

WOMEN &
CHRISTIAN
ORIGINS



Editors

ROSS SHEPARD KRAEMER
MARY ROSE D'ANGELO

New York • Oxford
Oxford University Press

1999

ment: Q's image or its retention in Luke does concern women's ordination. On including the parable in Q, see Kloppenborg, "Jesus and the Parables" 311-17; Jacobson, *First Gospel* 227.

60. Then again, the juxtaposition of the two parables may have suggested to Q hearers that the man and woman were married or members of the same (temporarily ill-tuned) household.

61. See Cortey, "Women and Gender" ms. 20-35, esp. note 59. See also William Arnal's "Reconstruction of Q 7:29-30," paper presented to the International Q Project, Claremont, CA, May 1994, which Cortey follows. The reconstruction, including "prostitutes," was rejected by the majority of members.

62. Batten, "More Queries" 48; Cortey, "Women and Gender" ms. 4. The point is also made by those supporting Matthean priority (Farmer, *Gospel of Jesus* 76).

63. Schottroff, "Sayings Source Q" 523.

64. See n. 18 above.

65. Arnal, "Gendered Couples" 2, who offers several examples from contemporary literature of forensically based pairs.

66. *Ibid.* 12.

67. On relating the saying to dining rather than to "two men on a bed," see John Kloppenborg, "Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q," *HTR* 80 (1987) 287-306, esp. 302 n. 57. I thank Kathleen Cortey for this reference. See also Cortey's *Private Women, Public Media: Social Conflict in the Synoptic Tradition* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993) 117-18. In *QThom*, 61, the reference to the dining couch is explicit.

68. See the sage comments of Allison, *The Jesus Tradition* 43-46.

69. For comparative models using different databases from within the canon, as well as from Greek, Roman, and Jewish outside sources, see *Inter alia*, Schottroff, *Lydia's Shirts*; Schüssler Fiorenza, *Jesus*; Batten, "More Queries"; and Arnal, "Gendered Couples."

70. Cf. Levine, "Yeast of Bden" 13.

71. *Ibid.* 32.

72. With thanks to Dale C. Allison, Jr., Mary Rose D'Angelo, William E. Arnal, Kathleen Cortey, Jay Geller, Deirdre Good, Ross Kraemer, and Adele Reinhartz for critical comments on earlier drafts of this chapter.

8



(RE)PRESENTATIONS OF WOMEN
IN THE GOSPEL OF
MATTHEW AND LUKE-ACTS

Mary Rose D'Angelo

Representations is a particularly apt description of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke: these works in some sense present Jesus again by rethinking Mark's narrative so as to integrate the sayings of Q. Both provide (independent) stories about the birth and childhood of Jesus that supply Jesus with the father he lacks in Mark (6:3-4) and bring the narratives closer to ancient biographies. Both aim at cleaner narrative and more elegant diction. Both texts use language and forms that associate them with the Bible, offering themselves as an extension or completion of the sacred writings. For both, interpretation of the Bible is central, but they use very different exegetical techniques to identify and explain Jesus and the early Christian community. Both carefully supply resurrection appearances and commands to the disciples that provide for the continuance, transformation, and growth of the community. In the case of Luke, this effort produced a second volume, the Acts of the Apostles. And each has been read both as the most inclusive and as the most repressive of the gospels for women.

Since both authors reuse material on women and gender from Mark and Q, one entrée into their representations of women is to examine the ways these authors revise the stories about women from Mark and the gendered sayings from Q. But this approach must be used with caution and attention to context; their revisions respond to a wide variety of factors that include, but are not limited to, the gender prescriptions and assumptions that characterized the community. For instance, both Matthew 12:41-42 and Luke 11:31-32 use a saying from Q that contrasts the wickedness of "this generation" to the Ninevites, who repented at the preaching of Jonah, and the queen of the South, who came from the ends of the earth to hear Solomon. They use the examples in reverse order.

but this reversal probably corresponds not to the respective genders of the queen of the South and Jonah, but to the authors' preferences in christology. In Matthew, the comparison with the queen is climactic because Matthew prefers Wisdom christology; Matthew's genealogy identifies Jesus as a descendant of David through Solomon (1:7). In Luke, the climactic comparison is with Jonah because Luke prefers a prophet christology; Luke's genealogy identifies Jesus as a descendant of David through Nathan (3:31).

Similar problems arise with the attempt to interpret the omission of stories or sayings that refer to women. Mark's generous widow (Mark 12:41-44) does not appear in Matthew. But any conclusions about gender implications have to take into account Matthew's interest in joining the tirade against the Pharisees from Q (Matthew 23) to a revised version of Mark 13 that predicts the Jewish war, the fall of the temple, and the coming judgment (Matt 24:1-26:1). The Gospel of Luke does not reuse Mark's story of the Greek (Syro-Phoenician) woman. But is the story omitted because the author is hostile to upply women or wishes to restrict the gentle mission to the male apostles Peter and Paul? In fact, the story of the Greek woman falls into the so-called "great omission," the lengthy section of Mark (6:45-8:26) entirely absent from Luke. If the author knew and omitted the whole section, the omission of this story need not result from Luke's views on gender, but from other concerns.² Further, it is possible there was no deliberate omission; Luke may have used an edition of Mark that did not include this section at all.³

Matthew

Matthew is widely believed to have been written at the end of the first century in Syria.⁴ Much attention has been devoted to its "Jewish background," and Kathleen Corley's claim that Matthew is "most Jewish" and "most egalitarian" was made as a salutary antidote to the tendency among feminists and other scholars to explain away reflections of patriarchy, misogyny, or both in early Christian texts as an inheritance from Judaism.⁵ Indeed, Judaism is so widely taken to be the context of Matthew that one scholar refers to "Matthew's Christian Jewish community."⁶ Such characterizations are based on the centrality of legal and exegetical traditions to the gospel. The phrase "a scribe disciplined to God's reign" in Matthew 13:52 appears to be an apt description of Matthew and, in fact, of the communal life reflected in the gospel. The forms of scriptural interpretation the gospel uses and the legal and pious observances it commends resemble traditions from either of the two forms of ancient Judaism most familiar to Christian interpreters, that is, either the texts of Qumran (the Dead Sea Scrolls) or rabbinic Judaism, whose emergence appears to have been roughly contemporaneous with the writing of Matthew.⁷ The only evidence that some rabbinic practices and opinions were extant in the nineties of the common era is the appearance of similar traditions in Matthew, for the surviving major sources of rabbinic Judaism began to be compiled only in the third century CE. While analogies between Matthew's community and Jewish communities like

Qumran and the rabbinic groups are real and important, claiming that Matthew is "most Jewish" underestimates the possibility that the other gospels reflect or react to forms of Judaism that did not survive beyond the first or second century. It also obscures other problematic indicators of the gospel's context and concerns.

Matthew indulges in an anti-Jewish polemic that has contributed heavily to the history of Christian anti-Judaism. A particularly virulent and lengthy revision of Q's tirade against the Pharisees prefates and justifies the predictions of the fall of the temple (23:1-26:1). This gospel's version of the Roman trial depicts Pilate as washing his hands of the blood of Jesus (and absolving the Roman government of the responsibility for Jesus' death), while the Jews accept blood guilt for Jesus' death on themselves and their children (27:24-25). The final commission to the eleven commanding them to make disciples of all the Gentiles may imply the mission to Jews is over (28:19); it certainly assumes a significant and growing gentle element in the community.⁸

In the Gospel of Matthew, the material from Mark and Q (as well as other unknown sources) was reorganized and integrated into tightly constructed units composing a "messianic biography" that gives a narrative explanation of Jesus as son of David and son of God (1:1, 15).⁹ Particularly noteworthy are five sermons or blocks of teaching, which have sometimes been interpreted as an attempt to model the book on the Pentateuch (the first five books of the Bible): the Sermon on Mount (5:1-7:28), a missionary instruction (9:34-11:1), a parables discourse (13:1-53), a "church order" (17:24-19:1), and a tirade against the Pharisees that leads into an apocalyptic speech (23:1-26:1).¹⁰ These sermons, which bear some resemblance to the type of ancient collections called "words of the wise," by no means exhaust the teaching of Jesus in Matthew. And in Matthew disciples are primarily learners or students; the invitation to discipleship is "learn of me" (11:29).

The importance of teaching in Matthew raises the question of whether women are treated as disciples in Matthew. Matthew's frequent references to the "twelve (or eleven) disciples" have been read by some interpreters as excluding women from discipleship.¹¹ The best starting point for considering this question appears to be the women at the cross.

There were there many women watching from afar who had followed Jesus from Galilee ministering to him; among whom were Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joseph and the mother of the sons of Zebedee. (27:55-56)¹²

As in Mark, three women are named as witnesses to the death of Jesus. In Matthew, not only the three named women, but also the great crowd of women, are explicitly said to have "followed Jesus from Galilee." With the latter phrase, the author elides Mark's note that the women had been followers of Jesus in Galilee, and it is possible to see this revision as changing their role from long-term disciples to mere companions on the journey. But the use of the word "ministering" in conjunction with "followed" makes any demotion unlikely. Two of the named women, Mary Magdalene and Mary, the mother of James and Joseph, provide the two witnesses Matthew deems necessary (18:16; Deut 19:15)

to connect the death of Jesus, the place where he was buried, and the empty tomb (27:55-6, 61; 28:1-8). At the tomb, the two women prove absolutely faithful, comprehending, and obedient; they withstand the spectacular descent of the angel and delight in his message, while the guards Matthew has introduced into the scene are comatose with fear. The two women also become the first to see the risen Jesus in a new very brief narrative (Matt 28:9-10) in which they are given a message for the disciples.

The woman who anoints Jesus (Matt 26:2-16//Mark 14:1-11) remains a prophet who both designates Jesus as Messiah and predicts his death by preparing him for burial. Kathleen Corley notes that in Matthew the woman seems to be among the diners.¹³ She is contrasted not only with the pusillanimous high priests (Matt 26:2-5) and the mercenary Judas (26:14-16), but also with the disciples, who are the ones who object to her "waste" of the ointment. The women at the tomb do not go to anoint Jesus, so Mark's ironic connection between the witnesses and this woman, who has already accomplished this task, is lost in Matthew. The wife of Pilate is also given a bit part in the passion narrative; she is the medium through whom a dream warns Pilate of Jesus' innocence (27:19). On the whole, the role of the women in these scenes seems to have been enhanced rather than diminished, if anything. Matthew is more conscious of the role of women as witnesses than Mark is.

Other issues in the treatment of women in Matthew surround the "mother of the Zebedees" who replaces Salome at the cross. This figure was introduced into the narrative to put forward the request Mark assigns to her two sons, the request for places on his right and left hand in his reign (Matt 20:20-23; compare Mark 10:35-40). By responding that those places are for the ones for whom they have been prepared by God (20:23), Jesus points forward to the two brigands who would be crucified on his right and left (27:38). Thus the author creates a new dramatic irony by making the mother of the sons of Zebedee a witness to this fulfillment of Jesus' prophecy. She disappears after the scene at the cross; it is hard not to conclude that, like Judas, she has learned her lesson. And the characterization of the mother has misogynist overtones, in making the request, she performs the legitimate maternal role of brokering the status and future of her sons.¹⁴ But the author uses her to remove the taint of misunderstanding and ambition from her two sons and at the same time evokes a stereotype of women as liable to cause competition and dissension among men that was a widespread feature of philosophical and literary debates about marriage.¹⁵

Whereas the first "teaching" of Jesus' ministry in Mark turns out to be an exorcism in the synagogue (Mark 1:21-28), Matthew's author supplanted this narrative with three chapters of practical wisdom, the Sermon on the Mount (5-7). Miracles come second in Matthew's narrative, organized into a suite of ten miracles interspersed with calls and teaching on discipleship (8:1-9:34). With the missionary sermon (9:35-11:1), these miracles provide the "deeds of the Messiah" (11:2-6) that identify Jesus as the "one to come." The cure of Peter's mother-in-law (8:14-15//Mark 1:29-31) is presented with two other miracles that illustrate Matthew's claim that Jesus' cures fulfill Isaiah 53:4 (Matt

8:17). As in Mark, she demonstrates and responds to her cure by "serving/ministering." In Matthew, her cure, with the many cures summarized in 8:16, leads to the emergence of new disciples and teaching on the cost of discipleship (Matt 8:18-22).

The double miracle of Jairus' daughter and the woman with the flow of blood (Matt 9:18-26//Mark 5:21-43) are also set into the context of discipleship; they immediately follow the call of the disciple named Matthew and the controversy stories that defend the practices of Jesus' disciples (Matt 9:9-17//Mark 2:13-22). Both miracle accounts are drastically shortened; the author generally tends to shorten and streamline the narratives of Mark. Miracles in particular are likely to be shorn of any detail that might associate them with magic and are focused more strongly around Jesus. In Matthew's narrative, the woman (described as bleeding) no longer cures herself, as she does in Mark; Jesus' commendation of her faith is no longer an acknowledgment of what has already happened, but the word that effects the healing. So, too, the emphasis on the crowd as an obstacle and the exchange of power and knowledge between Jesus and the woman disappear. Faith is no longer a prerequisite of Jesus' spiritual power as in Mark 6:5, but rather Jesus exercises that power to reward faith (Matt 13:58). The raising of Jairus' daughter is also modified. The girl's age is dropped, so that the symmetry between the woman's twelve years of illness and the girl's twelve years of life disappears. The Aramaic command and its translation have also been dropped, perhaps because the foreign language had magical overtones.¹⁶

Matthew's version of these two miracles has also been interpreted as a liberation of women from the restrictions of the Levitical purity code, and Amy-Jill Levine has addressed the highly problematic aspects of this interpretation.¹⁷ She notes that the woman is not described as having a flow of blood, but simply as bleeding, and points out that it is by no means certain that the bleeding in question is uterine bleeding.¹⁸ Dropping the note of the child's age also changes Mark's picture of a young girl dying on the brink of marriage. If this reading is correct, then the connection of the two women through twin perils to the female body disappears. Levine suggests a different juxtaposition: the bleeding woman reflects the saving blood of Jesus and the risen girl, an image of his resurrection.¹⁹

The Greek and Syro-Phoenician woman of Mark 7:24-30 emerges in Matthew 15:21-28 as a "Canaanite." This highly anachronistic characterization increases her foreignness; neither her language nor her place of origin connects her with the readers. Lest anyone miss the implication that "Canaanite" equals "Gentile," Matthew adds to Jesus' rude rebuff the explanatory words "I was sent only to the lost sheep of Israel" (compare Matt 10:6). By causing this gentile woman to address Jesus as "son of David," the author suggests that it is not only her persistence, but also the content of her faith in Jesus as the Messiah of the Jews that wins her case. In Matthew the exchange with this woman effects a unique grant to the Gentiles rather than a shift in Jesus' consciousness as in Mark; the succeeding cures appear to be set in Jewish territory (15:29-31). Thus it appears that, by comparison with Mark, Matthew has reduced not only

the active participation of the woman with the flow of blood in her own cure, but also the narrative importance of the gentle woman.

Does this diminution mean that Matthew specifically wishes to reduce the activity of women in the narrative? This does not seem to be the case. For one thing, miracles involving men are equally drastically revised (see Matt 8: 28–32//Mark 5:1–20). For another, Matthew also introduces women into narratives in Mark. Kathleen Corley points out that Matthew explicitly includes women and children in the narratives of the feeding of the five and four thousand in the wilderness (14:15–21, 15:32–38). Corley interprets this note as an indication that Matthew has transformed Mark's version of the feeding story from a male-only symposium to a family meal. Presumably, the author of Matthew either assumed that Mark's reference to five thousand men (*andres*, Mark 6: 44) implied the presence of many more women and children or else sought to inflate the miracle. She argues that women are consistently present in the meals narrated in Matthew, and that this reflects the practice, including the eucharistic practice, of Matthew's community. Corley also notes that in Matthew Herodias and her daughter appear to be present at Herod's banquet. This suggests that women are accustomed to dining with men in Matthew's social context. At the same time, she observes that in Matthew the hostility toward John is Herod's rather than Herodias' (14:4 as opposed to Mark 6:19).¹⁰

One explanation for a diminished role of women in miracles may be that, since the gospel's christology is higher, miraculous power resides in Jesus, and the participants in miracles are less active. This could be read in conjunction with the references to "the twelve disciples" to suggest that the prophetic spirit is restricted in Matthew, so that communal authority is less egalitarian. In fact the picture is more complex. The function of miracles in Matthew is different than in Mark, where the miracles are central to the message, offering spiritual power to the reader. In Matthew, miracles function to identify Jesus as the Messiah and fulfiller of the scriptures. The prophetic experience of power and spirit resides in the process of teaching and learning, of making decisions about communal practice of God's will and word, particularly through the interpretation of scripture. The continuing presence of Jesus as the teacher of the community "wherever two or three are gathered" guaranteed this enterprise (18:18–20). The final words of the gospel are the promise, "I am with you always, until the completion of the age" (28:20). This promise is enabled through the Wisdom christology that has developed in part from sayings found in Q. In Matthew 11 the author weaves together a sequence of sayings to answer the question: "Are you the one who is to come, or shall we look for another?" The author claims that the messianic works that Jesus does (11:2–6) are the deeds of Wisdom, the divine female persona: "Wisdom is justified by all her works" (11:19). The invitation of Wisdom herself is placed on Jesus' lips to complete his identification with her:

Come to me all you who labor and are heavily burdened and I will give you rest. Take my yoke on you and learn from me, for I am meek and humble of heart and you will find rest for your souls. For my yoke is kindly and my burden is light.

This invitation draws on a number of speeches of Wisdom (Prov 8:1–9:6; Sir 24:19–23; 51:23–28; Isa 55:1–3). A shorter version is attributed to Jesus in the *Gospel of Thomas*, Saying 90: "Come to me, for my yoke is easy and my Lordship is gentle, and you will find rest for yourselves."¹¹ But the author of Matthew, by joining Wisdom's invitation directly to the sayings that speak of the reciprocal knowledge of father and son, provides an explanation for the title "son of God." For Matthew "son of God" identifies Jesus not merely as the pious martyr of Wisdom 2 or as the messianic king of 2 Sam 7:14, but as Wisdom herself, God's image and God's offspring (Wis 7:24–26). Thus within the gospel the female persona of Wisdom virtually disappears behind the male person of Jesus. In Matt 23:34–35, Jesus articulates the divine plan by saying "on this account, I, O, I (Jesus) send you prophets and sages and scribes." In Luke's version (and probably Q's), divine Wisdom is the speaker: "On this account also the Wisdom of God said 'I, O, I shall send them prophets and emissaries'" (Luke 11:49–51). Wisdom's female persona may reemerge briefly here when Jesus compares himself to a hen gathering her chicks (Matt 23:36). The comparison between God's reign and the leaven a woman hides in dough may also involve a residual image in the last sermon of Jesus in Matthew draws upon two central wisdom traditions, the choice between the wise and foolish ways (Psalm 1; Matt 7:13–28; *Didache* 1–6) and the antithesis between woman Wisdom and foolish woman (Proverbs 7–9).¹²

The greatest number of new references to women in Matthew are those in the genealogy and the five brief stories about the birth and early childhood of Jesus that open the gospel. Both the genealogy and the stories are forms of scriptural interpretation; their main purpose is to identify Jesus as the Messiah, the legitimate descendant and heir of David. The genealogy traces the ancestry of Jesus through three times fourteen generations from father to son; it includes the names of four women: Tamar (Gen 38), Rahab (Joshua 2), Ruth, and the wife of Uriah (Bathsheba; 2 Samuel 11:1–12). The key is Tamar: when her father-in-law Judah accused her of adultery, she produced the tokens to show the child was his. Knowing that she had deceived him in order to force him to fulfill the law by giving children to his deceased sons through her, Judah declared: "She is more righteous than I" (Gen 38:26). All four of the women are in some degree suspect, but each ultimately proves righteous and a worthy mother to the lineage. It may also be the case that the four women are meant to indicate the inclusion of Gentiles in the messianic line, but the ultimate point of including the four seems to be to defend Mary, mysteriously pregnant before cohabiting with her spouse (1:18–25). Mary herself figures in the background of the five tales of Jesus' birth, each built around a dream, a citation of scripture, and a synonym for Messiah or an explanation of Jesus' messiahship. But Joseph is the protagonist, perhaps also to defend Mary from the charge of being a loose woman and Jesus from the charge of illegitimacy.¹³

The bulk of teaching in Matthew addresses practice; the material that most directly addresses gender is the divorce sayings. Wire takes the androcentric

articulation of the divorce prohibitions as evidence that teaching in Matthew was directed toward the literate male disciples and not toward the women.²⁴ In fact, androcentric language in teaching and exhortation does not necessarily imply a male audience or even a male author. Many centuries later, Julian of Norwich and Teresa of Avila both tend to speak of the Christian with the masculine pronoun or the collective "man," even when referring to their own experience. But as Wire notes, more than androcentric language is involved.²⁵ Several aspects of Matthew's versions raise important issues about the construction of gender within the gospel.

Prohibitions of divorce appear twice in the gospel, once in the Sermon on the Mount (5:29–32) and once immediately following the church order (19:2–12). The latter is directly based on Mark 10:2–12, which the author reorganizes by combining Mark's debate with the Pharisees (Mark 10:2–9) and the private teaching (Mark 10:10–12) that follows into a single public discourse. In the new debate, the question becomes whether a man may divorce his wife for every reason or only for impurity (a point of debate also attributed to the Pharisees in rabbinic sources). An exception for *porneia* (illicit sex) is added to the proscription of remarriage by a man (Matt 19:9). The proscription of remarriage by a woman who has divorced (Mark 10:12) disappears. Matthew then adds an entirely new section in which the disciples complain that, if that is the case of a man with a woman, it would be better not to marry—an opinion that Jesus commends, suggesting that those who are able to accept the counsel should make themselves "eunuchs for God's reign" (10–12).²⁶

The revisions in Matt 19:2–9 are usually seen as aimed at a Jewish context. The prohibition of divorce and remarriage to a woman is assumed to have been dropped because Jewish women were unable to divorce anyway. *Porneia* is frequently interpreted as those sexual relations between kin forbidden by Leviticus. As is widely noted, one of the texts from Qumran does list forbidden relations as fornication, along with polygamy and sex with a menstruating woman (Damascus Document 5:8–9), and Paul applies the word to such relations (1 Cor 5:1). But it is by no means clear that these observations explain Matthew's version of the passage. For one thing, the view that Jewish women never initiated divorce is mistaken.²⁷ And while *porneia* can refer to forbidden relations, it is used more broadly both at Qumran and by Paul.²⁸

While Matthew's revisions undoubtedly take some account of contemporary Jewish practice, they are formed primarily by the situation and concerns of early Christianity. Hermas, an early second century Christian prophet, recounts a visionary question-and-answer session that touches on divorce and remarriage. His formulation uses *porneia* to refer to the wife's adultery: If the husband knows her sin, and the wife does not repent, but persists in her fornication, he becomes liable for her sin and the sharer of her adultery.²⁹ Matthew appears to share this conviction, commending Joseph's decision to divorce the mysteriously pregnant Mary privately (Matt 1:19). This view was fostered not only by Jewish practice, but also by Roman law. Augustus' marriage legislation made adultery a matter of criminal law; men who did not divorce a wife accused of adultery could be prosecuted under a charge of pimping.³⁰ Thus an early Christian writer who

forbids divorce and remarriage as Matthew does might find it necessary to add the exception of adultery in order to make clear that Christian practice does not fly in the face of the moral standard enshrined in the law by tolerating adultery.³¹

Matt 19:10–12, like Mark 10:10–12, is a special teaching addressed to the disciples. But this teaching, unlike Mark's, is not private, and it changes the context of the divorce question, showing that for Matthew the issue in questions of divorce and remarriage is sexual purity as a spiritual practice whose ultimate demand, for those who can manage, is to become "a eunuch for God's reign" (Matt 19:10–12). Matthew combines the "antifamilial" sayings from Q and sets them into the missionary discourse (Matt 10:34–37//Luke 12:51–53, 14:25–27, 17:33); perhaps the author sees the invitation to "make oneself a eunuch for the reign of God" as an extension of the disruption the reign causes in familial bonds.

Another application of the divorce sayings appears in Matt 5:27–32, within the Sermon on the Mount. In Matt 5:21–48, Jesus proposes a series of interpretations of the law as a way of "being perfect as your heavenly father is perfect" (5:48). In Matt 5:29–32, sayings of Jesus are presented as instruction for spiritual practice of the commandment, "You shall not commit adultery" (5:27, Exod 20:14). The first saying, found only in Matthew, extends the commandment by equating a lustful gaze with adultery (28). Verses 30–31 revise Mark 9:43–47, a set of three sayings commanding that one sacrifice one's right hand, foot, or eye rather than "stumble" (apostasize). In Mark (and in Matt 18:7–10, where the verses also appear), the sayings constitute an exhortation to martyrdom. But in Matthew 5:30–31, the concern is sexual; the hand and eye ("touching" and "looking") are the occasion of sexual sin. In 5:32, Matthew introduces the stipulation of a deed of divorce from Deut 24:1, interpreting it as a casuistic law that protects and explains the command against adultery by ensuring that no one can marry a woman who is still another man's wife. The sermon supplants it with two new commandments, one charging a divorcing husband with causing a woman's adultery and the other equating marriage to a divorced woman with adultery (5:32).³²

Taken together, Matt 19:1–12 and 5:27–32 testify to the emergence of a Christian practice of sexual discipline regulating both the structures of marriage and the thoughts of the heart and culminating in rejection of sex "for those who can take it" (19:12). Although specifically Christian, this discipline builds on the teaching of Genesis and Deuteronomy, and the "exception" for adultery accommodates the Roman legal requirement that an adulterous wife be divorced. The practice is articulated in terms of the proper use of women by men. Women too are bound by it, but are not directly addressed. This does not mean that either this discipline or any of the rest of the prescriptions and decisions addressed to men throughout Matthew are not learned and practiced by women. But it does mean that women practitioners must either accommodate the teaching for themselves or themselves to the teaching.

Women are also perceived as sexual actors: prostitutes and tax collectors are said to have believed John and are preceding the high priests and elders into God's reign (Matt 21:31–32). Corley has taken this saying as an indication of

Matthew's more progressive gender ideology, which allows the community to risk the stigma of associating with loose women.³³ The first function of the saying in context is to shame the high priests and elders. But in the context of sexual practice in Matthew, the community may not so much signal its acceptance of former prostitutes as boast about its ability to transform them.

Thus Matthew seems to accept the continued communal and prophetic activity of women, as Mark and John do. But also as in Mark and John, anxiety about the flesh intervenes. Matthew's increasing concern with moral and ascetic practice causes women to be perceived as temptations, occasions when a man may give way to lust (Matt 5:28) or to greed and ambition (20:20). The Wisdom christology of Matthew is likewise two-edged: while its insistence on the continuing presence of Jesus endows the community with the capacity to rethink and remake its practice, it also effaces the female persona of Wisdom behind the male person of Jesus.

Luke-Acts

Luke-Acts is a two-volume historical work. In a formal dedicatory introduction, the author describes himself as following (*παράκολουθῶν*, a masculine participle) other writers and reworking material from sources and witnesses into a narrative that shows the surety of Christian instruction (1:1–4). Some portions of Acts were written in the first person plural, and tradition ascribes the work to Luke, the companion of Paul, but few contemporary scholars believe that the author was an eyewitness to any parts of the narrative. Dates assigned to Luke-Acts range from 90 to about 145 CE. A number of factors in Luke-Acts accord particularly well with a date in the early second century: the style of scriptural quotation, the author's interest in martyrdom, the concern with distinguishing Christians from Jews, the use of the word "Christian," and the character of struggles over gender reflected in the texts all fit best into that period. The gospel could not have been written after 145 CE, as Marcion, a second-century Christian leader who rejected any continuity with Judaism and the Hebrew Bible, possessed a version of the gospel by about that date. Marcion's edition appears to have been both expurgated and originally shorter than the canonical edition. There is yet a third version, the so-called "Western" text of Luke-Acts, which is longer, particularly in Acts.³⁴ Thus Luke also underwent a process of development and editing. While Acts presupposes Luke, it is not certain that the author projected a second volume while writing the gospel.³⁵

The gospel offers a real date for the year of John's appearance and Jesus' ministry (3:1) and is concerned to present its narrative on a world stage (Acts 26:26). The author's cultural attention to the Roman world and frequent references to "cities" (as opposed to villages) suggest that his mental landscape is the cities of Asia Minor and Greece that appear in Acts. The two books are driven by a theory of history that divides it into three periods: the period of the law and prophets through John the Baptist, the center of history in the year of Jesus' ministry, and the era of the church, which begins with the Pentecost story in

Acts 2, but is already envisaged in Luke 24:49.³⁶ This pattern tends to place Jesus definitively in the past in a way that the other gospels do not. Mark points forward to the appearance of Jesus (16:7). Matthew closes with Jesus insisting on his continued presence (28:20), and John treats ascension as a prelude to Jesus' appearances (20:17). But in Acts 1:3–14, the ascension story explicitly puts an end to resurrection appearances. Luke's Jesus is described in retrospect as "a man, a prophet mighty in word and work" (Luke 24:19), and one whom God "anointed with holy spirit who went about doing good and freeing all those downtrodden by the devil" (Acts 10:38).

The author of Luke-Acts appears to have deliberately multiplied representations of women within the narrative; there are significantly more women in Luke than in Mark and Q together, and stories about women are particularly striking in the gospel's special material. A number of these stories have played an important role in popular Christian feminist interpretation of the Bible. Among them are the cure of the bent-over woman (Luke 13:10–17), the story of Mary and Martha (Luke 10:38–42), and the infancy narratives (Luke 1–2). In the last (unlike Matthew's infancy stories), Mary is the protagonist; the other figures are related to Jesus through her, and the dilemmas and choices are hers. The story of the woman who had been bent over by "a spirit of weakness for eighteen years" (13:10) and became able to stand up straight had obvious appeal to the wide range of women struggling with the centuries of humiliations and restrictions imposed upon women by Christian denominations, as well as by the patriarchal social order. And the story is central to Luke's christology: it is articulated in terms of the prophetic message of release-forgiveness (*aphesis*) announced in Jesus' opening sermon (4:18–19): the woman was "bound" by Satan, and Jesus "freed her from her bond on the sabbath day" (13:17). The story of Martha and Mary played a role in arguments for the inclusion of women in discipleship; its ambiguities are discussed in chapter 5.

Unlike the other three canonical gospels, Luke-Acts uses gender as a central category. This has sometimes caused Luke to be read as the gospel for women.³⁷ But a number of feminist scholars have observed that Luke's writings also restrict or denigrate the participation of women.³⁸ Luke-Acts is less a compilation of good news for women than, in the words of Turid Karlsen Seim, a "double message."³⁹

The centrality of gender in Luke-Acts emerges most notably in the pairing of stories about women with stories about men. There are two types of paired stories in Luke. The first is a unit of two brief stories with an identical point or similar function, one story about a male figure and one about a female figure.⁴⁰ This technique does not originate with Luke; some pairs of this type are taken over from Q, while others are from Mark. But in many cases, the story about the man comes from Mark or Q, while the one about the woman is special to Luke; one example is the man who had a hundred sheep (Luke 15:1–7//Matt 18:10–14) supplemented in Luke by the woman who had ten coins (Luke 14:8–10). Frequently, the story about the woman displays interests characteristic of the author: the cure of the centurion's servant focuses on the centurion's recognition of Jesus as one under authority, whose mighty deed attests both power