

WOMEN &
CHRISTIAN
ORIGINS

Editors

ROSS SHEPARD KRAEMER
MARY ROSE D'ANGELO

New York • Oxford
Oxford University Press
1999

- English Lecture (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968) 231 s.v. *Oratio* 3; 5; Walter Bauer, *William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Frederick Danker, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 102 s.v. *Oratio* 2a.
59. See chapter 8.
60. So Corley, "Jesus, Mary Magdalene and Salome" 15-16.
61. Willi Marxsen, "Jesus, Mary Magdalene and Salome" (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970) 138-48.
62. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Jesus: Miriam's Child, Sophia's Prophet: Critical Issues in Feminist Christology* (New York: Continuum, 1994) 125.
63. Ibid. 123-28.
64. Bart D. Ehrman, "Cephas and Peter," *JBL* 109 (1990) 463-74.
65. Paul uses the word of himself (1 Cor 3:5; 2 Cor 3:6; 6:4; 11:23), Apollos (1 Cor 3:5), and perhaps also Timothy (1 Thess 3:2). Ephesians uses it of Paul (1:23; 25) and of Ephraïm (1:7); 1 Tim 4:6 applies it to Timothy.
66. The question is a chapter title in John Dominic Crossan, *Jesus, A Revolutionary Biography* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1995) 159-92.
67. This question is not pursued by Crossan.
68. James B. Strange, "Magdala," *ABD* 4:463-64; on the basis of the town's Aramaic name and economic interests, Kathleen Corley suggests that Mary might have been a fisherwoman ("Jesus, Mary Magdalene and Salome" 14).
69. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad, 1983) 110-59; Crossan, *Historical Jesus* 265-302.
70. Chapter 2, p. 46.
71. See, for instance, Burton L. Mack, *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988) 25-97; Crossan, *Historical Jesus* esp. 417-26; Crossan, *Revolution and Biography* 193-201.
72. This picture is a summary of some major features of reconstructions by Mack and Crossan.
73. The critic was Celsus, reported by Origen in his refutation of Celsus' *True Doctrine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) 1-13.
74. Gerd Theissen, *Socialology of Early Palestinian Christianity*, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978) esp. 1-16; Alan Segal, *Rebbeck's Children: Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986) 68-95; Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her* 99-159; Schüssler Fiorenza, *Miriam's Child* esp. 141-43; Mary Rose D'Angelo, "Re-Membering Jesus," in *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America*, Baltimore, June 9-12, 1994, Vol. 49, ed. Paul Crowley, 13-146.
75. Mary Rose D'Angelo, "Abba and 'Father': Imperial Theology and the Traditions about Jesus," *JBL* 111 (1992) 627-30; D'Angelo, "The Concrete Foundation" 131-46; D'Angelo, "Re-Membering Jesus" 198-218.
76. See Philip Thibet, "Bringing Miriam out of the Shadows," *Bible Review* 5 (1989) 14-25, 34.
77. If Peter and Cephas are the same, then the letters of Paul give more substantial evidence about Peter in 1 Cor 1:10-18, 15:5-8 and Gal 2:11-16.

(RE)PRESENTATIONS OF WOMEN IN THE GOSPELS

John and Mark

Mary Rose D'Angelo

What are you looking for? Jesus asks the first disciples in the Gospel of John (1:38).¹ This is an important query for feminist investigation of the gospels. A wide variety of questions has been put to these texts: whether the gospel writers view women positively or negatively, whether their messages are inclusive or exclusive, whether they challenge or accommodate established gender roles, and even (since these works are all actually anonymous) whether a woman could have been the author of one or more of them. These questions produce very different answers about the same texts. For instance, two social science approaches come to nearly opposite conclusions about the representations of women in Mark and Matthew.

Antoinette Clark Wire's sociological approach asks whether the gospels are congruent with or deviant from their settings in the matter of gender.² In Wire's view, the narratives of Mark reflect the tradition of "oral storytellers who show a dependent peoples' searing critique of power"; the gospel includes stories told by women of their healings, although the narrative as it stands is distanced from the women, whom she regards as nonliterate.³ Wire describes Mark's community as scribal, drawing an analogy between the practice reflected in Matthew and the living conditions and accommodations of Qumran (that is, the community reflected in the sectarian documents from the Dead Sea). She concludes that the Pharisees and the community of Matthew as Matthew; Wire sees the women of the Pharisees and the community of Matthew as nonliterate.⁴ She concludes that the author of Matthew views women as "embedded" in male relatives,⁵ and that

the gospel does not present women as disciples.⁵ For Wire, the function of the gospel was primarily to train literate male disciples while holding up women and other marginal people as examples of faith.

Kathleen Corley, on the other hand, uses the methods of social anthropology to locate the three synoptic gospels' "views of women in the context of the changing meal practices of antiquity." By comparing the ways in which women are depicted in meal settings, she attempts to decide which of the three gospels and gospel writers shows the most advanced social ideology. She comes to the conclusion that Mark's gospel never shows women eating or reclining with men, and that Mark is not free of "social conservatism," while Matthew does show women reclining with men, and presents women as meeting the criteria for discipleship, and as examples of "true faith and Christian service." For Corley, the Gospel of Matthew is both the "most Jewish" and "most egalitarian" of the three synoptic gospels.

[illegible]

In this chapter, I have made the somewhat unusual decision to begin with the Greek-speaking Roman world, and then to move on to the Latin-speaking world. This is a reversal of the order in which the history of the first-century CE is usually presented, and I have done this for a number of reasons. First, the Greek-speaking world was the center of the Roman Empire, and it was in this world that the most important literary and theological developments of the first century took place. Second, the Greek-speaking world was the world in which the New Testament was written, and it is in this world that the New Testament is most often read. Third, the Greek-speaking world was the world in which the early church was born, and it is in this world that the early church's most important leaders lived and worked. Finally, the Greek-speaking world was the world in which the early church's most important theological and literary developments took place, and it is in this world that the early church's most important literary and theological works were written. I have therefore decided to begin with the Greek-speaking world, and then to move on to the Latin-speaking world. This is a reversal of the order in which the history of the first-century CE is usually presented, and I have done this for a number of reasons. First, the Greek-speaking world was the center of the Roman Empire, and it was in this world that the most important literary and theological developments of the first century took place. Second, the Greek-speaking world was the world in which the New Testament was written, and it is in this world that the New Testament is most often read. Third, the Greek-speaking world was the world in which the early church was born, and it is in this world that the early church's most important leaders lived and worked. Finally, the Greek-speaking world was the world in which the early church's most important theological and literary developments took place, and it is in this world that the early church's most important literary and theological works were written.

Mark together and to begin from John. In part, this is because similar approaches may be used in evaluating gender in these two gospels; while it is clear that both Mark and John had access to earlier sources, none of these sources has survived. While it is possible and sometimes necessary to speculate about them, the direct comparisons between Matthew or Luke and Mark as their sources are not possible between the Gospels of Mark and John and their sources. Further,

ууос

Mark is believed by most scholars to be the earliest of the synoptic Gospels and is inclined to see Mark and John as roughly contemporary. The Gospel of Matthew and Luke. While John was once regarded as the latest of the gospels and as dependent on all the others, these assumptions are now widely contested. The gospel's narrative outline differs radically from Mark's; John includes three Passovers and therefore at least parts of three years, while Mark has only one. The amount of material the two works have in common is very limited and often very differently formulated. Further, John appears to have developed through a relatively long process of revising and editing in a rather idiosyncratic community separated from the local Jewish synagogue. The letters called 1, 2, and 3 John are thought to be later productions of the same community. Many scholars envisage a first edition of John that was contemporary with and independent of Mark.¹ Thus it is possible to place at least the first full version of John around the year 80 and to see Mark as from approximately the same date. Beginning with the gospel attributed to John has the salutary effect of dislodging the overly precise gospel narrative pattern that has largely been established by the dramatic skills of the author of Luke.

Since the gospels originated as anonymous works and were later attached to names that would accord the texts apostolic authority, it is a priori possible that one or more was written by a woman.² The formal introduction to Luke includes a masculine modifier for the narrator (1:3): "thus that author at least assumes a male persona. But there are no explicit clues to the gender of the other three authors, and in speaking of them I avoid the masculine pronoun."³ For the gospels, like most ancient literature, I refer to the readers and hearers of the gospels. Like most ancient literature, the gospels were expected to reach a majority of one sex or the other, but not both. The gospels were expected to reach differing degrees of literary skill; so, indeed, would the authors. The Greek and the never far from oral performance.

131 • PRESENTATIONS OF WOMEN IN THE GOSPELS •

(5). The community seems to have been very little concerned with structures (1:11-13; cf. 1:13, 14, 15:13, 17, 18). The community seems to have been very little concerned with structures (1:11-13; cf. 1:13, 14, 15:13, 17, 18).

offices, and titles. Both connection and leadership are understood through ancient models of friendship.¹² The twelve¹³ are referred to only in passing (6:67, 70, 71; 20:24); these few brief references can be attributed to the later layers of the gospel. There is no list of the twelve, and twelve famous disciples can be produced only by including Mary Magdalene, Martha, Mary, Lazarus, and the unnamed beloved disciple. The term "apostle" is used only once, not of a specific disciple, but generically (1:13:16). Mary Magdalene appears to fit the Pauline definition of apostle (1 Cor 9:1, 15:3-8); she is accorded the first vision of the risen lord and delivers an apparently oracular message in his person and words (20:17-18).¹⁴ This scene reflects the strong prophetic and visionary element that persists through the stages of communal development from the earliest levels of the tradition through the letters (see 1 John 4:1-2, 5:6). Like the Gospel of Mary, the last chapter of John and its appendix seem to reflect struggles or negotiations of authority within the community; the differing positions are represented by Peter, the beloved disciple, Thomas, and Mary Magdalene. The prominence given to Mary suggests that the authority and leadership of women are at issue in the community.¹⁵

One of the letters begins, "The elder to a chosen lady and her children" (2 John 1). The female figure in this address and the "chosen sister" whose "children" send a closing greeting (2 John 13) are often explained as feminine personifications of communities rather than as real women members or leaders of congregations.¹⁶ But these phrases resemble an attack on a woman prophet whom the author of Revelation calls "jezebel" and on her "children" (Rev 2:20, 2:23). Thus the "chosen ladies" of 2 John may have been women prophets, while "children" referred to their congregations or disciples, and the "elder" who wrote the letter was allied with the prophet described as "your chosen sister."¹⁷

The Gospel of John includes a number of sayings that begin with the words "I am." These sayings are likely to have originated as the product of the prophetic or John's community. The prophets of the second-century movement called the New Prophecy (Montanism) produced similar sayings. Not only Montanus, but also the two women prophets Priscilla and Maximilla are credited with oracles in which the spirit that speaks in the prophet identifies itself for the community. The saying of Maximilla, "I am driven as a wolf from the flock; I am not a wolf; I am the good shepherd,"¹⁸ resembles the saying, "I am the good shepherd" (John 10:11, 14), not only in imagery but also in function. It defends the prophetic spirit and leadership against the claims of an orthodoxy.

John resembles the gnostic dialogues that present Jesus as the heavenly visitor.¹⁹ This gospel makes extensive use of dialogue forms and explains Jesus as everything in the Bible, from the Davidic Messiah to Jacob's ladder, but primarily as the one who comes from God. His message is also similar to some aspects of gnostic thought: what distinguishes both Jesus and the true disciple is their knowledge of their own origin and destiny (see also chapter 12). They are like the spirit-wind in that outsiders can know neither where they come from nor where they are going (3:5-7).

Several types of dialogues appear in John. Chapters 13-16 strongly resemble works like *Dialogue of the Savior* and *Apocryphon of James*, in which the disciples ask questions in turn in order to structure what is basically a revelatory discourse. John 6:22-59 and 10:22-39 belong to this category. But there are also dialogues of a more dramatic type peculiar to John. In these, two parties hold the stage and speak: the protagonists, usually "straight man," a third, invisible party, the reader and hearers are drawn into the dialogue by the use of irony and double meaning, which invite them to fill in what the interlocutor does not know. The most important of these are the dialogues with Nicodemus (3:1-21), the Samaritan woman at the well (4:1-42), the blind man (9:1-10:1), and Martha or Martha and Mary (11:1-11:44).

The dialogue with the Samaritan woman provides a relatively easy entrée into the rather peculiar thought world of the gospel and is also an excellent example of the interplay of gender in the text and between the text and its interpreters. With the exception of the early fifth-century writer John Chrysostom, most commentators of the past tended to denigrate the woman, reading her history as sinful and her reactions as obtuse.²⁰ This misreading results not only from misogyny but also from failure to recognize that 2:23-4:42 forms an integrated whole. The dialogues with Nicodemus (3:1-21) and with the woman (4:1-42) illustrate 2:25: Jesus "needed no one to testify to him about the human being for he himself knew what was in the human being."

The dialogue with the Samaritan woman is set in the context of baptism (1-3), and attention is drawn to the location in Samaria and Jacob's well (4-6). The time is given as noon (6), but not, as is sometimes suggested, because the woman was shunned as immoral by other women and could not come at the normal hours (morning and evening). Rather the purposes of this comment are dramatic: It contrasts the woman with Nicodemus, whereas he came by night and left in the dark, she comes at the point of fullest possible light (3:1, 4:6-7).²¹ Jesus initiates their first exchange (7-9), accosting the woman with a request for a drink. Her reply calls attention to their ethnic identifications and to her own gender. The gospel writer notes for the reader that the Samaritans and Jews do not have dealings or, perhaps, share utensils (like water jars). With the second exchange (10-12), Jesus offers, "Living water" and shifts the focus to his own identity; the woman responds to the shift: "Are you greater than our father Jacob?" she asks. Calling Jacob "our father" underlines the common ancestor of Jesus and the woman and points to the separation of the Samaritans and Jews, an issue addressed further on in the dialogue (4:20-24). If later commentators see her question as obtuse, the (first-century Christian) reader cannot help answering her with a resounding "yes!"

In the climactic third exchange (13-15), Jesus presents her with the offer she cannot refuse: water from a source within herself that will enable her never to thirst. Behind this promise is the reformulation of a wisdom motif that is used to explain both Jesus and the spirit in John. This motif portrays Wisdom as that female aspect of the deity that human beings can take into themselves as

food and drink so that she becomes part of them—or perhaps they become part of her (Sir 24:19–22; cf. Isa 55:1–4; Prov 9: 5; 34). If for Sirach eating and drinking of wisdom will cause the sage to hunger and thirst continually, for John the one who eats and drinks of Jesus will never hunger or thirst again (John 6:35, 50). In John 7:37–39, "Living water" is explicitly identified with the spirit and is said to flow from the breast of the one who believes. In response, the woman asks for this water, "that I may thirst not come here to draw." This clause has frequently been seen as evidence of her incomprehension; most commentators have concluded that she has taken his offer literally. But the rest of the dialogue betrays that assessment.

The next set of exchanges (16–20) form the turning point of the dialogue. Jesus orders the woman to bring her husband (or her man; the Greek word *andros* is used for both). When she responds that she has none, he agrees and announces that she has had five and the one she has now is not hers. This verse has been the subject of a wide variety of exegetical extravaganzas, which have ranged from the allegorical, claiming the five husbands are the five gods supposedly worshipped by the Samaritans, to the misogynist, characterizing the woman as a well-known sinner.¹⁸ It is difficult to specify the meaning of Jesus' comment; multiple husbands in the scriptures either are the result of Levirate marriage (Mark 12:18–27) or depict the woman as victim (Job 6:10–7:16). A more intriguing possibility is suggested by a wall painting from the House of Dioscuri in Pompeii, in which a woman in a sun hat offers a drink to a traveler with a staff and a dog. The painting is worn, but the woman appears to be elderly; she sits upon a round object that looks like a well with a water jug beside her.¹⁹ The scene may evoke some well-known comic vignette; perhaps a first-century audience would have taken the five husbands mentioned in John 4:18 to indicate the woman's age and have assumed that number six was not up to sex or preferred the slave girl.

It is equally possible that Jesus' pronouncement is meant to remain mysterious to the audience; whatever his meanings, the woman hears his words as revelatory. In relating her encounter with Jesus to the other Samaritans, she declares, "Come and see a man who told me everything I've ever done" (4:29, 4:39). In response to Jesus' insight, she recognizes him as a prophet (19). One gross misreading claims, "She changes the subject away from this embarrassing question."²⁰ Despite the best efforts of centuries of Christian commentators, the text impures neither sin nor shame to the woman. She expresses no repentance and Jesus neither forgives her nor warns her against sinning again (as he does in the parable of the lost sheep in the light (3:19–21)).

This exchange foregrounds the importance of prophecy in John 2:23–4:2 (and the gospel as a whole). Jesus' pronouncement and the woman's response both represent one of the most important functions of early Christian prophecy: knowledge of what is in the human heart (John 2:25; see also 1 Cor 14:24–25, 29, 4:37) as his seemingly casual comment illuminates Nathanael (1:48–49). Her

recognition of him as a prophet manifests her special knowledge as well, and she builds upon it by asking him to perform a second prophetic function, that of advising on dilemmas, especially of right worship (see 1 Mac 4:46). She puts to him the single most important theological question between her own people and his: the question of where to worship, on Mount Gerizim (reverted by the Samaritans) or in Jerusalem.²¹

Jesus' response is double. First, he exercises a third function of early Christian prophecy, prediction: he foretells the fall of the temple in Jerusalem with the warning, "the day is coming when you will worship neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem" (4:21). When Jesus supposedly spoke with these words, the temple on Mt. Gerizim had already been destroyed (128 BCE); by the time the first readers and hearers came upon his prophecy, the temple in Jerusalem also lay in ruins.²² The second response speaks directly to the readers and hearers as well: it is they who have the prerogative of true spiritual worship (4:23–24). The excellence of this answer leads the woman to propose a further identification of Jesus as the coming Messiah who "will tell us everything" (4:25). And Jesus concedes with the words, "I am [he]" (4:26).

The aftermath of the dialogue underlines its effect. The woman leaves behind her water jug (4:28) for her aspiration of 4:15 is fulfilled; she no longer needs to come and draw water. Instead, without a command or commission from Jesus, she proselytizes her neighbors (4:28–30, 39–42). In this she is contrasted with the disciples, who puzzle over the meaning of Jesus' harvest sayings while she performs them (4:31–38). Raymond Brown concluded that the author portrayed the woman as performing apostolic functions.²³

Are there literary and theological functions of gender in this dialogue? Does the dialogue function to challenge or to reinforce gender prescriptions? It is clear that gender does play some role; the author causes both the woman (4:8) and the disciples (4:32) to emphasize that there is something unexpected about the interaction between Jesus and this woman. These comments have frequently been used to claim that Jesus or the author rejected Jewish or rabbinic practice in the treatment of women (see chapter 2). But there is no suggestion of conflict with the Jewish community here. The virulently anti-Jewish polemic that characterizes the story of the blind man (9:1–10:21), the bread of life discourse (6:1–7), and passages like 8:30–59 and 10:22–39 is lacking in this passage and suggests that the community did not expectence the role of women within it as a source of tension with the Jewish communities it knew. That the questions are voiced (or not voiced) by the disciples and the woman herself argues that, if there was tension over the participation and leadership of women, it arose from expectations within rather than from extramural disputes.

The community still appears to identify more closely with the woman at the well, who is both a woman and a Samaritan, than with Nicodemus, the Jerusalemite teacher, Pharisee and ruler of the synagogue. Unlike the Pharisees depicted as opponents of the blind man, Nicodemus is not a hostile character, but one whose fear keeps him in the dark until the end of the gospel (7:50–52, 19).

39). But the narrative demonstrates that the learning accessible to this teacher in Israel is less effective than the drink of water the woman gets and the enlight-

The stress on the woman's gender (or the beggar's blindness) might be no more than an attempt to show that even the most unlikely candidate can be endowed with spirit and wisdom and become a source of life in her/himself. But throughout the gospel, the best examples of the "autonomy of the believer" are women. Inspired by some mysterious source of knowledge, the Samaritan woman proselytizes her neighbors without any commission from Jesus (4:29-42). Jesus' mother, ignoring his abrupt response to her plea on behalf of the wedding hosts, prepares the stewards for the miracle (2:4-6). Martha pushes Mary to meet Jesus, claiming that he has summoned her, when (as far as reader can tell) this is not true.

When Mary anoints Jesus, her act apparently foresees and foretells his death and may have messianic overtones. Since the scene implies that he reclines on a dining couch, the author's comment that "the house was filled with the perfume of the ointment" (John 12:3) may evoke Song of Songs 1:12: "When the king was on his couch, my nard gave forth its odor."³⁸ Thus although she anoints his feet rather than his head, her deed has no penitential overtones, but rather seems to effect the same result as the prophetic acts of Samuel, who anointed Saul and David as king. Male disciples also experience revelations: the beloved disciple initiates Jesus on the basis of Jesus' knowledge about him.³⁹ But they rarely exemplify the spiritual knowledge exhibited by the women.

Erotic touches in the representations of women in John coexist with ascetic and spiritualist tendencies and anxieties about physically, particularly the physicality of Jesus, that frequently accompany prophecy. Mary, the sister of Martha, is described as anointing Jesus' feet with pure nard and wiping them with her hair. If the scene is prophetic and messianic, it achieves these effects by casting Mary in the role of the woman lover from Song of Songs 1:12. The scene in which Mary Magdalene seeks the body of Jesus (John 20:1-2, 11-15) may echo the woman of Song of Songs seeking her lover (3:1-3). Martha is singled out as loved by Jesus, then Mary and Lazarus added (11:5). So, too, both Lazarus and the unnamed male disciple are described as "the one whom Jesus loved."

At the same time, ascetic concerns surface in the text. Jesus refuses food for the sake of living off the will of God (4:31-34) and never actually gets the drink he asks from the woman; she leaves her jug behind, and so herself never gets the water she came for (4:7, 29). In the resurrection appearances, Jesus rejects a touch or embrace from Mary (20:17) and although he invites a touch to resurrect the implications of scenes in which Jesus refuses a touch from Mary or passes through walls. Luke 24:36-43 depicts Jesus as eating bread and fish to prove that he is not a spirit. Thus it appears that, at least at the earlier stages, this community adopted a ploy that is also found in other spiritualist and prophetic

movements, like the New Prophecy. Encratic Christianity, and the Shakers: anxieties about the flesh were contained by relegating eros to the spiritual realm, and ascetic practice enabled the fuller exploitation of eros and a relatively wide realm of participation for women.⁴⁰ But the identification of women with flesh and sexuality remained, and ascetic ambitions helped to lay the groundwork for future tensions about women's roles.

Thus the Gospel of John offers powerful pictures of women, apparently enabled by the communal prophetic experience that made every believer a source of spirit and life. What little leadership and structure there was seems to have been charismatic and dynamic in character. This did not exclude conflict over communal roles. It is noteworthy that Mary Magdalene does not appear in the appendix (John 21) with Peter and the beloved disciple, and 21:14, in counting the appearance as the third time Jesus appeared to his disciples, seems to exclude Mary either as a visionary or as a disciple.⁴¹ The verse may reflect less participation in leadership among women in the community in its later years, or the desire to restrict women's participation on the part of the author of the appendix or its audience. This communal prophetic experience offers itself through the persona of Wisdom as food and drink. But within the gospel, the female persona of Wisdom who makes this offer disappears entirely behind the male dyad of father and son. In its prologue, the masculine personification of the Word pre-empted her. And the powerful figures of women in the gospel are presented in erotic and familial categories. In so far as ascetic and spiritualist tendencies liberated women from these categories, they do so only by limiting them as actors in the world.

Mark

Mark is assigned to a variety of dates ranging from 66 CE to the early 80s CE because the prophecies of Mark 13:1-2, 14-20 appear to have been written after the destruction of the temple in 70 CE or at least long enough after the beginning of the Jewish war that its outcome was predictable. There is some evidence the gospel went through more than one edition, until the middle of the twelfth century, most editions of the Bible published a later appendix as longer version of Mark.⁴² Tradition long associated the gospel with Peter and the city of Rome. While some scholars continue to regard Rome as the likely place of composition, most are skeptical about this location.⁴³ Arguments have been made for both Galilee and Syria, but the gospel's provenance remains uncertain.⁴⁴

Only three women disciples are named in the Gospel of Mark. Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joses and Salome are named to provide continuous witnesses to the death of Jesus, the burial, and the empty tomb (16:40-41, 47; 16:1-8). While their major function is thus to show that Jesus actually died, that someone knew where he was buried, and that the tomb found empty was the right one, the role of these women is more indicative of the role

of women in Mark's community and more central to the theology of the gospel than might at first appear. Mark 1:5:41 designates them as "following" Jesus, that is, as disciples and heirs of his teaching. These terms, especially "ministres" (*diakonos*), reflect the terminology used by early Christian communities, and the verse as a whole probably reflects the participation of women in the community of Mark, as well as memories of women in the movement during Jesus' lifetime.⁴⁶ At the death scene, the three women are accompanied by many others who had come up with him from Galilee (1:5:41). While this is the first explicit mention of these women, it implies that women were on the road with Jesus throughout his preaching career. In 3:32, the sisters, as well as the mother and brothers, of Jesus seek him out, and Jesus claims the one who does God's will as brother, sister, and mother; this suggests that the author envisages women amidst the crowds that assemble to hear Jesus and probably among his companions (3:32, 35).

The three named women also play important dramatic and theological roles in the Gospel of Mark as dominated by a focus on the cross. Halfway through the Gospel, the prediction of Jesus' death is made a test of true understanding of Jesus' messianicship. When Peter fails this test, a new invitation to discipleship requires that the true follower take up the cross and expect to share Jesus' death (8:34–35). After Judas betrays Jesus, Peter denies him, the others flee, and Jesus dies crying out his abandonment by God. The women remain faithful, and two of them follow his corpse to the burial. The last verse of the Gospel, 16:8, describes their flight and their silence about the vision and message committed to them. The flight of the male disciples is sometimes seen as evidence of Mark's desire to discredit the twelve, and the flight of the men and the women's silence can be interpreted as parallel failures that function as warnings to the reader.

But this warning hardly exhausts the meaning of the scene in 16:1–8. In Mark, Jesus appears for the last time hanging dead on the cross, and the departure of the women closes the Gospel; they are the last figures the reader sees. Their flight and silence may have been intended to leave the first readers and hearers with the conviction that they themselves were the true recipients of the message, obligated to proclaim the Gospel of God and "the coming of the son of man" (compare Mark 1:1:14–15; 1:3:26; 14:9).

Six unnamed women play roles in the narrative: Peter's mother-in-law (1:29–31), Jairus' daughter and the woman with the flow of blood (5:21–43), the so-called Syro-Phoenician woman (7:24–30), the widow who contributes her whole living to the temple treasury and provides Jesus with the occasion to castigate the scribes (12:41–44) and the woman who anoints Jesus (14:1–11). The narrative also offers two female villains, the daughter of Herod and her mother Herodias, depicted as the catalysts for the death of John the Baptist, as well as one woman bit player, the woman servant of the high priest who questions Peter (14:66–70). While it is clear that the names of the three women at the cross and tomb and of Herodias are given because the author wishes to use their fame as testimony to the veracity of the narrative, it is less clear why no other women's names are given. Does the author wish to respect the Greek view that the names of respectable women should not be unnecessarily made public?⁴⁷

Is it the case that the unnamed women function as primarily typical or representative figures, who invite the readers and hearers to locate themselves within the narrative?

Four of the women appear in miracle stories that are juxtaposed with miracles in which a male figure is central. The first of these stories establishes the importance of the miracles in Mark's apocalyptic history.⁴⁸ The healing of Peter's mother-in-law, with an exorcism of a demoniac in the synagogue, constitutes the first day of Jesus' ministry (1:21–39). The spiritual power displayed in the exorcism demonstrates the authority of Jesus' teaching (1:22, 27), and the encounter with the demon reveals his mission: he has come to destroy Satan's reign (1:24). The healing story illustrates the effect of that mission for the audience (1:31). The raised her, and "she served/began to minister" (1:31). Together, the two miracles initiate a flood of spiritual deeds at the end of the sabbath, after spending a night in prayer, Jesus concludes from them that he must go on the road to preach (1:38).

Does gender play any role in the narrative? Claiming that in these stories "Jesus shows his willingness to heal women as well as men" misreads the context: it seems more accurate to suggest that the two miracles show Mark's Jesus his power to heal.⁴⁹ Pairing of stories of women and men is a compositional technique present also in Q and highly developed by Luke; it may have originated as a catechetical device for engaging the women among the audience.⁵⁰ Another possible function of gender here is found in Davies' claim that the woman's "serving" identifies her as a disciple. This suggestion has been developed by some feminist commentators as a testimony to women's ministry and has been challenged by others who see the word as relegating her to female household tasks.⁵¹ These perceptions are not actually mutually exclusive. The woman's literary function must be considered here: the author uses her gender role as a way to introduce Christian terminology into the career of Jesus and to invite the readers and hearers to place themselves within the narrative at its outset; like her, they have been raised by Jesus and minister to him.

Equally important for Mark's readers is the rather startling story of the "Syro-Phoenician woman," who could be better identified as the Greek woman. While this figure has sometimes been described by feminists as representative of the excluded and marginal, "a triple outsider" by gender, ethnicity, and religious-cultural affiliation,⁵² for Mark and the first audience of Mark, this woman is very much an insider. She is first identified as "Greek"; this descriptor is usually taken to mean "Gentile" (not Jewish). She was certainly meant to be Gentile, but Mark's audience would likely have been even more struck by the recognition that she was linguistically and culturally Greek, like themselves, as well as Gen-tile, probably also like many, if not most, of them. She is identified only secondarily as Syro-Phoenician, that is, from the southern part of Syria known as Syria Phoenicia.⁵³ If Mark was written in Syria, she would have been a triple insider for the audience, winning her petition from Jesus through her "word" or message as the representative of Mark's community in the text. This story of a woman who wins aid by a smart answer is followed immediately by the healing of a man who is deaf and mute, or rather impaired of speech, and who is

enabled to speak rightly (7:31–37). This cure takes place in the largely Gentile area called the Decapolis (7:31). The implication seems to be that the Greek woman's struggle with Jesus signaled a change in the scope of his mission.

Was her gender intended to play a role in the story's impact? Corley has seen the introduction to this story as an instance of Mark's need to confine women to household settings. But a more obvious function of the note that "he went into the house, wishing no one to know" (7:24) is simply to emphasize Jesus' reluctance to be known, the "secret" motif and concern with inner and outer circles that characterizes the gospel as a whole. Perhaps this instance of secrecy was intended as a discouragement for Gentile favor seekers and prepared the reader for Jesus' rebuff of the mother. The callousness of Jesus' comment violates Christian perceptions about how Jesus ought to have behaved, discomfort with this picture has caused many commentators to deflect attention from the calculated insult by castigating "Jewish exclusivity." This implication is not foreign to Mark; the woman's demand for access for Gentiles like herself follows Mark's critique of the Pharisees' interpretation of the laws by tradition. But for Mark, the emphasis is on the combination of boldness and humility that enables the woman (and the Gentile community) to wrest what she wants from the reluctant Jesus. The woman's verbal assertiveness violates twentieth century views of ancient expectations of women and, in fact, probably challenged such expectations, but since she speaks on behalf of her daughter, her posture would have met with the same approval as the sayings of the Pharisean women that were popular in antiquity.⁴⁵ And it should be noted that the content of the posture is quite sub-

mistive; in fact, Ross Kacemer has suggested that the story may focus on a woman in order to make Jesus' rebuff less offensive to ancient ears.⁴⁶ One gender aspect of the text that deserves attention is that the woman's assertiveness is on behalf of her daughter: she undertakes the obligations of the good mother.⁴⁷ The double miracle account of the daughter of Jairus and the woman with the flow of blood (Mark 5:21–43) has become an important locus for feminist interpretation of the Gospel of Mark, and rightly so. This narrative does have at least an implicit focus on gender and furthermore strikingly displays the character of the miraculous for Mark. But the focus of much feminist interpretation has been problematic.⁴⁸ A wide variety of commentators remark on the ritual impurity of the woman with the flow of blood, and some applaud Jesus' willingness to incur impurity, both by suffering her touch and by touching the dead girl.⁴⁹ These observations are sometimes made the basis for positioning the story in a larger picture that posits a special Markan inclusivity, or Mark's rejection of Levitical purity regulations, and the other stories about women are then fitted into this picture.⁵⁰

But Mark's narrative shows no interest in purity, and for good reason.⁵¹ The stories are set in Galilee, and the ritual purity that would be lost by touching a corpse or touching a menstruant was required only for participation in the temple in Jerusalem. Since purity was easily reacquired by waiting until sunset and bathing, it was of interest only once the fairly arduous trip to Jerusalem had already been made.⁵² In the early part of the gospel Jesus is presented as uphold-

ing the temple's authority to recognize the cleansing of leprosy (1:44). This is not to say that purity is of no interest in Mark; Mark 7:1–23 complains about the Pharisee's insistence on washing hands before meals and on pure vessels for food. But it is unsurprising that there is no comment on impurity in 5:21–43. Neither the story of the daughter of Jairus nor that of the woman with the flow of blood shows any controversial elements at all. No opponents call attention to the supposed breach of purity, the miracle effects no refutation of such objections, and no scornful or judgmental authorities are put to shame.⁵³

Using Antiochite Clark Wire's category of demand story to analyze these intertwined narratives puts the focus on two quite different and central aspects of the stories themselves and of the miraculous in Mark: the activity or perseverance of the inquirer, characterized by Mark as faith, and the transfer of spiritual power, especially by touch.⁵⁴ While Wire developed her categories in the hope of interrogating their function for the original tellers, they are also helpful in reading the miracles of Mark. The demand story's major feature (lacking in Wire's other three categories) is a demand (or request) for healing or help.⁵⁵ "The demanding party from the first takes an active part in the struggle and overcomes" Wire sees the key to the demand stories' function in their focus on an obstacle: a rebuke or rebuff from the healer or an intensification of the difficulties of the cure, like a crowd that obstructs access. The teller or narrator invites the hearers to identify with the one making the demand. The story of the woman with the flow of blood Wire describes as the "most remarkable" in this respect, noting that the crowd presents an obstacle to the woman in reaching Jesus and an obstacle to Jesus in recognizing the woman. The crowd and the woman together, by delaying Jesus, intensify the obstacles in Jairus' case. The conjunction of the two stories underlines the perseverance of the woman and, less explicitly, of Jairus. The structures of these two stories illustrate the importance of transfer of power and of touch as its means in striking ways. All healings are to some degree manifestations of power (dynamis) overcoming weakness, and touch is a particularly important (though not the only) means of this transfer.⁵⁶

It is precisely touch and the transfer of power that are foregrounded in the unique features of Mark's narrative of the healing of the woman with the flow of blood. The woman is introduced into the narrative of the daughter of Jairus with a long string of participles that recount the unhappy history of her disease: "she touched" (5:27). The woman herself prescribes this touch as the means of her healing: "If I touch even his garments I shall be saved" (5:28). The success of her prescription is immediate: "and at once she was sprung of her blood was dried up, and she knew in her body that she was healed" (5:29). This first assurance of the healing is immediately reinforced and explained by the parallel description of Jesus' reaction: "and immediately Jesus, having recognized in himself the power gone out of him, turned and said, 'Who touched me?'" (5:30) Jesus' parting commendation of her faith simply concedes to her what she has already taken from him: the power with which to supply her weakness.⁵⁷ Wire notes that "her faith has saved her even without [Jesus'] will."⁵⁸ This emphasis on the exchange of power and the special knowledge by

which Jesus recognizes it disappears in Matthew's revision. In Matthew, "you faith has healed you" is not an acknowledgment of what has already taken place, but rather the formula of healing: the woman is healed only after Jesus utters these words (9:22).

The life of Sulla by the second-century writer Ptolemy relates an anecdote that sheds some light on this narrative. Valeria Messalla, passing Sulla at the games, drew a thread out of his garment and excused herself with the plea that she eventually becoming his fourth wife. Ptolemy implies that her touch and apology were a calculated ruse by which she effected an introduction to him. But the anecdote underlines the belief that a touch can transfer power, showing that the woman's touch can draw out of Jesus the power she seeks and needs. The woman's indirect approach to Jesus does not really need to be explained as "timidity," induced by psychological or social constraints. Mark explains it by the overwhelming crowd, but it functions in the narrative to draw attention to the unique knowledge that Jesus has "in himself," creating the pretext on which he makes known his ability to distinguish the one powerful touch from all the others that press upon him.¹⁴ As in the Gospel of John, early Christian prophecy is reflected in the christology of Mark and in this narrative in particular: the exchange of spiritual power in the miracle, the special knowledge both Jesus and the woman experience, and perhaps even the woman's prediction of her cure reflect the community's prophetic and charismatic experience.

The raising of Jairus' daughter likewise manifests the transfer of the ultimate power, life itself, to overcome the ultimate weakness, death, through the touch of Jesus and the supporting presence of the believing disciples and the parents of the child. One of the most intriguing aspects of this miracle is the ambiguity about whether the child is asleep or dead. A similar ambiguity appears, and in fact is underlined, in a story in which the second-century philosopher, Apollonius of Tyana, raises a young girl on the brink of her wedding.¹⁵ This ambiguity serves a variety of functions. In both authors, it offers the occasion to present and disarm natural skepticism about the miraculous. In Mark, it also evokes the Christian language that draws together awakening, resurrection, and baptism. Miracles in Mark illustrate the conjunction of power and faith, including those miracles that are illustrations of the power of prayer (9:14-31, 11:20-25).¹⁶ (Eph 5:14). And it contributes to the larger function of the miraculous in Mark. The miracles of the woman with the flow of blood and the seemingly dead girl form the climax of a suite of miracles that begins in 4:35 and leads to the summary in Mark 6:1-6. Often characterized as "Jesus' rejection at Nazareth" (on the basis of Luke 4:16-30), Mark 6:1-6 might better be called "Mark's theory of miracles." The claim that Jesus "could do no miracles there because of their lack of faith" (6:5) underlines what Mark 1:35:8 carefully obscures: the conviction that miracles require faith. The ambiguity of sleep or death does not detract from but evokes the faith the power invites, requiring the reader to choose as the woman did.

Does gender function in these stories? Is it significant that it is two stories about women that are told together and, in fact, intertwined? For an ancient audience, there may have been an inherent connection, or perhaps symmetry, between the two stories in Mark 5:21-43: the two stories record healings or wonders that cure two opposing dangers to which the female body was understood to be subject. The woman with a twelve-year flow of blood suffers from a womb that is inappropriately open. The twelve-year old girl may well represent the young girl who dies because her womb is closed; at twelve, she is just at the age for marriage in Roman law (and in subsequent rabbinic law).¹⁷ Older medical writers saw young girls at this age as threatened by "hysteria,"¹⁸ suffering from a closed womb, and prescribed marriage, sexual intercourse, and child-bearing as the remedy. Soranus, the early second-century physician, describes acute "hysteria" as a disease that was deathlike, but not necessarily mortal.¹⁹ While Soranus does not list virginity as one of the causes of hysterical suffocation or recommend marriage as older sources do, an audience of hysterical suffocation might well share his view of hysteria's symptoms as deathlike, but not necessarily fatal, while continuing to believe that unmarried girls are particularly vulnerable to its seizures.

Three other stories deploy central women characters as foils for male characters. The villainous Herodias and her daughter who bring about death of John the Baptist are contrasted with the twelve who take up his fate (6:7-31). The widow who gives all she owns (12:41-44) is contrasted with the scribes who devour the households of widows (12:38-40). Most importantly, the woman who anoints Jesus is contrasted with Jesus' betrayers, the Jewish leaders (14:1-2) and Judas (14:7-11). In anointing Jesus' head, she acts in the role of Samuel anointing Saul and David; as a prophet, she designates him as the messianic (anointed) king. Jesus' defense of her deed identifies it as a work of mercy (burying the dead), similar to but more urgent than feeding the poor, and so changes her prophetic message of his messianic identity into a prophecy of his death. The women who go to the tomb to anoint his body set out to do what the readers know has already been done. Mark adds a prophecy of Jesus' own that is fulfilled for and by the reader, who hears her memorialized in the preaching many years and miles away (14:9).

It would be difficult to argue that Mark's representations of women challenge ancient gender roles. In fact, at least some gender stereotypes contribute to the theological or literary functions of many of these characterizations. The malice of Herodias underlines the probity of the "just and holy man" John (Mark 6:20), the vulnerability of the widow helps make her generosity a foil to the rapacity of scribes (12:38-44), and the powerlessness of the servant girl points out Peter's cowardice (14:66-70). Not only do stereotypes of femininity play a role in the narrative, the author also appears to be concerned with restricting antifeminist, antipatriarchal aspects of the tradition. Mark 10:1-31 has been structured to exclude the idea that one may divorce one's wife or, probably more importantly, one's husband or abandon small children for the sake of God's reign (in Mark, for the sake of Jesus and the gospel). Mark 10:17-31, the story of the rich man and the private teaching to the disciples that completes it, puts forward

the demand that one leave all and follow Jesus (10:21, 28): "all" might be "household or brothers or sisters or mother or father or children or fields" (10:27). Luke's version of the saying mentions a wife among these that can be left for the gospel (Luke 18:29; compare Luke 14:26, which requires that disciples have their family members), and this version is sometimes seen as original.⁶⁶ But to prepare for the demands of Mark 10:17-31, the author offers a debate on divorce, which opposes it on the grounds of the monogamous creation (10:2-9), coupled with private teaching for the disciples, which equates divorce and remarriage with adultery (10:10-12). The two scenes are followed by a brief anecdote in which Jesus rebukes the disciples for turning away little children brought by their parents, declaring "of such is God's reign" (Mark 10:13-16).⁶⁸

These passages are sometimes interpreted as part of an egalitarian platform; Mark 10:2-9 has been seen as undoing the right of a man to discard a wife, 10:10-12 has been seen as equalizing the status of wife and husband in regard to adultery, and 10:13-16 has been treated as an endorsement of communal child care.⁶⁹ But while divorce was and is often deeply and comprehensively damaging for women, so is and was the inability to obtain a divorce. While it is true that both Jewish and Roman law permitted divorce, proscribing divorce could still have had political and apologetic motivations. In the mid-second century, the early Christian writer Justin described one divorce as the catalyst for a persecution of Christians (2 Apology 2). A woman who had converted to Christianity and objected to her husband's sexual practices divorced him. In retaliation, the husband denounced both the woman and the teacher who had instructed her in Christianity; both were arrested. The teacher was executed and further arrests of Christians followed. From the perspective of the Roman empire, early Christianity was an innovation in religion, in itself a bad thing; worse, it was an innovation in Judaism, an Eastern, barbarian and suspect worship. Communities might well feel the need to show that they were by no means a threat to Roman imperial "family values." The equation of remarriage with adultery (Mark 10:10-12) is particularly suggestive in light of the anxiety about adultery that both produced and was increased by the antiaultery law promulgated by Augustus in 18 BCE.⁷⁰ That Mark explicitly considers the case of a woman who divorces a husband as well as of a man who divorces a wife has often been interpreted as a reflection of more "liberal" Roman, rather than Jewish, legal practice. This assessment has been questioned as more evidence emerges that Jewish women in antiquity did, in some cases, initiate divorces.⁷¹ More importantly, it responds to the political reality that a woman divorcing an unbelieving husband is as likely, and in fact more likely, to endanger the community.⁷²

Both the shared spiritual power offered in the miracles of Mark and the appearance of women as disciples and ministers presumably reflect experience and practice. Mark's community relied on faith that could move mountains, used words of spiritual power, and was ministered to and administered by women as well as men. The twelve men described in the gospel as an inner circle within

Conclusions

It would be difficult to argue that either Mark or John addresses the issue of gender or foregrounds the participation of women in any coherent or comprehensive way. Neither of the authors or the communities behind them appears to have made the status of women any central focus in their concerns. Nor is it the case that either narrative reflects gender practices that were unheard of or even challenging for their time. What is clear is that these two gospels differ in their representation of women and in the workings of gender in their narratives. They differ from each other, from the rethinking of Mark by Matthew and Luke, and from later attempts to synthesize the gender arrangements of early Christianity. They give the lie to simplistic claims that Jesus was a campaigner against gender prescriptions of his time on the one hand and, on the other, that Jesus selected twelve male disciples in order to create an all-male ministry.

John and Mark do seem to accept, indeed to assume, the participation of women in communal life in ways that would cause dissension, become marginal-ized, and eventually be eliminated and to offer at least some vivid and dynamic representations of women. They have two factors in common that seem to enable this. One is the continued importance of prophetic experience; for both communities, leadership appears to have depended on a call based in spiritual expertise rather than on appointment. As in both Judaism and Greco-Roman religions, prophecy in early Christianity was accessible to women as well as men, though not necessarily equally or in all settings. Secondly, in both works, the communal life seems to have been identified with the private and voluntary sphere. In John, ancient models of friendship and familial language provided an alternative family for the community and locates special teaching for the disciples within the house. While this does not necessarily mean that the setting directly reflected the practice of house churches, this material addresses the readers and hearers, the real insiders. At this early stage these ways of constructing

NOTES

1. This translation and all translations in the chapter are my own unless otherwise acknowledged.

2. Antiochene Witte, "Gender Roles in a Scriptural Community," in *Social History of the Multicultural Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches*, ed. David L. Balch (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1991) 87-121.

3. Ibid. 119-20.

4. Ibid. 111-12, 115.

5. Ibid. 103.

6. Kathleen E. Cortey, *Private Woman, Public Male: Social Conflict in the Synoptic Tradition* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993).

7. Ibid. 106-7, 178.

8. Ibid. 186.

9. For a discussion of theories of dating and stages of development, see Robert Kysar, "John, The Gospel of," ABD 3:918-22.

10. On the possibility of women writers behind anonymous early Jewish and Christian texts, see the exchange between Mary R. Lefkowitz and Ross S. Kraemer in the following: Mary R. Lefkowitz, "Did Ancient Women Write Novels?" in "Women Like This: New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World," ed. Amy-Jill Levine (Leiden: Brill, 1997) 259-72; Seizer seems to attribute the appendix to the author of the gospel (268). It is also possible that the verse refers to the group of appearances only, or that the number reflects an older, unrecoverable source of appearances in Galilee.

11. In John 19:35 ("the one who has seen has testified"), the third-person singular masculine participle has been taken as referring to the author, who is identified as the beloved disciple. More recently, the author is distinguished from the beloved disciple, who is understood to be the real or symbolic mediator of the tradition. It is also possible 19:35 refers to the spirit; 1 John 5:6 identifies the spirit as the one who testifies.

12. See Raymond E. Brown, "Roles of Women in the Gospel of John," *Theological Studies* 36 (1975): 688-99, reprinted in Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple: The Life, Loves and Hates of an Individual Christ in New Testament Times* (New York: Paulist, 1979); Elisabeth Schüssler Florenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad, 1983) 323-34.

13. See chapter 5.

14. Ibid.

15. Reported in Buschius, *Ecclastical History* 5:16:17.

16. Builtman not only rejects the idea that it applies to a real woman, but also questions whether it can apply to a real congregation. The Johannine Epistles, trans. R. Philip O'Hara with Lane C. McCaughy and Robert W. Funk, Hermenia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973) 107-8.

17. Ross S. Kraemer, *Her Share of the Blessings: Women's Religions among Pagans, Jews and Christians in the Greco-Roman World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992) 176.
18. Pheme Perkins, *The Early Church and the Crisis of Gnosticism* (New York: Paulist, 1980); Ruth Majercik, "Dialogue," ABD 2:185-88, esp. 188.
19. John Chrysostom, *Homilies* 30-35 on the Gospel of John.
20. Gall R. O'Day, *Mark's Contrast on Other Grounds: "John," in The Women's Bible Commentary*, ed. Carol A. Newsom and Sharon H. Ringe (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1992) 295.
21. R. Builtman, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971) 189, n.3; Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, Volume 1: Anchor Bible Commentary, Volume 29 (New York: Doubleday, 1966) 171.
22. For a reproduction see John Ward-Parkins and Amanda Claridge, *Pompeii A.D. 79: Essay and Catalogue* (New York: Knopf, 1978) 24.
23. Theodor Zahn, cited in Builtman, *Gospel of John* 189, who rejects this reading.
24. So also O'Day, "John," 296.
25. Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews* 13:255; worship continued after that date and, like the temple, Mount Gerizim was also defended against the Romans in 70 CE, with colossal Samaritan losses (Josephus, *Jewish War* 3:7-32).
26. On the Jewishness of Martha and Mary in John, see esp. Adèle Reinhardt, "From Narrative to History: The Resurrection of Mary and Martha," in Levine, "Women Like This" 161-184; Reinhardt, "The Gospel of John" in Elisabeth Schüssler Florenza, *Searching the Scriptures: Volume 2, A Feminist Commentary* (New York: Crossroad, 1994) 580-82.
27. It also provides a contrast to 11:39.
28. Even this is not clearly prophetic; it may only mean that he believes Mary's pronouncement.
29. Mary Rose D'Angelo, "A Critical Note: John 20:17 and Apocalypse of Moses 31," *JTS* n. s. 41 (1990) 529-36.
30. Rosemary R. Rueher, *Sexism and God-Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology* (Boston: Beacon, 1983) 150-58.
31. Claudia Seizer, "Excellent Women: Female Appearances to the Resurrection," *JBL* 116 (1997) 259-72; Seizer seems to attribute the appendix to the author of the gospel (268). It is also possible that the verse refers to the group of appearances only, or that the number reflects an older, unrecoverable source of appearances in Galilee.
32. Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990) 276-303.
33. Ibid. 274-76.
34. See Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels* 289-91.
35. See chapter 5.
36. Ibid. 28 (1983) 29-48.
37. Plutarch (*The Brevity of Women*, *Moral Essays* 242B-E) attributes this view to Thucydides, contrasting it with a less stringent opinion on the part of Gorgias and setting the stage for the Roman custom of ennobling women, as well as men, at least after death.
38. This description of the genre is that of Adela Yarbro Collins, *The Beginning of the Gospel: Readings of Mark in Context* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1991) 29-48.
39. Cortey, *Private Woman* 87.

41. Mary Rose D'Angelo, "Women in Luke-Acts: A Redactional View," *JBL* 109/3 (1990) 447-48.
42. W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge University Press, 1966) 42-23; Corley, *Private Woman* 87.
43. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *But She Said: Feminist Practices of Biblical Interpretation* (Bos-ton: Beacon, 1992) 12.
44. Septimius Severus eventually made it an independent province.
45. (Pseudo-) Pivarch, *Sayings of the Spartan Women*, *Moralia* 240C-42D.
46. Kerenyi, *Her Share of the Blessings* 133.
47. See Suzanne Dixon, *The Roman Mother* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988) 210-32.
48. For the fuller discussion on which this is based, see Mary Rose D'Angelo, "Gen-der and Power in the Gospel of Mark: The Daughter of Jairus and the Woman with the Flow of Blood" in *Aspects of the Miraculous in Ancient Judaism and Christianity*, ed. John C. Cavadi (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, forthcoming). See also chapter 3.
49. E.g., Daniel Harrington, "The Gospel According to Mark," *New Jerome Biblical Com-mentary*, 4:136, ed. Raymond E. Brown, J. Fitzmyer, and R. Murphy (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1988) 608.
50. See Johanna Dewey, "The Gospel of Mark" in Schüssler Fiorenza, *Searching the Scriptures* 483; Marla J. Selvidge, *Woman, Cult and Miracle Narrative: A Redactional Critical Investigation on Mark 5:24-34* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 1990) 83. See also Selvidge, "Mark 5:25-34 and Leviticus 15:19-20: A Reaction to Restrictive Purity Regulations," *JBL* 103 (1984) 619-623; Selvidge's material is reused in a Japanese feminist reading of Mark that seeks to challenge purity restrictions in Japanese religions and popular culture: Hisako Kimikawa, *Woman and Jesus in Mark* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1994).
51. See chapter 3.
52. D'Angelo, "Gender and Power," Amy-Jill Levine, "Discharging Responsibility: Mathews Jesus, Biblical Law and Hemorrhaging Women," in *Measures New and Old: New Essays in Matthean Studies*, ed. Mark Allan Powell and David Bauer (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996) 388.
53. Johanna Dewey, "Jesus' Healings of Women: Conformity and Non-Conformity to Dominant Cultural Values as Historical Reconstruction," *SBL Seminar Papers* (1993) 187-88.
54. Antoinette Wire, "The Gospel Miracle Stories and Their Tellers," *Semina* 11 (1978) 83-113.
55. *Ibid.* 99-108 for the full description of demand stories.
56. *Ibid.* 100.
57. Gerd Theissen, *The Miracle Stories of the Early Christian Tradition*, trans. Francis McDoo-nagh (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) 90-93.
58. See also John Donahue, "Though the story reflects popular belief in the physical power of holy people [cf. Acts 5:15; 19:11-12], the final words of Jesus shift the emphasis to the faith of the woman" in "Mark," *Harpers Bible Commentary*, ed. James L. Mays (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988) 991.
59. Wire, "Gospel Miracle Stories" 102.
60. Pivarch, *Salla* 35.
61. Theissen infers from this anecdote that a woman's touch could have been seen as dangerous and hostile and attributes both Valeria Messalla's excuse and the "timidity" of the woman in Mark to this fear (Miracle Stories 134).
62. See also Mary Rose D'Angelo, "Theology in Mark and Q: Abba and 'Father' in Context," *HTR* 85 (1992) 156-62.
63. Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* 4.45.

64. Sharyn Echols Dowd, *Power, Power, and the Problem of Suffering: Mark 11:22-25 in the Context of Markan Theology* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988); Collins, *Beginning of the Gospel* 58-72.
65. For a fuller treatment, see D'Angelo, "Gender and Power."
66. Soranus, *Gynecology* 3.26; trans. Owsel Temkin, Soranus' *Gynecology* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins, 1956) 149.
67. See Gerd Theissen, *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978) 11.
68. For a more extensive presentation of this argument, see Mary Rose D'Angelo, "Remarriage and the Divorce Sayings Attributed to Jesus," in *Divorce and Remarriage: Religious and Psychological Perspectives*, ed. William F. Roberts (Kansas City, MO: Sheed and Ward, 1990) 78-106, esp. 94-95.
69. Johanna Dewey, "The Gospel of Mark" 491; E. Schüssler Fiorenza (in *Mammy of Her* 143, 149) credits these ideas to a pre-Markan tradition.
70. *Lex Julia de adulteriis coercendis*; see discussion in Susan Treggiari, *Roman Marriage: Last Comings from the Time of Cicero to the time of Ulpian* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991) 277-98, esp. 294.
71. See chapter 3.
72. D'Angelo, "Remarriage and the Divorce Sayings" 99.
73. So Dewey, "Gospel of Mark" 506-8.