fact that the girl is not as young as the diminutive might lead one to think, in which case it is not extraneous information linking the two stories by the number twelve. Cf. Chadwick, "The Daughter of Jairus", 313; Klostermann, Markusevangelium, 58.

[160]Pace BAG, 724; H. Greeven, "προσκυνέω", TDNT VI, 763. On this word as a customary form of respectful greeting, cf. Str-B I, 519; A-S, 386; LSJ, 1518. Alternatively, it could be Matthew's attempt to introduce a stronger Christological emphasis into the story. That Jesus is 'worshipped' at the outset of the story prepares the reader for what is to follow and focuses on who Jesus is.

[161]Mark uses the idiomatic ἐσχάτως ἔχει ('at the point of death') Luke has αὐτὴ ἀπέθνησκεν ('she was dying'). Matthew's ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν probably means 'she has just now died', in which case, Matthew, to emphasize the magnitude of Jesus' deed, has compressed the narrative leaving out the later word of the messengers. On the other hand, Chadwick, "The Daughter of Jairus", 310, suggests that a man full of anxiety might say, 'She is dead by now' and mean the same as ἐσχάτω ἔχει.

[162]It was common to lay hands on the sick in Jesus' day; cf. E. Lohse, "χείρ", TDNT IX, 431 and n. 43; Daube, NT and Rabbinic Judaism, 224-33.

[163]Luke uses the more dramatic συνπνίγω ('to choke', 'to suffocate'); Mark has the milder συνθλίβω.

[164]This is likely a uterine haemorrhage making the woman religiously unclean for that whole period; cf. Marshall, Luke, 344. Luke, perhaps because of his profession, chooses to omit the derogatory remark of Mk 5.26; cf. Ellis, Luke, 130. Twelve years is probably a round number for an illness of long standing; cf. Taylor, Mark, 290.

[165]All three accounts say Jesus was wearing a ἱμάτιον which is the square upper garment or mantle on the corners of which any good Jew would have tassels. Cf. Num 15.38-40, Deut 22.12, Mk 6.56, Jn 13.4, 19.23, Ac 18.6. In one of the rare minor agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark, they add that it was the tassels which the woman touched. Cf. Plummer, Luke, 235; Manson, Luke, 98. If, as is probable, Luke did not use Matthew (or vice versa) at this point, this additional detail in both Gospels may reflect: 1) coincidence of redactional activity; 2) additional information derived from oral sources because the story was still being passed on by word of mouth even after it was written down. The latter possibility cannot simply be dismissed since this addition serves little obvious theological purpose, but tassels were so common that both the First and Third Evangelists could have added this feature independently based on their knowledge of Jewish customs in order to make the narrative more explicitly 'Jewish'.

[166]Mt 9.21 and Mk 5.28 make it apparent that her faith was tainted by a magical notion about Jesus' garments. Luke tells us that this touch immediately caused the blood flow to cease. In Mark, πηγή is used metaphorically to mean that the flow, not its source, dried up. Cf. W. Michaelis, "πηγή", TDNT VI, 116, n. 18.

[167]C. Neil, "The Throng and the Touch", ET 10 (1898-99) 123. It is faith that distinguishes her touch from the crowds. Cf. Lane, Mark, 193.

[168]The less formal θύγατερ is used rather than γύναι perhaps to indicate tenderness, or to show that she was now a daughter of faith worthy of respect and concern. Cf. Danker, Jesus, 110; Plummer, Matthew, 142. Notice how Matthew spares the disciples by omitting Mk 5.31 and seems to indicate in v 26b that the woman was healed not immediately after touching Jesus' garment but after Jesus' pronouncements (contrast Mk 5.29, Lk 8.44). This and the omission of Mk 5.30 serve to take the magical tinge out of Mk 5.27-30.

[169]τρέμουσα in both Mark and Luke. Luke presents the woman as if she was afraid of being noticed (v 47). All three Evangelists in different ways indicate that her fears were allayed: in Matthew by θάρσει; in Mark by ὕπαγε εἰς εἰρήνην καὶ ἴσθι ὑγιὴς; in Luke more simply by πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην. The remark in Mark (and with some alteration in Luke) may well be original as it is in part a rendering of לְשָׁלוֹם לֵךְ. Cf. BDF, sec. 206, p. 111; MHT II, 463.

[170]Perhaps we may now speak of a motif in the Gospels where the disciples or such leading figures as Simon the Pharisee or the synagogue ruler in Lk 13.10-17 are contrasted with women in the area of faith or understanding with the latter cast in a more favorable light. In Mark's account it is Jesus' disciples that answer Him and reveal an attitude of exasperation with His seemingly stupid question; in Luke it appears to be Peter alone, as representative of the disciples, who responds; καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ likely is a secondary addition. Cf. Metzger, TC, 146. We should note that the role change of this woman (as with the woman of Samaria or the sinner woman of Luke 7) was from that of outcast to that of a normal member of the community, except in cases where witnessing for or being a disciple of Jesus became involved. Cf. pp. 285-8 of thesis.

[171]There was certainly no doubt in the messengers' or the mourners' minds about the state of the girl when Jesus arrived at her home.

[172]Mark's παρακούω ('overhear') is replaced by Luke's ἀκούω. Jesus is not ignoring the messengers' sad news, but is responding to it by telling Jairus to have faith. Cf. BAG, 624; LSJ, 1314.

[173]In Mark it is πίστευε ('keep on believing'); in Luke πίστευσον ('believe', 'start believing'). The μὴ φοβοῦ may be redactional. Cf. Mk 6.50; Lk 2.30; Mt 28.10, etc.

[174]Except Jairus. Luke's account seems to indicate that the mother was standing outside the house when Jesus and the others arrived. Cf. Lk 8.52. Matthew omits the disciples to focus on Jesus and His work.

[175]Oepke, "γυνή", TDNT I, 784; "Jesus seems to observe the Jewish proprieties. Thus, he does not approach the bed of Jairus' daughter without witnesses..." Also, He is careful to have adequate witnesses when there is a mixed audience of followers and non-followers lest He be suspected of sorcery or necromancy.

[176] αὐλητής means flute player; cf. BAG, 121. On the requirement to hire two flute players for mourning, cf. Str-B I, 521a.

[177]Matthew has τὸ κοράσιον (=the Aramaic טְלִיתָא). CF. BDF, sec. 111, 61; sec. 147.3, 81. Mark has the same at 5.41b; Luke has no extra noun at 8.52b and calls the girl παῖς at 8.54.

[178]Swete, Mark, 102; Taylor, Mark, 285-6; C. Armerding, "The Daughter of Jairus", BSac 105 (1948) 56-8, and "Asleep in the Dust", BSac 121 (1964) 156-7. Armerding makes much of the contrast between Jn 11.14 and Mk 5.39 and the use of different words for sleep in the two contexts (καθεύδω, κοιμάω) in order to prove that the girl was asleep only. His arguments about 1 Thess 5.10, however, are unconvincing. The most probable explanation is that in our text and in 1 Thess 5.10 καθεύδω is used of actual death, but death as seen from God's point of view. Cf. Marshall, Luke, 347; Taylor, Mark, 295. What Jesus says and does, as well as the reaction which follows, seems to indicate that Mark saw it as a resurrection story.

[179]There is evidence in rabbinic literature for speaking euphemistically of death as sleep, but this does not seem to be the case here. Cf. Str-B I, 523; H. Balz, "ὕπνος", TDNT VIII, 548-55; Oepke, "καθεύδω", TDNT III, 436.

[180]Cf. Marshall, Luke, 347; and the Matthean and Marcan accounts at this point.

[181]The reading in W, 28, 245, 349, etc. is due to scribal confusion with the woman's name in Ac 9.40.
Metzger, TC, 87. That Mark translates ταλιθὰ κοῦμ shows his desire to emphasize that Jesus did not use a magic formulation, and this distinguishes the narrative from many pagan healing stories. Cf. Kittel, "λέγω", TDNT IV, 107. It also probably shows his own closeness to the Aramaic original and his audience's distance, since they apparently needed a translation. Luke's omission of the transliteration probably reveals that he or his audience or both are yet a step further removed than Mark from the original source.

[182]Plummer, Luke, 238, says "He intimates that nature is to resume its usual course: the old ties and old responsibilities are to begin again." Faith is as much a part of (if not the necessary prerequisite to) restoration in the case of Jairus' daughter as of the Jewess (Mk 5.36, Lk 8.50). It is only when the Gospel and its call, not sickness or death, divides the physical family that the family of faith must replace physical family relationships. Here, as in Mk 1.29-31, we have instances where the physical family is restored so that it can see itself in light of the priorities of faith. Yet neither Jairus nor the Jewess are urged to give up all and follow Jesus. This evidently was not a requirement for all who believed in Jesus and His power. What this suggests is that Jesus as often endorsed a transformed perspective on women's traditional roles and the given family structure, as created new roles for women in the family of faith.

[183]Cf. Swidler, "Jesus was a Feminist", 177-83; Sanderson, "Jesus and Women", 19-21.

[184]The practice of male-female parallelism in healings is a phenomenon found in all three Synoptics; cf. Mk 1.21-28, 29-31, 7.24-30, 31-36, Mt 8.1-13, 14-15, Lk 7.1-10, 11-17. The difference in the members in some of the pairs and the fact that no one pairing is shared by all three writers intimates that all of the first three Evangelists were interested in presenting this parallelism, not simply in reproducing a parallelism found in their source(s). Luke has two healing (7.11-17, 13.10-17) of or involving women not found elsewhere in the Gospels. Undoubtedly, Luke has a special desire to draw attention to Jesus' concern for women, but in uniquely Lukan material he may in part be reproducing a motif found in his special source. Cf. Marshall, Luke, 285-6.

[185]Cf. Lk 2.36-38, 18.2-5, 20.47, 21.1-4; Stählin, "χήρα", TDNT IX, 449-52.

[186]Cf. E. Klostermann, Das Lukasevangelium. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament Vol. V (ed. H. Lietzmann; Tübingen, 1929) 87; Bultmann, History, 215; R. H. Fuller, Interpreting the Miracles (London, 1963) 64. Bultmann argues that the narrative was created in Hellenistic Jewish circles.

[187]Cf. H. Schürmann. Das Lukasevangelium. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Vol. III (ed. A. Wikenhauser, et al.; Freiburg; 1969) 1.404-5.

[188]Cf. Schürmann, Lukasevangelium, 1.45; Bultmann, History, 420 citing W. L. Knox.

[189]Cf. Marshall, Luke, 283-5.

[190]Cf. Caird, Luke, 109-110: "The resuscitation of the dead is as well attested as any of the other miracles of Jesus. Luke drew this story from his private source L, the story of Jairus' daughter from Mark, and from Q a saying of Jesus which includes the raising of the dead among the achievements of the ministry (7?2)."

[191]Schürmann, Lukasevangelium, 1.405.

[192]Cf. Danker, Jesus, 93; Creed, Luke, 102-3; Marshall, Luke, 284.

[193]Cf. Philostratus, Life of Apollonius of Tyana 4.45 (LCL I) 456-9, and the other parallels cited in Marshall, Luke, 283, most of which post-date both Jesus' life and the time when the Gospels were written. Indeed, it is possible that the Apollonius story is an imitation of a Gospel miracle such as this, but cf. Creed, Luke, 102-3

[194]Schürmann, Lukasevangelium, 1.405.

[195]Contrast Dibelius, From Tradition, 75-6, and Schürmann, Lukas-evangelium, 1.401. Cf. Marshall, Luke, 285-6. Schürmann argues that the desire to show Jesus' concern for women is characteristic of Luke's special source; cf. 7.11-17, 36-50, 8.1-3.

[196]Jesus is rejected,at home in Nazareth (Lk 4.18-20) but is accepted in a village that is only a few miles south. Cf. Ellis, Luke, 118. Elijah had to go further (Sidon) for such acceptance.

[197]The widow's family appears to have been rather prominent in the town since a large crowd went with her in the procession. The widow may have been recognizable to Jesus by her clothing. Cf. Stählin, "χήρα", TDNT IX, 449, n. 81.

[198]Cf. Caird, Luke, 109 ,and these features: 1) he is an only son; 2) she is a widow; 3) Jesus has compassion on her (ἐπ' αὐτῇ); and 4) He gave the son to his mother.

[199]Schweizer, "υἱός", TDNT VIII, 364.

[200]This is an extraordinary command considering that it was customary among the Jews for the grieving process to last thirty days and to involve loud wailing (cf. Lk 7.13, Jn 11.33) and dramatic expressions of grief, especially on the first three days, which were the days of most intense feeling when expression of irretrievable loss was at its peak. Cf. Danker, Jesus, 93; Str-B IV.1, 578-607; Edersheim, Life and Times, 1.554-8 and 2.316 ff.; Brown, John i-xii, 424; Stählin, "κοπετός", TDNT III, 845-6.

[201]The σορός is likely in this case a bier. Cf. BAG, 766; MM, 581; pace LSJ, 1621. By touching the bier, Jesus acquired second grade uncleanness (one day) and by lifting the man and giving him to his mother, first grade uncleanness (seven days). Cf. M. Oholoth 1.1-5, Danby, 649-50, n. 3, 800-01. It appears from M. Mo'ed Katan 3.8,

Danby, 211, that stopping a funeral procession or setting down the bier was illegal. Cf. Str-B I, 522, and II, 161.

[202]Νεανίσκε indicates he was between twenty-five and forty years old and most likely the head of the household. Cf. Philo, On the Creation 105 (LCL; trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker; London, 1929) 84-7.

[203]The response to Jesus' λέγω is καὶ ἤρξατο λαλεῖν - the communication brings life and is the sign of its certain return. Resuscitation, like resurrection, is a sure sign of the presence of the Kingdom and its King actively triumphing over death. Cf. Oepke, "ἐγείρω", TDNT II, 335.

[204]The parallel in Josephus, The Life 148 (LCL) 56-7 suggests it means just fear. Marshall, Luke, 286 says, "Fear...is the natural reaction of men to a demonstration of unearthly power; but the recognition of the source of that power leads also to a glorifying of God..." Cf. BAG, 871; A-S, 472.

[205]'In Palestine and surrounding areas'. CF. BDF, sec. 218, p. 117; MHT III, 257. Judea probably means Palestine. Cf. Creed, Luke, 104; Plummer, Luke, 200-01. περίχωρος means the areas immediately outside Palestine. Cf. Marshall, Luke, 287.

CHAPTER V: WOMEN IN THE MINISTRY OF JESUS

INTRODUCTION

There were several distinct groups of women that interacted with Jesus during His ministry. After a detailed examination of the material in the Gospels and Acts that refers to the mother of Jesus, we will proceed to investigate Jesus' relationship to Mary and Martha, and finally to study those women who traveled with Jesus and played a crucial role in the events surrounding His death and Resurrection. By examining the status and place of these women in Jesus' ministry, we will perhaps discover the background for and the explanation of the new roles women assumed in the primitive Christian community as described by the author of the Book of Acts.

A. Mother Mary, Jesus' Disciple

The credal phrase, "Born of the Virgin Mary", rightly emphasizes that Mary's importance in the NT is due to her relationship to her Son who is the focus of the Gospels. Thus, we must recognize that Mary is not mentioned as a result of an independent interest in her person, but because of the important role she played in Jesus' life.[1] Nonetheless, Mary is the most important woman in the Gospels as is evidenced by the fact that she is the only woman in the NT for whom we have anything like a life history. We will begin with an investigation of the infancy narratives, proceed through the Gospel material, and conclude with an examination of Ac 1.14.[2]

1. The Infancy Narrative of Matthew

We have had occasion to discuss the question of the relation of history and myth (or history and legend) in the Gospels, a question which the birth narratives raise in an acute form.[3] First, it is necessary to define what material we will be contending is of historical value and what we will treat solely as a reflection of the Evangelist's theology and purposes. We will not attempt to argue for the historicity of Joseph's vision in 1.20-21, since vision is a recurring motif in Matthew 1 (cf. vv 13, 19) and may well be legendary. Further we will treat the Matthean genealogy as Midrashic in character and thus not to be taken as a strictly accurate genealogical record though in some particulars it may be historically correct. On historical matters

we will leave the question open as to why Joseph finally took Mary to be his wife. We will ,however , contend that: 1) the virginal conception is to be found in the account of the First Evangelist and has an historical basis; 2) that the statements about Joseph in vv 18-19 are likely historically accurate except that it is probable that the phrase ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου is the Evangelist's addition intended to assert the virginal conception at the outset of the narrative (the actions of the historical Joseph are best explained on the assumption that he knew Mary was pregnant but did not know by what means); 3) that the statement made in v 25a has historical value.

The first mention of Mary in the NT is found in the genealogy of Mt 1.16: "...and Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary of whom Jesus was born, who is called Christ."[4] What the First Evangelist intimates by this phrase is: 1) that Jesus is legally in the line of David through Joseph, but 2) that physically Mary is Jesus' only human parent. Indeed , both the genealogy and the following pericope (Mt 1. 18-25) can be seen to focus primary on Jesus as the son of David and the Son of God, themes present elsewhere in Matthew as well.[5] Mt 1. 18-25 may be taken as an explanation of how Jesus could be born of Mary and not of Joseph and yet still be in the Davidic line.[6] The genealogy and the pericope which follows assume and to some extent explain the virginal conception perhaps in an attempt to answer the difficulties consequent upon Jesus' irregular origins.[7]

What is unusual about the Matthean genealogy is that it mentions not only Mary but also four other women.[8] There are several hypotheses to explain why the First Evangelist includes Tamar, Rahab, Ruth ,and Uriah's wife: 1) because he is attempting to identify Jesus with Gentiles or sinners; 2) because these women were subjects of controversy in the Jewish debate about the Davidic Messiah; 3) because they were involved in 'irregular' unions and yet they were vehicles of God's Messianic plan; 4) because he wished to show that not only Jesus but also other great Davidic kings had irregularities in their past history and yet were God's chosen ones. None of these views is without problems; however, it seems probable that view three is the most accurate.[9] If so, then the First Evangelist calls attention to Mary as an instrument of God's providence even prior to 1.18-25. The genealogy also points out Jesus' indebtedness to women as well as to men for His Davidic ancestry, and to Mary especially for His humanity.

At this point, four questions need to be asked: 1) What led the First Evangelist to phrase 1.16 in the awkward manner he has chosen? 2) Why did he try to explain Jesus' origins in terms of a virginal conception (1.18-25)? 3) Why does Luke also feel it necessary to include this idea? 4) Were the two Evangelists attempting to apply pagan or Jewish birth legends to Jesus in order to divinize their main figure?

If one examines Matthew 1-2 and Luke 1-2 from the perspective of genre criticism and compares them to notable pagan divine birth stories, the resemblances are lacking at precisely the places where one might expect to find similarities. This is more true of the Lukan birth narrative than of the Matthean (the visions in Matthew might be taken as a characteristic embellishment, as they are found in some pagan narratives), but even in Matthew a notable restraint is exercised and the focus is not on the 'wonder' but on how to demonstrate Jesus' Davidic descent <u>despite</u> the miraculous birth.[10] There is little if any trace of the idea of <u>hieros gamos</u> in the Matthean and Lukan narratives.[11] Further, it is questionable whether or not the idea of a virginal conception was part of Jewish Messianic expectations in or before the Evangelists' time.[12] The extant Jewish infancy narratives may have influenced the First (or Third) Evangelist at certain points, but not in the matter of a virginal conception.[13] The origins of the idea of a virginal conception by Mary and of the consequent difficulties evident in the Matthean and Lukan narratives are likely to be sought elsewhere than in the extra-biblical parallels.[14]

Perhaps then the idea of the virgin birth was a theologoumenon, a theological idea about the origins of Jesus that circulated in the early community and arose out of pious or even apologetic attempts to read a high Christology back into the story of Jesus' birth, or alternatively, to forestall any suggestion that Jesus' origins were questionable. The problem with this suggestion is that it is hard to see why Christians would create so much trouble for themselves by the use of a concept which is so difficult to explain and which opens the door to the charge that Jesus was illegitimate, a charge actually made by various Jews in later days and possibly even in NT times (Jn 8.41?)[15] It is apparent that the First and Third Evangelists feel under some constraint to make reference to the virginal conception. It is doubtful that if the virginal conception was simply a theologoumenon it would have so constrained these authors. Further, why is it

that this surprising idea was so widely "...known and accepted during the second century by Christians of various origins and many places?"[16] It could be argued that at least in the case of the First Evangelist the idea was derived from Is 7.14. But even this is unlikely since neither παρθένος nor עלמה are technical terms for a virgo intacta though they may mean virgin in some contexts.[17] Further, as Davies points out, Matthew's formula quotations (cf. 1.23) appear to be the sort in which, "...the 'historical' event seems to determine the incident and nature of the quotation...the scriptural quotation subserves the event."[18]

It seems that the explanation which best accounts for the First Evangelist's circumlocutions at 1.16 and the obvious difficulties present in 1.18-25 as the author attempts to hold virginal conception and Davidic descent together is that the idea of the virginal conception is grounded in an historical event.[19] This would explain why two Evangelists, operating independently with different source material, manage to include this difficult idea in their narrative. It would also explain the rather widespread acceptance among Christians of this idea in the early part of the second century. There is, however, a formidable objection to this view; namely, the apparent silence of the rest of the NT on this matter. It is understandable, so the argument runs, that some of the other NT documents might fail to mention this idea because it was outside their purposes or knowledge, but is it reasonable to believe that all of them would do so? A full scale response to this critique is not possible here, but perhaps part of the explanation lies in the following considerations: 1) it is possible that the Fourth Evangelist knew of the virginal conception and this knowledge is intimated in some of his material (1.14, cf. 8.41); 2) it is possible that Mark's 'son of Mary' (6.3)[20] reveals that the Second Evangelist knew Jesus was not physically a 'son of Joseph'; 3) John McHugh suggests that the silence of the earlier parts of the NT about this idea may be attributed to the fact that Mary disclosed this idea to no one during her earthly life except the beloved disciple.[21] While no view is without difficulties, the least problematic view seems to be the one which accepts the historical foundation of the virginal conception and explains the evidence in light of this fact. Accepting this position we will now return to our discussion of the birth narrative in the First Gospel.

With the mention of Mary and the other women in the genealogy, one might expect the First Evangelist to give special attention to Mary's

role; however, he goes on to focus almost exclusively on Joseph. This has led some commentators to speculate that his source for the birth narrative was Joseph himself.[22] This is perhaps unlikely ,but it is probable that the Evangelist is relying on a source.[23] He assumes the truth of the divine intervention in Mary's life, but focuses on Joseph's reaction to the situation.[24] It is not without purpose that only Joseph, apart from Jesus, is given the title of 'son of David'. It is through Joseph and the naming of his Son that Jesus becomes, like His father , a son of David.[25] The focus on Joseph and Jesus continues as the birth narrative continues. It is Joseph who initiates the actions that take place after he is instructed three times by an angelic messenger (Mt 1.24, 2.13, 2.19). He is seen as the head of his family and the one who will guide and protect Mary and Jesus. It is Joseph , not Mary , who receives these divine revelations and is presented as the model disciple or son of Israel, being obedient to God's word as he receives it.[26] It is when we turn to the second theme in this birth narrative ,Jesus as the Son of God, that Mary comes to the fore through her relationship with Joseph and her role as Jesus' mother. Even here, though, the story is couched in light of what has happened to Mary, but is focused on Joseph's reaction to Mary's pregnancy. We now turn to the details of the narrative to understand how Mary's role and her virginal conception were viewed by this Gospel writer.

Perhaps the first major exegetical point is the significance of πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν in Mt 1.18. The difficulty is that we have a genitive absolute agreeing with the subject.[27] Two possible meanings are: 'before they had marital union', or 'before they married or cohabited'. If the former is meant, it would imply that Mary and Joseph consummated their marriage after the birth of Jesus.[28] If the latter is accepted, then there need be no such implication - it would simply be a statement about Mary's pregnancy during betrothal. There is, however , a third possibility - both marriage and its consummation are intended by this general phrase. It is difficult to imagine a Jew or Jewish Christian separating these two ideas.[29] Thus, it seems likely that sexual union is at least implied. This phrase is, however, mainly a way of explaining that God alone was responsible for Mary's conception and that Jesus is the result of God's, not Joseph's ,creative act. As I. Broer notes, the First Evangelist is concerned with Joseph's conduct only until the birth, to affirm that the virgin has given birth as the prophet foretold.[30] Thus, Jesus as a son of David and as the Son of God is seen

as a fulfillment of OT prophecy. This being so, Mary is fulfilling the role which would be the Jewess' greatest honor - being parent to a first born son who is the Davidic Messiah. Through her, Israel's national destiny is fulfilled.[31]

Mt 1.18 goes on to say Μαρίας...εὑρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου. It seems clear from the text that Joseph discovered Mary was pregnant, for the action in v 19 is precipitated by the εὑρέθη in v 18.[32] If δίκαιος was an original part of this story and not an addition by the Evangelist meant to improve Joseph's image, then it appears that it meant 'righteous' in the sense of being obedient to the observance of Jewish law or customs in regard to adultery.[33] Though the Law did not require one to divorce an adulterous fiancée or wife and the penalty mentioned in Deut 22.22-28 was no longer being extracted in Jesus' day,[34] a 'righteous' man would likely feel bound to do as the rabbis suggested and put her away.[35] Alternatively, it is possible that Joseph was 'righteous' in the sense of being compassionate in divorcing her quietly,[36] but such an interpretation of δίκαιος has little linguistic or historical support. On the (non-historical) level of the Evangelist's presentation, a third possibility arises - δίκαιος means 'righteous' in the sense of not wishing to interfere with or defile a holy act of God. On this view, Joseph knew of (and is either awed or bewildered by) the divine intervention and feels he should bow out gracefully and quietly.[37] It is possible that the Evangelist intended this. By adding the ἐκ clause, the μὴ φοβηθῇς (v 20), and using δίκαιος in this sense he would have spared Joseph from appearing to be legalistic and unkind to Mary.

It appears that the Evangelist portrays Joseph as caught between the holy Law of God and his love for Mary. He did not wish to expose her to ridicule by public divorce,[38] yet his allegiance and submission to God's will came first. How could Jesus be his son in any case? The Evangelist adds the angel's annunciation to answer this question for his audience. His intention is to paint a theological picture of Joseph as a model disciple who gives up a Jewish father's greatest privilege (siring his first born son) in order to obey God's will (cf. 1.24). The attempt to rehabilitate the image of Joseph is perhaps part of the Evangelist's larger purpose of demonstrating the respectability of Jesus' origins.

Mt 1.25 concludes this pericope and has often been a point of debate between Protestant and Catholic scholars. How one exegetes this

passage will determine what one thinks of the idea of Mary being a perpetual virgin. Thus, this verse bears close scrutiny which centers around three points, one textual, one lexical, and one grammatical.

The textual problem is not major but it is noteworthy that Codex Bobiensis and the Sinaitic Syriac omit entirely οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτὴν ἕως οὗ. Thus, the text would read, "...and he took unto himself his wife and she bore a son." This omission probably results from several scribes thinking that the verse as it now stands might imply that Joseph had other children by Mary or sexual relations with her at a later date. One old Syriac manuscript substitutes "purely was dwelling with her", again reflecting apologetic concerns.[39] Though this evidence is scant, it nonetheless shows that some scribes discerned that this text could be taken as casting doubts on the idea of Mary's perpetual virginity.

The grammatical concern involves the tense of the verb γινώσκω and the lexical problem involves the meaning of ἕως οὗ. McHugh notes that γινώσκω here is in the imperfect implying the duration of the time Joseph did not have sexual relations with Mary. He agrees, as do most commentators, that the verb does not have some unusual 'spiritual' sense, but refers to sexual intercourse.[40] He argues that the imperfect implies the author did not exclude the possibility that Mary and Joseph continued to abstain after Jesus' birth. If later consummation was in the Evangelist's mind, then McHugh contends he would have used the aorist in the sense of a pluperfect. David Hill also lends credence to this in saying that this text does not absolutely deny the idea of Mary's perpetual virginity.[41] It seems correct to assert that the focus of this text is on the fact of Mary's virginity <u>ante partum</u> and, as the imperfect verb implies, the duration of Joseph's abstinence from intercourse prior to Jesus' birth.[42] It is the secondary points made by the text, however, which decide the issue.

According to W. C. Allen and A. Plummer, the imperfect tense of γινώσκω is against the tradition of perpetual virginity.[43] Plummer says that the imperfect implies subsequent sexual relations between Mary and Joseph even more than the punctiliar aorist. This is because the phrase, 'he used not to', or 'he was not knowing her' implies a <u>certain</u> duration of time delimited by the ἕως οὗ which implies that the previously abstained from action did or will take place after that duration is over.[44] Attempts to redefine ἕως as 'while' or 'without', or to see it as the beginning of a new phrase are unconvincing in view

of the grammatical and lexical evidence.[45] Thus, Mary's virginity ante partum is affirmed in Mt 1.18-25, but Mary's virginity post partum likely is ruled out by this text. If Joseph was in fact a righteous and good Jewish man, then both the abstinence from sexual relations before marriage and the participation after marriage is historically probable, as is his conduct mentioned in 1.19 (if he did not know about or understand the virginal conception).

Speaking purely on the level of the Evangelist's theological presentation, we may note that he focuses on Joseph's role to show how Jesus also became a son of David. It is Joseph, not Mary, who connects the sections and ties this infancy narrative together (a role Mary plays in Luke's infancy narrative). Joseph is pictured as a model of obedience to God's will (Mt 1.24), and as an object three times of God's revelation (1.20 ,2.13, 2.19). He is both presented and addressed by God through the angel as the head of his family - the one who guides and protects them. Mary is seen as submissive to Joseph's leading into and out of Egypt. In fact , she not only is submissive, but also silent. Thus, the Evangelist reaffirms the traditional Jewish roles of headship and subordinaticn despite the fact that Mary is singularly honored by a special relationship with God and His Son. This may be due to the Evangelist's audience.[46] It is only in Luke's infancy narrative that we see the different emphasis on Mary's role as mother and servant of God and His Son.

2. The Infancy Narrative of Luke

Luke's infancy narrative[47] is in many respects the feminine counterpart to the First Evangelist's, a fact which is not surprising when one considers that one-third of uniquely Lukan Gospel material involves women. It is Elizabeth and Mary, not Zechariah and Joseph, who are first to receive the message of Christ's coming, who are praised and blessed by God's angels, and who are first to sing and prophesy about the Christ child. As we shall see, Luke presents these women not only as witnesses to the events surrounding the births of John and Jesus, but also as active participants in God's Messianic purposes , and perhaps also as the first examples of the lowly being exalted as part of God's plan of eschatological reversal that breaks into history with, in, and through the person of Jesus.

The question then becomes, how much of this presentation may we take as of some historical worth? Is Luke using sources or creating his own infancy narrative? If the former, do they contain birth legends

with no basis in history or are they narratives that include certain historical traditions? Are these narratives expanded and altered versions of OT stories or are they merely patterned after such stories? Of necessity we will only indicate in a general way the line of approach that will be taken here and offer some reasons why other views have been rejected.

Two points can be asserted with reasonable certainty: 1) for much of the material in Luke 1-2, the Evangelist is relying on sources; 2) nevertheless, he has shaped the material so that it has become an integral part of his Gospel and indeed of his two volume work. On the first point we may note that Luke 1-2 abounds in Hebraisms in contrast to the classical Greek of the prologue.[48] While this could mean that Luke has deliberately adopted a Hebraising style in 1.5-2.40, when we find peculiarly Semitic phrases ('walking in the commandments', 1.6 ,or 'advanced in their days',1.7) in these narratives, phrases which seem natural in the context in which they are found and thus do not appear to be a matter of artifice ,it appears we have evidence of the use of sources. Then too, some of the content in these narratives points in this direction: various irrelevant details devoid of theological significance (the name of Anna's father) or details that seem to conflict with Luke's purpose of casting the Baptist and his kin in the shadow of Jesus and His kin (e.g. ,that Mary goes to visit Elizabeth and she utters Spirit-inspired words first).[49] In regard to the second point, P. Minear has amply demonstrated how Luke's major themes are presaged in Luke 1-2, how the canticles in Luke 1-2 have parallels in the citation from Joel in Acts 2, and P. Schubert has shown various parallels between Luke 24/Acts 28 and material in Luke 1-2.[50] If we are correct in these two points, then it explains the mixture of Lukan and non-Lukan features in this material.

In regard to this mixture, it is crucial to note that it is especially in the speech material, "that the expression of specifically Christian doctrine is (with one exception) conveyed".[51] Because this is so, the dialogue between the angel and Mary in 1.26-31 will be treated solely on the basis of what it tells us about Lukan theology. What then of the Canticles? It will be noted that in terms of content "...the Magnificat and the Benedictus have only minor touches that make them Christian."[52] We are not here concerned with the Benedictus , but Brown's remark about the Magnificat is germane. It appears to be

a piece of tradition that Luke added to his narrative and adapted only slightly. It is also worth pointing out that in Simeon's second oracle (2.34-35), a theme is presented which outside of the birth narratives Luke gives no attention to - the 'sword' piercing Mary. This may well indicate that Luke is using a source here, for though 2.48-51 might be seen as a partial fulfillment of this prophecy, the context of the oracle seems to refer to the effect of Jesus during His ministry (cf. v 34). Verses 34-35 ,however ,have various Lukan words which at least indicate that Luke has made this material his own.

Has Luke composed some of these oracles and even some of the narratives on the basis of the OT? J. Drury ,among others, thinks that Luke is doing a free midrash on various OT texts.[53] McHugh points out that while a midrashic style of exegesis is being used by Luke on certain OT texts ,it is the events of the Gospel tradition that lead the author to turn to the OT to find analogies and answers - the OT is not the starting point of the author or his source for these events.[54] The character and divine origin of a current event are shown by "proof from prophecy". This, however ,is a very different matter from what Drury suggests. In Luke's narrative ,even where Gospel event is not the point ,it is often the point of departure for proof texting. As Brown says ,while we may have a midrashic hermeneutic in operation , midrash is not a satisfactory designation for this material. Any material that contains the idea of a virginal conception cannot be wholly composed out of the OT and the independent testimony of both the First and Third Evangelists to this idea indicates that both authors were drawing on at least some early Christian tradition. It would be wrong, however ,to deny that these Evangelists consciously present their infancy material narratives in a form that reflects the influence of OT stories. Luke in particular shows an interest in salvation history past and present ,and in recitation theology. This technique involves seeing and drawing parallels between different people and events in salvation history which is a very different matter from creating pious legends about Jesus on the basis of OT stories.

Dibelius is right that Luke 1-2 is made up of traditions which grew apart from the main body of tradition.[55] Brown suggests that the Magnificat along with the other Canticles likely arose out of a Jewish Christian community. It is not likely that they were taken over from a Jewish community because the emphasis on salvation accomplished is not consonant with the Judaism of Jesus' day or before.[56]

It also appears that the sort of narrative material Luke found in his source ultimately goes back to such a setting ,for the tone of Luke 1-2 is very much one which finds Jewish institutions, aspirations ,and customs as part of everyday life. Though this may in part explain why this material is so different from the Gospel traditions about Jesus' ministry ,it is not a full explanation. Perhaps McHugh is close to the mark when he suggests that the narrative material in Luke 1-2 differs from the rest of the Gospel because it involves a family history ,not a record of the public ministry.[57] In short , it derives from what might almost be called a private source. By its very nature only Mary could have known of the virginal conception (if it is an historical fact). That we have it recorded in two Gospels indicates that she must have told someone of this great mystery. And if she spoke of this, it is almost certain that she would have explained to some degree the historical context of this miracle. Perhaps after all we should take seriously the hints Luke gives us in 1.2 about relying on those who were eye-witnesses from the beginning (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς) and the hints in 2.19 ,51 about Mary storing up information in her memory. This hypothesis would explain why it is that Luke seems to tell the story through Mary's eyes , why it is that Luke with only rare exceptions includes vivid details only when Mary figures in the narrative ,[58] and why the material has a Jewish-Christian flavor. Let us be clear that we are not suggesting that in the Canticles we have a verbatim account of what was spoken on the occasion ,for Luke has clearly shaped and edited his material and in some places made additions. Nor are we saying that Luke has simply passed along the narrative material that can ultimately be traced back to Mary without alteration. In fact, in the case of the dialogue between Mary and the angel we have posited that Luke has composed the material. The point is , however, that Luke had source material before him of some substance for at least the narratives he relates that involve Mary ,and possibly the canticles which she likely spoke or heard.[59] The view adopted here, though not problem free, appears to have more in its favor than either the view that we have a free composition (perhaps on the basis of OT stories) by Luke or the view that we have a collection of pious legends. Pious Christian legends would not likely have included the concept of the virginal conception which made it difficult to assert Jesus' Davidic descent, or the idea that Mary did not fully grasp what was going on at various points (cf. 2.19, 33 , 48-50). Jewish stories

would not have included the idea of a virginal conception or of salvation as realized, and these narratives are probably too Semitic in character to be Hellenistic in origin. If we are correct in tracing material mentioned above at least to an early Jewish Christian community and probably in part ultimately back to Mary herself, then it is likely that the material has considerable historical worth.

The first mention of Mary in Luke's Gospel is found at 1.27. Here Mary is introduced as a παρθένος engaged to Joseph of the house of David.[60] While the focus in Luke is primarily on Jesus as Son of God (and thus Mary comes to the fore), the theme of Jesus as a son of David is not absent (1.27, 32). It is intimated by the reference to the throne of David (1.32) that Joseph will be considered the father of this child, and therefore the Evangelist removes any reason for Mary to refrain from marriage.[61] Let us examine carefully this passage which Luke has constructed.

The additions of εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν after σοῦ in 1.28, and in one case καὶ εὐλογημένος ὁ καρπὸς τῆς κοιλίας σου are not likely original; since there is no adequate explanation why ℵ, B, L, W, etc. should omit either or both these phrases. Lk 1.42 is probably the source of these insertions.[62] In the same verse we find the significant greeting, χαῖρε. While it is true that this may be a normal Greek greeting, in light of 1) the parallels between Lk 1.28-38 and Zeph 3. 14-20 (LXX), 2) the fact that normally a Biblical 'call' narrative does not include such a greeting, and 3) considering Mary's response to the greeting, it seems more probable that we should see something more significant here than a simple greeting in χαῖρε.[63] F. Danker seems nearer the truth in saying,

> Gabriel's greeting is unusual, for women were ordinarily not addressed in this way, and not even Zechariah heard words such as these. Hail is equivalent to 'Greetings!' but conveys the sense of 'Rejoice!'...That Gabriel, one of the highest members of the heavenly council, should come to the insignificant village of Nazareth and present himself before this girl - this is a miracle of the New Age and presages the announcement of the Magnificat, that the mighty are brought low and the humble exalted (vs 52). (64)

The connection beween χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμένη, and χάριν (vv 28-30) should be noted. Mary should rejoice because she is highly favored by God - she is to be graced with the privilege of giving birth to the Messiah.

Verse 30 implies that Mary has received grace freely given by God and says nothing of Mary being either a dispenser or a meritorious

receiver of that grace.[65] The phrase ὁ κύριος μετὰ σοῦ is likely an OT greeting meant as a statement (Judg 6.12, Ruth 2.12) indicating God's supportive presence which prepares the recipient for the service they are about to undertake. It is unlikely therefore, that it refers to the moment of conception (the future tenses in 1.35 probably rule this out in any case).[66]

Mary's reactions show that she does not understand fully what the angel has said, indeed she is deeply perplexed or confused.[67] The ἀσπασμός likely refers to the whole saying of the angel, but it may refer to the χαῖρε specifically. As the angel recognizes, Mary is afraid.[68] The consequence of Mary standing in favor (εὗρες γὰρ χάριν) with God is that He is about to shower on Mary a special benefit.

In v 31 there are three future verbs, the first two involve prophecy and the last is likely a command.[69] Taken in its natural sense, καλέω intimates that Mary will name Jesus. This does not exclude Joseph from the process, but Luke appears to give Mary the same status as the First Evangelist gives Joseph (Mt 1.21).[70]

The crux of the annunciation story is to be found in Mary's response in v 34: πῶς ἔσται τοῦτο ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω. Bultmann has suggested that since vv 34-35 are so Lukan in wording, they have been added to a narrative that originally did not refer to the virginal conception.[71] This is unlikely since: 1) all of vv 28-37 appear to be a Lukan composition; 2) there are hints elsewhere even in the narrative of this idea (cf. 1.27, 3.23, though the latter may also be Lukan);[72] and 3) vv 34-35 are parallel to 1.18-19 and a 'How?' question is customary in a Biblical annunciation narrative.[73] Generally, it is agreed that the τοῦτο refers back to Mary's conceiving and giving birth, as the γινώσκω implies. It rarely is disputed that γινώσκω has a sexual meaning here.[74] What is not agreed upon is whether γινώσκω has a past reference ('I have not known up until now'), a present reference ('I do not know' - immediately or in the present time), or a future or eternal reference ('I am not to know', or 'I do not intend to know' man). To a great degree the discussion hinges on whether one sees συλλήμψῃ as referring to the immediate future (virtually the present), or the more distant future.[75] If one takes γινώσκω to refer to an eternal state of affairs, then one will opt either for a past,[76] or an immediate[77] vow to virginity on Mary's part. If one takes γινώσκω to refer to the immediate present or near future, then one must presume that Mary understood the angel to mean immediate conception or at least conception before the betrothal period was over.[78] There are several good reasons to reject the vow to virginity theory in any form:

1) Luke portrays Mary as reflecting the normal Jewish mindset concerning marriage and children (1.48); 2) there is no indication from Luke that such prior or present commitment was made by Mary; 3) the fact that Luke's audience could not have deduced such a vow from the text as it now stands; 4) the fact that Luke indicates that Mary had entered already into the process of Jewish marriage.[79] She, unlike Zechariah who questioned the 'whether', is asking 'how', considering her state of betrothal and her abstinence from intercourse during that period, this conception and birth can take place now or in the near future.[80] She is seeking clarification, not proof (for which Zechariah was punished). The angel's further response can be seen as a further explanation of how Mary will conceive prior to marital consummation. Thus, γινώσκω means not only that Mary has had no intercourse previously, but also that there is no prospect of it now or in the near future, which would be necessary if there is to be conception.[81] This is why the angel must inform her that she will conceive (future) by the Holy Spirit.

The response of the angel in v 35 is of particular interest because of the use of the verbs ἐπέρχομαι and ἐπισκιάζω. The former verb is, except for two examples, peculiar to Luke in the NT. The phrase πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ (1.35) should be compared to Ac 1.8: ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Mary is present both here at the birth of Jesus and at the birth of the Church (Ac 1.14). In both cases there is a promise that "the Spirit will come upon you". Luke may be intending us to see Mary as a key link between the life of Jesus and the life of the Church.[82] The second verb ἐπισκίαζω is also of importance and can mean 1) 'to overshadow' in the sense of 'to cover'; 2) 'to throw a shadow upon'; 3) 'to overshadow' in the sense of protection if in reference to the idea of the Shekinah glory cloud of God's divine presence (cf. Lk 9.34).[83] One writer has suggested a connection to the idea of a shadow of miraculous power, known elsewhere in Hellenistic literature and in Ac 5.15.[84] If, however, one takes this verb to mean 'to overshadow' for protection, then it is not so much a reference to a miraculous impregnation (as ἐπέρχομαι likely is) as an assurance that Mary will have divine protection during the encounter with the Spirit and the resulting conception.[85] If so, then it is conceivable that Luke intends us to see here the beginning of the eschatological reversal of the curse on Eve (Gen 3.16). In any case, one or both of these verbs is an explicit reference to the virginal conception.

The reaction in v 38 to the angelic explanation is the classic expression of submission to God's word and will - Ἰδοὺ ἡ δούλη κυρίου γένοιτό μοι κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου. It is possible that this phrase or something like it was found in Luke's source as Mary's response to God's intervention in her life. This suggestion becomes plausible if vv 47-49 (τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ) of the Magnificat do go ultimately back to Jesus' mother. On the other hand, Luke may have written 1.38 on the basis of vv 47-49, in which case he is here presenting Mary as a model disciple responding as she ought to God's call.[86] The first phrase of 1.38 often is toned down by the translation 'handmaiden', but the actual meaning is 'Behold the slave of the Lord'. Thus, Luke portrays Mary as binding herself totally to God's will, giving up her plans and desires for the future.[87] Her response was one of submission in full recognition of what effect this act of God could have for her social position and her relation to Joseph. She could not presume he would understand. We see the Evangelist presenting Mary as one who is willing to give up betrothal and reputation for God's purposes, the sort of self-sacrifice which, in Luke's Gospel, is the mark of a disciple.[88] "Mary is thus a model of what Israel ought to be, and her self-description is a mark of identity for the new community...."[89]

Luke presents Mary as the connecting link between the various segments of this infancy narrative;[90] thus, save for Jesus, she is presented as its central figure. The narrative of the meeting between Elizabeth and Mary, in view of its style and Palestinian background, is not likely a composition of Luke.[91] As Bultmann says, it was likely found in Luke's source.[92] Historically there is little that is problematic about the narrative, and the fact that Elizabeth is portrayed favorably and first speaks by the leading of the Spirit favors its authenticity. We will consider the matter of who spoke the Magnificat momentarily, but it may have been inserted by Luke into this context. Verses 50-55 may originally have been part of a Jewish or early Jewish-Christian hymn spoken by someone other than Mary.[93] Thus, we will not treat these verses as of historical value for our study of Mary. The case with vv 46-49 seems to be otherwise. "The lack of Christian colouring suggests that the present hymn fits no situation better than that of Mary herself...although this does not necessarily mean that Mary composed the hymn at the precise occasion in the text."[94]

Mary goes to visit her kinswoman, Elizabeth, and receives from her a two-fold blessing. In vv 42-43 we learn that Mary is blessed

among women because she is the μήτηρ τοῦ κυρίου μου; i.e., because the fruit of her womb is blessed. This is a derived honor for it is the fact that she bears Jesus that makes her favored. Interestingly it is for God's work in the pregnancy that Mary is a called blessed by all generations (1.48). The implication seems to be that motherhood and the blessedness it involves are affirmed and hallowed, for God has chosen this means to bring His Son into the world. Mary's blessedness in her role of mother is what Elizabeth first remarks upon, and yet Mary could not have been the mother of God's Son had she not first believed and submitted to God's word. Elizabeth's second blessing relates specifically to this - μακαρία ἡ πιστεύσασα...[95] The same word is not used here as in 1.42 for blessing. In v 45 we have μακαρία which means 'fortunate' or 'happy' and it does not so much convey a blessing, as recognize an existing state of blessedness or happiness.[96] In v 42 we have Εὐλογημένη which recognizes that God has conferred a blessing on Mary.[97] Future generations are called to recognize this beatitude. In a sense, Luke intimates the resolution of the tension between physical and spiritual blessedness by presenting Elizabeth's pronouncement of both blessings - it is the blessedness of believing in God's promise that leads to the physical blessings (cf. 1.42, 45). Luke indicates, however, that Mary must yet wrestle to obtain a proper perspective on both (cf. 2.50). Her difficulty will be in learning and understanding not only her own priorities but also her Son's priorities which must first be with His spiritual Father and family, and secondly with His physical family (cf. Lk 2.49-51, 8.21). In the Lukan narrative, Mary has declared herself the Lord's slave, but she has still to learn that this entails her being Jesus' disciple first and His mother second.

Because of a textual problem, it is not clear to whom Luke ascribed the Magnificat. Some manuscripts, chiefly Latin, attribute it to Elizabeth. Apparently, Origen knew of some manuscripts, possibly Greek, that read Elizabeth rather than Mary.[98] This evidence is outweighed in quality, quantity, and geographical spread, and date by ℵ A, B, and other important witnesses. Nonetheless, given the history of the Church in relation to Mary, Elizabeth is the more difficult reading. Indeed, it may be too difficult. For this reason, some scholars have hypothesized that originally there was no name written here; the text simply read καὶ εἶπεν ascribing it neither to Mary nor Elizabeth, and that Luke has attributed this anonymous canticle to one

or the other of his female characters.[99] There is, however, some internal evidence that favors the view that Elizabeth originally spoke this canticle; for instance, 1) Elizabeth, as an older, childless woman is better described as having received mercy from Yahweh who was mindful of her lowly estate; 2) this song has affinities with the Song of Hannah (1 Sam 2.1-10) whose old, barren condition is more like Elizabeth's state than Mary's; 3) the words of v 56 support the idea that Elizabeth is the last speaker, because Mary is mentioned by name whereas Elizabeth is referred to as 'her' (it is more natural to refer to the last speaker by the personal pronoun); 4) Lk 1.41 says that Elizabeth is filled with the Holy Spirit, which is common before prophecy, but there is no mention of Mary being so filled.[100]

If the canticle was originally anonymous, certain factors make it most likely that Luke would ascribe it to Mary. He wants to make clear that Mary and Jesus are more important than Elizabeth and John the Baptist. Luke uses the concluding part of his narrative to underline the point he made in vv 27-33 about Mary and Jesus. It is unlikely that Luke would have Elizabeth sing her own praises at this point.[101] The balance of probability and the textual evidence is with the view that this hymn, or at least vv 47-49 in some form, was originally spoken by and attributed to Mary. Verses 47-49 reflect an individual's response to an act of God for that individual.

The word ταπείνωσις can mean 'lowly state' and does not refer necessarily to childlessness. It could refer to the fact that Mary was a member of the peasant class. The repetition of the name of the preceding subject in 1.56 has parallels to OT style (Num 24.25, Deut 32.44, 2 Sam 2.1), and possibly the style of the Magnificat's introduction favors Mary as the subject.[102] Mary resembles Hannah when she presents Jesus in the Temple and encounters Simeon (1 Sam 1.21-28, 2.19-20).[103] There is in fact nothing in the Magnificat (and particularly vv 47-49) which Mary could not have said of herself. It is Mary who has been referred to previously as ἡ δούλη κυρίου. We conclude that the traditional view is to be preferred on both external and internal grounds.[104]

What is the nature of Mary's paean of praise? Historically it probably was a simple song of praise for the honor bestowed on Mary and a recognition that future generations would consider her fortunate. In its present context, since Luke has joined vv 47-49 to what follows, it has become a song of promise ,prophetic protest, and powerful

deliverance by the Lord of the poor and oppressed.[105] It is Jewish in nature and similar to the Psalms and the Song of Hannah, but it is also on the border between OT and NT literature, rooted in the OT past while shedding light on the NT present and future as God begins to do new things.[106] Mary is thus portrayed by Luke as a type of the OT prophetess who proclaims OT hopes as the salvation of God breaks in; however, she differs from the OT priests and prophetesses in that she herself helps to bring in salvation. She represents Israel who obeyed God's commands, one of the lowly and poor upon whom God has bestowed unmerited favor. She is not merely a representative symbol of Israel's collective need and response, for the song in its introduction is about her individuality. She as an individual fulfills her people's hopes by being the vehicle through which God's salvation and Messiah comes. Lowliness, not exaltation, was the historical condition of Mary's life, and she reveals and embodies God's salvation and power through frailty and weakness. It is wrong to suggest that Luke casts Mary in the role of a venerated saint. Rather, Mary recognizes (v 48) that she is insignificant and of lowly estate, undeserving of God's favor. Her blessedness is in what God has done for her (v 49), and thus it is God, not Mary, who receives praise in this song.[107] It is precisely because Mary is not portrayed as a sinless and angelic figure that she can be a model and a sign of hope for other believers. If God can favor this undeserving and lowly maid, then there is hope for others as well.

The theme of Mary as ἡ δούλη κυρίου assumes greater proportions and importance[108] when we note the significance of Mary's role in Heilsgeschichte, summed up aptly by W. Grundmann: "The fact that God has regard to the lowly estate of his handmaiden gives rise to the hope that His eschatological action...is now beginning..." [109] Mary is seen as a forerunner of a Christian disciple, one who reveals what God will do for those who accept God's will in regard to the new thing He is bringing about.[110]

In order to obtain a more holistic perspective on Mary's role in Luke's infancy narratives, we must examine that role in light of the role Elizabeth plays in Luke 1-2. Luke presents a somewhat developed picture of Mary's kinswoman, but he takes pains to cast her in the shadow of Mary, just as Elizabeth's son is cast in the shadow of Mary's Son.[111] The stories about Elizabeth and Zechariah are uniquely Lukan; though he found these narratives in his source, he has shaped

them to show that both men and women are objects of God's salvation and subjects who convey His revelation.[112] Let us see how Luke works out this schema.

After the prologue, Luke's Gospel begins in similar fashion to the First Evangelist - an angel appears to a man speaking of a miraculous birth. In Luke, the angel tells Zechariah of the birth of John; Zechariah expresses doubt, while Elizabeth expresses faith. She says, "The Lord has done this for me...In these days He has shown His favor and taken away my disgrace among men." (Lk 1.25). She speaks both as a typical Jewish woman and as one who has been liberated by grace to sing His praise. Her response anticipates Mary's, "I am the Lord's servant...may it be to me as you have said." (Lk 1.38), and her "...for He has been mindful of the humble state of His servant." (Lk 1.48). Elizabeth perhaps is portrayed as the forerunner of Mary. As Luke presents things, her miraculous conception serves as a reassurance to Mary that the angel's word is true (1.36).

Elizabeth, in her relation to Mary, reminds us of her son John's role in the Gospels in relation to Jesus. When Elizabeth is visited by Mary she says, "Blessed are you among women and blessed is the child you will bear! But why am I so favored, that the mother of my Lord should come to me?" (Lk 1.42-43). Compare this to the Lukan form of John the Baptist's words: "He who is Mightier than I is coming, the thong of whose sandal I am not worthy to untie." (Lk 3.16, cf. Mk 1.7). Both texts convey the sense of unworthiness and the clear distinction between the lesser and greater person. Luke perhaps wishes to emphasize the importance of Mary by concentrating on her forerunner and showing how Elizabeth is like, and yet not like, the mother of Jesus. Mary is prepared for giving birth by staying for three months with Elizabeth (Lk 1.56).

Elizabeth, not Zechariah, is seen as the one of faith. To the surprise of all the relatives and neighbors, Elizabeth gives to their son the name John, as the angel told her (Lk 1.60).[113] It is only when Zechariah concurs with Elizabeth's words that he is freed from his dumbness and is able to praise God (1.64). Even when he does speak, his song in many ways is an echo of Mary's (cf. 1.54 and 1.68; 1.55 and 1.72-73; 1.52 and 1.71).[114]

Just as Elizabeth is given more prominence than Zechariah and is cast in a more favorable light as a model of faith, so too is Mary in relation to Joseph. There is little mention of Joseph (cf. 1.27)

until after the major prophecies and songs have been given concerning Jesus. It is Joseph, like Zechariah, who is silent in Luke's Gospel in contrast to Mary's silence in Matthew 1-2. In his way, perhaps Luke gives notice of the new freedom, equality, and importance of women in God's plan, in contrast to the prejudices and limitations they often faced in Judaism. Luke does indicate, however, that it is Joseph who leads and guides the family on a journey, and it is to the town of his family line that they go to register (Lk 2.4-5, cf. Mt 2.13-23).[115] Luke is also careful to mention Joseph's presence by the manger when the shepherds come to visit (2.16). While Luke's vision of the new age does include the idea of equality for women in service and importance to the Lord, there is no indication that he is rejecting patriarchy outright in his infancy narrative.

To this point we have seen that through the prominence of Elizabeth as Mary's forerunner and by the absence of Joseph, Mary is cast in a central role in this infancy narrative. This becomes more apparent when we examine Mary's relationship to Anna and Simeon in the Temple.

The presentation of Jesus in the Temple is a scene intended in part to indicate to Luke's audience that Mary and Joseph were good, pious Jews obedient to the Law. The narrative in 2.22-40 appears to have undergone considerable editing. It may be an independent narrative, as Bultmann avers, but the parents' astonishment probably does not point in this direction as such reactions are stock features of narratives with miraculous occurrences.[116] The precept of the Law mentioned in v 23 does not exist in the form in which it is cited. This verse appears to be a loose citing of three separate verses in Exodus: 13.2, 12, and 15. The alteration may be because Jesus, who was conceived by the Holy Spirit, needed no consecration, nor was he to be 'redeemed' because He had been sent into this world to live an entire life consecrated to God.[117] In addition to the purification and redemption motifs, we find here the idea of Jesus being offered in the Temple to God for His service (cf. 1 Sam 1.11, 22, 28). This may explain why there is no mention of the paying of a redemption price. It was not necessary to go to the Temple for the redemption and the child's presence was unnecessary at the purification,[118] but if the purpose of the trip was primarily to present Jesus to the Lord (22b) and secondarily to purify Mary (v 22, 24, cf. Lev 12.8), then a trip to the Temple and the presence of both parents and child is understandable. Luke 2.49 (if it is historical) may count against this

view ,but probably Jesus' parents did not expect Him to be involved in the Temple until He came of age. It has been conjectured that this story is a Christianized version of a Buddhist legend but, as Creed notes, the tone of the Buddhist story is entirely different from Lk 2.22-40 and, "The theme of an old man anticipating the future of the divine child is in itself one that may easily have arisen independently."[119] Though Bultmann conjectures that Anna is a doublet of Simeon on the grounds she has nothing to say,[120] "...her rather otiose role is more likely to be an indication of historicity," [121] (as are the unnecessary particulars Luke mentions about her).

The process of composing this narrative seems to have been similar to the process which Luke used elsewhere in this infancy narrative. He has adapted and revised a basic narrative which likely included vv 34-35 and he has added an additional canticle, the Nunc Dimittis, to that narrative as is indicated by the similarity of vv 28 and 34a, and the smooth transition from 27 to 34 if the intervening material is omitted. The Nunc Dimittis suited the person of Simeon but it derived from another source, perhaps the same from which he got 1.50-55.[122] Thus, we shall not treat this song as an historical utterance of Simeon but note its significance for the Lukan theological schema and for his portrayal of Mary. In regard to the rest of the narrative, those who are unable to accept the possibility of prophetic activity or miraculous occurrences will undoubtedly classify this material as strictly legendary, but the encounter with Anna is so little developed that it seems unlikely to be legendary and, as Dibelius allows, the encounter with Simeon probably has an historical basis, though Luke may have transferred the setting to the Temple.[123]

Anna and Simeon in Luke 2 are representatives of the old order of Jewish piety and of the longings of their people for the Messiah. Simeon is described as one who has been looking for the "consolation of Israel", a term for the salvation that would come to Israel in the Messianic era.[124] He resembles Zechariah in that he is a righteous and devout man (cf. 1.6 to 2.25). The narrative indicates that Simeon had been assured that he would not die before he saw the Messiah; thus, having seen Jesus in the Temple, he can depart in peace. The text implies he is an old man.

Luke has Simeon bless both Joseph and Mary to indicate God's endorsement of them in their roles as mother and father. Lk 2.33 indicates that Luke, like the First Evangelist, recognizes Joseph as

Jesus' legal parent.[125] Lk 2.35a has been seen as a reference either to Mary's doubts about Jesus at the cross, or to her co-suffering with Jesus beneath the cross, or to the word of God as a sword piercing Mary.[126] Luke, however, makes no mention of Mary at the cross and thus views involving the cross are probably not consistent with the way the Evangelist understood this verse. How one interprets this verse and its relation to what follows is determined by whether or not one sees here a parenthetical remark. In favor of 2.35a not being parenthetical is the fact that Mary is being addressed. On the other hand, this would imply that the ὅπως clause which follows hinges on what happens to Mary as an individual, as well as to how people react to the sign (v 34c). In light of the rest of Luke's Gospel, this seems to be an unlikely coupling of reaction to Jesus and reaction to Mary's individual experience.[127] Further, it would not be unnatural for Simeon to speak parenthetically to Mary since the oracle is primarily about Jesus, not His mother. On balance, then, it seems best to take Lk 2.35a as a parenthetical remark with the understanding that v 35a is linked partially to vv 34 and 35b. In this case, it is the rejection of Jesus which causes a division among Israel and reveals the negative thoughts many have about Jesus,[128] and it is this rejection that is at least in part the sword that pierces Mary. The sword (ῥομφαία) is symbolic of the cause of Mary's anguish, i.e., seeing her Son spoken against and rejected by her own people. She is part of true Israel, yet she is being divided between Israel and her Son.[129] If the sword represents this general rejection which causes anguish, then we can see that the clause which follows refers to this rejection which reveals Israel's true nature. Thus, we can translate, "Behold this child is destined to cause the falling and rising of many in Israel and be a sign spoken against so that the thoughts of many hearts will be revealed, and a sword will pierce your soul."[130] It is possible that Luke means to imply that Mary's sword of rejection also entails Jesus' apparent turning away from her (cf. Lk 8.19-21, Mk 3.21-35) even as early as the next scene in Luke's account (2.41-52).

Luke frames this material (the infancy narrative in general) with a man and a woman who are connected closely with the Temple (cf. 1.5-25, 2.22-40).[131] The woman who completes the two halves of the parallel structure is Anna. She, like Simeon, is old and devout (2.37). It is possible, though not probable, that Anna was a part of an order of widows with specifically religious functions in the Temple (hence her

constant presence there).[132] In view of other parallels noted between Luke 1-2 and Acts 1-2, it is possible that Luke intends that we should see in Anna a foreshadowing of the pouring out of the Spirit of prophecy on men and women (Ac 2.17).[133] In fact, she is the only woman in the NT of whom the word προφῆτις is used.[134] She stands in the line of such OT figures as Deborah and Huldah, and Luke's shaping of the material may be the cause of her resemblance to Judith, a heroine in inter-testamental Jewish literature.[135] Possibly, Luke mentions her because she is the second and validating witness to testify of Jesus' significance (Deut 19.15).[136] If so, then Luke deliberately is placing a high value on the witness of a woman, in contrast to many rabbis of that era. Once Anna arrives and sees Jesus she goes forth to witness to the rest of the righteous remnant who longed for the Messiah (2.38). She is thus presented as both a prophetess and a proselytizer for the Messiah. Plummer has made an interesting comparison of Anna and Simeon.[137] Simeon comes to the Temple under the influence of the Spirit, while Anna is always there. The sight of the Messiah makes Simeon happy to encounter death, while Anna goes forth to proclaim what she has discovered. Do these two represent in Luke's schema respectively the OT prophetic order satisfied to see the Messiah and die out, and the NT proselytizing schema that goes forth proclaiming the new thing God is doing? If there is anything in this, it probably reveals how Luke has carefully cast his material in such a way to bring out the theological themes he desires to present. By adding the phrase ἐν τῷ πνεύματι and the Nunc Dimittis to an existing narrative, the Evangelist achieves the desired effect.

Luke does wish to show that true Israel (Zechariah, Elizabeth, Simeon, Anna) recognizes the Savior, even when Jesus' own parents do not understand fully. Mary in a sense is put in perspective as one potential disciple (among many) who does not always have the clearest insight among those who are 'true Israel'.[138] This lack of complete understanding on Mary's part comes out at several points in the narrative. Lk 1.29, 34, and 2.33 all point in this direction and all these verses were likely composed by Luke. In 2.41-52 it is said explicitly of Mary and Joseph - καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐ συνῆκαν τὸ ῥῆμα ὃ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς (2.50).[139] This material, because it is narrative material and appears to reflect badly on Jesus' parents, is likely of historical value and was found in Luke's source. Nonetheless, Luke's inclusion of it likely says something about his own views on the

matter. Luke does not paint an idealized portrait of Mary but is willing to reveal both her insight and her faith, and her lack of understanding. Along with the statements or implications of Mary's lack of full understanding, we have affirmations by Luke that Mary πάντα συνετήρει τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα συμβάλλουσα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς (2.19, cf. 2.51). "The context of the second statement suggests that more than mere memory-retention is meant; and that is made specific in the first statement by the presence of a participle form symballein, indicating that in her heart Mary did something with what she retained."[140] If we compare similar phrases in Josephus, Gen 37.10-11 (LXX), and Dan 4.28 (LXX),[141] then it appears that Luke is telling us that Mary is preserving in her heart, "the mysterious words and events that surrounded Jesus' birth (or his finding in the Temple) and trying to interpret them. This would mean that Mary did not grasp immediately all that she heard but listened willingly, letting the events sink into her memory and seeking to work out their meaning."[142] Thus, we see that Luke is presenting Mary as an example of a person growing toward full understanding. The point is that it will take time for Mary to understand all that happens in the course of Jesus' earthly life.

> ...Luke's idea is that complete acceptance of the word of God, complete understanding of who Jesus is, and complete discipleship is not yet possible. This will come through the ministry of Jesus and particularly through the cross and resurrection. It is no accident that the final reaction of the parents of Jesus in the infancy narrative is very much like that of the disciples of Jesus after the third passion prediction: "They did not understand any of these things, and this word (rēma) was hidden from them" (18:34). But Luke does not leave Mary on the negative note of misunderstanding. Rather, in 2:51b he stresses her retention of what she has not yet understood and (implicitly - see 2:19) her continuing search to understand. (143)

What then is the historical value of the final pericope in Luke's infancy narrative? Dibelius stated categorically that this story shows most clearly the marks of legend, but goes on to caution, "A legendary form as such is in any case no decisive objection against the historicity of the hero, or even of an event, although again it is no guarantee for the faithfulness of the record to the truth."[144] Bultmann also sees this narrative as legendary and says that only here in the Gospels do we find any biographical interest in Jesus in a purely historical sense.[145] Speaking purely in terms of literary form, however, it appears likely that this narrative is a pronouncement story.[146] The

narrative may derive from a different source than the rest of Luke 1-2 as it is less Semitic in style and in fact has no less than 13 'Lucanisms'.[147] Verse 50 seems to point to this narrative's independence from what precedes; however, one must bear in mind that v 49 indicates that the parents ought to have known through various experiences about Jesus and His purposes. The story has no miraculous aspects to cause historical difficulties and in fact, as Ellis points out, a trip to the Temple shortly before a son came of age was customary, for a Jewish father was required to acquaint his son with the religious obligations that he was to assume as an adult.[148] The story is basically about the disassociation of Jesus from His earthly parents and His adherence to His heavenly Father and, as such, this motif coupled with the parents' lack of understanding is likely to have a basis in history as it conflicts with the increasingly reverential portraits the early Church painted of Jesus' family as time went on.[149] It is not likely either that Luke borrowed the motif from the ministry and placed it here or that he created the motif, because in his version of Mk 3.21, 31-35 (in Lk 8.19-21) he deliberately tones down the negative quality of the Marcan account. This story is not likely an example of a hidden life story such as we find in the Apocryphal Gospels and it is instructive to note how much difference there is between our narrative and the embellishment of it found in the Infancy Stories of Thomas.[150] The basic narrative apart perhaps from vv 44, 47, and 52 (which Luke seems to have added on the basis of v 40 to round off this section of the Gospel) is likely of considerable historical worth. It is possible that by including 2.19 and 51 Luke is indicating the ultimate source of the information he is conveying.[151]

In Lk 2.41-52 Luke continues to place Mary in the foreground and Joseph in the background by mentioning that Mary questions Jesus (2.48).[152] Her questions are the natural ones that would come from any anxious parent, but apparently Jesus thinks that they should have known where He would be and why. This may be because He had been consecrated to the Lord's service by them in the Temple. If they had understood their Son, then they would not have searched anxiously for Him. The narrative, in the interchange between Jesus and Mary, is in some respects similar to Jn 2.1-12, particularly because in the end Jesus does what Mary wishes without verbally indicating He would (cf. Lk 2.51a and Jn 2.12).[153] The tension between the claims of the physical and spiritual family on Jesus are made evident when Mary speaks of His father (Joseph) and Jesus

replies in terms of His real Father (God).[154] In the conclusion of the pericope the Evangelist deliberately draws on a certain parallel between Mary and Jesus. He states that Jesus grew in wisdom and stature, and also that Mary stored up information and gave it careful consideration so that she could understand her Son. Thoughtful learning is a characteristic mark of the growing disciple in Luke's Gospel (cf. 8.15, 18-21, 10.39).[155] It may be that Luke wishes to make clear that while Mary recognizes Jesus' miraculous birth, she does not understand what this may imply in regard to His life work and mission.[156] In this she would be like other disciples who do not understand fully until after the Resurrection (Lk 24.45-47). Mary is thus a very approachable model of faith with its struggles for the Lukan audience.

In the investigation of the different portions of Luke 1-2 we have assessed the material's historical value and now we must sum-up its theological value in regard to Mary. She typifies the hopes of true Israel, embodies the hope of Israel and exemplifies the proper response to God's plan of salvation. As Elizabeth's two blessings indicate, God has worked both through Mary's faith response and through her motherhood to bring about the birth of the Savior. Mary's central role in Luke's infancy narrative is a result of God working through Mary's spiritual and physical being. We have noted her central role in various places in the text: 1) the Evangelist composes a scene where Mary, not Joseph, receives revelation; 2) she sings the Magnificat; 3) by Elizabeth's own words, Mary is shown to be a more crucial figure than Elizabeth herself (1.41-45); 4) Simeon addresses Mary specifically (2.35); 5) Mary alone speaks for the family at Lk 2.48 ; 6) while many wonder at the events surrounding Jesus' birth, twice Mary is said to ponder their significance (2.19, 51); 7) Mary in a unique way will feel the effects of Israel's rejection of her Son (2.35); 8) Mary links the various sections of this infancy narrative (1.39 ,56, 2.5, 22 , 39, 41; in Luke 2 Joseph and Mary link the events).

Mary reflects the overlap between the old and new ages - she continues to fulfill the requirements of the Law, but believes in the new things God will do through her. Luke 1-2 reveals that in the context of Judaism, God can and does reveal the equality of male and female as recipients and proclaimers of God's revelation.[157] True Israel is called to believe in what God is doing and also to see the blessedness of the motherhood of Mary (cf. Lk 1.42, 2.34). By presenting Mary as an example of true Israel, Luke is able to describe, through one individual, both the struggles of relating a Jewish heritage to

God's eschatological activities, and the struggles of relating material blessing and the physical family to spiritual blessing and the family of faith. Significantly, from the first of his Gospel, Luke stresses that physical and spiritual blessings are both part of the new thing God is doing. It is not a case of being either Jesus' mother or His disciple, but of orienting her motherhood to the priorities of faith in God's new activity through Jesus. Her struggles in this emerge in Lk 2.41-52. As part of Luke's presentation of the reversal the Gospel brings about, Luke stresses the way women rejoice and are liberated as God acts. Elizabeth is liberated from the curse of barrenness and the reproach of Jewish men; Mary is liberated to sing and prophesy even in a situation where she would appear to be of questionable character; Anna is motivated to witness to those looking forward to the redemption of Jerusalem. The male characters in this narrative, however, either remain silent (Joseph), are struck dumb (Zechariah), or ask to be dismissed in peace (Simeon). While other figures in the infancy narrative fade into the background, Mary with her Son are carried over into the ongoing story of the Gospel.[158] We must now turn to Jn 2.1-12 and begin to see how she is portrayed apart from the infancy narratives.

3. The Wedding Feast at Cana - Jn 2.1-12

The historical value of Jn 2.1-12 is frequently questioned and thus a brief discussion of the major problems this passage raises for the historian is in order. It is often noted that this miracle story is out of character in its content both with the other 'signs' in this Gospel and with the miracles in the Synoptics. It is not required in the situation, and the magnitude of the miracle could be seen as comical. It is possible that the Evangelist or his source has adopted or adapted a Hellenistic and pagan miracle story and applied it to Jesus.[159] Dodd has suggested that Jn 2.1-12 may ultimately go back to a parable of Jesus.[160] It has also been argued that the dialogue in vv 3-4 shows Johannine characteristics and thus is probably not part of the pre-Gospel form of this narrative.[161] These arguments will be examined in reverse order.

While it may be granted that the reference to Jesus' hour is characteristically Johannine and thus may well be an addition of the Evangelist, the initial and most problematic sentence of the reply of Jesus cannot be so categorized, apart perhaps from the word γύναι. Even in the case of γύναι, however, it is unusual for a son to use such a term in response to his mother and so one should not be too hasty in

assuming that it was not an original part of the narrative. It is, after all, in keeping with a pronouncement such as Mk 3.34-35 which probably is authentic Jesus material.[162] Secondly, there is nothing particularly Johannine about οἶνον οὐκ ἔχουσιν in content or form.[163] In regard to Mary's word to the servants, while the form is Johannine the content does not reflect any characteristically Johannine ideas. In short, this sentence may simply reflect the Evangelist's tendency to recast the material in his source into his own style and vocabulary. It is possible that the original pre-Gospel form of the dialogue in Jn 2.3-5 included: 1) a statement or plea by Mary indicating the problem; 2) v 4a ,possibly without γύναι; 3) possibly another statement by Jesus (omitted by the Evangelist), for the transition from vv 4 to 5 is awkward on any showing; 4) some form of the final statement by Mary to the servants preparing them to act if Jesus asks them to do something. It is difficult to believe that the Evangelist , who elsewhere (John 19) presents a favorable picture of Jesus' mother, could have added v 4a which could be taken to reflect badly on her.[164] For the same reason, γύναι may well be original to the narrative.

The suggestion of Dodd that this narrative grew out of a parable is possible, but unfortunately we do not have the original parable or anything like it that would substantiate this view. Mk 2.22 and parallels should probably not be adduced at this point since the analogy in the Second Gospel only has its force because the container is a wine skin, whereas in John we are talking about purification jars. Further, in the Johannine narrative the new wine is put into the old containers. In its form and brevity, however, this narrative is much like the Synoptic miracles,[165] and as has been noted by Barrett and Schnackenburg (among others) it appears to have only been lightly worked over by the Evangelist.[166] This favors the view that it was originally a miracle story and that it does not derive from the Evangelist.

A more probable suggestion is that this story has in some respects been influenced by (if not derived from) extra-Biblical miracle tales involving wine.[167] Even here one must proceed with caution, however. In most respects our narrative does not bear the hallmarks of a Hellenistic wonder story. We are not told how or when the change from water to wine took place. Indeed, the mention that the miracle had taken place is made indirectly and casually in the course of the narrative (v 9a) and there is no attempt to indicate or create a response to the miracle itself by those present at the time (taking v 11 or at least 11b to be

the Evangelist's own addition).[168] The concern in John 2 is with the revelation of Jesus' divine glory to those who believe, not with a god's divine assistance or manifestation in the cult.[169]

> Moreover, it may be legitimately asked if the Evangelist, who has shown himself to be working within the general framework of the traditional miracles of Jesus in six of his seven narratives, would be likely to introduce a seventh narrative from an extraneous tradition? As for the uniqueness of the miracle, is changing water into wine so different from the multiplication of loaves? Both have echoes in the Elijah-Elisha tradition... (170)

Perhaps the best explanation of what we find in John 2 is that this narrative in its present form has been written up by someone who was conscious of both the OT miracles and the Hellenistic miracle material and has shaped the story in light of such material. The amount of wine produced, for instance, may be a touch that reflects an attempt to show that Jesus was greater than Bacchus.[171] Nevertheless, the retouching has not been done with a heavy hand and it is possible to produce a plausible pre-Gospel form of this narrative that likely included some form of a dialogue between Mary and Jesus.[172]

In the end the historical value of the dialogue, which is our prime concern, depends in part on whether or not the Evangelist is drawing on the Synoptics. If so, then the apparent tension and distance between Mary and Jesus could be derived from various Synoptic texts (Mk 3.32-35, Lk 2.48-50; cf. Jn 7.3-5).[173] If he is not relying on the Synoptics, and we have given reasons elsewhere to show that such dependence is not the best explanation of the evidence,[174] then we have in John 2 and in the dialogue in particular independent confirmation of a Synoptic motif that has high claims to historicity since it stands in contrast to later pious legends about Jesus' relations with His family. It is plausible then that Jn 2.3-4a, 5 has real historical value, especially since v 4a is not likely a product of the Evangelist's imagination and cannot stand alone as an isolated saying. In regard to the rest of the pericope it is sufficient for our purposes to say that the arguments against this story having in its broad outlines foundations in an historical event in Jesus' life are not decisive.

Jn 2.1-12 is possibly an example of a 'hidden life' story (cf. Lk 2.41-52) relating an incident that took place before Jesus had broken away from His family.[175] The miracle of Cana and the episode in Jn 19.25-27 frame the public ministry of Jesus, and one expects to find a certain continuity between the two episodes (along with some development).

The dialogue between Jesus and Mary is at the heart of both John 2 and 19 - both include the address γύναι and both involve Jesus doing something that aids Mary. One should note the significant placement of the mother of Jesus at the inception and climax of Jesus' ministry (and only in these two places), an indication of the important place Mary is given in this Gospel.[176] Our discussion of Jn 2.1-12 must focus on the central dialogue in vv 3-5 and especially on the crucial and difficult v 4.

One's view of Mary's role here will be determined to a great degree by how one translates v 4. We will examine first the easier half of the verse - οὔπω ἥκει ἡ ὥρα μου - which may well derive from the Evangelist. Is this phrase to be taken as a statement or a question? As the Evangelist has painted the scene Mary does seem to think Jesus will do something (v 5), and in fact Jesus does go on to act in v 6. It would be a more natural transition to this act if Jesus was saying that it was now time to act.[177] There are two grammatical points in favor of reading it as a question: 1) the οὔπω clause is asyndetic unlike its other eleven occurrences in John; 2) the phrase follows a question which, on the basis of Mt 16.9, Mk 4.40, 8.17, leads one to expect another question.[178] There are, however, some considerations which make this view untenable. When the Fourth Evangelist has Jesus refer to His hour, no act before the Passion is in view (cf. 7.30, 8.20).[179] The parallels in Mt 16.9, Mk 4.40 and 8.17 are not true parallels. They do involve two questions in succession and οὔπω, but they are not found in John and they do not follow an idiomatic Greek phrase such as we have in Jn 2.4a (τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ, γύναι). Other attempts to find parallels in Mk 1.24, Mt 8.29, and Lk 8.28 or in the LXX, are unsuccessful because the subject (demons) or the situations are not parallel to Jn 2.4 (cf. Judg 11.12, 2 Chr 35.21, 1 Kgs 17.18, 2 Kgs 3.13). The only similarity that all these phrases share with Jn 2.4 is that they are involved contextually with an expression of hostility, warning, or protest.[180]

In favor of taking this phrase as a statement are most of the translations and many notable commentators.[181] Further, v 4b seems to be an explanation of what immediately precedes it - the idiom in 2.4a - τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, γύναι - is colloquial and any attempt to render it literally ('What to me and to you.') is not helpful. It involves ellipsis and is best seen as a dative of possession which cannot be rendered literally into English. Nor can it be equated

with the phrase πρός plus the accusative.[182] A careful study of Hebrew OT (2 Chr 35.21) and extra-Biblical (Epictetus, Demosthenes, Suetonius, etc.) parallels reveals that the idiom is often unfriendly. The Hebrew and Greek forms of this phrase seem to deal with persons, but in the Greek it can deal with things.[183] It does not appear that Derrett is correct about the guests providing some of the wine, for it is the bridegroom who is commended when the new wine is sampled (2.9-10).[184] This means that this phrase probably does not refer to a joint obligation of Mary and Jesus, and/or the disciples.

A clue to the translation of v 4a may be found in the fact that we seem to have a Semitism here.[185] If so, the phrase means, 'That is your business, do not involve me.' Jesus would be disengaging from Mary's concern or request and not necessarily from Mary herself.[186] This, however, fails to explain why Mary did not take Jesus' words as a refusal of her concern, and why Jesus does act.

The most probable explanation of v 4a is that Jesus is disengaging from Mary in her role of parent in authority over Him (cf. Mk 3.20-35) and not from her concern for the problem at the wedding feast. He sees in her statement, "they have no wine," an implied imperative, 'Do something.' He does not reject the need, but the authority of the one expressing it, for she has failed to understand her Sons' mission and His primary allegiance to the spiritual family.[187] Jesus' heavenly Father, not His earthly mother, must determine when His hour is to come and what He is to do until then.[188]

Probably the Evangelist means, "My hour has not yet come," to imply that in that hour Jesus will have an obligation to fulfill to Mary and then she will have a claim on Him (cf. Jn 19.25-27).[189] In the Fourth Gospel it is not until the word comes from the cross that the mother of Jesus is ushered officially into the spiritual family of Jesus (those who do have a claim on Him).[190] Two things show that the Evangelist intends v 4a to be seen as a gentle rebuke, not an irretrievable rejection, and that our interpretation is correct. First, the vocative γύναι is a term of respect or affection. It implies "neither reproof nor severity".[191] It is the normal way that Jesus is depicted in the Gospels as addressing women that He either does not know well, or must address in a formal manner (Mt 15.28, Lk 13.12, Jn 4.21, 20.13). There are, however, no known uses of this word in either Hebrew or Greek by a son in addressing his mother.[192] It is likely that while it is not intended to carry a derogatory connotation toward Mary's motherhood, 'woman' is Jesus' way of placing His relationship to Mary on a different basis. He is disengaging from her parental authority.[193] If, however, as seems less likely, γύναι is

the Evangelist's own addition to the narrative, then it is one way that he has softened the blow of Jesus' remark. Another way that he softens the blow is by adding, "My hour has not yet come", a phrase by which the Evangelist explains that Jesus cannot relate to Mary as mother or recognize her claim on Him until His hour has come. For now He must be about His Father's work (cf. Lk 2.49).[194] They will be reunited as a spiritual family when His hour comes; however, at Cana she is not placed among the group that has faith in and travels with Jesus as disciples.[195] Jn 2.5, if it is an original part of this pericope, may imply that historically Mary had some faith and knowledge of Jesus' compassionate nature, and perhaps of His miracle-working power, but her powers to intercede for others with Him are not stressed here.[196] So far as its historical worth is concerned, this dialogue reveals both that Jesus disengaged from Mary in her role as mother and that Mary, unlike Jesus' brothers (cf. Jn 7.5) was apparently not without some faith in Jesus long before the post-Easter community was formed. In the schema of Johannine theology, Jesus' disengagement from Mary is related to the theme of Jesus' 'hour' and thus the scene at the cross is prepared for and the blow of disengagement is softened. The Evangelist may intend some slight hint that Mary is a type of Eve (tempting the new Adam), but the term γύναι probably should not be taken as an indication that Mary is seen as the archetypal woman here.[197] Rather, the point would seem to be that it is as 'woman' that Mary must work out the tensions between the physical and spiritual family, for later (Jn 19.26) the Evangelist indicates that it is as 'woman', not as Jesus' mother, that she enters the community of faith. Before turning to John 19, we must examine the role of Mary in the Synoptics apart from the Infancy Narratives.

4. Mary in the Synoptics

There is a paucity of material on Mary in the Synoptics apart from the Birth Narratives of Matthew and Luke. Before the Passion Narratives there is only Mk 3.20-35 and parallels, and Mk 6.1-6 and parallels. Both are for the most part passing remarks, and thus we see that the Evangelists are not compelled either by controversy or personal interest to develop a fuller picture of Mary. Probably this reflects the fact that Mary was not a prominent influence in Jesus' earthly ministry. What references we do have refer also to Jesus' brothers and sisters, and therefore we will deal with the question of whether or not these are Mary's children.

Mk 3.21 is the most crucial text and fraught with difficulties. Unique to Mark, it is set in the context of Jesus' exorcisms (3.7-12) and the Beelzebub controversy (3.22-30). The references to Jesus' family seem to serve as a frame for this pronouncement story (3.20-21, 31-35) as well as a setting for Jesus' word about His true relatives.[198] It is likely that we have here an example of the Marcan Schachtel-technik.[199] Mark has combined two (or three) originally separate narratives into an effective chiastic structure with three accusations and three answers.[200] Of the material in 3.20-21 Taylor has rightly said, "The narrative is based on the best historical tradition. No one has the hardihood to suggest that it is a creation of the community, for without the warrant of fact no early narrator would have alleged that the family at Nazareth thought that Jesus was beside Himself and went out to restrain him."[201] A similar judgment should probably be pronounced on 3.31-35 even if it should prove to be at one time a narrative independent of 3.20-21 for the contrast between Jesus' physical and spiritual family is not likely a creation of the post-Easter community.[202]

The textual problems in Mk 3.21 are not major but do reflect what can happen to a 'hard' saying. Codex D, W, and it read, "When the scribes and the rest heard concerning Him", thus removing all possible references to Jesus' family.[203] Another set of interesting emendations centers around the word ἐξίστημι. While most manuscripts read ἐξέστη, Θ, 565, and others read ἐξέσταται ('he escaped'). D and it add to ἐξέσταται the word αὐτούς ('he escaped from them'); Codex W and 28 remove all reference to insanity by saying ἐξήρτηνται αὐτοῦ (they were 'adherents of his' or 'dependent on him').[204] These variants, none of which are likely original readings, reflects two concerns: 1) a desire to protect the image of the Holy Family, and 2) a desire to protect the image of Jesus.[205] This tells us that οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ was taken at a relatively early date in the West to refer to Jesus' family, an interpretation which is correct as we shall see.

Though some commentators conjecture that οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ may refer to the disciples, this idea is not supported from the context or lexical evidence.[206] Note that when Mark wishes to express the idea of the disciples in general, he uses οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν (4.10), not οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ. Beyond this fact there is abundant support for seeing this phrase as referring to Jesus' family.[207] It is likely that Mark intended οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ to be explained in v 31 (ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ

καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ).[208] This includes Mary, and it is interesting that recent Catholic scholars agree with this interpretation, but either do not see this entire group as the subject of ἔλεγον in v 21, or say that the subject of ἔλεγον is indefinite.[209] This is unlikely because when one has a natural plural subject in the immediate context (οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ), it is normal and natural for it to be related to this plural verb.[210]

The purpose of the family is made clear in the Marcan account; Mary and the brothers have gone forth to seize Him because they thought He was 'beside himself' or not in control of His situation.[211] At the least, vv 20-21 indicate that Mary and Jesus' brothers misunderstood Jesus' mission and ministry at this point.[212] Further, in what may be a separate pericope (vv 31-35) the way Jesus contrasts His physical and spiritual family (v 34) implies that the former group was not the same as the latter (vv 32-34). Verse 34 reads: περιβλεψάμενος τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν κύκλῳ καθημένους λέγει Ἴδε ἡ μήτηρ μου...; this contrasts to the group in v 31 which is ἔξω στήκοντες. The contrast is made more vivid by the First Evangelist who adds, καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν, Ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ μου...(12.49). The point is that there are some among those sitting who are (or are more nearly) His spiritual kin at this point than His family outside.[213] In its Marcan context, this contrast would have little force if Jesus' family did not share the opinion expressed by those who were saying ἐξέστη. In the first two Gospels someone other than Mary is identified, at least hypothetically, by Jesus as His spiritual mother. Neither the Matthean nor the Lukan parallels are as strong in tone as Mark. Neither includes Mk 3.21 and thus Jesus' family is spared at this point. The door is left open, however, for Jesus' physical family to join His spiritual family, even in Mark - "Whoever (Mark ὃς ἄν, cf. Matthew, ὅστις) does the will of God" will belong to His spiritual family (Mk 3.35, Mt 12.50, Lk 8.21).[214] Mark, however, did not want His readers to identify with the relatives of Jesus since they misunderstood His mission. Mark's plan in this pericope is to reveal the nature of true kinship.

Mk 3.20-21 indicates that whether or not Mary led the efforts to seize Jesus, at the very least her faith was not strong enough to resist her own protective instinct or the determination of the others with her.[215] There may be reflected a concern for Jesus'

person by His family, but it is due to serious misunderstanding of what He was doing which leads them to think that He is not properly caring for Himself.[216]

In Mk 3.31-35 and parallels, Jesus does not agree to His family's request for an audience, but whether or not He knew their intention is unclear from the text.[217] The pronouncement which closes this pericope, even in its Marcan form, leaves the door open for the inclusion of His family within the family of faith at some future time if they will relate to Him on the basis of faith as His disciples. If some form critics are correct that Mk 3.20-21 and 3.31-35 (and parallels) were originally separate traditions, then we may have two pieces of evidence that reflect negatively on the family of Jesus in their relationship to Him. The First and Third Evangelists attempt to tone this material down by omitting Mk 3.21 and in the case of Luke by presenting a milder form of Mk 3.35 (cf. Lk 8.21). The main focus of the text, however, is not on Jesus' family but on the nature and basis of Kingdom relationships.[218]

Mk 6.1-6 (and parallels) is another text which requires close scrutiny as we examine the Gospel tradition about Mary. Bultmann has contended that we have in this text a perfect example of an ideal scene probably built out of the Oxyrhynchus form of the saying found in 6.4.[219] The difficulty with this view is that there is no mention of Jesus' kin or home in the Oxyrhynchus saying, and a reference to a prophet without honor in his country (or among those who knew him) does not suggest the sort of narrative about Jesus' relatives we have in Mk 6.1-6. Indeed, it need not suggest a specific reference to Jesus' family at all. Dibelius, who originally agreed with Bultmann, later decided that there is too much special material here for it to be the filling out of a saying.[220] This is likely a correct judgment for, "The section contains elements which it is particularly hard to imagine the early Church's inventing: the statement in v 5, the reference to Jesus' kinfolk in v 4 which was discreditable to people who had come to be prominent in the Church, and probably also the designation of Jesus as 'Son of Mary'."[221] The Marcan form of the tradition then likely preserves material of real historical value.

In Mk 6.1-6, the family of Jesus is not present; however, they are mentioned first by Jesus' listeners and then by Jesus Himself. What connects this pericope with Mk 3.21, 31-35 and parallels is the

idea that physical relationship or knowledge of Jesus' physical relations proves to be a stumbling block to seeing Jesus as He truly is. There is also a connection in that Jesus places His relatives and His own household once again in a category other than that of believer or disciple.[222]

Mk 6.3 and its parallel in Mt 13.55-56 (cf. also Lk 4.14-30) is of prime concern. The textual problem in regard to Mk 6.3 is not resolved easily because p^{45} and f^{13}, among others, have ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Μαρίας, rather than the generally accepted reading, ὁ τέκτων, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Μαρίας. The reading which best explains the others on both textual and theological grounds is ὁ τέκτων, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Μαρίας for the following reasons: 1) Calling Jesus a carpenter would not be seen as demeaning to a Jewish or early Christian audience familiar with the Jew's high estimation of manual labor,[223] while it might be to a later Hellenistic or Roman audience. Thus, this reading is likely the earlier form of the two. 2) The reference to Jesus as "Son of Mary" likely reflects a setting of controversy and an insult would be implied by this phrase.[224] Thus, the First Evangelist likely has changed this phrase because of its negative connotations. 3) The external evidence of the uncials strongly supports this text. 4) If the phrase "Son of Mary" is original to Mark, then it reveals one of the reasons why Jesus' wise words were not received. How could a child of undistinguished or dubious origins be able to interpret truly the Torah? It is Mark alone who records that Jesus placed His own family in the group with those who stumbled over His apparently ordinary or mysterious origins. It is difficult to believe that Mark would record such statements if they had no basis in fact, especially with the Church's tendency to revere and respect the family of Jesus after His death.[225]

Mk 6.3 and Mt 13.55 are the only references in the Gospels where Jesus' brothers are mentioned by name.[226] The vast literature on this subject should be consulted for a fuller treatment.[227] Traditionally, there have been three main views concerning the relation of these brothers and sisters to Jesus, to which have been added various modifications. The view most widely held in the Western Church is that of St. Jerome, first put forth in a treatise against Helvidius in A.D. 382. He asserts that the Lord's brethren are cousins, being the children of Mary's sister.[228] The Helvidian view which prompted Jerome's new approach to the problems says that they were Jesus'

actual brothers, being the children of Mary and Joseph after Jesus' birth.[229] The third view was put forth by Epiphanius in A.D. 376-377. He held that the brothers of Jesus were children of Joseph by a previous marriage. This latter view drew on certain statements in earlier apocryphal Christian documents but was fully presented first by Epiphanius himself.[230] Each view has problems and all were formulated in their more or less final forms between A.D. 375 and 385. The Hieronymian view seems the least likely for the following reasons: 1) the noun ἀδελφός seldom if ever is used in the NT to mean ἀνεψιός (cf. Col 3.10), nor in the classical usage of ἀδελφός is there much if any evidence that it was used to mean 'cousin'.[231] 2) This view claims that James, the brother of the Lord = one of the Twelve = James the Less, son of Alpheus; indeed, it has been claimed by some Catholic scholars that all the brothers of the Lord were among the Twelve or the disciples except for Joses. This contradicts the explicit evidence of Mk 3.21, 31-35, and Jn 7.5.[232] 3) Jerome also inferred from the μικρός used with James (son of Alpheus?) that this meant James the Less to distinguish him from James, the Apostle and son of Zebedee. The word μικρός, however, is not used in a comparative but a positive sense as 'the little'. Further, there is no Scriptural support for calling James, the son of Zebedee, 'the great'.[233] 4) One must maintain not only a questionable punctuation of Jn 19.25, but also the improbability that two sisters would have the same name in order to assert that Mary of Clopas was the sister of Mary, mother of Jesus.

The Epiphanian view is more probable than the Hieronymian though there are convincing reasons for rejecting it as well. 1) If Joseph previously had other sons, then Jesus could not have been legally his first born or first in line for the Davidic throne.[234] 2) "Epiphanius' evidence is wholly based upon apocryphal gospels, and everyone knows that for all his diligence in collecting fragments of tradition and local gossip, he was not exactly critical in his assessment of the material collected."[235] 3) It appears that Lightfoot or his predecessors in the Epiphanian view may have derived their view from a misreading of ancient texts.[236] Another view, proffered by McHugh, deserves closer scrutiny.

McHugh accepts the fact that ἀδελφός means 'brother', not 'cousin', and acknowledges that contextual hints are necessary if one is to deduce that ἀδελφός means something other than full-blooded brother

in a non-spiritual context.[237] He believes, however, that he finds such hints in the NT texts under investigation. He suggests, for instance, that the singular verb in Mk 3.31 following the reaction of Jesus' mother may indicate that she is separated from the brothers.[238] It may, however, indicate no more than that Mark's main concern is to mention Mary and her activity, the brothers being of secondary importance. The number of this verb may even be a simple grammatical infelicity and in any case should not be taken as an indicator of a particular view of the relation of Mary and these 'brothers'. Further, the view that Mark changed the phraseology of 3.21 when he came to vv 31-32 in preparation for v 35 does not explain why Mark has failed at least in v 31 and probably in v 32 to mention the sisters at all. There is no difficulty in Mark's applying the more general phrase οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ (3.21) to Jesus' immediate family, in the same way we might in English use the phrase 'my folks' or 'my people' to refer to parents and blood brothers and sisters. Then, too, Mark may be using two different sources in 3.20-21 and 3.31-35.

The arguments of McHugh in regard to Mk 6.1-6 and parallels should also be rejected.[239] Mark's phrasing "the Son of Mary" and "(a) brother of James", etc. is perfectly natural since James had other brothers and Jesus is <u>the</u> Son of Mary in question here. In fact, some scholars argue that the single article here may imply that Jesus bears the same kind of relationship to both Mary and the brothers.[240] It does not likely hint at a distinction between the relation of Jesus to His mother and to these brothers. It is also hard to believe that the First Evangelist's mention of "all" Jesus' sisters,[241] (a qualification not found in Mark) is his attempt to pile up arguments against Jesus' Messiahship since there is no attempt in the rest of the pericope to answer such a charge. Why would he strengthen the case of the opposition and then not strengthen the response of Jesus to counter it? To be sure, neither the First nor the Second Evangelist tries to hide the fact that Jesus' origins were a stumbling block to some but it is hardly likely that they would bolster the case of the opposition. The addition of "all" in Matthew requires some other explanation, especially in view of the modification of "the carpenter" to "the carpenter's son" which indicates that the Evangelist is intent on eliminating potentially offensive material (not adding it). Nothing should be made of the First Evangelist's choice

of the verb λεγέται. Interestingly, it is singular and thus wrongly some might even attempt to apply it only to its nearest antecedent, Mary. The reference in Mk 6.4 to 'kinsmen' should probably not be taken as an indication that the brothers in 6.3 were not blood brothers, since it may well be a reference to some of Jesus' audience quite apart from those listed in 6.3, or alternatively it may simply be added for rhetorical effect as the group referred to becomes increasingly smaller.[242] McHugh also suggests that the First Evangelist's phrase, 'the other Mary' (27.61, 28.1) might be used to distinguish her from Jesus' mother. Mother Mary, however, is not mentioned in these two Matthean texts and the reference should and does make sense in context - as a means to distinguish this woman from Mary Magdalene.[243]

A more adequate argument than McHugh presents is required to explain why these 'foster' children are frequently mentioned in the same breath with Mary (cf. Mk 3.21, 31-35 and parallels, Mk 6.1-6 and parallels, Jn 2.12),[244] and why also these brothers and sisters, like Mary, are identified as residents of Nazareth and Jesus' closest relatives.[245] The question is whether or not the Evangelists' audiences would have understood 'foster-brother' by the word ἀδελφός, when no clear hints of this meaning are forthcoming in the texts under discussion.[246] The answer to this question must in all probability be no. Thus, McHugh's view is not to be accepted as the best explanation of the data.

We are left with the Helvidian view which admittedly has problems, though none are insurmountable. Bishop Lightfoot's objection that Jesus would never commend His mother to a stranger (Jn 19.26-27) rather than His own physical brother(s) is not obvious. As noted in Mk 3. 31-35, Jesus is insistent that the family of faith take precedence over the physical family (cf. Mk 10.29-30), and thus it is more natural (if Jn 19.26-27 is of historical value) for Jesus to entrust His dearest relative to His dearest friend since they were united in the bond of faith.[247]

There is little evidence that tells us whether or not the brothers in Mk 6.3 and the men in Mk 15.40 are different or the same; however, James and Joses are common names and they could easily be two different sets of brothers. Further, perhaps the fact that the James of Mk 15.40 is called μικρός does distinguish him from the James of Mk 6.3 who receives no such title.[248] Finally, it cannot be argued on the basis

of the fact that some called Jesus the son of Joseph that Jesus was related to His brothers in the same way as He was related to His legal father (Joseph). This overlooks the fact that in the reference to Jesus as the son of Joseph, none of those on whose lips we find the term were in a position to know about the virginal conception (Mt 13.55, Mk 6.3 p^{45}, Lk 4.22, Jn 1.45, 6.42). In the one reference where the comment comes from a Gospel writer himself (Lk 3.23), it is tactfully qualified by the phrase ὡς ἐνομίζετο. There are no good reasons to reject the Helvidian view, and many good reasons to commend it, since it allows one to take not only ἀδελφός but also ἕως οὗ in Mt 1.25 and the meaning of Lk 1.34 in their most natural sense. As Taylor says, "It may also be fairly argued...that the expressions used in Lk. ii.7 and Mt. i.25 would have been avoided by writers who believed in the perpetual virginity of Mary."[249]

How does accepting the Helvidian view affect our understanding of Mary and her role? It reveals her as a normal Jewish mother who saw her blessedness primarily in bearing children and in raising them properly. It also reveals that she perhaps was subject to the unbeliefs or misunderstandings about Jesus that her other children held. Mk 3.21, 31-35 reveals both her natural concern for and her misunderstanding of Jesus. Mark, and to a lesser degree Matthew and Luke, portray Mary during the ministry as an example of how kinship ties can hinder proper understanding of Jesus as Messiah. They also show that Mary was fully human and likely struggled with the difficulties of placing her spiritual allegiance to Jesus over her motherly love for Him and her other sons and daughters. In this she may be seen as a point of contact for other married women in the Gospel writers' audiences.

5. Mary at the Cross - Jn 19.25-27

Jn 19.25-27 is without question a crux in the Johannine problem. We have here a scene of which there is no trace in the Synoptic material. It seems likely though, if Luke had known the story he would have used it, for Ac 1.14 does show that he had some interest in whether or not Jesus' mother became a member of His community. Again,the scene with women standing near the cross seems to flatly contradict the Synoptic account and some have argued that the location is historically improbable.[250] Then, too, the historicity of this incident is in part bound up with the question of whether or not the beloved disciple was an historical figure. Finally, the list of women differs from those found in

the Synoptics, both in its names and in its placement, and it is of particular importance that only the Fourth Evangelist includes Jesus' mother in the list.

There are certain indications that the Fourth Evangelist is relying on a source for at least part of this material and that the source was not the Synoptics. In the first place, his list of names varies too much from any of the Synoptic lists for it to be probable that he derived his own list from those found in the first three Gospels. It may be that they share only one name (Mary Magdalene) in common.[251] Secondly, the absence of any mention at 19.25 of the beloved disciple among those that are standing at the cross and the mention of two women who are not to be found elsewhere in the Fourth Gospel and whose mention has little apparent purpose or significance makes it likely that the Evangelist has not created this list. It is not impossible that he added Jesus' mother's name to a pre-existing list, but why then did he not also add the beloved disciple in preparation for 19.26-27? These considerations lead to the suggestion that he found Jesus' mother's name listed in his source as one of those present at the cross. As we shall point out, there is nothing historically unlikely about a few grieving women being allowed near Jesus' cross especially if it was guarded, and there are reasons for thinking that the ἀπὸ μακρόθεν of the Synoptics derives from the Psalms and should not be taken as an historical description of their location.[252]

If the beloved disciple is an historical figure, and it seems unlikely that the Evangelist or the Johannine community would have made claims such as we find in 19.35 if they were not relying on the testimony of an historical figure,[253] it is not at all certain that he was one of the Twelve. If he was not, then there is no contradiction between his presence at the cross and the tradition that the Twelve deserted Jesus before He went to the cross. It must be borne in mind that the Fourth Evangelist probably bears witness to the desertion (cf. 16.32, 20.10) and yet he saw no incongruity in mentioning the presence of the beloved disciple at the cross. Again, if the beloved disciple is an historical figure, then it is possible that the tradition being drawn on in Jn 19.26-27 was originally about Jesus providing for the ongoing security of His mother by placing her in the care of a friend he knew and trusted.[254] That He would entrust her to a disciple is not historically unlikely because: 1) there are

strong reasons for thinking that He considered the family of faith His primary family (cf. Mk 3.34-35); 2) it is likely that at the time of Jesus' death, His physical brothers were unbelievers (cf. Jn 7.5). If the beloved disciple is an ideal figure, then Jn 19.26-27 is likely a Johannine creation meant to affirm various things (which we will soon discuss) about men and women as disciples of Jesus. Even if this is so, it does not preclude the possibility that the Evangelist incorporated into this ideal scene certain historical fragments about what happened to Mary. Perhaps, the Fourth Evangelist simply had access to a traditional list of women who were present at the cross that included the name of Jesus' mother,[255] and he knew that Mary at some point joined Jesus' community. Finally, the entire narrative may be a creation of the Evangelist himself without use of or access to any historical information.

Of these various possibilities the option which will be accepted in the discussion which follows is: 1) that v 25 is a traditional list to which the Evangelist added a narrative found in his sources;[256] 2) that originally the narrative in vv 26-27 was about Jesus providing ongoing care for His mother - a motif likely based in historical fact; 3) that the Evangelist has transformed his material into a powerful statement about men and women as disciples at the foot of the cross and has used it as a vehicle to affirm the historical truth that at some point (not necessarily at the cross) Mary became a full-fledged disciple of her Son. The other views mentioned are, however, options which cannot be ruled out.[257] There will be no attempt here to claim historical value for more than the substratum which the Evangelist uses in writing his narrative (i.e., Mary's presence at the cross and in the Church, and Jesus' provision for Mary).

The story of Mary witnessing her Son's crucifixion probably should be seen as the climactic episode of the Fourth Evangelist's Passion Narrative.[258] Drawing on elements presented in Jn 2.1-12 (mother of Jesus, γύναι, the 'hour', physical family, disciples), the Evangelist presents in Jn 19.25-27 the resolution of the tension or division between Jesus' physical family and His spiritual family in the context of Jesus' 'hour'.

In Jn 19.25 we read of Jesus' mother standing near the cross with three other women.[259] It should not be objected that it is historically unlikely that Mary or these women would be near the cross, for

evidence shows that relatives and close friends might be permitted to stand near a crucifixion.[260] In the end, it was the women, not the Twelve, who stayed with Jesus to the last. In the Johannine schema here is the point at which Jesus could not reject His mother's claims. His 'hour' had come, and so too had hers in a different sense of the word.

From among these four women, the Evangelist has Jesus single out His mother and address her as at Cana - "Woman". This time, however, the intention is not disengagement, but rather engagement or unification. The Evangelist wishes to show that Mary is accepted officially into Jesus' spiritual family, yet she is still addressed as γύναι, the same address used in Jn 2.1-12. Where is the point of similarity in these two narratives that warrants such an address? One would have expected the Evangelist to portray Jesus as using a more intimate term to address His mother in her anguish and sorrow.[261] Perhaps the Evangelist is indicating the following: Jesus resolves for Mary the tension between her roles as mother and disciple of Jesus. He is in control of this scene, and He alone speaks and calls His mother γύναι precisely because He does not wish to renew the filial bond, but rather to confirm her in her relationship to Him as disciple. As she loses Jesus both in a physical and spiritual sense, she gains a new family, the beloved disciple being her first 'son' in the faith. She does not cease to be a mother; however, at Jesus' hour she becomes a mother of a different sort and joins with the family of faith.

Mary learns that she is to be a mother as a disciple, not a mother and also a disciple. Discipleship must be the larger context in which her role as mother is delimited and defined. Mary responds in silence and submission. She obeys the word of the Lord and goes with the beloved disciple. In so doing she is the model woman - a testimony to a woman's new freedom in faith and also to a woman's traditional roles of serving under the authority and headship of man. Her new son is the man under whose charge she now is. This is reflected in the fact that, though John is first commended to her, she does not take charge but rather is received into the charge of the beloved disciple. It is not without reason that Jesus calls her "Woman". She must enter the family of faith in full recognition of whom she is as a sexual being. She will not lose that sexuality for some spirituality in the community of belief. Rather, she will assume both her old role of motherhood and her new roles as witness, prophetess, and

proclaimer of God's word in relationship to believers. She will orient her physical nature so as to engender and further the growth of Jesus' true kindred. In this, she is like the many other women who followed Jesus, being liberated by God's word, and serving Jesus and the Twelve in their traditional roles (cf. Lk 8.1-3, Mt 27.55 and parallels). This is the Evangelist's theological message. Perhaps Stauffer is closer to the historical truth in this matter when he suggests that Mary needed someone to provide for her after Jesus' death:

> Jesus knew this. And a crucified man had the right to make testamentary dispositions even from the cross. Now Jesus took advantage of this right, and, using the formal language of Jewish family law, he placed his mother under the protection of John: "Woman, behold your son!" And to the disciple: "Behold your mother!" (262)

Having given an overview of the meaning of Jn 19.25-27, let us see how the exegetical particulars bear on this interpretation. As R. E. Brown and others have noted, the Evangelist likely intends us to recognize a revelatory formula in the phrases, γύναι ἴδε ὁ υἱός σου...Ἴδε ἡ μήτηρ σου.[263] The formula involves two things: 1) God's messenger sees someone and says, "Behold!" and, 2) after this, a description or explanation of one's role or task in salvation history is given.[264] An exegetical point which favors our interpretation is the mention of the ὥρα in 19.27 which may refer back to what Jesus said to His mother in Jn 2.4. This is the hour of Jesus which has come and so it is also Mary's hour. After it (ἀπ' ἐκείνης τῆς ὥρας) she will be irrevocably a part of the family of faith.[265]

How are we to take the phrase εἰς τὰ ἴδια? Originally this pericope may have had some reference to the specific provisions Jesus made for Mary's care. In its present context and in light of various other Johannine texts, it appears that this phrase means more. Perhaps a clue is found in Jn 1.11: εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθεν, καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον. This phrase seems to mean, "He came into His own (or "His own home") and His own people did not receive Him." Consider another example found in Jn 16.32: ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ ἐλήλυθεν ἵνα σκορπισθῆτε ἕκαστος εἰς τὰ ἴδια κἀμὲ μόνον ἀφῆτε - "Behold, the hour is coming and has come whereupon you will be scattered, each to his own (home) and you will leave me alone."[266] For the disciples this means the time when they abandon Jesus and go home - the Church is scattered leaving Jesus alone. In Jn 19.25-27, however, the Church is reestablished in unity. Jesus united His own family with the family of faith and gives them a home (εἰς τὰ ἴδια) which is the home of the one

faithful disciple. The εἰς τὰ ἴδια in Jn 19.25-27 represents the 'church' gathered, in contrast to Jn 16.32.[267]

The Evangelist intends the scene to be balanced between attention given to the beloved disciple and attention given to Jesus' mother. Both are addressed and both receive a commission. While Mary's importance stands out here (she is addressed first and her future is considered at the end of v 27),[268] and it may be significant that the beloved disciple is only referred to as a son of Mary (while Mary is addressed as "Woman" and referred to as mother of this disciple),[269] throughout this scene only the beloved disciple is called ὁ μαθητής and it is he who takes charge of Jesus' mother at the close of this scene. It should be emphasized that this disciple's faith and his role as representative disciple, antedate Mary's role as spiritual mother.[270] Thus, Mary is not depicted here as the mother of the Church, but as a spiritual mother to and in the Church. "Initially, it is significant that the scene brings together two figures for whom John never gives us personal names .That may mean that the significance of both figures lay in their respective roles."[271] It also means that the Evangelist's focus is on these two persons as models or types. Not Mary alone, but both Mary and the beloved disciple are in a sense a foreshadowing of the Church, standing beneath the cross of their Lord.[272]

It is to be noted that Mary and the beloved disciple are not depicted simply as representative male and female disciples. Jesus does not refer to them as 'sister' or 'brother'. This is a scene about the new equality of male and female beneath the cross of Jesus, but the way that equality is expressed is by the woman resuming her role as mother with new significance, and the disciple becoming a son. In this scene then the tension between physical family and the family of faith is resolved as Mary is included in the fold. Further, the tension between traditional roles and the role of disciples is resolved as the representative disciple becomes a son again, and Mary a mother. The Fourth Evangelist's vision of male-female equality in the Christian community entails an incorporation of the physical family into the family of faith, and a reinterpretation of physical family roles in light of the priorities of the family of faith. Thus, the new community is served rather than severed by traditional roles and relationships. This scene is not about the replacement of Jesus' physical brothers by His brother in the faith, but the text does imply

that the beloved disciple becomes Jesus' brother by sharing the same mother.[273] Also, it is not correct to shift the emphasis of this text to something which is not mentioned here - the care of the mother for the son (i.e., the disciple).[274]

The mother of Jesus is seen as the typical female disciple who struggles with the relationship of her physical and spiritual roles. She is depicted as a spiritual mother to and in the Church, though not as Mother Church that gives birth to spiritual children, since the beloved disciple's faith antedates Mary's role as spiritual mother.[275] If this assessment of Mary as a symbol of woman (γύναι) in her new relationship to the community of faith is correct, then it appears to be part of the plan of the Fourth Evangelist to show that in Christ the dignity of woman is restored and her place of equality affirmed.[276] Especially significant is that Jesus' mother typifies the traditional role of mother and that she is the symbol of woman in her new roles as spiritual mother and disciple. The Evangelist is indicating that her two types of roles, once confused (cf. John 2) are now fused under the cross of Jesus, in service of His community, typified by the beloved disciple.

Having achieved the reconciliation of the physical family and the family of faith, of male and female, the Evangelist intimates that Jesus has accomplished the work the Father had given Him - μετὰ τοῦτο εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤδη πάντα τετέλεσται...(Jn 19.28).[277] The Fourth Evangelist saw in the material he drew upon a great deal more than Jesus' act of filial piety. He saw in it an example of male and female standing as equals (though with different roles to play) beneath the cross of Christ.

6. Mary in the Church - Ac 1.14

Ac 1.14 is part of one of the summaries or transitional passages in Acts and as such is likely to be a Lucan composition.[278] This means that probably it is later material than the incidents which it links.[279] This may mean that the historical value of these summaries is open to question since they are generalized statements and the material is apparently to be seen as typical. As Cadbury says, however: "Certain items are mentioned with a definiteness and brevity that imply that his knowledge or his sources were more complete. In that case the summaries may rest on more information than we ourselves now have access to. They can be judged if at all only each for itself."[280]

Ac 1.14 has this sort of definiteness and brevity. It might be possible to contend that the reference to γυναιξὶν in Ac 1.14 reflects evidence of Lukan male-female parallelism and reflects his attempts to indicate women's participation in Jesus' community.[281] The reference to the women here and especially to Mary, however, should probably not be seen in this light. Luke may be drawing on a traditional list of who made up the early post-Easter community. Setting aside the birth narrative, Luke shows almost no interest in Jesus' mother in his Gospel and she does not appear again in Acts. "Luke may have known little of how Mary became a public disciple, and his silence about her in the rest of Acts may mean that he knew little about the details of her subsequent career, but the basic affirmation in Ac 1.14 is scarcely a product of his wishful thinking."[282] In fact, Jn 19.25-27 apparently provides independent confirmation that Mary at some point joined Jesus' followers. The presence of some of the women that followed Jesus is also historically likely, especially if one or some of them saw the risen Lord. They too disappear after Ac 1.14 and thus the reference to them is not inserted to prepare for anything that follows. Accordingly, it is probable that the list in Ac 1.14 of who was present at the beginning of the Church has real historical value, but the mention of their activity is to be taken as a Lukan description of what was typical and exemplary in the early community and reflects Luke's redactional emphases on unity (ὁμοθυμαδὸν) and prayer (τῇ προσευχῇ).[283]

In Ac 1.13-14 Luke is providing a link between the Ascension and the coming of the Spirit, and he is emphasizing and recognizing those people who made up the actual core of the primitive Church at its inception. They are presented as being bound together in a unity which is exemplary for ensuing generations of the Church. Since this is to be seen as a linking passage, Lampe likely is correct in saying, "Mary is mentioned separately...to link the beginning of Ac. with the opening of Luke's first volume..."[284] As was noted in the Lukan birth narrative, Mary is used again to link several key events in NT history. As she was involved actively in the birth of Christ, so now she is involved actively in the nascent Christian community. Luke, however, mentions Mary only in passing in Ac 1.14, probably because the role she played at the birth of the Church was less crucial than her role at the birth of Jesus.

There are several significant textual variants for Ac 1.14 affecting our discussion of the women mentioned in this text. The second σύν in v 14 (omitted in the UBSGNT but included in NTGNA) is not present in ℵ², A, C*, D, 88, 104, and others. It is possible that the omission is a scribal improvement, but Metzger argues that the σύν is a scribal addition meant to separate Mary from the brothers. If so, then it may reflect an attempt to remove any hints that these brothers were Mary's own children by birth.[285] Another interesting variant is found in Codex Bezae which reads, σὺν ταῖς γυναιξὶν καὶ τέκνοις. The mention of children, coupled with the ταῖς inserted before γυναξίν in D , effectively attaches these women to the Apostles and removes the possibility that these women might be a separate group. This change is part of an anti-feminist tendency in the Western text reflected elsewhere in Acts.[286] Still, we must ask whether these women are wives of the Apostles or an independent group of women. Either of these suggestions is grammatically possible, but some scholars have felt it more probable that the Apostles' wives are in view.[287] Several considerations, however, favor the other option. Luke has mentioned repeatedly an independent group of women traveling with Jesus from Galilee as followers and helpers (Lk 8.1-3, 23.49, 55, 24.10). Secondly, most of the earliest and best manuscripts read σὺν γυναιξὶν which can be seen as a standard formula - the women well-known as a distinct group of Jesus' followers.[288] Finally, Luke shows no interest in the Apostles' wives elsewhere.[289]

In view of these factors, it is significant that Mary is not said to be one of a group of women, but is distinguished from them by καί which likely implies 'and in particular' or 'especially'.[290] Mary is the only woman, indeed the only person, other than the Eleven, mentioned by name and thus her importance is made clear. It may be that Luke intends to associate Jesus' brothers with her thus forming two distinct groups besides the Eleven.[291] In any event, we have a clear witness to Mary's place within the inner circle of disciples. As such, she, like the other women, is living out her new freedom in Christ and her new equal place in the family of faith. R. E. Brown suggests that this whole group of disciples represents the eye-witnesses of all stages of Jesus' life: 1) Mary and the family who knew of Jesus' birth and childhood (Lk 2.19, 51); 2) the Eleven who knew about the earthly ministry (Ac 1.21-22); 3) the women who were at the crucifixion, burial, and empty tomb. If this is correct, then this group in nuce

constitutes those who are to go out and bear witness and proclaim the truth of Christ after they receive the Spirit (Ac 1.8).[292] It also implies that Luke saw Mary and these women as crucial and valid witnesses to key events in Jesus' life. Supposing that Luke is presenting his sources here (or a list of witnesses), it may be significant that only Mary is truly a witness from the beginning.

By including a list of men and women Luke wished to show that from the first day of the existence of the Church, both men and women were active in the community, and that men and women, including Jesus' followers and family, were of one accord about Jesus. It may be significant that Luke places Mary in a class by herself. It is, however, impossible to argue for Mary as our unique intercessor on the basis of this text since she is represented as one person among a group of praying disciples, and in any event the praying motif may be one of Luke's redactional additions to a list of witnesses.

Despite the fact that Mary is not mentioned elsewhere in Acts, Ac 1.14 serves to confirm the fact to Luke's audience that Mary became a full-fledged disciple of her Son. "He is content in his last mention of Mary to show her of one accord with those who would constitute the nascent church at Pentecost, engaged in prayer that would so mark the life of that Church (Acts 2:42; 6:4; 12:5)."[293] By mentioning her by name in Ac 1.14, Luke shows that Mary links the Incarnation of Christ, and the inception of the Church. From the silence of the rest of Acts we may deduce that Mary's role as an individual is limited to Christian beginnings in more than one sense. As a symbol or representative type, however, she serves as a model for Luke's audience - one who, despite some struggles and lack of understanding (Lk 2.35, 48-50, 8.19-21), totally believed in and accepted her Son as her Lord in the end. She serves as an example, especially for women disciples, of one who strove to reconcile the tensions between family and faith.

7. Conclusions

We will not reiterate here the conclusions drawn at the end of various sections involving Mary, but we will make a few concluding remarks. The portrait of Mary painted by Mark and the First Evangelist is quite different from that in the other two Gospels. In Mark the portrait cannot be said to be positive. The Second Evangelist, if anything, indicates only Mary's misunderstanding of Jesus' mission (Mk 3.21, 31), and Jesus' distancing from His family in favor of an

identification with the family of faith (3.31-35), though the possibility of the physical family finding a place within the spiritual one is never ruled out. In Mk 6.1-6 Mary appears as someone well-known in Nazareth, who appears to have other children besides Jesus and about whom there is some controversy in regard to the birth of her first son (hence the term 'son of Mary').

The First Evangelist follows Mark in distinguishing Jesus' physical and spiritual family, but omits Mk 3.21 to soften the criticism of Mary and the family. He also omits the term of reproach 'son of Mary', though he follows Mark in indicating that Jesus' family is seemingly well-known to His countrymen. While the First Evangelist omits the indication of misunderstanding in Mk 3.21, the criticism appears in a somewhat muted form in 13.57 (καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ). The Matthean birth narratives portray Mary as a good Jewish woman who is silent and who follows the lead of her husband (cf. 2.13, 20) but in whose life God has performed a miracle resulting in the virginal conception. The portrait here of Jesus' mother is not strongly negative, but Mary is not portrayed as exemplary either.

The portrayal of Mary in the two volumes of Luke's work is both positive and negative, and thus could not be classified as an 'idealized' presentation. Mary is presented as a woman who accepts God's will in her life (1.38), sings God's praises, prophesies about herself (1.46-49), and takes her place as part of the inner circle of the early Church (Ac 1.14). Thus, she is presented as an example to Luke's audience, though even Luke indicates her lack of clear understanding of her Son's mission (2.50) and in a mild way has Jesus indicate that His true mother and brothers are other than His physical mother and brothers at one point in the ministry (8.20-21). Nonetheless, she is said to be one who stores up knowledge about the life of Jesus (2.19, 51) and in Luke's schema attentive listening and learning is a mark of a true disciple (10.38-42). Luke indicates that Mary and Joseph are both good Jews (cf. 2.39) and that as part of 'true' Israel Mary will not be unaffected by the way Jewish people react to Jesus (2.35). Luke has muted somewhat the criticism of the family in his parallel to Mark 3 but to some degree it is still in evidence at 2.50.

The Johannine picture of Jesus' mother, like Luke's has both positive and negative aspects. Jesus disengages from her authority as mother (γυνῆ, 2.4), and yet Mary appears to have faith that Jesus will act (2.5). The family and disciples, though distinguished, are

pictured together at 2.12. The scene in Jn 19.25-27 is an idealized one, as Mary is presented as the representative female disciple at the foot of the cross and thus the Fourth Evangelist indicates that Mary gained a place among Jesus' disciples. As for historical matters, however, this scene probably only tells us about Jesus' care for His mother as He was dying.

Thus, two Evangelists feel it important to indicate that Mary gained a place in Jesus' community. But what is particularly striking is that all four Gospels to one degree or another indicate that Jesus' mother failed at some point to completely understand or honor her Son (cf. Mt 13.57b, Mk 3.21, Lk 2.50, Jn 2.4), that Jesus distanced Himself from her, and that He distinguished His physical family from His spiritual one (cf. Jn 2.4, Mk 3.31-35 and parallels, Mk 6.4b, Mt 13.57b). It is also significant that all four Gospels portray Mary as a good Jewish woman in one way or another - whether this entails portraying her as silently following the lead of her husband (Matthew 1-2), or as following the precepts of Jewish law (Lk 2.22 ff.), or as participating in Jewish festivals and ceremonies (cf. John 2, Lk 2.41), or apparently being the bearer of a good number of children (Mk 6.3 and parallels, Mk 3.31 and parallels, Ac 1.14, Jn 2.12, 7.5).[294] The overall impression left by the material in the Gospels about Mary is that no Evangelist made a concerted effort to give Mary more significance than she actually had in the life of Jesus; that no Evangelist attempted to paint a purely idealized portrait of her; and that no Evangelist attempted to portray a strictly Christian (i.e., non-Jewish) picture of Jesus' mother.

B. Mary and Martha

1. Hosts or Guests? - Lk 10.38-42

Though it is unlikely they traveled with Jesus, Mary and Martha may have been the most important and prominent women in Jesus' life after His own mother. The Gospels give us three accounts of how these women figured in Jesus' life - Lk 10.38-42, Jn 11.1-44, and Jn 12.1-11.

The Lukan story is a brief vignette sandwiched between two crucial sections - the Good Samaritan and the Lord's Prayer. It seems possible to see a purpose and progression in this arrangement: the Good Samaritan parable (10.25-37) gives an example of how to serve and love one's

neighbor; Lk 10.38-42 teaches that the "one thing necessary" is not first service, but listening to and learning from Jesus (allowing Jesus to serve us); and the Lord's Prayer (11.1-4) gives an example of what is to be heard and learned from Jesus.[295]

This uniquely Lukan pericope, the only Synoptic passage on Mary and Martha, appears to be a unitary construction, for the climactic saying of Jesus (10.41-42) could not have stood on its own.[296] The question remains, however, whether this scene is an 'ideal', mainly legendary, construction, or whether it contains good, historical tradition. Bultmann gives no reason for suggesting that this scene is 'ideal'[297] and it is questionable whether the 'legendary' view should stand. The characterization of Mary and Martha is neither highly embellished nor detailed. It involves a simple contrast in activities or attitudes and this characterization is to some extent confirmed in another strand of the tradition (cf. Jn 11.20 ff.; 12.2 ff.).[298] Secondly, in view of the uniqueness both of Mary's activity and of Jesus' attitude about it when compared to Jewish attitudes about women disciples and their proper role in the home and later attitudes in the Church about a woman's place and role in the Christian community and family (cf. for instance 1 Tim 2.9-15), it is most unlikely that this scene is an 'ideal' construction.[299] Thirdly, there appears here no interest in Mary and Martha for their own sake. The narrative is presented not to indulge a Christian audience's curiosity about certain well-known early disciples but to relate Jesus' teaching in vv 41-42, to indicate how it arose, and to show how it applied to later Christians as well. Some of the textual problems in v 42 may have arisen because this text in its original form might have appeared too radical to some, calling even women away from putting their traditional roles first so that they too might have the good portion Mary partook of.[300] Thus, it is more probable that this story has a sound basis in historical fact, even though Luke has written and presented the narrative in his own language and style.[301]

Martha appears to be the older sister and the mistress of the house, for she ὑπεδέξατο αὐτόν.[302] It is she who takes charge of preparing for the guest and she feels she has a right to her sister's asistance.[303] Though this story primarily focuses on Martha and what she must learn about "the one thing necessary", Mary appears to know already, for she "was listening to his word."[304] Contrary to what

some commentators have asserted, Mary is not sitting at her Master's feet at the table.[305] Here the meal is clearly yet to come. The use of the phrase "to sit at the feet of" in 10.39 is significant since there is evidence that this is a technical formula meaning 'to be a disciple of'.[306] If so, then Luke is intimating to his audience that Mary is a disciple and as such her behavior is to be emulated. Though we mentioned previously that women could attend synagogue, learn, and even be learned if their husbands or masters were rabbis,[307] for a rabbi to come into a woman's house and teach her specifically is unheard of. Further, being alone with two women who were not one's relatives was considered questionable behavior by the rabbis.[308] Thus, not only the role Mary assumes, but also the task Jesus performs in this story is in contrast to what was expected of a Jewish man and woman.

While Mary is taking on the not so traditional role of disciple, Martha is engaged in what some would call 'woman's work' - providing hospitality for her guest. In a Jewish context, however, women were not allowed to serve at meals if men were in attendance, unless there were no servants to perform the task.[309] It is possible that Martha's behavior is atypical and reflects her desire and willingness to serve Jesus, even if it meant assuming a servant's role. Martha, whether because she resents not receiving help from Mary or because she envies Mary's 'portion', is "distracted by a good deal of serving",[310] Rather than quietly serving without complaint, she vents her feelings by accusing Jesus of not caring, and indirectly accusing Mary of neglecting her when she needed help.[311] Jesus does not respond as Martha expected. His remarks, however, are neither an attempt to devalue Martha's efforts at hospitality, nor an attempt to attack a woman's traditional role; rather, Jesus defends Mary's right to learn from Him and says this is the crucial thing for those who wish to serve Him. Jesus makes clear that for women as well as men, one's primary task is to be a proper disciple; only in that context can one be a proper hostess. His address to Martha shows a recognition that Martha is concerned with 'many things'.[312] Such things as even one's own family, however, must be seen as of lesser importance, indeed in an entirely separate and subordinate category, to the responsibility of hearing God's word and being Jesus' disciple.

Unfortunately, the rest of Jesus' response to Martha, the climax of this pericope, is clouded with large textual difficulties. There

are no less than six possibilities for the text of Lk 10.42a.[313]

1) ὀλίγων δέ χρεία ἐστιν ἢ ἑνὸς - B
2) ὀλίγων δέ ἐστιν χρεία ἢ ἑνὸς - p^{3} ℵ^{c} C^{2} L f^{1} 33 $syr^{h\,mg}$ cop^{bo} eth Origen$^{1/2}$ Basil Jerome Cyril
3) ὀλίγων δέ ἐστιν ἢ ἑνὸς - ℵ*
4) ἑνὸς δέ ἐστιν χρεία - p^{45} A K P Δ Π Ψ f^{13} 28 565 700 892 et al. Byz Lect l^{60m} et al. Clement Basil Macarius Chrysostom Antiochus John-Damascus
5) ὀλίγων δέ ἐστιν χρεία - 38 (syr^{pal}) $Cop^{bo^{ms}}$ arm geo Origen 1/2
6) omit the entire clause - $it^{a\ b\ e\ ff^{2}\ i\ l\ r^{1}}$ syr^{s} Ambrose Possidius

It is probable that option three should be eliminated as it appears to be either a later simplification of, or a scribal mistake based on, option one or two. It could be argued that variants one or two are the products of a process of conflation and that the original text read either, 'few things are necessary', or 'one thing is necessary'. Scribes who had some manuscripts with one reading and some with the other might have conflated the two rather than take a chance of omitting the original text.[314] Another factor which argues against the longer readings is that they do not have the wide geographical spread of the shorter . . . readings.[315] In addition, the shorter reading with ἑνὸς may claim the support of p^{45} and other important manuscripts.[316] Both scholarly opinion and the evidence of the Fathers appear equally divided between the longer and shorter readings, though the modern English translations are not.[317] Though nearly all the Old Latin manuscripts omit the clause entirely, it appears that only one or two of the Latin Fathers witness this omission, which weakens the evidence for the omission.[318] Contrary to M. Augsten's assertion, the fact that the shorter reading is rather "secular" in thought is not a basis for ruling it out.[319]

Purely on the basis of external evidence, it is difficult to decide between the longer and shorter readings. Several internal considerations, however, give the shorter reading a slight edge. Though variants one and two are more difficult readings, that is precisely the difficulty. In the context, Jesus is contrasting Martha's 'many' with something else. It does not seem likely that Jesus would contrast many and few here when in fact it is one thing (τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα), Mary's listening and learning, that He is defending. Elsewhere in Luke,

the importance of one thing is stressed (15.8, 16.13, 18.19, 22).[320] It is not a matter of contrasting the active to the contemplative life; rather, it is a matter of contrasting the importance of listening to and learning the word of God to anything else.[321] We are dealing with a matter of priorities and only one thing can come first and be absolutely necessary.

If one of the longer readings is preferred, Creed is right that a pun on a 'few dishes' (ὀλίγων) and the 'one portion' Mary has been served is being made.[322] This idea is not ruled out, however, if we only have ἑνός and πολλά. The meaning then would be that Jesus did not come to be served, but to serve. He is the host, and Mary and Martha are the guests. Mary has just received τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα.[323] This is not to be taken from her.[324] The phrase τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα probably is not to be seen as a comparative term (such as the better or best portion), for we are dealing with something in a class by itself.[325] It should be noted also that this is something that the Evangelist intimates Mary chose for herself (middle), responding to the Word in faith by placing it first.[326] As in the case of Jesus' relation to His mother Mary, we see once again a reorganizing of traditional priorities in light of Kingdom requirements. Martha's service is not denigrated but it does not come first. One must re-orient one's lifestyle according to what Jesus says is the 'good portion'. It is this universal priority of faith and equality in faith that gives women a new and equal place under the new covenant. This is the radical nature of the Gospel and why it dramatically affected women's status especially in first century Palestine. Luke portrays Mary as a disciple sitting and learning at the feet of her Master, and as such she serves as a model for his audience. The appeals to a woman's traditional role, here voiced by Martha, do not prevail against the fact that women (like men) are called to be hearers and obeyers of Jesus' word first. We must now turn to the Johannine portrayal of these two women.[327]

2. A Confession and a Proclamation - John 11

Few would dispute the fact that the story of the raising of Lazarus raises more problems than almost any other miracle recorded in the Gospels for the student of history. It is not possible to deal adequately with all the difficulties this narrative poses in these paragraphs; thus, the most we can hope to do is present a few reasons for the approach taken and explain why other approaches have been rejected.

In our discussion of Lk 10.38-42 we suggested that it was unlikely that there was a relation of dependence either of Luke on John or the converse so far as their material on Mary and Martha is concerned. Further support for this view can now be given. Clearly, the Fourth Evangelist does not derive the association of Lazarus with Mary and Martha from Luke. Also, he did not derive the connection of Mary with an anointing of Jesus in Bethany from Luke. Yet Jn 11.2 makes clear that the Fourth Evangelist expects his audience to already be cognizant of this tradition. Thus, he himself did not likely create the connection nor did he procure his information on this matter from the Synoptics. This leads to the conclusion that he had a source of information about Mary (and Martha?) other than the Synoptics.[328] Further, the suggestion that the Lazarus narrative derives from Lk 16.19-30 is implausible. In the first place there is no raising of a man named Lazarus in the Lukan parable; indeed, the conclusion suggests that such a raising would be pointless and thus is not to be undertaken (v 31). Secondly, the Lazarus in the Lukan parable bears no resemblance to the man who was part of a household that could afford a tomb and entertain house guests such as Jesus (John 11).[329] Lazarus was not an unusual name, but it should be noted that it was unusual for a character in a parable to be named.[330] Thus, "It is the occurrence of the name in the Lucan parable that calls for explanation. Such an explanation would be forthcoming if there existed in pre-Johannine tradition a story about the resurrection of a man called Lazarus, with a general implication that this did not win men to faith in Christ."[331]

Another of the major difficulties with this narrative so far as its historicity is concerned is that there is no real trace of it in the Synoptics (unless Lk 16.19-30 evidences it). This is problematic mainly because the raising is of such a dramatic and crucial nature (in John it is the act which precipitates the organized efforts to get rid of Jesus) that, it is contended, the Synoptics could hardly afford to leave it out, if they knew of it. Two things lessen the force of this argument. First, as Morris points out, "...Mark has nothing about Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem before the final week."[332] Matthew and Luke are fundamentally following Mark. It is thus not at all unlikely that Mark simply had no knowledge of this story. This is especially believable if 1) some of the drama of the narrative is due to the Fourth Evangelist's handling of the material and, more importantly, 2) the placement of the narrative is the work of the

Fourth Evangelist. Brown has provided a very plausible argument for the view that the placement of this narrative is the Evangelist's own doing, as he intends to provide a dramatic end to the public ministry of Jesus and prepare the way for the narration of the Passion and Resurrection narratives.[333] If this narrative was originally simply another story of the raising of the dead by Jesus, perhaps without the delay motif which heightens the drama, it is quite believable that even if Mark (or any of the Synoptists) knew of the narrative, they could have chosen to omit it and include another raising story since theirs is, after all, a selective presentation of Gospel events.

In regard to the form and content of this narrative it is difficult to separate what may be attributed to the work of the Evangelist and what to his source(s), although Bultmann and Schnackenburg believe they are able to make such a separation. The former argues that the figures of Mary and Martha probably do not belong to the original form of this narrative; the latter concludes that the Mary material was likely in the source and that the Evangelist has constructed the dialogue with Martha as a sort of doublet of the encounter with Mary and as a forum for conveying Christological remarks and a Christian confession.[334] At this point, however, a word of caution is in order. As Dodd remarks: "Nowhere perhaps, in this Gospel, have attempts to analyze out a written source, or sources, proved less convincing, and if the evangelist is following a traditional story or fixed pattern, he has covered his tracks."[335] The story as it stands is both a literary unity and thoroughly Johannine.[336] But this may mean no more than that the author has made the story his own, and told of these (possibly historical) events in his own style with a certain amount of poetic license. As for its form, this narrative has certain of the features that are usually found in the miracle narratives in the Synoptics.[337] All other things being equal this may count against seeing this narrative as in the main a Johannine creation.

For our part it should be noted that even if the raising of Lazarus proves to be a legend, or a creation of the Evangelist, the encounters Jesus had with the grieving Martha and Mary may not be, and it is these encounters with which we are concerned in this thesis. There are certain features in these encounters that point toward their basic authenticity; 2) the characterization of Martha and in some respects Mary comports with that in Luke 10, while likely being

independent of the Lukan material; 2) Martha's faith in Jesus is not a full-blown Christian faith, nor does the presentation of Jesus here reflect some later Christo-monistic ideas, but, as Bultmann says, "...her faith in his power is faith in the power of his prayer;...The Revealer accordingly is removed from the sphere of the θεῖος ἄνθρωπος as the old miracle stories see him; it is recognized that everything he possesses he has from God.";[338] 3) Martha's statement in v 24 simply expresses a common Jewish idea about resurrection; there is nothing particularly Christian about it.

As for v 27, while the Evangelist may simply be assembling various Christological titles here (cf. Jn 1.19 ff.), it is noteworthy that this confession is inadequate and does not include the crucial element of belief in Jesus' present power to raise the dead. Were the construction purely redactional the Evangelist would perhaps have made the confession more suitable to the occasion. Perhaps Martha made some sort of rudimentary confession, within the parameters of correct Jewish belief and expectation about the Messiah, and the Evangelist has made the confession more clearly and traditionally Christian (for 27a, cf. Mk 8.29 and parallels; for 27b, cf. Mk 1.11 and parallels; for 27c, cf. Jn 1.9 and Mt 11.3, et al.). V 27c may simply be the Evangelist's creation on the basis of Jn 1.9. The proclamation in Jn 11.25-26 in its present form may be assigned to the Evangelist. This, however, does not preclude the possibility that Jesus spoke privately to some of His closer disciples about His life-giving powers. If Riesenfeld is right that the original Sitz im Leben for the Johannine 'I am' sayings and proclamations was the informal discussions of Jesus with His closer disciples,[339] then it is possible that even vv 25-26 may in some form go back to Jesus. The use of ἀνάστασις and ἀνιστάναι here may indicate the use of a source for they are not common in John and are used only once of Jesus' own Resurrection (20.9).[340] Perhaps with Brown we may conclude: "From the contents of the Johannine account then, there is no conclusive reason for assuming that the skeleton of the story does not stem from early tradition about Jesus."[341] Thus, it seems reasonable to assign the characterization of Mary and Martha, the idea that Martha made a rudimentary confession of a Jewish belief in resurrection and in Jesus as Messiah, the self-proclamation of Jesus as a life-giving source, and the general encounter of Jesus with the grieving sisters to a Sitz im Leben Jesu; but that as far as the exact wording, the dramatic delay of Jesus' coming, the setting of

the raising at the climax of the ministry, and perhaps even the raising itself, it is best not to go beyond a statement of what these aspects of the narrative say about the Evangelist's own views and theology.

Jn 11.1-44 is the longest continuous narrative in the Fourth Gospel apart from the Passion narrative. This is not without reason, for in the Johannine schema of things it is the climactic and most miraculous episode in the series of signs he presents.[342] In many ways this story parallels the first sign in John 2 and serves to bring together and reemphasize some of John's chief themes. The message Mary and Martha send in 11.3 is similar to the open-ended suggestion of Jesus' mother in 2.3. Further, Martha's remark in 11.22 about 'whatever you ask' resembles Mary's statement in 2.5. In both scenes, the hope is implied that Jesus will act despite the seeming impossibility of the situations.[343] It is fitting that v 40 (cf. 11.4) mentions glory, for this also relates back to the Cana miracle (2.11) and forward to the climax of this Gospel. In this story, as in John 2 and John 7, Jesus can only act as the Father wills, not at the request of His mother, sisters, brothers, or friends. This causes the delay in Jesus going to Bethany.[344] It is this fact which explains why He seems to reject mother Mary's request and the plea of Mary and Martha, and then in fact responds as if He had not rejected their suggestion.[345] As the best is saved for last in John 2, so in the Gospel as a whole the best miracle is saved for last. In John 2 Jesus comes and brings new life and joy to the celebration of the union of two lives; in John 11 He brings new life and reunion to a family He dearly loved. Finally, both narratives involve women whom the Evangelist portrays as being in the process of learning Jesus' true nature and becoming His true disciples. For Mary and Martha and mother Mary there is perhaps knowledge of and belief in Jesus and His miracle working power, but in both cases this knowledge and faith is insufficient. They do not realize that Jesus is able to bring life because He is the Resurrection and the Life.[346]

Realizing that Lazarus is the object and Jesus the subject of this story, it is interesting to note that Mary and Martha play a more prominent part than their brother.[347] The factors in this narrative important to this study are not the emotions Mary and Martha express (which are common human reactions to death), but the way the Evangelist portrays these women, the confession of faith by Martha, and Jesus' proclamation to Martha.

The character portrayals of Mary and Martha in John 11 are on the whole true to the portrayals we saw earlier in Lk 10.38-42. Martha appears to be the elder sister and the hostess of the home.[348] She is clearly the more out-going, thus, it is she who goes out to meet Jesus first. Martha's outspokenness, which gives us more knowledge of her than we have of Mary, sometimes makes her appear to have less faith and understanding. The Evangelist portrays Mary as a woman of great devotion. She is always at her Master's feet whether to revere (Jn 11.32), or to anoint (Jn 12.3, cf. Lk 10.39). Both women are devoted to Jesus and are close friends whom He loved and visited on more than one occasion.

John, in rather balanced fashion, mentions Mary first and then Martha in 11.1; Mary only in 11.2; Martha only (by name) in 11.5; and then both Martha and Mary have a private audience with Jesus in 11.17-37. While Mary gets more prominence in vv 1-5, Martha is the more central figure in vv 17-37. In v 2 Mary is described by John as ἡ ἀλείψασα τὸν κύριον μύρῳ καὶ ἐκμάξασα τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ταῖς θριξὶν αὐτῆς. It would be this act that would remind John's audience of Mary, thus the story in 12.1-8 must be based on well-known tradition. The statement in Jn 11.5 that Jesus loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus is perhaps more significant than it appears on the surface. First, the order of the names (two women, then Lazarus) is unusual. Perhaps the Evangelist is intimating that these women were closer to Jesus than Lazarus was, or were more prominent or important than Lazarus in the eyes of the Evangelist. It is pointed out frequently that Lazarus is the only male in the Fourth Gospel who is named as the object of Jesus' love (cf. 11.3, 5), but what is overlooked is that Martha and Mary are the only women so mentioned by name. In light of the theological significance of such language elsewhere in John and its use to describe the relationship between Jesus and His disciples, it seems the Evangelist is implying that these women and Lazarus were disciples of Jesus;[349] and that there were women prominent among the disciples even during Jesus' earthly ministry (11.2 hints that Mary should be known).

The Evangelist portrays Martha as one who sincerely believes in Jesus and has faith in His power, for she says, "I know even now God will give you whatever you ask." (v 22). This does not seem to imply that she believes Jesus can or will raise her brother since her confession of faith does not go beyond the orthodox Pharisaic view of

resurrection on the last day,[350] and since her later comment (v 39) makes probable she still does not expect Jesus to raise Lazarus. Brown's summary about Martha's faith seems accurate:

> Throughout the incident involving Martha we see that she believes in Jesus but inadequately. In vs 27 she addresses him with lofty titles, probably the same titles used in early Christian professions of faith; yet 39 shows that she does not as yet believe in his power to give life. She regards Jesus as an intermediary who is heard by God (22), but she does not understand that he is life itself (25). (351)

What is the Evangelist trying to convey by having Martha confess - ἐγὼ πεπίστευκα ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος (v 27)? Schnackenburg suggests that this confession is likely a model for the Evangelist's audience.[352] This may well be so, for it is similar to the Petrine confession, especially in its Matthean form (16.6 - Σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος). Perhaps it is not too much to say that Martha's confession is the least inadequate to this point in the Fourth Gospel. Certainly, it is more adequate than the Samaritan woman's hopeful question in 4.29, or her affirmation that the Messiah will come into the world (cf. 4.25 to 11.27). Ironically, Martha's confession is also a fuller and perhaps more satisfactory statement than the Petrine confession in Jn 6.68-69. It is possible that the Evangelist has constructed his Gospel so that alongside the crescendo of the miraculous, we have a crescendo of confessions. This would mean that Martha's confession takes on new importance because of its placement in the climactic episode of the series of signs. Perhaps a further indication of the importance of Martha for the Evangelist's audience is that she receives a revelation from Jesus about Himself that prompts the confession in v 27. By giving his audience a story in which a woman is the recipient of one of Jesus' most profound and direct statements about Himself, and in which a woman makes a heart-felt and accurate response to Jesus' declarations, the Fourth Evangelist intimates that women have a right to be taught even the mysteries of the faith, and that they are capable of responding in faith with an accurate confession. In short, they are capable of being full-fledged disciples of Jesus.

In this pericope, the portrait of Mary is not favorable. In her audience with Jesus she makes the same initial remarks as Martha (11.21, 32), though again it is likely this is not so much a complaint as a statement of loss and grief.[353] She makes no confession, and

her wailing[354] in Jesus' presence suggests an attitude of hopelessness and lack of trust in Him. This must be balanced against the hint in 11.3 (cf. vv 21, 32) that both Mary and Martha had enough faith to believe that only Jesus could deal with their drastic situation.

In conclusion we have in John 11 not an idealized portrait of two women disciples, but a portrait that indicates that women are capable of faith and an accurate confession, and are worthy recipients of the teaching of Jesus about Himself. Martha's confession (v 27), even if it was in actuality only a rudimentary expression of certain conventional expectations coupled with a belief that Jesus was the one who had been sent to fulfill those expectations is noteworthy. In its present form (accepting that v 27b, c is likely the Evangelist's contribution to the confession) the confession rivals and resembles the great Petrine confession (Mt 16.16 and parallels). By placing it on Martha's lips, the Evangelist makes his own statement about the ability of women to be confessing and exemplary Christians. It is also true that the Evangelist portrays Martha as having her bad moments when she so misunderstands Jesus and His intentions that she questions His reasons for having the stone rolled away and is rebuked. Mary is presented as one who has given herself wrongly over to an all consuming sorrow even in Jesus' presence though she too has faith, and the Evangelist indicates (11.2) that she will yet honor Jesus by anointing Him (12.1-8). It is to this anointing that we must now turn.

3. Another Anointing - Mk 14.3-9 (Mt 26.6-13, Jn 12.1-8)

How are the anointing stories in Mk 14.3-9 and parallels and Lk 7.36-50 to be assessed? Are they two forms of one story, or two distinct stories having similarities perhaps as a result of cross-fertilization at the level of oral tradition?[355] The first similarity between the Lukan anointing story and the story in Mark and Matthew is that the meal is held at the house of a man named Simon (John does not specify). This, however, is a superficial similarity when one considers how many Simons are in the NT and Josephus.[356] A second similarity between the narratives is that a woman anoints Jesus with perfume, and in the Synoptics the perfume is contained in an alabaster jar. This last detail does not prove that we are dealing with the same story because in the first century Mediterranean world, it was known that "the best ointment is preserved in alabaster."[357] We know that dealers in perfumes were

exceedingly common in Israel for the rabbis often mentioned them.[358] What then of the fact that a woman is involved in all four of the Gospel accounts of an anointing? Luke says the woman is a sinner, which is contrary to the picture of Mary of Bethany presented in Luke 10, and the picture we find in John 11 and 12.[359] It seems that Luke, who relied on Mark, did not identify the sinner woman with the unnamed woman in the Marcan account. "The fact that Luke has omitted the narrative in Mk 14:1-9 at the corresponding point in his own Gospel is no proof that he regarded this story as identical with Mark's. It simply indicates that he saw the similarity between the two narratives and avoided repetition."[360] The Lukan story is set at a different time and place from the Marcan story, and for many scholars these are decisive reasons for not identifying the two stories.[361] Both anointing stories involve an act of devotion and love, but there is no hint in the Lukan story that a prophetic and proleptic burial rite is involved, as is likely the case in the other three Gospels. "The very strong element of sinfulness and forgiveness, that is essential to the Lucan story, is totally missing in the Bethany account."[362] Finally, the way Jesus uses the act of anointing and a parable of debtors in the Lukan story to teach Simon that he who is forgiven more is more grateful, is completely at variance with the other anointing story. The point and purpose of Luke's narrative is very different from that of the other anointing story. If Luke knew Mark, it seems improbable that he would so thoroughly rearrange the story so as to change its essential point and purpose, or leave only fragmentary details of similarity if he intended to relate the same event as Mark.[363] Even a cursory examination of the anointing stories of Mark, Matthew, and John make it apparent that they are dealing with the same event. Between these three accounts the similarities are of the essence of the story.[364] We thus conclude that the Lukan anointing story is not the same as that found in Mk 14.3-9 and parallels, and we are justified in treating the latter as a separate story.

What then is the historical value of Mk 14.3-9 and parallels? It seems clear that the story rests on good tradition. Dibelius calls it a paradigm of noteworthy purity and Bultmann says that it is no ideal scene but in the strictest sense biography, although he contends that vv 8b-9 are likely secondary.[365] This need not be the case if Jn 12.7 is an independent attestation to the same idea expressed in Mk 14.8b (cf. below). Probably the Evangelist's

shaping of the material may be seen in the reference to the Gospel and 'the whole world' in v 9. Perhaps the original form of this prophecy or pronouncement simply spoke of the woman's deed being held in memory continually. The placement of this episode before the triumphal entry in John seems historically more likely than Mark's placement which may be located next to the Lord's Supper narrative for theological reasons. This leads us to ask whether or not the Fourth Evangelist, like the First, is dependent on Mark for this narrative. There are certain verbal similarities that might point in this direction: the use in both Gospels of the rare word πιστικῆς; ἄφετε αὐτήν in Mark and ἄφες αὐτήν in John; the use of ἐνταφιασμόν in both Gospels; the saying about the poor; and the mention of 300 denarii.[366] Against these points must be balanced the following considerations: 1) it is very difficult to believe that the Fourth Evangelist, if he had Mk 14.8, 9 before him, would have introduced in its place the difficult Jn 12.7;[367] 2) while not impossible, it seems unlikely that the Fourth Evangelist would have modified Mark's reference to an anointing of Jesus' head to an anointing of His feet and the wiping of His feet with the woman's hair;[368] 3) it is unlikely that the Fourth Evangelist would deliberately add to Mary's actions the questionable act of loosing the hair if Mark was his source; 4) counting against literary dependence is the fact that there are "...small differences that surround the details in which they are most alike (Mark has <u>valuable</u> perfume in contrast to John's <u>expensive</u> perfume; Mark has <u>more</u> than 300 denarii)..."[369] There seems to be no compelling reason why the Fourth Evangelist would have altered the Marcan account in these ways if he knew of it. This leads to the suggestion that the two Gospels are reporting, independently of each other, two different versions of one sequence of events. It is also unlikely that the Fourth Evangelist is relying on Luke's anointing narrative for one must require that he transfer the description of the act of a woman with an immoral past to Mary of Bethany and embody that description in a narrative that has a wholly different point from the Lukan narrative.[370] The similarities between the Lukan and Johannine anointing stories (especially the wiping of the feet with her hair) are perhaps best explained by the likelihood that at the stage of oral tradition some of the details of one anointing story have been transferred to the other and vice versa. What then are we to make of the personal references unique to the Johannine account (Mark, Martha, Lazarus, Judas)? It is quite possible that the

Evangelist has added these names to a general account of the anointing, possibly on the basis of the narrative being set in Bethany in his source.[371] It is perhaps more likely, if the Fourth Gospel's account is independent of the Synoptics, that the names are original, for Jn 11.2 seems to indicate that the association of Mary with the anointing was already known to his audience (and thus went back to tradition that preceded the Fourth Gospel). It must be remembered that in the Canonical Gospel tradition there is no definite trend to add names at the later stages of the tradition. It was equally ~~so~~ common in the polishing of a narrative for practical use that names, places, and interesting (but unnecessary) details be omitted in order to generalize the narrative.[372] Thus, in conclusion, it would appear that the Fourth Evangelist presents, in most regards, a form of this anointing story that is closer to the original than Mark's generalized account.

The story contains typical Johannine irony in that the place where Jesus gave life to the dead (12.1) becomes the place where "Seated beside Lazarus, whom He 'called out of the tomb' (xii.17), He is anointed as one would anoint a corpse."[373] The characterization of Martha and Mary in John 12 comports well with the Lukan portrayal. There is one noticeable difference, however, between the portrayal of Martha in Luke 10 and John 12. In John 12 there are no complaints by Martha and no hint of a rebuke to Martha - she serves quietly. If Leipoldt is correct, then we may see the process of liberation and Christian service expressed in Martha's life for she is performing the functions a free servant or slave would perform at an all male feast.[374] She apparently violates certain rules of Jewish practice in order to take on the role of servant and show love to her Master for what He has done for her and her family. Liberty in Christ is not only freedom from customs which restrict love, but also freedom to take a lower place, to humble oneself to serve.

Mary also may be taking on the role of servant when she anoints Jesus. There were many reasons for anointing in a Jewish context. As Lk 7.46 implies, anointing with oil was not of the same order or purpose as anointing with perfume, especially fragrant and expensive perfume. The latter was reserved either for burial rites, or for cosmetic or romantic purposes in small quantities (Song of Solomon 1.12, Jn 19.39-40, Lk 24.1).[375] What Mary poured on Jesus' feet is called μύρον and is not oil, but perfume, nard being a well-known Eastern ointment with a potent fragrance.[376] The Fourth Evangelist, perhaps with deliberate exaggeration to indicate that this is an act

of complete devotion, says Mary used about a pound of nard, a very large amount considering the perfume's worth.[377] It is not true that anointing of the feet is unknown in antiquity.[378] Athenaeus tells us of a man having a female slave smear his feet with μύρον.[379] Though it may not be common practice, Billerbeck cites cases where the rabbis allowed a person to anoint their own feet, and in some places women could anoint rabbis.[380] Thus, the possibility that Mary did anoint Jesus' feet, especially if this was originally intended as an act of humble devotion, should not be dismissed. A plausible explanation of Mary's act of wiping Jesus' feet with her hair might be found in the custom of wiping one's hands on the head or hair of a servant if the hands had excess oil or water on them at dinnertime. Mary could have used her hair to wipe off the excess perfume as she had seen servants do in the past.[381] In a Jewish context, however, for a woman to let down her hair in the presence of unrelated men was scandalous.[382] Thus, it is best to attribute the act to the cross-fertilization of the two anointing stories while the anointing of the feet may well be original to the story. It is easy to see why Mark would change the anointing of the feet to an anointing of the head to emphasize Jesus' royal nature and role. It is not so easy to explain the change to the feet if the anointing of the head was original.[383]

In all three narratives the motive of the woman (unnamed in the Synoptics) appears to be devotional. In all three Gospels, Jesus interprets the act in relation to His burial. In Matthew and Mark it is evident that the act is seen as a proleptic anointing for Jesus' burial.[384] It has been suggested that since the First Evangelist and Mark tell us that the head of Jesus is anointed, it is possible they viewed this act as a kingly coronation rite.[385] If so, then the woman is portrayed as taking on the task of a prophet or priest. Since both the First Evangelist and Mark make clear, however, that Jesus refers the act to His burial, then it is probably to be viewed this way in the main.[386] This means that they viewed the act as prophetic in character in which case the Synoptists may have been suggesting to their audiences that women could legitimately assume the roles performed by prophets.[387] In Mark and Matthew the act is described as a beautiful deed - which may indicate to the Evangelists' audiences that such extravagant devotion should be seen as an example for all disciples.

Jesus' response to the objection that Mary's extravagant act has wasted about a year's wages of a day-laborer is problematic in the Fourth Gospel.[388] The existence of αὐτήν in John makes it unlikely that we should treat ἄφες as merely an auxiliary.[389] In Mark it seems clear that the sense is 'Leave her alone'.[390] If the ἵνα in John is imperatival,[391] then the translation, 'Let her alone; let her keep it' is necessitated. If not, then we should connect ἄφες to the following phrase and translate 'Allow her to keep it'. Our second difficulty with the Johannine phrase is in the word τηρέω. There is no lexical evidence for the meaning 'keep it in mind'.[392] In John it can mean 'to keep' (as in keep a commandment, cf. Jn 8.51, 55, 9.16, 14.15, 21, 23, 24, 15.10, 20). As Barrett has pointed out, it is most unlikely that John means 'to retain' the ointment since the whole house is filled with the smell and Judas is indignant at the extravagance.[393] Thus, it seems probable that it means 'Let her observe it (the rite) now as though it were (i.e., with a view to) the day of my burial preparation.' The Fourth Evangelist then in essence is saying the same as the First and Second. If this translation is correct, then the implication is that Jesus prophetically sees that Mary will not have an opportunity to prepare Him for burial later, and thus she is allowed to have the opportunity now. We reject the suggestion that αὐτό refers to the ointment itself (as if Mary could save some for the actual burial), and also the suggestion that τηρήσῃ αὐτό refers to Mary 'keeping in mind' on that fateful day that she had anointed Jesus previously.

The first two Evangelists close their presentation of the anointing with the remark, "Truly I say to you, wherever the Gospel is preached throughout the world, what she has done will also be told in memory of her." This saying sets up this woman as an example, and if one deletes the clause ὅπου...τὸν κόσμον, there is no reason why the saying cannot be attributed to Jesus, even though the Fourth Evangelist omits it.[394] The Fourth Evangelist gives evidence in 11.2 that those words were coming true already, and it is possible (though perhaps not probable) that we should take the reference to the odor filling the house in 12.3 as a symbolic way of saying the same thing we find in Mk 14.9 and Mt 26.13.[395]

4. Conclusions

We may note the striking correspondence between the Lukan and Johannine portrayals of Mary and Martha. As Stauffer remarks,

> We learn much concerning the validity of the Gospel tradition and its value as a historical source when we observe that the characters of Mary and Martha, the sisters of Lazarus, are given the same delineation in all the Gospels. Martha appears resolute, energetic, ready of tongue, used to giving orders, as eager to make suggestions as to reprove (Luke 10, 38. 40. 41; John 11, 20 ff. 28. 39 f.; 12, 2); Mary is hesitant, slow, quiet, easily moved, obedient, devoted (Mark 14, 3 ff.; Luke 10, 39. 42; John 11, 20. 29. 32 f.). (396)

Interestingly, Mary is the only woman in the Gospels that Jesus defends twice for her devotion and desire to serve her Master. In Luke 10, Mary is portrayed as a disciple who has a right to learn from Jesus; in John 12, we see her as a disciple who has a right to take the role of servant and honor Jesus in an extravagant and exemplary way. The Fourth Evangelist does not present an idealized portrait of Mary, however, for in John 11 he shows that she, like Martha, was capable of misunderstanding and not trusting Jesus sufficiently. It is possible that Mary's act of anointing is presented by the First and Second, and even the Fourth, Evangelist as a coronation ritual,[397] but more likely it is seen as a prophetic burial rite. The Gospel writers may be implying that it was acceptable for women to take on the role or tasks of a prophet.[398]

In comparing the portraits of Martha in Luke 10 and John 12, we note that Martha appears in the same role in both cases. The mention of her household in Jn 11.19 may indicate that she need not have performed these tasks, in which case we see in her life how her devotion to Jesus led her to take on the role of servant. We noted Brown's suggestion that the audience of the Fourth Evangelist would see Martha's activities as corresponding to those that a deacon would perform for the Church community; thus, John 12 might be seen as giving precedent for deaconesses.[399] In any event, it is significant that the Fourth Evangelist portrays Martha as making perhaps the least inadequate confession about Jesus up to this point in this Gospel (11.27), and she in turn receives one of the most dramatic revelations of Jesus' nature. Both of these factors indicate that Martha is to be seen by the Evangelist's audience as someone who is in the process of becoming a full-fledged disciple. By relating this scene, the Evangelist intimates that women were worthy of being taught even the mysteries of the faith (cf. Jn 4.21-26). Confirmation that John is portraying both Mary and Martha as disciples is to be found in the statement in Jn 11.5 that Jesus loved them (cf. 13.1). Indeed, they, together with Lazarus, are the only figures in the Fourth Gospel who

are mentioned by name (cf. 10.3) as Jesus' loved ones. In these stories we have pointed out the interesting juxtaposition of women's new freedom to be disciples and be taught by a rabbi with the freedom to take up the roles of a servant, roles which were forbidden by the rabbis to women who had servants (as Mary and Martha likely did). Luke 10 makes clear that she must first orient her priorities so that the good portion comes first, being the one thing necessary. Having her priorities straight (as in John 12) she can resume the role she may have performed previously. This role is given new significance as a means of serving the Master and manifesting discipleship to and love for Him.

Apparently, Mary and Martha did not travel with Jesus, for He always comes to them. This did not make them any less His disciples or His 'followers' who were progressing toward being full-fledged disciples. There were women, however, who took the unprecedented step of leaving their home and family in order to travel with Jesus. It is these women we must now study.

C. Women Who Followed Jesus

1. On the Road with Women Disciples - Lk 8.1-3

Lk 8.1-3 is near the middle of a series of pericopes that make special reference to women.[400] It is likely an introduction to and illustration of the teaching of the parable of the sower (8.4-15). The women are living embodiments of what happens when the sower sows his seed in soil that can receive and nurture it.[401] The passage may have originally been a companion to or completion of Lk 7.36-50 indicating women's gratitude to Jesus for being helped or healed (cf. 7.11-17, 36-50). Luke, however, may have placed it here to prepare for the women's roles in the Passion and Resurrection events[402] and in the Church (cf. Lk 23.55, Ac 1.14), to indicate that women were witnesses even from the days of the early Galilean ministry.

Though Lk 8.1-3 in its form and content is thoroughly and distinctively Lukan,[403] it nonetheless contains material of considerable historical value. The list of women is likely traditional and does not appear to be derived from Mark's list (cf. Mk 15.41).[404] Possibly, Luke himself has added the names of Joanna and/or Susanna as a result of personal knowledge or of a well-informed Palestinian source.[405] There is little reason to question the authenticity of the information that women traveled with and served Jesus and the disciples as this was conduct which was unheard of and considered scandalous in Jewish

circles. It is unlikely to have been invented by a Christian community which contained converted Jews and which did not wish to appear morally suspect to a Mediterranean world that was already sexually and morally indulgent.

In its focus on women, this pericope continues Luke's emphasis on the universalization of the Gospel as it breaks down barriers to help, to heal, and to save (2.32, 4.26, 10.29 ff. etc.). Women are a continuing theme and example used by Luke as he tries to teach the qualities of a true disciple - one who witnesses to the person and work of Christ;[406] one who serves the Lord and the brethren freely from her own means, etc. Thus, in 8.1-3, Luke presents us with a microcosm of his major themes of discipleship, universalization of the Gospel, and Good News to the poor and downtrodden. As Conzelmann suggests, this pericope may also point out how the bonds of the family of Christ should have priority over the ties of one's family by heredity or marriage.[407]

Lk 8.1-3 stands in contrast to its historical context in rabbinic Judaism. We know women were allowed to hear the word of God in the synagogue but they were never disciples of a rabbi unless their husband or master was a rabbi willing to teach them.[408] Though a woman might be taught certain negative precepts of the Law out of necessity, this did not mean they would be taught rabbinic explanations of Torah. For a Jewish woman to leave home and travel with a rabbi was not only unheard of, it was scandalous. Even more scandalous was the fact that women, both respectable and not, were among Jesus' traveling companions. Yet it was apparently an intended part of His ministry for women to benefit from His teaching (cf. Lk 10.38-42) and healing. While Jesus rejects much of rabbinic teaching on women's 'flightiness', inferior nature, and monthly ritual uncleanness, this does not mean He abrogated all sexual, social, or creation order distinctions recognized under the old covenant. Indeed, it seems rather clear that He affirmed the headship and authority of the man when He chose Twelve men from among His disciples to be leaders of the community.[409] Though it was uncommon or unknown for women to be traveling disciples of a rabbi, it was not uncommon for women to support rabbis and their disciples out of their own money, property, or foodstuffs.[410]

The first woman mentioned, Mary Magdalene, is the best known among these women possibly because her healing was the most dramatic, i.e., seven demons indicates a possession of extraordinary malignity.[411]

She and apparently the others mentioned were living proof of the Gospel's power. Mary of Magdala commonly is placed first when listed with other women (Mt 27.56, 61, 28.1, Mk 15.40, 47, 16.1, Lk 24.10). She is undoubtedly important, and Luke wishes to mention her so her special devotion and witness in Luke 24 will be seen as the proclamation of someone who has long been one of His disciples. Similarly, Joanna is a long-time disciple, present with Mary at the tomb and the upper room, and thereafter bearing witness. She is very unlike Mary of Magdala who came from a small town and was undoubtedly avoided by many until Jesus healed her. Joanna is the wife of Chuza who managed Herod's estate.[412] Thus, she was a woman of some means and prominence. Here Luke gives evidence of how the Gospel breaks down class and economic divisions and reconciles men and women from all walks of life into one community. The third woman, Susanna, though perhaps known to Luke's audience, is unknown to us and is not mentioned elsewhere in the Gospel. Luke intends us to understand that these three women were only the most prominent among ἕτεραι πολλαί[413] women that followed Jesus. Luke indicates that Jesus' actions in behalf of these women freed them to serve both Him and the disciples (αὐτοῖς)[414] ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων.[415] This meant something unique. The traditional roles of hospitality and service could be seen as a way to serve not only the physical family, but also the family of faith. Being Jesus' disciple did not lead these women to abandon their traditional roles in regard to preparing food, serving, etc. Rather, it gave these roles new significance and importance, for now they could be used to serve the Master and the family of faith. The transformation of these women involved not only assuming new discipleship roles, but also resuming their traditional roles for a new purpose.

In light of what has been said, it appears that the purposes of this pericope are: 1) to reveal the proper response to the healing and teaching of Jesus Christ - true discipleship involves serving the Lord and the brethren in whatever way is needed from whatever resources one has; 2) to point out that women are equally called to be disciples and witnesses as part of the universal spread of the Gospel; 3) to show that Jesus brings in the 'acceptable day of the Lord' which liberates the captives and the poor (women fitting one or both categories), and which fulfills Joel's prophecy (3.1-5);[416] 4) to show the continuing loyalty of these women as disciples of Christ; 5) to point out women of prominence, at least known in the early Palestinian

Church, who were some of the first in a Jewish culture to be healed and liberated to a position of equality with men; 6) possibly to indicate that these women were a source of Luke's information on the court of Herod and various parts of Jesus' life and ministry;[417] 7) to serve as an introduction to and illustration of the parable that follows - the 'good soil' was not limited to a particular class, race, or sex.

2. Women at the Cross - Mk 15.40-41 (Mt 27.55-56; Lk 23.49; Jn 19.25)

We have had occasion to note several trends or patterns in our examination of women to this point. One of these, found in the parables and also in some of the pronouncement stories and elsewhere, involved a reversal of male-female roles, or a reversal of expectations. Another pattern found almost exclusively in Luke and John involves presenting narratives so that certain women are revealed to be or as becoming disciples (Jesus' mother, Mary and Martha, the women of Lk 8.1-3). Perhaps the most surprising reversal was that Jesus' women friends and traveling companions, not the Twelve or even the Three, became the primary witnesses to the most crucial events in Jesus' earthly career - His death, burial, and Resurrection.

The Passion narrative, it is generally agreed, was one of the first pieces of tradition to become relatively fixed in the course of transmission. Accordingly, few would doubt that the reporting by the Evangelists of the betrayal, failure, or desertion of Jesus' trained male leadership, the Twelve, during the crucial events of the last days of Jesus' ministry is historically accurate. It is not something that the post-Easter community was at all likely to invent. Thus, we will take it as an historical given that there was at least one disciple that betrayed Jesus (Judas), that there was one who denied him (Peter), and that the general desertion described in Mk 14.50 (cf. vv 32, 37, 43, and Mt 25.56, Jn 20.10) took place sometime during those crucial events. Apart from the beloved disciple, who represents the model male disciple (Jn 19.26-27) and may not be one of the Twelve (if indeed he is an historical figure) no men who were clearly among the circle of disciples of Jesus perform any good acts during the events immediately prior to and including the Crucifixion. It is striking that the Evangelists' portray various non-disciples both Jew and Gentile as assisting or in part accepting Jesus (cf. Mk 15.21 and parallels, Mk 15.42-47 and parallels, Mk 15.39 and parallels,

Lk 23.40-43). Some of this material may be redactional, but it is not likely that all of it is, and it is the general pattern we are concerned with here - abandonment by the Twelve, help or devotion expressed by others (the women or non-disciples). Even more striking is the fact that this pattern of doubt and desertion among the Twelve persisted even after the reports of Jesus' Resurrection reached them. Even in Luke, who is fond of male-female paralleism, we have a picture of the failure and disintegration of the trained male leadership during this crisis. Rengstorf comments:

> Luke ceases to use μαθητής for the disciples of Jesus at the end of the Gethsemane story (22:45). From then on he has οἱ περὶ αὐτόν (22:49; cf. also 22:56, 58, 59), οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτῷ (23:49, based on Ps. 38:11; 88:8, 18), οἱ ἕνδεκα καὶ πάντες οἱ λοιποί (24:9), αὐτοί (24:13), οἱ ἕνδεκα καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς (24:33)....The only possible explanation is that the behavior of the disciples of Jesus during the passion is equivalent to a breach of the relationship by them, and that it is the task of Jesus to gather disciples afresh after His resurrection. (418)

While Rengstorf goes too far in claiming that this is the only possible explanation, it is probably the best. The first have become last or even lost; and it speaks well for their faithfulness to history that the Evangelists, especially Luke, have not omitted or glossed over this fact. But what of the last and least among the brethren? We will now examine Mk 15.40-41 and parallels.

In the Synoptics, the brief paragraph about women at the cross follows the proclamation of the centurion about Jesus. In John, it follows the story of the soldiers dividing Jesus' garments. Apparently, the women were not limited in number to those listed in Mark's account.[419] Luke mentions in addition to the women "all his acquaintances" (πάντες οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτῷ). Since it appears Luke is following Mark at this point,[420] this phrase may be his attempt to create a male group of witnesses to parallel the females. Probably he means us to think of Jesus' friends in Jerusalem or His relatives. It seems likely that Luke would have used the term 'the Apostles' or 'the Twelve' (now Eleven) if he meant them by this phrase.[421]

Where were these mourning women standing? The Synoptics use the phrase ἀπὸ μακρόθεν while the Fourth Evangelist uses παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ (with the impersonal object in the dative, which is unknown elsewhere in the NT). The preposition the Fourth Evangelist uses literally means 'near' or 'beside', but one is not able to determine exactly how near.[422] In this case it must mean within hearing as well as

seeing range. On the other hand, the phrase ἀπὸ μακρόθεν normally would mean from a distance, though again the phrase is not exact and in the Synoptics must mean within eyesight. Some of those who stood far off could have made their way to the cross. Perhaps this whole dilemma is one created by a failure to recognize that Ps 37.12 (LXX) likely stands in the background here, in which case, the phrase ἀπὸ μακρόθεν should not be taken as a literal description of their historical position. Luke especially appears to be under the influence of this OT verse which may in itself explain his reference to οἱ γνωστοὶ (cf. Ps 37.12 LXX - οἱ ἐγγιστα).[423] As we noted earlier, there probably is rabbinic support for the idea that crucified men sometimes were surrounded by relatives and friends.[424] Thus, the Johannine description cannot be considered implausible and the Synoptic one cannot be assumed to be intended as a precise historical statement.

In Mark, we have the following women listed: Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James the Little and Joses, and Salome;[425] in Matthew: Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joseph, and the mother of the sons of Zebedee. In Luke, we have no specific list; however, the Third Evangelist may have intended us to recall the list of those whom Jesus helped or healed in Lk 8.1-3, or planned for the reader to find out their names in 24.10. The former is perhaps more likely since he says these women at the cross are those who had followed Jesus from Galilee.[426] In John, we appear to have four women listed: Jesus' mother, the sister of Jesus' mother, Mary of Clopas, and Mary of Magdala. Even though the First Evangelist is almost certainly following Mark, it is not certain whether he has omitted Salome's name and replaced it with another, or if he identifies Salome and the mother of the Zebedees. Again, while Mary of Clopas may be the mother of James and Joseph,[427] it may also be that these are two different people and to simply assume their identity is overly harmonistic. This is especially so if Mark is correct that there were "many other women" present. Luke, if he means us to refer back to 8.1-3 has the additional names of Joanna and Susanna. If he means us to refer to 24.10, then he probably adds but one name, Joanna, who was perhaps important to Luke as one of his sources of information. It is striking that all four Gospels agree in listing Mary of Magdala and it appears likely that Mk 15.40, Mt 27.56, Lk 24.10 share at least two names in common. The Fourth Evangelist has special reason to list Jesus' mother, and it is strange that she is omitted in the

Synoptics if she was actually present. Nevertheless, we have argued previously that the reference to her in Jn 19.25 may well be historical, especially if Jn 19.27b is, and since some explanation must be given for her presence in the Church (cf. Ac 1.14). In any event, the mention of various women by name indicates their importance in the eyes of the Evangelists and early Church and argues strongly for the view that historically at least some of these women (Mary Magdalene and another Mary, not Jesus' mother) must have played a crucial role in the Passion and Resurrection events.

The Synoptic lists are arranged perhaps in order of importance or familiarity both in relation to the Gospel writer and to his audience.[428] In every instance in the Gospels where women followers of Jesus are mentioned, Mary Magdalene's name is placed first (except in Jn 19.25 where there is a special interest in Jesus' mother).[429] Mary Magdalene's first place was not only because of her loyalty to Jesus or notable service, but also (and perhaps primarily) because of her witness about the risen Lord. These particular lists of those at the crucifixion may be more like that in 1 Cor 15.5-8 than is sometimes thought.[430] They may be lists of those who saw and witnessed about the risen Lord. Each of the Synoptic accounts refers to the fact that they witnessed the crucifixion,[431] and the First Evangelist and Mark refer to these women's service specifically to Jesus (διηκόνουν, Mk 15.41, Mt 27.55) a fact noted earlier in Lk 8.3 (though there the Twelve are also among those served), and thus not repeated by Luke here. In addition, all three accounts speak of these women as followers of Jesus. In Mark we are told they ἠκολούθουν Him when He was <u>in</u> Galilee. The First Evangelist says they ἠκολούθησαν Jesus <u>from</u> Galilee, while Luke says they συνακολουθοῦσαι Him <u>from</u> Galilee. Let us examine the Marcan account first.

David Flusser notes an intentional contrast in the Marcan account between those who represent the Christian community and those who reject Jesus: "...all the 'non-Christian' Jews are enemies of Jesus, and as followers there are only the Christian women from Galilee (and the centurion)."[432] Thus, Mark wishes to show that except for His women followers, Jesus died amidst a host of enemies.[433] Mark distinguishes between those women who followed Jesus when He was in Galilee, and many other women (ἄλλαι πολλαί) who came up with Jesus into Jerusalem. The long-time women followers of Jesus probably are referred to in the former category. It may be that the latter was simply a group of women who came up with Jesus into Jerusalem (but cf. Ac 13.31).

Alternatively, these may be Jesus' women followers from Judea. The discipleship status of the named women is likely indicated by Mark in three ways: they are said 1) to be witnesses of the most crucial events in Jesus' life (θεωροῦσαι); 2) to have served Jesus (διηκόνουν - note this is said only of the women in Mk 15.40-41a); and 3) to have followed Him (ἠκολούθουν). The reason why Mark does not use the word μαθητής of any of these women may be because usually he reserves this word for the official witnesses or inner circle of Jesus, i.e., the Twelve.[434] We conclude that Mark intends us to understand that the named women are disciples of long standing, even while Jesus was in Galilee.[435] Thus, they are prepared to be reliable witnesses to the events beginning with the Crucifixion.

In the Fourth Gospel we noted that the Beloved Disciple and Mary at the cross are representative male and female disciples. In Luke we note that ὁρῶσαι is feminine and has the women as its antecedent, in which case there is a stress on women as the witnesses. Further, it is the women alone of whom it is said αἱ συνακολουθοῦσαι αὐτῷ in Lk 23.49. Bauer says that 'follow' here has the connotation of being a disciple.[436] While this verb's other uses in the Gospels (cf. Mk 5.37, 14.51) do not appear to have theological overtones, and as the simple form of this verb is that which usually is used of following a disciple,[437] the conjunction here of 'following' and 'witnessing' probably indicates that Luke is intending συνακολουθέω to have theological overtones. Further, if we compare this 'from Galilee' phrase to Ac 1.21-22 (cf. Jn 15.26-27), then it may be that 'from Galilee' in itself is intended to accredit and authenticate the witness of the women to the empty tomb and the message about the risen Lord in Matthew and Luke. If they followed Jesus 'from Galilee', then they were in a position to remember His words and appearance so that they could relate what they were hearing and seeing now to what they had known before. Thus, the change of Mark's ἐν to ἀπὸ in Luke and Matthew may be motivated by an attempt to indicate the women's credentials. In Matthew as in Mark, we have three verbs, at least two of which refer to what disciples do or ought to do - 'watch' Him ('look on'), 'serve' Him, and 'follow' Him. The First Evangelist is unambiguous in that he ascribes these things only to the women (no men are mentioned). Further, he says that these women followed Jesus serving him (διακονοῦσαι αὐτῷ, cf. Mk 15.40-41) perhaps implying that there was a history and a personal relationship behind this grateful service.[438] Thus, some women in the Synoptics are depicted as faithful disciples

of long standing who are being prepared to bear witness to the things they began to see and take part in at this time. In John, Mary is portrayed as one who witnessed Jesus' death and was ushered into the community of faith, thus becoming a full-fledged disciple. The portrait, though perhaps in many regards an 'ideal' one, nonetheless indicates that all four Evangelists at this juncture were concerned to portray the women as disciples who had prior contacts with Jesus. That the women followers (save Jesus' mother) are specifically named and the men are basically anonymous (or go unmentioned) may be the Gospel writers' testimony to who had the more crucial roles and parts in the events of the last days of Jesus' earthly life.

3. The First Visit to the Tomb, the Burial - Mk 15.42-47 (Mt 27.57-61; Lk 23.50-56).

The narrative about Jesus' burial, as Taylor says, "belongs to the best tradition".[439] Bultmann claims that apart from vv 44-45, 47 it makes no legendary impression.[440] But v 47 is not likely a later addition because the tendency of the tradition in regard to these events was not to add women as witnesses but rather to upgrade the discipleship status of Joseph (cf. Mk 15.43, Mt 27.57, Jn 19.38) and thus provide a male witness at the crucial points.[441] Further, if one allows that the women witnessed the crucifixion and some went to the tomb on Easter morning, one must posit that they found out by some means where Jesus was buried. It is quite believable that they would have followed Joseph to the grave. We may thus examine this narrative with relative certainty that it gives us historical information about the women's part in these events.

Even though the Synoptic Gospels all refer to it, studies of the women's part in the climactic events of Jesus' earthly career often overlook the fact that His female followers made more than one trip to His tomb.[442] It was the custom for relatives or close friends or disciples (in the case of a well-known teacher, cf. Mk 6.29) to request the body of their beloved when he had been executed by the Roman government.[443] That this does not happen in Jesus' case is probably a clear indication that neither the Eleven nor Jesus' relatives were present after His death.[444]

The women themselves did not bring Jesus' body to the tomb; in fact, it is not clear when the women reached the tomb in comparison to the time of Joseph of Arimathea's arrival. C. Masson points out that the perfect τέθειται in Mk 15.47 probably indicates that they arrived after the actual entombment was completed.[445] Though Joseph may have had a few hours to make preparations while Jesus was dying,

the actual burial process was likely a hasty operation, so that all would be completed by the evening when the Sabbath began.[446] Thus, it is plausible these women deduced that because of the haste involved, Joseph probably had not been able to do the task properly. It is also possible that the women wished to perform their own final act of devotion regardless of what had been done already. They may have wished to fill the tomb with sweet spices (since embalming was not a Jewish practice), or to place the spices in the winding sheet to retard decay and cover the odor.[447] In any case, their intended devotion is in contrast to the malignity of those men who had brought about Jesus' death (the chief priests, Pharisees, etc.).[448]

Mark, followed by the First Evangelist, informs us that two women went to the tomb on the day Jesus died. Mark mentions Mary Magdalene and Μαρία ἡ Ἰωσῆτος,[449] while the First Evangelist has Mary Magdalene and "the other Mary".[450] Probably, we are to see "the other Mary" as the one listed second in Mt 27.56 - the mother of James and Joseph. Luke refers in general, as in 23.49, to the women who had accompanied Jesus from Galilee.[451]

The reason for recording this incident is made explicit in Mark. It is because the women witnessed where He was laid. The First Evangelist implies as much, but Luke has altered the Marcan account in a way that reflects an interest in showing that Jesus' body was properly cared for. Mark uses the same word for the witnessing or observing as he did in 15.40 (here ἐθεώρουν). The women were the validating eye-witnesses of the tradition that Jesus actually had died and been buried.[452] The Eleven were not even there to see His death and burial. In view of the general attitudes of Jewish, Roman, and Greek men toward women's testimony, it is virtually certain that no Gospel writer would have invented such a dependence on the word of women.[453] There was apparently some confusion in the tradition as to when the women prepared the spices to take to the tomb, and it serves no purpose to speculate on the matter. It is sufficient to say that they brought prepared spices to the tomb on Easter morning.

It is, however, interesting that only Luke mentions explicitly the women's observance of the Sabbath. Thus, he wished to remind his audience that in these events we are still involved in the old dispensation. The women are loyal both to Jesus and to the old order - and follow both to the end. If, as is likely, Luke is correct in stating this, then the observance of the Sabbath prevented the women from being at the tomb when Jesus passed from death to new life.

It limited their activities of preparation and of travel.[454] That these women obeyed the commandment is mentioned by Luke to indicate to his audience that they were not rebels but pious Jews devoted to the Scriptures. Thus, he intimates that their witness could be trusted as reliable.[455] If so, then we see another instance of Luke's special efforts to give women and their faith and witness prominence. Nevertheless, we must remember that these women expected to find Jesus where they had last seen Him. There is no indication that they anticipated the Resurrection. What they found on Easter morning came as a complete surprise.[456]

4. The Second Visit to the Tomb, the Resurrection Narratives

E. L. Bode states, "The only Easter event narrated by all four evangelists concerns the visit of the women to the tomb of Jesus."[457] This observation indicates that all four Gospel writers saw this event as essential to their Resurrection narratives. For the sake of clarity, and to prevent conflation of texts, we will treat each account separately.

a. Mark 16

The Marcan account of the women's second visit to the tomb unfortunately is replete with textual, exegetical, traditio-historical, and theological difficulties. The textual problems are the least grave and will be treated first. Despite the arguments of W. R. Farmer, reviving the view of J. W. Burgon,[458] it is not likely that Mk 16.9-20 was the original intended conclusion of the second Gospel for the following reasons: 1) While Farmer's theory about Alexandrian theological editing is plausible as an explanation of the omission in ℵ and B, his attempt to explain the omission it it^{k}, syr^{s}, arm^{mss}, geo^{1}, ^{A}, and others, in the same fashion is built on a tenuous assumption about the interdependence of these manuscripts because of the travels and influences of Origen. 2) Farmer's view fails to explain adequately how it was that the best witnesses and version in various geographical areas happen not to have these verses (cf. syr^{s}, only similar to B in its omission of 16.9-20), while it is mainly the secondary or tertiary witnesses (except in the West) that include these verses. 3) The further one gets from the probable places of origin of our earliest Greek NT manuscripts (Egypt, Palestine), the more unanimous is the testimony for inclusion (i.e., the authorities for Italy and Gaul are the strongest and most unanimous witnesses for

the inclusion). 4) The evidence of the shorter ending argues strongly against the longer ending.[459] 5) There are too many non-Marcan phrases and too many reminiscences of other Gospel accounts to maintain the Marcan nature of 16.9-20.[460] It appears that 16.9-20 was not originally composed to follow 16.8, but is a mosaic of other Gospel narratives of the Resurrection appearances and other accounts adapted and added here to finish the story.[461] Before we are able to discuss whether or not 16.8 was Mark's intended ending, we must discuss the problems of history and tradition involved in this pericope.

Mk 16.1-8, as the reiteration of the names of the women at 16.1 with slight differences from 15.40 and 47 likely indicates, appears to be a tradition that came to Mark independently of the material that precedes it on Jesus' death and burial.[462] The material presents the scholar with considerable difficulties. It is alleged that vv 7 and 8 contradict each other and thus some scholars contend that v 7, based on 14.28, is Mark's redactional insert.[463] Further, it is contended that the miraculous rolling away of the stone is clearly legendary as is the angelophany.[464] It has also been maintained that the trembling and astonishment of the women is the stock response to revelation in Mark, and that the women's silence is probably apologetic in nature, i.e, it was added to explain why the empty tomb tradition arose relatively late in comparison to the appearance traditions.[465] Finally, the women's intention to anoint Jesus is considered suspect since Jesus' body would have already begun to decay and since Joseph had probably performed this task before burial.

Examining these arguments in reverse order, the last objection to the historicity of this narrative is not sound as our discussion of Jesus' burial indicated.[466] The strong desire to perform an act of devotion could easily account for the women's actions, whatever the state of Jesus' body or the amount of Joseph's preparations. Further, Fuller admits that the suggestion that the women's silence is an apologetic motif is "altogether too modern and rationalistic an explanation".[467] But could the silence be intended to illustrate "...that the official witness is independent of the questionable meaning of the empty tomb?"[468] This seems unlikely since in v 6 the Evangelist allows a linkage of the two traditions (the empty tomb, and the risen Jesus; cf., "he is not here, he is risen"), and he stresses the absence of the body (6c), and if one interprets the women's silence as absolute, it involves the Good News about the Resurrection just as much as it does the empty tomb. It is best to

interpret the silence in the manner the Evangelist suggests - whatever the women experienced on Easter morning, it frightened them enough to silence them at least for a time ("they said nothing...for they were afraid"). Nor do we likely have here an attempt to disparage the witness of women or disassociate the Christian message from their witness - this could only be maintained if Mark ended his narrative at 16.8 which, as we will argue, is unlikely. In fact, if v 7 is Mark's addition to the narrative, he makes the women emissaries of God and bearers of the Good Tidings.

It is quite probable that Mark has heightened the tension of this narrative by adding words indicating fear and wonder (cf. 5b, 8a) but let us suppose for a moment that the women had encountered unexpectedly a supernatural being or even an empty tomb. The reaction of fright would be normal when faced with these sights. Thus, it seems that the reaction in v 8b, even if only to an empty tomb, should not be dismissed as a stock feature though the reaction in vv 5b and 8a may be interpreted in this way.

Before considering the possible contradiction between vv 7 and 8, a few words about the angelophany are necessary. Visions of supernatural beings are recorded in various places in the OT and NT, and it is difficult to dismiss them all as purely legendary (cf. Is 6. 1-4). The encounter of man with the supernatural is, to a large degree, the theme of the Bible, and one must maintain anti-supernatural presuppositions to argue that all of these encounters are unhistorical. While the historian will not be able to explain such phenomena in terms of purely natural causes, it is questionable whether or not it is right for the historian to so define what can be historical that supernatural occurrences are ruled out from the start. It is not his task to define what can happen, but to relate and explain what did, whatever the ramifications for his presuppositions. Thus, if we do not dismiss this angelophany as fictitious or legendary, it is not because we are not aware that there are legendary narratives of this sort, but because in this case such an encounter seems to best explain the actions and reactions of those involved in these matters. There is little in this narrative that looks like a legendary embellishment apart from perhaps the miraculous rolling away of the stone. The Resurrection event is not described as in later apocryphal accounts, the angel's appearance is not mentioned, and his attire is described in the simplest of terms (v 5, contrast Mt 28.3, Lk 24.4).

The women's reaction has probably been somewhat enhanced but not as we find it in Lk 24.5. It would seem that the women's reaction (fear and flight) is best explained if they at least encountered an empty tomb and possibly also something else.

Quite apart from the Marcan account there was apparently an early tradition that spoke of women (or a woman) experiencing an angelic vision (cf. Lk 24.23) as well as the empty tomb, and involved in that vision was a simple message - Jesus was not dead but alive (Lk 24.23b) or if, as is likely, the Marcan form is more original, "he is risen, he is not here". Perhaps Mark has expanded this message to include more of the kerygma (6a, 6c?).[469] What then are we to make of v 7? It can be seen as a Marcan insert as it includes the Marcan 'going forth to Galilee' motif (14.28), and Peter figures prominently in Mark. But speaking purely in terms of Marcan logic, why would he insert a verse that appears to contradict his very next statement (v 8)? The verse should make sense in its present context, and it would if the Marcan account went on to narrate the women reporting to the disciples what they experienced. Thus, while the original form of the tradition may well have not included v 7, because Mark's narrative probably went on to speak of the women's report and one or more appearances of Jesus, the Evangelist saw no conflict between vv 7 and 8. The nucleus then of the Marcan narrative (vv 1-2, 5, 6b, 8a, c) is probably of historical value for it is unlikely that Mark, who wished to include the empty tomb as part of the Christian message (cf. vv 6b, c), would have invented female witnesses to support the idea, or added a legendary angelophany to heighten the fright of his witnesses and thus make their witness suspect.[470]

Now we may discuss whether or not Mk 16.8 was the intended ending of the second Gospel. In the past thirty years there has been a trend among NT scholars to answer in the affirmative. The objection that grammatically it is unlikely that anyone would end a work, much less a Gospel, with ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ has been shown by several scholars to have little weight. Cadbury is able to provide clear examples from the papyri that ending a sentence, paragraph, or work with γάρ is not unknown or even irregular.[471] It seems probable, however that if Mark had intended to conclude at this point he would have used a verb in the aorist, rather than the imperfect which suggests something more was intended.[472] Another difficulty arises over the meaning of this concluding verb. Apparently, this verb involves an element of fright or terror. Against this it has been argued that this verb

may refer to reverential awe, rather than fear of a negative sort. Various studies of Mark's usage of these verbs of fear have concluded that what he intends is to indicate the natural and normal reaction to the supernatural, especially when it breaks in unexpectedly (cf. Mk 5.42, 9.26).[473] Mark, however, is capable of using the verbs of fear and amazement in perfectly ordinary ways, and one could just as well argue that the usage in 11.18 (ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ αὐτόν, πᾶς γὰρ ὁ ὄχλος ἐξεπλήσσετο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ) gives us our closest parallel to the usage in 16.8. Further, the view held by Lightfoot and others fails to deal with the two γάρs in Mk 16.8. In the first place, we are told they fled from the tomb for trembling and astonishment (or bewilderment) took hold of them.[474] Secondly, we are told they said nothing to anyone for they were afraid. We must ask whether or not Mark is saying that reverential awe led the women to flee from the tomb? Further, while on one level silence and a reverential awe in the face of mystery might be a sufficient and appropriate response to a miraculous act of God, in this case silence is not golden for we are now on the other side of the Resurrection and keeping the Messianic secret is no longer the order of the day (cf. 9.9).[475] Even the arguments that Mark's Gospel begins equally abruptly, and that he is recording only the beginning of the Gospel in this volume do not account sufficiently for the reactions of the women recorded in v 8.[476] Mark's work begins abruptly, but it begins with the Gospel and we have every reason to expect it to end with the Gospel, even if abruptly. The appearances of the risen Lord are crucial extensions of the Resurrection so far as the Church is concerned, for it is these appearances which were responsible ultimately for the regathering of Jesus' followers. It is unlikely that Mark, writing to the Christian community, would fail to reaffirm that it was the risen Jesus Himself who was responsible for the foundation and existence of that community. Finally, the view of Lightfoot and others fails to answer why, as early as the first half of the second century, someone felt compelled to add a long ending to Mk 16.8, and someone else (perhaps later) added a shorter ending where our Gospel apparently breaks off.[477] Thus, it seems unlikely that Mk 16.8 was the original ending of the second Gospel.[478]

Thus, either Mark's original ending is lost without a trace, or perhaps there are traces of it even in the NT. The former view is probably a counsel of despair, since Matthew and Luke were dependent

on Mark and all go on to relate Resurrection appearances as does Acts 1.[479] A. E. Haefner has suggested that Ac 1.13, 14, and 3.1-11 constitute the original conclusion of Mark's Gospel;[480] however, under his scheme, we still have no account of any Resurrection appearances. An older and more probable conjecture is that of E. J. Goodspeed who points out correctly that Matthew, unlike Luke, takes over virtually everything he finds in Mark.[481] This in itself is an argument against Haefner's view. In Matthew, unlike Luke, we have the 'going forth into Galilee' motif so prominent at the end of Mark's Gospel (14.28, 16.7). Further, in Matthew "...in the reference to the 'mountain where Jesus had appointed them' there seems to lurk some allusions to the story of the Transfiguration for which Mark is demonstrably Matthew's source."[482] Taking into account the unique material which the First Evangelist incorporated into the Marcan narrative (i.e., the bribing of the watch, 28.11-15), we note that Mt 28.9-10 and 16-20 form what could be a natural conclusion to Mark's Gospel. Mt 28.9-10, 16-20 implies that the women reported what they saw, brings to light the Galilean appearance promised in Mk 14.28 and 16.7, and contains the recommissioning of the Twelve intimated in the pre-Resurrection narrative of Mark and Matthew. Thus, perhaps the original conclusion of Mark's Gospel can be found in Matthew. We can now examine what Mk 16.1-8 relates about women and their roles in the events at the tomb.

Mark's Resurrection narrative begins by telling us that Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome brought spices the day after the Sabbath in order to anoint Jesus. At some point in the in the early hours of the following morning (the first day of the week) the women departed for the tomb.[483] That the women bring spices to the tomb indicates that there was no question in their mind that Jesus was dead. They had come to perform a devotional anointment, not to receive a revelation.[484] None of the Gospels record that anyone saw the Resurrection, though various disciples are reported to have seen the risen Lord later. Mark, however, wishes to indicate that before anyone claimed to see the risen Lord, the word came that He had triumphed over the grave. We will not pause to dwell on the Marcan kerygmatic formulation of the angel's message except to say that Mark is attempting to indicate continuity between the earthly and the risen Jesus, and to confirm the value of the empty tomb tradition. It was this same Jesus who was born in Nazareth and died on a cross that was

now risen and now went before them into Galilee. Confirmation of this truth comes by inspecting the empty tomb. This was the real value of the empty tomb. Apart from the word of revelation, the empty tomb was open to various interpretations, not all of them positive (cf. Jn 20.13). But as a confirmation of or witness to the truth of the word that Jesus was risen, it was an important fact. In many studies of Mk 16.1-8 the importance of the conjunction of the angel's word and the empty tomb is minimized or overlooked. What is significant for our subject is that the women were not simply eye-witnesses of an empty tomb that, taken in isolation, was ambiguous. Indeed, first they were ear-witnesses of the Easter message which gave them the key to a proper interpretation of the empty tomb. Thus, the women had both heard and seen. They could testify not only to an empty tomb but also to a risen Jesus.

Mark's addition of the commission was perhaps an attempt to circumscribe the role the women played in these affairs. The Evangelist claims that their task was specific and limited - they should go and proclaim the truth to Jesus' disciples and especially to Peter, or, better said, convey a command (which is perhaps in Mark's eyes not the same as preaching or teaching).[487] In Mark's scheme the key purpose of the women's commission was to restore and to reinstate the Apostles so that they could become the authoritative witnesses to the world.[488] The women's reaction to the angel's words was to flee from the tomb (v 8). We concluded earlier that Mk 16.8, though not the original ending, is the last authentic verse in the Marcan account. Thus, too much should not be built on the words καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπαν, ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ.[489] If Mk 16.8 was the original conclusion, then Mark intended to reveal the women's lack of understanding and at least temporary disobedience as a climax to his Gospel, but this can hardly be called a climax or a model post-Easter reaction to the Gospel. All that Mark carefully builds from the crucifixion, to the burial, to the empty tomb in regard to the women's important witness of these events is called into question. This makes it unlikely that Mk 16.8 is the intended conclusion. Mark cannot have wished to destroy in one final event what he created in a sequence of three key events from 15.40 on.[490] Thus, while recognizing that these women were badly frightened by the occurrence at the tomb, καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπαν, ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ probably did not imply a total and eternal silence of these women in disobedience to the angel's command. Rather, it was their immediate and instinctive reaction. If we note the

parallel construction in v 8,[491] then it is possible that Mark intends us to relate the two sentences which each follow καὶ as well as the two γάρ clauses. The implication would be that for the circumscribed period of time while the women fled from the tomb, they said nothing to anyone. The limitation on the period of silence is especially likely if this remark was originally parenthetical and the story continued.[492]

What can we deduce about women and their roles from this passage? The women went to the tomb to perform a role that was traditionally theirs - anointing of a corpse. In the Marcan redaction, they left the tomb charged with performing a most untraditional role - relating to Jesus' disciples the angel's Easter message and, by implication, the angel's command to go to Galilee. Did Mark intend to provide a precedent for Christian women to instruct even an all male audience? Put in a different way, is Mark claiming that the circumstances of salvation history are such that they bring about the reversal Jesus preached - the first become last, and the last, first? We noted before that Mark says there were women witnesses to the three crucial events later confessed in the Creeds - death, burial, and, by revelation and implication of the empty tomb, the Resurrection. E. Dhanis has shown that Mark's narrative of these three events is bound together and given continuity by the triple mention of these women whose witness validated each event. Mark thus reveals that these women are the foundation of the confession of the first three articles of the traditional creed (cf. 1 Cor 15.3-4).[493] This contention is supported by noting how Mark's narrative reveals a correspondence between the angel's words and the women's witnessing - "You seek Jesus the Nazarene (cf. 15.41 - they followed Him in Galilee), the crucified one," (cf. 15.40 - the women witnessed the crucifixion). It is possible that Mark went on to make clear that the women received a reassuring appearance of Jesus before they could properly carry out their task (cf. below on Mt 28.9-10). Further, as Catchpole says,

> ...Mark 16.7 and 8b do not have to be related as command and disobedience to command, but as command and an obedience which brings the message to certain specified persons while at the same time realizing correctly that the public at large are not meant to be brought within its scope. Of course this indicates indirectly that disclosure to the world at large is going to happen by means of the preaching of the disciples rather than through the women. (494)

Thus, while Mark likely intends this passage to give a precedent for women to bear witness to the Easter events, and affirms the worth of women witnessing to men, even the male leaders of the community (Peter especially is mentioned), at the same time the commission given to them reaffirms these women's subordinate position in relation to the Apostles. The women's witness is an indispensable foundation for the Gospel tradition, but the Apostles are the official witnesses to the world. In this Mark seems to be following the example of Jesus by not only presenting women with new and liberating roles, but also reaffirming the male headship pattern for Jesus' new community.

b. Matthew 28

Since in all probability the First Evangelist is dependent on his Marcan source for information about the empty tomb (except for the material about the sealing and guarding of the tomb, added for apologetic reasons) our task in this section is to note how the First Evangelist has modified his source in ways that affect his portrayal of the women. We will not be arguing that he added any historical material to his empty tomb narrative, but that he has passed on the historical nucleus he found in Mark with modification. We will, however examine Mt 28.9-10 to see if it has historical value.

While Mark mentions three women coming to the tomb, the First Evangelist mentions only two. Fuller suggests that this modification is made in order to be more consistent than his source,[495] for Mark goes from three to two and back to three in 15.40, 47, and 16.1.[496] The First Evangelist also mentions three women at the cross, though only two at the burial and tomb. In Matthew we are told that the women go to see the tomb; there is no mention of spices or intention to anoint. It is argued that this change is due to the insertion of the sealing of the tomb.[497] While this is a plausible explanation of why the First Evangelist might omit the anointing motif, it does not fully explain why he includes the 'seeing'. Perhaps the best explanation of the presence of the 'seeing' motif is given by F. Neirynck who argues that this verse serves as a title to this section - the witnessing of the women. This accords with the First Evangelist's use of θεωρέω in 27.55 (cf. Mk 15.47, 16.4), and it also makes sense in view of the role the women are about to be assigned. The Evangelist is suggesting that seen from the point of view of God's providential plan, the women come 'to witness' the empty tomb and go forth to

witness about it, whatever their own original intentions might have been.[498] If Neirynck is correct, then it likely rules out the view that the Evangelist intended us to think that the women witnessed the opening of the tomb (and thus the Resurrection?).[499]

The First Evangelist has modified his source so that the 'young man' has become the 'angel of the Lord' (cf. 1.20, 2.13, 19). Has this modification been made to suggest that in this appearance of the angel of the Lord we have a theophany, not just an angelophany? The lack of a definite article before angel, the mention of lightning (cf. Dan 10.6), the phrase 'white as snow' (cf. Dan 7.9), and the angel's words, "I have told you" (cf. Josh 5.14-15) are thought to point in this direction. The point would be that Mt 28.2-7 described in symbolic terms the Resurrection and its proof - the empty tomb.[500] The difficulty is that it is hard to see the purpose of Mt 28.9-10 if 28.2-7 is theophanic. Further, why does the angelophany not produce worship in the women as does the Christophany? Probably, the Evangelist does not want to hint that anyone saw the Resurrection save the angel, and that through the angel's words and the empty tomb the women learn of the Resurrection.

The angel's address to the women begins abruptly (note the guards alone have been mentioned in v 4), because the First Evangelist has incorporated his guard story into the Marcan narrative. The following differences between the Matthean and Marcan account of the angel's message are of significance to this study: 1) the First Evangelist places no stress on the women's developing reactions to the events, reserving his comments on their feelings to one place after the angel's message. He, as elsewhere, avoids Mark's wonder or astonishment vocabulary, leaving out Mark's μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε and substituting μὴ φοβεῖσθε ὑμεῖς. 2) The ὑμεῖς is emphatic and brings out the fact that the women, perhaps in contrast to the guards, have no reason to be afraid.[501] 3) In Matthew, the angel not only tells the women what he knows of their intention (as in Mark), but also that he knows of it (οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι). 4) The command to tell Peter in particular is omitted. 5) There is an addition of καθὼς εἶπεν after "He is risen" stressing that Jesus foretold it. Later, after the statement about Galilee, Matthew has ἰδοὺ εἶπον ὑμῖν instead of Mark's καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν (Mt 28.7 - Mk 16.7). The angel thus speaks on its own authority in Matthew to some degree. Is there some hint here that the women are not merely messengers of but intended recipients of

the Resurrection proclamation? 5) The women are told to go quickly (ταχὺ, v 7) to tell the disciples and they do so (v 8). Thus, their complete obedience is made clear. This is a non-Marcan feature. 7) In Matthew, part of the message the women are to take to the disciples is ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν (not mentioned in Mark directly as part of what they are to say). The women are to proclaim the Resurrection as well as where the risen Jesus can be seen. Further, if ὅτι in Mt 28.7 is recitative (as it seems to be in Mk 16.7), then there is no contradiction between a promise that Jesus will be seen in Galilee and the fact that He is seen by the women in Jerusalem. The appearance promised in Galilee is a promise for the Eleven alone. The women are given no clear indication that they too will see Him. The First Evangelist, unlike Mark, seems to suggest that to hear that He is risen is sufficient for them, for they have been faithful through these Passion and Resurrection events. The Eleven, however, needed more. If we are correct in seeing part of Mark's lost ending in Mt 28.9-10,[502] this favors the view that the ὅτι in Mark is also recitative and there is a clear distinction in both Matthew and Mark between promise and authoritative appearance to the Eleven in Galilee, and surprise appearance to the women alone in Jerusalem. Is there any historical basis for such a distinction?

Thus far, we have been discussing the narrative as a literary unit in comparison with Mark's pericope, trying to discover the logic of the material and its internal consistency in its present form. We suggested in the previous section that Mk 16.7 was an insert by Mark into his source but did not at that time try to make a decision as to whether it was purely a theological addition (the 'going forth to Galilee' motif) or whether it had some historical basis. On one level, if the Galilean setting is a Marcan theological creation, then it solves various problems. The First Evangelist is simply following Mark at this point and so his is not an independent witness for the Galilean setting. This could open the door for the suggestion that historically the appearances took place in the Jerusalem area. This would certainly comport with Luke's Resurrection narratives and John 20, and it could be argued that Mt 28.9-10 is also an indication of knowledge of Jerusalem appearances. If this argument is correct, then it would likely support the view that the appearance to the women (or at least a woman) in Jerusalem was not a later invention intended to give validity to the women's empty tomb/Resurrection message report. The difficulty with this view is Jn 21.1.

Could there then have been some historical tradition behind Mk 16.7? The mention of Peter's name would seem to support this view (cf. 1 Cor 15.5, Lk 24.34)[503] as does the likely independent testimony to a Galilean setting in John 21. Perhaps the least inadequate solution to this dilemma is to suggest that there was after all an historical tradition that some appearances to the official witnesses took place in Galilee, though there were also separate traditions that spoke of a surprise appearance to one or some of the women in Jerusalem that was likely the first appearance of Jesus to anyone. Thus, the First Evangelist, likely following Mark at 28.9-10, 16-20, supports appearances in two different settings. We conclude that Mk 16.7, though a Marcan formulation and insertion into his source, was likely based on some historical information which he may have derived from another source, possibly Peter himself.

The reaction of the women to the angel's words in Matthew is both similar to and different from Mark's account. In both, the women leave the tomb rapidly, but the First Evangelist adds ταχὺ and omits ἔφυγον. He tells us the women left <u>with</u> fear and great joy, not <u>because</u> of it. This modification of Mark is perhaps made in light of what is to follow in vv 9-10 and is an attempt to soften, if not eliminate, Mark's negative tone. The First Evangelist intends us to think that the women's emotions are mixed and their running is not only out of fear of their experience at the tomb, but also from a desire to ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ (v 8). The First Evangelist omits entirely the silence due to fear which we find in Mk 16.8, and thus we have a much more positive portrayal of the women in this angelophany than in Mark's, and the women's role seems to be more significant in Matthew than in Mark. In Matthew, we are told directly that the women must say that Jesus is risen from the dead.

It is necessary at this point to assess the historical value of the tradition in Mt 28.9-10 since it is material that we do not find in the <u>present</u> form of Mark, and since it has notable parallels to material found in John 20. We must first consider the possibility that this Christophany to the women is a doublet of the angelophany.[504] It is argued that in the Matthean outline the women were going to tell the disciples anyway, that they are rejoicing greatly and needed no reassurance, and that Jesus' appearance to them is superfluous. It is seen as a Matthean attempt to link closely the empty tomb and Resurrection appearance traditions.[505] This last suggestion overlooks

the fact that this appearance does not take place at the tomb as 28.8 clearly implies, and in fact we are not told its location at all.[506] The link between the empty tomb and the appearances already exists in the revelation and command in 28.6-7 and the women's obedience to it in 28.8. Why would the First Evangelist, who puts considerable stress on Peter and the Twelve (who were to be the official witnesses), create a narrative making women the first to see the risen Lord, especially if he had some of Jewish extraction in his audience? It is obvious from 27.62-66, 28.4, 11-15, that the Evangelist has apologetic aims and is sensitive to possible criticisms of the tradition he presents. The suggestion that Mt 28.9-10 is a doublet also fails to do justice to the following facts about this text: 1) κρατέω with the accusative is not typically Matthean;[507] 2) the First Evangelist tends to substitute an infinitive for the final ἵνα and thus the use of ἵνα here may indicate a source;[508] 3) the reaction of the women to meeting Jesus is different from their reaction to the encounter with the angel - they do not worship the angel, nor do they have to be commanded to come when Jesus appears; 4) That it is Jesus they meet, not just an angel, is a significant enough difference in the two accounts, even if all the other distinctions are ignored.[509] We thus conclude that Mt 28.9-10 is not a doublet of the angelophany. It is to be treated as an important narrative in its own right. This does not, of course, demonstrate the narrative's historical value but perhaps the following arguments will serve to show that the best explanation of the existence of this material is that it is based in historical fact: 1) it is not likely that the First Evangelist, Mark, or the early Christian community would invent an appearance to women considering how the world would view their witness; 2) it is also virtually inconceivable that any early Christian would invent a <u>first</u> appearance to the women because of the difficulties this would create in regard to Church authority and the guarantors of the tradition (cf. 1 Cor 15.3-8);[510] 3) it appears that in John 20 we have an independent account of this same tradition; 4) the tradition of 'on the third day' likely presupposes an appearance and/or empty tomb <u>on that day</u>;[511] 5) "Even the most skeptical historian has to posit an 'x'...to account for the complete change in the behavior of the disciples..."[512] Further, the cause must be adequate to explain the effect. It must explain not only the disciples' changed attitude but also the centrality of the Resurrection in the early Church's preaching.[513] It must explain why different and separate traditions existed - that different individuals

(Peter, Mary) and different groups (the Eleven, the 500) saw Jesus alive after His death. The supposition of a subjective vision or mental projection does not comport either with the facts just mentioned or with the recorded frame of mind of the disciples and the women prior to seeing Jesus. The record indicates that they were all grieving, being convinced that Jesus had passed away, and there is no hint that any expected the Resurrection. We thus conclude that the best explanation for what we find in at least Mt 28.9-10 and John 20 is that Jesus actually rose and appeared to a or some women in Jerusalem 'on the third day'. It could be maintained that appearances to the Eleven or James were devised to bolster the authority structure of the early Church. But there is no such plausible explanation of the appearances to the women. Insofar as the specific historical value of Mt 28.9-10 is concerned it will be maintained that the historical nucleus is: 1) the encounter; 2) possibly the clinging motif; 3) the charge to "tell my brothers". The last, if original, would not have been superfluous since Mk 16.7, though using historical material, was not likely a historical utterance but a Marcan formulation. At this point we must examine the women's reactions to meeting Jesus for the Evangelist presents their response as the only reaction in these Matthean post-Resurrection narratives that is completely exemplary for his audience.

There is a certain amount of contrast between the picture the First Evangelist paints of how the women react to Jesus' appearance (28.9-10), and how the male disciples react (28.16-17). When the women see Jesus, they eagerly grasp His feet and worship Him (28.9).[514] When Jesus appears to the men we are <u>not</u> told that they worship Him but that some have doubts (οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν, 28.17). This reversal can be recognized as part of a larger pattern when we see it in the following Matthean context: 1) the women receive the first appearance; and 2) it is only as a result of the women's testimony that the men go to Galilee and see Jesus.

What these women apparently needed was confirmation and reassurance of what they understood already, not a repetition of the angel's words that Jesus is risen. Perhaps in particular the Evangelist implies they needed to be confirmed in their surprising new task of 'instructing' the Eleven. This last suggestion is confirmed upon examination of the content of the words in 28.10. When the women see Jesus they approach Him and ἐκράτησαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας. This is similar to what we find in Jn 20.17; in fact, there are reasons for seeing Mt 28.9-10 and Jn 20.13-18 as two versions of the same story.[515]

While the First Evangelist may mention the grasping because of his apologetic concerns (i.e., it demonstrates to the women and the Evangelist's audience the physical reality of the risen Jesus) more likely we are to see this as an expression of the women's eager desire to be near to Jesus once again.[516] Elsewhere in Matthew, this gesture represents supplication (8.2, 9.18, 15.25, 18.26, 20.20), but here the women are not asking for help, they are giving adoration to their beloved Master (cf. Ac 10.25).[517] The women's response is instantaneous once they hear the Master's voice (possibly another indication that this is another form of John 20).[518] The word ἐκράτησαν is joined to προσεκύνησαν by a καί indicating that they are two coordinate activities.

The Evangelist does not have Jesus make a verbal effort to reassure them that He is risen; rather, the μὴ φοβεῖσθε in v 10 is followed by a reiteration of the women's task. It is that which the Evangelist indicates Jesus had to confirm to them. It is interesting that in Matthew we are not told how the women's words were received. Perhaps the Evangelist wished to spare the Eleven at this point, or did not wish to imply that the women's efforts went for nothing.

Having compared Mt 28.9-10 to 16-20, we saw that only the women followers of Jesus are portrayed as post-Resurrection models for the Evangelist's audience. Their devotion is sincere, their joy great, their obedience perfect. They worship Jesus. By contrast, there is no such outward expression of devotion by the men, but it is said that some of Jesus' chosen leaders doubted. In the reactions of these two groups we see a certain amount of male-female contrast. In the action of Jesus, the Evangelist presents male-female parallelism - He appears both to a group of female followers and to the male disciples (first the sisters, then the brothers). He gives a commission to both groups. In the difference of the commissions we see a pattern of male headship emerging. The women are given a crucial, but temporary, task in service to the community of disciples. They are told to leave Jesus and go to the disciples, and are authorized to instruct those who are already brethren. In the Matthean theological schema the men are given the permanent task and authority to make disciples and the promise of Jesus' continual presence. The commission of the women both affirms the women's new roles in the community ('instructing' the Eleven) and reaffirms the Eleven's headship role. Mt 28.16-20 makes explicit what was implicit in the commanding of the women to tell the disciples to go to Galilee (28.7, 10).

In conclusion the Matthean Resurrection narratives prove to be an interesting combination of motifs involving male and female disciples. On the one hand, we have a pattern of reversal in which the women are presented as better models of discipleship than the men, and the women, rather than the men, receive the first appearance of Jesus. Another part of this pattern of reversal is that the women assume the role normally allotted to men of instructing Jesus' male followers. On the other hand, the women's task is limited in nature and serves the purpose of reassembling the Eleven (and possibly others) so that they can be recommissioned as leaders of Jesus' Resurrection community and as evangelists given authority to make disciples of all nations. Thus, we see how both women's new roles and the headship of the male followers of Jesus can be affirmed in one breath by the First Evangelist. In Mt 28.1-10, we have the crucial and historically credible admission that the Church owed its testimony to the empty tomb to Jesus' women followers and that it was they who were surprised and blessed by Jesus' <u>first</u> post-Easter appearance.

c. <u>Luke 24</u>

Luke presents us with no new material so far as the historical role of women in the Resurrection events is concerned in comparison to Mark or the First Evangelist, but rather his own version of the empty tomb tradition, and there is no mention of an appearance to any woman. It is not certain whether Luke has drawn his empty tomb narrative from Mark with editorial modification,[519] or from a special source with additions from Mark.[520] On the whole it seems, in view of all the Lukan vocabulary and stylistic elements in our narrative, that the second option is the more likely. In any event we will be examining this material and its differences from the first two Gospels only to determine how Luke views these women's roles and not to argue for the historicity of any of the Lukan modifications or additions to the story, with the exception of the mention of Joanna in 24.10.

We have noted that Luke, more than the other Evangelists, gives special prominence to women and their roles. Thus, it is odd that, in his account of the women's witness at the cross and at the burial, he is less specific than the other Evangelists as to who was involved. Luke has, however, told us the two essential things we need to know about the women to prepare us for their Easter morning activities: 1) that they had followed Jesus from Galilee (23.49, 55); and 2) that

they had seen the tomb and how His body was laid in it (23.55).[521] This second detail, which may be a Lukan alteration of his source (cf. Mk 15.47), reflects a tendency to show concern for how Jesus' body was treated.[522] In the Lukan presentation of the matter, the women know where to look for the tomb, whom they were coming to mourn, and what He had prophesied about Himself (cf. 24.8). With this information, Luke prepares his audience for the role of witness that these unsuspecting women are about to assume.

The women come to the tomb bringing the spices they prepared (contrast Mk 16.1). By saying this, Luke links 24.1 with 23.56 and makes clear that the women's minds are on the past. They do not expect anything new to transpire now that Jesus is dead.[523] At this point, Luke gives us a somewhat parallel construction: εὗρον δὲ τὸν λίθον ἀποκεκυλισμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου εἰσελθοῦσαι δὲ οὐχ εὗρον τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.[524] In short, the women find that which they did not expect, and they did not find that which they were certain would be there. Luke has not mentioned the stone and he shows no concern with how it was rolled away. Further, Luke postpones the angelophany probably because he wishes to make the point that an uninterpreted empty tomb would not necessarily lead to faith in the risen Lord, indeed here he has the women react in quite the opposite manner (with doubt and perplexity). At this point Luke tells us that two men suddenly came upon them. In Luke's Gospel, the angels do not point out the empty tomb to the women.[525] It has been suggested that the two gleaming figures are meant to recall Luke's Transfiguration story (cf. 9.31) and to look forward to the Ascension (Ac 1.10).[526] If so, then it is significant that this scene is presented as a private revelation to a few women.[527] If the women's reaction to the empty tomb was bewilderment, then their reaction to the angelic appearance is even stronger. They are terrified (ἐμφόβων, 24.5) and bow down their faces to the ground. It is uncertain whether Luke has added this as a natural reaction to the gleaming countenance of the angels, or an act of fear or respect, or an act of worship.[528] It is not likely the last, though it may be intended as a sign of awe and respect for the supernatural. The angel's address to the women is the most problematic portion of the narrative. The variety of statements attributed to the angel(s) in the Gospels may indicate"...that the angelic message is a literary device to bring out the significance of the discovery, which the different Evangelists felt free to develop in different (and characteristic) ways."[529] If Luke is following Mark

at this point, he has felt at liberty to modify the Marcan account considerably to suit his own theological schema - focusing on Jerusalem.[530] The angels address the women in unison with a mildly rebuking question, "Why do you seek the living among the dead?"[531] This takes the place of Mark's "You seek Jesus", and the First Evangelist's, "I know that you seek Jesus." Thus, Luke presents the women in a more negative light at this point. The angels call the women to remember what Jesus had said to them while He was in Galilee. By this means, Luke implies they were with Him there and were taught these prophecies, for they were among His disciples.[532] The μνήσθητε of v 6 and the ἐμνήσθησαν of v 8 perhaps are to be taken in the technical sense of calling to mind the words of Jesus and realizing the implications of their present fulfillment (cf. Ac 11.16, Jn 2.22, 12.16).[533] In this call to remember, the women are being summoned to be true disciples. There is no future element in the angel's words or any commissioning of the women to go tell the disciples (though Luke says they do so).[534] Thus, the women are treated not primarily as emissaries to the disciples, but as true and representative disciples in their own right worthy of receiving special revelation about Jesus.

Luke adds an account of how their words were received (unlike Matthew and possibly Mark). The women abandon the tomb (ὑποστρέψασαι, v 9) and announce all these things (ταῦτα πάντα) to the Eleven and all the rest (τοῖς ἕνδεκα καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς λοιποῖς).[535] Only now, after recording the full scope of the women's roles in the death, burial, and Resurrection of Jesus, does Luke give the reader a list of who was involved in these events. This placing of a list after certain crucial events is similar to Luke's procedure in Ac 1.13-14.[536] The placement of presumably known names at a climactic point may be Luke's way of validating what he recorded previously. The Evangelist may be claiming that these specific people are witnesses and guarantors of these things. If this is so, then again we see Luke emphasizing the equality of women and their worth as valid witnesses to all three events. Perhaps Luke's mention of Joanna (instead of Mark's Salome) indicates where he got his information about some of these things.[537] Her witness as a member of a family of standing and position might be effective if Luke's audience is in part of a similar nature. The placing of the list after the death, burial, empty tomb sequence is appropriate since after this point the women are no longer the sole witnesses to what transpired, and in fact Luke goes on to stress that it is the Eleven who are the primary recipients of the most crucial

appearance of Jesus. In Luke, it is the Apostles who are constituted as witnesses in a special sense and guarantors of the fact that the risen Jesus appeared (cf. 24.36-49, Ac 1.21-22).[538] Luke stresses that the women's witness is crucial for what takes place up to that point; in fact, even the Apostles can only validate the women's words (v 12) and others among the disciples can only talk about them (vv 22-24). Consider also the contrast between Lk 24.9 and 10. In the latter verse, it is the named women καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ σὺν αὐταῖς who have to bear witness to the Apostles. In the former we are told that it is the Eleven καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς λοιποῖς who receive this report. Thus, we note another example of role reversal - certain leading women and others with them instruct or announce the Good News to the men and even to the Apostles whose future it would soon be to make such proclamations.[539] Grammatically, v 10 is difficult and it must be admitted that Luke has left the impression that the other women were the primary ones who spoke to the Apostles about these things.[540] Perhaps the difficulties have been created by Luke's insertion of a mainly traditional list of female witnesses at v 10a.[541]

Luke appears to make a deliberate and stark contrast between the women witnesses and the men who receive the witness. He says that the women's words seemed to their mind to be nonsense, and they refused to believe the women's report (ἠπίστουν αὐταῖς).[542] This reaction is typical of the common Jewish male prejudice against a woman's testimony;[543] however, Peter is portrayed as taking the women seriously enough to go and inspect the tomb to see if their report was accurate.

Many scholars consider Lk 24.12 an insertion based on Jn 20. 3-10.[544] Textually, however, there is no more reason to omit this verse than τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ in v 3, or οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε ἀλλὰ ἠγέρθη in v 6; and there are good contextual reasons for including it.[545] For instance, Lk 24.24 seems to presuppose some such verse as 24.12 and there is no textual question as to the originality of 24.24. Further, the style of 24.12 is Lukan.[546] It has been suggested that 24.12 is Luke's apology to his female readers for the Apostles' refusal to believe the women's witness about the empty tomb.[547] The content of 24.12 does not duplicate the story of the women's visit. No angels appear to Peter, nor is there any divine message given to him - these are the two primary features of the women's visit. The fact that Peter does not enter the tomb and that he sees the strips of linen lying

by themselves also distinguishes this account from the narrative of the women's visit.[548] Only the fact of the visit and Peter's wondering (θαυμάζων contrast ἀπορεῖσθαι, v 4) is reminiscent of the women's visit. The parallels perhaps are Luke's way of informing us that the initial reaction of both women and men to an uninterpreted empty tomb is not faith but doubt and uncertainty.

Unlike the First and Fourth Evangelists, Luke does not go on to recount a Resurrection appearance to one or more of the women.[549] A few points, however, should be made about Luke's main appearance story, the encounter on Emmaus Road, as there is evidence of male-female contrast even in this story which does not feature women. In the midst of the carefully constructed dialogue in 24.17-27, we may note the following points of comparison and contrast:[550]

1)	καὶ γυναῖκές τινες ἐξ ἡμῶν	(v 22)	WHO
	καὶ...τινες τῶν σὺν ἡμῖν	(v 24)	
2)	ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον	(v 22)	WHERE
	ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον	(v 24)	
3)	καὶ μὴ εὑροῦσαι τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ	(v 23)	WHAT WAS FOUND
	καὶ εὗρον οὕτως καθὼς καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες εἶπον	(v 24)	
4)	ἦλθον λέγουσαι καὶ ὀπτασίαν ἀγγέλων ἑωρακέναι οἱ λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ζῆν	(v 23)	WHAT WAS SEEN
	αὐτὸν δὲ οὐκ εἶδον	(v 24)	

Though the structure is not perfectly parallel here, we can see how a certain parallelism is maintained throughout. In group one we have two parties who make a journey; the former exclusively female, the latter Luke apparently intends to be exclusively male (in light of Lk 24.12 and the fact that Cleopas is speaking and seems to identify with the latter group). In group two we see that the destination of the two parties is identical. In group three we see reversal whereby the supposed idle tale of the women is confirmed by some of the men.[551] Group four brings out male-female contrast; the women faithfully reported that the angels said Jesus was alive, while the men by implication insisted that they would have to see to believe. In the phrase αὐτὸν δὲ οὐκ εἶδον, the word αὐτὸν is in an emphatic position and indicates the chief complaint of the men.[552] The irony reaches its peak at this point since it is Jesus who is being told all this, and thus the men are made to look very foolish indeed. In conclusion, we see that in Luke's main appearance narrative there is a vindication of Jesus' female followers at the expense of some of His male followers.[553] The women had seen angels and they had reported accurately the empty tomb and the Easter message. The men could only confirm the report of the empty tomb and they did not see Jesus or anyone else.

In chapter 24, Luke masterfully reemphasizes some of his key ideas about male-female relationships which he developed during the first 23 chapters of his Gospel. In 24.1-11 we see the new prominence of women as valid witnesses, worthy of being named as such in the Gospel story. We also noted evidence of male-female contrast and role reversal, for it is the women, rather than the men, who receive the more complete revelation and have the less inadequate understanding of the significance of these events (cf. 24.1-11 to 24.12; 24.22-23 to 24.24 - the women remembered and Peter wondered). In Lk 24.34 in particular and 24.33-53 in general, we possibly see Luke's reassertion of the primacy of the community's male leadership. Remember that Luke, if he knew of such traditions, does not include any account of an appearance of Jesus to a woman or group of women. In a sense then, Luke 24 presents a microcosm of his views on these matters and thus prepares us for the equality of relationship of male and female, the new prominence of women, and the reassertion of male leadership that we find in Acts as accomplished and accepted facts. Our discussion of women and their roles in Acts must wait, however, until we complete our examination of the Resurrection narratives.

d. John 20

It has often been argued that because the empty tomb traditions seem to be lacking in Paul and in the early Church's preaching, that they likely entered the collections of Gospel tradition or the Passion narrative material after the traditions about Jesus' appearances. The Synoptic evidence we have examined thus far may support the view that the Evangelists had separate empty tomb traditions and appearance traditions, but it is very difficult to tell since Mark's ending is lost to us. Even if we grant that the empty tomb traditions may have been collected and given final form later than the appearance narratives, it does not follow from this that the empty tomb narratives are 'late apologetic legends'.[554] What in fact seems to be the case is that even in the early thinking and preaching about Jesus' Resurrection the idea of the empty tomb was implied. In Paul's argument in 1 Corinthians 15, while Paul emphasizes that the physical and resurrection bodies are not one and the same (15.44, cf. Phil 3.21), he also argues that the resurrection body is produced out of the physical body by a miraculous transformation ("we must all be changed"). Secondly, in the sequence "died, buried, raised" (1 Cor 15.4), the idea of the empty tomb is likely implied. The early Jewish Christian

community and Paul himself would not likely have thought of the idea of a Resurrection that did not entail an empty tomb. Caird says of the word resurrection: "No Jew would have dreamed of using this word to describe an afterlife in which the physical body was abandoned to the grave. Yet the word was certainly in use from the beginning of Christianity."[555] Thirdly, the phrase "on the third day" also seems to imply an empty tomb beginning on that day, though perhaps the phrase indicates when the appearances began. Perhaps it was the case that the traditions about the empty tomb were not added to the written collections of Passion narrative material until after the appearance narratives, and that they were added for apologetic reasons to counter various arguments of the opposition. Nevertheless, the when and why of the addition of this material to the Gospel tradition need not affect the historicity of the nucleus of the story: that a woman or some women went to Jesus' tomb early on Easter morning, found the tomb empty, possibly had an encounter that could be described as 'a vision of angels' and at some point repeated all this to the disciples.

In regard to John 20 we have a considerable problem in that apparently the Evangelist has divided one empty tomb tradition about Mary's visit into two parts or else has included two separate traditions about the one event into his narrative. The third possibility, that Mary made two trips to the empty tomb, is considered unlikely by most scholars. It is true that if one omits vv 3-11 and considers v 2 to be a Johannine composition on the basis of v 13, with the intention to link the visit of Mary to the empty tomb to that of Peter's and the beloved disciple's, we have a natural sequence of events in vv 1, 11-18. The difficulty for this view is the οἴδαμεν in v 2 in comparison with the οἶδα in v 13. The former looks like a vestige of a source that mentioned the presence of several women at the tomb.[556] This may be so, but the Fourth Evangelist may have οἴδαμεν in v 2 to try to differentiate the words of Mary a little here from those in v 13.[557] The Fourth Evangelist is a careful writer and editor of his material and it seems unlikely that οἴδαμεν is included accidentally and is a trace of an earlier source. The present arrangement appears to be intended to demonstrate, as in Luke, that the initial reaction of both women and men to an uninterpreted empty tomb is bewilderment or even concern about foul play. As we shall see, it is not clear that even in the beloved disciple's case the empty tomb produced belief in a risen Jesus. The Fourth Evangelist has clearly made the empty tomb story found in vv 11-13 his own.

Besides individualizing the account so as to focus only on Mary,[558] it appears that he has deliberately toned down the angelophany so as to highlight the Christophany that follows. The angels do serve a theological function but they are not angeli interpretes, and they do not proclaim the good news of Easter.[559] The Evangelist appears to try and link the empty tomb and appearance narratives in two ways: 1) the repetition of the question in vv 13, 15 (the latter is more likely in its original setting than the former); 2) the repetition of Mary's turning (v 14 may be borrowed from v 16).[560] The judgment of Dodd is probably to be accepted on the dialogue in vv 14-17 that here the Evangelist is relying on material that goes back to a very early source, possibly even back to the report of Mary herself.[561] There are, however, traces of Johannine redactional work at two places in v 17: 1) οὔπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα; and 2) the command that Jesus gives Mary to relay to the disciples. Following the pattern of concise appearance narratives detected by Dodd we may isolate the following original elements in this narrative; 1) Mary was disconsolate, thinking the body was stolen; 2) Jesus appeared and spoke to her; 3) she recognized Him and responded verbally and possibly with actions (clinging to His feet or attempting to do so); 4) He directed her to go tell His brothers and she did. Much of this pattern can be confirmed by the other forms of this story in Matthew and the Marcan appendix, both of which are likely independent of John 20.[562] In favor of the historicity of the nucleus of this narrative is that it is improbable that the Fourth Evangelist would; 1) create an appearance story about Mary Magdalene who plays no significant role in his Gospel apart from John 20; 2) indicate that this appearance was the first such appearance (a fact independently confirmed in Matthew 28), if there was not strong evidence to support this. Fuller notes that this narrative, because it relates a revelatory encounter, reflects the earliest traditions about the nature of the Resurrection appearances.[563] All in all, the nature of this narrative, its dialogue, and its basic narrative elements point to the conclusion reached by Dodd: "...the story of Mary Magdalene represents a good tradition, unknown to Luke, better preserved here than in Matt. xxviii (though the evangelist has written it up in his own manner)."[564]

Apart from the Passion and Resurrection narratives, we know very little about Mary Magdalene. From Lk 8.2 (cf. Mk 16.9) we know that she followed and served Jesus as early as His Galilean ministry,

probably as a result of Jesus' exorcism of the seven demons that possessed her.[565] We do not hear of Mary Magdalene again until the scene at the cross, and probably we would not have heard of her at all were it not for the part she played in the events beginning at the cross. In every list of women in the Gospels (save Jn 19.25) she is placed first. To what may we attribute this remarkable pre-eminence and consistency of position in Mt 27.56, 61, 28.1, Mk 15.40, 47, 16.1, Lk 8.2, 24.10? To anticipate, it may be because Mary received a private appearance of the risen Lord, the first appearance Jesus made after His Resurrection.[566]

It has been urged by Hengel and Daniélou that, "...Mary of Magdala has the same relation to the group of women that Peter has to the group of the Apostles. In the fourth century, Peter of Alexandria was still familiar with this parallel. The faith of the Church rests on Simon whom Christ called Cephas, the Rock, and on Mary whose name Magdalen means 'fortress'."[567] One Church Father is known to have said of Mary Magdalene that she was "like an apostle".[568] Whether or not such assertions are justified to a large extent depends on how one evaluates Jn 20.1-2 and 11-18.

Immediately, we are confronted with a problem. What is the relationship, if any, between Mt 28.1, 9-10 and Jn 20.1-2, 11-18? Some scholars argue that we are dealing with the same narratives in both cases and that the Johannine account is dependent upon and has particularized the Matthean.[569] Another view is that both Matthew and John shared a common, probably non-Marcan, source.[570] Yet another school of thought represented by P. Benoit, argues that the Fourth Gospel has a long literary history and that the Synoptics may be drawing on an early form of this Johannine story.[571] Those who follow Benoit argue that the First Evangelist has generalized an ancient Johannine story. This last view has in its favor the fact that the First Evangelist is well-known for compressing and generalizing the narratives he takes over. The argument is strong so long as the Matthean and Johannine Christophanies involving women are being examined (Jn 20.15 ζητεῖς, cf. Mt 28.5; Jn 20.17 τοὺς ἀδελφούς, cf. Mt 28.10; Jn 20.18 ἀγγέλλουσα, cf. Mt 28.8 ἀπαγγεῖλατε; the clinging motif; and fact of a first appearance), but becomes questionable when the Synoptic and Johannine angelophanies are compared. It must be remembered that the empty tomb and appearance traditions were likely passed on separately and the empty tomb tradition in the Fourth Gospel appears to be a heavily edited and individualized version of

the empty tomb tradition. The similarities in the Synoptic and Johannine angelophanies are mainly a result of the Evangelists' using stock elements (white apparel, etc.) and do not reflect a clear dependence of the Synoptics on John. The best explanation of what we find in the Gospel Christophanies and angelophanies seems to be the following: 1) the Synoptics and John are drawing on traditions they share in common, not on each other; and 2) the Johannine form of the Christophany appears to be much closer than the Matthean to the original form of this tradition, but the Marcan angelophany is likely more primitive than the Johannine.

The context of John 20 varies somewhat from the Synoptic setting for the Easter events. For instance, in John there is no mention of women at Jesus' burial. There are certain interesting parallels between Jn 19.25-27 and John 20. It is as if the Fourth Evangelist deliberately set out to give us a narrative about the two leading women in the early Christian community, Mother Mary and Mary Magdalene, who represent the two circles of Jesus' physical and spiritual families. We argued that in Jn 19.25-27 we see the Evangelist depicting how these two circles began to intersect, a process which actually culminated only after Jesus was risen. More frequently noted are the parallels between Mary Magdalene and Thomas, and the contrasts between the Magdalene and the beloved disciple (and/or Peter). All of these possible points of contact between John 20 and what precedes and follows should be remembered as we examine the exegetical details of our narrative.

In one sense Jn 20.1-2, 11-18 is a moving drama of 'the progress of a soul'. It relates how Mary Magdalene went from 1) a state of abject sorrow and preoccupation with the dead body of Jesus which she still identified as the Lord, to 2) a sudden state of euphoria that Jesus was in fact alive, which again involved a 'clinging' to Jesus' physical nature in a way that limited her understanding of her Lord, to 3) a state of understanding so that she was able to leave her preoccupations behind and become an 'apostle to the Apostles'.[572] Because the Johannine angelophany adds nothing new to our understanding of the women's visit to the tomb we will not discuss it in detail. It is worth noting, however, the Johannine technique of excerpting a portion of his empty tomb narrative and giving it a more detailed tradition at v 12, after the other empty tomb narrative has been included.[573] Also, we may note that Mary had good reason for fearing that Jesus' body had been stolen, for apparently grave-robbing was

prevalent in Palestine in the first century and warranted an edict from Claudius (?) issued in Nazareth.[574]

Jn 20.3-10 (cf. Lk 24.12, 24) is an interlude which does not concern us directly except that it is sometimes contended that the beloved disciple's faith is contrasted to Mary's sorrow and apparent spiritual insensitivity. The beloved disciple believed - ἐπίστευσεν. In the Johannine schema of things this may mean that he believed what Mary had said or, more likely, that something miraculous had happened to Jesus or His body without specifically implying a belief in the Resurrection. In fact, we are told that Peter and the beloved disciple did <u>not</u> understand from Scripture that Jesus had to rise from the dead. This may mean that the beloved disciple believed in the Resurrection from the visible evidence. Elsewhere in John, πιστεύω does not imply complete belief in the risen Lord or even that Jesus is the Messiah (cf. 2.23-24, 12.42-43, 20.8 - where we are not told what was believed).[575] Thus, we should be cautious in making dramatic contrasts between the reactions of Mary and the beloved disciple to the moved stone and the empty tomb.[576] What the beloved disciple believed is uncertain especially in view of v 9 and also in view of the fact that he went home and apparently said nothing either to Peter or Mary (v 10)!

We will now examine vv 11-18 as a literary unit constructed by the Evangelist to see how he portrays Mary.

From v 11 we begin to see a gradual process of revelation to Mary. We recognize a certain similarity between Mary's activity in v 11 and Peter's in v 5. Peter παρακύψας sees (βλέπει) the grave clothes. Mary παρέκυψεν...καὶ θεωρεῖ two angels sitting like bookends in the tomb where Jesus was laid. Theologically, they serve as a supernatural parenthesis indicating God's activity is involved in this emptiness between them. There is a void, but it is not devoid of meaning. They indicate that Jesus' body is no longer in the tomb and thus one should no longer focus on the past, the tomb, or Jesus' dead body.[577] Their virtual silence is preparatory for the significant dialogue that follows, emphasizing it by means of contrast. This revelation is of a more positive and living nature than what Peter received. He saw vestiges of something which might have meant no more than that an orderly conclusion to Jesus' life had taken place - God took Him up into heaven. Mary saw something which pointed to God's present activity. Amazingly, she does not react to the angel's presence but simply continues to cry. Apparently, the Evangelist wishes us to think that anything less than Jesus Himself could not change her mood.

In this, she is like Thomas (cf. 20.25). The Evangelist has the angels attempt to draw her out of her sorrow by saying γύναι, τί κλαίεις? Mary's problem is that her mental horizons are fixed in the past. The body that was in the tomb is still called κύριόν μου (v 13). Significantly, it is only when Mary turns away (ἐστράφη v 14, στραφεῖσα v 16)[578] from the empty tomb (and the past) that she sees Jesus. Fuller intimates that there may be in this an implied criticism of the empty tomb tradition if used apart from the appearance traditions.[579]

The Evangelist has Jesus open the dialogue with the words-γύναι, τί κλαίεις? This is likely their original setting in the tradition. Perhaps we are meant to be reminded of the γύναι of Jn 19.26.[580] In that narrative we noted the progress from γύναι (v 26) to μήτηρ (v 27). In similar fashion here we note the progress from γύναι (20.15) to Μαριάμ (20.16). Just as the mention of μήτηρ indicated the point of recognition and acceptance by Jesus of His mother into the family of faith, so Μαριάμ is the point where Mary first recognizes Jesus and is recognized in such a way that her place in the family of faith is implied. "He calls his own sheep by name...and his sheep follow him because they know his voice" (cf. 10.3-4).[581] This may indicate that the Evangelist has deliberately cast his material in this fashion, but calling someone's name is such a common means of stirring a person's memory that it may be an authentic piece of tradition. In addition, we may note the presence of the language of the family of faith in both texts: 1) "Woman behold your son...behold your mother." (19.26-27); 2) "I am going to my Father and your Father, go tell my brothers." (20.17).[582] But Mary Magdalene is being favored in a way that Jesus' mother was not, for she is the first to see the risen Jesus, and she too had been at the cross with Jesus' mother.

By including the question τίνα ζητεῖς the Evangelist has Jesus hint that Mary is seeking someone (a living person), not something (a corpse).[583] Yet Mary's thoughts are still riveted on a body. She makes the blunder of mistaking Jesus Himself for a gardener who might have stolen Jesus' body. The irony is obvious and may be a Johannine addition to the narrative, but there are certain parallels to other appearance stories of the recognition type (Emmaus, possibly John 21).[584] When Jesus finally calls the Magdalene by her name, it appears she recognizes something familiar in the way He speaks to her. Her spiritual pilgrimage, however, is not over when she recognizes Jesus for her reply (ῥαββουνί) indicates that she still thinks of Jesus in terms of her past relationship with Him. This is verified by the

translation the Evangelist gives of the word διδάσκαλε and thus we are probably not meant to see this as a confession that parallels that of Thomas (cf. 20.28, ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου).[585] The reaction is natural, as is the 'clinging' (or attempting clinging) that follows.

There are, however, certain parallels between the story of the appearance to Mary and Jn 20.24-31. Consider the following: 1) both narratives focus on a special appearance to or at least for an individual by Jesus; 2) in both, the one receiving the appearance has a strong conviction that Jesus is not alive, and thus a strong preoccupation with the Jesus of the past (in Mary's case there is a fixation with Jesus' body, in Thomas' case with His wounds); 3) in both, there is a need to touch or hold on to Jesus; 4) in both, Jesus appears suddenly; 5) in both, the point is to lead an individual to overcome his/her doubts and believe in Jesus in the right way (cf. Jn 20.17, μή μου ἅπτου to Jn 20.27, μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος). We may see in these two narratives a deliberate male-female parallelism as the Evangelist attempts to indicate Jesus' desire to recover both His 'brothers' and 'sisters'. There are certain important differences in the stories, however. The command to touch in one case and its prohibition in the other are not so much a denigrating of Mary in comparison to Thomas, but reflect the relative needs in each situation. One must remember that in the Evangelist's portrayal of these events Thomas had heard of previous Resurrection appearances whereas Mary had knowledge only of Jesus before His death to guide her response. This is why there is no recognition motif in the Thomas story, but there is in Mary's story. Interestingly, Mary is given an apostolic task and Thomas is not. Further, Thomas' unbelief is more flagrant and more reprehensible than Mary's and he alone is chided for it. In both cases, however, only an appearance of Jesus suffices to alter the mood of the recipient.

Some of the above remarks about Mary's spiritual state when she exclaims, "Rabboni!", are verified perhaps by Jesus' cryptic words, μή μου ἅπτου, οὔπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. The problems in this verse are not confined to μή μου ἅπτου for the clause beginning with the οὔπω is also puzzling. In regard to μή μου ἅπτου, any number of solutions have been proposed. For instance, it is suggested that ἅπτου is a mistranslation from the Aramaic original, but this sort of solution should be resorted to only if one cannot make sense of the text as it stands.[586] The same applies to the thesis that μή πτόου ('fear not') became corrupted to μή μου ἅπτου, or that we should

insert φόβου after μή. These views have no textual support.[587] Some of our conclusions depend on whether we translate μή μου ἅπτου as 'don't touch me!', or 'stop touching (clinging to) me'. In either translation, it is implied that Mary is trying to approach Jesus in some way; otherwise, this would be an odd statement. The tense of ἅπτου probably is meant to imply a cessation of an action in progress and thus we should translate 'stop holding on to me'.[588] Thus, the Johannine and Matthean versions of this appearance agree at this point which favors the authenticity of this detail. It should also be noted that there is implicit even in Matthew the idea that Jesus wants the clinging to cease because of the charge He gives. Why, in the Johannine schema, is it that Mary is not allowed to hold on to Jesus, while later Thomas is bidden to put his finger in the nail prints of Jesus' hands? In Jn 20.27, the purpose of the touching is to lead Thomas to a more perfect faith. In Jn 20.17, however, the wrong sort of clinging to Jesus' physical being is involved. It assumes that relating to Jesus after His Resurrection is only a matter of renewing pre-Resurrection relationships.[589] It is not a case of Mary being irreverent.[590] It was simply that she still looked to the past and must be led to a higher more spiritual way of holding on to Jesus. Historically, there may have been a note of urgency in Jesus' words in that He wishes her to get on with the task He is about to assign her - instructing the brethren.[591]

Why has the Evangelist added the οὔπω clause to his source material? One suggestion is that he is having Jesus say 'stop clinging to me simply because I have not yet ascended.'[592] The idea the Evangelist wants to convey is that Jesus does not wish Mary to take advantage of what will only be a temporary possibility (and is thus not to be depended upon). The Evangelist thus indicates to his audience the dangers of the wrong sort of attachment to the earthly Jesus. In any case, this οὔπω clause probably rules out the notion that in the Evangelist's view the Ascension is taking place already and that this is the determining factor.[593] The ἀναβαίνω of v 17 probably is to be taken in the sense of a future certainty expressed as a present reality.[594]

One key to seeing this verse as the Evangelist intends can be found in the journeying motif. Frequently in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus is regarded as journeying back to the Father from whom He came (cf. 7.33, 13.3, 14.12, 28, 16.28). As P. Minear rightly pointed out, Mary's concern is with <u>where</u> Jesus' body is, even when she recognizes

and seizes Him. She is seeking Jesus in the wrong sense, for the Evangelist is asserting that it is not a knowledge of where Jesus is but where He is going that truly leads to finding Jesus and to having a permanent grip on Him. The Evangelist has Jesus speak to Mary of the Ascension as the proper answer to Mary's 'where' question. Until Jesus ascends He cannot be where all His disciples can have access to Him. Thus, the successful conclusion of Mary's "...pilgrimage of faith was precluded by ignorance of the 'end'."[595] The Evangelist is trying to teach his audience that they must first learn where Jesus is going and realize that it is only by His Ascension, paradoxically, that all spatial and temporal distance between Jesus and His followers can be eliminated. The Evangelist indicates Mary has learned this by the fact that she gives up the wrong sort of clinging to Jesus, and journeys to the disciples to proclaim her risen Lord. Knowledge of Jesus' true destination gives her the freedom to play a part in revealing the destiny of Jesus and His followers. Just as Jesus must journey to the Father before His disciples can journey to the nations, so too Mary must learn of Jesus' journey to the Father before she can journey to the disciples. That the two disciples journey to their own (homes?) (v 10) is an antithesis to Mary's journey and reveals that they do not yet know of Jesus' destination.

In this context, it is significant that Jesus says to Mary, "Go to my brothers..."[596] The word 'brothers' indicates Jesus is trying to reestablish a close family relationship with His disciples, not distinguish Himself from them. The point for Johannine theology is that my God (Father) is also your God (Father) and it is for this reason that Jesus can relate to His disciples as brothers.[597] Possibly the Evangelist implies that since Jesus already has reestablished relations with Mary, she too is among the brethren. As such, she is given the role, usually taken by Jesus' 'brothers', to bear witness. She is to be an 'apostle to the Apostles'. Not until v 18 is it clear that Mary has 'grasped' who Jesus truly is, and that she can no longer cling to the past, or her past basis of relating to Jesus, or even His present glorified body.

The words, "Mary Magdalene went proclaiming (ἀγγέλλουσα)[598] to the disciples..." very effectively tells us that she is now looking forward to the task at hand, knowing that the Jesus she has left at the tomb will not go away and leave her comfortless again. He had talked of spiritual family relationships in the present tense; this meant that her relationship with Him would continue albeit transposed

into a higher key. Thus, she tells the brethren, ἑώρακα τὸν κύριον. The awkwardness of the sentence likely points to the fact that καὶ ταῦτα εἶπεν αὐτῇ is a Johannine addition.[599] Further, that the Evangelist has preserved from his source ἑώρακα τὸν κύριον giving it first place likely also points to the original content of the message (in contrast to the Ascension additions by the Evangelist in v 17). Thus, we see how the Gospel events as well as the Gospel message have a tendency to cause reversals. Ironically Jesus has begun to reestablish fellowship with His brothers by first establishing it once more with one of His sisters. Insofar as the historical nucleus of this narrative is concerned, we have here the first appearance of Jesus granted to the disconsolate Mary Magdalene who, after clinging to Jesus, goes forth to proclaim to His 'brothers' that she had seen the risen Lord. Mary Magdalene is thus appropriately called 'the apostle to the Apostles', and perhaps was equal in importance for Jesus' fledgling community to Mother Mary herself. This is why Mary Magdalene repeatedly is first in the catalogues of women in the Synoptics. This is also why Hengel can say,

> Die Botschaft Jesu muss in besonderer Weise auf die Frauen in Israel gewirkt haben. Eine Frucht dieser Wirksamkeit ist Zeugenschaft der Frauen am Kreuze, bei der Grablegung und am leeren Grabe. Die unterschiedlichen Frauenkataloge wiesen darauf hin, dass diese Zeugenschaft in der Gemeinde eine gewisse Rangfolge unter den Frauen bewirkte. An der Spitze der Frauen steht - hier nur Petrus vergleichbar - Maria Magdalena, deren einzigartige Stellung dadurch begründet ist, dass sie der Auferstandene als erste seiner Erscheinung gewürdigt hat. (600)

D. The Place of Women in Jesus' Ministry

In chapter five we have examined the pericopes in the Gospels which depict women who are, or are in the process of becoming, Jesus' disciples. We have seen that this involved a woman who was a member of Jesus' physical family (His mother Mary), women who were His friends but did not travel with Him (Mary and Martha), and those women who followed Jesus in Galilee and to Jerusalem (Mary Magdalene and others). That Jesus taught women and allowed them to follow Him reveals how very different He was from other rabbis in His treatment of women. Probably, it is this precedent which explains why the Gospel writers, especially Luke and the Fourth Evangelist include a considerable amount of material revealing women's new freedom and equality in the presence of Jesus and in the midst of His community.

Our study of Jesus' mother led us to see how in Luke-Acts and in John, Mary's progress toward becoming Jesus' disciple and a full member of His spiritual family is depicted. She is presented as a model of one who is struggling to reconcile the roles of mother and disciple. In Luke 1, she is depicted as a prophetess, and in Jn 19. 25-27 (and perhaps Ac 1.14), the Fourth Evangelist portrays her in the role of spiritual mother to Jesus' disciples(s). Jn 19.25-27 also reveals the new equality of male and female disciples beneath the cross of Jesus. His mother is not idealized in the Gospels, however, for at least three of the Evangelists reveal that she had some lack of understanding of her Son and the nature of His mission (cf. Lk 2.50, Mk 3.21, 31-35, and parallels, Jn 2.1-12). Mary and Martha also are depicted as women in the process of becoming disciples. Lk 10.38-42 portrays Mary as having a right to learn from and become a disciple of Jesus. Indeed, this pericope makes clear that even for women, learning from Jesus takes precedence over a woman's role of preparing a meal and her responsibility of providing for a guest. While in Luke it is only Martha who appears to misunderstand the nature and priorities of discipleship, in John we see that both Mary and Martha do not understand fully Jesus and the extent of His power (cf. John 11). Nonetheless, the Fourth Evangelist also depicts Martha as making the least inadequate confession of Jesus in his Gospel (11.27), and Mary is presented as one who properly honors Jesus and perhaps unknowingly performs a prophetic burial rite for Him (12.1-8).

From Lk 8.1-3 through the Passion and Resurrection narratives we followed the portrayal of the women who traveled with Jesus. These women are remembered chiefly for the crucial role they played during the time of Jesus' death, burial, and Resurrection appearances, when all the male disciples (with one possible exception) fled and abandoned Jesus. A measure of the significance of the part these women played is indicated by the fact that it is only some of the events which involve only women that are mentioned by all four Gospels - the first visit to the tomb, finding the tomb empty, the encounter with the angels, receiving the Easter message (or in John, a question), from the angel(s). Women, however, were not only the witnesses of Jesus' death, burial, and empty tomb, but also in Mary's case the witness of the first Resurrection appearance, as two independent Gospel accounts make clear. The significance of these facts should not be underestimated, for it meant that for a major portion of the Christian kerygma, women were the sole or first witnesses whose testimony was

the basis of and the verification for the proclamation. Thus, not only Jesus' teaching and actions, but also the events surrounding His death and burial led to the acceptance of women as valid witnesses and genuine disciples of Jesus.

Jesus accepted women as His followers, and the Christian kerygma depends in part on their word. Thus, it is understandable why, as we shall see in chapter six, we find evidence in Acts that women played a significant role even in the earliest days of the post-Resurrection community, and why large numbers of women were attracted to the Christian faith and were accepted as full members of that community.

Chapter V: Endnotes

[1]Additional factors may help explain the amount of attention Mary receives in the Gospels: 1) the important role the traditions involving Mary's relation to Jesus began to play in the early Christian community (notice that Matthew, Luke, and John give a significant amount of space to some of these traditions); 2) the important role at least one member of Jesus' family had in the early Christian community (cf. Gal 1.19, Ac 1.14, 15.13, etc.); 3) various apologetic purposes, including a defense of Jesus' origins by the First and Third Evangelists.

[2]Reference to material outside the Gospels and Acts will be made in passing since it is beyond the scope of this thesis, and since it adds little information that is not already present or latent in the Gospels and Acts. The following points can be made about Revelation 12: 1) There is probably no evidence that Mary was seen as the Mother of the Church by the time Revelation was written. The most that can be said on the basis of Jn 19.25-27 and Ac 1.14, is that Mary was viewed as a spiritual mother in the Church. It is possible that women other than Mary are pictured as spiritual mothers in John's Gospel (Samaritan woman bears the seed of the Gospel in her town; Mary Magdalene to the male disciples). 2) The woman of Revelation 12 is cast as a semi-divine figure as is indicated by the heavenly bodies used to describe her and her crown, and it is doubtful that Mary was being referred to as the Queen of Heaven in the first or early second century. 3) The woman in Revelation 12 goes through more than birth pains, and it is unlikely that one would use βασανίζω ('torture' , 'torment') of an individual in labor. There appears to be no evidence of the verbal form of this word used of birth pains. Cf. BAG, 134; MM, 104; J. M. Ford, Revelation (Garden City, 1975) 198. Rather, it means being in torment. Perhaps G. R. Beasley-Murray, The Book of Revelation (London, 1974) 198, is closer to the truth when he asserts that the woman represents the people of God in both its Old and New Testament manifestations, and the children here are Christ and Christians. This fits the pattern of the book which freely combines Jewish and extra-Biblical concepts and applies them to the Church and her enemies. Cf. M. Vellanickal, "The Mother of Jesus in the Johannine Writings", Biblebhashyam 3 (4, 1977) 278-96, espec. 286.

[3]Cf. pp. 70 ff. of thesis.

[4]The word 'virgin' (Sinaitic Syriac and a few other mss.), is likely a later addition out of respect for Mary. Cf. Metzger, TC, 2 ff. The ms. tradition which has been said to refer to Joseph as Jesus' father will bear another interpretation. Cf. Metzger, "On the Citation of Variant Readings of Matt. I:16", JBL 77 (1958) 361-3.

[5]Indeed, as R. E. Brown, The Birth of the Messiah (London, 1977) 50, argues, it is likely that Matthew composed his infancy narratives as an integral part of his Gospel, not as an afterthought. Cf. F. Ripoll, "The Infancy Narratives and Mary", Biblebhashyam 3 (4, 1977) 297-302.

[6]K. Stendahl, "Quis et Unde? An Analysis of Mt 1-2", in Judentum-Urchristentum-Kirche. Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias (Beihefte zur ZNW 26; ed. W. Eltester; Berlin, 1960) 102: "... vv. 18-25 are the

enlarged footnote to the crucial point in the genealogy." Brown, Birth, 52-4, points out that Matthew 1 is about who and how (i.e., the virginal conception), and that Matthew 2 is about where and whence.

[7]Cf. R. E. Brown, The Virginal Conception and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus (New York, 1973) 27, nn. 30-1. Virginal conception is a more appropriate term than virgin birth for we are discussing her virginitas ante partum, not to be confused with the idea of Mary as a virgin in partu or a miraculous and painless birth which preserved the physical signs of her virginity. H. von Campenhausen, The Virgin Birth in the Theology of the Ancient Church (Naperville, Ill., 1964) rightly points out that Mary's Immaculate Conception, perpetual virginity, Assumption, and sinlessness are to be seen as concepts that arose after the NT was written.

[8]It was not normal to list women in a genealogy though it was done: 1) when the father was unknown; 2) to distinguish various sons that came from one patriarch but several different wives; and 3) if they were related to or were famous figures. Cf. M. D. Johnson, The Purpose of Biblical Genealogies with Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus (SNTS Monograph 8; Cambridge, 1969) 152; Gen 22.20-24, Exod 6.23.

[9]View 2 is the suggestion of Johnson, Purpose of Biblical Genealogies, 152 ff., and has the advantage that it is based on something all four women share in common, but it is based on Jewish debates on the women in the genealogy that are considerably later in date than Matthew's Gospel. Cf. R. E. Brown, K. P. Donfried, et al., eds., Mary in the New Testament (Philadelphia, 1978) 80, nn. 161-2. View four is doubtful since it seems unlikely that the Evangelist would try to argue in such a negative fashion and to prove that Jesus, David, and Solomon had something unseemly in their past. Similarly, "...dubious is an apologetics which answers (assumed) Jewish charges of Mary's sinfulness by pointing to other sinful women - Would that make Jesus' suspected origins less objectionable?" (Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 81). View three has the advantage that it is able to find something that Mary and these four women shared in common without focusing on something unseemly, but rather on the divine plan involved in these irregularities. Cf. Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 82; Brown, Birth, 125; Stendahl, "Quis et Unde?", 101.

[10]On the Lukan birth narratives, cf. John McHugh, The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament (London, 1975) 284-308.

[11]Cf. G. Delling, "παρθένος", TDNT V, 835; Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 121; Marshall, Luke, 13-77.

[12]Cf. McHugh, Mother, 282-3.

[13]Cf. M. M. Bourke, "The Literary Genus of Matthew 1-2", CBQ 22 (1960) 160-75.

[14]So Brown, Birth, 517-33.

[15]Cf. J. G. Machen, The Virgin Birth of Christ (Grand Rapids, 1965 repr.); Brown, Birth, 142.

[16]Brown, Virginal Conception, 50. Ignatius is very matter of fact about the concept; cf. Smyrneans 1.1, Apostolic Fathers I (LCL; trans. K. Lake; London, 1977) 326-48.

[17]Cf. G. J. Wenham, "BetQlāh, 'A Girl of Marriageable Age'", VT 22 (1972) 326-48; Deut 22.13-21; 2 Sam 13.1-19; Lev 21.2-3, 10-14.

[18]Davies, Sermon on the Mount, 308-09.

[19]Cf. McHugh, Mother, 255-342.

[20]Cf. p.. 252 of thesis.

[21]Cf.. McHugh, Mother, 324-5.

[22]Cf. Plummer, Matthew, 3 ff.

[23]As is well-known the First Evangelist relies heavily on Mark and the Q material, and this makes it reasonable to suppose that he was likewise dependent on sources in his birth narratives. Cf. Bultmann, History, 291-3. If the material has any significant historical value, then it is likely derived from a very individual source close to the events. Nevertheless, the Evangelist has made the material his own. It has a character, style, and structure consonant with and in some respects strongly resembling the rest of the First Gospel. Cf. Brown, Birth, passim; C. T. Davis, "Tradition and Redaction in Mt 1:18-2:23", JBL 90 (4, 1971) 404-27.

[24]H. Wansbrough , "Event and Interpretation: VIII. The Adoption of Jesus", Clergy Review 55 (12, 1970) 921-8, is right in saying that Mt 1.18-25 is dealing with how Jesus is adopted into the house of David and thus the focus and climax is on the annunciation by the angel telling Joseph how Jesus will be his son by the ritual of naming and so exercising authority.

[25]Legal paternity was a perfectly viable possibility in first century Judaism; cf. Brown, Birth, 138-9.

[26]Cf. X. Léon-Dufour, "Le juste Joseph", NRT 81 (3, 1959) 225-31. This picture of Joseph is very much in keeping with the Jewish view of the family structure and its patriarchal dominance. If Brown, Birth, 45, is right in seeing the First Evangelist's audience as including both Jewish and Gentile disciples, or even if R. Walker, Die Heilsgeschichte im ersten Evangelium (Göttingen, 1967) 9-10, 120-7, is correct that the author's main point is that the Jews have had their chance and thus the mission of the Church is to be directed toward Gentiles, then the Evangelist by setting up Joseph as a model disciple would be affirming that male headship and female subordination have their place in the new covenant community.

[27]There is, however, disagreement in the cases. Cf. MHT III, 322; BDF, sec. 423, p. 218.

[28]In favor of the view that it means sexual union, we have the following: BAG, 796; LSJ, 1712; Hill, Matthew, 78; M'Neile, Matthew, 7; Brown, Birth, 124; J. Schneider, "συνέρχομαι", TDNT II, 684, n. 1; MM, 606. The word γινώσκω may means sexual union in Mt 1.25; cf. BAG, 159 ff.

[29]Cf. BAG, 796.

[30]I. Broer, "Die Bedeutung der 'Jungfrauengeburt' im Matthäus-evangelium", BibLeb 12 (4, 1971) 248-60.

[31]McHugh, Mother, 37-48, 78-9; cf. Lk 11.27.

[32]Since Mt 1.18 is likely the Evangelist's editorial comment, the ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου is added in view of the author's knowledge of the whole situation and should not be taken as a statement about Joseph's initial understanding of the circumstances. Also, the δέ here seems to be continuative rather than adversative.

[33]So D. Hill, "A Note on Matthew i.19", ET 76 (4, 1965) 133-4; M'Neile, Matthew, 7; F. V. Filson, A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew (London, 1971) 54; BAG, 194; G. Schrenk, "δίκαιος", TDNT II, 183-9.

[34]Cf. McHugh, Mother, 164-5; Léon-Dufour, "Le juste Joseph", 225 ff. Consider the case of Hosea. The evidence sometimes cited to prove that the virginity of the bride at the time she was taken to her husband's house (i.e., after the betrothal interval) was normally not expected in Judea is far from proving the point. M. Ketuboth 1.5, Danby, 245, simply says that a man who dines alone with his bride-to-be may not lodge a virginity suit against her later. Cf. similar sayings in Str-B I, 45-7. The ruling provides for a situation which, in the eyes of the rabbis, was not above suspicion and it is possible that it is merely contingency legislation. Pace Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 83, n. 173. It does not indicate what was accepted practice in this matter.

[35]Cf. M. Sotah 1.5, Danby, 293.

[36]So C. Spicq, "'Joseph, son mari, étant juste...' (Mt. I,19)", RB 71 (1964) 206-14; cf. McHugh, Mother, 166, n. 7.

[37]So McHugh, Mother, 168 ff.; Wansbrough, "Event and Interpretation", 921 ff.; K. Rahner, "Nimm das Kind und seine Mutter", GL 30 (1, 1957) 14-22.

[38]Cf. Col 2.15; H. Schlier, "παραδειγματίζω", TDNT II, 31-2; J. M. Germano, "Nova et vetera in pericopam de sancto Joseph (Mt. 1,18-25)", VD 46 (6, 1968) 351-60; M'Neile, Matthew, 5-7; McHugh, Mother, 168, n. 11; LSJ, 1308; BAG, 619; MM, 137-8. A formal procedure was necessary since betrothal was seen as legally binding. Cf. Jeremias, Jerusalem, 359 ff.; M. Kiddushin 1.1, Danby, 321.

[39]Cf. Hill, Matthew, 80; M'Neile, Matthew, 10; W. C. Allen, The Gospel According to St. Matthew (ICC; Edinburgh, 1907) 10-11. The Old Syriac and k are no earlier than the fourth century as mss., but the reading they preserve may be older.

[40]Cf. McHugh, Mother, 204; BAG, 160; R. Bultmann, "γινώσκω", TDNT I, 705, n. 65; Hill, Matthew, 80; Plummer, Matthew, 9.

[41]McHugh, Mother, 204; Hill, Matthew, 80.

[42]McHugh, Mother, 204; A. Vögtle, "Mt. 1,25 und die Virginitas B. M. Virginis post partum", TQ 147 (1, 1967) 28-39.

[43]Allen, Matthew, 10-11; Plummer, Matthew, 9-10.

[44]M'Neile, Matthew, 10, says, "In the New Testament, a negative followed by ἕως οὗ (e.g., xvii.9)...always implies that the negated action did, or will, take place after the point of time indicated by the participle..."

[45]The meaning of ἕως without οὗ is not relevant here. BDF, sec. 485, p. 237. Moule, I-B, 85, says that ἕως οὗ in the NT is strictly equivalent to 'until such time as' (cf. LSJ, 751). As BAG, 335, shows, the translation 'while' of ἕως οὗ is found only when the verb is in the subjunctive. The punctiliar sense of the aorist indicative ἔτεκεν when coupled with οὐκ indicates the duration of Joseph's not knowing. Thus, while ἕως οὗ may not in itself imply anything about what happened after the limit of the 'until' (so Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 86-7, n. 177), when it precedes an aorist indicative such as ἔτεκεν and following ἐγίνωσκεν, it is hard to escape the conclusion that Joseph knew her after the child was born.

[46]Cf. Brown, Birth, 231; R. R. Ruether, Mary - The Feminine Face of the Church (London, 1979) 26.

[47]Neither 'birth story' nor 'infancy narrative' is an adequate description for Luke 1-2, especially since Lk 2.41-52 deals with Jesus at age twelve. Possibly, Luke 1-2 or even 1-4.30 should be seen as Luke's prologue and preparation for the themes he develops in the ministry and indeed on through Acts 28.

[48]Ellis, Luke, 67, assigns this material to Luke's Jerusalem traditions and says of it: "This substratum is as ancient as any material in the New Testament..." Bultmann, History, 291 ff., admits the use of sources but denies they have much historical value.

[49]Cf. McHugh, Mother, 125-49.

[50]Cf. P. Minear, "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories", in Studies in Luke-Acts, 111-30; P. Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24", in Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann (Beihefte zur ZNW 21; ed. W. Eltester; Berlin, 1954) 165-86.

[51]McHugh, Mother, 139.

[52]Brown, Birth, 244.

[53]Cf. Drury, Tradition and Design, passim.

[54]Cf. McHugh, Mother, 111-3; R. Laurentin, Structure et Théologie de Luc I-II (Paris, 1957) 93 ff.

[55]Dibelius, From Tradition, 123.

[56]Cf. Brown, Birth, 346-50.

[57]McHugh, Mother, 145-6.

[58]McHugh, Mother, 146.

[59]The material on the Baptist likely derives from other sources and is of no concern to us here.

[60]By this term Luke is making clear that Mary had no intimate sexual relationship before the confrontation with Gabriel. So Danker, Jesus, 10; Delling, "παρθένος", TDNT V, 826-36, is probably right that, as in Matthew, the focus is on the specialness of Jesus and His birth, and that παρθένος is not used for ascetic or docetic reasons. The birth in the narrative is depicted as a normal human birth (Lk 2.23). Elizabeth conceives and gives birth through the natural agency, but with God's help, since she and Zechariah are old. Mary, the παρθένος, conceives by an act of God alone. Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 121, states, "The agency of the Spirit and the term 'overshadow' come, as we have seen, from NT christological formulation where no sexual import is possible. God is not a sexual partner but a creative power in the begetting of Jesus." On the term here, cf. C. H. Dodd, "New Testament Translation Problems I", BT 27 (3, 1976) 301-5, and the reply by J. Carmignac, "The Meaning of Parthenos in Luke 1.27 - A reply to C. H. Dodd", BT 28 (3, 1977) 327-30.

[61]It is probable that οἴκου Δαυίδ is to be taken with Joseph alone because: 1) the genealogy of Luke (3.23) is traced through Joseph; 2) the word order; house of David is appended only to Joseph's name; 3) the mention twice of τῆς παρθένου connected by καί emphasizing that the second time we are returning to παρθένος after an intervening phrase involving Joseph; 4) we should have read τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς if ἐξ οἴκου referred to Mary alone. Cf. Creed, Luke, 16; E. Lohse, "υἱὸς Δαυίδ", TDNT VIII, 485. Thus, the angel's words are an assurance that Mary will marry and Joseph will accept Jesus as his legal son.

[62]Cf. Metzger, TC, 129; Plummer, Luke, 22.

[63]On the parallels and the usual form of annunciations and call narratives, cf. G. S. Prabhu, "'Rejoice, Favored One!' Mary in the Annunciation Story of Luke", Biblebhashyam 3 (4, 1977) 259-77; McHugh, Mother, 31-52. Pace Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 130-2; Marshall, Luke, 65. The view that χαῖρε is the ordinary Greek greeting fails to explain why Luke portrays Mary as wondering what sort of greeting she had just received. The standard blessing formula ὁ κύριος μετὰ σοῦ is not likely intended as the source of the confusion. Cf. endnote 66 below.

[64]Danker, Jesus, 11.

[65]Cf. Plummer, Luke, 22; Brown, Birth, 326-7; R. L. Humenay, "The Place of Mary in Luke: A Look at Modern Biblical Criticism", AER 5 (1974) 291-303. The phrase εὗρες γὰρ χάριν παρὰ τῷ θεῷ is equivalent to a common OT phrase (Gen 6.8, Judg 6.17, 1 Sam 1.18, 2 Sam 15.25) and as such signifies the free, gracious choice of God, rather than human acceptability. Cf. Marshall, Luke, 66. Pace McHugh, Mother, 48. The word εὗρες is akin to a prophetic perfect and implies the certainty of God's plan which He will fulfill in the future through Mary (thus, the future verbs in v 35; cf. Creed, Luke, 17).

[66]Cf. Prabhu, "'Rejoice, Favored One!'", 275, n. 16; Brown, Birth, 288. The phrase could be a wish rather than a statement; i.e., 'the Lord be with you'. Cf. A. Strobel, "Der Gruss an Maria (Lc 1,28). Eine philologische Betrachtung zu seinem Sinngehalt", ZNW 53 (1-2, 1962) 86-110.

[67]BAG, 188; LSJ, 414; Plummer, Luke, 22.

[68]H. Balz, "φοβέω", TDNT IX, 212, though the angel's 'fear not' may simply be a conventional reassurance.

[69]Plummer, Luke, 23.

[70]Luke does not say specifically that Mary names Him (cf. 2.21). Cf. Gen 16.11, 30.11, Judg 13.24, 1 Sam 1.20, and Brown, Birth, 289. Here it should be noted that God through the angel gives the name; thus, Mary and/or Joseph are instructed what to call Him.

[71]Cf. Bultmann, History, 295.

[72]Cf. McHugh, Mother, 174-5.

[73]Brown, Birth, 301-2.

[74]Cf. McHugh, Mother, 173; Prabhu, "'Rejoice, Favored One!'", 273, n. 9; C. P. Ceroke, "Luke 1,34 and Mary's Virginity", CBQ 19 (3, 1957) 329-42.

[75]Brown, Birth, 289 (cf. p. 148 and n. 44) points out that the Hebrew participial expression in birth announcements "...can be understood as either a present (already pregnant) or a future." He goes on to add rightly, "Luke's future verb cannot be explained away as a misunderstanding of a putative Semitic original, for the verbs in 1:35 are also future."

[76]So most Catholic exegetes; cf. M. Zerwick, "...quoniam virum non cognosco (Lc I,34)", VD 37 (1959) 212-24, 276-88. The hidden assumption in Carmignac, "The Meaning of Parthenos", BT 28 (3, 1977), 329, nn. 6-8, is that the present tense of γινώσκω must refer to the permanence of Mary's virginity. This is not necessarily so.

[77]McHugh, Mother, 193 ff.

[78]J. J. Devault, "The Concept of Virginity in Judaism", MS 13 (1962) 23-40; Creed, Luke, 18; Danker, Jesus, 12.

[79]Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 114-5, nn. 244-5.

[80]Cf. Zerwick, "...quoniam virum non cognosco", 286-8.

[81]In any case, to say 'I have had no relations', and 'I know no man immediately', are virtually equivalent. Cf. Brown, Birth, 289, Danker, Jesus, 12, on Gen 19.8, Judg 11.39, and our text. Cf. H. Guy, "The Virgin Birth in St. Luke", ET 68 (1957) 157-8.

[82]M. E. Isaacs, "Mary in the Lucan Infancy Narrative", WayS 25 (1975) 80-95. Note the connection between 'handmaiden' in Lk 1.38 and Ac 2.18; cf. Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 137.

[83]Cf. Plummer, Luke, 24; Creed, Luke, 20; S. Schulz, "ἐπισκιάζω", TDNT VII, 400, thinks divine generation is meant, but admits that this word is never used as a euphemism for sexual relations.

[84]Cf. P. W. van der Horst, "Peter's Shadow: The Religio-Historical Background of Acts v.15", NTS 23 (2, 1977) 204-12.

[85]So LSJ, 657; cf. BAG, 298; Ps 91.4, 141.8.

[86]McHugh, Mother, 132-3.

[87]We do not have mere resignation here. Cf. Marshall, Luke, 72: "γένοιτό μοι...a wish expressed by the optative..." (i.e., 'may it be to me'). Also, McHugh, Mother, 64-7.

[88]Plummer, Luke, 25; cf. Lk 12.49-53, 14.25-27.

[89]Danker, Jesus, 13.

[90]Note how Luke maintains his focus on Mary rather than Joseph by important passing remarks (2.19, 51).

[91]Marshall, Luke, 77-8.

[92]Bultmann, History, 294-6.

[93]Brown, Birth, 350-7.

[94]Marshall, Luke, 79, following Schürmann; cf. Machen, Virgin Birth, 75-101.

[95]The ὅτι clause which follows is in all likelihood causal and thus the focus is on the ground of Mary's blessedness, i.e., her faith, not the content of that faith. Cf. Plummer, Luke, 30; Creed, Luke, 22; but cf. Marshall, Luke, 82; and Ac 27.25. Vv 43-44 may be Luke's insertion into the narrative to cast Elizabeth and her baby in the shadow of Mary and Jesus.

[96]Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 136, n. 302.

[97]Brown, Birth, 333, is correct that εὐλογημένος here has a comparative, not a superlative, value. Cf. Judg 5.24.

[98]Cf. Metzger, TC, 130-1. The witnesses to the Elizabeth reading are $it^{a,b,l}$, Irenaeus^{lat} Niceta, and Jerome's translation of Origen's remark that some (Greek?) mss. of Luke read Elizabeth, not Mary. Cf. S. Benko, "The Magnificat: A History of the Controversy", JBL 86 (3, 1967) 263-75.

[99]Cf. A. von Harnack, "Das Magnificat der Elisabet (Luk, I,46-55) nebst einigen Bemerkungen zu Luk. I und 2", in Studien zur Geschichte des Neuen Testaments und der Alten Kirche (Berlin/Leipzig, 1931) 62-85; Creed, Luke, 22; Danker, Jesus, 15.

[100]Cf. Danker, Jesus, 15; Creed, Luke, 22-4.

[101]Ellis, Luke, 75.

[102]Cf. Marshall, Luke, 78; W. Grundmann, "ταπεινός", TDNT VIII, 21 (cf. Gen 30.13).

[103]Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 139.

[104]Cf. J. G. Davies, "The Ascription of the Magnificat to Mary", JTS 15 (2, 1964) 307-8; Brown, Birth, 334-6.

[105]Cf. Brown, Birth, 350-5.

[106]Creed, Luke, 303-4; Plummer, Luke, 30-1.

[107]Cf. M. Luther, "The Magnificat" in Luther's Works Vol. 21 (ed. J. Pelikan; St. Louis, 1956) 321: "Note that she does not say men will speak all manner of good of her, praise her virtues, exalt her virginity or her humility, or sing of what she has done. But for this one thing alone, that God regarded her, men will call her blessed. That is to give all the glory to God as completely as it can be done." Cf. J. de Satgé, Mary and the Christian Gospel (London, 1976).

[108]Cf. J. T. Forestell, "Old Testament Background of the Magnificat", MS 12 (1961) 204-44; A. Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament (London, 1958) 176-8.

[109]Grundmann, "ταπεινός", TDNT VIII, 21.

[110]Cf. Brown, Birth, 349.

[111]Brown, Birth, 252, 342.

[112]On the male/female parallelism in the Lukan infancy narrative in particular, cf. Brown, Birth, 248-53.

[113]One should be careful not to make too much of this act since Elizabeth calls her son by the name the angel gave her. The naming ritual is an important rite of exercising authority by a Jewish parent, but in this case the woman is merely passing on the name the angel had given.

[114]P. Benoit, "L'Enfance de Jean-Baptiste selon Luc I", NTS 3 (1956-57) 194, avers that Luke himself composed the Benedictus using various sources. Cf. J. A. T. Robinson, "Elijah, John, and Jesus - an essay in detection", in Twelve New Testament Studies (London, 1962) 49-52, on the contention that it was a product of a Baptist circle.

[115]The text does not say that Mary was of the line of David though several mss. try to insert such an idea. Cf. Plummer, Luke, 53; Creed, Luke, 33.

[116]Cf. Bultmann, History, 300, to Marshall, Luke, 115.

[117]McHugh, Mother, 100-01.

[118]Dibelius, From Tradition, 126-7.

[119]Creed, Luke, 37-8; cf. Dibelius, From Tradition, 127-8, who also rules out a dependence theory.

[120]Bultmann, History, 300.

[121]Marshall, Luke, 115.

[122]Brown, Birth, 454-6.

[123]Dibelius, From Tradition, 126-7.

[124]Cf. Str-B II, 124-6; Marshall, Luke, 118.

[125]οἱ γονεῖς (Lk 2.27) is the natural term for Luke to use of Mary and Joseph without resorting to circumlocution. As Marshall, Luke, 119, says, "...it is hypercritical to find here a tradition that did not know of the virgin birth." Pace Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 144, n. 320 and 158, n. 356. Cf. Lk 2.5, 27, 33, 41, 48.

[126]Cf. Brown, Birth, 462-3, who enumerates most of the well-known views. Also P. Benoit, "'Et toi-même un glaive transpercera l'âme!' (Luc 2,35)", CBQ 25 (3, 1963) 251-51.

[127]Pace Brown, Birth, 318-9; on Lk 8.19-21, cf. pp. 250-1 of thesis.

[128]Brown, Birth, 441, 465, appears to be correct in seeing the contents of these thoughts as negative or hostile, rather than mixed. Cf. Marshall, Luke, 123.

[129]So Marshall, Luke, 123. The key to a proper interpretation here would seem to be found by asking what negative factor affected both Jesus and Mary causing them anguish. The answer would be: the rejection of Jesus by most of Israel (He was the sign spoken against).

[130]Anguish, doubt, sorrow, or suffering are not what the sword represents; they are the results of the sword's work (cf. Ezek 14.17). The rejection of Jesus, not Mary's reaction to her Son's rejection, is what the sword represents. Cf. McHugh, Mother, 106-12. The sword parallels ἀντιλεγόμενος and it is not awkward for the ὅπως clause to follow.

[131]Brown, Birth, 446, 466.

[132]Cf. Creed, Luke, 43; Marshall, Luke, 124; Str-B II, 141.

[133]So Brown, Birth, 466. G. Stählin, "χήρα", TDNT IX, 451, states: "She is a prophet and is thus granted to see the child Jesus (v. 38). She is a witness, and is as such a model of the full-scale witness of the woman in the Christian community. She is unwearying in prayer....And in virtue of her witness and prayer she stays continually in the temple, cf. v 49. In this regard, too, this prophetess is a model for the first community of disciples, Lk 24:53; Ac 2:46."

[134]On Ac 21.9 and Rev 2.20, however, cf. pp. 389-92 of thesis.

[135]Who was also devout, did not remarry and lived to approximately the same age (105, cf. Judith 16.23). Cf. Danker, Jesus, 36. As Marshall, Luke, 124, cautions, Anna's age is mentioned in such a way that there probably is not a conscious modelling of it on the age of Judith.

[136]Marshall, Luke, 115.

[137]Plummer, Luke, 71.

[138]Luke stresses that Mary and Joseph are good Jews at several points: 2.21, 22, 23-4, 39. As Brown, Birth, 437, notes, "...if the birth were conceived as miraculous, no purification should have been needed." Apparently, Joseph and Mary did not see the birth as other than normal, and thus the διανοῖγον μήτραν of Lk 2.23 is fatal to the view that Mary gave birth to Jesus with the preservation of her virginity. So Plummer, Luke, 65; Creed, Luke, 39; Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 153, n. 344.

[139]Given the information in the Gospels, it is improbable that one can determine when Mary recognized her Son's Messianic nature and mission. Laurentin, Structure et Théologie, 165 ff., enters too much into speculation about Mary's psychological state at various points in Luke 1-2, primarily on the basis of Lk 2.19, 51.

[140]Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 148-9. The δέ in 2.19 is adversative and Mary's reaction is contrasted to that of the shepherd's audience. She is not merely awed by these things, but gives thoughtful consideration to what has been said and done.

[141]Josephus, Antiquities 2.5.3 (sec. 72) (LCL IV) 198-9; Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 150.

[142]Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 150-1.

[143]Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 161-2.

[144]Dibelius, From Tradition, 104, cf. 106-8.

[145]Bultmann, History, 300-07.

[146]Cf. Brown, Birth, 480, n. 7; McHugh, Mother, 113-4.

[147]Cf. Brown, Birth, 481, n. 9.

[148]Ellis, Luke, 85.

[149]Marshall, Luke, 125-6.

[150]NTAp I, 298-9.

[151]Cf. Marshall, Luke, 114. Even those who are skeptical about such matters remark, "If Luke were interested in underlining either eyewitness tradition or historicity, such a statement would have been very appropriate after the annunciation which involved the virginal conception." (Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 148).

[152]It has been suggested that by having Mary as the spokeswoman for the family, Luke prepares the reader for the eclipse of Joseph who will not appear again in Luke-Acts except at Lk 3.23. Cf. Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 160.

[153]Cf. Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 159-60, n. 360.

[154]Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 161, n. 367. Note also that Jesus' reproach is directed to both Joseph and Mary (αὐτούς, 2.49); Mary is not singled out for rebuke.

[155]Cf. Danker, Jesus, 29.

[156]Ellis, Luke, 86.

[157]Cf. Danker, Jesus, 31-7. Mary reveals the new freedom and equality of women because of God's action through Jesus; but she also reaffirms more than anyone else in the Gospels a woman's traditional role of motherhood. In giving prominence to Mary in both roles, Luke shows that while there may be tensions between the roles, there is no necessary or inherent conflict between motherhood and discipleship that cannot be resolved (cf. 1.42, 45).

[158]Brown, Birth, 494.

[159]Cf. Bultmann, John, 118-9; Dibelius, From Tradition, 101-2.

[160]Dodd, Historical Tradition, 226-7.

[161]Cf. McHugh, Mother, 388-90, 462-6; Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 184-5.

[162]Cf. pp. 250-1 of thesis.

[163]As McHugh, Mother, 463-4, recognizes.

[164]Cf. Bultmann, John, 114-5, who does not see the dialogue as a later addition. Cf. Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 185, n. 416; Brown, John i-xii, 103, notes as a viable possibility the option that the Evangelist has excerpted portions of an original dialogue according to what suited his theological purposes.

[165]Cf. Dodd, Historical Tradition, 223; Schnackenburg, John I, 323-4.

[166]Cf. Barrett, John (1978) 8, 189; Schnackenburg, John I, 324: "None of the usual criteria of Johannine style are to be found in it."

[167]Cf. the review of the evidence in Barrett, John (1978) 188-9.

[168]Cf. Schnackenburg, John I, 324; Bultmann, John, 114-5.

[169]Schnackenburg, John I, 340.

[170]Brown, John i-xii, 101.

[171]Dodd, Historical Tradition, 225, may be right, however, that: "The time was not yet when apologists could safely draw parallels between Christ and figures of pagan mythology." If this is so, then the influence may be more indirect, as Dodd suggests, and not a matter of conscious borrowing.

[172]I adhere to McHugh's reconstruction (Mother, 463) except that I would add v 4a and possibly v 5 in some form.

[173]Cf. Dodd, Historical Tradition, 226, for a list of the similarities this narrative has to various Synoptic motifs. It will be noted that there are parallels not only to the narrative ideas, but also to the substance of the dialogue (which is likely another argument against the Johannine creation of vv 4a and 5).

[174]cf. pp. 53-57 of thesis.

[175]There are some reasons to doubt that this is a 'hidden life' story since in John it takes place after the record of the encounter of Jesus with John (1.32 ff.) and also after the gathering of at least some of the disciples (1.35-51, 2.2).

[176]Cf. Vellanickal, "The Mother of Jesus", 279.

[177]If it is taken as a question, then the Evangelist is trying to give a reason why Jesus must dissociate Himself from her request, i.e., He has begun His ministry and can only follow the dictates of His heavenly Father. Cf. Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 191, and n. 427; Zerwick, sec. 447, p. 151; A. Vanhoye, "Interrogation Johannique et exégèse de Cana (Jn 2,4)", Bib 55 (1974) 157-67; M.-É. Boismard, Du Baptême à Cana (Jean 1.19-2.11) (Lectio Divina No. 18; Paris, 1956) 133-59.

[178]Vanhoye, "Interrogation johannique", 159-66.

[179]Barrett, John (1955) 159, citing 12.23, 27, 13.1, and 17.1. Morris, John, 181. Dodd, Interpretation, 365, however, says that in some sense Jesus' hour has come in part at this juncture.

[180]E. J. Goodspeed, "The Marriage at Cana in Galilee, a Reply" Int 1 (1947) 487 ff.

[181]Cf. KJV, RSV, NASB, NEB, Phillips, NIV, JB, TEV; Barrett, John (1955) 159; Brown, John i-xii, 99-100. Morris, John, 181, points out in n. 22 that the expected answer after a question introduced by οὔπω is no.

[182]Goodspeed, "The Marriage at Cana", 487-8; H. E. Dana and J. R. Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament (Toronto, 1927) 85, comments, "This is an idiom for which we have no exact equivalent in English."

[183]C. Lattey, "The Semitisms of the Fourth Gospel", JTS 20 (1919) 330-6, sees this phrase as Semitic and translates it, "Let me be", but cites the following parallels: Demosthenes, Contra Aphobum, ch. 12; Suetonius, Lives of the Caesars, Otho 7; Synesius, Epistle 105 (this is not really a parallel since it does not involve the dative of possession). Cf. MM, 180, citing BGU IV (14 B.C.); BAG, 216; Robertson, 539, 736; Epictetus, The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, The Manual and Fragments 1.4.28 (LCL; trans. W. A. Oldfather; London, 1928) 309, cf. 1.22.15, 1.27.13, 2.19.19.

[184]J. D. M. Derrett, "Water into Wine", BZ 7 (1963) 80-97. The interpretation offered below does not rule out Derrett's point (though Jn 2.9-10 seems to). It is, however, possible that the Evangelist could be out of touch with what the usual procedure was.

[185]Brown, John i-xii, 99; Lattey, "The Semitisms", 335-6; Zerwick, sec. 221, p. 70, and n. 7.

[186]Cf. the Greek usage cited in endnote 183 above; JB, NEB, NIV.

[187]Barrett, John (1978) 191, notes: "In the same way Jesus refuses to act upon the instructions of his brothers (7.6)." Yet He does go up to the feast; thus, it is not the advice but the motives involved in

their suggestion (cf. 7.4) that is rejected. Brown, John i-xii, 102, rightly says it is Mary's role, not her person or advice, that is being rejected here.

[188]Cf. Jn 8.28, 42, 10.18, 25. 29, 30, 12.49, etc. Jesus' negative answer to Mary is in harmony with the Synoptic passages that deal with Mary in relation to Jesus' mission. Cf. Lk 2.49, Mk 3.33-35, Lk 11.27-28.

[189]Barrett, John (1955) 159, rightly says, "...the reply of Jesus seems to mean: 'You have no claims upon me - yet.'"

[190]The phrase ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ is almost a technical term in John. Mary is never called by her own name, only by this phrase by the Evangelist. This shows that her significance is wholly in relation to her Son. As Brown, John i-xii, 98, remarks, "...'the Mother of X' is an honorable title for a woman who has been fortunate enough to bear a son." It is, however, a title that implies no veneration of Mary's person, but focuses on her role. Cf. Michaelis, "μήτηρ", TDNT IV, 643. The Fourth Evangelist usually is very explicit in his use of names with the exception of two people - Mary and the beloved disciple.

[191]A-S,96; cf. Barrett, John (1955) 159; LSJ, 363.

[192]Cf. Brown, John i-xii, 99; Morris, John, 180.

[193]Oepke, "γυνή", TDNT I, 777, states, "When Jesus addresses His mother in this way...it excludes the filial relationship." Cf. Morris, John, 181, n. 20.

[194]Cf. McHugh, Mother, 365-9.

[195]There are several textual variants at 2.12 that are of significance for our discussion of whether or not Jesus was Mary's only child. The two second century Bodmer papyri and B omit 'his' before brothers, and more significantly Codex Sinaiticus and some early versions omit 'and his disciples', while A, f^1, 565, 1241 favor the single 'he stayed'. Was there a pre-Gospel form of this Cana story that involved only Jesus and His family, or were the 'brothers' originally disciples, and someone added 'and his disciples' thinking the brothers were blood brothers? Cf. Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 194-6. Barrett, John (1978) 194, thinks 'his disciples' is an addition that arose to emphasize that the mother and brothers stayed in Capernaum, while Jesus left to begin His ministry. This may explain why ἔμειναν is read for ἔμειναν in some mss. For a fuller discussion, cf. Brown, "The Problem of Historicity in John", CBQ 24 (1962) 1-14. If we accept the best attested text, then John, like the Synoptics, associates Mary with Jesus' brothers. Further, in John, as in the Synoptics, Mary and the brothers are not numbered among Jesus' traveling disciples. There is then a uniform picture in all the Gospels of the separation of Jesus' family from His disciples. There may be a slight hint in Jn 2.3 that Mary has some faith in Jesus, whereas Jn 7.5 says the brothers did not believe in Him during the ministry. Contrast Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 195-6, to pp. 249-51 of thesis.

[196]Cf. Brown, John i-xii, 103: "...it must be honestly noted that the evangelist does nothing to stress the power of Mary's intercession at Cana...Mary's final words, 'Do whatever he tells you,' stress the sovereignty of Jesus and not Mary's impetration."

[197]On Mary as the archetypal woman, cf. McHugh, Mother, 373-8; Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 189-90; Vellanickal, "The Mother of Jesus", 286-7. "Why...should 'Woman' be symbolically more important in John when addressed to the mother of Jesus than when addressed to the Samaritan woman or to Mary Magdalene?" (Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 190). If such typology is present in our text, it is not developed to any degree. The use of γύναι to refer to Mary "...may mean that he places no special emphasis on her physical motherhood." (Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 189). But there is also no attempt to divorce Mary's sexual identity as woman from her potential discipleship status.

[198]J. D. Crossan, "Mark and the Relatives of Jesus", NovT 15 (1973) 81-113, is probably wrong to argue that 3.20 goes with what precedes rather than with what follows.

[199]Cf. Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 55-6.

[200]Cf. McHugh, Mother, 237, n. 3; Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 56. This structure parallels οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ with Jesus' family (3.21, 31-35) and perhaps compares their motives with those of the scribes (3.21b, 22a, b).

[201]Taylor, Mark, 235; cf. Bultmann, History, 50.

[202]Bultmann, History, 29, suggests 3.20-21, 31-35 belong together; Dibelius, From Tradition, 47, is probably wrong to contend that 3.20-21 was written as preparation for vv 31-35.

[203]Cf. Lane, Mark, 138, n. 76; NTGNA, 91.

[204]BDF, sec. 342, p. 176, "they are attached to him."

[205]Metzger, TC, 81; Oepke, "ἐξίστημι", TDNT II, 459, n. 2.

[206]As Crossan, "Mark", 85, points out, the οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ cannot refer to the Twelve because αὐτοὺς of 3.20 hardly can be the ἀκούσαντες of 3.21, nor can they be Jesus' followers in a wider sense because the ὄχλος of 3.20 is presumably the ὄχλος of 3.32, and these are approved as οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν in 3.32, 34. Pace H. Wansbrough, "Mark iii.21 - Was Jesus out of his mind?" NTS 18 (2, 1972) 233-5. Cf. D. Wenham, "The Meaning of Mk. iii.21", NTS 21 (2, 1975) 295-300.

[207]Especially Papyrus Grenfell II, 36, 9 - οἱ παρ' ἡμῶν πάντες - 'all our family'. Cf. J. H. Moulton, "Mark iii.21", ET 20 (1908-09) 476; MM, 479; Moule, I-B, 52 (second edition only).

[208]Lane, Mark, 139; Cranfield, Mark, 133; Taylor, Mark, 236.

[209]McHugh, Mother, 238-9, attempts to limit the subject of ἔλεγον to Jesus' 'foster' brothers. Cf. C. H. Turner, "Marcan Usage: Notes, Critical and Exegetical, on the Second Gospel", JTS 25 (1924) 383-6; MHT III, 292. Brown, Birth, 520, however, accepts the probability

that Mark includes Mary among 'his own', who thought Jesus was beside Himself. As Crossan, "Mark", 85, says, even if ἔλεγον is impersonal, the οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ concur in the judgment that Jesus is beside Himself enough to act on it. The parallelism between ἔλεγον in vv 21 and 22 suggests that it is 'his own' that is the subject of this verb in v 21. So Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 57; cf. J. Lambrecht, "The Relatives of Jesus in Mark", NovT 16 (4, 1974) 248-9.

[210]Cranfield, Mark, 134; cf. McHugh, Mother, 238, n. 9.

[211]As Crossan, "Mark", 85, notes, κρατέω in 3.21 likely does not refer back to the ὄχλος of 3.20, nor should it be taken in a metaphorical sense here. The meaning is likely 'to seize', or 'to apprehend' and take into custody. Cf. BAG, 449; MM, 358. The reason why Jesus' family was going to seize Him is explained by the γάρ clause - they said He was ἐξέστη. The meaning of ἐξίστημι in this context would seem to be 'out of control', or 'beside himself', rather than 'insane'. But cf. BAG, 276; LSJ, 595; Zerwick, sec. 4, p. 2; to Oepke, "ἐξίστημι", TDNT II, 459; W. C. van Unnik, "Jesus the Christ", NTS 8 (2, 1962) 101-16.

[212]Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 58.

[213]Cf. McHugh, Mother, 236-7. The real contest is between physical kinship standing without and some of the spiritual kinship which is closer to Jesus literally and spiritually.

[214]The suggestion in Brown, Birth, 371-8, that Lk 8.21 is in praise of the faith of the members of Jesus' physical family is not convincing. Reading Lk 8.21 resumptively, though grammatically possible, is unlikely in view of the fact that even Mary is depicted by Luke as misunderstanding Jesus (2.48-50). There is no preparation for a reversal of this fact before 8.21. Brown's view fails to explain why even in Luke there is no indication that Jesus complies with his family's wishes for an audience, and why Luke makes a mild contrast between the physical family standing ἔξω (8.20), and the crowd who are implied to be hearers of the word since they are listening to Jesus. Rather, in Lk 8.21 we have an abstract statement that Jesus' spiritual family are those who hear and do God's will. Only this view comports with various other Lukan texts (cf. 12.49-53, 14.26).

[215]Cranfield, Mark, 134-5; Lane, Mark, 139.

[216]Pace McHugh, Mother, 238; with Taylor, Mark, 236.

[217]Cranfield, Mark, 145; Lane, Mark, 147.

[218]Danker, Jesus, 105, sees in Lk 8.19-21 a continued criticism of Mary (cf. 2.48-51), working out the theme of the sword piercing Mary and the sword of Jesus' rejection of her. This theme is interrelated to the theme of true blessedness at 11.27-28. Vv 27-28 may not deny that parenthood is a blessing, but rather affirm by hyperbolic contrast that in comparison to the blessedness of faith in action, all other forms of blessedness pale in significance. Cf. Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 172.

[219]Bultmann, History, 30-1. If Mark had received a saying, it could have had differences in the key clauses from the Oxyrhynchus form, but we have no evidence that provides a basis for this conjecture, and Bultmann's argument is that the scene in Mark 6 was derived from the Oxyrhynchus form.

[220]Dibelius, From Tradition, 110, cf. 43. [221]Cranfield, Mark, 192.

[222]The phrase ἐν τοῖς συγγενεῦσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ which follows ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ in Mk 6.4, which all mss. except ℵ* have, refers to Jesus' relatives in a more general sense. However, Taylor, Mark, 301, says that many mss. but not B, Θ, 13, fam[1] and fam[13] pc have συγγενέσιν, not συγγενεῦσιν (cf. Synopsis, 195). The three part grouping of those among whom Jesus has no honor is an ever narrowing circle - His town, His kinsmen, His own house. It is this last phrase, ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ, unless it is a reference to the synagogue, which makes clear that Jesus' immediate family (Mary and the brothers and sisters) are among those who do not honor or understand Him properly. As Crossan, "Mark", 103, notes, 'own relations'/'own house' is redundant if both mean those associated with Jesus' family. More likely Mark intends to give us a list of who are ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ at 6.3. Cf. Taylor, Mark, 301.

[223]Cf. Str-B II, 10-11; Cranfield, Mark, 195-6.

[224]Cf. E. Stauffer, "Jeschu Ben Mirjam - Kontroversgeschichtliche Anmerkungen zu Mk 6:3", in Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black (ed. E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox; Edinburgh, 1969) 119-28; Marshall, Luke, 186. Normally when one was called the 'son of a woman' in a Jewish context, it did have an insulting connotation. Cf. J. K. Russell, "'The Son of Mary' (Mark vi.3)", ET 60 (1948-49) 195. The insulting connotation is supported by Jn 8.41, 9.29 which suggest there were questions about Jesus' origins at least as early as the composition of the Fourth Gospel. There is evidence that there was a polemic against Mary among the rabbis. Cf. Str-B I, 41-2, 147. There was a Jewish legal principle which may have been extant in Jesus' day - 'A man is illegitimate when he is called by his mother's name, for a bastard has no father.' Cf. E. Stauffer, Jerusalem und Rom im Zeitalter Jesu Christi (Bern/München, 1957) 118, 158, n. 62. Stauffer shows that in the extra-Biblical history of the phrase 'son of Mary', it is used almost exclusively in a polemical sense. But cf. McHugh, Mother, 271 ff.; H. K. McArthur, "Son of Mary", NovT 15 (1, 1973) 38-58; Brown, Birth, 541.

[225]Perhaps the earliest evidence of the respect Jesus' family commanded in the Church is the rather abrupt ascendency of James to a position of importance in the Jerusalem Christian community (cf. Gal 1.19, Ac 12.17, 15.3) and this after we are told that Jesus' brothers did not believe in Him during His earthly ministry (Jn 7.5). Ac 1.14 and such documents as the Proto-Evangelium of James presuppose a growing reverence for the family during the first and second centuries.

[226]Lk 4.16-30 is only partially parallel, and it omits the names of the brothers. The lists of names in Matthew and Mark are nearly identical save that Matthew reverses Mark's order of the names of Simon and Judas. Also, Mark has a Hellenized form of Joseph (Joses), while Matthew gives the name in its more familiar form. Cf. J. B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (London, 1896) 268, n. 1, to McHugh, Mother, 201, n. 4.

[227]The following works are some of the most helpful on this matter: A. Meyer and W. Bauer, "The Relatives of Jesus", in NTAp I, 418-32; McHugh, Mother, 200-54; J. B. Mayor, The Epistle of St. James (London, 1910) v-lv; Lightfoot, Galatians, 252-91; J. H. Ropes, The Epistle of St. James (ICC; Edinburgh, 1916) 53-74; J. Blinzler, Die Brüder und Schwestern Jesu (Stüttgart, 1967); S. Chapman, "The Brothers of the Lord", JTS 7 (1905-06) 412-33; H. von Soden, "ἀδελφός", TDNT I, 144-6.

[228]The prominence of this view in Church history after Jerome is largely due to the fact that he and Augustine both advocated it strongly, though in their day it was still a matter of debate. Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, 289-90; Blinzler, Die Brüder, 130-44.

[229]This view is not without patristic support, in the main from Tertullian. It is interesting, however, that before Helvidius it was held by the Antidicomarianitae in Arabia or Agaria, by Bonosus in Sardica, by Jovinian in Milan. This may be significant in that out of the way places are usually the last to relinquish ancient views. These places also represent good geographical spread which favors the antiquity of this tradition. Cf. Ropes, James, 54-5.

[230]The first clear statements of this view are in the Gospel of the Hebrews, the Gospel of Peter, and the Proto-Evangelium of James. The later patristic support Lightfoot cites is little more than the endorsement or embellishment of the statements of these apocryphal works or the traditions behind them, except perhaps for the case of Clement of Alexandria. Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, 274, 291.

[231]It is possible that there is one example in the NT (Mk 6.17-18) where ἀδελφός means 'step-brother'. Cf. Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 65, n. 121. The evidence of Gen 14.14-16, Lev 10.4, 1 Chron 23.21-22, where the LXX is influenced by the usage in Hebrew of the term אח (which may refer to full or half brothers or even more distant degrees of kinship) may or may not be relevant to our investigation. It must first be shown that Semitic influence is likely in the NT texts we are investigating. MM, 8-9, points out that ἀδελφός sometimes is used wrongly in the LXX of relatives other than full brothers (cf. p. 42). The evidence Blinzler, Die Brüder, 44-5, cites from Josephus does not support his case. In Josephus, Antiquities 1.207 (LCL I) 102-3, an obvious deception is involved; in Jewish War 6.356-357 (LCL II) 478-9, Blinzler wrongly assumes that 'brothers' is equated with 'kinsmen'. Rather, it appears that Josephus means that the brothers involved are kinsmen, but from this it does not follow that Josephus means kinsmen by brothers. There is little or no evidence that ἀδελφός was used to mean kinsmen in Koine Greek. The evidence cited by J. J. Collins, "The Brethren of the Lord and Two Recently Published Papyri", TS 5 (1944) 484-94, of two Egyptian papyri (dated between 134 and 89 B.C.) shows that such usage was possible but, as Collins admits, probably Semitic influence was involved. Lightfoot, Galatians, 261, is right in saying, "But it is scarcely conceivable that the cousins of anyone should be commonly and indeed exclusively styled his brothers by indifferent persons; still less, that one cousin in particular should be singled out and described in this loose way, 'James the Lord's brother'."

[232]Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, 248, n. 1, 259-61; McHugh, Mother, 226, and n. 9; Chapman, "The Brothers", 412. It should be noted that Paul probably is using the term 'apostle' in Gal 1.19 in a broader sense than of the Twelve or, alternatively, εἰ μή may mean 'but only'.

[233]Lightfoot, Galatians, 262; McHugh, Mother, 231.

[234]Cf. Plummer, Luke, 224; McHugh, Mother, 210.

[235]McHugh, 221. [236]McHugh, 210-22. [237]McHugh, 254.

[238]McHugh, 239, n. 11. [239]McHugh, 239 ff.

[240]Cf. Robertson, 285; Michaelis, "μήτηρ", TDNT IV, 642.

[241]McHugh, 240, 248. [242]McHugh, 241. [243]McHugh, 246-7.

[244]Note that in Jn 7.1-12 these brothers are apparently old enough to go up to the Feast of Tabernacles on their own (cf. 1 Cor 15.7). de Vaux, Ancient Israel, 22, remarks on how small the homes were and adds that even in OT times we rarely hear of a parent surrounded by more than his or her unmarried children (Neh 7.4). It appears likely that these brothers would have been at least 18-20 years old and likely married. Cf. Moore, Judaism II, 119.

[245]Here the whole argument turns on the crowd's knowledge of who these brothers, sisters, and parents are. Their argument has no force if these are foster-brothers, for Jesus could not be presumed to be the same as them since they had different parents. Nor could they be said to be ordinary in the same way. We may note that the ὧδε probably means Jesus' sisters are not merely in town but among the audience. Cf. Schrage, "συναγωγή", TDNT VII, 818. This makes Jesus remarks in Mk 6.4 more pointed. The contrast here and in Mk 3.35 is not nearly so forceful if in fact these are not Jesus' actual sisters and brothers.

[246]If our exegesis of Mt 1.25 and Lk 1.34 is correct, then this militates against both the Epiphanian and McHugh's view. Possibly, but not probably, the πρωτότοκος in Lk 2.7 implies that Mary had further children. Cf. Ropes, James, 54; Mayor, James, xiv-xv; McHugh, Mother, 203 ff. The view advocated by McHugh was rejected by Lightfoot, Galatians, 254, and n. 3.

[247]If the children in Mk 6.3 were those of Mary of Clopas, then why are they with Mary, Joseph's wife? Cf. BAG, 523; Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 71-2.

[248]McHugh, Mother, 205; Lightfoot, Galatians, 258-9, finds nearly a dozen Josephs in the NT, two James among the Twelve alone, while in Josephus we have nineteen Josephs.

[249]Taylor, Mark, 249.

[250]Cf. Barrett, John (1978) 551; R. Schnackenburg. Das Johannes-evangelium. Herders Theologischer zum Neuen Testament. Vol. IV.3 (ed. A. Wikenhauser and A. Vögtle; Freiburg, 1975) 323.

[251]Cf. Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 207.

[252]Cf. endnote 260 below on the objections raised in Barrett, John (1978) 550-2, on the historicity of this material. Dodd, Historical Tradition, 138, n. 2, mentions as possible that "...the Evangelist had a form of Passion tradition which, like those of Mark

and Luke, included a note of the presence of women, and their names, but was not, as were theirs, associated with the testimonia from Ps. xxxvii.12, lxxxvii.9."

[253]Cf. Bultmann, John, 673, n. 2; Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 209, n. 463: "...he is the human witness par excellence for the Johannine community (19:35, 21:24) and how do we explain this emphasis if the evangelist knew that the beloved disciple really was not present at any of the events he is supposed to have witnessed?" It is also possible, though not likely, that the one referred to in 19.35 is not the beloved disciple, but someone else.

[254]It is most probable that he would make such provisions for his mother especially if she was a widow, in view of His teaching on the matter of corban. Cf. pp. 88-90 of thesis.

[255]Cf. Schnackenburg, Johannesevangelium IV.3, 320-1; Brown, John xiii-xxi, 922.

[256]Possibly the list was originally mentioned after the death of Jesus (cf. the Synoptics) and the Evangelist has moved it forward to prepare for vv 26-29 (Bultmann, John, 671). Dodd, Historical Tradition, 127-8, points out how this pericope breaks the unities of time and place (cf. 19.27, 35) and looks like an insertion. This counts against Johannine creation of vv 26-27. Cf. Barrett, John (1978) 547-8: "The probability must remain that John was using what was already in his day traditional material..." Was this tradition originally about an unnamed disciple and Mary and the Evangelist has labeled that disciple, "the beloved"? Cf. Dodd, Interpretation, 428.

[257]Cf. Schnackenburg, Johannesevangelium IV.3, 319-28; Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 209-10.

[258]Certainly the μετὰ τοῦτο εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤδη πάντα τετέλεσται in 19.28 points in that direction. Cf. Brown, John xiii-xxi, 911; Stauffer, Jesus, 138.

[259]Two is not a valid option for it involves identifying the mother of Jesus with Mary of Clopas which is not Johannine. Cf. Brown, John xiii-xxi, 905-6. The following considerations argue against seeing three women: 1) such a view requires having two Marys in one family, cf. BAG, 437; 2) it is often the case that names are presented in pairs connected by καί when listed in the Gospels, cf. Mt 10.2-4, Lk 6.14-16, G. E. Evans, "The Sister of the Mother of Jesus", RevExp 44 (1947) 475; 3) the Synoptics testify to three women other than Mother Mary at the Crucifixion; 4) to maintain that there were only three women one must resort to a rather unnatural punctuation at 19,25 and ignore the two καὶs which divide the names into two pairs, cf. B. Schwank, " Das Christusbild im Zweiten Teil des Johannesevangeliums (X(X) - Die ersten Gaben des erhöhten Königs: Jo 19,23-30", SS 29 (7, 1964) 299.

[260]Cf. Stauffer, Jesus, 136, 229 note for p. 136, 1.10. The example of R. Eleazar b. Shimeon (ca. A.D. 180) standing and weeping near a crucified man may be cited (cf. Str-B II, 580), and compared to our text (Schwank, "Das Christusbild", 298). The objections of Barrett, John (1978) 551 to Stauffer's view, based mainly on the military requirements of execution of a rebel king and on Josephus

Life 420-421 (LCL) 154-5, are unconvincing for the following reasons: 1) E. Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. - A.D. 135) Vol. I (Edinburgh, 1973) 370-2, does not make clear how the military requirements of the execution of a rebel king affected the standing of friends or relatives near the cross; 2) the text being cited from Josephus does not say anything about permission being required to approach a crucified person, though it may imply that permission was required to get someone released from his cross (these are two different, though not unrelated, matters); 3) the evidence cited by Stauffer and Str-B argues against Barrett's view (J. T. Gittin 48c and Tosephta Gittin 7.1 [cf. Lane, Mark, 576] may refer to mass executions, not to public or state executions where there would be guards); 4) it is not certain that what applied to men crucified along a roadside, would also apply to someone crucified just outside Jerusalem in the presence of Roman guards. Cf. Josephus, Life 420 (LCL) 154 (ὡς ἐκεῖθεν ὑποστρέφων εἶδον... likely implies it is not in a city). The very presence of the guards in Jesus' case meant there was no need to prohibit or hinder a few grief stricken women (and one man?) from being near His cross. They would not be perceived by armed guards as a real threat.

[261]Though it is possible, as Prof. Barrett has suggested to me, that γύναι may be used because the term 'mother' is about to be used in a different sense, this does not explain its use in John 2. It is better to find an answer that explains the use of γύναι in both John 2 and 19.

[262]Stauffer, Jesus, 138. Thus, what I am suggesting is that the Fourth Evangelist has not simply drawn out the implications of what actually happened at the cross, but reinterpreted this tradition to serve his own theological purposes. The Evangelist appears to have transformed a simple and historically credible narrative about Jesus' care for His mother into a pregnant statement about Mary and about man and woman beneath the cross.

[263]On the revelatory formula, cf. Jn 1.29, 36, 47; 1 Sam 9.17; Brown, John xiii-xxi, 923. Was this originally an adoption or testamentary disposition formula modified by the Evangelist? Cf. Stauffer, Jesus, 138; Barrett, John (1978) 552.

[264]Cf. M. De Goedt, "Un schème de révélation dans le Quatrième Évangile", NTS 8 (1961-62) 145-9.

[265]A. Feuillet, "L'heure de la femme (Jn 16.21) et l'heure de la Mère de Jésus (Jn 19,25-27)", Bib 47 (3, 1966) 361-80, attempts to link Jn 16.21 and 19.25-27. But Mary's hour of pain is unlike that of the disciples, for hers is an hour of arrival, theirs an hour of departure, dispersion, and grief. Jn 16.21 is a general metaphor, not a veiled allusion to Mary.

[266]The phrase τὰ ἴδια can mean 'his house', or 'his home', or even 'his own property and/or possession'. Cf. BAG, 370; LSJ, 818; MM, 298, who translate εἰς τὰ ἴδια as 'into, among his own' ,'Home' then perhaps is not what the phrase usually connotes, but rather 'one's own (something)', the something being determined by the context. It is probably best to translate all the uses of τὰ ἴδια in John the same, i.e., 'his own house', with the understanding that the phrase is used in a broader sense in 1.11a and 16.32 (where it is a dwelling), and in the narrow sense in 19.27. McHugh, Mother, 278 probably is incorrect in saying that εἰς τὰ ἴδια means "as a spiritual possession of (his) heart".

[267]Barrett, John (1955) 458-9.

[268]Vellanickal, "The Mother of Jesus", 288.

[269]Schwank, "Das Christusbild", 302.

[270]Cf. Jn 1.35-39, 18.15-16, 19.25-27, 13.23, 20.2, 6-9, 21.7, 20; Vellanickal, "The Mother of Jesus", 289; Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 217.

[271]Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 212.

[272]Cf. Schwank, "Das Christusbild", 302.

[273]It is pointed out rightly in Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 213-4, that there is no mention of 'brother' in 19.26-27.

[274]Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 215-6.

[275]To be a spiritual mother to or in the Church and to be 'Mother Church' are two different things. Brown, John xiii-xxi, 925, states, "...the concept of the personal spiritual motherhood of Mary makes its appearance...in the 9th century in the East with George of Nicomedia..." If, seeing Mary as Daughter of Zion is dependent on linking Jn 16.21 and 19.25-27 (cf. McHugh, Mother, 384-5), then this is unlikely (cf. Brown, John xiii-xxi, 925-7). The same difficulty faces the Eve symbolism and it becomes even less likely if there is no (or no primary) reference to Mary in Revelation 12. Cf. Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 216-7; and pp. 328, endnote 2, of thesis.

[276]Cf. Gospel of Bartholomew IV.5, NTAp I, 495. Perhaps we may speak of the Fourth Evangelist's tendency to depict women as 'first class' disciples when we consider the mention of: Jesus' love for Mary and Martha (11.5, cf. 13.1 and pp. 276-7 of thesis); 2) the Evangelist's portrayal of Mary Magdalene as first witness of the risen Jesus and as a sheep who knows the Shepherd's voice when she is called by name (cf. 20.16, 10.2-4); 3) the Samaritan woman who believes and to some extent bears witness (John 4); 4) Jesus' mother as a model with the beloved disciple of male and female members of Jesus' true family (cf. 19.25-27). All of this becomes significant when (with Brown, "Roles of Women", 699) we recognize that disciple is "the primary Johannine category".

[277]It seems likely that πάντα τετέλεσται alone refers to what precedes and the ἵνα clause goes with what follows as an example of a final clause which precedes. So MHT III, 344; BDF, sec. 478, p. 253. This would rule out seeing Jesus' act for His mother as Scripture fulfillment, but in the Evangelist's scheme of things the act which completes or climaxes the Passion after which Jesus could be sure that 'all was now (ἤδη) completed'.

[278]Its similarity in style, content, and wording to other such passages in Acts (2.42 - ἦσαν δὲ προσκαρτεροῦντες; 2.46 - προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν; cf. 6.4) makes this virtually certain. Cf. H. J. Cadbury, "The Summaries in Acts", in The Beginnings of Christianity (ed. F.J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake; London, 1933) IV.397; Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 173-4, n. 395.

[279]Cadbury, "The Summaries", Beginnings IV, 396, 402.

[280]Cadbury, "The Summaries", Beginnings IV, 402.

[281]Cf. Lake and Cadbury, Beginnings II (1922) 11; E. Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles - A Commentary (Philadelphia, 1971) 155-6, concludes that the reference to Jesus' family is added for edification - improving the pious image of the early days. Conzelmann, Theology of Luke, 172, n. 1, suspects Ac 1.14 to be an interpolation, but its language and style is too Lukan to sustain such a view.

[282]Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 175.

[283]Cf. Haenchen, Acts, 155.

[284]G. W. H. Lampe, "Acts", in Peake's Commentary on the Bible (ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley; London, 1962) 887, par. 774e.

[285]Cf. Metzger, TC, 284; Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 173, n. 394; A. Ehrhardt, The Acts of the Apostles (Manchester, 1969) 52. Some Catholics have argued that σύν is original and distinguishes Mary from the brothers here; but McHugh, Mother, 235, recognizes the weakness of this argument. It likely provides early evidence of a sensitivity among certain scribes in post NT times about Mary's virginity as an ongoing state.

[286]On 17.4, 12, 34, etc. cf. pp. 376-7 of thesis. Haenchen, Acts, 154, n. 3; W. Thiele, "Eine Bemerkung zu Act 1:14", ZNW 53 (1-2, 1962) 110-11. Though the reading in D may be an accommodation to Ac 21.5, on the whole it appears to be an attempt to submerge the prominence of women disciples in the early Church.

[287]Lampe, "Acts", 887, par 774e; Ehrhardt, Acts, 49; BDF, sec. 257, p. 134; Lake and Cadbury, Beginnings II, 11.

[288]Haenchen, Acts, 155; F. F. Bruce, The Book of the Acts (Grand Rapids, 1954) 44; F. J. Foakes-Jackson, The Acts of the Apostles (London, 1931) 6-7.

[289]Haenchen, Acts, 155.

[290]F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles (Grand Rapids, 1952) 74, though he adds that it could mean 'including'.

[291]Haenchen, Acts, 154.

[292]Brown, Birth, 431, n. 76; Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 176. Could this be the inner core which Luke mentions in Lk 1.2 and relies on for his information?

[293]Brown, ed., Mary in the NT, 176-7.

[294]M N. Maxey, "Beyond Eve and Mary - A Theological Alternative for Women's Liberation", Dialogue 10 (1971) 112-22, advocates that Mary's role as mother is not to be seen as the norm or model for women believers today. As Brown, Birth, 342, rightly points out, Mary's blessedness in the Gospels is derived in part because the fruit of her womb is blessed. This reveals her subordination, as Brown notes. One must also say that Mary's faith is blessed and is in fact the prerequisite to her being the vessel of the Incarnation.

[295]Cf. Danker, Jesus, 133; Marshall, Luke, 450. Luke is progressing from 'love your neighbor' to 'love your God with your whole heart', and then on to an example of how devotion to God is manifested by the Lord's Prayer.

[296]So Bultmann, History, 33; Marshall, Luke, 451.

[297]Cf. Bultmann, History, 33, 60-1, 67.

[298]I take it that John is not dependent on Luke here and vice versa. Cf. Creed, Luke, 154 on the characterization; cf. pp. 283-4 of thesis.

[299]Cf. Dibelius, From Tradition, 293, who speaks of Mary and Martha as holy persons and intimates that we have a legend here, which had its final basis in historical reality.

[300]Cf. endnote 321 below.

[301]Cf. Jeremias, NT Theology, 226; Marshall, Luke, 451. Luke's placement of the story indicates he is mainly including the story because of its spiritual, rather than social, implications. Cf. endnote 295 above.

[302]The shorter reading (αὐτόν) is to be preferred for there is no good reason why 'into her house' would have been omitted if it was a part of the original form of our text. Cf. Metzger, TC, 153; Marshall, Luke, 451-2. Contrast 9.53.

[303]Plummer, Luke, 290; Caird, Luke, 149-50.

[304]Note the imperfect tense - ἤκουεν. Cf. Plummer, Luke, 291.

[305]Pace Ellis, Luke, 162; cf. Plummer, Luke, 291.

[306]We find indications of this in Ac 22.3 and possibly Lk 8.35 (cf. v 39). Cf. Aboth 1.4, Danby, 446; Tanhuma Genesis Bereshith 2a, ML, Anthology, 474; Grassi, "Women's Liberation", 27-8; Brennan, "Women in the Gospels", 292-3. In rabbinic Judaism, a woman was expected to stay at home to mind family affairs so that her sons and husband could study. Cf. B. T. Berakoth 17a, Cohen, 112.

[307]Cf. pp. 9-11.

[308] . . . . . Such behavior on Jesus' part may be one reason why Jesus may have been thought to have loose sexual morals. Cf. Mt 9.11; Ellis, Luke, 162.

[309]Cf. pp. 185 of thesis. B. T. Kiddushin 70a, The Babylonian Talmud, 335-6; Swidler, Women in Judaism, 125. In Jn 11.19 we find the phrase πρὸς τὴν Μάρθαν καὶ Μαριάμ. The variant reading, τὰς περὶ Μάρθαν, though it has some substantial support in p^{45} vid and A, is rather unJohannine in style and probably secondary. The preferred reading likely refers to Mary, Martha, and their household (servants, friends, relatives). Certainly, the scribes who altered it to the more elegant τὰς περὶ Μάρθαν thought so. Cf. Metzger, TC, 234. If we may take this as an accurate statement, then it probably was not necessary for Martha to prepare and serve this meal; Martha's deed then would have been a labor of love.

[310]The δέ in v 40 seems to be adversative, contrasting Mary and Martha; thus, 'distracted' is probably the appropriate word to translate περισπάω. Martha is pulled in several directions at once. Cf. BAG, 656; Moule, I-B, 62. The word διακονία is used in its common sense of providing hospitality. Cf. BAG, 183. The πολλὴν here prepares us for the πολλά in v 41 and the contrast there between many and one.

[311]Cf. Caird, Luke, 150; Danker, Jesus, 133.

[312]The repetition of the name may express affection or concern (cf. Lk 22.31; BDF, sec. 493.1, p. 261), or even reproach (cf. Ac 9.4). θορυβάζῃ not τυρβάζῃ is the correct reading here; cf. Metzger, TC, 153-4.

[313]I owe the idea for this chart to A. Baker, "One Thing Necessary", CBQ 27 (1965) 127; cf. M. Augsten, "Lukanische Miszelle", NTS 14 (1967-68) 581-3.

[314]Marshall, Luke, 453.

[315]The longer readings seem largely confined to the area of Alexandria (B, S, and other less important mss.), while the shorter readings are attested in Egypt, Antioch, Caesarea, and Syria. Cf. Baker, "One Thing Necessary", 131.

[316]Cf. the apparatus in UBSGNT, 254-55; cf. Baker, "One Thing Necessary", 130.

[317]For the longer reading: Synopsis (1967); NTGNA; Ellis, Luke, 162; Danker, Jesus, 133; Plummer, Luke, 292; NIV (margin); RSV (margin); JB; G. Schrenk, "ἐκλέγομαι", TDNT IV, 172.
For the shorter reading: UBSGNT; Caird, Luke, 149; RS, Translator's Luke, 426-7; Phillips; TEV; NEB; RSV; KJV; E. Stauffer, "εἷς", TDNT II, 435. For the omissions: Creed, Luke, 154 (with hesitation); Manson, Luke, 132. On the evidence of the Fathers, cf. Baker, "One Thing Necessary", 131-5.

[318]Tertullian and Cyprian are silent; cf. Baker, "One Thing Necessary", 134.

[319]Augsten, "Lukanische Miszelle", 581-2.

[320]Baker, "One Thing Necessary", 136.

[321]Ellis, Luke, 162; Caird, Luke, 149. The copyists who decided in favor of the longer reading or option five may have been of the persuasion that stressing only one thing as necessary was not being single-minded, but simple-minded.

[322]Creed, Luke, 149-50; Plummer, Luke, 292.

[323]Danker, Jesus, 133.

[324]The conjecture of Wellhausen that ἥς should be substituted for ἥτις is rejected by MHT II, 435. It is the portion, not Mary, that is not to be taken away. Cf. MHT I, 92; Robertson, 728.

[325]Caird, Luke, 149-50; Plummer, Luke, 292.

[326]Pace F. Jeffrey, "Martha and Mary", ET 29 (1917-18) 186-8; cf. Robertson, 810.

[327]F. Stagg, "Biblical Perspectives on the Single Person", RevExp 74 (1, 1977) 14, says, "There may be significance in the fact that their marital status is a non-issue in the Gospels. This does not imply indifference to marriage, but it does mean that individuals have identity apart from marriage." Jesus' teaching on eunuchs (Mt 19.10-12) may have had the effect of allowing women to have a choice in regard to marriage. That Luke focuses on single women without comment on their marital status may reveal that by the time he was writing it was acceptable for women to remain single for the sake of the Kingdom. On Ac 21.9, cf. pp. 389-91. Mary and Martha, presuming they were single, could then be models for such people in Luke's audience, and this may be one reason why he includes this story.

[328]Cf. Schnackenburg, Johannesevangelium IV.2 (1971) 401, 430-1.

[329]Cf. Lk 10.38-42; and endnote 309 above. Jn 11.9 points to this conclusion.

[330]Dodd, Historical Tradition, 229, says that it is totally unique in giving its character a name.

[331]Ibid.

[332]Morris, Studies, 169.

[333]Brown, John i-xii, 429-30.

[334]Cf. Bultmann, John, 394-405; Schnackenburg, Johannesevangelium IV.2, 400-01, 430-1.

[335]Dodd, Historical Tradition, 230.

[336]So Hoskyns, Fourth Gospel II, 461.

[337]Dodd, Historical Tradition, 221-32; Jeremias, NT Theology, 89-90; Dibelius, From Tradition, 72.

[338]Bultmann, John, 402.

[339]Cf. endnote 348 below.

[340]Cf. Barrett, John (1978) 395.

[341]Brown, John i-xii, 429. J. N. Sanders, "Those whom Jesus loved, John xi.5", NTS 1 (1954-55) 29-41, argues well for a reconsideration that the narrative is historical in its foundation and life-like details. He is right in noting that the Fourth Evangelist depends here on a source (possibly eyewitness?) that knows Jerusalem and its neighboring towns well.

[342]Brown, John i-xii, 429.

[343]Brown, John i-xii, 433, 436.

[344]Barrett, John (1955) 325-6; Lightfoot, John, 218; Morris, John, 540.

[345]Cf. pp. 247-8 of thesis.

[346]Dodd, Interpretation, 255.

[347]Brown, "Roles of Women", 694, n. 19, points out that Lazarus is identified through his relationship to Mary and Martha perhaps because the women, but not Lazarus (who appears as an historical figure only in John), were known in the wider Gospel tradition. Cf. Lk 10.38-42; Jn 11.2.

[348]This is the impression given in Lk 10.38-42 and Jn 12.2. Cf. Morris, John, 539, 578; Lightfoot, John, 221, 228. That Mary appears to have less faith and fortitude in the Master's presence than her sister probably is due to her emotional state (cf. pp. 176-8 of thesis). John 12 likely gives us a clearer indication of her usual attitude toward Jesus.

[349]Cf. 13.1, 23, 34, 14.15, 21-28, 15.9, 12, 17, 19.26, 21.7, 15-16. So Brown, "Roles of Women", 694. It seems unlikely that there is a real difference in our text between φιλέω and ἀγαπάω. So Brown, John i-xii, 423; pace Sanders, "Those whom Jesus loved", 33.

[350]Dodd, Interpretation, 147, 364. The καὶ νῦν (v 22) here, in view of v 39, does not seem to suggest a hope of present resurrection. But cf. Stählin, "νῦν", TDNT IV, 1110; Barrett, John (1955) 328.

[351]Brown, John i-xii, 433.

[352]Cf. Jn 20.31; Schnackenburg, Johannesevangelium IV.2, 416.

[353]Lightfoot, John, 221; Barrett, John (1955) 328. Possibly the portrayal in 11.32 is a creation of the Evangelist on the basis of the saying of Martha in 11.21, and Mary's place at Jesus' feet in 12.3.

[354]κλαίω means not merely 'cry', but 'wail'. Cf. LSJ, 955; Brown, John i-xii, 425. It is possible that the Evangelist has somewhat embellished the sorrow and misunderstanding motif (e.g., by doubling the "Lord, if you had been here..." remark?) in order to heighten the narrative's tension so that the raising comes as a shock and surprise.

[355]For this last suggestion about cross-fertilization, cf. A. Legault, "An Application of the Form-Critique Method to the Anointings in Galilee (Lk 7,36-50) and Bethany (Mt 26,6-13; Mk 14,3-9; Jn 12,1-8)", CBQ 16 (1954) 131-45; cf. Marshall, Luke, 306. The table in Brown, John i-xii, 450, should be consulted to see the similarities and differences in the two narratives.

[356]Plummer, Luke, 209, notes some ten or eleven Simons in the NT, and about twenty in Josephus.

[357]Pliny, Natural History 13.3.19 (LCL IV) 108-11; cf. pp. 172, and 198, endnote 15 of thesis.

[358]Jeremias, Jerusalem, 8-9.

[359]The tenuous idea that Mary Magdalene = the sinner woman of Luke 7 overlooks the fact that demon possession and sexual sin are not synonymous in the Gospels (note in Lk 9.1-2 the mention of two

ministries). On ἁμαρτωλός, cf. pp. 171-2. In Luke 7 the unnamed sinner woman is forgiven and goes her way; in Lk 8.2 Mary Magdalene is introduced as one among several new persons. Cf. F. C. Burkitt, "Mary Magdalene and Mary, Sister of Martha", ET 42 (1930-31) 157-9. The idea that Mary of Bethany = Mary Magdalene is equally tenuous. Mary Magdalene is a traveling disciple; Mary of Bethany is always associated with a home and with Martha.

[360]Marshall, Luke, 306.

[361]So Plummer, Luke, 209; Ellis, Luke, 121-3; Morris, John, 571-3; Creed, Luke, 109; Burkitt, "Mary Magdalene", 159.

[362]Brown, John i-xii, 450-51.

[363]Cf. Sanders, "Those whom Jesus loved", 37; Creed, Luke, 109; Burkitt, "Mary Magdalene", 159.

[364]The Fourth Evangelist does not say that Jesus dined with Lazarus six days before Passover, though this might be implied by 12.12. He simply says, ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς πρὸ ἓξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα ἦλθεν. Zerwick, sec. 71, p. 26, says we do not have "six days before the Passover" because the preposition is governing the distance itself, not the point from which the distance is measured. MHT III, 248, suggests that it means "before six days of the Passover", but cf. BDF, sec. 213, p. 114.

[365]Cf. Dibelius, From Tradition, 43; Bultmann, History, 36-7; Taylor, Mark, 529.

[366]Cf. Schnackenburg, Johannesevangelium IV.2, 464-5.

[367]Cf. Dodd, Historical Tradition, 166-8.

[368]So Gardner-Smith, St. John, 47-8; cf. Bernard, John II, 410.

[369]Brown, John i-xii, 451. But note how Matthew handles his Marcan source at this point.

[370]Dodd, Historical Tradition, 167.

[371]If this is the case, then it must be asked why he has suppressed the name of Simon found in Mark.

[372]Cf. pp. 61-2 of thesis.

[373]Dodd, Interpretation, 370, cf. p. 369. D. Daube, "The Anointing at Bethany and Jesus' Burial", ATR 32 (1950) 186-99, suggests that the Gospel writers had an interest in showing that Jesus' body was treated reverently and duly anointed. As Barrett, John (1978) 409, says, it is difficult to see how this is reflected in John 12 since Jesus' body is provided for in Jn 19.38-42 in more than adequate fashion.

[374]Cf. Leipoldt, Die Frau, 145, 259-60; and pp. 185-6 of thesis. Brown, "Roles of Women", 690, suggests that by the time the Evangelist wrote, Mary's activity would be recognized as the function of an ordained office in the Church, i.e., deacon. If so, then the Evangelist might be suggesting that women were capable of performing diaconal ministries in the Church and should be authorized to do so.

[375]On anointing for burial, cf. Str-B I, 426-9, 986; de Vaux, Ancient Israel, 102-4; ML, Anthology, 486; cf. Leipoldt, Die Frau, 142-5, 259-60, n. 9 on social and royal anointings.

[376]Cf. BAG, 531, 535-6; MM, 419; Michaelis, "μύρον", TDNT IV, 800-01; Barrett, John (1955) 343; B. T. Shabbath 62a The Babylonian Talmud, 291. The word πιστικός likely means 'pure' or 'genuine', deriving from πιστός (cf. LSJ supplement, 121; MM, 514-5; A-S, 362), but it could be derived from a name of some sort (pistachio?). Cf. Barrett, John (1955) 343; BAG, 668; Max Zerwick and Mary Grosvenor, A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament (Rome, 1974) I.323.

[377]λίτρα = twelve ounces = one Roman pound; cf. BAG, 476.

[378]Pace Brown, John i-xii, 454; Morris, John, 573, n. 6.

[379]Athenaeus, The Deipnosophists 12.553 (LCL V) 512-3 (though this is somewhat later than our period).

[380]Str-B I, 427-8, 986; Hill, Matthew, 334, says, "The gesture of the woman would not be extraordinary in an eastern home..."

[381]This practice was customary in the first century Roman empire. Cf. Petronius, Satyricon 27 (LCL) 46 ff. Leipoldt, Die Frau, 145; Licht, Sexual Life in Ancient Greece, 435, 519. Jews had adopted various Graeco-Roman habits such as the practice of reclining at banquets. Cf. p. 171 of thesis. F. Büchsel, "ἀνάκειμαι", TDNT III, 654; Str-B IV, 56-76, 611-39, espec. 615-9; BAG, 55; H. Achelis, "Altchristliche Kunst", ZNW 17 (1916) 87.

[382]A good Jewess might pride herself in never letting anyone but her husband see her hair. Cf. Jeremias, Jerusalem, 360. For a woman to unloose her hair was shameful in the eyes of the rabbis. Cf. ML, Anthology, 108-09; M. Baba Kamma 8.6, Danby, 343.

[383]One possible explanation would be that the Fourth Evangelist is portraying the anointing story as a proleptic Last Supper which in John includes a foot washing by Jesus. Cf. E. E. Platt, "The Ministry of Mary of Bethany", TT 34 (1, 1977) 29-39. For another possibility, cf. endnote 397 below.

[384]The use of ἐνταφιασμόν (v 8) in Mark, and ἐνταφίασαι (v 12) in Matthew makes this clear.

[385]Platt, "Mary of Bethany", 29-39; Lightfoot, John, 235.

[386]It is possible that the woman was doing more than she realized at the time. Women normally performed the ritual of anointing for burial. Here, the woman probably intended it simply as an act of gratitude. Cf. pp. 293-5 of thesis.

[387]Cf. Brown, John i-xii, 454; J. K. Elliot, "The Anointing of Jesus", ET 85 (1974) 105-7.

[388]It is clearly the extravagance of the act that causes the angry objection. On the value of 300 denarii, cf. BAG, 178; MM, 145; Morris, John, 578; Mt 20.2.

[389]Cf. MHT I, 175; Robertson, 932; BDF, sec. 364, 183-4.

[390]Brown, John i-xii, 449; Barrett, John (1955) 345.

[391]MHT I, 178, 248; Robertson, 931.

[392]Cf. BAG, 822; A-S, 445; LSJ, 1789. The primary meaning in the papyri seems to be 'to observe'. Cf. MM, 633.

[393]Barrett, John (1955) 345; G. Bertram, "συντρίβω", TDNT VII, 925, n. 41.

[394]Cf. Cranfield, Mark, 415-8; Lane, Mark, 494-5; and contrast Jeremias, NT Theology, 133-4. It is unlikely that εἰς μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς is referring to a memorial by Mary to Jesus. Pace J. H. Greenlee, "εἰς μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς 'For her Memorial' Mt. xxvi.13; Mk xiv.9", ET 71 (1960) 245.

[395]The rabbinic saying from Ecclesiastes Midrash Rabbah 7.1 probably dates from a time after the era of Jesus and the NT writers. Cf. Barrett, John (1955) 344.

[396]Stauffer, Jesus, 223-4.

[397]Barrett, John (1955) 341, thinks that the Fourth Evangelist may be implying that this is a royal anointing in preparation for Jesus' entry into Jerusalem. But, as Brown, John i-xii, 454, points out, Mary anoints Jesus' feet and in the next scene the Evangelist casts the narrative so that it appears Jesus does not accept the royal acclamations of the crowd (cf. Brown, John i-xii, 461-3). Barrett, John (1978) 409, says that the anointing of the feet need not point away from a coronation ritual since Jesus is glorified in death and is anointed with the spices of burial. Still, if the Fourth Evangelist intended to paint a kingly ritual anointing, then it would seem he would have brought the matter a little more to the foreground.

[398]Cf. pp. 389-92 of thesis. One of the notable attributes of a prophet in both the OT and NT is that he or she performs symbolic acts such as we have in our text. Cf. Ezek 4.1-5.5; Ac 21.10-11.

[399]Cf. pp. 285-7 of thesis. Cf. pp. 386-8 of thesis for another precedent which might have led to deaconesses.

[400]Manson, Luke, xiii-xix, notes 7.11-17, 36-50, 8.1-3, 10.38-42, 13.10-17, and more distantly 23.27-32. This section of the thesis appears in another form in ZNW 70 (1979) 243-8.

[401]Ellis, Luke, 124.

[402]So Klostermann, Lukasevangelium, 95-6; cf. Marshall, Luke, 315.

[403]Note Luke's fondness for parallelism: 1) κηρύσσω and εὐαγγελίζομαι 2) θεραπεύω and διακονέω; 3) πνεῦμα and δαιμόνιον. Creed, Luke, 112-3, lists the following elements as characteristically Lukan: 1) καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ...καὶ αὐτὸς; 2) καθεξῆς; 3) διώδευεν; 4) εὐαγγελιζόμενος; 5) ἀσθενειῶν.

[404]*Cf.* Caird, Luke, 116; M. Hengel, "Maria Magdalena und die Frauen als Zeugen", *in* Abraham Unser Vater, Festschrift für Otto Michel (Leiden, 1963) 243-56.

[405]*Cf. Klostermann,* Lukasevangelium, *96; Caird,* Luke, *116; and* endnote 412 below.

[406]Luke surely sees these women as more than just a hospitality or catering service for the men and Jesus. He saw them as being prepared to be witnesses. Cf. Lk 23.49 and 24.8 ("they remembered"). Historically, however, they may not have been trained to be such by Jesus, but may have simply served the disciples out of devotion to Jesus. Cf. Hengel, "Maria Magdalena", 247-8.

[407]Conzelmann, Theology of Luke, 47-8, says: "...it is possible that by his emphasis on the women he forestalls those [claims] of Mary. The Galilean women and Mary seem to stand in a similar relation to one another as the Twelve and the Lord's brethren."

[408]There are no known cases of a woman scholar who did not gain her knowledge through contacts in her own home (the servants of R. Judah, the wife of R. Meir). What they learned at home and in the synagogue was the minimum necessary to remain good Jews. We do not read of them going to any of the rabbinic study houses for more scholarly education.

[409]Cf. pp. 288-93 of thesis. Jesus broke with Jewish tradition in regard to having women disciples and traveling companions, and there is no reason why He could not have continued this revolutionary trend by choosing some women to be among the Twelve. It appears then that male headship as a pattern of leadership, if refined and redefined according to the dictates of discipleship and Jesus' example, was acceptable to Him. Jesus' choice of twelve men to be His special companions and to receive special teaching, and the fact that He recommissioned these men after the Resurrection to be leaders of His community, is inexplicable on the supposition that Jesus was a 'feminist', i.e., one who rejects a patriarchal framework outright. Such a person would have felt it necessary to include at least one woman among the Twelve. Cf. Schürmann, Lukasevangelium I, 446-8.

[410]Cf. ML, Anthology, 415-6, 423-5; B. T. Shabbath 62a, The Babylonian Talmud, 290; B. T. Berakoth 10b, Cohen, 64; cf. pp. 94-7 of thesis on Lk 20.47 and parallels; Josephus, Antiquities 18.81 ff. (LCL) 9; B. T. Babba Kamma 119a, Der Babylonische Talmud 6 (trans. L. Goldschmidt; Haag, 1933) 453 ff.; Baron, History of the Jews II, 240, 412-3; Str-B II, 164, rightly mentions that women in parts of the Roman Empire could be called mater synagogae. Cf. CII I, n. 523, p. 384; n. 606, p. 436; n. 639, pp. 457-8. They could be called ἀρχισυνάγωγοι because of their financial support or their respectability, not their leadership. Cf. CII I, n. 638, p. 457; Schrage, "ἀρχισυνάγωγος", TDNT VII, 846, and n. 20.

[411]Rengstorf, "ἑπτά", TDNT II, 630-1.

[412]Danker, Jesus, 101, says that the mention of Joanna not only shows a possible source of Luke's information, but also that the Gospel has "...penetrated Herod's own establishment." ἐπίτροπος here likely means 'manager' or 'steward'. Cf. BAG, 303; MM, 249; LSJ, 669; Michel, "οἰκονόμος", TDNT V, 150.

[413]RS, Translator's Luke, 327, says that these are to be distinguished from the 'some women' of Lk 8.2 who had been healed and were part of the group of disciples traveling with Jesus. The word αἵτινες seems to indicate that all these women provided for Jesus and the Twelve.

[414]The variant αὐτῷ was likely a later Christocentric correction. Cf. Metzger, TC, 144. The word διακονέω has its most common sense here of providing material aid. Cf. Beyer, "διακονέω", TDNT II, 85. Could this be the background or precedent for the later order and functions of deaconesses? Cf. Conzelmann, Theology of Luke, 47, n. 1; Ellis, Luke, 124.

[415]τὰ ὑπάρχοντα literally means 'substance' as in one's belongings (money, property). Cf. RS, Translator's Luke, 328; BAG, 845; A-S, 457; MM, 650-1. Probably, some of these women could give only their time and talents, perhaps in making meals or clothes. Cf. Arndt, Luke, 223. Caird, Luke, 116, says that the well-to-do women underwrote the expenses of the group.

[416]Cf. S. G. Wilson, The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts (Cambridge, 1973) 61.

[417]Cf. H. E. W. Turner, "The Virgin Birth", ET 68 (1956) 12-17.

[418]Rengstorf, "μαθητής", TDNT IV, 446-7. When one realizes that it is Rengstorf who has recognized perhaps more clearly than anyone the significance of the twelve Apostles for Luke, this is a most revealing statement.

[419]The ἐν αἷς in Mk 15.40=Mt 27.56 indicates this. The First Evangelist has γυναῖκες πολλαὶ (Mt 27.55), probably based on Mk 15.41 - ἄλλαι πολλαὶ.

[420]V. Taylor, The Passion Narrative of St. Luke, 94-5.

[421]Cf. Danker, Jesus, 242; RS, Translator's Luke, 738; Marshall, Luke, 877; Bultmann, "γνωστός", TDNT I, 718-9; BAG, 163; A-S, 94. D. Flusser, "The Crucified One and the Jews", Immanuel 7 (1977) 30, argues, "...Luke has given us an historically probable description of who mocked and who mourned the Crucified One, and it seems as if this is what was written in his source."

[422]Cf. BAG, 615; BDF, sec. 238, 124; Robertson, 614; MHT III, 273, says that it does not imply "the immediate neighborhood".

[423]Cf. BAG, 489; A-S, 276; Swete, Mark, 367; M'Neile, Matthew, 425; Creed, Luke, 288; Hoskyns, Fourth Gospel II, 630.

[424]Cf. pp. 258-9, and endnote 260, p. 347-8 of thesis.

[425]Cf. pp. 286-7 of thesis.
Plummer, Mark, 361, says ὁ μικρότερος would have been used if 'the Less' rather than 'the Little' was meant.

[426]So Marshall, Luke, 877; Danker, Jesus, 242; cf. 23.49b.

[427]Cf. p. 257, and endnote 259, p. 347 of thesis.

[428]Hengel, "Maria Magdalena", 250, argues that John's principle of arranging names is by degree of kinship to Jesus, while in the Synoptics they are listed according to their importance to and in the family of faith.

[429]The mention of Mary's sister and Mary Clopas before Mary Magdalene in Jn 19.25 is possibly a matter of mentioning relatives before acquaintances. Jn 19.26-27 is about how Jesus' closest relative is to relate to Him. The mention of Mary Magdalene in Jn 19.25 may be intended to imply that as Mary will receive a special mention in what follows (19.26-27) so will Mary Magdalene (20.1-18).

[430]There are several possible reasons why no women are mentioned directly in Paul's list that do not reflect in a negative way on their witness: 1) Paul's main concern is to mention the apostolic witnesses commissioned by the risen Lord (note the specific mention of Peter, the Twelve, James, all the Apostles, and then Paul); 2) Paul may be quoting a traditional list of official witnesses; 3) the omission of the appearances to women may be for apologetic reasons (i.e., in view of the common attitude toward a woman's witness) and need not imply anything about Paul's or the original list maker's view of women's witness. Paul does not say that Jesus appeared first to Peter, he simply says ὅτι ὤφθη Κηφᾷ. The εἶτα which follows likely indicates that this is a chronological list, but it may be a chronological list of the appearances to the official witnesses. Cf. Stagg, "Biblical Perspectives", 14, and pp. 301-3 of thesis. Brown, John xiii-xxi, 971, rightly says of Paul's list: "There is no reason why such a tradition should have included an appearance to a woman who could scarcely be presented as either an official witness to the resurrection or as an apostle." Cf. Brown, "Roles of Women", 692, n. 12.

[431]Matthew and Mark have θεωροῦσαι, while Luke has ὁρῶσαι. The gender of ὁρῶσαι as well as the position of the verb, indicates that, as Danker, Jesus, 242, says, "The women are mentioned almost as a separate group."

[432]Flusser, "The Crucified One", 32.

[433]Flusser, 34. Is this an Isaiah 53 motif?

[434]This appears especially to be the case in the Passion and Resurrection narratives in Mark. Cf. 14.13, 16, 17, 20, 32, 33, 43, 50, and 16.7. R. P. Meye, Jesus and the Twelve. Discipleship and Revelation in Mark's Gospel (Grand Rapids, 1968) has argued well the case that 'the disciples' = 'the Twelve' throughout Mark's Gospel with rare exceptions (cf. 2.15).

[435]Is Galilee for Mark the place where the disciples and Jesus begin and renew fellowship together? Cf. Mk 16.1-8.

[436]Cf. BAG, 791.

[437]Cf. Marshall, Luke, 877; Kittel, "συνακολουθέω", TDNT I, 216. As Zerwick, sec. 291, p. 99, and Moule, I-B, 101, say, present participles can be used to express relative anteriority ('having followed').

[438]BDF, sec. 390, p. 197; Plummer, Matthew, 405, n. 1. Alternatively, it is conceivable that the First Evangelist was attempting to limit the women to the tasks of hospitality (they followed and served - they were not trained as Jesus' envoys), or indicate to his audience the precedent and appropriateness of such roles for women. In view of 27.55a, the list of women, and Mt 28.9-10, the relegation to hospitality idea seems unlikely.

[439]Taylor, Mark, 599; cf. Cranfield, Mark, 461.

[440]Bultmann, History, 274.

[441]Cf. R. H. Fuller, The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives (New York, 1971) 65 .

[442]E. L. Bode, The First Easter Morning - The Gospel Accounts of the Women's Visit to the Tomb of Jesus (Rome, 1970).

[443]Lane, Mark, 579. On the normal burial place and customs for criminals, cf. Daube, NT and Rabbinic Judaism, 310-12; M. Sanhedrin 6.5-6, Danby, 390-1.

[444]Rengstorf, "ἀπόστολος", TDNT I, 430, n. 136.

[445]C. Masson, "L'Ensevelissement de Jesus, Marc xv, 42-7", RTP n.s. 31 (1943) 198-9.

[446]Cf. Masson, "L'Ensevelissement de Jesus", 194-7; P. Gaechter, "Zum Begräbnis Jesu", ZKT 25 (1953) 220-5.

[447]Cf. Josephus, Antiquities 17.8.3 (LCL) 462-3. Michaelis, "μύρον", TDNT IV, 801, and "σμύρνα", TDNT VII, 458, n. 12, points out that the use of spices probably indicates that no speedy Resurrection was expected by Joseph or the women. The following considerations should be taken into account before assuming that the women's act and motive for anointing Jesus two days after His death is unhistorical. 1) They may not have known whether or not Joseph had performed this part of the burial rites adequately, if at all. 2) If the women did know that Joseph had performed the necessary rites, this still need not deter them if their act was one of devotion. That there is already a wreath on the grave does not prevent one from placing one's own wreath out of love and devotion. 3) Jerusalem is mountainous and cool in the springs (cf. Brown, John xiii-xxi, 982, Jn 18.18). If Jesus was laid in a rock tomb (cf. Mk 15.46) which probably would be cool, then the state of Jesus' body might be such that further anointing or spices would not be pointless. It was less then 48 hours since Jesus' death when the women arrived at the tomb for the second time. Cf. Ellis. Luke, 270-1. 4) Even if the women knew that the tomb would be sealed, this would not necessarily deter them from making an effort to perform the devotional act. They were in an emotional state and their actions might be less than logical; cf. D. Wenham, "The Resurrection Narratives in Matthew's Gospel", TynB 24 (1973) 21-54.

[448]Plummer, Matthew, 413.

[449]There are several variant readings that are attempts to conform Mk 15.47 to what precedes in 15.40 or what follows in 16.1.

M. D. Goulder, "Mark xvi.1-8 and Parallels", NTS 24 (1978) 235, is wrong to insist that Mark had made a muddle by calling this Mary the wife or daughter of Joses in 15.47 and James in 16.1. This overlooks 15.40 where we are told of a Mary who is the mother of James and Joses. As Robertson, 501; BDF, sec. 162, p. 89; and MHT III, 168-9, say, such elliptical phrases as Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου are to be deciphered according to their context since they may equally well be referring to the mother, wife, daughter, or sister of James. Mk 15.47 in all likelihood was intended by the Evangelist as an abbreviated form of 15.40. The changing of the name may reflect that Mark is incorporating three separate traditions involving the same woman (15.40, 47, 16.1).

[450]ἄλλος is used often when only two people are in view. Cf. Mt 5.39, 12.13, 27.61; Robertson, 746-7.

[451]In 23.55b, the verb used is συνέρχομαι which may reflect Luke's attempt to distinguish the women's accompanying or following Jesus from Galilee, from their following Joseph to the tomb - κατακολουθήσασι, 23.55a.

[452]As 1 Cor 15.4 indicates, the burial was an important part of early Christian proclamation and thus the testimony to it was also important; cf. Lane, Mark, 581; Hill, Matthew, 357.

[453]In Judaism, a woman could testify in a situation when only one witness was required. Cf. M. Rosh Ha-Shanah 1.6-2.1, Danby, 189; J. M. Baumgarten, "On the Testimony of Women in 1QSa", JBL 76 (1957) 266-9. Baumgarten also notes that it was common practice in Athenian and Roman court situations not to allow women to testify. Cf. p. 14, and endnote 139, p. 38 of thesis.

[454]Cf. H. S. Cronin, "They Rested the Sabbath Day according to the Commandment - Luke xxiii.56", ET 16 (1904-05) 116-8.

[455]Danker, Jesus, 244.

[456]Swete, Mark, 372.

[457]Bode, First Easter, 5.

[458]W. R. Farmer, The Last Twelve Verses of Mark (Cambridge, 1974). Cf. Z. C. Hodges, "The Women and the Empty Tomb", BSac 123 (October, 1966) 301-09. On the question of who wrote Mk 16.9-20, cf. T. Zahn and A. Resch, "The Authorship of the Last Verses of Mark", Exp 4th ser 10 (1894) 219-32.

[459]"No one who had available as the conclusion of the Second Gospel the twelve verses 9-20, so rich in interesting material, would have deliberately replaced them with four lines of a colorless and generalized summary." Metzger, TC, 126, cf. pp. 122-6.

[460]Cf. vv 9-11 to Jn 20.1-2; vv 12-13 to Lk 24.13-35; v 15 to Mt 28.19; v 19 to Ac 1.9 in Moule, Mark, 133. Cf. G. W. Trompf, "The First Resurrection Appearance and the Ending of Mark's Gospel", NTS 18 (3, 1972) 327.

[461]These verses may date to the first half of the second century and may originally be a catechetical summary; cf. Lane, Mark, 601-11.

[462]Cf. Taylor, Mark, 602; Bultmann, History, 284-5.

[463]Cf. Fuller, Formation, 53; Bultmann, History, 285.

[464]Dibelius, From Tradition, 190; Fuller, Formation, 51.

[465]Bultmann, History, 285; cf. Bode, First Easter, 39.

[466]Cf. pp. 293-5 of thesis.

[467]Fuller, Formation, 53; cf. pp.301-2 of thesis.

[468]Bode, First Easter, 42.

[469]Cf. Taylor, Mark, 603.

[470]Cf. Bode, First Easter, 155-73; J. Daniélou, "The Empty Tomb", Month n.s. 39 (1968) 215-22; R. E. Brown, "The Resurrection and Biblical Criticism", Commonweal 87 (8, 1967) 234-5; G. Mangatt, "At the Tomb of Jesus", Biblebhashyam 3 (2, 1977) 91-6; D. Catchpole, "The Fearful Silence of the Women at the Tomb - A Study in Marcan Theology", JTSA 18 (1977) 3-10. It is worth noting that the Semitic phrase ἡ μία τῶν σαββάτων may indicate that Mark is drawing on a (Jewish Christian?) source at least in part here.

[471]H. J. Cadbury, "Mark 16.8", JBL 46 (1927) 344-5. These examples are important because they date both before and after the first century A.D. and their vernacular character makes them close to Mark in form and style. Cf. also R. H. Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark (Oxford, 1962) 80-97, 106-16; R. R. Ottley, "ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ Mark xvi.8", JTS 27 (1925-26) 407-9; M. S. Enslin, "ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ, Mark 16.8", JBL 46 (1927) 62-8; F. F. Bruce, "The End of the Second Gospel", EvQ 17 (1945) 169-81.

[472]Cf. Ottley, "Mark xvi.8", 409.

[473]Cf. Lightfoot, Gospel Message, 87 ff.; W. C. Allen, "St. Mark xvi.8, 'They Were Afraid' Why?" JTS 47 (1946) 46-9, and W. C. Allen, "'Fear' in St. Mark", JTS 48 (1947) 201-3; K. Tagawa, Miracles et Évangile. La pensée personnelle de l'évangeliste Marc (Études d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses no. 62; Paris, 1966) 99-122; Catchpole, "The Fearful Silence", 3-10; R. P. Meye, "Mark 16:8 - The Ending of Mark's Gospel", BR 14 (1969) 33-43.

[474]There is a parallel structure in 16.8:
a - and they went out and fled from the tomb
b - for trembling and astonishment had come upon them
a' - and they said nothing to anyone
b' - for they were afraid
Cf. R. H. Smith, "New and Old in Mark 16:1-8", CTM 43 (1972) 525-6. The γάρ is explanatory in each case. Cf. Robertson, 1190; Taylor, Mark, 609; Swete, Mark, 376-7.

[475]It is difficult to see how Fuller, Formation, 64, can maintain that the women's silence is part of Mark's secrecy motif since the scene takes place after the Resurrection, and in the Marcan redaction the women are told explicitly (v 7) to bear witness.

[476]Pace Lane, Mark, 591-2; T. C. Skeat, "St. Mark xvi.8: A Modern Greek Parallel", JTS 50 (1949) 57-8. There is no concrete evidence that Mark ever intended to write a second volume.

[477]Cf. Lane, Mark, 601-11.

[478]So Taylor, Mark, 609-10; Cranfield, Mark, 470-1; Klostermann, Markusevangelium, 190. The argument that Mark is presenting only that which is accessible to all Christians (i.e., the word about the risen Lord, the empty tomb, etc.) fails to take into account that the Fourth Evangelist goes out of his way to present his material as that which is accessible to all generations by faith in the word of testimony, yet he does not omit Resurrection appearances.

[479]We cannot go into the vexed question of how Mark's original ending became lost except to say that it is probable that Mark's Gospel was mutilated at this point, since 16.8 may have been at the end of a column, and since the end of a scroll would be outermost once it had been read. Apparently, it was left this way after reading for often the title and author of a work were put at the end, not the beginning, of a scroll. Cf. F. G. Kenyon, "Papyrus Rolls and the Ending of St. Mark", JTS 40 (1929) 56-7. Further, once Matthew and Luke came into circulation (documents which included almost all of Mark), the need for replacing a lost ending of Mark would not be felt for a time except in an area where Mark was the only Gospel available (perhaps Italy?). Cf. E. J. Goodspeed, "The Original Conclusion of the Gospel of Mark", AJT 9 (1909) 486.

[480]A. E. Haefner, "The Bridge Between Mark and Acts", JBL 77 (1958) 67-71.

[481]Cf. Goodspeed, "The Original Conclusion", 484-90. The conjectures of C. F. D. Moule, "St. Mark xvi.8 - once more", NTS 2 (1955-56) 58-9, and A. Farrer, St. Matthew and St. Mark (Westminster, 1954) 144-59, both of whom propose that Mark had only a short concluding phrase after 16.8, are worth consideration, but fail to solve the dilemma since the phrases they suggest do not include reference to any Resurrection appearances.

[482]Goodspeed, "The Original Conclusion", 488; cf. E. Klostermann, Das Matthäusevangelium. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. 4. (2nd revised ed.; ed. H. Lietzmann; Tübingen, 1927) 229.

[483]It is probably over-allegorizing to see an allusion to Jesus' Resurrection (via Mal 4.2) here, or to assume that the mention of the women being in darkness has theological significance. Pace R. H. Lightfoot, The Gospel Message, 88 ff.; and G. Herbert, "The Resurrection-Narrative in St. Mark's Gospel", SJT 15 (1962) 66-73.

[484]Cf. D. S. Margoliouth, "The Visit to the Tomb", ET 38 (1926-27) 280, says that it is possible that what the women intended to do was illegal and this is why they did not enlist anyone else's aid. Cf. G. Stählin, "κοπετός", TDNT III, 846.

[485]Cf. Taylor, Mark, 606; Cranfield, Mark, 465.

[486]C. E. B. Cranfield, "St. Mark 16.1-8", SJT 5 (1952) 287.

[487]Cf. J. Calvin, A Harmony of the Gospels III (trans. A. W. Morrison; ed. D. W. and T. F. Torrance; Edinburgh, 1972) 221.

[488]Perhaps Mark was not excluding the women from the promised appearance since they are addressed here. Contrast Brown, "The Resurrection", 234, to F. Neirynck, "Les Femmes au Tombeau: Étude de la Rédaction Matthéenne (Matt. xxviii.1-10)", NTS 15 (1968-69) 181-2.

[489]Pace Lightfoot, Gospel Message, 92; Mangatt, "At the Tomb of Jesus", 94-5.

[490]It is these women who provide the link between these events, as well as the link between the angel's message and the Eleven. Cf. H. Schlier, "Die Osterbotschaft aus dem Grab (Markus 16,1-8)", KG 27 (1, 1971) 4; L. Brun, "Der Auferstehungsbericht des Markus-evangeliums", TSK 87 (1914) 350.

[491]Smith, "New and Old in Mark 16:1-8", 525-6; cf. pp. 298-9 of thesis.

[492]Moule, "St. Mark xvi.8", 58-9, argues that the women's trembling and amazement made them run straight to the disciples and tell them only, and not stop along the way to give normal Eastern greetings or proclaim the Easter message. Cf. J. M. Creed, "The Conclusion of the Gospel according to Saint Mark", JTS 31 (1929-30) 175-80; L. J. D. Richardson, "St. Mark xvi.8", JTS 49 (1948) 144-5. T. Horvath, "The Early Markan Tradition on the Resurrection - Mk 16, 1-8", RUO 43 (3, 1973) 445-8, suggests that the women were frightened because their task of instructing men was unheard of among the Jews. Cf. pp. 308-09 of thesis.

[493]É. Dhanis, "L'Ensevelissement de Jésus et la visite au tombeau dans l'évangile de Saint Marc (Mc. XV,40 - XVI,8)", Greg 39 (2, 1958) 367-410, feels that catechetical interests or the primitive passion history affects how Mark presents these events. If so, then Mark may be implying that we owe this crucial part of the creed to these women and their witness. This is also an argument for Mark having originally had an account of Resurrection appearances. Cf. Taylor, Mark, 609.

[494]Catchpole, "The Fearful Silence", 6.

[495]Cf. Fuller, Formation, 75-6.

[496]The ἡ ἄλλη in Matthew may imply that only one other is present; cf. Robertson, 775; Büchsel, "ἄλλος", TDNT I, 264.

[497]Cf. Hill, Matthew, 359; Fuller, Formation, 74-5; Cranfield, "St. Mark 16.1-8", 411-12; Dibelius, From Tradition, 297-8.

[498]It is also maintained that having added the guard and sealing of the tomb, the First Evangelist had to add a second legend to explain how the tomb came to be open for the women's inspection. For our purposes it is unnecessary to debate the issue, as we are not claiming that this material is of historical value. Cf. Neirynck, "Les Femmes au Tombeau", 175-6. Taylor, Mark, 604, is probably wrong to suggest that the First Evangelist presents a more historically probable motive for the women's visit than Mark. That the Evangelist

has added to his source that the angels bid them to come and see probably points in this direction as may the ἀπαγγέλλω if it is used in a specialized sense of a Resurrection report. Cf. J. Schniewind, "ἀπαγγέλλω", TDNT I, 66. As Wenham, "Resurrection Narratives", 28, says, the women were not on a sight-seeing tour.

[499]Cf. Fuller, Formation, 74-5; K. Stendahl, "Matthew" in Peake's Bible Commentary (rvsd.) 797-8.

[500]Cf. W. K. L. Clarke, "Studies in Texts", Theology 43 (1941) 300-02; Bode, First Easter, 50-4, and n. 2; Hill, Matthew, 358; Neirynck, "Les Femmes au Tombeau", 174.

[501]Cf. G. Bertram, "θάμβος", TDNT III, 6, n. 12; Neirynck, "Les Femmes au Tombeau", 171-3; M'Neile, Matthew, 431.

[502]Cf. pp. 299 f. of thesis, and Trompf, "The First Resurrection Appearance", 315-9, on how closely Matthew follows Mark in his Passion narrative.

[503]Cf. Fuller, Formation, 56-64.

[504]Cf. M'Neile, Matthew, 433; Hill, Matthew, 359; Bode, First Easter, 56.

[505]For a search for an appearance pattern, cf. C. H. Dodd, "The Appearances of the Risen Christ: An Essay in Form-Criticism of the Gospels", in Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot (ed. D. E. Nineham; Oxford, 1955) 9-35. For a cogent refutation of some of the main points of Dodd's form-critical analysis, cf. Z. C. Hodges, "Form Criticism and the Resurrection Accounts", BSac 124 (1967) 339-48.

[506]Trompf, "First Resurrection", 321, argues that this story likely comes from Mark because of its lack of a location, a 'regular' feature of Mark's appearance stories. It may be asked at this point how one knows what the features of Mark's appearance stories are? If the Transfiguration narrative is singled out as a case in point, it may be objected that it is an open question whether or not the Transfiguration should be seen as a retrojected appearance story.

[507]Contrast Neirynck, "Les Femmes au Tombeau", 177, 190, on the doublet idea, to Wenham, "Resurrection Narratives", 33 ff.

[508]The ἵνα may be epexegetical as some contend, though this does not seem to be the case necessarily. On the First Evangelist's tendencies in regard to ἵνα, cf. MHT III, 135.

[509]Cf. Neirynck, "Les Femmes au Tombeau", 179; Bultmann, History, 290.

[510]The absence of the article before Ἰησοῦς in 28.9 may indicate that the First Evangelist is implying this is the first Resurrection appearance. Cf. BDF, sec. 260.1, p. 136.

[511]Cf. N. Walker, "After Three Days", NovT 4 (1960) 261-2; Plummer, Matthew, 420; M'Neile, Matthew, 431.

[512]Fuller, Formation, 2. Scholars will, of course, differ on what the 'x' must entail to provide an adequate explanation of this change.

[513]Cf. G. E. Ladd, I Believe in the Resurrection of Jesus (Grand Rapids, 1975) 29-43.

[514]BAG, 724, notes, "The Risen Lord is esp. the object of worship: Mt 28:9, 17; Lk 24:52 t.r." As Hill, Matthew, 359, says, the Evangelist's addition of προσκυνέω "...may well reflect a liturgical setting for the development of the tradition."

[515]Zerwick, sec. 7, p. 3, argues that the 'they' in 28.9 is a plural of category referring only to Mary Magdalene. Cf. MHT III, 26; Wenham, "Resurrection Narratives", 33-5; Bode, First Easter, 55.

[516]Cf. Neirynck, "Les Femmes au Tombeau", 178; Fuller, Formation, 79.

[517]Cf. Neirynck, "Les Femmes au Tombeau", 179; Greeven, "προσκυνέω", TDNT VI, 764; K. Weiss, "πούς", TDNT VI, 630.

[518]Cf. Schweizer, Matthäus, 342.

[519]Cf. Bultmann, History, 285-90; Creed, Luke, 289-91.

[520]Cf. Taylor, Passion Narrative of St. Luke, 101-09; Ellis, Luke, 271-3.

[521]C. F. Evans, Resurrection and the New Testament (London, 1970) 104.

[522]It is hard to see why Fuller, Formation, 95-6, contends that in Luke the women were cooperating with Joseph but did not reach the grave on Friday before the Sabbath began.

[523]Cf. X. Léon-Dufour, Resurrection and the Message of Easter (New York, 1974) 108.

[524]The textual evidence is strongly in favor of inclusion of τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. This phrase contributes to Luke's emphasis on the empty tomb and the continuity between the Jesus of the earthly ministry and the risen Lord. Cf. Metzger, TC, 183. On the parallel construction, cf. I. H. Marshall, "The Resurrection of Jesus in Luke", TynB 24 (1973) 66.

[525]Cf. Léon-Dufour, Resurrection, 112.

[526]Cf. Marshall, Luke, 885; Caird, Luke, 256; Ellis, Luke, 272.

[527]A point in favor of the view that Luke is presenting this scene as the women's transfiguration experience is the mention of two men; cf. Lk 9.30; Ellis, Luke, 272; Bode, First Easter, 59.

[528]Some see this as a typical reaction to special revelation or heavenly creatures. Cf. Gen 18.2, Dan 7.28, 10.9, 15; Danker, Jesus, 246; Bode, First Easter, 59. Others see this as a gesture of respect or worship; cf. E. Lohse, "πρόσωπον", TDNT VI, 775-9. Others say it is a matter of fear or avoidance of light; cf. Marshall, Luke, 885; Manson Luke 304.

[529]Marshall, Luke, 883; Bultmann, History, 290.

[530]The formulation as it now stands is Lukan and may be built up in the following fashion: δεῖ from 9.22; εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων from 9.44; ἀναστῆναι from 9.44; ἀναστῆναι from 18.33. Cf. Evans, Resurrection, 103; Schubert, "Structure...of Luke 24", 183.

[531]Cf. J. Schniewind, "ἀπαγγέλλω", TDNT I, 66.

[532]Evans, Resurrection, 103; cf. Lk 8.1-3, 23.55. Luke omits Mark's promised appearance in Galilee, probably because of his Jerusalem schema.

[533]This sort of remembering may be seen as the prolegomenon to a faith response, but it is not clear that 'to remember' is equivalent to 'to respond in faith'. But cf. Danker, Jesus, 247; Creed, Luke, 294; Bode, First Easter, 62, 67; Michel, "μιμνῄσκομαι", TDNT IV, 677.

[534]This feature, not likely derived from Mark's (lost) ending, may reflect Luke's tendency to maximize the visibility and importance of the women's role.

[535]Cf. Evans, Resurrection, 104; Danker, Jesus, 247.

[536]Cf. Marshall, "Resurrection of Jesus", 64. Léon-Dufour, Resurrection, 151, suggests that the list is here in order to link the death, burial, and Resurrection. The placement of the list and at least part of its contents appears to be derived from Luke's special source. Cf. Fuller, Formation, 95.

[537]Ellis, Luke, 272; Hengel, "Maria Magdalena", 245-6.

[538]Cf. Léon-Dufour, Resurrection, 153.

[539]It seems likely that the juxtaposition of τοῖς λοιποῖς and αἱ λοιπαί is meant to imply a group of men in the former instance and a group of women in the latter. Cf. Marshall, "Resurrection of Jesus", 74.

[540]Cf. Léon-Dufour, Resurrection, 159. Luke may add these other women at this point to create the impression of numerous witnesses of the empty tomb who went to the Apostles, and thus rule out the Eleven's excuse that it was only an idle tale of one or two hysterical women. The translation in the JB probably best conveys Luke's meaning. The omission of ἦσαν δὲ by A, D, W, and others is probably a later attempt to smooth out the syntax. Cf. Metzger, TC, 184. The reading ἦν δέ in K and other mss. is also likely a later correction, and interestingly it singles out Mary Magdalene for special mention. Cf. pp. 315-25 of thesis on John 20.

[541]Joanna may be Luke's addition. Cf. Marshall, "Resurrection of Jesus", 74.

[542]Schubert, "Structure...of Luke 24", 168, and n. 12, cf. p. 174, suggests that ἠπίστουν is a conative imperfect and translates "they could not bring themselves to believe them."

[543]If this reaction is not a Lukan creation but derives from his special source, then it could be historically accurate. The suggestion that Luke in this verse is trying to imply that the apostolic witness

is not believable in view of vv 12 and 24, where Luke deliberately reports the confirmation of the women's words by at least one Apostle. Cf. Marshall, "Resurrection of Jesus", 71; Bode, First Easter, 67, 71.

[544]Plummer, Luke, 550; Manson, Luke, 265.

[545]Assimilation might be a possible reason for omitting vv 6 and 12. This does not, however, outweigh the following considerations: Lukan male-female parallelism, Luke's stress on Peter, and Luke's point that faith only comes from an appearance of Jesus who instructs His disciples on the basis of the Word, all argue for seeing v 12 as Lukan and an original part of our text. Cf. Metzger, TC, 184; A. R. C. Leaney, "The Resurrection Narratives in Luke (xxiv.12-53)", NTS 2 (1955-56) 110-14; Bode, First Easter, 68-9; Ellis, Luke, 272-3.

[546]Cf. Marshall, Luke, 888.

[547]Cf. A. Feuillet, "La découverte du Tombeau vide en Jean 20,3-10 et la Foi au Christ ressuscité", EspV 87 (19, 1977) 283-4. Further, only Peter may be mentioned in 24.12 in order to stress the irony or reversal involved in having the chief Apostle confirm the women's message. Cf. P. Benoit, "Marie-Madeleine et les Disciples au Tombeau selon Joh 20,1-18", in Judentum Urchristentum Kirche, 148.

[548]Cf. Léon-Dufour, Resurrection, 116.

[549]Schubert, "Structure.. of Luke 24", 172, concludes that the traditional empty tomb has little or no significance on the basis of the critique in 24.24. This fails to recognize that Luke is not devaluing the women's witness in 24.24, but rather is depicting the obtuseness of the followers to whom the women reported.

[550]These parallels are suggested by J. D'Arc, "Catechesis on the Road to Emmaus", LV 32:2 (1977) 143-56. Various scholars have conjectured that the unnamed disciple was a woman, perhaps Cleopas' wife. Cf. Caird, Luke, 259; Marshall, Luke, 894. This may be so, but Luke makes nothing of the fact and thus the conjecture deserves no more than a passing mention. Women are not featured here in any case.

[551]It is not clear why Luke says 'some' in 24.24, but mentions only Peter in v 12. Perhaps the difference is a result of Luke's use of two different sources for these two stories.

[552]So D'Arc, "Catechesis", 151-3; cf. Marshall, Luke, 896; RS, Translator's Luke, 753.

[553]It is possible that Luke means to imply Peter's precedence over these two disciples in receiving an appearance. Cf. vv 24, 34; Evans, Resurrection, 106. This might be an attempt to restore Peter to his preeminent place after he experiences less at the empty tomb than the women.

[554]Cf. Bultmann, History, 284-99; Bultmann, John, 681-3.

[555]Caird, Luke, 255-6; Ellis, Luke, 273; Bernard, John II, 665.

[556]Cf. Brown, John xiii-xxi, 1000.

[557]Bode, First Easter, 74-5; Zerwick, sec. 7, p. 3.

[558]Brown, John xiii-xxi, 999, notes, "...the Johannine tendency to individualize for dramatic purposes." In affirming this we are presupposing that the source used by the Fourth Evangelist looked something like that found in the Synoptics in that it included various women and an angelophany in which the Easter news is proclaimed. We doubt that Jeremias, NT Theology, 304, following Benoit, "Marie Madeleine", 141 ff., is right that the form of the empty tomb narrative in John is more primitive than in Mark.

[559]Cf. Fuller, Formation, 136-7. On their function in John 20, cf. p. 317 of thesis. The view that the angels are simply theological furniture inserted to advance the action is problematic precisely because they do not really advance the action. Jesus begins all over again with the same words they spoke, for the angel's have not altered Mary's state of mind.

[560]Cf. Jeremias, NT Theology, 305: "The account sounds most plausible; it is simple and free from any bias..." Cf. endnote 574 below.

[561]Cf. the reaffirmation of this view in Dodd, Historical Tradition, 148.

[562]Cf. Dodd, "Appearances of the Risen Christ", 9-35; Brown, John xiii-xxi, 972-3.

[563]Fuller, Formation, 137.

[564]Dodd, Historical Tradition, 149; but cf. Barrett, John (1978) 561.

[565]Cf. Rengstorf, "ἑπτά", TDNT II, 630-1.

[566]Dodd, "Appearances of the Risen Christ", 29-32, sees these lists as independent witnesses (i.e., not compiled out of the Gospels) to the women's roles in the Easter events, used to supplement the Evangelists' other sources.

[567]Daniélou, "The Empty Tomb", 217; Hengel, "Maria Magdalena", 254-6; Bode, First Easter, 75. Brown, "Roles of Women", 692, argues, "The phenomenon of giving a quasi-apostolic role to a woman is even more apparent in chap. 20." Brown points out that on the Pauline criterion for apostleship (having seen the risen Jesus and having been sent to proclaim Him) and in view of the fact that what Mary proclaims is the standard apostolic proclamation ('I have seen the Lord') Mary comes close to meeting the requirements for, or functioning as, an apostle. Interestingly, in Gnostic quarters it is Mary Magdalene, not Peter, who became the most prominent witness to the teaching of the risen Lord. Cf. "The Gospel According to Mary", NTAp I, 342-4.

[568]Rabanus Maurus in his famous ninth century life of Mary Magdalene. Cf. Brown, "Roles of Women", 693 and n. 14; Hengel, "Maria Magdalena", 251 and n. 1.

[569]Cf. for instance, Trompf, "First Resurrection", 308-13, and the scholars listed in Wenham, "Resurrection Narratives", 33-7.

[570]Cf. Neirynck, "Les Femmes au Tombeau", 185-9, and espec. B. Lindars, "The Composition of John XX', NTS 7 (1960-61) 142-7. Lindars shows that Jn 20.1-2 has parallels in word usage in Mk 16.1-3, 6 and Lk 24.1, 2, 10, and also Lk 24.3-5, 9, 23. He concludes that John is using traditions that stand behind all the Synoptics.

[571]Benoit, "Marie-Madeleine", 141-52.

[572]Cf. C. Journet, "L'apparition à Marie de Magdala", NVet 40 (2, 1965) 147.

[573]Cf. Lindars, "Composition of John XX", 143-4. Some doubt is shed on this in that Lindars bases some of his conclusions on the narrative in John 11 and the questionable idea that Mary Magdalene = Mary of Bethany. Contrast Bode, First Easter, 72.

[574]Cf. Barrett, NT Background, 15; Brown, John xiii-xxi, 983-4.

[575]Cf. Brown, John i-xii, 512-4; Morris, John, 833-4; Westcott, John, 290-1.

[576]Such contrasts are made by Feuillet, "La découverte", 273-84. P. S. Minear, "'We Don't Know Where...' John 20:2", Int 30 (1976) 127, rightly points out that the function of the two disciples in vv 3-10 is a dual corroboration of Mary's report. He ably refutes the usual view that the beloved disciple believed Jesus was risen. Cf. Stählin, "φιλέω", TDNT IX, 132.

[577]Though the Fourth Evangelist has limited their role, the angels are not superfluous stage furniture, but cf. Bode, First Easter, 82. John does not have angelophanies anywhere else in his Gospel and thus we cannot call the presence of angels here typical of the Johannine redaction. Cf. Bultmann, John, 682. On the importance of these angels to John's narrative, cf. Minear "'We Don't Know Where'", 126-9.

[578]Probably, the point of at least the second turning (v 16) is to bring out that Mary is still looking back toward the tomb and still thinking of Jesus' corpse (cf. v 15 - even while she is talking to the living Lord) until He addresses her as Mary, and she turns (spiritually as well as physically) to Him.

[579]Cf. Fuller, Formation, 136-42.

[580]The term γύναι is Jesus' usual means of addressing a woman who is unfamiliar or unrelated to Him, especially in public. Here Mary is well-known to Jesus and this is a private encounter. Thus, there is reason to suspect that γύναι has more than its normal significance and is a theological insertion. If this word is inserted by the Evangelist, then γύναι suggests perhaps that at this point Mary is unfamiliar or not properly related (in the spiritual sense) to Jesus.

[581]Cf. Barrett, John (1955) 469; Morris, John, 839. As Brown, "Roles of Women", 695, points out, "...John has no hesitation in placing a woman in the same category of relationship to Jesus as the Twelve would be placed if they are meant "by his own" in 13:1." Cf. 10.3-5. Here Mary is depicted as one in the process of becoming a full-fledged disciple. It is not enough to recognize the Shepherd's voice, one must go on to understand His word and work and obey His commands.

[582]Cf. Minear, "'We Don't Know Where'", 137.

[583]Morris, John, 838.

[584]Benoit, "Marie-Madeleine", 144-6, 150-2.

[585]Hoskyns, Fourth Gospel II, 646-8, and Morris, John, 839, probably are wrong to see the title "Rabboni" as a declaration of faith paralleling Thomas' exclamation. Cf. Brown, John xiii-xxi, 991-2; Lightfoot, John, 334-5.

[586]Cf. for instance, B. Violet, "Ein Versuch zu Joh 20,17", ZNW 24 (1925) 78-80; MHT II, 476.

[587]On the first suggestion, cf. W. E. P. Cotter, "'Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended unto the Father' (St. John xx.17)", ET 43 (1931-32) 45-6; W. D. Morris, "John xx.17", ET 40 (1928-29) 527-8.

[588]Cf. T. H. Farmer, "'Touch me not'", ET 28 (1916-17) 92-3; T. Nicklin, "'Noli me tangere'", ET 51 (1939-40) 478; Dodd, Interpretation, 443, n. 2. A. Shaw, "The Breakfast by the Shore and the Mary Magdalene Encounter as Eucharistic Narratives", JTS 25 (1974) 12-26, may be right that the Fourth Evangelist records this narrative to meet and correct the needs of those who, like Mary, feel a need to have direct contact with the physical Jesus of history.

[589]Cf. Brown, John xiii-xxi, 1012; E. F. Harrison, "The Son of God Among the Sons of Men - XV. Jesus and Mary Magdalene", BSac 105 (1948) 440; Barrett, John (1978) 565.

[590]Cf. C. Spicq, "Noli me tangere", RSPT 32 (1948) 226-7; D. C. Fowler, "The meaning of 'Touch Me Not' in John 20:17", EvQ 47 (1, 1975) 16-25; Journet, "L'apparition", 146. On this view Mary is being instructed to have more reverence for the glorified Christ and Thomas is being encouraged to see that the crucified Christ is glorified.

[591]Cf. Barrett, John (1955) 470; Zerwick, sec. 476, 160, taking what immediately follows γάρ as parenthetical.

[592]Cf. Westcott, John, 293. Barrett, John (1955) 470, and John (1978) 565-6, suggests the following paraphrase, "...stop touching me (or attempting to do so); it is true that I have not yet ascended to the Father but I am about to do so...; this is what you must tell my brothers."

[593]Pace Brown, John xiii-xxi, 994.

[594]Cf. MHT III, 63; Robertson, 869-70. Alternatively, it might be a way of expressing something about to happen. Cf. BDF, sec. 323, p. 168; Barrett, John (1978) 566; 1 Cor 15.32.

[595]Minear, "'We Don't Know Where'", 132; Lightfoot, John, 335, and n. 1; C. F. Evans, "I Will Go Before You Into Galilee", JTS n.s. 5 (1, 1954) 16-17; also pp. 248-56 of thesis.

[596]Both the Johannine and the original historical context probably rules out any reference to Jesus' physical family (v 18), as the Matthean parallel shows. Pace G. Richter, "Der Vater und Gott Jesu und seiner Brüder in Joh 20,17", MTZ 24 (2, 1973) 107-11.

[597]With Brown, John xiii-xxi, 1016-17; G. Schrenk, "πατήρ", TDNT V, 996, 1001; contrast Barrett, John (1978) 566; Lightfoot, John, 333.

[598]Possibly, a technical usage may be in mind here, i.e., proclaiming the Good News. Cf. Schniewind, "ἀγγέλλω", TDNT I, 61. It has been argued that πορεύομαι in Jn 20.17 is used as a technical term to refer to the missionary command or activity. Cf. F. Hauck and S. Schulz, "πορεύομαι", TDNT VI, 575.

[599]We must insert something like, 'she told them' after καί as we move from direct to indirect speech. Cf. Barrett, John (1955) 471; Robertson, 438.

[600]Hengel,"Maria Magdalena", 256.

CHAPTER VI: WOMEN IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH - THE BOOK OF ACTS

INTRODUCTION

When one turns the page from the Gospels to the Book of Acts, one also turns a corner in the study of women and their roles among Jesus' followers. For the most part, the teaching and actions of Jesus during His earthly ministry served as a preparation for the roles women began to assume on Easter morning. It is only appropriate then, having studied the causes that led to women playing an active part in the primitive Christian community, that we now examine the effects of Jesus and His teaching on women and their roles as depicted in Luke's second volume.

It would not be true to say that Luke features women and their roles in his Book of Acts to the same degree as he did in his Gospel. Nevertheless, he gives us at least five glimpses of their roles in the early Christian community. Further, there are certain traces of Lukan male-female parallelism, and perhaps male-female role reversal in the material not directly focusing on women. That women figure prominently in some of his redactional summaries reveals that Luke has not abandoned his interest in women's place in the community of Jesus' followers between the time he wrote his Gospel and his history of the primitive Church. This was evident to some of the earliest readers of Acts, for there is a significant anti-feminist tendency in the Western recension of this work. Finally, it is not unintentional that in the few texts where Christian women do receive attention, Luke gives us something of a survey of the different roles they played in the earliest days of Church history, as his invitation, based on historical precedent, to his audience to "go and do likewise".

A. Incidental References to Male-Female Parallelism, Male-Female Role Reversal, and Female Prominence

There are certain incidental features of Acts that appear to reflect Luke's penchant for male-female parallelism. We find examples of it both inside and outside the Christian community. Ananias and Sapphira (Ac 5.1-11) are in some respects negative counterparts to Priscilla and Aquila, even though they were apparently members of the Christian community. Luke is exercised to show that both husband and wife were equally culpable (cf. vv 2 and 8b), the former attempting to deceive Peter, the latter lying openly to him. The actions of this

couple stand in contrast to the exceptional generosity and honest services of the only other Christian couple to whom Luke gives significant attention - Priscilla and Aquila. Perhaps Luke chose to present Christian couples who were polar opposites in order to provide examples for Christians to avoid or to emulate. Luke stresses the parallels in intention and activity of the male and female members of both couples.

It is also noteworthy that Luke gives examples of male-female partnership outside the Christian community, especially when he refers to governing authorities. The examples of Felix and Drusilla (24.24) and Agrippa and Bernice (25.13-26.12) come to mind. Luke's mention of Agrippa and Bernice three times (25.13, 23, 26.20) is hard to understand since they play no real part in the story. Perhaps Luke has a concern to show that the Word goes out to men and women of all classes in society, and that prominent women who hear the Gospel sometimes heed it (cf. Lk 8.3 and Ac 16.11-15).

An examination of Luke's summaries reveals that he wishes to stress both male-female parallelism and the reception of the Gospel by prominent women. For example, in the process of recording the swelling tide of conversion (2.41, 47, 4.4), Luke points out quite specifically at 5.14: μᾶλλον δὲ προσετίθεντο πιστεύοντες τῷ κυρίῳ πλήθη ἀνδρῶν τε καὶ γυναικῶν. When Saul decides to persecute the Christians in Damascus, he plans to seize ἄνδρας τε καὶ γυναῖκας (9.2, cf. 8.3). This should imply to Luke's readers that the women were significant enough in number and/or importance to the cause of The Way that Saul did not think he could stop The Way without taking women as well as men prisoners. We find this sort of parallelism at 17.34 as well where Luke gives us the name of one male (Διονύσιος) and one female (Δάμαρις) who were among the converted at Athens.[1] If we look closer, the parallel construction extends further, for we have τινὲς...ἄνδρες among whom is Dionysius, and then we have καὶ γυνὴ... καὶ ἕτεροι σὺν αὐτοῖς. Thus, two general groups serve as a parenthesis around two particular names.

In the same chapter are two further references revealing Luke's interest in prominent women converts. At 17.4, at least two groups of people who became Christians are mentioned: 1) τῶν τε σεβομένων Ἑλλήνων πλῆθος πολύ; 2) γυναικῶν τε τῶν πρώτων οὐκ ὀλίγαι. In 17.12, we find three groups: 1) many Jews (17.12a); 2) καὶ τῶν Ἑλληνίδων γυναικῶν τῶν εὐσχημόνων; 3) καὶ ἀνδρῶν οὐκ ὀλίγοι. In the first

instance (17.4), "not a few women of the first magnitude" of importance are converted. Again in 17.12 we have a similarly described group of women who apparently "searched the Scriptures" (17.11), even though Jewish women (or God-fearing women proselytes) normally were not allowed to study the Tanak. Thus, Luke may be pointing to the new freedom given to women by the Gospel even as they were in the process of accepting it.[2] In the second listing also, not a few prominent or respectable Greek women are converted. Interestingly, in each passage it is the women, not the men, who are qualified by words indicating their importance or eminence.

It is clear that the editors of the Western text disliked the fact that Luke mentions prominent women instead of prominent men. While there is some ambiguity in the text of 17.4 as we have it in p^{74}, ℵ, A, B, E, P (so that γυναικῶν τε τῶν πρώτων might be translated 'the wives of leading men' instead of the rendering 'women of the first magnitude' offered above), D and others give us the unambiguous καὶ γυναῖκες τῶν πρώτων. We find the same phenomenon at 17.12. D* alters the text so that both the men and women are prominent (καὶ τῶν εὐσχημόνων ἀνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες) and thus the women's prominence is lessened somewhat. Of a similar nature is the addition of καὶ τέκνοις at 1.14 by Codex Bezae so that women are no longer an independent group, but simply the wives of the Apostles.[3] In the Western text of chapter 18 there is a definite effort to reduce the prominence of Priscilla, probably because she appears to the editors to be assuming her husband's first place, and also because she was a well-known teacher of a male Christian leader, Apollos. At this point we may quote J. H. Ropes speaking of 18.26:

> For πρισκιλλα και ακυλας ℵ ABE 33 boh sah, cod vg, ακυλας και πρισκιλλα is read in D d gig Aug and in the Antiochian recension. The desire to reduce the prominence of Priscilla seems to have been at work in a number of places in this chapter. The original writer appears never to have mentioned Aquila without Priscilla, and always (except at the first introduction vs 2) put Priscilla's name first; the glossator departs from him in both respects. Only in vs. 18, where κειραμενος was interpreted of Aquila (cf. h) does the 'Western' reviser fail to put the husband first...cf. the 'Western' text of vs. 2 ('with Priscilla'; αυτω for αυτοις D), vs. 3 ('Aquila'), vs. 7 (απο ακυλα), vs. 21 (τον δε ακυλαν, instead of κακεινους, vs. 19), vs. 26 (ακυλας και πρισκιλλα). (4)

W. M. Ramsay has observed rightly that the omission in Codex Bezae of καὶ γυνὴ ὀνόματι Δάμαρις at 17.34 is in all likelihood more evidence

of an anti-feminist tendency in this textual tradition.[5] As in 17.4 and 12, there may also be a tendency to elevate the status of men at 17.34, not being satisfied simply to lessen the prominence of women. For instance, After Ἀρεοπαγίτης D adds εὐσχήμων. This addition is redundant since this man's high standing is implied in Ἀρεοπαγίτης (but cf. Mk 15.43). It is perhaps a further attempt to transfer words only applied to women in Acts, so that they apply to men as well (cf. 13.50, 17.12). J. A. Robinson's suggestion that εὐσχήμων was perhaps originally an ascription after Damaris' name, which became an ascription after Dionysius' name when D dropped the reference to this woman, is possible but not quite convincing in view of the textual evidence.[6] Ramsay's argument that a respectable woman could not have heard Paul in Athens is questionable in view of the evidence produced by classics scholars that Athenian matrons were not confined to quarters.[7] Nonetheless, it is likely that Damaris was an educated 'companion' since her name is probably a vulgar form of the word for 'heifer'.[8] E. J. Epp suggests that the changes in Acts 16 in the Western text indicate that Lydia was seen by this editor as a Gentile without connections with the synagogue.[9] It is possible that this was an attempt to lower Lydia's status, since Luke seems to present God-fearers in a positive light on the whole (though cf. 13.50). It appears that the anti-feminist tendency of the Western text was not confined to any particular portion of the NT since it is probably in evidence at Col 4.15. While B, 6, 424^{c}, 1739, 1881, et al. have αὐτοῦ indicating a church in the house of Nympha, D, G pm, et al. have αὐτῆς indicating a church in the house of Nymphas.[10] In view of the above evidence, it appears that there was a concerted effort of the Church, perhaps as early as the late first century or beginning of the second, to tone down Luke's second volume, as well as other texts that indicated that women played an important and prominent part in the early days of the Christian community. Ramsay remarks with some justification that in reaction to the conventions in various parts of the Roman Empire,

> ...the Universal and Catholic type of Christianity became confirmed in its dislike of the prominence and the public ministration of women. The dislike became abhorrence, and there is every probability that the dislike is as old as the first century, and was intensified to abhorrence before the middle of the second century. (11)

In fact, it seems more likely that the Western text was simply reflecting Roman and Western ideas about women not playing prominent roles in

public life.[12] In any event, the evidence we have marshalled is sufficient to bear witness that Luke deliberately was giving women special prominence, not only in his Gospel but also in Acts, and it very soon rubbed people the wrong way.[13]

One of the major themes in Luke's Gospel is the idea of reversal of roles or expectations - the last become first, the first becoming servants. Luke carries this theme over into his second volume to some extent; for instance, in Ac 6.1-7 we find the Christian community confronted with a dilemma. The widows of the Hellenists were being overlooked in the daily distribution of food. Accordingly, the Twelve met and decided they must appoint someone outside the Twelve for the task. They did not feel that they should take time from their preaching 'to wait on tables' or 'to act as finance officers' (διακονεῖν τραπέζαις). In view of Lk 8.3 and 10.38-42, one might expect that the Apostles would delegate this task to women; however, they tell the community to choose seven men, full of wisdom and the Spirit. Stephen and Philip, who are among the prominent preachers and teachers of the Word in the early part of Acts (cf. 6.8-8.40), are among those chosen. Thus, leading men are chosen for a task that normally a male servant would fulfill in a Palestinian Jewish setting, or a woman would fulfill in a Hellenistic or Roman setting.[14] In the eyes of the Hellenists, for a prominent man to fulfill such a task would be demeaning and a reversal of roles with a man doing a woman's or servant's work.

This concludes our summary of the incidental references in Acts that reflect Luke's various themes relating to women and their roles. Though the quantity of material is not vast, nonetheless, it reveals that even in passing remarks Luke strove to emphasize male-female parallelism, male-female reversal of roles, the reversal of expected evaluations of women, and finally, the new prominence of women in the Christian community.

B. Women as Prominent Converts and μητέρες συναγωγῆς

At various points in our investigation of the Gospel material (cf. Mk 1.29-31, Lk 10.38-42), we noted Jesus' tendency to rely on the system of standing hospitality. We suggested this reliance implied an endorsement of certain roles commonly assumed by women. Perhaps now we may tentatively hypothesize that this reliance and Jesus' instructions to His closest friends to rely on this system

(cf. Mt. 10.5-32, Lk 9.2-5, 10.1-16), not only set a precedent for the traveling missionaries in the early Church, but also established a practice from which came the house church. If this supposition is correct, then it explains why prominent women are mentioned wherever house churches are mentioned in the NT. Women converts of some means who initially were offering occasional lodging and hospitality to fellow Christians, became the Christian equivalent of a μήτηρ συναγωγῆς[15] as their homes, originally hostels for traveling Christians, became regular meeting places of the converts in their area. In a sense, the Church owed its continuing existence to these prominent women who provided both a place for meeting and the hospitality required by the community. A woman's customary role of providing hospitality to visiting guests became a means by which they could support and sustain the Church.

Luke's interest in lodging and hospitality has long been a recognized feature of both his Gospel and Acts.[16] D. W. Riddle suggests that these people and places are mentioned, not in order to historicize an otherwise non-descriptive narrative or to give it the feel of authenticity, but in order to recognize those who helped in the transmission of the Gospel in those early days.[17] Luke's second volume is about the spreading of the Gospel and those who made it possible; these places of lodging and hosts are mentioned as vital supports to that movement. However, it is not just a matter of these families providing temporary lodging for traveling Christian preachers and prophets, but a matter of providing a place where the Gospel could be preached and oral and written traditions could be collected. As various missionaries would pass through, more news would be passed on, not only about the life of Jesus, but also about current events involving Christians. Thus, we may see hospitality not only as the physical support that kept the message going, but also as the medium in which the message took hold and was preserved. Riddle suggests:

> These examples of hospitality suggest that the custom may account for a notable phenomenon of those days: the acceptance of the travelling preacher's message by entire households....That the primitive churches were house-churches is a detail of this, and an aspect of early Christian hospitality. (18)

Christian hospitality was obviously a vital factor both in the intensive (home becomes house-church) and the extensive (home-as-lodging for missionary and the Word) growth of the early Church. Inasmuch as

women were mainly responsible for the hospitality of that day in a situation where the house was the center for the Church, women quite naturally were in the forefront of providing the modus vivendi for Christian life and growth, and the spread of the Gospel. Probably, it is no accident that at the only two points in Acts where Luke clearly tells us of a church meeting in a particular person's home (12.12, 16.40), not just a place of lodging or hospitality, it is in the house of a woman. Perhaps Luke chose these examples in order to point out the role women, particularly prominent well-to-do women, played in the growth of the early Church.[19] An examination of these two passages is now in order.

1. Mary, Mother of John Mark

The story of Peter's late night visit to the house of Mary, mother of John Mark, in Ac 12.12-17, is filled with suspense and humor giving the reader the real sense of a first-hand account. The details about Rhoda's joy, eagerness, and forgetfulness have caused more than one scholar to say, "We have here personal recollection, narrated to Luke by the maid herself...."[20]

Nevertheless, various scholars have thought that the realism in this narrative is a matter of consummate art rather than convincing actualities. Haenchen, for instance, sees 12.12-17 as a "chorale finale" to the story of Peter's miraculous escape. He views the specific notes about James and the brethren and the house of Mary the mother of John Mark as Lukan additions to a legend.[21] The difficulties with this viewpoint are several. First, as has been shown by E. P. Sanders, one cannot speak of a definite tendency to add specifics to the tradition as it develops. There are too many cases where specifics are original and are dropped in the later stages of the Gospel tradition to be able to posit a definite tendency in either direction.[22] This being the case, we cannot simply assume that the specifics of place and name found in 12.12-17 are later additions. Further, even if, as J. Munck avers, Luke has added "tell James and the brethren" to an otherwise primitive piece of material,[23] perhaps in order to indicate who was in charge in Jerusalem at that time, it does not follow from this supposition that Luke has added something that did not correspond to the historical circumstances. James, as is well-known, is a very shadowy figure in Acts, who only comes to the fore in one place (chapter 15), and it is hard to believe that Luke

would have created this reference to him unless he thought James was a leader then. Also, it is not at all improbable that if Peter was leaving Jerusalem he would want to notify the other leader(s) of the Jerusalem Church of his departure. Thus, while Luke may have added this detail, its 'unhistorical' character is unproven.

In regard to the 'legendary' character of Ac 12.12-17, this too may be doubted. Before we procede let it be noted that we will not discuss Ac 12.1-11 and the miraculous aspect of Peter's escape; we will simply posit that he had escaped in some manner.[24] Several factors count against seeing Ac 12.12-17 as legendary. Firstly, there is the matter of the incongruity between the Christians praying apparently for Peter's safe release, and their disbelief in its occurrence. Prayer and its being answered by miraculous intervention is a prominent theme in Luke-Acts (cf. Lk 1.13, Ac 1.14, 8.15). Thus, it is hard to believe either that Luke would have invented this incongruity, or that he would have taken it over if he had not been constrained to believe it reflected the historical circumstances. Secondly, Luke is usually cautious to avoid casting the Christian community in a negative light, since it is probable that he is in part writing an <u>apologia</u> for the Christian movement. This counts against the idea that Luke is magnifying the miracle here for effect at the expense of some of his Christian characters. Yet in this narrative Christians appear at first disbelieving and then overwhelmed by an apparent miracle as though they had not come to expect such things from their God. This last fact also counts against seeing this narrative as a pre-Lukan legend written for edification. In later apocryphal literature early Christian characters are frequently portrayed as rather flawless, even superhuman figures. We see none of that here. This is why Lake concludes, "However sceptical one may be about the details in the prison, it is impossible to deny the convincing nature of the behavior of Rhoda and of the family."[25] Thus, with due caution not to overstate our case and without failing to make allowances for the story-teller's art, we may see here an essentially historical narrative.

Luke tells us that Peter went to the house of Mary, the mother of John called Mark. This lets us know that Mary was a widow, and that Luke's audience would know her primarily because of her son.[26] Several points in the narrative tell us that Mary was financially well-to-do; for instance, that many (ἱκανοί) could meet in her house suggests this, as does the phrase in v 13 (τὴν θύραν τοῦ πυλῶνος), and

the mention of Rhoda, the παιδίσκη. H. Burton's suggestion that παιδίσκη need not imply a female servant, while lexically possible, probably is ruled out by its usage elsewhere in the NT and the context of our passage.[27] Mary's house was being used as a place for gathering together and praying (συνηθροισμένοι καὶ προσευχόμενοι), implying that it was a regular meeting place. This is also indicated by the fact that Peter comes directly to this house in particular;[28] however, in this case there was a special reason for gathering and praying - the chief Apostle was imprisoned. It is possible that this was a prayer meeting primarily attended by women, since 1) a woman answers the door in the middle of the night; 2) Peter's words make clear that James and "the brethren" are not at the meeting (v 17).[29] If this is correct, then it should not be overlooked that Peter entrusted his parting words to a group of women.

This particular prayer meeting may have included Rhoda, the servant girl, for it says she came to answer the knock at the door (προσῆλθεν...ὑπακοῦσαι),[30] perhaps implying that she was within the house and at the prayer meeting. If she was participating in the prayer meeting, then we have very early evidence of the equalizing effects of the Gospel so that not only women, but even slaves, were accepted as participating members of the new community (cf. Ac 1.14). It seems probable that Rhoda was a Christian who, like the family she served, had heard Peter's preaching and teaching.[31] Unfortunately, when she relates her good news, she receives a response similar to that which the women received on Easter (cf. Lk 24.11). Her audience thought that she was mad (μαίνῃ), but it is hard to tell whether this response reflects prejudice against Rhoda as a witness, or simply obtuseness and disbelief on the part of the listeners. Possibly there were still latent prejudices against a woman's, and particularly a female servant's, word of witness. Nevertheless, Rhoda's perseverance paid off, her word was vindicated, and because of her persistence, a crucial message was passed to the Christian community to be sent on to its leaders.

Thus, the witness of a woman is shown to be trustworthy, and Luke presents Rhoda as an example for his audience. Also, that Luke points out that Mary would hold such a meeting in a time of mounting opposition in Jerusalem to the Christian movement is evidence that Luke saw Mary's courageous contribution to the community of faith as exemplary. Perhaps here, as in Lk 24.11, 12, Luke intended a rebuke to those in his audience who had a tendency to devalue the word or work of women.[32] Finally, this

pericope also presents God's answer to the prayer of Mary and others, and thus reveals His confirmation of the activities in which these women were engaged.

2. Lydia

As we noted in chapter one of this thesis, women were allowed to play a significant part in Macedonian society from the Hellenistic age onward. They were allowed not only to be involved in political affairs, but also to be money earners and to engage in commercial matters with or without their husbands. It is not surprising that the NT also bears witness to the prominence of women in this part of the Mediterranean. At Thessalonica, many of the chief women were converted (Ac 17.4), and at Beroea we find a similar phenomenon (17.12). It is interesting that Paul in his correspondence with the Philippians, refers to women who were prominent in the Church at Philippi (4.2-3). Perhaps the most significant narrative that brings to light the fact that prominent women living in Macedonia not only were converted to Christianity, but also assumed important roles in the Christian community, is the story of Lydia in Ac 16.12-15, 40.

As elsewhere in Acts, Luke chooses what may be classed as representative examples of conversions in the area covered by his narrative. It is probably not accidental that he focuses primarily on the conversion of one woman (16.12-15, 40) and one man (16.23-39). Luke's intention is once again to convey a certain male-female parallelism, not for its own sake, but in order to stress the equality of man and woman in God's plan of salvation, and their equal importance to the new community.[33]

The structure of Ac 16.12-40 is important to our discussion, for it reveals how vital it was that Lydia provided a meeting place for Christians.[34] The Gospel is seen to triumph in the midst of the Jewish meeting place (16.14-15), and in the midst of a Roman stronghold (in the city, cf. 16.18-19, and in their prison, cf. 16.25-26). It is seen to triumph over natural and supernatural powers, whether it be magistrates and their jails, or demons. Luke is at pains to show that the Gospel and its followers can exist within the confines of a place of Roman authority by creating its own space 'in house'. That Lydia provides such a meeting place for Christians in the city is crucial. Thus, Luke shows that the faith, while not subservient to Rome, is not fundamentally at odds with the Roman empire or its authorities.

> There are no real critical problems raised by Ac 16.12-15, 40.
>
> The way in which the status of the colony of Philippi and the smallness of the Jewish community are spoken about reveals exact knowledge of the conditions. Nor does the story of Lydia give any cause to suspect that here pious imagination has simply conjured up a romance. The 'we' which dominates in this text can therefore be understood without difficulty as the eyewitness account of the reporter. (35)

Even if the eyewitness is not the author of Acts, we probably have an eyewitness testimony here which the author has used, for the narrative has no questionable features or signs of artifice.

The story of Lydia is extraordinary in many regards. In some ways she should not be seen as a typical Macedonian woman for Lydia had come to Philippi from her native city of Thyatira, famous for its production of clothing goods with a distinctive and very popular royal purple dye.[36] She had acquired her skill in her home town and perhaps had moved to an environment where she could better take advantage of imperial Roman tastes and needs. Perhaps her name reflects her background, for Thyatira was once a part of the Kingdom of Lydia, but it is also possible that her name indicates she had originally been a slave or, more likely, a freed woman.[37]

When Paul first arrived in Philippi with his companions, it appears that he was not able to find a synagogue or identifiable group of Jews, and thus he waited until the Sabbath.[38] The absence of the sufficient number of males to make a quorum (10) is probably not surprising in a Roman city where there appears to have been a low view of Jews, and it is conceivable that the edict of Claudius had been implemented to some extent in this Roman stronghold (cf. 16.20-21).[39] This lack of men explains the lack of a synagogue, for no matter how many Jewish women were present, there would not be a synagogue without the required ten men. It is then significant that Paul, in contrast to his Jewish background, is willing to begin a local church with a group of women converts. That women could constitute the embryonic church, but not the embryonic synagogue, reveals the difference in the status of women in the two faiths at that time, and it seems likely that Luke intended us to draw this contrast by mentioning the προσευχὴν in v 13 and the church meeting in v 40 in Lydia's house.[40]

On the Sabbath, Paul and his companions went down to the riverside outside the city gates, sat down (assuming the posture of a Jewish

rabbi), and taught the women gathered at the place of prayer.[41] Among them may have been some Jewesses, but there was one prominent God-fearer (σεβομένη τὸν θεόν) who had also brought along members of her household.[42] Just as Paul's coming to Macedonia was due to revelation (God's work) so Lydia's conversion is the work of God - ὁ κύριος διήνοιξεν τὴν καρδίαν προσέχειν τοῖς λαλουμένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου (v 14, cf. Lk 24.45).[43] Luke intimates that God intended Lydia and her household to be the first converts in Macedonia so that the initial European church would have a good home. Lydia responded to God's work in her life by begging Paul and his company to take advantage of her hospitality.[44] Her last plea is especially significant, for it is based on Paul's acceptance of her as a sincere convert to Christianity (εἰ κεκρίκατέ με πιστὴν τῷ κυρίῳ εἶναι...). Apparently, she had grasped from the first that whatever barriers being a Gentile and a single woman might erect in regard to housing non-Christians (particularly Jews) in her home, these barriers were no longer obstacles to Christians, even Christian males whom she had just met.[45] Faith was the only door she had to pass through to be accepted as a disciple and a hostess of disciples.

Lydia's significance was not confined to her being a disciple or hostess to traveling disciples. Luke wishes us to understand that what began as a lodging for missionaries, became the home of the embryonic church in Philippi. This is intimated by the fact that when Paul and Silas emerge from prison they go to Lydia's house to encourage the brethren (πρὸς τὴν Λυδίαν...παρεκάλεσαν τοὺς ἀδελφούς, 16.40), rather than to the Philippian jailor's house where they had also been entertained (16.34). Once again we see how a woman's fruitful role of providing hospitality played an integral part in the establishment and continuance of a local church. As Rackham states:

> Lydia is one of the striking women who were, so to speak, the nursing mothers of the infant church... Like Dorcas she was a woman devoted to good works, like Eunice she entertained the apostle, like Mary the mother of John Mark she had a church in her house, like Priscilla she 'laboured with the apostle in the gospel.' (46)

Probably it is not correct to identify Lydia with the "true yoke-fellow" of Phil 4.3; but it appears that Lydia set the example for the whole Philippian church, for it became noted for supporting Paul liberally,[47] and for providing him with female co-workers (Phil 4.2-3). Lydia progressed from being a marginal member of a Jewish circle in which

she could never receive the covenantal sign, to being a central figure in the local Christian church and the first baptized convert in Europe so far as we know. We may conjecture that it was because of Lydia and women like her that the Philippian church earned such high praise from the Apostle to the Gentiles and acquired a place in his heart as perhaps his most beloved group of converts.

C. Women as Deaconesses

No one is certain when the office of deaconess began in the Church. At the very least it seems probable that the office had its origins in Apostolic times,[48] and perhaps the first traces of its existence may be found in the NT (cf. Rom 16.1, 1 Tim 3.11). What seems more certain and demonstrable is that women were performing in NT times the functions later associated with the office of deaconess. We earlier conjectured that the role women played in the ministry of Jesus (as depicted in Lk 8.1-3) perhaps served as a precedent or background to a de facto, if not official, female diaconate.[49] Possibly, we find a development of the idea of women serving the community by providing material aid in Ac 9.36-42.

It appears that Luke obtained the two stories in 9.32-42 from one (possibly Jewish-Christian) source that had narratives about Peter. As Haenchen says, "The second story he has left relatively untouched."[50] If so, then it counts in favor of the authenticity of this tradition, as would its Jewish-Christian origin if that conjecture is correct. The major critical problem raised by the narrative is, of course, the miracle of raising the dead. This problem does not, however, affect our subject directly. Even if it was the case that this miracle was not an historical event, one would still need to posit an adequate historical cause to explain why such a tale would be told about Tabitha. That there was a woman named Tabitha who performed such tasks as indicated in this text and became well-known in the Christian community, is probably the irreducible historical minimum that would explain why such a legend would arise about her or, alternatively, if this story is mainly about Peter, why she would be chosen to be included in a story indicating Peter's powers. Thus, it is more probable than not that Luke is conveying reliable information about Tabitha and her role in the early Christian community, whatever the historical value of the portion of the narrative recounting the raising.

In Ac 9.32-42 we find a sequence of two miraculous deeds by Peter - one performed for a man, one for a woman. The account of the healing of Aeneas is very brief (vv 32-35), and we may conjecture that Luke included it merely to create a certain male-female parallelism which reveals how the Gospel ministers equally to both sexes.[51] Aeneas, a paralytic, bed-ridden for eight years, is healed by Peter's proclamation that Jesus heals him (similarly v 40). We are told that πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες in the area of Lydda and Sharon saw that Aeneas was healed and ἐπέστρεψαν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον. We may compare this conclusion to the end of the Tabitha story where it is stated, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν πολλοὶ τὸν κύριον (v 42). This is the only detail of the Tabitha story which is somewhat less spectacular than the Aeneas story in fact or effect. In Ac 9.32-42 there is a clear crescendo in the miraculous - whereas Aeneas is healed of paralysis, Tabitha is raised from the dead (cf. v 37, ἀποθανεῖν). In other respects as well the story and person of Tabitha are presented in a more positive light than the story and person of Aeneas. While it appears that Aeneas was a Christian (cf. 9.32, Peter was paying a visit πρὸς τοὺς ἁγίους), he is not specifically called a disciple as is Tabitha. Further, there is no real interest in Aeneas himself, only in the fact of his healing. By contrast, the story of Tabitha relates in a specific way what Tabitha did and why she was important to the community (cf. v 36, 39). There is an obvious interest in her person reflected in the mentioning of the details of the funeral preparations (v 37, 39). Finally, Peter himself recognized how important she was to the community, for he makes a point of presenting her to the disciples (v 41), which did not happen in Aeneas' case. Thus, while the primary purpose of relating Ac 9.36-42 is perhaps to present the reader with the first instance of the raising of the dead after Pentecost and to show the power of God and the Gospel working through Peter, there is also an obvious interest in the person being raised and why her raising was important. This story may be taken as an example of the Lukan interest in giving a woman more prominence than a man he has mentioned in the immediate context (vv 32-35).

Perhaps the main reason that Tabitha deserves and receives mention in Acts is that she functioned as a deaconess, a very generous supporter of widows. Whether or not she was commissioned for the task, it is interesting that at the outset of the story Luke presents her credentials, and they are the sort one would look for in a deaconess. We

are told that Tabitha, also called Dorcas,[52] was a female disciple (μαθήτρια), a word used nowhere else in the NT.[53] Perhaps Luke reserved this term for her because among the Christian women he mentions she best exemplified the behavior of a true disciple. We are told that Tabitha literally was "full of good works" (πλήρης ἔργων ἀγαθῶν),[54] which meant that she was engaged continually in performing good works. In addition to this, we are told that she gave money or material aid to the needy (ἐλεημοσυνῶν ἃ ἐποίει), and v 38 implies that this was a service given solely to community members (οἱ μαθηταὶ).[55] Some of her good works involved making outer and under garments for needy women.[56] That she was able to provide such aid probably indicates that she was at least moderately well-off and single (unmarried or widowed).[57] That Tabitha's service had been to πᾶσαι αἱ χῆραι (v 39), indicates a specialized and ongoing ministry, not just an occasional good deed to friends or neighbors. Perhaps it is implied that some sort of specialized commission, as well as Tabitha's continual good will, was the reason for this service. The description of Tabitha is reminiscent of Lk 8.3 and Ac 6.1-7, and thus it seems possible that Luke saw Tabitha as fulfilling a task similar in kind to the work of the Seven. When she died it was a great loss particularly to the needy women of the community.

That Luke tells us that Peter, one of the 'pillar' Apostles, through the power of the Spirit, would raise her from the dead for the sake of the widows and Tabitha herself may indicate the importance and significance she had for the local Christian community (even if one affirms the legendary nature of the miracle). She was a female disciple, single, perhaps wealthy, and full of good works. It appears that her ministry may have been commissioned, for it was an ongoing concern directed to a specialized group of recipients. It is possible, though not probable,that she was in charge of an order of widows.[58] If the Seven may be called deacons or their forerunners, then perhaps we may call Tabitha a deaconess. Luke tells us that by virtue of the miracle that occurred in her life, many believed. Thus, she is presented as a model of one who builds up and maintains the community by her service and living example of the power of the Gospel. It is the presentation of Tabitha as a model disciple that differentiates this story from that of Aeneas. This presentation of a woman as an example to be emulated may not have met the expectations of Luke's audience, but it probably met their needs.[59]

D. Women as Prophetesses

The daughters of Philip are perhaps the first recognized and recorded examples of Christian prophetesses in the apostolic age. It seems likely that Luke's passing reference to Philip's daughters is made partly because of his interest in the theme of fulfillment (cf. Lk 1.1, 1.20, 4.21, 21.22-24, 22.16, etc.). Yet, could it also be that Luke refers to these women because of his interest in the roles of women in the primitive Christian community? In order to answer this question, we must try to discern what sort of prophetesses Luke thought these women were. Were they of the sort we find in Paul's correspondence with the Corinthians (1 Cor 11.5), and thus perhaps involved in ecstatic utterance? Or are we to see them as female counterparts to Agabus (Ac 11.28, 21.10-11), and thus a continuation of the type of prophet we find in the OT? Or are we to see them as some combination of these two types? Let it be noted that this text presents us with no real critical problems. Philip's daughters and their powers of prophecy are not likely fabrications of the author since other sources indicate that they were well-known in the early community even if later there was some confusion as to the identity of their father Philip.[60] Haenchen argues that the information about these daughters is taken from an itinerary the Evangelist is following and that this explains why we have no prophecy of these women recorded by the Evangelist. The itinerary was only interested in who Paul's hosts were, not in their activities.[61] Whether or not this is true depends on whether one thinks that the author of Acts was part of the 'we' mentioned in vv 8, 10, or that he was using an (eyewitness?) source here. Without trying to present a case about the problematic 'we' sections, we may note that even if Haenchen's source theory is correct, it does not count against the correctness of the information presented about the existence, activity, and status of these women. Indeed, from Haenchen's viewpoint it may even count for it since the material cannot be labeled a creation of Luke.

A survey of all Luke's references to prophets and prophesying in his two volumes leads to the following conclusions:

1) Prophets and their functions are significant themes throughout Luke-Acts and relate closely to Luke's stress on fulfillment and the Holy Spirit.[62]

2) Luke makes a point of establishing that his most important, or at least his exemplary, characters are prophets: John the Baptist, Lk 1.76, 7.26, 20.6; Jesus, Lk 4.18-24, 7.16, 39, 9.19, 13.34, 22.64, 24,19;

Peter, Ac 1.20, 2.4-21, 5.3, 9, 11.15-17; Paul, Ac 13.1, 9-11, 17.2-3, cf. 24.14, 26.22-27, 27.10, 23-24, 31, 34; Elizabeth, Lk 1.41-45; Mary (or Elizabeth) Lk 1.46-55; Anna, Lk 2.36-38; Agabus, Ac 11.27-28; 21.10-11; Judas and Silas, Ac 15.32.

3) Luke appears to limit the term προφήτης to a select group; i.e., some of the church leaders (cf. Ac 15.22, 32).[63]

4) Prophecy is a gift of the Holy Spirit, and while it may be accompanied by glossolalia, it is not identical with that phenomenon (cf. Ac 19.6).

5) Most of the prophecies recorded in Luke-Acts are citations of OT prophecies that are seen as referring to Jesus, to some event in His life, or to some event that results from His ministry (e.g., the giving of the Spirit).

6) NT prophets are seen as engaged primarily in discerning the fulfillment of the predictive prophecy of the OT, rather than in giving new predictive prophecy of their own, though the latter is somewhat in evidence (cf. Ac 11.28, 27.10, 23-24, 31, 34).

7) Prophets are shown to have a supernatural ability to discern people's character (Lk 7.39-50, Ac 6.3, etc.).

8) There are false prophets but they are not as powerful as Christian prophets (Ac 13.6, cf. Lk 6.26).

9) Israel's continual character is summed up by the term prophet-killer (cf. Lk 11.48-51, 13.34, Ac 7.52).

At this point we may quote Ellis:

> ...Christian prophecy in Acts is represented as an eschatological power of the Holy Spirit from God Ac 2.17) or from the risen Jesus (Ac 1.8, 2.17, and 3, cf. Psa. 68.19 [18], Eph 4.8). Although prophecy is a possibility for any Christian, it is primarily identified with certain leaders who exercise it as a ministry. (64)

As Ellis suggests, Philip's daughters probably should be included among these leaders, since they appear to be more than just occasional prophesiers.[65] From the above survey it appears that Luke thought and we should think of Philip's daughters as prophetesses who, while standing in the tradition of the OT prophets much like Agabus, also manifest the presence of the Spirit in their lives in new ways. They would perhaps be known for their ability through the Holy Spirit either to predict future events in salvation history, or to discern the present fulfillment of previous prophecy. Perhaps also they had a supernatural ability to discern people's character.[66] The fact that Luke records

that Agabus, rather than Philip's daughters, performs a prophetic act may reflect the fact that he had heard (or heard about) Agabus' prophecy but had not heard (or heard about) what the women had prophesied. Having examined these contextual matters, let us now investigate Ac 21.8-9 in detail.

It is not clear how we should take παρθένοι. If it means 'virgins' the it may reflect an early stage of an order of single women who had a certain ministry to the Church.[67] Because of the conjunction παρθένοι and προφητεύουσαι it would seem that Luke is not just making an abstract or irrelevant statement about the virginity of Philip's daughters. These are the two main facts he relates about these women and it seems natural to suppose that Luke gives us these facts because they are related to their roles and their spiritual example in the Church. C. Parvey has suggested that, "The daughters of Philip were probably also among the first women celibates who decided not to marry for the sake of the Kingdom."[68] Apparently, if he knew more, Luke did not feel the need to say more about these women because his audience would be familiar with their activities and lives already.[69] It is plausible, and it has been conjectured, that Luke obtained a good deal of his information about the persons and events of the early years of Judaean Christianity from Philip's daughters on this visit, and during the two years he spent in Caesarea while Paul was in jail (cf. Ac 24.27).[70] If this is so, then we again see how Christian hospitality to traveling missionaries, and the house church system, led to the depositing and collecting of various important oral or written traditions with those or by those who provided the hospitality (often women believers).[71] Besides the possibility that Philip's daughters were conveyors of tradition, they are said also to have the gift of prophesying. The participial form, προφητεύουσαι, points to an activity or gift rather than an office, but in view of Lk 2.36 it is doubtful that Luke deliberately was trying to avoid calling them prophetesses.[72] Perhaps we should not make too rigid a distinction between these women's functions or gifts and their office.

Our NT evidence, though slight, is sufficient to give us the following information concerning Philip's daughters:

1) They were Christian women whose gift of prophecy was considered legitimate at the earliest stages of Church history.

2) This prophesying was likely of a similar nature to that which we find in Ac 11.28 and 21.10-11. As such, it stood in the tradition of

the OT prophets, while still manifesting the new work of the Spirit. It probably is not to be compared to the utterances of the prophetesses in the later Montanist movement.[73]

3) There appears to be a connection between these women being virgins and their having such a gift or role. Perhaps we may see here the working out of Jesus' teaching about being single for the sake of the Kingdom.[74] It is probably not coincidental that most of the women we find in Acts playing a significant role in the religious community were either single or widowed.[75] There was probably a strong feeling that a married woman's primary role was to be a wife and mother.

4) There may have been an order of virgins or unmarried women at an early date.[76]

5) Possibly one of the reasons Luke mentions Philip's daughters is that they were one of his sources of information. If we are to believe Eusebius,then they lived to an old age and served as a source for the later Church's knowledge of the earliest days of the primitive community.[77]

6) Possibly also Luke mentions these women because of the Christian hospitality they provided for him and Paul, as well as others.[78]

Thus, Luke seems exercised to present representative examples of single women in the new as well as old roles they could perform for the sake of the Kingdom.

E. Women as Teachers

The critical problems raised by Ac 18.1-3, 24-26, insofar as they bear on our subject, are few in number. The picture of Priscilla and Aquila as co-workers of Paul comports with the evidence of the Apostle's letters and none of the major commentaries have raised questions about the factuality of the encounter of this couple with Apollos. It has, however, been suggested that Luke perhaps cast this narrative in such a way as to show, "...the way in which Christian baptism supplanted John's baptism."[79] If this were the case, we would expect Luke to make some mention of either Apollos' water baptism or Spirit baptism as part of this story. Such a mention is entirely lacking. This lack would be a major problem in light of chapter 19 if Apollos was <u>not</u> already a Christian when he met Priscilla and Aquila. If, however, he was already a Christian, and we bear in mind that for Luke Spirit baptism, not water baptism, is the critical factor, it is understandable why the narrative in chapter 18 makes no reference to either type of baptism. Further, Luke's concern is not so much with what Apollos was

taught (the content of the teaching is never clearly mentioned), or the results of that teaching, but that he was taught 'more accurately' by this couple. This suggests that his concern is not doctrinal but personal - he may wish to indicate the role of this couple (and particularly of Priscilla). It might be suggested that Luke is attempting to cast Apollos in the shadow of his 'hero' Paul by having Apollos instructed by Paul's companions. This is possible, but one would have thought that Luke would have omitted such phrases as "He had been instructed in the Way of the Lord", or "He spoke and taught accurately the things concerning Jesus", if he had intended to place Apollos clearly in the shadow of, or theologically in the debt of, Paul and his co-workers. The suggestion that such phrases are traditional elements may be correct, but they are traditional elements that Luke uses and must have accepted as consistent with the picture he wished to convey. That Apollos' knowledge seems to be an odd combination of Baptist and Christian ideas does seem at odds with later Christian views. This must count in favor of the accuracy and earliness of Luke's narrative here for, "In the transition from Judaism to Christianity it must have been quite possible to find such surprising combinations."[80] Also, in favor of the accuracy and earliness of this story is the fact that Priscilla is mentioned as Apollos' instructor, especially in view of the later tendencies witnessed in the textual tradition and elsewhere to suppress such activity by a woman. We may reasonably expect our narrative to tell us something about Priscilla's actual role in relation to Apollos.

The Western text (D) did its best to cover up Priscilla's role in the early Church entirely.[81] Four out of the six times the two are mentioned in the NT, Priscilla's name comes first (Ac 18.18, 26, Rom 16.3, 2 Tim 4.19) in most of the best manuscripts (ℵ, B, et al.); whereas in the Western text this is reversed at 18.26; and at 18.2, 3, 7, 18, and 21 there are various attempts either to insert Aquila's name without including Priscilla, or to exclude or subordinate Priscilla.[82] Quite clearly Priscilla's name being predominantly first is unusual and perhaps significant. What then was the Western text trying to gloss over?

As Bauer points out, it was not unheard of in antiquity for a woman's name to precede her husband's,[83] but it certainly was not usual to mention the woman first in Jewish and even Christian circles. Luke himself is careful to distinguish Aquila from Priscilla in Ac 18.2.

It is only Aquila who is a Jew from Pontus, thus possibly implying that Priscilla was from the city they had recently left - Rome.[84] Thus, it has been suggested that there is a special significance in the prominence of Priscilla's name over Aquila's. The suggestions usually have been that either Priscilla was of higher social rank,[85] or of more prominence in the Church,[86] or both, than her husband.[87] If Priscilla was of noble birth or connected with either a patrician family or a flourishing commercial enterprise, then such extensive funds would come from her rather than from the trade of leather-working in which she helped her husband.[88] This might explain her prominence over Aquila in the NT, but it is more probable that her greater prominence is because of her more significant role in the Church. In any case, Priscilla and Aquila had a considerable sum of money from somewhere, so that they could have a home and a church in their houses in Rome, Corinth, and Ephesus. To examine this possibility we now turn to a closer analysis of Acts 18, particularly vv 24-26.

There are good reasons for thinking that Priscilla and Aquila were Christians before they met Paul. They were ordered to leave Rome in approximately A. D. 49 as a result of the edict of Claudius. If Suetonius is correct that this edict came about because of "disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus",[89] then it is likely that the Jews were rioting because of Christians preaching Christ in or near Jewish synagogues.[90] But who exactly were expelled - the Jews or the Jewish Christians? Though Ac 18.2 says πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, what is probably meant is all those Jews or Christians who were involved in or responsible for the riots.[91] Anyone involved in such a conflict would not likely be indifferent about which side a third party took on the issue. As Haenchen remarks, "That a Jewish couple expelled because of the conflict with Christians in Rome deliberately gave a Christian missionary work and shelter is far more improbable than that Paul found lodgings with Christians who had fled from Rome."[92] If, as seems probable, Priscilla and Aquila were already Christians, we now see why Paul immediately leaves them in Ephesus - to lay some foundations for his later evangelistic work in that city (cf. Rom 16.3-4). R. B. Rackham rightly points out that Ephesus was a real stronghold of paganism and only well-trained Christian leaders could deal with this. It is significant then that Paul left Priscilla and Aquila there. Haenchen adds, "...the interest which the author obviously takes in Aquila and Priscilla...shows that they were so

important to the history of the Christian mission that Luke could not overlook them."[93]

What role do we find Priscilla and Aquila taking? A linguistic analysis of 18.24-26 will help at this point. First, we can note two sets of parallels:

1) τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου and τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ('way of the Lord' and 'way of God').
2) ἀκριβῶς and ἀκριβέστερον ('accurately' and 'more accurately').

Turning to the matter of the two ὁδός phrases, does τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου = τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ? Probably there is some relation between the two for it appears that it is the instruction in τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου and the possession of the Spirit which lead Apollos to teach ἀκριβῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.[94] Further, though Priscilla and Aquila's instructions may have included various matters of Christian doctrine, it is probable that it at least included instruction in the Christian practice of Baptism, since the one deficiency in Apollos' knowledge clearly indicated in the text is that he knew only the baptism of John. Thus, τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ likely involves a matter of practice. Michaelis argues categorically that ὁδός here must mean, "the way which God himself takes", not man's way to God, or the Christian way of life, though he recognizes that Luke uses the phase to mean all of these at various points in Acts.[95] B. T. D. Smith argues that ὁδός here means or involves Christian practice and he is supported in this by Haenchen, and perhaps Lake and C. S. C. Williams.[96] A clue to who is correct in this case may be found by comparing ἀκριβῶς and ἀκριβέστερον.

If ἀκριβέστερον is a true comparative ('accurately' - 'more accurately' in a somewhat antithetical comparison), then this implies that τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ = τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ and Michaelis would be correct in his understanding of ὁδός here. It would also imply that Apollos was not as far along in doctrine or in practice as he should be to be truly termed a Christian, and is thus at a similar point in his spiritual pilgrimage to the twelve disciples in Acts 19. As Lake and Cadbury recognize, it may be that ἀκριβέστερον is an elative comparative rather than a true comparative.[97] If this is the case, then τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ is to be contrasted with τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, the latter referring to matters of Christian initiation (i.e., Christian Baptism), and the former to the story of Jesus. If so, then Apollos was a Christian who needed some advanced instruction primarily on a matter of practice (the 'way' of Christian Baptism).[98] Since we are told that

Apollos had been instructed in τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου, it seems unreasonable to suggest that he knew only the earthly Jesus, and since he taught accurately the things concerning Jesus it seems unlikely that he knew only the OT prophecies about the Messiah. Would Luke have attributed accurate teaching to Apollos if he omitted the Resurrection or Spirit-giving of Jesus?[99]

The likelihood that Apollos had the Holy Spirit, and that τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ at least involves the practice of Baptism, militates against the former view (true comparative), as do the following considerations: 1) τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησου for Luke involves the historical Jesus as taught in the kerygma;[100] 2) the text does not say that Priscilla and Aquila corrected Apollos' knowledge about the things concerning Jesus, but that they instructed him ἀκριβέστερον in τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.[101] Apollos received more accurate information compared to what he had before, but the instruction in τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου was not inaccurate, only inadequate.[102] Thus, we may argue that τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ = τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου. Hence, τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ refers here at least to the practice of Christian Baptism which, pace Michaelis, is not so much a way God takes with us, but a way for His community to respond to His call.

We are now in a position to discuss Priscilla's part in these matters. It is stated clearly that both she and Aquila instructed Apollos (ἐξέθεντο) and her name is mentioned first, so that if anyone is indicated by Luke as the primary instructor it is Priscilla![103] We should not belittle the significance of their teaching by saying it is only a matter of practice. "More accurately" implies that Priscilla expounded the matter further than basic Christian teaching, or at least in a way that involved the whole panorama of Christian teaching, so the place of the part would be seen in relation to the whole. Apollos already had a basically correct framework and knowledge about τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Further, Apollos is not just any convert to the faith but a man "well versed in Scripture", and this presupposes that Priscilla and Aquila were also adept and knowledgeable enough in Scripture to teach Apollos in such a fashion that he would accept it from both a woman and a man (given the usual Jewish attitude toward women and their mental capabilities).

That Luke presents this story without censuring or censoring Priscilla's involvement implies that he approved of her contribution to the teaching of Apollos. Obviously, since Luke does not make clear exactly what was taught, it is the fact of the teaching and the identity

of the teachers and pupil that he wishes his audience to note. There may be special considerations involved, i.e., Priscilla and Aquila team-taught Apollos, and perhaps a team ministry is different from a woman acting alone. It appears, however, that Priscilla took the initiative here, if either one did, and her being married does not seem to be a determining factor. The fact that this act took place in at least semi-privacy probably is not very significant in terms of its possible implications for correct Church practice, since there is no indication that Luke was trying to avoid having Priscilla teach Apollos in a worship context.[104]

Priscilla and Aquila certainly were important figures in the early Church. They were masterful and knowledgeable teachers of such prominent and "learned" (λόγιος) figures as Apollos, being like Apollos "able (well-versed) in the Scriptures."[105] Not all the implications of Ac 18.24-26 are clear, but certainly Luke presents Priscilla as a συνεργός of Paul in the Gospel. As John Chrysostom says, "He sailed for Syria...and with him Priscilla - Lo, a woman also - and Aquila. But these he left at Ephesus with good reason, namely that they should teach."[106]

F. Conclusions

At the beginning of this chapter we remarked that Luke does not feature women to the same degree in his second volume as he did in his first. While there is no need to modify this statement, we should go on to add that in Acts Luke gives us five important glimpses into the roles women took in the primitive community. Further, he indicates his continued interest in women and their roles in some of his redactional summaries and his male-female parallelism. It was sufficiently obvious to some of the Western revisers of Acts that Luke, even in his second volume, was giving women special attention, and they felt called upon to tone down some of his more 'feminist' summaries and to rearrange some of his material that gave Priscilla and others special prominence.

Luke's five vignettes about Christian women are interesting and important because they reveal the variety of roles women assumed in the primitive community. In the mother of John Mark and in Lydia, we see women assuming the role of 'mother' to the fledgling Christian community in Jerusalem and Philippi respectively. This involved providing both the home and the hospitality needed for the local Christian missionaries passing through. Thus, these women aided both

the intensive and extensive growth of the Christian community. It is perhaps also true that these women, as some of the first converts in their areas, served as spiritual examples and leading witnesses for the faith. Their role as mothers to the Church probably entailed providing both physical and spiritual sustenance to the believers. Perhaps Phil 4.3 lends credibility to this conjecture.

The role we see Tabitha playing in Acts 9 is similar to that of Lydia and the mother of John Mark in that it entails providing material aid to believers. In Tabitha's case it appears to be a more specific ministry to widows in particular. We conjectured that because of the specific and ongoing nature of her good works that we may have here evidence of a woman who was commissioned by the local community as one of the first deaconesses in the primitive Church. Certainly she served in some of the capacities later associated with that office so that even if she was not labeled or commissioned as a deaconess, Luke may be presenting her as a prototype of a deaconess. That Luke calls her a female disciple, a word used nowhere else in the NT, may be his way of indicating to his audience that this woman and the role she performs are exemplary of how Christian women ought to be and act. Nevertheless, he shows no desire to confine women to roles that only involved providing material assistance, for he also mentions women who prophesied and women who taught.

Luke's mention of Philip's prophesying daughters is tantalizingly brief, but it is sufficient to indicate that women were involved in this important activity that had its roots in OT practice but also manifested the new gift of the Spirit (Ac 2.17). Prophesying was not the activity of every early Christian and a good case has been made by Ellis for seeing it as primarily identified in Acts as the task of certain Church leaders. If so, then perhaps the reference in Ac 21.9 to the fact that Philip's daughters prophesied is more important than it might at first appear. We also learned from Ac 21.8-9 that Philip's daughters were virgins. Whether or not Luke mentions this because he thought that in a woman's case, being single was a prerequisite for the task of prophesying (or the office of prophetess, cf. Lk 2.36-37), or, less likely, because Philip's daughters were part of an order of virgins, we probably have evidence in the use of this term that Jesus' teaching on being single for the sake of the Kingdom had made it

possible for His women followers to have a choice as to whether or not they would marry. This meant that roles other than the traditional ones of wife and mother became possible for Christian women, and perhaps in Philip's daughters we may see early examples of the sort of roles these women were assuming.

Perhaps most important of all is Luke's reference to Priscilla in Acts 18. Apart from Jesus' mother, she alone among the Christian women mentioned by name in Acts is referred to in several other places in the NT. Her significance is not confined to the fact that she seems to have been more important or more prominent than her husband, or that she was one of Paul's co-laborers in and for the Gospel. Priscilla is mentioned as a teacher, and not just a teacher of other women or some nameless converts, but as someone adept enough to give Apollos, a leading male evangelist (Ac 18.24-28 ,1 Cor 1.12, 3.4-6), a "more accurate" instruction, possibly about the important matter of Christian Baptism. This is the one incident in Priscilla's life that Luke chooses to draw to his reader's attention, and by so doing he reveals the new roles women were assuming in the Christian community. Luke's portrayal of this woman is unreservedly positive - there is no hint that he disapproves of Priscilla's actions. Thus, it is fair to assume that Luke is presenting her as a model for the behavior of at least part of his audience.

We have seen how Luke presents Christian women as spiritual mothers to the Church, as deaconesses whether in title or in function, as prophetesses, and as teachers. By the very fact that Luke mentions that women were performing these roles, he shows how the Gospel liberates and creates new possibilities for women. It is probably true that Luke is not interested in women and their roles for their own sake; rather, the incidental evidence and the five vignettes we have studied in Acts reveal how the Gospel manifested itself and progressed among the female population in various parts of the first century Mediterranean world. In Jerusalem (1.14, 12.12-17), in Joppa (9.36-42), in Philippi (16.11-15), in Corinth (18.1-3), in Ephesus (18.19-26), in Thessalonica (17.4), in Beroea (17.12), and in Athens (17.34) we find women being converted or serving the Christian community in roles that normally would not have been available to them apart from that community. Thus, Luke chronicles the progress of women as part of the progress and effects of the Christian Gospel. Though it is not perhaps one of his major themes in Acts, nonetheless he takes care

to reveal to his audience that where the Gospel went, women, often prominent, were some of the first, foremost, and most faithful converts to the Christian faith, and that their conversion led to their assuming new roles in the service of the Gospel.

Chapter VI: Endnotes

[1]It is likely that we have an elliptical sentence and there is no need to include Damaris in the list of male converts. Cf. Bruce, Acts, 341; Haenchen, Acts, 527 and n. 1; Lake and Cadbury, Beginnings IV, 120. Probably, the roughness of the grammar here and elsewhere in Acts reveals that we are dealing with a first draft.

[2]Parvey, "Theology and Leadership", 145.

[3]Cf. W. Thiele, "Eine Bemerkung zu Acts 1.14", 110-11; and pp. 262-5. of thesis on Mary in Ac 1.14.

[4]J. H. Ropes, The Beginnings of Christianity III (1926) 178, note on v 26.

[5]W. M. Ramsay, The Church in the Roman Empire Before A.D. 170 (London, 1893) 161-2; contrast, Metzger, TC, 459.

[6]Cf. Ramsay, Church, 161-2; Lake and Cadbury, Beginnings IV, 220. Only D omits the phrase καὶ γυνὴ ὀνόματι Δάμαρις, and only D inserts εὐσχήμων. If εὐσχήμων was original or even early and ascribed to Damaris, then there likely would be some other evidence that it was not simply D's addition. Notice that Lk 23.50 does not retain Mk 15.43's εὐσχήμων. Perhaps Robinson thought that e's rendering of γυνή as mulier honesta pointed in this direction.

[7]Cf. W. M. Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen (London, 1895) 252, and pp. 12-14, and endnote 139, p. 38 of thesis.

[8]Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller, 252. Such nicknames commonly were given the hetairai by their patrons. Cf. Licht, Sexual Life in Ancient Greece, 330-2.

[9]E. J. Epp, The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts (Cambridge, 1966) 89-90. This suggestion apparently is based on the fact that D, e, vg have ἐδόκει προσευχή at v 13; and D* has κύριον at v 14.

[10]E. Lohse, Colossians and Philemon (Philadelphia, 1971) 174, and n. 44; Metzger, TC, 627.

[11]Ramsay, Church, 162. On the dating of these Western readings, cf. Metzger, TC, 259-72; A. F. J. Klijn, A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts, Part II, 1949-69 (Leiden, 1969).

[12]Cf. p. 28, cf. pp. 23-6 of thesis.

[13]On the anti-feminist tendencies of the Western text of Acts, cf. Epp, Theological Tendency, 75 and n. 90, and 168, n. 7; P.-H. Menoud, "The Western Text and the Theology of Acts", BSNTS 2 (1951) 30-1, and n. 42; Ropes, Beginnings III, ccxxxiv; Metzger, TC, 454, n. 1, 459-60, 466-7.

[14]It is possible that what these men are being appointed to do is supervise the distribution of food, not "wait on tables" or serve food. While some rabbis insisted that a woman is not to serve a meal to men or to eat with men, it is questionable whether or not the rabbis' ruling applied to the serving of women (here widows) or to homes without servants or sons. Cf. Swidler, Women in Judaism, 125; Str-B I, 480, 882. Without attempting to answer whether the Hellenists were Greek speaking Jews or Jews adopting Hellenistic practices, we may note that neither the Greeks nor the Romans had any scruples about women waiting on tables, though it was strictly speaking only a woman who was of the servant class whom they would expect to perform such a task in any but the poorest of homes. Cf. Cato's list of a housekeeper's duties in, On Agriculture 143 (LCL) 124-5. Cf. above on Mk 1.29-31 and pp. 184-6 of thesis.

[15]Cf. pp. 287 and 359, endnote 415 of thesis.
There is a difference between a Jewess being called a 'mother of the synagogue' and my use of the term of certain Christian women. In Jewish circles the term was bestowed on benefactresses or was simply an honorary title. So far as I know, a Jewess never had a synagogue in her own home, and in this respect she differed from her Christian counterparts. My use of the term of John Mark's mother and Lydia not only includes the idea of benefactress, but also the idea of being a house mother to a church. Cf. O. Michel, "οἶκος", TDNT V, 130.

[16]This is carefully detailed by Cadbury, "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts, III - Luke's Interest in Lodging", JBL 45 (1926) 305-22. Cf. the following examples which involve or turn on matters of hospitality or lodging: Lk 7.36-50, 10.38-42, 19.1-10, 16.19-31, 14.7-14, 10.25-34, 16.1-13, 24.29-30, 13.36-43; Ac 1.13, 12.12-17, 2.46, 21.8, 21.16, 28.7, 17.5-9, 9.11, 10.5-6, et al.

[17]D. W. Riddle, "Early Christian Hospitality: a Factor in the Gospel Transmission", JBL 57 (1938) 141-54.

[18]Riddle, 152.

[19]There are intimations elsewhere in the NT that such women played an important part in the establishment or maintenance of house churches. Cf. Rom 16.3-5, 1 Cor 16.19, and possibly Col 4.15. The elect lady of 2 John may be Lady Eclecta who has a church in her house (cf. v 1, τέκνοις), but v 13 probably militates against this suggestion.

[20]W. N. Ramsay, The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament (London, 1915) 209-21, and here 209; Cf. Bruce, Book of Acts, 251-2.

[21]Haenchen, Acts, 388, 391.

[22]Cf. Sanders, Tendencies, 151-83.

[23]Munck, Acts, 114.

[24]Haenchen, Acts, 359, allows, "It is not of course impossible that Peter succeeded in escaping and that the legend of his deliverance developed out of this."

[25]Lake and Cadbury, Beginnings IV, 138.

[26]It is possible that Mary was not a widow, but if her husband was not a Christian and was alive, it seems unlikely that they would meet in such a house. If the husband was a Christian, it is hard to explain why he is not mentioned as owner of the house. Cf. Stählin, "χήρα", TDNT IX, 451, and n. 107; R. B. Rackham, The Acts of the Apostles (10th ed.; London, 1925) 178; M. D. Gibson, "The House in which the Last Supper was Held", JTS 17 (1915-16) 398.

[27]H. Burton, "The House of Mary", Exp 2nd ser 1 (1881) 313-8. Though παιδίσκη is literally a diminutive of girl, in the NT it is always used of someone of servant class. Cf. BAG, 609; Mt 26.69, Mk 14.66, 69, Lk 22.56, Ac 16.16, and espec. Jn 18.17.

[28]Burton, "The House of Mary", 315.

[29]Burton, 317-8, suggests this is an all-female prayer meeting but the gender of ἱκανοί likely rules this out. That Peter says τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς instead of 'his brethren' probably rules out a reference to Jesus' family. On the other hand, if 'the brethren' means The Twelve, then Peter's words do not imply this is an all female meeting.

[30]Burton, 316.

[31]Cf. Ramsay, Bearing, 210; H. A. W. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Acts of the Apostles I (Edinburgh, 1877) 308.

[32]Oepke, "γυνή", TDNT I, 785, notes that this text indicates women's full membership in the early Christian community.

[33]T. F. Torrance, "St. Paul at Philippi: Three Startling Conversions. Acts 16:6-40", EvQ 13 (1941) 62-74.

[34]Y. Redalié, "Conversion ou libération? Notes sur Actes 16,11-40", Bulletin du Centre Protestant d'Études 26 (7, 1974) 7-17.

[35]Haenchen, Acts, 502; cf. Munck, Acts, 161, et al.

[36]This was true even in Homer's day. Cf. Homer, The Iliad, 4.141-3 (LCL I; trans. A. T. Murray; London, 1924) 162-3, who refer to this as a woman's task. On women in Asia Minor and Rome, cf. pp. 11-21 of thesis. She may have been a commercial traveler with houses in several locations (like Priscilla and Aquila?). Cf. J. Hastings, "Women in the Acts of the Apostles", ET 4 (1892-93) 434-6.

[37]Cf. Bruce, Book of Acts, 331; Lake and Cadbury, Beginnings IV, 191.

[38]The following are indications that there was no synagogue in Philippi: 1) Paul does not follow his normal custom of immediately going to the synagogue to preach (ἦμεν δὲ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει διατρίβοντες ἡμέρας τινάς, v 12); 2) no men are mentioned when Paul finds a group involved in worship of a Jewish sort; 3) there is no conclusive evidence in rabbinic sources that it was common to build synagogues next to bodies of water. Rengstorf, "ποταμός", TDNT VI, 602, suggests that the women met there as it was convenient for their necessary ablutions. Cf. Str-B II, 742; Bruce, Book of Acts, 331. Bruce, Acts, 314 points out that when προσευχή is used of a building it refers to the same thing as the term συναγωγή. Cf. S. M. Zarb, "De Iudaeorum ΠΡΟΣΕΥΧΗ in Acts XVI.13,16", Ang 5 (1928) 91-108; Lake and Cadbury, Beginnings IV, 190-1; pace Greeven, "προσεύχομαι", TDNT

II, 808. The evidence of Josephus, Antiquities 14.258 (LCL VII) 586-7, probably does not support Schrage's view ("συναγωγή", TDNT VII, 814, 817, n. 119, 830) that it was common to build synagogues near bodies of water. Elsewhere in Acts, when Luke wishes to refer to a synagogue he uses συναγωγή. Zarb, 107-8, intimates that προσευχή, if not referring to a building, was used of a Jewish meeting place where there was not a sufficient number of men to make up a quorum. 4) It is not likely that Jewish men, if present, would have allowed Paul to baptize Lydia without raising objections (ἐλαλοῦμεν ταῖς συνελθούσαις γυναιξίν. v 13); 5) nor is it likely that Paul would have stayed with Lydia if Jewish men were present among the converts, for Paul was careful to avoid any scandal, save the scandal involved in preaching the Gospel; 6) despite the textual difficulties, ἐνομίζομεν προσευχὴν εἶναι is probably the reading to be preferred and we should translate "where we thought there was a place of prayer." Pace BDF, sec. 297.2, 204; Bruce, Acts, 314; with Metzger, TC, 447, and Haenchen, Acts, 494, n. 5; MHT I, 82, n. 1.

[39]Cf. E. H. Plumptre, "The Philippian Sisterhood", in his Biblical Studies (London, 1885) 405; W. D. Thomas, "The Place of Women in the Church at Philippi", ET 83 (1971-72) 117; W. Rees, "St. Paul's First Visit to Philippi (Acts of the Apostles 16:11-40)", Ser 7 (1955) 99-105.

[40]Cf. Thomas, "The Place of Women", 117; Haenchen, Acts, 499.

[41]Haenchen, Acts, 494; C. Schneider, "κάθημαι", TDNT III, 443-4.

[42]Thus, Lydia was not a full proselyte of Judaism. Cf. Bruce, Acts, 215; Kuhn, "προσήλυτος", TDNT VI, 744. Possibly, these were her female relatives and/or children, and/or servants. It seems probable that Lydia was a widow, but this is not stated. That she heads a household may imply it. Cf. Rackham, Acts, 283; Stählin, "χήρα", TDNT IX, 451, n. 107; Bruce, Acts, 314.

[43]Rackham, Acts, 283; Foerster, "προσκληρόω", TDNT III, 766; Lake and Cadbury, Beginnings IV, 192.

[44]Though παρεκάλεσεν here may mean 'encourage' or 'invite'; in view of the repetition of the plea, it seems that 'beg' or 'plead' is a more likely translation. Cf. BAG, 622; A-S, 340; BDF, sec. 328, p. 170. At 16.40 the same word means 'encourage', but the context is different.

[45]Whether she was unmarried or widowed, it would be scandalous in Jewish circles for Paul to stay with Lydia. W. M. Ramsay, "The Denials of Peter - Section III: The House in the New Testament", ET 27 (1915-16) 471-2, suggests that Lydia was able to entertain men without violating local custom because her house was large enough to allow the men to have one section to themselves.

[46]Rackham, Acts, 283. Thomas, "The Place", 117, suggests, "In that house, it may be said, the church at Philippi was born."

[47]There is evidence that women continued to be prominent in the Philippian church after Paul's time. Cf. Thomas, "The Place", 119-20 on Polycarp. Thomas is probably right that Paul would have looked eventually for male converts to lead the Philippian church. Luke may well have remained in Philippi for this purpose, for the 'we' section does not begin again until 20.5-6. Turner, MHT IV, 52, calls the Lydia story a characteristically Greek narrative as is common in the 'we' section of Acts.

[48]Cf. J. Daniélou, The Ministry of Women in the Early Church (Leighton Buzzard, England, 1974) 20; R. Gryson, Le ministère des femmes dans l'Eglise ancienne (Gembloux, 1972) 19-33; G. G. Blum, "Das Amt der Frau im Neuen Testament", NovT 7 (1964) 142-61, concentrating especially on the Pauline corpus. Beyer's comment (διάκονος", TDNT II, 93) has a special relevance to the details of Ac 9.36-42: "It is indisputable, however, that an order of deaconesses did quickly arise in the Church. A particular part was played here by widows who, on the strength of their chaste conduct on the one side and their loving service on the other, already received official recognition in 1 Tim 5.3 ff." Cf. endnote 59 below for a fuller qualification. Early extra-Biblical evidence of women deacons is to be found perhaps in Pliny, Letters 10.96 (LCL II; trans. W. Melmoth; London, 1927) 404-5. Here "ministrae" are referred to and Melmoth translates it as deaconesses. This letter dates from A.D. 111-113.

[49]Cf. pp. 285-8 of thesis on Lk 8.1-3 and espec. endnotes 414 and 415, p. 359.

[50]Haenchen, Acts, 342. The funeral procedures indicated in this narrative (the body washed in accordance with Jewish purification laws, Peter's touching the woman only after she came back to life, possibly the weeping widows and the body lying in state) all point to a Jewish Christian milieu as the source of this narrative.

[51]And perhaps also that the chief Apostle was no respecter of persons.

[52]This probably indicates that Luke's audience was not Aramaic speaking. Dorcas or Tabitha means 'gazelle". Cf. Lake and Cadbury, Beginnings IV, 109-10; BAG, 810; MM, 169, 624. Does this name indicate that this woman was originally a slave or freed woman? Cf. Lake and Cadbury, Beginnings IV, 110.

[53]Haenchen, Acts, 339, n. 1, says that μαθήτρια is a Hellenistic word. Cf. Bruce, Acts, 212; Rengstorf, "μαθήτρια", TDNT IV, 460-1. J. Viteau, "L'Institution des Diacres et des Veuves - Actes vi.1-10, viii.4-40, xxi.8", RHE 22 (1926) 513-37, argues that Tabitha is called disciple because she has had formal instruction in Christian religion, perhaps in preparation for being a 'spiritual widow'. That Luke calls Tabitha a disciple indicates he had no difficulties in calling women Christians and thus it is unlikely that Luke is trying to exclude the widows from the group of believers in v 41. Cf. Ac 9.32, 41. The phrase τοὺς ἁγίους καὶ χήρας on the surface might imply that the widows were not among the saints (Christians). Alternatively, if there was a semi-official order of widows at this time, then χήρα may be a technical term for a certain group within the community who had duties involving funeral preparations and mourning (cf. v 39). Stählin, "χήρα", TDNT IX, 451, n. 107, and 452, n. 108 (cf. n. 144), mentions the possibility that we do have an order of widows here and this is why they are mentioned. Possibly, Luke did not wish to exclude the widows from among the 'holy ones', but wished to give them special mention as being present and thus comforted. Luke's tendency to use male-female parallelism in speaking of community members, or his tendency to give female Christians special mention, might lead him in this direction. Cf. the structure of Ac 1.14, and B. Newman and E. Nida, A Translator's Handbook on the Acts of the Apostles (London, 1972) 201. The point would be that both a group of men and a group of women witnessed the results of Peter's deed and were equally worthy to do so and bear witness to it.

[54]Cf. NN, Translator's Acts, 200; Bruce, Acts, 212. Delling, "πλήρης", TDNT VI, 286, objects to the translation 'full of good works', but at least in English it is an accurate idiomatic way of saying 'continually involved in doing good'.

[55]ἐλεημοσυνῶν ἃς ἐποίει refers to Tabitha's donations. Haenchen, Acts, 339, says it is added to forestall the idea that Tabitha might have received good works. The καί probably is not epexegetical. In the NT this phrase always refers to benevolent activity to the poor or needy. Cf. Bultmann, "ἐλεημοσύνη", TDNT II, 486.

[56]χιτῶνας καὶ ἱμάτια; cf. Haenchen, Acts, 339; Bruce, Acts, 213; NN, Translator's Acts, 201. The ἱμάτιον ('cloak') was worn over the χιτών ('tunic').

[57]Cf. M. Shabbath 23.5, Danby, 120.

[58]For the view that she is part of an order of widows, cf. Viteau, "L'Institution des Diacres", 532-3. In any case, as Parvey, "Theology and Leadership", 145, remarks, "To be recorded as raised from the dead, and to be the focus of the first such miracle by a fellow disciple, she must have been considered indispensable to the congregation."

[59]This Tabitha probably is not the Tabitha referred to in the "Historia Josephi". Cf. E. Nestle, "Schila et Tabitha", ZNW 11 (1910) 240; W. E. Crum, "Schila und Tabitha", ZNW 12 (1911) 352. Also, though Tabitha was perhaps a widow, she probably was not part of an order of widows, for her deeds seem to be more in line with a diaconal ministry, though perhaps our knowledge on this subject is too meagre to permit such a distinction. Cf. Rackham, Acts, 145, and n. 4. It should be noted that the good deeds of the widows in 1 Tim 5.10 belong to the widows' past, and that 1 Tim 2.10 indicates that good deeds were not the task of widows alone. Probably 1 Tim 5.10 is a general description, not a list of widow's official functions.

[60]Cf. endnotes 70 and 73, p. 407 of thesis.

[61]Haenchen, Acts, 603-4.

[62]By my count, there are 85 or more references to prophets and prophesying in Luke-Acts, evenly distributed between the two volumes (approximately 42 in Luke, and 43-45 in Acts).

[63]This is documented by E. E. Ellis, "The Role of the Christian Prophet in Acts", in Apostolic History and the Gospel (ed. W. Ward Gasque and R. P. Martin; Grand Rapids, 1971) 55-6.

[64]Ibid.

[65]Cf. Ellis, "Role of the Christian Prophet", 56, 62. It should be noted that Luke says προφητεύουσαι, not 'they prophesied about this or that'. He thus is referring to their functions in general, not to a particular prophecy for which they were noted. It was this which was distinctive about their ongoing activities.

[66]Friedrich, "προφήτης", TDNT VI, 849, notes that while there are affinities between NT and OT prophets, in view of Acts 2 and Joel's prophecy, the existence of Christian prophets is a sign that the eschatological age is present already. Cf. Ellis, "Role of the Christian Prophet", 67.

[67]So Viteau, "L'Institution des Diacres", 523. Such an order of virgins or spiritual widows appears to have existed at least as early as the early decades of the second century. Cf. Ignatius, Smyrnaens 13.1, The Apostolic Fathers (LCL I; trans. K. Lake; London, 1912) 266-7.

[68]Parvey, "Theology and Leadership", 145. παρθένοι may simply mean 'unmarried' with no technical sense at all, and it is possible that Luke mentions this because he thinks it is a good example for his audience to follow. Cf. Delling, "παρθένος", TDNT V, 834, and n. 52, to 1 Cor 7.5; NN, Translator's Acts, 405; BAG, 632; LPGL, 1037-40.

[69]Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History 3.39.2-6, 5.24.1-3 (LCL I) 290-5, 504-5. He certainly saw them as important in the early Church though apparently he confused them with the daughters of Philip the Apostle, or confused their father with Philip the Apostle.

[70]If Paul did spend two years in prison. Cf. Bruce, Acts, 387, and Book of Acts, 424, and n. 11. Bruce thinks that Luke's information on Josephus Barsabbas came from Philip's daughters. Cf. Ac 1.23 and Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History 3.29.9-10 (LCL) 294-5. Eusebius says that Papias got his information on Barsabbas from these daughters; however, there is some question whether or not these daughters could have lived that long. If they were in their twenties by the late forties or early fifties A.D., it is conceivable that some or perhaps one of them lived into the second century.

[71]Cf. Ac 9.36-42, 12.12-17, 16.11-15, and Riddle, "Early Christian Hospitality", 141-54.

[72]Pace Friedrich, "προφήτης", TDNT VI, 829; Lake and Cadbury, Beginnings IV, 267.

[73]It is interesting that Eusebius, as well as Luke, distinguishes between the gift of prophecy and various sorts of ecstasy. Cf. Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History 5.17.2-4 (LCL) 484-5. It appears that some Montanists tried to appeal to Philip's daughters as a precedent. Cf. Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History 3.31.3-6 (LCL) 270-3; A. M. Johnson, "Philip the Evangelist and the Gospel of John", AbrN 16 (1975-76) 49-72, espec. 58-62.

[74]Cf. pp. 112-6 of thesis on eunuchs for the Kingdom; Foakes-Jackson, Acts, 195. D. H. Hill, New Testament Prophecy (London, 1979) 101, says, "...all that Acts 21.9 suggests is that they were attached to a single community (and therefore not wandering prophets) and that there was a connection between virginity and prophecy (cf. Luke 2.36) consonant with the esteem in which asceticism was held by Jewish-Christian communities."

[75]It is to be noted that in both examples of prophetesses in Luke-Acts (Anna, Philip's daughters) there seems to be a relationship between abstinence from marriage and the gifts they have. Cf. Stählin, "χήρα", TDNT IX, 451, n. 98; contrast Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History 3.30.1, 5.18.3-4 (LCL) 268-9, 486-7.

[76]Cf. Rackham, Acts, 400; Foakes-Jackson, Acts, 194-5.

[77]There are difficulties in discerning whether or not the daughters of Philip the Evangelist in Caesarea are the same women who were said to live in Hierapolis and Ephesus. Cf. Lightfoot, Colossians and Philemon, 45-7 and n. 3; Bruce, Acts, 386 and n. 1; or P. Corssen, "Die Töchter des Philippus", ZNW 2 (1901) 289-99. Also Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History 3.39.8-13 (LCL) 294-7; Lake and Cadbury, Beginnings IV, 267; Danièlou, The Ministry, 9-13; Gryson, Le Ministère, 25-6, and n. 1.

[78]Cf. Rackham, Acts, 400; Stählin, "ξένος", TDNT V, 22-3, and n. 162.

[79]Lake and Cadbury, Beginnings IV, 231.

[80]Munck, Acts, 183.

[81]On the anti-feminist tendencies in the Western text, cf. pp. 376-8 of thesis.

[82]At 18.2 (cf. Ropes, Beginnings III, 170) h (cf. m) adds, ὁ δὲ παῦλος ἐγνωρίσθη τῷ ἀκύλᾳ with no mention of Priscilla. Further, we should note that while Codex Bezae has προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ὁ παῦλος, Codex Vaticanus and other chief witnesses read προσῆλθεν αὐτοῖς. At 18.3, there is a clear attempt in some mss. to avoid implying that Priscilla worked: In the reconstruction from it^h and syr^{hmg}, because of the addition of "and Paul became known to Aquila" at the end of v 2, what follows in v 3 seems to imply that Paul and Aquila, not Paul, Aquila, and Priscilla, were of the same trade as appears to be implied in most other mss. A, D, pl, among others, try to avoid any ambiguity about whether or not Priscilla worked by having ἠργάζετο (referring to Paul) rather than ἠργάζοντο (as in B*, ℵ*). Further, D gig omit the phrase ἦσαν γὰρ σκηνοποιοὶ τῇ τέχνῃ altogether. At 18.18, it^h reads, "Aquila, qui votum cum fecisset (Cenchris) caput tondit" (cf. Metzger, TC, 464). An activity of Aquila's is thus inserted into the text without including or implying anything about Priscilla's activities. Several mss. of the Latin Vulgate, however, say that both Priscilla and Aquila had cut their hair because of a vow. For a different interpretation of some of these textual variants, cf. F. W. Blass, "Priscilla und Aquila", TSK 74 (1901) 124-6.

[83]BAG, 708.

[84]A. von Harnack, "Über die Beiden Rezensionen der Geschichte der Prisca und des Aquila in Act Apost. 18,1-17", in Studien, 54-6.

[85]BAG, 708. Also, Bruce, Book of Acts, 369; E. H. Plumptre, "Aquila and Priscilla", in his Biblical Studies (London, 1885) 423.

[86]Haenchen, Acts, 550; W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (ICC; 5th ed.; Edinburgh, 1902) 418-20.

[87] Harnack, "Über die Beiden Rezensionen", 48-61.

[88]As C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (New York, 1968) 396, says, the mobility of this couple suggests they had considerable funds. Possibly the αὐτοῖς of 18.2 and the ἦσαν γὰρ σκηνοποιοί in 18.3, suggest that Priscilla, as well as Aquila and Paul, was a leather worker. It was customary for

Roman women to have access to money and property through inheritance or their trade. Cf. pp. 23-5 of thesis, If Priscilla was a freed woman (cf. Sanday and Headlam, Romans, 418-20; Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller, 268; G. Edmundson, The Church in Rome in the First Century [London, 1913] 242-3) there is no improbability of her marrying or being a leather worker. Cf. Haenchen, Acts, 534, n. 3; Lake and Cadbury, Beginnings IV, 223; E. Nestle, "St. Paul's Handicraft: Acts xviii.3", JBL 11 (1892) 205-6; R. Silva, "Eran, pues de oficio, fabricantes de tiendas (σκηνοποιοί) (Acts 18,3)", EstBib 24 (1965) 123-34.

[89]Suetonius, The Deified Claudius 25.4, The Lives of the Caesars (LCL II; trans. J. C. Rolfe; London, 1920) 52-3 and note a: "Iudaeos impulsore Chresto".

[90]Chrestus and Christus are aurally the same and could be mistaken easily. Cf. C. S. C. Williams, A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles (London, 1957) 209; Bruce, Book of Acts, 368. It is more probable that the edict of Claudius was given ca. A.D. 49-50, rather than A.D. 41 as some have suggested. Cf. Lake and Cadbury, Beginnings V (1933) 459-60.

[91]They are the ringleaders of the riot. This is substantiated by the following considerations: 1) Luke often uses πᾶς hyperbolically (Ac 3.9, 11, 20.27, etc.); 2) R. O. Hoerber, "The Decree of Claudius in Acts 18.2", CTM 31 (11, 1960) 690-4, shows that this view is upheld by an investigation of Suetonius, Tacitus, and Dio Cassius; 3) there were already Christians in Rome when Priscilla and Aquila were expelled (cf. Ehrhardt, Acts, 65, 98-9); 4) it is not likely that the expulsion edict would affect those Jews who were Roman citizens (cf. Bruce, Book of Acts, 368).

[92]Haenchen, Acts, 533, n. 4; cf. Plumptre, "Aquila and Priscilla", 421; Rackham, Acts, 324; Williams, Acts, 209.

[93]Haenchen, Acts, 539; cf. J. Schneider, "προσέρχομαι", TDNT II, 684; H. Conzelmann, History of Primitive Christianity (trans. J. E. Steely; Nashville, 1973) 98-9, rightly points out that they were to set-up a house church in Ephesus as well. Cf. 1 Cor 16.19.

[94]There is a slight textual difficulty, but τοῦ Ἰησοῦ is better attested and the more difficult reading. Cf. Metzger, TC, 466. ζέων τῷ πνεύματι, literally 'boiling over in the Spirit', is not likely a reference to the (fiery) human spirit since Apollos' natural gifts were already mentioned in v 24 and since in the only two clear references in Acts where πνεῦμα connotes the human spirit, a possessive adjective is added to make this obvious (cf. Ac 7.59, 17.16). D (gig) clearly thinks of Apollos as already a Christian - ὃς ἦν κατηχημένος ἐν τῇ πατρίδι τὸν λόγον. Cf. Metzger, TC, 466; H. Conzelmann, Die Apostelgeschichte (Tübingen, 1972) 118. Probably we have here a usage parallel to Rom 12.11 (cf. 1 Thess 5.19). Cf. Oepke, "ζέω", TDNT II, 876. It is not the human spirit that moves Apollos to teach accurately about Jesus.

[95]Michaelis, "ὁδός", TDNT V, 89-90.

[96]B. T. D. Smith, "Apollos and the Twelve Disciples at Ephesus", JTS 16 (1914-15) 245-6; Haenchen, Acts, 551; Lake and Cadbury, Beginnings IV, 233; Williams, Acts, 216. E. Schweizer, "Die Bekehrung des Apollos, Apg 18,24-26". Beiträge zur Theologie des Neuen Testaments - Neutestamentliche Aufsätze (1955-1970) (Zürich, 1970) 71-9.

[97]Lake and Cadbury, Beginnings IV, 233-4; BDF, sec. 244, p. 127; MHT I, 78, all agree that we likely have an elative here.

[98]The text does not tell us whether or not Apollos was baptized, but it is unlikely that the Ephesian brethren would have recommended Apollos to Corinth if he had not received Christian Baptism. So Smith, "Apollos", 245-6 (cf. Ac 18.27). There is, however, no way of knowing whether or not Priscilla and Aquila baptized Apollos. It is possible that once Apollos received the right teaching on Baptism that he emphasized this in Corinth, and that the parties in Corinth are divided along Baptismal lines - "I am of Apollos" then means, 'I was initiated into the community by Apollos.' Note that Baptism is uppermost in Paul's mind when he first speaks of the parties in 1 Cor 1.12-17.

[99]Smith, "Apollos", 241-6, points out that if the OT Messianic prophecies were meant, Luke would likely have said τὰ περὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ or τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ γεγράμενα. When Luke uses the phrase τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, it refers to the essential kerygma about the risen Jesus. Cf. Ac 28.31 (Lk 24.27). Cf. Haenchen, Acts, 567; Rackham, Acts, 342; Foerster, "Ἰησοῦς", TDNT III, 291.

[100]Foerster, "Ἰησοῦς", TDNT III, 291 ff. Cf. endnote 99 above.

[101]This would imply that Apollos' instruction in τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου had been insufficient. Perhaps then κατηχέω denotes elementary instruction in the Christian faith and practice from Scripture, bearing in mind that neither the OT nor John the Baptist taught Christian Baptism. Rengstorf, "διδάσκω", TDNT II, 145-6, is probably right that διδάσκω involves showing that Jesus is the Messiah using OT proof texts, i.e., the kerygma used in preaching to non-believers and especially Jews, based on the OT. ἐκτίθεμαι then would refer to the further expounding of God's word to more mature Christians. Cf. C. Maurer, "παρατίθημι", TDNT VIII, 163, n. 6.

[102]The elative comparative is still a comparative implying that more complete information was given. Cf. Robertson, 665; BAG, 32.

[103]G. B. Stevens, in The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers XI (ed. P. Schaff; Grand Rapids, 1975) 245, n. 2, states, "Luke here places the name of the wife Priscilla first and then Aquila...It [the instruction] is most naturally construed with the name to which it stands nearest especially with this unexpected arrangement of names." Stevens is here commenting on Homily XL of John Chrysostom. Since in the usual text Aquila's name, being second, is nearest to the verb, what Stevens apparently means is that because Priscilla is listed first, it is more natural to assume that she, if anyone, took the lead in instructing Apollos. On the basis of Chrysostom's text of Ac 18.26 which possibly read, "...πρίσκιλλα προσελάβετο αὐτόν καὶ ἀκριβέστερον αὐτῷ ἐξέβετο τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου," Blass conjectures that the name Aquila originally may have been an interpolation at this point. Cf. Blass, "Priscilla und Aquila", 124-5, and R. Schumacher, "Aquila und Priscilla", TGl 12 (1920) 97.

[104]This is to read twentieth century concerns back into the text. προσλαμβάνω seems to mean, 'to take aside', or possibly, 'to take home'. Cf. BAG, 724; Delling, "προσλαμβάνω", TDNT IV, 15; E. F. Harrison, Acts: The Expanding Church (Chicago, 1975) 285.

[105]For the improbable conjecture that Priscilla was the authoress of the Epistle to the Hebrews, cf. Harnack, "Probabilia über die Adresse und den Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes", ZNW 1 (1900) 33-41; R. Hoppin, Priscilla, Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews and Other Essays (New York, 1969). The gender of διηγούμενον in Heb 11.32 probably rules out Harnack's and Hoppin's view. Cf. Schumacher, "Aquila und Priscilla", 98-9,

[106]Stevens, in Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers XI, 245. On Paul's view of Priscilla and Aquila and their work, cf. E. A. Leonard, "St. Paul on the Status of Women", CBQ 12 (1950) 311-20.

Thesis Conclusions and Implications

Having completed our investigation of the texts in the Gospels and Acts which deal with women and their roles, we are now in a position to correlate some of the conclusions of the various chapters of this study and offer some tentative suggestions about their possible implications for the material in the rest of the New Testament that deals with our subject. This will involve assessing the results of the thesis as a whole, rather than rehearsing the conclusions found at the end of each major section of this work. It should be borne in mind that from the outset this study has been two-fold in nature. On the one hand, it has attempted to investigate the attitudes of Jesus and the Gospel writers toward women and their roles. On the other hand, it has examined the women who played a part in the pre- or post-Ascension community of Jesus and the roles which they played in this community.

Our study of Jesus' words and deeds led us to conclude that in many, though not all, regards, Jesus differed with His Jewish contemporaries and, to a lesser extent, with His contemporaries elsewhere in the first century Mediterranean world in His views of women and their roles. It is striking that Jesus' views were most at variance with the attitudes prevalent, if not predominant, in His immediate Jewish surroundings. This is all the more remarkable when we note that Jesus, so far as we know, never left His immediate Jewish environment for any length of time and, more importantly, directed His mission specifically to His fellow Jews.

Jesus' rejection of divorce outright would have offended practically everyone of His day. Further, Jesus' view that the single state was a legitimate and not abnormal calling for those to whom it was given, went against prevailing views in various parts of the Roman Empire about a man's duty to marry and procreate, but nowhere more so than in his native Palestine. We suggested that it was this teaching which made it possible for women also to assume roles other than those of wife and mother in Jesus' community. That Jesus did not endorse various ways of making women 'scapegoats', especially in sexual matters, placed Him at odds with other rabbis, though doubtless even many Gentiles would have thought that Jesus' rejection of the 'double standard' was taking equality too far. Further, we do not find negative remarks about the nature, abilities, and religious

potential of women in comparison to men on the lips of Jesus in contrast to various Jewish, Greek, and Roman authors. There is also reason to believe that Jesus' estimation of the worth and validity of a woman's word of testimony was higher than that of most, if not all, of His contemporaries (cf. Jn 4.27-42). Jesus' teaching that the family of faith's claims took priority over the claims of the physical family on both men and women (cf. Mk 3.31-35, 10.29-30), also led to some circumstances that both Jew and Gentile would have found objectionable; for instance, what husband (Jew or Gentile) would have willingly let his wife leave home and family to become a follower of an itinerant Jewish preacher? Yet Lk 8.3 likely indicates that Joanna, the wife of Chuza, had done this. This teaching, however, did not lead Jesus to repudiate either the traditional family structure outright or, it would seem, the patriarchal framework which existed to one degree or another in all the various Mediterranean cultures of that day. Jesus' teaching on the matter of corban, on honoring parents, on divorce, and on children makes clear that He was not advocating a rejection of the traditional family structure. If Mt 5.27-32 and Jn 7.53-8.11 are any indication, then Jesus reaffirmed the responsibility of the husband and male leaders to be moral examples for the community. Jesus' choice of twelve men to be leaders of His new community also leads one to think that Jesus was attempting to reform, not reject, the patriarchal framework under which He operated. What is radical about Jesus' teaching at this point is that Jesus understands male headship to mean special responsibility, not special privilege, for the man, since the model of leadership He upholds is that of the servant, one who, like his Master, takes a lead in serving others, not in lording it over them (cf. Mk 9.35 and parallels; Lk 22.24-27).

Certain of Jesus' words and deeds, such as His teaching on the laws of uncleanness, His healing of a woman on the Sabbath, and His willingness to converse with a strange woman in public, while obviously offensive to His fellow Jews, would probably not have raised many eyebrows outside Jesus' native context. Then, too, Jesus' attitude toward a woman's right to religious training and to be a disciple of a religious leader, while no doubt shocking to Jews, would not have seemed radical to many Romans or Greeks of His day. The Romans in particular were committed to educating both men and women about various matters including religion. In Greece, not only were some women, mainly the companions, allowed to learn from or even instruct

various philosophers, but also they themselves could become ministrants or oracles in some of the cults, as was true in Macedonia and Asia Minor as well.

Jesus' views of women and their roles do not fit neatly into any of the categories of His day. He was not a Qumranite, nor was he a traditional rabbi in these matters, though He had certain things in common with both groups. His use of women, both fictitious and real, as examples of faith for His followers, and His teaching on honoring parents, is not without precedent in rabbinic literature. His calling of men and women to radical commitment to God, in view of the inbreaking of the Kingdom, has certain affinities with the teachings of both John the Baptist and Qumran. Yet, on the whole, and especially in view of His Jewish context, Jesus appears to be a unique and sometimes radical reformer of the views of women and their roles that were commonly held among His people. It is easy to see why Jesus' teaching and actions involving women were in the main more readily received by Gentiles than by Jews, even though Jesus directed His ministry mainly to the Jews. The social conditions in various Gentile environments (especially Macedonia, Asia Minor, and Rome) were such that people in these contexts were more prepared and willing to hear and heed Jesus on the matter of male-female equality and new roles for women. This does not mean, however, that there was not resistance to such ideas even in settings that were not specifically Jewish. Perhaps the very reason the Third and Fourth Evangelists take pains to present various women as religious models for their audiences is that the case still needed to be argued when they wrote their Gospels. This lead us to discuss the views of the four Evangelists on these matters.

Following the lead of their Master, the Third and Fourth Evangelists and, to a lesser extent, the First and Second, make attempts to present women in a more positive light than was common in their day. Luke especially seems determined to drive home his point about the equal place and new roles of women in the community of Jesus by utilizing the techniques of male-female parallelism (not only in the pairing of parables but also elsewhere), male-female role reversal, and by giving space to stories about women not found in the other Gospels. Luke's five vignettes in Acts presenting women assuming various roles in the primitive Christian community must not be passed over as though they were only descriptive accounts of history. Their choice, placement, and content reveal a deliberate attempt on the author's part to

indicate to his audience how things ought to be. Further, there is evidence that Luke's message was all too clear, for the editors of the Western text of Acts recognized the implications of these narratives and attempted to tone down the language in them which spoke of women's new freedom and roles in the Christian community. It is also of interest that both Luke and the Fourth Evangelist wished their audiences to know that the tensions between the claims of the physical family and the family of faith on a woman could be resolved so long as the physical family allowed itself to be defined and directed by the dictates and priorities of the family of faith. Thus, in their own way, they present episodes in the life of Jesus' mother to reveal both the difficulties of hearing and heeding the call to discipleship faced by a mother, and how those difficulties could be successfully overcome as Mary learns to become a mother as a disciple. The stories about Mary and Martha, especially Lk 10.38-42, also reflect this theme.

Another motif that comes to light in the Gospels is the presentation of women as valid witnesses of the truth about Jesus (John 4 for instance), and especially about His death, burial, empty tomb, and appearance as the risen Lord. Though it may have been a matter of necessity, it is significant that a crucial part of the Christian kerygma is based on the testimony of Jesus' female followers. It is to the credit of the Evangelists that, far from trying to gloss over this fact, it is highlighted in different ways by the First Evangelist, Luke, the Fourth Evangelist, and probably Mark. Worthy of special mention is Luke's way of revealing the validity of the testimony of Jesus' female followers by showing that it was confirmed by the Apostle Peter (cf. Lk 24.1-10, 12). Also notable is the Fourth Evangelist's presentation of Martha's confession as, to some extent, a model for his audience (cf. Jn 11.27, 20.31).

It is not only Luke and the Fourth Evangelist, however, who seem to be drawing out the logical implications of Jesus' words and deeds that relate to our subject in their handling of the Gospel material. This may also be affirmed in the case of the First Evangelist. We see this particularly in his presentation of the story of the Syrophoenician woman who is praised for her great faith. This is significant when it is remembered that it is in Matthew that the male disciples are on more than one occasion called "you of little faith". The First Evangelist also presents the reaction of the women followers to the appearance of Jesus in a more positive light than the reaction of the Eleven to their encounter with their risen Lord (cf. 28.9, 17).

Interestingly, he also stresses the male headship theme in his birth narrative by focusing on Joseph, the head and leader of his family. This theme also appears elsewhere in the First Gospel (cf. 5.27-32).

Mark, because of his lack of a birth narrative and of his original ending, is more difficult to assess. While Mark presents only the negative side of Mary's relationship to Jesus (3.21, 31-35), and speaks of the fear and flight of the women from the empty tomb (16.8), it is also Mark who presents the story of the healing, faith, and testimony of the sick woman in the most positive terms (5.26, 33-34 and parallels), who refers to spiritual mothers and sisters (3.35, cf. Mt 12.50), who presents Jesus' absolute rejection of divorce (Mark 10) and, most of all, who emphasizes the presence of Jesus' female followers at the cross, burial, and empty tomb. There is, then, evidence that Mark, as well as the other Evangelists, attempts to present women in a positive light in his Gospel and, it may be added, it is probably wrong to make too much of Mk 16.8 in a negative way since the narrative likely continued. Further, the negative portrayal of the family of Jesus in Mark 3 is likely due to the tensions between the claims of the physical family and the family of faith on Jesus, and not because Mark is interested in portraying Mary in a negative light as an end in itself. What, then, was the effect of these new attitudes about women and their roles on the women who participated in the community of Jesus? What was the community of Jesus offering women in terms of status and roles in comparison to what was offered them in Judaism or in various pagan cults?

To begin with, it is apparent, not only in the Gospels and Acts but also in the Epistles (e.g., Romans 16), that the impact of the Christian message on women was considerable. It is probable that Jesus' teachings, in a somewhat similar fashion to the teachings and practices of the cult of Isis, attracted women in part because of the new roles and equal status they were granted in the Christian community. There were many cults in Greece and Rome that were for men only or, at best, allowed women to participate in very limited ways. Further, it is easy to see why women who were on the fringe of the synagogue community became Christian converts. Judaism offered women proselytes a circumscribed place at best, for they were faced with the rabbinic restrictions that limited their participation in religious functions. In our discussion of Lydia, we noted that while women neither were able to make up the quorum necessary to found a

synagogue, nor were able to receive the Jewish covenant sign, these limitations did not exist in the Christian community. The necessary and sufficient explanation of why Christianity differed from its religious mother, Judaism, in these matters is that Jesus broke with both biblical and rabbinic traditions that restricted women's roles in religious practices, and that He rejected attempts to devalue the worth of a woman, or her word of witness. Thus, the community of Jesus, both before and after Easter, granted women <u>together</u> with men (not segregated from men as in some pagan cults) an equal right to participate fully in the family of faith. This was a right that women did not have in contemporary Judaism or in many pagan cults. Jesus' teachings on the priorities of discipleship, His willingness to accept women as His disciples and traveling companions (cf. Lk 8. 1-3, 10.38-42), and His teaching on eunuchs and what defiled a person, effectively paved the way for women to play a vital part in His community. <u>Anyone</u> could have faith in and follow Jesus - He did not insist on any other requirements for entrance into His family of faith.

In regard to the roles women could and did assume in Jesus' community, Luke particularly shows us that a variety of tasks were assumed by women, especially in the post-Easter community. The Third Evangelist gives evidence (cf. Lk 8.3, Ac 9.36-42) that women often enough simply resumed their traditional roles of providing hospitality or material support, though now it was in service to the community of Jesus. Such roles were acceptable so long as they did not hinder a woman from choosing or learning more about the "one thing needful" (Lk 10.38-42). It is interesting and perhaps significant that the major female figures in the Gospels are depicted as being in the process of becoming full-fledged disciples, a process which involved their learning how to reorient their traditional roles so that the priorities of the family of faith were heeded. Thus, we saw Mary learning to be a mother <u>as</u> a disciple, Martha learning to be a hostess <u>as</u> a disciple, and Mary Magdalene and others providing material aid as they followed Jesus. In the post-Easter community we find women assuming a greater variety of roles, some of which were specifically of a religious nature (e.g., the prophetesses of Ac 21.9), and some of which would have been forbidden to a Jewish woman (e.g., being a teacher of men in Ac 18.24-26).

While the teaching and community of Jesus was perhaps more easily and more naturally embraced by Gentile women than by Jewish women, it offered Jewish women more in terms of status and roles than it did

to Gentile women. For a Jewish woman, the possibility of being a disciple of a great teacher, of being a traveling follower of Jesus, of remaining single "for the sake of the Kingdom", of being a 'mother' to a house church, or even of being a teacher of the faith to persons other than children, were all opportunities that did not exist prior to her entrance into the community of Jesus. Nonetheless, the Christian faith and community offered Gentile women a great deal also. As well as the roles mentioned above, the offer of salvation from sin, of starting life with a new self-image and purpose, of actively participating in a community whose Master had directed His mission especially to the oppressed, were offers that appealed greatly to Gentile, as well as Jewish, women. This new status and these new roles, some of which had not been available to these women before, are factors which explain the influx of women into the community of Jesus.

Turning to the implications this study may have for the material in the rest of the New Testament concerning women, and for New Testament studies in general, it is possible that our study has certain implications for textual criticism. It will be remembered that in our discussion of the material in Acts we noted that there was an anti-feminist tendency in the Western text. Thus, all other things being equal, perhaps a textual variant that gives women special prominence, or praises a woman at the expense of a man, has a better chance of being an original or earlier reading than one which does not (cf. Col 4.15). Possibly, Rom 16.7 had an original reading of Ἰουλίαν which had been changed to Ἰουνιᾶν so that a clear reference to a woman as an 'apostle' could be avoided. On the other hand, we noted that it is the two Gospels thought to have been written at the greatest distance from the actual Gospel events (Luke and John) that devote more space to women and their roles. This need not mean that it is wrong to date Luke's and the Fourth Evangelist's compositions after those of Mark and the First Evangelist's. More likely, the explanation of this phenomenon is to be found in the fact that the further one gets in time from the Gospel events and first years of the primitive Christian community, the more conventional ideas and stereotypes of women crept into the Christian community, and thus the more Gospel writers need to emphasize a woman's rightful place and her right to varied roles in Jesus' community. No certainty, however, can be had in these matters since our knowledge of what happened in the Christian community during the last decades of the first century is not vast.

The implications of this study lead us to conjecture that Paul's appeal to the creation order in his discussion of matters involving men

and women (cf. 1 Cor 11.7-9, and possibly 1 Cor 14.34 and 1 Tim 2.13) is a technique that he may have derived from the teaching of Jesus (Mt 19.4-6 and par.). Further, Paul's belief that singleness for the Kingdom was not only a legitimate but also a preferable option to being married may well be derived from the attitude and teaching of Jesus about 'eunuchs' for the Kingdom (cf. Mt 19.10-12 and 1 Corinthians 7). Paul's concept of continent singleness (and fidelity in marriage) as a gift (χάρισμα, 1 Cor 7.7) seems to echo the οἷς δέδοται of Mt 19.11. Paul openly states that his teaching about the indissolubility of marriage is derived from "the Lord" (1 Cor 7.10-11). This leads one to suppose either that the view of the exceptive clauses in Matthew considered in this thesis is correct (since Paul also rejects incestuous relations as illegitimate from the outset in 1 Cor 5.1-2), or that the exceptive clauses are the First Evangelist's redactional expansion on the words of Jesus. It should also not go unnoted that structurally 1 Corinthians 7 (cf. also 1 Cor 11.1-12) is a grand exercise in male-female paralleism on a scale and to a degree that even Luke did not pursue. In all these matters (singleness, the indissolubility of marriage, the gift concept) Jesus and Paul stand together and in contrast to their own Jewish backgrounds. The precedent set by Jesus of allowing women to travel with Him and to hear and heed His words and to serve the community may also have borne fruit in Paul's ministry, for there were several women with whom Paul traveled or considered his συνεργοί (cf. Ac 18.1-3, 18-26, Rom 16.1-4, 6, 7(?), 12, 15, 1 Cor 16.19).

If we are right that Jesus was attempting to reform, not reject, the patriarchal framework of his culture, then it is understandable why Paul and other New Testament authors sought to redefine, not reject, concepts of male headship and leadership in light of Christian or biblical ideas (cf. especially Eph 5.21-33, "as the Church submits... as Christ loves..."; 1 Cor 11.3-12, "in the Lord"; and 1 Pet 3.6, ὡς Σάρρα...κύριον αὐτὸν καλοῦσα). The work of the Spirit in women's lives led some of them to prophesy (Ac 21.9). If the gift gave a person a certain leadership status, as we at one point conjectured (cf. also 1 Cor 12.28), then there may be an integral connection between 1 Cor 14.1-33a and 33b-36. Paul may be exhorting women prophetesses in 1 Cor 14.33b-36 to exercise their gifts in a way that did not involve the violation of their husband's headship (cf. 1 Cor 11.3-5, 14.34-35). It is possible that the tensions in Paul's thought between the concept of male headship and his willingness to allow

women to exercise new roles in the Christian community are tensions that were inherent in the attitudes and teachings of Jesus, and do not reflect, as some have suggested, tensions between ideas drawn from Paul's non-Christian rabbinic past and theological concepts that he had learned since becoming a Christian.

There are other possible points of contact between the insights brought to light by this thesis and the material found in the rest of the New Testament. One avenue worth exploring is the possible relationship between the household codes found in various NT Epistles and the teachings of Jesus. It is often assumed that these household codes were adopted and adapted by Christians from non-Christian writings or teachings on ethics. If this is the case, then it might be evidence of how the Church began to accommodate its Christian teaching about women and the family to the conventions of its environment. On the other hand Jesus Himself had something to say about such matters as the honoring of parents, the treatment of children, and other relevant subjects that might be classified as general ethics. Could there be a connection between this teaching and that found in the Epistles on these matters? This question must wait until a further study is undertaken before it can be answered.

As for this study, it is not intended to be the last word on its subject, but rather the first part of a larger effort that this author is undertaking to understand the whole of the New Testament's teaching on women and their roles. Only when all of the New Testament material has been exegeted properly can the hermeneutical question of its applicability to the modern Church situation be approached. Thus, it is hoped that this thesis will be judged for what it is: an open-ended beginning, rather than a self-contained end.

Bibliography

This bibliography is not intended to be an exhaustive listing of works relating to the subject matter of this study, but rather a list of those works found useful in the preparation of this thesis.

General Reference Works

Greek and Hebrew Texts

Aland, Kurt, et al., eds. The Greek New Testament. 3rd ed. London: United Bible Societies. 1975.

Aland, Kurt, ed. Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum. 8th ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt. 1973.

Nestle, E. and K. Aland, eds. Novum Testamentum Graece. 25th ed. London: United Bible Societies. 1971.

Kittel, R. and P. Kahle, eds. Biblia Hebraica. 7th ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt. 1951.

Rahlfs, A., ed. Septuaginta. 9th ed. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt. 1971.

English Translations

The Authentic New Testament. Hugh J. Schonfield. Aberdeen: The Central Press, Dennis Dobson, Ltd. 1955.

The Jerusalem Bible, Reader's Edition. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc. 1968.

Good News Bible, Today's English Version. New York: American Bible Society. 1976.

Harper Study Bible, Revised Standard Version. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Bible Publishers. 1971.

Holy Bible, King James Version. New York: Collins, 1957.

Holy Bible, New International Version. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Bible Publishers. 1978.

New American Standard Bible. New Testament. 2nd ed. Carol Stream, Illinois: Creation House, Inc. 1963.

The New English Bible. New Testament. 2nd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press. 1970.

The New Testament. James Moffatt. New York: Association Press. 1920.

The New Testament in Modern English. J. B. Phillips. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1972.

Concordances

Hatch, Edwin and Henry A. Redpath. A Concordance to the Septuagint. 2 vols. Graz: Akademische Druck - u. Verlagsanstalt. 1954.

Moulton, W. F. and A. S. Geden, eds. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. 4th ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.

Young, Robert. Analytical Concordance to the Bible. 22nd ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1970.

Dictionaries

Brown, Colin, ed. The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House. 1975-1978.

Kittel, Gerhard and G. Friedrich, eds. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. 10 vols. trans. G. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1964-1976.

Grammars

Blass, F. and A. Debrunner. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament. trans. R. W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1961.

Dana, H. E. and J. R. Mantey. A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament. New York: Macmillan Company. 1955.

Moule, C. F. D. An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek. 2nd ed. London: Cambridge University Press. 1959.

Moulton, J. H., W. F. Howard, and N. Turner. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. 4 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1908-1976.

Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. Nashville: Broadman Press. 1934.

Zerwick, Maximilian. Biblical Greek. trans. J. Smith. Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici. 1963.

Indexes:

Goodwater, Leanna. Women in Antiquity: An Annotated Bibliography. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc. 1975.

Mattill, A. J. and M. B. A Classified Bibliography of Literature on the Acts of the Apostles. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1966.

Metzger, Bruce. Index of Articles on the New Testament and the Early Church Published in Festschriften. SBL Monograph 5. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature. 1951.

Metzger, Bruce. Index to Periodical Literature on Christ and the Gospels. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1966.

Jewish Texts

Cohen, A. ed. The Babylonian Talmud: Tractate Berākōt. London: Cambridge University Press. 1921.

Danby, Herbert, trans. The Mishnah. London: Oxford University Press. 1933.

Epstein, I., ed. The Babylonian Talmud. 35 vols. London: Soncino Press. 1935-1952.

Freedman, H. and A. Simon, eds., trans., Midrash Rabbah. 10 vols. London: Soncino Press. 1951.

Gaster, T., trans. The Dead Sea Scriptures. Garden City: Doubleday and Company. 1964.

Goldin, J., trans. The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan ('Abot de-Rabbi Natan). New Haven: Yale University Press. 1955.

Goldschmidt, L., trans. Der Babylonische Talmud. 9 vols. Haag: Martinus Nijoff. 1929 ff.

Lauterbach, G. Z., trans. Mekilta de Rabbi Israel. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publishing Society of America. 1933.

Lohse, E., ed. and trans. Die Texte aus Qumran, Hebräisch und Deutsch. München: Kösel Verlag. 1971.

Montefiore, C. G. and H. Loewe. A Rabbinic Anthology. New York: Schocken Books. 1974.

Schwab, M., trans. Le Talmud de Jérusalem. 11 vols. Paris: Librarie Orientale et Américaine. 1871 ff.

Vermes, G., trans. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Harmondworth: Penguin Books. 1965.

Lexicons

Abbott-Smith, G. A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1937.

Bauer, W. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. trans. and adapted by W. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. 4th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1952.

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1972.

Lampe, G. W. H. A Patristic Greek Lexicon. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1961.

Liddell, H. G. and R. Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon. 9th ed. rev. H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie with supplement by E. A. Barber (1968). Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1940.

Moulton, James Hope and George Milligan. The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans. 1930.

Miscellaneous

Boeckh, A., et al., eds. Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum. Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae. 4 vols. Berlin: Officina Academica. 1828-1877.

Charles, R. H., trans., ed. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1913.

Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae. 16 vols. Berlin: Georgius Reimerus/W. de Gruyter et Co. 1863 ff.

Dessau, Hermann, ed. Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae. 3 vols. Berlin: Weidmann. 1892-1916.

Dittenberger, W., ed. Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum. 3rd. ed. 4 vols. Leipzig: S. Hirzel Pub. 1915-1924.

Frey, J.-B., ed. Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum. 2 vols. Rome: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana. 1936.

Hennecke, Edgar. New Testament Apocrypha. 2 vols. ed. W. Schneemelcher. trans. R. McL. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1963-1965.

Inscriptiones Graecae. Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae. 14 vols. Berlin: Georgius Reimerus/W. de Gruyter et Co. 1873-1972.

Peake's Commentary on the Bible. rev. and ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd. 1962.

Strack, Hermann L. and Paul Billerbeck. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. 6 vols. München: C. H. Beck. 1974-1975 repr.

Wettstein, Jacobus. Novum Testamentum Graecum. 2 vols. Graz: Akademische Druck - u. Verlagsanstalt. 1752/1962.

Commentaries

Textual and Grammatical

Metzger, Bruce M. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. London: United Bible Societies. 1971.

Newman, Barclay M. and Eugene A. Nida. A Translator's Handbook on the Acts of the Apostles. London: United Bible Societies. 1972.

Reiling, J. and J. L. Swellengrebel. A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Luke. Leiden: E. J. Brill for United Bible Societies. 1971.

Zerwick, Maximilian and M. Grosvenor. A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament. Vol. I. Gospels-Acts. Rome: Biblical Institute Press. 1974.

Exegetical Commentaries

Matthew

Allen, W. C. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. ICC. Edinburgh. T. & T. Clark, 1907.

Filson, F. V. Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew. London: A. & C. Black. 1971.

Hill, David. The Gospel of Matthew. New Century Bible. Greenwood, South Carolina: Attic Press, Inc. 1972.

Klostermann, E. Das Matthäusevangelium. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. 4. 2nd revised ed. ed. H. Lietzmann. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck). 1927.

Lohmeyer, E. Das Evangelium des Matthäus. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. ed. W. Schmauch. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1958.

M'Neile, Alan Hugh. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. London: Macmillan and Company. 1965.

Plummer, Alfred. An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew. London: Elliot Stock. 1909.

Schniewind, J. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. Das Neue Testament Deutsch Vol. 2. eds. P. Althaus and J. Behm. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1950.

Schweizer, E. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. Das Neue Testament Deutsch. Vol. 2. n.s. ed. G. Friedrich. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1976.

Mark

Cranfield, C. E. B. The Gospel According to St. Mark. Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary. London: Cambridge University Press. 1972.

Klostermann, E. Das Markusevangelium. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. 3. ed. H. Lietzmann. 2nd revised edition. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck). 1926.

Lane, William L. The Gospel According to Mark. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1974.

Lohmeyer, E. Das Evangelium des Markus. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Vol. 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1951.

Moule, C. F. D. The Gospel According to Mark. Cambridge Bible Commentary on the New English Bible. London: Cambridge University Press. 1965.

Pesch, R. Das Markusevangelium. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Vol. II. eds. A. Wikenhauser, A. Vögtle, R. Schnackenburg. Freiburg: Herder. II.1, 1976. II.2, 1977.

Plummer, Alfred. The Gospel According to St. Mark. London: Cambridge University Press. 1914.

Schniewind, J. Das Evangelium nach Markus. Das Neue Testament Deutsch. Vol. 1. ed. P. Althaus and J. Behm. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1949.

Schweizer, E. Das Evangelium nach Markus. Das Neue Testament Deutsch. Vol. 1. n.s. ed. G. Friedrich. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1975.

Swete, Henry Barclay. The Gospel According to St. Mark. London: Macmillan and Company. 1898.

Taylor, Vincent. The Gospel According to St. Mark. 2nd ed. New York: St. Martin's Press. 1966.

Luke

Caird, G. B. The Gospel of St. Luke. Pelican New Testament Commentaries. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, Ltd. 1963.

Creed, John Martin. The Gospel According to St. Luke. London: Macmillan and Company. 1930.

Danker, Frederick W. Jesus and the New Age According to St. Luke St. Louis: Clayton Publishing House. 1972.

Ellis, E. E. The Gospel of Luke. New Century Bible. Greenwood, South Carolina: Attic Press, Inc. 1974 rev. ed.

Klostermann, E. Das Lukasevangelium. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. 5. ed. H. Lietzmann. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck). 1929.

Lagrange, M.-J. Évangile selon St. Luc. Paris: J. Gabalda. 1948.

Manson, William. The Gospel of Luke. Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1930.

Marshall, I. Howard. The Gospel of Luke, A Commentary on the Greek Text. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Exeter: Paternoster Press. 1978.

Morris, Leon. The Gospel According to St. Luke. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1974.

Plummer, Alfred. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke. ICC. 5th ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1922.

Schürmann, H. Das Lukasevangelium. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Vol. III. ed. A. Wikenhauser, A. Vögtle, and R. Schnackenburg. Freiburg: Herder. III.1, 1969.

John

Barrett, C. K. The Gospel According to St. John. London: S. P. C. K. 1955.

_____. The Gospel According to St. John. London. S. P. C. K. 2nd ed. 1978.

Brown, Raymond E. The Gospel According to John. The Anchor Bible 2 vols. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc. 1966, 1970.

Bultmann, R. The Gospel of John: A Commentary. trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray. Oxford: B. Blackwell. 1971.

Hoskyns, Edwyn C. The Fourth Gospel. ed. F. N. Davey. 2 vols. London: Faber and Faber Ltd. 1940.

Lightfoot, R. H. St. John's Gospel, A Commentary. ed. C. F. Evans. London: Oxford University Press. 1957.

Morris, Leon. The Gospel According to John. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1971.

Schnackenburg, R. Das Johannesevangelium. Herders Theologischer zum Neuen Testament. Vol. IV. ed. A. Wikenhauser and A. Vögtle. Freiburg: Herder. IV.1, 1972; IV.2, 1971; IV.3, 1975.

_____. The Gospel According to St. John. Vol. I. Herder's Theological Commentary on the New Testament. ed. J. Massingberd [sic] Ford and K. Smyth. trans. K. Smyth. New York. 1968.

Westcott, Brooke Foss. The Gospel According to St. John: The Authorised Version. London: John Murray. 1882.

Acts

Bruce, F. F. Commentary on the Book of the Acts. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1954.

_____. The Acts of the Apostles. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1952.

Conzelmann, D. Hans. Die Apostelgeschichte. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. VII. ed. G. Bornkamm. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck). 1972

Foakes-Jackson, F. J. The Acts of the Apostles. Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1931.

_____, and Kirsopp Lake, eds. The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I. The Acts of the Apostles. 5 vols. London: Macmillan and Company. 1920-1933.

Haenchen, Ernst. The Acts of the Apostles, A Commentary. trans. B. Noble, G. Shinn, and R. Mcl. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1971.

Harrison, E. F. Acts: The Expanding Church. Chicago: Moody Press. 1975.

Meyer, Henrich. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Acts of the Apostles. trans. P. Gloag and W. Dickson. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1877.

Rackham, Richard B. The Acts of the Apostles, An Exposition. Westminster Commentaries. 10th ed. London: Methuen and Company. 1925.

Williams, C. S. C. A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. London: A. & C. Black. 1957.

Greek and Latin Texts

Unless otherwise noted, the following are found in:
The Loeb Classical Library (LCL). ed. G. P. Goold, et al.
London: Wm. Heinemann/Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Appian. The Civil Wars. 2 vols. trans. H. White. 1913.

Apuleius. The Golden Ass (Metamorphoses). trans. W. Adlington. rev. S. Gaselee. 1915.

Aristophanes. Lysistrata-Thesmophoriazusae-Ecclesiazusae-Plutus. trans. B. B. Rogers. 1924.

_____. Wasps. trans. B. B. Rogers. 1924.

Aristotle. Politics. trans. H. Rackham. 1932.

Athenaeus. The Deipnosophists. 7 vols. trans. C. B. Gulick. 1927-1941.

Cato and Varro. On Agriculture. trans. W. D. Hooper and H. B. Ash. 1934.

Cicero. De Oratore. trans. E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham. 1942.

_____. Letters to Atticus. 3 vols. trans. E. O. Winstedt. 1912-1929.

_____. Letters to His Friends. 3 vols. trans. W. G. Williams. 1927-1929.

_____. Philippics. trans. W. C. A. Ker. 1926.

Columella. De Re Rustica. 3 vols. trans. H. B. Ash, et al. 1941-1955.

Demosthenes. Private Orations. 3 vols. trans. A. T. Murray. 1936-1939.

Dio Cassius. Roman History. 9 vols. trans. E. Cary. 1914-1927.

Diodorus Siculus. Library of History. 12 vols. trans. C. H. Oldfather et al. 1933-1967.

Diogenes Laertius. Lives of Eminent Philosophers. 2 vols. trans. R. D. Hicks. 1925.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Roman Antiquities. 7 vols. trans. E. Cary. 1937-1950.

Dinarchus, et al. The Minor Attic Orators. trans. J. O. Burtt. 1954.

Epictetus. Dissertationes ab Arriano Digestae. ed. H. Schenkl. Stuttgart: G. Teubner. 1965.

_____. The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, The Manual and Fragments. trans. W. A. Oldfather. 1928.

Euripides. Andromache. Budé. trans. L. Meridier. Paris: Société D'Édition "Les Belles Lettres". 1960.

_____. 4 vols. trans. A. S. Way. 1912.

Eusebius. Ecclesiastical History. 2 vols. trans. K. Lake and J. E. L. Oulton. 1926/1932.

Gellius. Attic Nights. 3 vols. trans. J. C. Rolfe. 1927.

Gaius. Institutes. Budé. trans. J. Reinach. Paris: Société D'Édition "Les Belles Lettres". 1950.

Herodotus. 4 vols. trans. A. D. Godley. 1920-1924.

Hesiod. Work and Days. trans. Hugh G. Evelyn-White. 1936.

Homer. The Iliad. 2 vols. trans. A. T. Murray. 1924/1925.

Ignatius. Smyrnaeans. The Apostolic Fathers. 2 vols. trans. K. Lake. 1912/1913.

Josephus. Jewish Antiquities. 6 vols. trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, et al. 1930-1965.

_____. The Jewish War. 2 vols. trans. H. St. J. Thackeray. 1927-1928.

_____. The Life - Against Apion. trans. H. St. J. Thackeray. 1926.

Juvenal. Satires. ed. J. D. Duff. London: Cambridge University Press. 1970.

Livy. 14 vols. trans. B. O. Foster, et al. 1919-1967.

Lucian. The Syrian Goddess. trans. A. M. Harmon. 1925.

Martial. Epigrams. 2 vols. trans. W. C. A. Ker. 1920.

Menander. The Principal Fragments. trans. F. C. Allinson. 1921.

Pausanias. Description of Greece. 5 vols. trans. W. H. S. Jones and H. A. Ormerod. 1918-1935.

Petronius. trans. M. Heseltine. 1969.

Philo. On Abraham-On Joseph-On Moses. trans. F. H. Colson. 1935.

_____. On Drunkenness, et al. trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. 1930.

_____. Hypothetica (Apology for the Jews) et al. trans. F. H. Colson. 1941.

_____. On the Creation-Allegorical Interpretation. trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. 1929.

_____. On the Special Laws. trans. F. H. Colson. 1937.

_____. Philo Supplement. 2 vols. trans. R. Marcus. 1953.

_____. The Sacrifices of Abel and Cain. trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. 1929.

Philostratus. Life of Apollonius of Tyana. 2 vols. trans. F. C. Conybeare. 1912.

Pindar. The Odes. trans. J. E. Sandys. 1915.

Plato. Lysis-Symposium-Gorgias. trans. W. R. Lamb. 1925.

_____. The Republic. 2 vols. trans. P. Shorey. 1930-1935.

_____. Timaeus et al. trans. R. G. Bury. 1929.

Pliny. The Letters. 2 vols. trans. W. Melmoth. rev. W. M. L. Hutchinson. 1915.

_____. Natural History. 11 vols. trans. H. Rackham et al. 1938-1962.

Plutarch. Moralia. 15 vols. trans. F. C. Babbitt et al. 1927-1969.

_____. The Parallel Lives. 11 vols. trans. B. Perrin. 1914-1926.

Polybius. The Histories. 6 vols. trans. W. R. Paton. 1922-1927.

Propertius. trans. H. E. Butler. 1912.

Quintilian. 4 vols. trans. H. E. Butler. 1920-1922.

Remains of Old Latin. 4 vols. trans. E. H. Warmington. 1935-1940.

Sallust. The War with Cataline. trans. J. C. Rolfe. 1960.

Seneca. Letters to Lucilius. Budé. ed. F. Prechac. trans. H. Noblot. Paris: Société D'Édition "Les Belles Lettres." 1945.

_____. Moral Essays. 3 vols. trans. J. W. Basore. 1928-1935.

Sophocles. Oedipus the King-Oedipus at Colonus-Antigone. trans. F. Storr. 1912.

Statius. Silvae-Thebaid. trans. J. H. Mozley. 1928.

Strabo. Geography. 8 vols. trans. H. L. Jones 1917-1932.

Suetonius. The Lives of the Caesars. 2 vols. trans. J. C. Rolfe. 1914.

Tacitus. Agricola-Germania-Dialogue. trans. M. Hutton and W. Peterson. rev. R. M. Ogilvie et al. 1970.

_____. Histories-Annals. 4 vols. trans. C. H. Moore and J. Jackson. 1925-1937.

Thucydides. History of the Peloponnesian War. 4 vols. trans. C. F. Smith. 1919-1923.

Varro. see Cato and Varro.

Valerius Maximus. Decem Libri Dictorum et Factorum - Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium. ed. C. Kempf. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner. 1966.

Vitruvius. On Architecture. 2 vols. trans. F. Granger. 1931-1934.

Xenophon. Banquet. Budé. trans. F. Ollier. Paris: Société D'Édition "Les Belles Lettres." 1961.

_____. Memorabilia-Oeconomicus. trans. E. C. Marchant. 1923.

_____. Cyropaedia. 2 vols. trans. W. Miller. 1914.

Studies on Women

Allworthy, T. B. Women in the Apostolic Church. A Critical Study of the Evidence in the New Testament for the Prominence of Women in Early Christianity. Cambridge, England: W. Heffer & Sons. 1917.

Bullough, Vern L. The Subordinate Sex - A History of Attitudes Toward Women. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 1973.

Clark, Elizabeth and H. Richardson, eds. Women and Religion, A Feminist Sourcebook of Christian Thought. New York: Harper & Row. 1977.

Daly, Mary. Beyond God the Father, Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation. Boston: Beacon Press. 1973.

Jewett, Paul K. Man as Male and Female. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1975.

Leenhardt, Franz and F. Blanke. Die Stellung der Frau im Neuen Testament und in der alten Kirche. Zürich: Zwingli Verlag. 1949.

Leipoldt, J. Die Frau in der antiken Welt und im Urchristentum. Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang. 1955.

_____. Jesus und die Frauen. Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang. 1921.

Mollenkott, Virginia R. Women, Men, and the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon Press. 1977.

Pape, Dorothy. God and Women. London: Mowbrays. 1977.

Ruether, Rosemary R., ed. Religion and Sexism, Images of Woman in the Jewish and Christian Traditions. New York: Simon and Schuster. 1974.

Russell, Letty M. Human Liberation in a Feminist Perspective - a Theology. Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1974.

Scanzoni, Letha and Nancy Hardesty. All We're Meant to Be. Waco, Texas: Word Books. 1974.

Stagg, Evelyn and Frank. Woman in the World of Jesus. Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1978.

Stendahl, Krister. The Bible and the Role of Women. FBBS 15. trans. Emilie T. Sander. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. 1966.

Swidler, Leonard. Biblical Affirmations of Woman. Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1979.

Tavard, George H. Woman in Christian Tradition. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press. 1973.

Trible, Phyllis. God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality. Philadelphia: Fortress. 1978.

New Testament Theologies

Bultmann, Rudolf. Theology of the New Testament. 1 vol. ed. trans. K. Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1951/1955.

Guthrie, Donald. New Testament Theology. Downer's Grove: Inter-Varsity Press. 1981.

Jeremias, Joachim. New Testament Theology, The Proclamation of Jesus. trans. J. Bowden. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1971.

Kümmel, W. G. The Theology of the New Testament. trans. J. E. Steely. London: S. C. M. Press. 1974.

Ladd, George Eldon. A Theology of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1974.

Richardson, A. An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. London: S. C. M. Press. 1958.

Stauffer, Ethelbert. New Testament Theology. trans. J. Marsh. London: S. C. M. Press. 1955.

Standard Works
(frequently cited)

Baron, Salo Wittmayer. A Social and Religious History of the Jews. 2nd ed. 5 vols. New York: Columbia University Press. 1952-1960.

Ben-Sasson, H. H., ed. A History of the Jewish People. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1976.

Conzelmann, Hans. The Theology of St. Luke. trans. G. Buswell. New York: Harper & Row. 1961.

Daube, David. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion. London: Athlone Press. 1956.

Derrett, J. Duncan M. Law in the New Testament. London: Darton, Longman & Todd. 1970.

_____. Studies in the New Testament. Vol. 1. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1977.

Dodd, C. H. Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel. London: Cambridge University Press. 1963.

_____. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. London: Cambridge University Press. 1953.

Edersheim, Alfred. The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. 1 vol. ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1971.

Jeremias, Joachim. Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus. trans. F. H. and C. H. Cave. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. 1969.

Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. 2 vols. New York: Schocken Books. 1971.

de Vaux, Roland. Ancient Israel, Its Life and Institutions. trans. John McHugh. London: Darton, Longman & Todd. 1973.

Chapter 1: Bibliography

Adcock, F. E. "Women in Roman Life and Letters", Greece and Rome 14 (1945) 1-11.

Altheim, F. A. A History of Roman Religion. trans. H. Mattingly. London: Methuen & Company. 1938.

Arthur, Marylin B. "Early Greece: The Origins of the Western Attitude Toward Women". Arethusa 6 (1, 1973) 7-58.

Balsdon, J. P. V. D. Roman Women: Their History and Habits. London: The Bodley Head. 1962.

Bammel, Ernst. "Markus 10.11 f. und das jüdische Eherecht". ZNW 61 (1970). 95-101.

Barth, M. Ephesians. 2 vols. The Anchor Bible. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc. 1974.

Baer, Richard A. Philo's Use of the Categories of Male and Female. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1970.

Blackman, A. M. "On the Position of Women in Ancient Egyptian Hierarchy". JBA 7 (1921). 8-30.

Bonner, R. J. "Did Women Testify in Homicide Cases at Athens?" Classical Philology 1 (1906). 127-32.

Bonsirven, J. Palestinian Judaism in the Time of Jesus Christ. trans. W. Wolf. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. 1964.

Carcopino, J. Daily Life in Ancient Rome. trans. E. O. Lorimer. London: George Routledge & Sons. 1941.

Cohen, B. "Concerning Divorce in Jewish and Roman Law". PAAJR 21 (1952). 3-34.

Compernole, R. van. "Le Mythe de la Gynecocratie-Doulocratie Argienne". Hommages à Claire Préaux. ed. J. Bingen et al. Bruxelles: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles. 1975. 355-64.

Cornish, F. W. and J. Bacon. "The Position of Women". A Companion to Greek Studies. 4th ed. ed. L. Whibley. London: Cambridge University Press. 1931. 610-17.

Cruveilhier, P. "Le droit de la femme". RB 36 (1927). 353-76.

Delling, Gerhard. Paulus' Stellung zu Frau und Ehe. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag. 1931.

Donaldson, James. Woman: Her Position and Influence in Ancient Greece and Rome, and Among Early Christians. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1907.

Dover, K. J. "Classical Greek Attitudes to Sexual Behavior". Arethusa 6:1 (1973). 59-73.

Farnell, L. R. The Cults of the Greek States. 5 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1896-1909.

Fisher, Eugene J. "Cultic Prostitution in the Ancient Near East? A Reassessment". BTB 6:2-3 (June-October, 1976). 225-36.

Flacelière, Robert. Love in Ancient Greece. trans. J. Cleugh. London: F. Muller, Ltd. 1962.

Galt, C. M. "Veiled Ladies". AJA 35 (1931). 373-93.

Gaudemet, J. "Le Statut de la Femme dans L'Empire Romain". Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin. Vol. XI. La Femme. Bruxelles: Éditions de la Librarie Encyclopédique. 1959. 191-222.

Goldfeld, A. "Women as Sources of Torah in the Rabbinic Tradition". Judaism 24 (2, 1975). 245-56.

Gomme, Arnold W. "The Position of Women in Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B. C.". Essays in Greek History and Literature. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1937. 89-115.

Grenfell, B., ed. An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment, and Other Greek Papyri, Chiefly Ptolemaic. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1896.

_____. and A. Hunt, et al., eds. The Tebtunis Papyri. 4 vols. London: Oxford University Press/Cambridge University Press. 1902-1976.

_____, and A. Hunt, et al., eds. The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. 46 vols. London: Egyptian Exploration Fund. 1898-1978.

Hadas, M. "Observations on Athenian Women". Classical Weekly 29 (Feb. 3, 1936). 97-100.

Hallett, J. P. "The Role of Women in Roman Elegy; Counter-Cultural Feminism". Arethusa 6:1 (Spring, 1973). 103-24.

Harper's Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities. ed. H. T. Peck. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1897.

Hauptman, J. "Images of Women in the Talmud". Religion and Sexism. ed. Rosemary R. Ruether. New York: Simon and Schuster. 1974.

Hopkins, M. K. "The Age of Roman Girls at Marriage". Population Studies 18 (1965). 309-27.

Johnson, M. "Widows in the First and Seventeenth Centuries". Classical Weekly 25 (Nov. 16, 1931). 48.

Klein, Charlotte. "Jewish Women in the Time of Mary of Nazareth". Bible Today 60 (1972). 746-52.

Kuenen-Janssens, L. J. Th. "Some Notes Upon the Competence of the Athenian Woman to Conduct a Transaction". Mnemosyne ser. 3, 9:3 (1941). 199-214.

Licht, Hans. Sexual Life in Ancient Greece. ed. L. H. Sawson. trans. J. H. Freese. London: George Routledge. 1932.

Lightfoot, J. B. St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House. 1953.

Loane, H. J. Industry and Commerce of the City of Rome (50 B.C. - A.D. 200). Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press. 1938.

Loewe, R. The Position of Women in Judaism. London: S. P. C. K. 1966.

Lowy, S. "The Extent of Jewish Polygamy in Talmudic Times". JJS 9 (1958). 115-35.

MacDonald, E. M. The Position of Women as Reflected in Semitic Codes of Law. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1931.

Macurdy, G. H. "Julia Bernice". AJP 56 (1935). 246-53.

_____. "Queen Eurydice and the Evidence for Woman Power in Early Macedonia". AJP 48 (1927). 201-14.

Marmorstein, Emile. "The Veil in Judaism and Islam". JJS 5-6 (1954-1955). 1-11.

Marshall, F. H. "The Position of Women". A Companion to Latin Studies. ed. J. E. Sandys. London: Cambridge University Press. 1910. 184-90.

Martin, Ralph P. Philippians. New Century Bible Series. Greenwood, South Carolina: Attic Press, Inc. 1976.

Meeks, Wayne A. "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity". HR 13:3 (Feb. 1974). 165-208.

Meiselman, Moshe. Jewish Woman in Jewish Law. New York: KTAV Publishing House/Yeshiva University Press. 1978.

Mendelsohn, S. The Criminal Jurisprudence of the Ancient Hebrews. 2nd ed. New York: Hermon Press. 1968.

Mohler, S. L. "Feminism in the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum". Classical Weekly 25 (Feb. 15, 1932). 113-7.

Nilsson, Martin. The Dionysiac Mysteries of the Hellenistic and Roman Age. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup. 1957.

_____. Greek Folk Religion. New York: Harper & Row. 1961.

_____. A History of Greek Religion. trans. F. J. Fielden. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1925.

_____. Die Religion der Griechen. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr. 1927.

Oepke, A. "γυνή". TDNT I (1964). 776-89.

Peritz, I. J. "Women in the Ancient Hebrew Cult". JBL 17 (1898). 111-48.

Pirenne, Jacques. "Le Statut de la Femme dans L'Ancienne Égypte". Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin. Vol. XI: La Femme. Bruxelles: Éditions de la Librarie Encyclopédique. 1959. 63-77.

_____. "Le Statut de la Femme dans la Civilization Hébraïque". Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin. Vol. XI: La Femme. Bruxelles: Éditions de la Librarie Encyclopédique. 1959. 197-20

Pomeroy, Sarah. Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves. London: Robert Hale and Company. 1975.

_____. "Selected Bibliography on Women in Antiquity". Arethusa 6:1 (Spring , 1973). 125-57.

Préaux, Claire. "Le Statut de la Femme à L'Epoque Hellénistique, Principalment en Égypte". Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin. Vol. XI: La Femme. Bruxelles: Éditions de la Librarie Encyclopédique. 1959. 127-75.

Rengstorf, Karl. "μανθάνω". TDNT IV (1967). 390-461.

Richter, D. C. "The Position of Women in Classical Athens". Classical Journal 67 (1971). 1-8.

Rubensohn, O., ed. Elephantine-Papyri. Berlin: Weidmann. 1907.

Schechter, S. Studies in Judaism. 1st ser. Philadelphia: Jewish Publishing Society of America. 1945.

Sigal, P. "Elements of Male Chauvinism in Classical Halakhah". Judaism 24 (2, 1975). 226-44.

Smith, A. H. "Notes on a Tour of Asia Minor". JHS 8 (1887) 216-67.

de Ste. Croix, G. E. M. "Some Observations on the Property Rights of Athenian Women". Classical Review n.s. 20 (1970). 273-8.

Sukenik, E. L. Ancient Synagogues in Palestine and Greece. London: Oxford Press for the British Academy. 1934.

Swidler, Leonard. Women in Judaism: The Status of Women in Formative Judaism. Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press. 1976.

Tarn, W. W. and G. T. Griffith. Hellenistic Civilisation. 3rd ed. London: Edward Arnold, Ltd. 1952.

Treggiari, Susan. "Domestic Staff at Rome in the Julio-Claudian Period (27. B. C. - A. D. 68)". Histoire Sociale: Revue Canadienne 6 (1973). 241-55.

_____. "Libertine Ladies". Classical World 64 (Feb., 1971). 196-8.

Villers, R. "Le Statut de la Femme à Rome jusqu'à la Fin de la République". Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin. Vol. XI: La Femme. Bruxelles: Éditions de la Librarie Encyclopédique. 1959. 177-89.

Wender, D. "Plato: Misogynist, Paedophile, and Feminist". Arethusa 6:1 (Spring, 1973). 75-90.

White, R. E. "Women in Ptolemaic Egypt". JHS 18 (1898). 238-66.

"Women". Encyclopedia Judaica. Vol. 16. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, Ltd. 1971. cols. 623-30.

"Woman, Rights Of". Jewish Encyclopedia. Vol. 12. ed. I. Singer. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Company. 1906. 556-9.

Wright, F. A. Feminism in Greek Literature from Homer to Aristotle. London: George Routledge & Sons. 1923.

Wright, G. E. "Women and Masculine Theological Vocabulary in the Old Testament". Grace Upon Grace, Essays in Honor of Lester J. Kuyper. ed. J. I. Cook. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1975. 64-9.

Yadin, Y. "Expedition D - The Cave of Letters". IEJ 12 (1962). 227-57.

Yaron, R. "Aramaic Marriage Contracts - Corrigenda and Addenda". JSS 5 (1960). 66-70.

Zucrow, Solomon. Women, Slaves, and the Ignorant in Rabbinic Literature. Boston: The Stratford Company. 1932.

Chapter 2: Bibliography

Barrett, C. K. Jesus and the Gospel Tradition. London: S. P. C. K. 1967.

_____. "Q: A Re-examination". ET 54 (1942-1943). 320-3.

Beardslee, William A. Literary Criticism of the New Testament. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. 1970.

Benoit, P. "Reflexions sur la 'Formgeschichtliche Methode'". RB 53 (1946). 481-512.

Black, M. "Second Thoughts. IX. The Semitic Element in the New Testament". ET 77 (1965). 20-3.

Bornkamm, Günther, Jesus of Nazareth. Trans. I. and F. McLuskey with James M. Robinson. New York: Harper & Row, Pub. 1960.

Brown, Colin, ed. History, Criticism and Faith, Four Exploratory Studies. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press. 1976.

Brown, Raymond E. "After Bultmann What? An Introduction to the Post-Bultmannians". CBQ 26 (1964). 1-30.

Brownlee, W. H. "Whence the Gospel According to John?" in John and Qumran. ed. J. H. Charlesworth. London: Geoffrey Chapman. 1972. 166-94.

Bruce, F. F. "History and the Gospel". Jesus of Nazareth: Saviour and Lord. ed. Carl Henry. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co. 1966. 87-108.

_____. "Myth and History". History, Criticism and Faith, Four Exploratory Studies. ed. Colin Brown. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press. 1976. 79-100.

Bultmann, Rudolf. History of the Synoptic Tradition. trans. John Marsh. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1963.

Burkitt, F. C. The Gospel History and Its Transmission. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1906.

Burney, C. F. The Poetry of Our Lord - An Examination of the Formal Elements of Hebrew Poetry in the Discourses of Jesus Christ. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1925.

Davies, W. D. "Reflexions on tradition: The Aboth Revisited". in Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox. ed. W. R. Farmer, et al. Cambridge: University Press. 1967. 127-59.

Dibelius, Martin. From Tradition to Gospel. trans. Bertram Lee Woolf. London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson. 1934.

Dodd, C. H. "The Framework of the Gospel Narratives". in New Testament Studies. Manchester: University Press. 1953. 1-11.

Drane, John. Jesus and the Four Gospels. Tring, England: Lion Publishing. 1979.

Dunn, J. D. G. "Demythologizing - The Problem of Myth in the New Testament". in New Testament Interpretation. ed. I. H. Marshall. Exeter: Paternoster Press. 1977. 285-307.

_____. "Prophetic 'I'-Sayings and the Jesus Tradition: The Importance of Testing Prophetic Utterances within Early Christianity". NTS 24 (1977-78). 175-98.

Ellis, E. E. "New Directions in Form Criticism". in Jesu Christus in Historie und Theologie, Neutestamentliche Festschrift für Hans Conzelmann zum 60. Geburtstag. ed. G. Strecker. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck). 1975. 299-315.

France, R. T. "The Authenticity of the Sayings of Jesus". in History, Criticism, and Faith, Four Exploratory Studies. ed. Colin Brown. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press. 1976. 101-41.

_____ and David Wenham, eds. Gospel Perspectives. Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels. Vol. I. Sheffield: JSOT Press. 1980.

Gardner-Smith, P. Saint John and the Synoptics. Cambridge: University Press. 1938.

Gerhardsson, Birger. Memory and Manuscript. Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity. trans. Eric J. Sharpe. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup. 1961.

____. The Origins of the Gospel Traditions. London. SCM Press. 1979.

____. Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup. 1964.

Grudem, W. The Gift of Prophecy in 1 Corinthians. Ph.D. Thesis. Cambridge: University Press. 1978.

Gundry, R. H. The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel - with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1967.

Guthrie, D. New Testament Introduction. Downer's Grove: Inter-Varsity Press. 1970.

Hanson, Anthony T., ed. Vindications. Essays on the Historical Basis of Christianity. London: SCM Press. 1966.

Hanson, R. P. C. "The Enterprise of Emancipating Christian Belief from History". in Vindications. ed. A.T. Hanson. London: SCM Press. 1966. 29-73.

Hengel, Martin. Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity. trans. John Bowden. London: SCM Press. 1979.

____. Judaism and Hellenism. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. 1974.

Henry, Carl F. H., ed. Jesus of Nazareth: Saviour and Lord. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co. 1966.

Hill, D. H. New Testament Prophecy. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott. 1979.

Honoré, A. M. "A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem". NovT 10 (1968). 95-147.

Kümmel, W. G. Introduction to the New Testament. trans. Howard Clark Kee. 17th rev. ed. London: SCM Press. 1975.

Ladd, George E. The New Testament and Criticism. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co. 1967.

Manson, T. W. Studies in the Gospels and Epistles. Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1962.

Marshall, I. H. I Believe in the Historical Jesus. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co. 1977.

_____., ed. New Testament Interpretation. Essays in Principles and Methods. Exeter: Paternoster Press. 1977.

Martin, Ralph P. New Testament Foundations. Vol. 1: The Four Gospels. Exeter: Paternoster Press. 1975.

Morris, Leon. "The Fourth Gospel and History". in Jesus of Nazareth: Saviour and Lord. ed. Carl F. H. Henry. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co. 1966. 121-32.

_____. Studies in the Fourth Gospel. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co. 1969.

Moseley, A. W. "Historical Reporting in the Ancient World". NTS 12 (1965-1966). 8-26.

Moule, C. F. D. The Birth of the New Testament. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Adam and Charles Black. 2nd ed. 1966.

_____. The Epistle to the Colossians and to Philemon. Cambridge: University Press. 1968.

_____. "The intention of the evangelists". in New Testament Essays. Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson. 1893-1958. Manchester: University of Manchester Press. ed. A. J. B. Higgins. 1959. 165-79.

____. The Phenomenon of the New Testament. London: SCM Press. 1967.

Perrin, N. What is Redaction Criticism? Philadelphia: Fortress Press. 1969.

Riesenfeld, Harald. The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings. A Study in the Limits of 'Formgeschichte'. London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. 1957.

Robinson, John A. T. Redating the New Testament. London: SCM Press. 1976.

Sanders, E. P. The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition. SNTS Monograph 9. Cambridge: University Press. 1969.

Schürmann, Heinz. "Die Vorösterlichen Anfänge der Logientradition - Versuch eines Formgeschichtlichen Zugangs zum Leben Jesu". in Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien. Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag. 1968. 39-65.

Sevenster, J. N. Do You Know Greek? How Much Greek Could the First Jewish Christians Have Known? trans. J. de Bruin. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1968.

Sherwin-White, A. N. Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1963.

Smalley, S. S. "Redaction Criticism", in New Testament Interpretation. ed. I. H. Marshall. Exeter: Paternoster Press. 1977. 181-95.

Smith, D. M. "John and the Synoptics: Some Dimensions of the Problem". NTS 26 (1980) 425-44.

Stanton, G. N. Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching. SNTS Monograph 27. Cambridge: University Press. 1974.

_____. "Presuppositions in New Testament Criticism". in New Testament Interpretation. ed. I. H. Marshall. Exeter: Paternoster Press. 1977. 60-71.

Stein, R. H. "The 'Criteria' for Authenticity". in Gospel Perspectives. ed. R. T. France and D. Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT Press. Vol. I. 1980. 225-63.

Stonehouse, N. B. Origins of the Synoptic Gospels. Some Basic Questions. London: The Tyndale Press. 1964.

Streeter, B. H. The Four Gospels. A Study of Origins. rev. ed. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd. 1930.

Styler, G. M. "The Priority of Mark", in Birth of the New Testament. by C. F. D. Moule. London: Adam and Charles Black. 2nd ed. 1966. 223-32.

Talbert, Charles H. What is a Gospel? The Genre of the Canonical Gospels. London: S. P. C. K. 1978.

Taylor, R. O. P. The Groundwork of the Gospels. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1946.

Taylor, Vincent. The Formation of the Gospel Tradition. London: Macmillan and Company. 1933.

Votaw, C. W. The Gospels and Contemporary Biographies in the Graeco-Roman World. FBBS 27. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. 1970 repr.

Weiss, H. "History and a Gospel". NovT 10 (1968). 81-94.

Wenham, D. "Source Criticism". in New Testament Interpretation. ed. I. H. Marshall. Exeter: Paternoster Press. 1977. 139-49.

Chapter 3: Bibliography

Aicher, G. "Mann und Weib - ein Fleisch (Mt 19,4 ff.)". BZ 5 (1907). 159-65.

Allis, O. T. "The Parable of the Leaven". EvQ 19 (1947). 254-73.

Arendzen, J. P. "Ante-Nicene Interpretations of the Sayings on Divorce". JTS 20 (1918-1919). 230-41.

Argyle, A. W. "Wedding Customs at the Time of Jesus". ET 86 (1974-1975). 214-5.

Baltensweiler, H. "Die Ehebruchsklauseln bei Matthäus". TZ 15 (1959). 340-56.

_____. Die Ehe im Neuen Testament - Exegetische Untersuchungen über Ehe, Ehelosigkeit, und Ehescheidung. Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag. 1967.

Bammel, Ernst. "Is Luke 16,16-18 of Baptist's Provenience?" HTR 51 (1958). 101-06.

Barrett, C. K. A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. New York: Harper & Row. 1968.

Barth, Karl. Church Dogmatics. Vol III.4. ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. trans. A. T. Mackay, T. H. L. Parker, et al. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1961.

Beasley-Murray, G. R. Baptism in the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1962.

Berger, K. "Hartherzigkeit und Gottes Gesetz. Die Vorgeschichte des antijüdischen Vorwurfs in Mc 10:5". ZNW 61 (1-2, 1970). 1-47.

Black, M. "The Marcan Parable of the Child in the Midst". ET 59 (1947-1948). 14-16.

Blakeney, E. H. "A Note on St. Matthew xxii.29". ET 4 (1892-1893). 382.

Blass, F. "On Mark xii.42". ET 10 (1898-1899). 286-7.

_____. "On Mark xii.42 and xv.16". ET 10 (1898-1899). 185-7.

Blenkinsopp, J. Sexuality and the Christian Tradition. London: Sheed & Ward. 1970.

Bligh, J. "Qorban!" HeyJ 5 (1964). 192-3.

Blinzler, J. "Die Strafe für Ehebruch in Bibel und Halacha. Zur Auslegung von Joh. VIII.5". NTS 4 (1, 1957). 32-47.

_____. "εἰσὶν εὐνοῦχοι - Zur Auslegung von Mt. 19,12". ZNW 48 (1957). 254-70.

Boismard, M.-É. "Chronique Archéologique". RB 65 (1958) 400-23.

Bonsirven, J. "'Nisi fornicationis causa' Comment résoudre cette 'crux interpretum'?" RSR 35 (1948). 442-64.

Brennan, I. "Women in the Gospels". New Blackfriars 52 (1971). 291-99.

Brown, C. "Child". DNTT I (1975). 283-5.

Brown, Raymond E. New Testament Essays. Garden City: Doubleday & Company. 1968.

Brueggemann, W. "Of the Same Flesh and Bone (Gn 2,23a)". CBQ 32 (1970). 532-42.

Buchanan, G. W. "Some vow and oath formulas in the New Testament". HTR 58 (3, 1965). 319-26.

Büchsel, F. "κατακρίνω". TDNT III (1965). 933-54.

Burkill, T. A. "Two into One: The Notion of Carnal Union in Mark 10:8; 1 Kor 6.16; Eph 5.31". ZNW 62 (1971). 115-20.

Burkitt, F. C. "The Parable of the Ten Virgins". JTS 30 (1928-1929). 267-70.

Buzy, D. "Le juge inique (Saint Luc, XVIII,1-8)". RB 39 (1930) 378-91.

Cadbury, H. J. "A Possible Case of Lukan Authorship". HTR 10 (1917). 237-44.

Cangh, J.-M. van. "Fondement évangélique de la vie religieuse". NRT 95 (6, 1973). 635-47.

Catchpole, D. R. "The Son of Man's Search for Faith (Luke XVIII.8b)". NovT 19 (2, 1977). 81-104.

_____. "The Synoptic Divorce Material as a Traditio-Historical Problem". BJRL 57 (1974-1975). 92-127.

Clarke, W. K. L. "The Excepting Clause in St. Matthew". Theology 15 (1927). 161-2.

_____. "Studies in Texts. 2. The Excepting Clause in St. Matthew". Theology 16 (1928). 161-3.

Colpe, C. "ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου". TDNT VIII (1967). 400-77.

Cranfield, C. E. B. "The Parable of the Unjust Judge and the Eschatology of Luke-Acts". SJT 16 (1963). 297-301.

Crouzel, H. "Le Texte patristique de Matthieu v.32 et xix.9". NTS 19 (1, 1972). 98-119.

Darlow, T. H. "Divorce and Childhood, A Reading of St. Matt. xix.3-15". Exp 4th ser 7 (1893). 294-9.

Daube, D. "An Attack on Discrimination Against Women; the Adulteress of John 8". unpublished essay of 25 pages. by permission of the author. abbreviated form will appear in "Biblical Landmarks in the Struggle for Women's Rights". Juridical Review (in press).

_____. "Biblical Landmarks in the Struggle for Women's Rights" Juridical Review (in press) 24 pages.

_____. "Concessions to Sinfulness in Jewish Law". JJS 10 (1959). 1-13.

_____. The Duty of Procreation. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1977.

_____. "Repudium in Deuteronomy". Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black. ed. E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1969. 236-9.

Delling, G. "Βάπτισμα βαπτισθῆναι". NovT 2 (1958). 92-115.

_____. "Das Gleichnis vom gottlosen Richter". ZNW 53 (1962). 1-25.

_____. "Das Logion Mark X.11 (und seine Abwandlungen) im Neuen Testament". NovT 1 (1956). 263-74.

_____. "σύζυγος". TDNT VII (1971). 748-50.

_____. "τέλος". TDNT VIII (1972). 49-87.

Denney, J. "The Dissolution of Religion". Exp 5th ser 4 (1896). 263-76.

_____. "The Sadducees and Immortality". Exp 4th ser 10 (1894). 401-09.

Derrett, J. Duncan M. "'Eating up the Houses of Widows': Jesus's Comment on Lawyers?" Studies in the New Testament I. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1977. 118-27.

_____. KORBAN, O ΕΣΤΙΝ ΔWPON". Studies in the New Testament I. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1977. 112-7.

_____. "Law in the New Testament: The Parable of the Unjust Judge". Studies in the New Testament I. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1977. 32-47.

_____. "Law in the New Testament: Si scandalizaverit te manus tua abscinde illam (Mk. IX.42) and comparative legal history". Studies in the New Testament I. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1977. 4-31.

_____. "Law in the New Testament: The Story of the Woman Taken in Adultery". NTS 10 (1963-1964). 1-26.

Deschryver, R. "La parabole du juge malveillant (Luc 18,1-8)". RHPR 48 (4, 1968). 355-66.

Dodd, C. H. The Parables of the Kingdom. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1961.

Donfried, K. P. "The Allegory of the Ten Virgins (Matt. 25:1-13) - As a Summary of Matthean Theology". JBL 93 (1974). 415-28.

Drury, J. Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel - A Study in Early Christian Historiography. London: Darton, Longman, & Todd. 1976.

Dupont, J. Mariage et Divorce dans l'Évangile Matthieu 19,3-12 et parallèles. Bruges: Abbaye de Saint André. 1959.

____. "Les paraboles du sénevé et du levain". NRT 89 (1967). 897-913.

Ellis, E. E. "Jesus, the Sadducees, and Qumran". NTS 10 (1963-1964). 274-9.

Falk, Z. W. "Notes and Observations - on Talmudic Vows". HTR 59 (3, 1966). 309-12.

Fensham, F. C. "Widows, Orphan, and the Poor in Ancient Near Eastern Legal and Wisdom LIterature". JNES 21 (1962). 129-39.

Fitzmyer, J. A. "The Aramaic Qorbān Inscription from Jebel Ḫallet et-Ṭûri and Mark 7.11/Matt. 15.5". JBL 78 (1959). 60-5.

_____. "The Matthean Divorce Texts and Some New Palestinian Evidence". TS 37 (2, 1976). 197-226.

Fleming, T. V. "Christ and Divorce". TS 24 (1963). 106-20.

Flender, H. St. Luke - Theologian of Redemptive History. trans. R. H. and I. Fuller. London: S. P. C. K. 1967.

Ford, J. Massyngberde. "The Parable of the Foolish Scholars, Matt. xxv.1-13". NovT 9 (1967). 107-23.

France, R. T. Jesus and the Old Testament. London: Tyndale Press. 1971.

Funk, R. W. "Beyond Criticism in Quest of Literacy: The Parable of the Leaven". Int 25 (1971). 149-70.

Galot, J. "La motivation évangélique de célibat". Greg 53 (4, 1972). 731-57.

Gansewinkel, A. van, Ursprüngliche oder grundsätzliche Unauflösbarkeit der Ehe?" Diakonia 3 (2, 1972). 88-93.

Gavin, F. "A Further Note on πορνεία". Theology 16 (1928). 102-05.

Glasson, T. F. "The Marcan Parable of the Child in the Midst". ET 59 (1947-1948). 166.

Goodspeed, E. J. "The Greek Text of Mark vii.11". ET 20 (1908-1909). 471-2.

Grassi, J. A. "Women's Liberation: The New Testament Perspective". Living Light 8 (2, 1971). 22-34.

Greeven, H. "εὔχομαι". TDNT II (1964). 800-08.

_____. "Ehe nach dem Neuen Testament". NTS 15 (1968-1969). 365-88.

Haacker, K. "Ehescheidung und Wiederverheiratung im Neuen Testament". TQ 151 (1, 1971). 28-38.

_____. "Der Rechtssatz Jesu zum Thema Ehebruch (Mt. 5,28)". BZ 21 (1, 1977). 113-6.

Haenchen, E. Der Weg Jesu. Eine Erklärung des Markusevangeliums und der kanonischen Parallelen. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann. 1966

_____. "Matthäus 23". ZTK n. f. 48 (1951). 38-63.

Hamann, H. P. "The Ten Virgins: An Exegetical-Homiletical Study". LTJ 11 (2, 1977). 68-72.

Hampden-Cook, E. "Whom did the Disciples Rebuke?" ET 17 (1905-1906). 192.

Hanse, H. "ἔχω". TDNT II (1964). 816-32.

Harrington, W. J. "Notes and Comments - The New Testament and Divorce". ITQ 39 (2, 1972). 178-87.

Harrison, E. F. "The Son of God Among the Sons of Men. VIII. Jesus and the Woman Taken in Adultery". BSac 103 (1946). 431-9.

Hart, J. H. A. "Corban". JQR 19 (July, 1907). 615-60.

Hauck, F. "μοιχεύω". TDNT IV (1967). 729-35.

_____. and S. Schulz. "πόρνη". TDNT VI (1968). 579-95.

Holzmeister, U. "Die Streitfrage über die Ehescheidungstexte bei Matthäus 5,32, und 19,9". Bib 26 (1945). 133-46.

Hoskyns, E. and N. Davey. The Riddle of the New Testament. London: Faber & Faber, Ltd. 1958.

Humbert, P. "Jesus Writing on the Ground (John viii.6-8)". ET 30 (1918-1919). 475-6.

Hunter, A. M. The Parables Then and Now. London: SCM Press. 1971.

Isaksson, A. Marriage and Ministry in the New Temple: A Study with Special Reference to Mt. 19.13-12 [sic] and 1 Cor. 11.3-16". trans. N. Tomkinson. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup. 1965.

Jeremias, Joachim. "Zur Geschichtlichkeit des Verhörs Jesu vor dem Hohen Rat". ZNW 43 (1950-1951). 145-50.

_____. Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries. trans. D. Cairns. SCM Press. 1960.

_____. Jesu Verheissung für die Völker. Stuttgart. W. Kohlhammer. 1956.

_____. "LAMPADES - Mt. 25:1, 3f, 7f". ZNW 56 (1965). 196-201.

_____. "νύμφη". TDNT IV (1967). 1099-1106.

_____. The Parables of Jesus. 2nd rev. ed. trans. S. H. Hooke. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1972.

_____. "Tradition und Redaktion in Lukas 15". ZNW 62 (3-4, 1971) 172-89.

_____. "Zwei Miszellen: 1. Antik-Jüdische Münzdeutungen. 2. Zur Geschichtlichkeit der Tempelreinigung". NTS 23 (2, 1977). 177-80.

Johnson, A. F. "A Stylistic Trait of the Fourth Gospel in the Pericope Adulterae?" BETS 9 (2, 1966). 91-6.

Käser, W. "Exegetische und theologische Erwägungen zur Seligpreisung der Kinderlosen - Lc 23:29b". ZNW 54 (3-4, 1963). 240-54.

Kleist, J. A. "Eunuchs in the New Testament". CBQ 7 (1945). 447-9.

Kümmel, W. G. "Jesus und der jüdische Traditionsgedanke". ZNW 33 (1934). 105-30.

_____. Promise and Fulfilment - The Eschatological Message of Jesus. trans. D. M. Barton. London: SCM Press. 1957.

Leaney, A. R. C. "Jesus and the Symbol of the Child (Luke ix.46-48)". ET 66 (1954-1955). 91-2.

Leeming, B. and R. A. Dyson. "Except it be for Fornication?" Scr 8 (1956). 75-82.

Leenhardt, F. J. "Les femmes aussi...à propos du billet de répudiation". RTP 19 (1, 1969). 31-40.

Legasse, S. Jésus et L'Énfant. Paris: Gabalda Press. 1969.

Lehmann, M. R. "Gen. 2.24 as the Basis for Divorce in Halakhah and New Testament". ZAW 72 (1960). 263-7.

Lewis, F. Warburton. "The Pericope Adulterae". ET 29 (1917-1918). 138.

Lightfoot, J. B. St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon. London: Macmillan and Company. 1879.

Lohse, E. "Σιών". TDNT VII (1971). 319-38.

_____. "χείρ". TDNT IX (1974). 424-37.

Mahoney, A. "A New Look at the Divorce Clauses in Mt 5,32 and 19,9". CBQ 30 (1968). 29-38.

Manson, T. W. "The Pericope de Adultera (Joh. 7,53 - 8,11)". ZNW 44 (1952-1953). 255-6.

_____. The Sayings of Jesus. London: SCM Press. 1957.

Margoliouth, D. S. "Jesus Writing on the Ground". ET 31 (1919-1920). 38.

Marshall, I. H. Eschatology and the Parables. London: Tyndale Press. 1963.

Matura, T. "Le célibat dans le Nouveau Testament". NRT 97 (6, 1975). 481-500.

Michaelis, W. "πίπτω". TDNT VI (1968). 161-73.

Michel, O. "οἰκία". TDNT V (1967). 119-59.

Moingt, J. "Le Divorce (Pour Motif d'Impudicité) (Matthieu 5,32: 19,9)". RSR 56 (1968). 337-84.

Montefiore, C. G. The Synoptic Gospels. Vol. I. London: Macmillan and Company. 1909.

Murray, J. Divorce. Philadelphia. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company. 1975.

Nembach, U. "Ehescheidung nach alttestamentlichem und jüdischem Recht". TZ 26 (3, 1970). 161-71.

Nock, A. D. "Eunuchs in ancient religion". ARW 23 (1925). 25-33.

Oepke, A. "καλύπτω". TDNT III (1965). 556-92.

_____. "παῖς". TDNT V (1967). 636-54.

O'Rourke, J. J. "A Note on an Exception: Mt 5:32 (19:9) and 1 Cor 7:12 Compared". HeyJ 5 (3, 1964). 299-302.

Parvey, C. F. "The Theology and Leadership of Women in the New Testament". Religion and Sexism, Images of Woman in the Jewish and Christian Tradition. ed. R. R. Ruether. New York: Simon and Schuster. 1974. 117-49.

Phipps, W. E. Was Jesus Married? - The Distortion of Sexuality in the Christian Tradition. London/New York: Harper & Row. 1970.

Power, E. "Writing on the Ground". Bib 2 (1921). 54-7.

Powers, B. W. "Marriage and Divorce: The Dispute of Jesus with the Pharisees, and its Inception". Colloquium 5 (1, 1971). 34-41.

Quesnell, Q. "'Made Themselves Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven' (Mt 19,12)". CBQ 30 (1968). 335-58.

Ramsay, W. M. "On Mark xii.42". ET 10 (1898-1899). 232.

_____. "On Mark xxi.42". ET 10 (1898-1899). 336.

Reicke, B. "πᾶς". TDNT V (1967). 886-90.

Rengstorf, K. H. "ἕπτά". TDNT II (1964). 627-35.

_____. "κορβᾶν". TDNT III (1965). 860-66.

Richards, H. J. "Christ on Divorce". Scr 11 (13, 1959). 22-32.

Ridley, W. D. "The Parable of the Ten Virgins". Exp 5th ser 2 (1895). 342-9.

Sanderson, J. "Jesus and Women". The Other Side 9:4 (July-August, 1973). 16-21, 35-36.

Schaller, B. "'Commits adultery with her', not 'against her', Mk 10:11". ET 83 (4, 1972). 107-08.

Schilling, F. A. "What Means the Saying about Receiving the Kingdom of God as a Little Child (τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς παιδίον, Mk x.15, Lk xviii.17)". ET 77 (2, 1965). 56-8.

Schmidt, K. L. "συγκαλέω". TDNT III (1965). 487-536.

Schneider, C. "κακολογέω". TDNT III (1965). 468.

Schneider, J. "εὐνοΘχος". TDNT II (1964). 765-8.

_____. "τιμή". TDNT VIII (1972). 169-80.

Schoeps, H. J. "Restitutio Principii as the Basis for the Nova Lex Jesu". JBL 66 (1947). 453-64.

Schrenk, G. "ἱερεύς". TDNT III (1965). 221-83.

_____. "πατήρ". TDNT V (1967). 974-1022.

Schulz, S. "σπέρμα". TDNT VII (1971). 543-7.

Schweizer, E. "Matthew's View of the Church in His 18th Chapter". AusBR 21 (1973). 7-14.

_____. "υἱός". TDNT VIII (1972). 363-92.

Sickenberger, J. "Zwei neue Äusserungen zur Ehebruchklausel bei Mt." ZNW 42 (1949). 202-09.

Simon, L. "Le Sou de la Veuve - Marc 12/41-44". ETR 44 (2, 1969). 115-26.

Sperber, D. "Mark xii.42 and its metrological background". NovT 9 (3, 1967). 178-90.

Spicq, C. "La parabole de la veuve obstinée et du juge inerte, aux décisions impromptues (Lc. xviii, 1-8)". RB 68 (1, 1961). 68-90.

Stählin, G. "Das Bild der Witwe. Ein Beitrag zur Bildersprache der Bibel und zum Phänomen der Personifikation in der Antike". JAC 17 (1954). 5-20.

_____. "θρηνέω". TDNT III (1965). 148-55.

_____. "ἀποκόπτω, ἐκκόπτω, κοπετός". TDNT III (1965). 830-60.

_____. "χήρα". TDNT IX (1974). 440-65.

Stauffer, E. "γαμέω". TDNT I (1964). 648-57.

Strobel, A. "In dieser Nacht (Luk 17,34) - zu einer älteren Form der Erwartung in Luk 17,20-37". ZTK n. f. 58 (1961). 16-29.

_____. "Zum Verständnis von Mat. xxv, 1-13". NovT 2 (1957-58). 199-227.

Swidler, L. "Jesus was a Feminist". Catholic World 212 (1970-1971) 177-83.

Taylor, C. "The Pericope of the Adulteress". JTS 4 (1902-1903) 129-30.

Taylor, V. The Passion Narrative of St. Luke - A Critical and Historical Investigation. SNTS Monograph 19. ed. Owen E. Evans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1972.

Terrien, S. "Toward a Biblical Theology of Womanhood". Religion in Life 42 (1973). 322-33.

Thompson, T. L. "A Catholic View on Divorce". JES 6 (1969). 53-67.

Thielicke, H. The Waiting Father, The Parables of Jesus, trans. J. W. Doberstein. New York: Harper & Row. 1959.

Turner, N. "The Translation of Μοιχᾶται ἐπ' Αὐτήν in Mark 10:11". BT (7 (1956). 151-2.

Vaganay, L. "Le schématisme du discours communautaire à la lumière de la critique des sources". *RB 60* (1953). 203-44.

Vawter, B. "The Divorce Clauses in Mt 5,32, and 19,9". *CBQ 16 (1954).* 155-67.

Warfield, B. B. "The Importunate Widow and the Alleged Failure of Faith". ET 25 (1913-1914). 69-72, 136-9.

Weiss, K. "συμφέρω". TDNT IX (1974). 56-87.

Windisch, H. "ζύμη". TDNT II (1964). 902-06.

Winter, P. "Genesis 1.27 and Jesus' Saying on Divorce". ZAW 70 (1958). 260-61.

Winterbotham, R. "The Second Advent". Exp 1st ser 9 (1879). 67-80.

Zeitlin, S. "Korban". JQR 53 (2, 1962). 160-3.

———. "Korban: a Gift". JQR 59 (2, 1968). 133-5.

Zimmerman, H. "μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ (Mt 19,9) - ein literarisches Problem - Zur Komposition von Mt 19,3-12". Catholica 16 (4, 1962). 293-9.

Chapter 4: Bibliography

Aquinas, S. Thomas. Commentary on the Four Gospels Collected out of the Works of the Fathers. 6 vols. trans. M. Pattison, et al. Oxford: James Parker and Co. 1874.

Armerding, C. "Asleep in the Dust". BSac 121 (1964). 153-8.

_____. "The Daughter of Jairus". BSac 105 (1948). 56-8.

Balz, H. "ὕπνος". TDNT VIII (1972). 545-56.

Beyer, H. W. "διακονέω". TDNT II (1964). 81-93.

Bligh, J. "Jesus in Samaria". HeyJ 3 (1962). 329-46.

Bonneau, N. R. "The Woman at the Well. John 4 and Genesis 24". Bible Today 67 (1973). 1252-9.

Bowman, J. "Early Samaritan Eschatology". JJS 6 (1955). 63-72.

_____. "Samaritan Studies". BJRL 40 (1957-58). 298-329.

Brown, Raymond E. "Roles of Women in the Fourth Gospel". TS 36 (4, 1975). 688-99.

Bunn, L. H. "John IV.34-42". ET 41 (1929-1930). 141-2.

Burkill, T. A. "The historical development of the story of the Syrophoenician woman (Mark vii:24-31)". NovT 9 (3, 1967). 161-77.

_____. "The Syrophoenician Woman: The congruence of Mark 7:24-31". ZNW 57 (1-2, 1966). 23-37.

Cadbury, H. J. "Between Jesus and the Gospel". HTR 16 (1923). 81-92.

Carmichael, C. M. "Marriage and the Samaritan Woman". NTS 26 (1980) 332-46.

Chadwick, G. A. "The Daughter of Jairus and the Woman with an Issue of Blood (Mt. ix.18; Mk. v.22; Lk viii.41)". Exp 4th ser 8 (1893). 309-20.

_____. "Peter's Wife's Mother". Exp 4th ser 6 (1892). 355-64.

Cholmondeley, F. G. "Christ and the Woman of Canaan". ET 13 (1901-02). 138-9.

Conzelmann, H. "χάρις". TDNT IX (1974). 387-415.

Dahl, N. A. "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts". Studies in Luke-Acts. ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn. London: S. P. C. K. 1968. 139-58.

Dammers, A. H. "Studies in Texts. A Note on Luke VII,36-50". Theology 49 (1946). 78-80.

Derrett, J. Duncan M. "Law in the New Testament: The Syrophoenician Woman and the Centurion of Capernaum". NovT 15 (3, 1973). 161-86.

Diaz, J. R. "Palestinian Targum and the New Testament". NovT 6 (1963). 75-80.

Dodd, C. H. "The Dialogue Form in the Gospels". BJRL 37 (1954-1955). 54-67.

Donohue, J. J. "The Penitent Woman and the Pharisee: Luke 7.36-50". AER 142 (1960). 414-21.

Dublin, J. "οὗ χάριν". ET 37 (1925-1926). 525-6.

Emerton, J. A. "Notes and Studies - Maranatha and Ephphatha". JTS 18 (1967). 427-31.

Foster, J. "What seekest thou? John iv.27". ET 52 (1940-1941). 37-8.

Fuller, R. H. Interpreting the Miracles. London: SCM Press. 1963.

Goppelt, L. "ὕδωρ". TDNT VIII (1972). 314-33.

Greeven, H. "προσκυνέω". TDNT VI (1968). 758-66.

Hall, D. R. "The Meaning of συγχράομαι in John 4:9". ET 83 (2, 1971). 56-7.

Harrison, E. F. "The Son of God among the Sons of Men. VI. Jesus and the Woman of Samaria". BSac 103 (1946). 176-86.

Harrisville, R. A. "The Woman of Canaan. A Chapter in the History of Exegesis". Int 20 (3, 1966). 274-87.

Hasler, J. Ireland. "The Incident of the Syrophoenician Woman (Matt. xv.21-28, Mark vii.24-30)". ET 45 (1933-1934). 459-61.

Hauck, F. "θερίζω". TDNT III (1965). 132-3.

Hindley, J. C. "Our Lord's Aramaic - A Speculation". ET 72 (1960-1961). 180-1.

Hogan, M. P. "The Woman at the Well (John 4:1-42)". Bible Today 82 (1976). 663-9.

Jeremias, J. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. trans. N. Perrin. London: SCM Press. 1966.

_____. Jesus' Promise to the Nations. trans. S. H. Hooke. London: SCM Press. 1958.

_____. "Lukas 7:45, εἰσῆλθον". ZNW 51 (1960). 131.

_____. "Μωυσῆς". TDNT IV (1967). 848-73.

_____. "παράδεισος". TDNT V (1967). 765-73.

_____. "Σαμάρεια". TDNT VII (1971). 88-94.

Kittel, G. "λέγω". TDNT IV (1967). 100-43.

Lamarche, P. "La guérison de la belle-mère de Pierre et le genre littéraire des évangiles". NRT 87 (1965). 515-26.

Léon-Dufour, X. "La Guérison de la Belle-Mère de Simon Pierre". EstBib 24 (1965). 193-216.

Lifshitz, B. "Fonctions et titres honorifiques dans les communautés juives". RB 67 (1960). 58-64.

Lohse, E. "υἱὸς Δαυίδ". TDNT VIII (1972). 478-88.

MacGregor, W. M. "The Parable of the Money-Lender and his Debtors (Lk vii.41-47)". ET 37 (1925-1926). 344-7.

MacRae, G. W. Faith in the Word - The Fourth Gospel. Chicago: Franciscan Press. 1973.

Marshall, I. H. "The Problem of New Testament Exegesis". JETS 17 (2, 1974). 67-73.

Meecham, H. G. "Luke vii.47". ET 38 (1926-1927). 286.

Michaelis, W. "μύρον". TDNT IV (1967). 800-01.

_____. "πηγή". TDNT VI (1968). 112-7.

Neil, C. "The Throng and the Touch". ET 10 (1898-1899). 122-4.

Oepke, A. "ἐγείρω". TDNT II (1964). 333-9.

____. "καθεύδω". TDNT III (1965). 431-7.

Orchard, R. K. "On the Composition of Luke vii.36-50". JTS 38 (1937). 243-5.

Pesch, R. "Jairus (Mk 5,22/Lk 8,41)". BZ 14 (2, 1970). 252-6.

Platt, E. E. "The Ministry of Mary of Bethany". TT 34 (1, 1977). 29-39.

Potter, R. D. "Topography and Archaeology in the Fourth Gospel", in Studia Evangelica. ed. K. Aland et al. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. 1959. I.329-37.

Rabinowitz, I. "Be opened = Ἐφφαθά (Mark 7:34): Did Jesus Speak Hebrew?" ZNW 53 (1962). 229-38.

Sanders, E. P. "Priorités et dépendances dans la tradition synoptique". RSR 60 (4, 1972). 519-40.

Schlier, H. "ἀλείφω". TDNT I (1964). 229-32.

Schrage, W. "τυφλός". TDNT VIII (1972). 270-94.

Smart, J. D. "Jesus, the Syro-Phoenician Woman - and the Disciples". ET 50 (1938-1939). 469-72.

Smith, D. "Our Lord's Hard Saying to the Syro-Phoenician Woman". ET 12 (1900-1901). 319-21.

Stauffer, E. Jesus and His Story. trans. R. and C. Winston. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1974.

Storch, W. "Zur Perikope von der Syrophönizierin Mk 7,28 und Ri 1,7". BZ 14 (2, 1970). 256-7.

Turner, C. H. "Notes and Studies - Marcan Usage: Notes Critical and Exegetical on the Second Gospel". JTS 25 (1923-1924). 377-86.

_____. "Notes and Studies - Marcan Usage: Notes Critical and Exegetical on the Second Gospel". JTS 26 (1924-1925). 225-40.

Walker, R. "Jüngerwort und Herrenwort, Zur Auslegung von Joh 4: 39-42". ZNW 57 (1-2, 1966). 49-54.

Ward, B. Horace. "Our Lord's Hard Sayings to the Syro-Phoenician Woman". ET 13 (1901-1902). 48.

Weiss, K. "πούς". TDNT VI (1968). 624-31.

_____. "πυρέσσω". TDNT VI (1968). 956-9.

White, W. G. "St. John iv.27". ET 26 (1914-1915). 180.

Wilkinson, J. "The Case of the Bent Woman in Luke 13:10-17". Ev 49 (1977). 195-205.

Wood, H. G. "The Use of ἀγαπάω in Luke vii.42, 47". ET 66 (1954-1955). 319-20.

Chapter 5: Bibliography

Abel, E. L. "The Genealogies of Jesus Ho Christos". NTS 20 (1973-1974). 203-10.

Achelis, H. "Altchristliche Kunst". ZNW 17 (1916). 81-107.

Allen, W. C. "'Fear' in St. Mark". JTS 48 (1947). 201-3.

____. "St. Mark xvi.8, 'They were Afraid:' Why?" JTS 47 (1946). 46-9.

Augsten, M. "Lukanische Miszelle". NTS 14 (1967-1968). 581-3.

Baker, A. "One Thing Necessary". CBQ 27 (1965). 127-37.

Balz, H. "φοβέω". TDNT IX (1974). 205-19.

Barrett, C. K. The New Testament Background: Selected Documents. New York. Harper and Row, Pub. 1961.

Baumgarten, J. M. "On the Testimony of Women in 1QSa". JBL 76 (1957). 266-9.

Beasley-Murray, G. R. The Book of Revelation. London: Oliphants. 1974.

Benko, S. "The Magnificat: A History of the Controversy". JBL 86 (3, 1967). 263-75.

Benoit, P. "L'Enfance de Jean-Baptiste selon Luc I". NTS 3 (1956-1957). 169-94.

____. "'Et toi-même un glaive transpercera l'âme!' (Luc 2,35)". CBQ 25 (3, 1963). 251-61.

____. "Marie-Madeleine et les Disciples au Tombeau selon Joh 20,1-18". Judentum Urchristentum Kirche. Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias. Beihefte zur ZNW 26. ed. W. Eltester. Berlin: A. Töpelmann. 1960. 141-52.

Bertram, G. "θάμβos". TDNT III (1965). 4-7.

____. "συντρίβω". TDNT VII (1971). 919-25.

Bishop, E. F. F. "Mary (of) Clopas and her Father". ET 73 (11, 1962). 339.

Blinzler, J. Die Brüder und Schwestern Jesu. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk. 1967.

Bode, E. L. The First Easter Morning - The Gospel Accounts of the Women's Visit to the Tomb of Jesus. Rome: Biblical Institute Press. 1970.

Boismard, M.-É. Du Baptême à Cana (Jean 1.19-2.11). Lectio Divina 18. Paris: Éditions du Cerf. 1956.

Bourke, M. M. "The Literary Genus of Matthew 1-2". CBQ 22 (1960). 160-75.

Broer, I. "Die Bedeutung der 'Jungfrauengeburt' im Matthäus-evangelium". BibLeb 12 (4, 1971). 248-60.

Brown, Raymond E. The Birth of the Messiah. London: Geoffrey Chapman. 1977.

_____. "The Problem of Historicity in John". CBQ 24 (1962). 1-14.

_____. "The Resurrection and Biblical Criticism". Commonweal 87 (8, 1967). 232-6.

_____. The Virginal Conception and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus. New York: Paulist Press. 1973.

_____, and K. P. Donfried, et al., eds. Mary in the New Testament. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. 1978.

Bruce, F. F. "The End of the Second Gospel". EvQ 17 (1945). 169-81.

Brun, L. "Der Auferstehungsbericht des Markusevangeliums". TSK 87 (1914). 346-88.

Bultmann, R. "γινώσκω". TDNT I (1964). 689-719.

Burkitt, F. C. "Mary Magdalene and Mary, Sister of Martha". ET 42 (1930-1931). 157-9.

Büchsel, H. "ἄλλος". TDNT I (1964). 264-7.

_____. "ἀνάκειμαι". TDNT III (1965). 654-6.

Cadbury, H. J. "Mark 16.8". JBL (1927). 344-5.

Calvin, John. A Harmony of the Gospels III. ed. D. W. and T. F. Torrance. trans. A. W. Morrison. Edinburgh: St. Andrews Press. 1972.

Campenhausen, H. von. The Virgin Birth in the Theology of the Ancient Church. trans. F. Clarke. Naperville, Illinois: A. R. Allenson, Inc. 1964.

Catchpole, D. "The Fearful Silence of the Women at the Tomb - A Study in Markan Theology". JTSA 18 (1977). 3-10.

Carmignac, J. "The Meaning of Parthenos in Luke 1.27 - A reply to C. H. Dodd". BT 28 (3, 1977). 327-30.

Ceroke, C. P. "Luke 1,34 and Mary's Virginity". CBQ 19 (3, 1957). 329-42.

Chapman, S. "The Brothers of the Lord". JTS 7 (1905-1906). 412-33.

Clarke, W. K. Lowther. "Studies in Texts [Matt. xxviii,2-4]". Theology 43 (1941). 300-02.

Collins, J. J. "The Brethren of the Lord and Two Recently Published Papyri". TS 5 (1941). 484-94.

Cotter, W. E. P. "'Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended unto the Father' (St. John xx.17)". ET 43 (1931-1932). 45-6.

Cranfield, C. E. B. "St. Mark 16.1-8". SJT 5 (1952). 282-98, 398-414.

Creed, J. M. "The Conclusion of the Gospel according to Saint Mark". JTS 31 (1929-1930). 175-80.

Cronin, H. S. "They Rested the Sabbath Day according to the Commandment - Luke xxiii.56". ET 16 (1904-1905). 115-8.

Crossan, J. D. "Mark and the Relatives of Jesus". NovT 15 (1973). 81-113.

Daniélou, J. "The Empty Tomb". Month n.s. 39 (1968). 215-22.

D'Arc, J. "Catechesis on the Road to Emmaus". LV 32:2 (1977). 143-56.

Daube, D. "The Anointing at Bethany and Jesus' Burial". ATR 32 (1950). 186-99.

Davies, J. G. "The Ascription of the Magnificat to Mary". JTS 15 (2, 1964). 307-08.

Davis, C. T. "Tradition and Redaction in Matthew 1:18-2:23". JBL 90 (4, 1971). 404-21.

Delling, G. "παρθένος". TDNT V (1967). 826-37.

Derrett, J. Duncan M. "Water into Wine". BZ 7 (1963). 80-97.

Devault, J. J. "The Concept of Virginity in Judaism". MS 13 (1962). 23-40.

Dhanis, É. L'Ensevelissement de Jésus et la visite au tombeau dans l'évangile de Saint Marc (Mc. XV,40 - XVI,8)". Greg 39 (2, 1958). 367-410.

Dodd, C. H. "The Appearances of the Risen Christ: An Essay in Form-Criticism of the Gospels". Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot. ed. D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1955. 9-35.

_____. "New Testament Translation Problems I". BT 27 (3, 1976). 301-11.

Ehrhardt, A. The Acts of the Apostles. Manchester. 1969.

Elliot, J. K. "The Anointing of Jesus". ET 85 (1974). 105-07.

Enslin, M. S. "ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ, Mark 16.8". JBL 46 (1927). 62-8.

Evans, C. F. "I Will Go Before You Into Galilee". JTS n.s. 5 (1, 1954). 3-18.

_____. Resurrection and the New Testament. London: SCM Press. 1970.

Evans, G. E. "The Sister of the Mother of Jesus". RevExp 44 (1947). 475-85.

Farmer, T. H. "'Touch me not'". ET 28 (1916-1917). 92-3.

Farmer, W. R. The Last Twelve Verses of Mark. SNTS Monograph 25. London: Cambridge University Press. 1974.

Farrer, A. St. Matthew and St. Mark. Westminster: Dacre Press. 1954.

Feuillet, A. "La découverte du tombeau vide en Jean 20,3-10 et la Foi au Christ ressuscité". EspV 87 (19, 1977). 273-84.

_____. "L'heure de la femme (Jn 16,21) et l'heure de la Mère de Jésus (Jn 19,25-27)". Bib 47 (3, 1966). 361-80.

_____. "Quelques observations sur les récits de l'enfance chez saint Luc". EspV 82 (5, 1972). 721-4.

Flusser, D. "The Crucified One and the Jews". Immanuel 7 (1977). 25-37.

Ford, J. Massyngberde. Revelation. The Anchor Bible. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc. 1975.

Forestell, J. T. "Old Testament Background of the Magnificat". MS 12 (1961). 205-44.

Fowler, D. C. "The Meaning of 'Touch Me Not' in John 20:17". EvQ 47 (1, 1975). 16-25.

Fuller, R. H. The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives. New York: Macmillan. 1971.

Gaechter, P. "Zum Begräbnis Jesu". ZkT 25 (1953). 220-25.

Garrard, L. A. "What Happened on the First Easter?" HibJ 57 (1958-1959). 213-22.

Germano, J. M. "Nova et vetera in pericopam de sancto Joseph (Mt. 1,18-25). VD 46 (6, 1968). 351-60.

de Goedt, M. "Un schème de révélation dans le Quatrième Évangile". NTS 8 (1961-1962). 142-50.

Goodspeed, E. J. "The Marriage at Cana in Galilee, a Reply". Int 1 (1947). 486-9.

_____. "The Original Conclusion of the Gospel of Mark". AJT 9 (1909). 484-90.

Goulder, M. D. "Mark xvi.1-8 and Parallels". NTS 24 (1978). 235-40.

Grayston, K. "Matthieu 1:18-25, Essai d'Interprétation". RTP 23 (3, 1973). 221-32.

Greenlee, J. H. "εἰς μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς 'For her Memorial' Mt. xxvi.13; Mk xiv.9". ET 71 (1960). 245.

Guy, H. "The Virgin Birth in St. Luke". ET 68 (1957). 157-8.

Haefner, A. E. "The Bridge Between Mark and Acts". JBL 77 (1958) 67-71.

Harnack, A. von. "Das Magnificat der Elisabet (Luk. I,46-55) nebst einigen Bemerkungen zu Luk. I und 2". Studien zur Geschichte des Neuen Testaments und der Alten Kirche. Berlin/Leipzig: W. De Gruyter. 1931. 62-85.

Harrison, E. F. "The Son of God Among the Sons of Men - XI. Jesus and Martha". BSac 104 (1947). 298-306.

_____. "The Son of God Among the Sons of Men - XV. Jesus and Mary Magdalene". BSac 105 (1948). 433-42.

Hauck, F., and S. Schulz. "πορεύομαι". TDNT VI (1968). 566-79.

Hengel, M. "Maria Magdalena und die Frauen als Zeugen". Abraham Unser Vater, Festschrift für Otto Michel, zum 60 Geburtstag. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1963. 243-56.

Herbert, G. "The Resurrection Narrative in St. Mark's Gospel". SJT 15 (1962). 66-73.

Hill, D. "A Note on Matthew i.19". ET 76 (4, 1965). 133-4.

Hodges, Z. C. "Form-Criticism and the Resurrection Accounts". BSac 124 (1967). 339-48.

_____. "The Women and the Empty Tomb". BSac 123 (1966). 301-09.

Horst, P. W. van der. "Peter's Shadow: The Religio-Historical Background of Acts v.15". NTS 23 (2, 1977). 204-12.

Horvath, T. "The Early Markan Tradition on the Resurrection - Mk. 16,1-8". RUO 43 (3, 1973). 445-8.

Humenay, R. L. "The Place of Mary in Luke: A Look at Modern Biblical Criticism". AER 5 (1974). 291-303.

Issacs, M. E. "Mary in the Lucan Infancy Narrative". WayS 25 (1975). 80-95.

Jeffrey, F. "Martha and Mary". ET 29 (1917-1918). 186-8.

Jeremias, J. "Die Salbungsgeschichte Mc. 14,3-9". ZNW 35 (1936) 75-82.

Johnson, M. D. The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies, with Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus. SNTS Monograph 8. London: Cambridge University Press. 1969.

Journet, C. "L'apparition à Marie de Magdala". NVet 40 (2, 1965). 143-7.

Kenyon, F. G. "Papyrus Rolls and the Ending of St. Mark". JTS 40 (1939). 56-7.

Kittel, G. "συνακολουθέω". TDNT I (1964). 210-16.

Lambrecht, J. "The Relatives of Jesus in Mark". NovT 16 (4, 1974) 241-58.

Ladd, G. E. I Believe in the Resurrection of Jesus. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans. 1975.

Lampe, G. W. H. "Acts". in Peake's Commentary on the Bible. ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons. 1962. 882-926.

Lattey, C. "The Semitisms of the Fourth Gospel". JTS 20 (1919) 330-6.

Laurentin, R. Structure et Théologie de Luc I-II. Paris: Gabalda Press. 1957.

Leaney, A. R. C. "The Resurrection Narratives in Luke (xxiv.12-53)". NTS 2 (1955-1956). 110-14.

Legault, A. "An Application of the Form-Critique Method to the Anointings in Galilee (Lk 7,36-50) and Bethany (Mt 26,6-13; Mk 14,3-9; Jn 12,1-8)". CBQ 16 (1954). 131-45.

Léon-Dufour, X. "Le juste Joseph". NRT 81 (3, 1959). 225-31.

____. Resurrection and the Message of Easter. trans. R. N. Wilson. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston. 1974.

Lightfoot, J. B. St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. London: Macmillan and Company. 1896.

Lilly, J. L. "Jesus and his Mother during the Public Life". CBQ 8 (1946). 52-7.

Lindars, B. "The Composition of John XX". NTS 7 (1960-1961). 142-7.

Lohse, E. "πρόσωπον". TDNT VI (1968). 768-80.

Luther, M. "The Magnificat". Luther's Works. Vol. 21. ed. J. Pelikan. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House. 1956.

Machen, J. G. The Virgin Birth of Christ. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House. 1965 repr.

Mangatt, G. "At the Tomb of Jesus". Biblebhashyam 3 (2, 1977). 91-6.

Margoliouth, D. S. "The Visit to the Tomb". ET 38 (1926-1927). 278-80.

Marshall, I. H. "The Resurrection of Jesus in Lüke". TynB 24 (1973). 55-98.

Masson, C. "L'Ensevelissement de Jésus, Marc xv, 42-47". RTP n.s. 31 (1943). 193-203.

Maxey, M. N. "Beyond Eve and Mary - A Theological Alternative for Women's Liberation". Dialogue 10 (1971). 112-22.

Mayor, J. B. The Epistle of St. James. London: Macmillan and Company. 1910.

McArthur, H. K. "Son of Mary". NovT 15 (1, 1973). 38-58.

McHugh, John. The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament. London: Darton, Longman, & Todd. 1975.

_____. "On True Devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary". WayS 25 (1975). 69-79.

Metzger, Bruce M. "On the Citation of Variant Readings of Matt. I:16". JBL 77 (1958). 361-3.

Meye, R. P. Jesus and the Twelve. Discipleship and Revelation in Mark's Gospel. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans. 1968.

_____. "Mark 16:8 - The Ending of Mark's Gospel". BR 14 (1969). 33-43.

Meyer, A. and W. Bauer. "The Relatives of Jesus". NTAp I (1963) 418-32.

Michaelis, W. "σμύρνα". TDNT VII. (1971). 457-9.

Michel, O. "μιμνῄσκομαι". TDNT IV (1967). 675-83.

Minear, P. "Luke's use of the Birth Stories". Studies in Luke-Acts. ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn. London: S. P. C. K. 1968. 111-30.

_____. "'We Don't Know Where...' John 20:2". Int 30 (1976). 125-39.

Morris, W. D. "John xx.17". ET 40 (1928-1929). 527-8.

Moule, C. F. D. "St. Mark xvi.8 - once more". NTS 2 (1955-1956). 58-9.

Moulton, J. H. "Mark iii.21". ET 20 (1908-1909). 476.

Neirynck, F. "Les Femmes au Tombeau: Étude de la Rédaction Matthéenne (Matt. xxviii.1-10)". NTS 15 (1968-1969). 168-90.

Nicklin, T. "'Noli me tangere'". ET 51 (1939-1940). 478.

Oepke, A. "ἐξίστημι". TDNT II (1964). 449-60.

Ottley, R. R. "ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ, Mark xvi.8". JTS 27 (1925-1926). 407-9.

Piper, O. A. "The Virgin Birth, The Meaning of the Gospel Accounts". Int 18 (April, 1964). 131-48.

Platt, E. E. "The Ministry of Mary of Bethany". TT 34 (1, 1977). 29-39.

Prabhu, G. S. "'Rejoice, Favored One!' Mary in the Annunciation Story of Luke". Biblebhashyam 3 (4, 1977). 259-77.

Rahner, K. "Nimm das Kind und seine Mutter". GL 30 (1, 1957). 14-22.

Rengstorf, K. H. "ἀπόστολος". TDNT I (1964). 398-447.

Richardson, L. J. D. "St. Mark xvi.8". JTS 49 (1948). 144-5.

Richter, G. "Der Vater und Gott Jesu und seiner Brüder in Joh 20,17". MTZ 24 (2, 1973). 95-114.

Ripoll, F. "The Infancy Narratives and Mary". Biblebhashyam 3 (4, 1977). 297-302.

Robinson, J. A. T. "Elijah, John and Jesus - an Essay in Detection". Twelve New Testament Studies. London: SCM Press. 1962. 28-52.

Ropes, J. H. The Epistle of St. James. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1916.

Ruether, Rosemary R. Mary - The Feminine Face of the Church. London: SCM Press. 1979.

Russell, J. K. "'The Son of Mary' (Mark vi.3)". ET 60 (1948-1949). 195.

Sanders, J. N. "Those whom Jesus loved, John xi.5". NTS 1 (1954-1955). 29-41.

de Satgé, J. Mary and the Christian Gospel. London: S. P. C. K. 1976.

Schlier, H. "Die Osterbotschaft aus dem Grab (Markus 16,1-8)". KG 27 (1, 1971). 1-6.

_____. "παραδειγματίζω". TDNT II (1964). 25-33.

Schneider, J. "συνέρχομαι". TDNT II (1964). 666-84.

Schniewind, J. "ἀπαγγέλλω". TDNT I (1964). 56-73.

Schrage, W. "ἀρχισυνάγωγος". TDNT VII (1971). 798-852.

Schrenk, G. "δίκαιος". TDNT II (1964). 178-225.

Schubert, P. "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24". Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann. Beihefte zur ZNW 21. ed. W. Eltester. Berlin: A. Töpelmann. 1957. 165-86.

Schürer, E. The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B. C. - A. D. 135). Vol. I. rev. & ed. G. Vermes and F. Millar. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1973.

Schulz, S. "ἐπισκίαζω". TDNT VII (1971). 394-400.

Schwank, B. "Das Christusbild im Zweiten Teil des Johannesevangeliums (XIX) - Die ersten Gaben des erhöten Königs: Jo 19,23-30". SS 29 (7, 1964). 292-309.

Shaw, A. "The Breakfast by the Shore and the Mary Magdalene Encounter as Eucharistic Narratives". JTS 25 (1974). 12-26.

Skeat, T. C. "St. Mark xvi.8: A Modern Greek Parallel". JTS 50 (1949). 57-8.

Smith, R. H. "New and Old in Mark 16:1-8". CTM 43 (1972). 518-27.

Spicq, C. "'Joseph, son mari, étant juste...' (Mt. I,19)". RB 71 (1964). 206-14.

____. "Noli me tangere". RSPT 32 (1948). 226-7.

Stählin, G. "νόν". TDNT IV (1967). 1106-23.

Stauffer, E. "εἷς". TDNT II (1964). 434-42.

_____. Jerusalem und Rom im Zeitalter Jesu Christi. Bern/München: A. Franke Verlag. 1957.

_____. "Jeschu Ben Mirjam - Kontroversgeschichtliche Anmerkungen zu Mk 6:3". Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black. ed. E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1969. 119-28.

Stendahl, K. "Matthew" in Peake's Bible Commentary. ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons. 1962. 769-798.

_____. "Quis et Unde? An Analysis of Mt 1-2". Judentum Urchristentum Kirche. Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias. Beihefte zur ZNW 26. ed. W. Eltester. Berlin: A. Töpelmann. 1960. 94-105.

Strobel, A. "Der Gruss an Maria (Lc 1,28). Eine philologische Betrachtung zu seinem Sinngehalt". ZNW 53 (1-2, 1962). 86-110.

Tagawa, K. Miracles et Évangile. La pensée personnelle de l'évangeliste Marc. Études d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses 62. Paris: Presses Universitares de France. 1966.

Thiele, W. "Eine Bemerkung zu Act 1:14". ZNW 53 (1-2, 1962). 110-11.

Trompf, G. W. "The First Resurrection Appearance and the Ending of Mark's Gospel". NTS 18 (3, 1972). 308-30.

Turner, C. H. "Marcan Usage: Notes, Critical and Exegetical, on the Second Gospel". JTS 25 (1924). 377-86.

Turner, H. E. W. "The Virgin Birth". ET 68 (1956). 12-17.

Unnik, W. C. van. "Jesus the Christ". NTS 8 (2, 1962). 101-16.

Vanhoye, A. "Interrogation johannique et exégèse de Cana (Jn 2,4)". Bib 55 (1974). 157-67.

Vellanickal, M. "The Mother of Jesus in the Johannine Writings". Biblebhashyam 3 (4, 1977). 278-96.

Violet, B. "Ein Versuch zu Joh 20,17". ZNW 24 (1925). 78-80.

Vögtle, A. "Mt. 1,25 und die Virginitas B. M. Virginis post partum". TQ 147 (1, 1967). 28-39.

Soden, H. von, "ἀδελφός". TDNT I (1964). 144-6.

Walker, N. "After Three Days". NovT 4 (1960). 261-2.

Walker, R. Die Heilsgeschichte im ersten Evangelium. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des alten und neuen Testaments 91. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1967.

Wansbrough, H. "Event and Interpretation: VIII. The Adoption of Jesus". Clergy Review 55 (12, 1970). 921-8.

———. "Mark iii.21 - was Jesus out of his mind?" NTS 18 (1972). 233-5.

Wenham, D. "The Meaning of Mk iii.21". NTS 21 (2, 1975). 295-300.

———. "The Resurrection Narratives in Matthew's Gospel". TynB 24 (1973). 21-54.

Wenham, G. J. "Betûlāh, 'A Girl of Marriageable Age'". VT 22 (1972). 326-48.

Wilkinson, J. "Apologetic Aspects of the Virgin Birth of Jesus Christ". SJT 17 (2, 1964). 159-81.

Wilson, S. G. The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts. SNTS Monograph 23. London: Cambridge University Press. 1973.

Woodworth, R. B. "The Marriage at Cana in Galilee". Int 1 (1947). 372-4.

Worsley, F. W. "The Raising of Lazarus and the Synoptic Tradition". ET 19 (1907-1908). 43-4.

Zahn, T. and A. Resch. "The Authorship of the Last Verses of Mark". Exp 4th ser 10 (1894). 219-32.

Zerwick, M. "...quoniam virum non cognosco (Lc I,34)". VD 37 (1959). 212-24.

Chapter 6: Bibliography

Blass, F. W. "Priscilla und Aquila". TSK 74 (1901). 124-6.

Blum, G. G. "Das Amt der Frau im Neuen Testament". NovT 7 (1964). 142-61.

Bultmann, R. "ἐλεημοσύνη". TDNT II (1964). 477-87.

Burton, H. "The House of Mary". Exp 2nd ser 1 (1881). 313-8.

Cadbury, H. J. "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts. III. Luke's Interest in Lodging", JBL 45 (1926). 305-22.

Conzelmann, Hans. History of Primitive Christianity. trans. J. E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon Press. 1973.

Corssen, P. "Die Töchter des Philippus". ZNW 2 (1901). 289-99.

Crum, W. E. "Schila und Tabitha". ZNW 12 (1911). 352.

Daniélou, J. The Ministry of Women in the Early Church. trans. G. Simon. Leighton Buzzard, England: Faith Press. 1974.

Edmundson, G. The Church in Rome in the First Century. London: Longmans, Green and Company. 1913.

Ellis, E. E. "The Role of the Christian Prophet in Acts". Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays presented to F. F. Bruce on his 60th Birthday. ed. W. Ward Gasque and R. P. Martin. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1971. 55-67.

Epp, E. J. The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts. SNTS Monograph 3. London: Cambridge University Press. 1966.

Foerster, W. "Ἰησοῦς". TDNT III (1965). 284-93.

_____. "προσκληρόω". TDNT III (1965). 758-69.

Gibson, M. D. "The House in which the Last Supper was Held". JTS 17 (1915-1916). 398.

Gryson, R. Le ministère des femmes dans l'Église ancienne. Gembloux: Duculot. 1972.

Harnack, A. von. Über die beiden Rezensionen der Geschichte der Prisca und des Aquila in Act Apost. 18,1-27". Studien zur Geschichte des Neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche. 48-61.

_____. "Probabilia über die Adresse und den Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes". ZNW 1 (1900). 16-41.

Hastings, J. "Women in the Acts of the Apostles". ET 4 (1892-1893). 434-6.

Hoerber, R. O. "The Decree of Claudius in Acts 18:2". CTM 31 (11, 1960). 690-4.

Hoppin, R. Priscilla, Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews and Other Essays. New York: Exposition Press. 1969.

Jacobs, H. E. "The Female Diaconate of the New Testament". LCR 11 (1, 1892). 5-51.

Johnson, A. M. "Philip the Evangelist and the Gospel of John". AbrN 16 (1975-1976). 49-72.

Klijn, A. F. J. A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts. Part 2. 1949- 1969. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1969

Kuhn, K. G. "προσήλυτος". TDNT VI (1968). 727-44.

Leonard, E. A. "St. Paul on the Status of Women". CBQ 12 (1950). 311-20.

Lohse, E. Colossians and Philemon. trans. W. R. Poehlmann and R. J. Karris. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. 1971.

Manson, T. W. "The Problem of the Epistle to the Hebrews". BJRL 32 (1949-1950). 1-17.

Maurer, C. "παρατίθημι". TDNT VIII (1972). 152-68.

Menoud, P.-H. "The Western Text and the Theology of Acts". BSNTS 2 (1951). 19-32.

Michaelis, W. "ὁδός". TDNT V (1967). 42-114.

Nestle, E. "Schila et Tabitha". ZNW 11 (1910). 240.

_____. "St. Paul's Handicraft: Acts xviii.3". JBL 11 (1892). 205-06.

Oepke, A. "ζέω". TDNT II (1964). 875-7.

Plumptre, E. H. Biblical Studies. London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden and Welsh. 1885.

Ramsay, W. M. The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1915.

_____. The Church in the Roman Empire Before A. D. 170. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1893.

_____. "The Denials of Peter - Section III: The House in the New Testament". ET 27 (1915-1916). 471-2.

_____. St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1895.

Redalié, Y. "Conversion ou libération? Notes sur Acts 16,11-40". Bulletin du Centre Protestant D'Études 26 (7, 1974). 7-17.

Rees, W. "St. Paul's First Visit to Philippi (Acts of the Apostles XVI: 11-40)". Scr 7 (1955). 99-105.

Rengstorf, K. H. "ποταμός". TDNT VI (1968). 595-623.

Riddle, D. W. "Early Christian Hospitality: a Factor in the Gospel Transmission". JBL 57 (1938). 141-54.

Sanday, W. and A. C. Headlam. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. ICC. 5th ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1902.

Schaff, P. ed. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. XI. St. Chrysostom: Homilies on Acts and Romans. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans. 1975.

Schumacher, R. "Aquila und Priscilla". TGl 12 (1920). 86-99.

Schweizer, E. "Die Bekehrung des Apollos, Apg 18,24-26". Beiträge zur Theologie des Neuen Testaments - Neutestamentliche Aufsätze (1955-1970). Zürich: Zwingli Verlag. 1970. 71-9.

Silva, R. "Eran, pues de oficio, fabricantes de tiendas (σκηνοποιοὶ Acts 18,3)". EstBib 24 (1965). 123-34.

Smith, B. T. D. "Apollos and the Twelve Disciples at Ephesus". JTS 16 (1914-1915). 241-6.

Stählin, G. "ξένος". TDNT V (1967). 1-36.

Thomas, W. D. "The Place of Women in the Church at Philippi". ET 83 (1971-1972). 117-20.

Torrance, T. F. "St. Paul at Philippi: Three Startling Conversions. Acts 16:6-40". EvQ 13 (1941). 62-74.

Viteau, J. "L'Institution des Diacres et des Veuves - Actes, vi, 1-10; vii,4-40; xxi,8". RHE 22 (1926). 513-37.

Zahn, T. "Die 'Dormitio Sanctae Virginis' und das Haus des Johannes Markus". NKZ 10 (1899). 377-429.

Zarb, S. M. "De Iudaeorum ΠΡΟΣΕΥΧΗ in Act. XVI.13,16". Ang 5 (1928). 91-108.