

NEWCASTLE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

089 60431 9

Thesis L3673

AND THEY SAID NOTHING TO ANYONE

A redaction-critical study of the role and status of women
in the crucifixion, burial and resurrection stories
of the canonical and apocryphal gospels

by

Mary Catherine Carson (B.A., P.G.C.E.)

A Thesis submitted to the
University of Newcastle upon Tyne
for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

1990

**Abstract of Dissertation submitted
for PhD Degree
University of Newcastle upon Tyne,
1990**

M.C. CARSON, B.A., P.G.C.E.

AND THEY SAID NOTHING TO ANYONE

A redaction-critical study of the role and status of women in the crucifixion, burial and resurrection stories of the canonical and apocryphal gospels.

The overall aim of this research is to ascertain the position and status of women in the early church as reflected in the most important event for the Christian tradition - the resurrection of Jesus. In the course of this study, we will be attempting to unravel the source- and tradition-critical relationships in these narratives in an attempt to make sense of these texts and the redaction-critical processes involved.

In order to place this redaction-critical study in its wider context we will begin by looking briefly at the relevant background material. This will involve a short review of the general role and status of women in Judaism and the Graeco-Roman world and an examination of women in the early church. Our treatment of the stories of the crucifixion, burial and resurrection traditions will be developed within a framework of source-, form-, and redaction-critical analysis. The aim of this investigation will be to construct an interpretative framework within which we can assess the attitude to women in the early church as reflected in these particular narratives and the extent, if any, to which this attitude was influenced by questions of the acceptability of women as official representatives of the Christian Church.

The thesis is divided into six chapters. In our introduction we will briefly address the question of methodology and in particular we will look at feminist approaches to the bible. Throughout this investigation the tools of source, form and redaction criticism are used with contributions from the more recent disciplines of wider literary criticism and feminist hermeneutics. Chapter One provides a brief introduction to the role and status of women in the ancient world and

then focuses on women in the early church with special emphasis on equality and subordination of women. The next five chapters are devoted to the canonical and apocryphal stories of the crucifixion, burial and resurrection. We begin with Mark's gospel and then move on to the subsequent redactional treatment of the Marcan stories within the canonical and extra-canonical traditions where there is a source relationship between a text or a tradition critical comparison where Mark is not the source and the tradition is independent. The main question we will raise here concerns whether women were redacted out of, or into, the developing tradition. Beyond this, we need to consider what meaning each gospel writer intended these stories to convey, and how the first century reader might have understood this material being the audience to whom it was addressed. In particular the treatment of these stories will be related to the question of women's leadership in the early church. The conclusion will then draw together the themes developed in each of the individual chapters and attempt a dialogue with various feminist exegetes with reference to the particular redactional observations we have made in order to show how our distinctive reading of the data integrates with the overall enterprise of feminist hermeneutics.

In general our research has led us to conclude that the presentation of women in these stories is intimately connected with the question of the acceptability of women's leadership in the early church. We, therefore, have identified an attempt to write men back into the traditions at certain points with the effect that the women's role is thereby eclipsed. This redactional process does not, however, proceed unchallenged and within both the canonical and apocryphal traditions the conflict between male and female witness continues and is sometimes resolved in women's favour. Thus the role and status of women in the stories of the crucifixion, burial and resurrection can only ultimately be understood against the wider background of the struggles of the developing church and its relationship with various so-called 'heretical' groups and the position/status afforded to women within these traditions.

PREFACE

This thesis began with a desire to combine an interest in feminism with the study of the New Testament. The idea was first suggested by my supervisor, Dr. W.R. Telford, who was aware of my interest in both subjects. As a student I have benefited from Dr. Telford's scholarly advice and criticism. On a more personal note, both he and his wife Andrena have welcomed my husband and I into their home, and, to the amazement of the staff in the maternity unit of Shotley Bridge General Hospital, he even sent me flowers on the birth of my daughter with the attached card bearing a quote from 1 Tim 2:15 (thankfully not in Greek!).

I also owe my thanks to Linda Allen for her help and guidance with German. To the inter-library loan staff of Newcastle University Library, and in particular to Irene Dunn, I am very grateful for both their efficiency and thoroughness. The typing of the final draft of this thesis is the work of Bridget Yhearm, and I am indebted to her for her skill and professionalism. I would also like to note my thanks for her translation of several French articles. Although I am ultimately responsible for the proof-reading of this work, Louisa Beall has given help with this task.

Finally, I owe the biggest debt of gratitude to my family, particularly my sister Paula, my husband Paddy and daughter Aiveen who have all sacrificed many afternoons and evenings to the women at the tomb. I am looking forward to resuming normal family life, and I hope that when we have all had a chance to recover we will look back on the sacrifices we have made and feel they have all been worthwhile.

ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations for periodicals, reference works and serials used in this dissertation can be found in the Journal of Biblical Literature 95 (1976), pp. 331-346 and more recently in the Catholic Biblical Quarterly 50 (1988), pp. 769-776. Abbreviations of the Mishnah and Talmud are from J. Bowker, The Targums and Rabbinic Literature (Cambridge: University Press, 1969), pp. xvii-xxi. In addition, the following abbreviations are used:

BAG

A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. W. Bauer, W.F. Arndt, F.W. Gingrich. 2nd edn. ed. F.W. Danker. (Chicago: University Press, 1979).

BDF

A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. F. Blass, A. Debrunner. Rev. R. Funk (Chicago: University Press, 1961).

NTApoc

New Testament Apocrypha. Volume I, Gospels and Related Writings. E. Hennecke. Ed. W. Schneemelcher. ET R. McL. Wilson (London: Lutterworth Press, 1963).

N and PNF

A Selected Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. 1st Series. Ed. P. Schaff (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956).

A Selected Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. 2nd Series. Ed. P. Schaff, H. Wace (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952-57).

References to the Greek text are from the British and Foreign Bible Society edition (London, 1958, ed. E. Nestle, G.D. Kilpatrick), references to the English text of the Bible being from the Revised Standard Version (London: Collins, 1973).

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
PREFACE.....	iv
ABBREVIATIONS.....	v
CONTENTS.....	vi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
NOTES.....	12

Chapter

ONE - WOMEN IN THE EARLY CHURCH.....	14
A. THE ROLE AND STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE EARLY CHURCH.....	19
1. Equality of Women?.....	21
(a) Women in the house churches and wealthy female patrons.....	22
(b) Women as co-workers.....	23
(c) Female prophets.....	24
(d) Galatians 3:28.....	24
(e) 1 Corinthians 7.....	26
Summation on the equality of women in the early church.....	38
2. Subordination of Women?.....	38
(a) 1 Cor 11:2-16.....	39
(b) 1 Cor 14:33b-36.....	46
(c) Women in the Household Codes.....	47
Summation on the subordination of women.....	48
Conclusion on the role and status of women in the early church.....	49
B. WOMEN IN THE CHURCH FATHERS.....	50
(a) General attitudes towards women - dualism, creation, the fall and redemption.....	51
(b) Marriage.....	54
(c) Virginity.....	56

(d) Martyrdom.....	58
(e) The Ministry of Women in the Early Church.....	59
(i) Widows.....	59
(ii) Deaconesses.....	61
(f) Heretical groups and their attitudes towards women.....	62
Conclusion.....	66
CONCLUSION ON WOMEN IN THE EARLY CHURCH.....	67
NOTES.....	69

TWO - WOMEN IN MARK'S ACCOUNT OF THE CRUCIFIXION, BURIAL AND EMPTY TOMB.....

A. THE CRUCIFIXION - MARK 15:40-1.....	92
Summation.....	104
B. THE BURIAL - MARK 15:42-7.....	105
1. vv. 44-5.....	106
2. v. 46.....	106
3. v. 47.....	107
Summation.....	107
C. THE EMPTY TOMB - MARK 16:1-8.....	107
1. v. 1.....	109
2. v. 2.....	110
3. vv. 3-4.....	110
4. vv. 5-7.....	111
5. v. 8.....	115
Summation.....	118
CONCLUSION.....	119
NOTES.....	122

THREE - WOMEN IN MATTHEW'S ACCOUNT OF THE CRUCIFIXION, BURIAL AND EMPTY TOMB.....

A. THE CRUCIFIXION - Mt 27:55-6.....	142
1. v. 55.....	143
Summation.....	155
B. THE BURIAL - Mt 27:57-61.....	156
1. v. 57.....	157
2. v. 58.....	157
3. v. 59.....	158

4. v. 60.....	158
5. v. 61.....	159
Summation.....	159
C. THE GUARD AT THE TOMB - Mt 27:62-6; 28:4, 11-14.....	160
Summation.....	162
D. THE EMPTY TOMB - Mt 28:1-8.....	162
1. v. 1.....	163
2. vv. 2-4.....	164
(a) v. 2.....	165
(b) v. 3.....	165
(c) v. 4.....	166
3. vv. 5-6.....	167
4. vv. 7-8.....	167
E. THE CHRISTOPHANY TO THE WOMEN - Mt 28:9-10.....	168
Summation.....	170
CONCLUSION.....	171
NOTES.....	173

FOUR - WOMEN IN LUKE'S ACCOUNT OF THE CRUCIFIXION, BURIAL

AND EMPTY TOMB.....	181
A. THE CRUCIFIXION - Lk 23:48-9.....	185
1. v. 48.....	187
2. v. 49.....	188
Summation.....	198
B. THE BURIAL - Lk 23:50-56a.....	200
1. v. 50.....	201
2. v. 51.....	201
3. v. 52.....	201
4. v. 53.....	202
5. v. 54.....	202
6. vv. 55-56a.....	202
Summation.....	203
C. THE EMPTY TOMB - Lk 23:56b-24:12.....	203
1. vv. 23:56b-24:1.....	206
2. v. 2.....	206
3. v. 3.....	207
4. v. 4.....	207
5. v. 5.....	208

6. vv. 6-8.....	209
7. vv. 9 and 11.....	210
8. v. 10.....	211
9. v. 12.....	213
Summation.....	214
CONCLUSION.....	215
NOTES.....	220

FIVE - WOMEN IN JOHN'S ACCOUNT OF THE CRUCIFIXION, BURIAL AND

EMPTY TOMB.....	230
A. THE CRUCIFIXION - Jn 19:25-7.....	238
1. v. 25.....	239
2. vv. 26-7.....	242
(a) v. 26.....	243
(b) v. 27.....	244
Summation.....	247
B. THE BURIAL - Jn 19:38-42.....	248
1. v. 38.....	250
2. vv. 39-40.....	251
3. v. 41.....	252
4. v. 42.....	253
Summation.....	253
C. THE EMPTY TOMB - Jn 20:1-18.....	254
1. Mary Magdalene at the Tomb - Jn 20:1-2.....	258
(a) v. 1.....	259
(b) v. 2.....	261
Summation.....	263
2. The Disciples at the Tomb.....	263
Summation.....	267
D. THE ANGELOPHANY - Jn 20:11-14a.....	267
Summation.....	268
E. THE CHRISTOPHANY TO MARY MAGDALENE - Jn 20:14-18.....	269
Summation.....	271
SUMMATION ON JOHN 20:1-18.....	271
CONCLUSION.....	272
NOTES.....	276

SIX - WOMEN IN THE CRUCIFIXION, BURIAL AND RESURRECTION	
ACCOUNTS OF THE APOCRYPHAL TRADITION.....	289
A. THE CRUCIFIXION.....	297
1. The Gospel of Nicodemus.....	297
2. The Gospel of Peter.....	299
3. The Gospel of Bartholomew.....	301
Summation.....	301
B. THE BURIAL.....	302
1. The Gospel of Peter.....	303
2. The Gospel of Nicodemus.....	306
Summation.....	307
C. THE RESURRECTION STORIES.....	307
1. The Gospel of Peter.....	311
2. The Epistula Apostolorum.....	314
3. The Syriac Didascalia.....	317
4. The Gospel of Nicodemus.....	320
5. The Sophia of Jesus Christ.....	321
6. The Dialogue of the Redeemer.....	322
7. The Pistis Sophia.....	322
8. The Gospel of Mary.....	323
Summation.....	324
CONCLUSION.....	326
NOTES.....	328
 CONCLUSION.....	 333
NOTES.....	347
 BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	 348

INTRODUCTION

The title of this thesis is taken from the earliest narrative account of the most important event in the Christian tradition - the resurrection of Jesus. This is an event which has periodically caused controversy with the most recent example being the statements of the Bishop of Durham and the interpretations placed on those statements. It is an issue which is also pertinent to women. Although the writers of the canonical gospels do not actually describe the resurrection itself, they are all agreed that it is a visit by a woman, or a group of women to the tomb of Jesus which sets in motion the events of the first day of the week.

This reference to the women in the empty tomb narratives and their role as witnesses with a message to deliver brings us to another important issue. This is the continuing debate concerning the role and status of women in the church today. The immediate background here is the appointment of the first woman bishop within the Anglican communion. The reactions to this appointment have not been unlike some of the reactions we find to the stories of Mk 16:1-8 and parallels. According to the second century Platonist, Celsus, it hardly seems credible that we should be expected to accept the subjective reports of a female believer, among others, as proof of the resurrection. We read:

"But the question is, whether any one who was really dead ever rose with a veritable body. Or do you imagine the statements of others not only to be myths, but to have the appearance of such, while you have discovered a becoming and credible termination to your drama in the voice from the cross, when he breathed his last, and in the earthquake and the darkness? That while alive he was of no assistance to himself, but that when dead he rose again, and showed the marks of his punishment, and how his hands were pierced with nails: who beheld this? A half-frantic woman, as you state, and some other one, perhaps, of those who were engaged in the same system of delusion, who had either dreamed so, owing to a peculiar state of mind, or under the influence of a wandering imagination had formed to himself an appearance according to his own wishes, which has been the case with numberless individuals; or, which is most probable, one who desired to impress others with this portent, and by such falsehood to furnish an occasion to impostors like himself."¹

Before addressing ourselves to the specific literary task of examining the role and status of women in the stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb, we need to outline what prompted the present writer to focus on these narratives concerning women.

Like many other studies on women in religion, this thesis has its roots in the contemporary feminist movement.² While it is generally accepted that there is no one definition of feminism,³ for the present writer it represents an awareness of the inequalities experienced by woman in a society which continues to oppress her and treat her as 'other'.⁴ It is not a movement which is concerned solely with the liberation of women from this situation of inequality and stereotyping. In our opinion, feminism is concerned with realising the full humanity of both men and women.

Before embarking on this thesis the present writer had no experience of feminist theology, although she had previously taken a degree in theology. This research, therefore, began with an examination of the literature in this field. It soon became apparent that there was no one feminist theology or feminist perspective on the bible beyond an attempt to hold theology accountable to the modern world and the struggle for women's equality, dignity and power. All feminist theology does, however, begin with the assertion that the Judeo-Christian tradition does not support the liberation of women in various ways, including exclusion from language, ministry, biblical teaching and interpretation.⁵

The roots of feminist theology are usually traced to the work of the nineteenth century suffragist and activist E. Cady Stanton who, together with her committee, was responsible for The Woman's Bible (1895-1898). Those involved in this project recognised that the bible had been used to support the economic and social oppression of women. To correct this situation, Stanton and the others provided their own translations and commentary on those passages in the bible which involved women.

Since this pioneering work there have been many books and articles produced on feminist theology, particularly over the last thirty years. In the following survey we would like to indicate the range of literature available. In particular we will focus on feminist hermeneutics since this area provides an interesting perspective from which we can approach our three stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb. The material we will cover below is not, therefore, intended to be an exhaustive study, but an indication of some of the important contributions and developments in this field.

The work of Stanton and her group was followed by that of V.

Salving Goldstein who produced The Human Situation: A Feminine View (1960). In this work, Goldstein argued that the sexual identity of a theologian affected his or her relationship with the text, and beyond this that Protestant theology supported the current stereotyping of women into submissive and self-negating roles.

In a recent review of feminist theology C.P. Christ (1977) provided a useful analysis of current developments in the field where she divided feminist theologians into 'reformists' and 'revolutionaries'. 'Reformists' are those feminist theologians who believe there is a 'usable past' within the Judeo-Christian tradition with the essential core of Christian truth expressed in statements such as Gal 3:28. The 'revolutionaries' are those feminists who have decided that the Judeo-Christian tradition is not reformable. For them the essential core of this tradition is one where the divine power is personified as male. He is Father, Lord, King, Master and Judge. Christianity is irredeemably patriarchal⁶ and is rejected in favour of a 'gynocentric' or woman-centred theology. This latter form of feminist theology is advocated in particular by M. Daly who has been responsible for a number of publications (1968, 1973, 1978) and is supported by writers such as N.R. Goldenberg (1979) and other works emerging from the goddess, spiritualist and wicca movements.

Since this present work involves a study of three biblical texts and is, therefore, rooted in the Christian tradition, it has more in common with the work of 'reformist' feminist theologians. R.R. Ruether is an important contributor within this branch of feminist theology and has produced numerous books and articles (1972, 1974, 1975, 1979a 1979b, 1982, 1983). Her perspective is one which sees feminism closely related to struggles for liberation among other oppressed groups including both Jews and blacks. She traces the ideological roots of oppression in Western culture to the dualistic world view which Christianity inherited from the ancient world. This alienating world view resulted in a soul-body, male-female dualism with the female representing lower carnal nature and man the superior, spiritual world.

Ruether calls for the transformation of these negative symbols of oppression and she finds the critical impulse for such liberation within the bible itself. More particularly, she looks to the prophetic-messianic tradition in the bible which she identifies as the process whereby the biblical tradition constantly re-evaluates itself in new

contexts. Here contemporary society is condemned as sinful, unjust and idolatrous. Ruether herself recognises that the prophets did not address the issue of sexism although she does not see this as a problem. She states:

One cannot reify any critical prophetic movement, either in scripture or in modern liberation movements, simply as definitive text, once and for all established in the past, which then sets the limits of consciousness of the meaning of liberation. Rather, the prophetic tradition remains true to itself, to its own impulse and spirit, only by engagement in constant restatement in the context of the issues of justice and injustice in its times.⁷

L.M. Russell (1974, 1976, 1985) is another 'reformist' theologian who sees the bible as the 'liberating word' although she recognises that the message may need to be liberated from 'sexist interpretations'.⁸ Along with Ruether, Russell sees this liberation of biblical interpretation as liberation from one-sided, white, middle-class interpretation and hence she too identifies feminism with other liberation movements. Russell reads the bible from the perspective of the oppressed, with God cast in the role of liberator. To support this interpretation she focuses in particular on texts such as the Exodus narrative, the prophets and the message of Jesus, using these sections as the norm by which other passages should be understood.

P. Tribble is a 'reformist' feminist theologian responsible for developing a perspective on feminist theology which approaches the texts using the tools of modern rhetorical criticism (1973, 1978, 1982a, 1982b, 1984). Tribble began her work by discovering and recovering traditions within the bible which challenged the misogyny she found there. In her work God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality (1978), she highlights neglected metaphors which have been used to describe God. Thus pregnant woman, mother, wife and mistress are included alongside father, husband, king and warrior to illustrate the biblical metaphor of the image of God as both male and female (Gn 1:27).⁹ Apart from her interesting studies of the Genesis myths, Tribble has also moved on to re-tell biblical stories of terror, that is stories of abused women, in memoriam (1984). Here she offers sympathetic treatments of abused women such as the betrayal, rape, murder and dismemberment of the concubine in Judges 19 using a variety of methodologies and disciplines to develop her perspective.

In the field of New Testament studies, E. Schüssler Fiorenza combines an interest in historical-critical methods, hermeneutics and feminist analysis. Fiorenza has attempted a feminist reconstruction of

early Christianity and in her work In Memory of Her (1983), she claims the Jesus movement was originally an egalitarian movement. However, in later New Testament times, male-centred interpretation and editing of earlier traditions played down or covered over the important roles of women, either because these roles were seen as unimportant or threatening (1979, 1983b).

We will examine Fiorenza's hermeneutical approach below, and, for the present, we would highlight the attention she has given to the leadership roles which were held by women within the early Christian movement. A number of feminist studies have looked at the ministry of women in the early church and, as R.S. Kraemer (1983) has noted, many of these have been prompted by the continuing debate on the question of the ordination of women (Daniélou 1961; Stendahl, 1966; Harkness, 1972; Travard, 1972; van der Meer, 1973; Gryson, 1976; Carroll, 1975; Gardiner, 1976; Swidler, 1977; Stuhlmuehler, 1978; Tetlow, 1980).¹⁰ This issue is one which has a bearing upon our present study. Our examination of the role of the women at the cross and the tomb will be linked to an assessment of the position and status of women within the early Christian movement as a whole.

Although there are no sayings of Jesus which explicitly deal with the question of the role and status of women, a number of feminist studies have looked at Jesus' attitude towards women as reflected in his various encounters with women (Swidler, 1971; Walhberg, 1975, 1978; Stagg, 1978; Laurentin, 1980; Moltmann-Wendel, 1982; Evans, 1983). B. Witherington has recently recognised a gap in many of these treatments which he claims are for the most part on a non-technical level. In his Women in the Ministry of Jesus (1984), he offers a detailed exegetical treatment of women in the teaching and ministry of Jesus. Finally, various other studies of the gospels have focused on how the evangelists have portrayed women (Brennan, 1971; Parvey, 1974; Brown, 1975; Platt, 1977; Flannagan, 1978a, 1978b, Witherington, 1979; Maly, 1980; Schierling, 1980; Munro, 1980; Schmitt, 1981; Schneiders, 1982).¹¹

We will not concern ourselves here with those studies which deal with the apostle Paul or the church fathers since both these areas will be covered in our chapter on women in the early church. However, before concluding our examination of the literature we should note that a small number of studies have examined the role of Mary in the New Testament (Collins, 1970; Brown et. al., 1978; Kung and Moltmann, 1983; Lewis,

1984; Grassi, 1986). In the work of Fiorenza (1983a, 1983b) and L. Schottruff (1983), in particular, we also see that the question of the role and status of women in the early church is related to current sociological studies of the early church.

What is noticeable from this survey is that there has been relatively little attention given to the story of the women at the tomb. Fiorenza does deal with the question of Mary Magdalene as witness within the context of the continuing struggle between her and Peter as the primary resurrection witness (1975b, 1979). M. Hengel (1963) and Schottruff (1982) have examined the significance of Mary Magdalene as a resurrection witness. However, as we will discover in our literary examination of the stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb, most studies of these texts have not been undertaken from a feminist perspective. The primary concern has not been to examine the role and status of women as reflected in the empty tomb narratives, but with the development of the resurrection narratives and the theological perspectives of the individual writers.¹² Even E.L. Bode's, The First Easter Morning. The Gospel Accounts of the Women's Visit to the Tomb of Jesus (1970), is not primarily concerned with the question of the significance of the women at the tomb and whether these women were presented in a positive or negative light.

We will consider our own specific questions concerning the narratives of the empty tomb towards the end of our introduction, but for the present we must explain what is meant by a 'feminist perspective' on the bible. What exactly are feminist theologians doing when they say they are approaching the biblical texts from a feminist perspective?

M.A. Farley begins her examination of 'Feminist Consciousness and the Interpretation of Scripture' (1985) by quoting Lk 24:9-11. She asks the reader to consider whether the women returning from the tomb are "... beguiled by an illusion, used by traditions of which they are part, adding one more turn to the plot of a story that is only fiction or perhaps even deception or, worse, a story that will serve forever to injure the women who either tell it or hear it."¹³ These are the sorts of questions which one begins to ask when we look closely at those stories in the bible which deal with women.

Feminist hermeneutics does not, however, present us with one way of

approaching the bible, and as with feminist theology, there are a variety of feminist hermeneutical perspectives on the bible. Both C. Osiek (1985) and K.D. Sakenfeld (1985) have produced excellent review articles on the various methodologies employed by feminist theologians and S.M. Schneiders (1989) even raises the question of the legitimacy of raising such questions. According to Sakenfeld, feminists approach the bible with three different emphases: 1) looking to the texts about women to counteract texts used 'against' women, 2) looking to the bible generally and not particularly texts about women for a theological perspective offering a critique of patriarchy (sometimes called a liberation perspective), 3) looking to texts about women to learn from the history and stories of ancient and modern women living in patriarchal cultures (an approach reflected in the works of Tribble and Fiorenza in particular).

Osiek reviews Sakenfeld's categories and suggests her own five ways of categorising the various hermeneutical perspectives. These are, namely: 1) rejectionist, 2) loyalist, 3) revisionist, 4) sublimist and 5) liberationist. The first division is fairly self-explanatory and refers to those feminists who reject the bible and the Judeo-Christian tradition as irredeemably patriarchal. The second category, the loyalist approach, refers to those feminists who assert the essential validity and goodness of the biblical tradition. The third group of revisionists argue that while the biblical tradition is worth saving, it has been cast in a patriarchal mould and they move, therefore, towards the rehabilitation of the tradition through reform. The sublimists look to the glorification of the eternal feminine aspect of the tradition. They are separatist feminists and entertain no thoughts of equality or reconciliation with the male realm. Finally, liberationists approach the bible from a similar perspective to other liberation theologians.

The subject of feminist hermeneutics is one which has attracted an increasing amount of scholarly attention in recent years and numerous issues of scholarly journals have been given over to the subject.¹⁴ Having said this, feminist theologians are also very aware of the fact that their approach is looked upon as being 'ideologically suspect' and indeed their work has remained on the fringes of theology with little impact on mainstream biblical studies (Bass 1982). It is, therefore, important to outline some of the hermeneutical insights of feminist theologians which have inevitably informed our own approach to the

biblical texts.

Feminist theologians begin by challenging what Fiorenza terms the "scholarly pretence of value neutrality and objectivity of modern scholarship."¹⁵ Along with other feminist theologians, Fiorenza recognises that all interpretations of a text are subjective and influenced by the interests and concerns of the interpreter.¹⁶ The whole objective/subjective or exegesis/eisegesis argument is seen to be a false perception. Beyond this feminist theology shares with other liberation theologies the belief that all theological interpretation and historical scholarship is engaged for or against marginal and oppressed people and within such a context intellectual neutrality is not possible. Feminists, therefore, challenge the assumption of women's cultural marginality and religious subordination. Fiorenza and others would also challenge those who criticise the validity of their attempt to interpret biblical texts in terms of women's present experience. She comments:

Scholarly objections to the intellectual engagement of feminist theology and historiography overlook the fact that interpretations and reconstructions of the past are always defined by contemporary questions and horizons.¹⁷

According to feminists, not only have women been excluded from shaping and interpreting tradition from their own experience, but the tradition has been shaped and interpreted against them. What this means for Ruether is that

The tradition has been shaped to justify their exclusion. The traces of their presence have been suppressed and lost from the public memory of the community. The androcentric bias of the male interpreters of the tradition, who regard maleness as normative humanity, not only erase women's presence in the past history of the community but silence even the questions about their absence. One is not even able to remark upon or notice women's absence, since women's silence and absence is the norm.¹⁸

In terms of the biblical tradition, therefore, New Testament scholarship assumes, because of its own androcentric world view, that women were marginal figures in early Christianity and they did not occupy leadership roles. This perspective leads scholars to overlook sources for women in the early Christian movement and they interpret prescriptive statements as descriptive.¹⁹

In order to counteract such bias in scholarship, feminist theologians call for a "hermeneutics of suspicion".²⁰ They see androcentric texts as "... selective articulations of men often expressing as well as maintaining patriarchal historical conditions."²¹ They

further recognise that the bible came into existence in a strongly patriarchal environment and is a product of its own time. Beyond this, Fiorenza asks us to consider the fact that androcentric language can also function as inclusive language. Women may have been included more frequently among the audiences which were addressed by Paul and others than we have previously been conditioned to consider.²²

Another point which Fiorenza asks us to bear in mind is that the results of modern historical-critical scholarship have led us to view the gospel writers in a new light. We now recognise that the early Christian writers selected, redacted and reformulated traditions and sources according to their own theological intentions.²³ We should not, therefore, assume that women were overlooked in this redaction process.

A final point which is raised by Fiorenza is that the canonization of the New Testament did not take place in a vacuum but was carried out against a background where the church was involved in a bitter struggle with various so-called heretical groups.²⁴ For Fiorenza, this struggle resulted in a gradual patriarchalisation of the early Christian movement. It was also a controversy which involved a dispute concerning the legitimacy of women's leadership. Thus, in order for us to gain a true perspective on the role and status of women in the early church, we need to include all the available sources for women in the early church, both canonical and non-canonical. She sums up her approach:

If the "silences" about women's historical experience and theological contributions in the early Christian movement are produced by androcentric language, texts, and historical models of reconstruction, then we have to find ways to "break" the silences of the texts and to derive meaning from androcentric historiography and narrative. Rather than understand the texts as an adequate reflection of the reality about which they speak, we have to search for rhetorical clues and allusions that indicate the reality about which the texts are silent.²⁵

Fiorenza is rejecting the argument from silence as a valid historical judgement and she is asking us to search for clues in the text which may point to another reality. These clues should then be used to integrate them into a feminist model of historical reconstruction so that we can fill out the silences in the text and see them as part of the submerged traditions of the egalitarian early Christian movement.

To sum up, then, feminist hermeneutics provides us with some important insights on the processes which were involved in the selection, editing and reformulation of early Christian sources. In terms of our own study we are approaching the biblical texts from a perspective which is informed by a reading of feminist theology and the issues which have been raised by feminist theologians. This reading has led to a general consciousness-raising regarding the treatment of women in the biblical texts both by the writers of those texts and their subsequent interpreters.

As to the precise methods we will be using in our analysis of the stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb those we will use are the traditional techniques of source, form and redaction criticism with an input from more recent developments in the field of modern literary criticism. We will briefly outline this approach in our introduction to Mark's treatment of the stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb. It is also important, however, that we draw attention at the outset to some of the questions we will be asking of these texts.

Beginning with the question of sources we will be examining the various texts of the empty tomb story in particular and asking questions about the sources used by the evangelists and the way in which these are put together. We will look here at the question of the relationship between the empty tomb narrative in the Synoptic gospels and the Johannine story. We will be interested to learn whether John²⁶ represents an independent tradition over against the Synoptics and if so whether the Johannine story is an earlier version than that which we find in Mark 16:1f. and parallels. In our examination of possible sources used by the evangelist we will, therefore, be paying particular attention to the unity of the texts and looking at internal tensions or repetitions. We will focus on areas of agreement and points of difference between the various writers. With the story of the discovery of the empty tomb this will include an examination of who actually goes to the tomb, the motivation for their visit, the time of their departure for the tomb, what they saw there, the message they received, their reaction to this, and finally, the reactions, if any, of those they tell about what they have seen and heard at the tomb.

Each of our individual chapters on the stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb will begin by noting the points of contact and

areas of disagreement between the various evangelists. In our detailed examination of the texts we will then go on to say something about how the individual evangelist has handled his source, his methods of writing and his interests and ideas. By looking at how the various writers have selected and handled their material we can begin to consider the question of how they perceived the role and status of women. Did they present the women at the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb in a positive or negative light? Did they feel any embarrassment over the presence of the women in the closing scenes of the gospel? Did they, therefore, try to write the men back into the traditions and silence the witness of the women?

Our review of feminist theology and particularly feminist hermeneutics has suggested to us that in order to gain a true perspective on the women in the stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb we need to consider all the available sources for women in Christianity. Thus the final part of our literary study will examine these texts as well as certain other relevant passages from the apocryphal gospels. It is only then that we can make any assessment on the marginality or otherwise of women in early Christianity.

Having introduced the apocryphal gospels as one aspect of the wider background for our study, we also need to note that the texts of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb represent only a small selection of the available traditions for women in the early church. In order to set our present study in its proper context, therefore, we need to look at the wider setting of the role and status of women within the early Christian movement. In our first chapter we will need to examine the treatment of women in the New Testament writings and the church fathers. In particular we will relate this examination to the title of this thesis "and they said nothing to anyone". We will, therefore, be particularly interested to see whether women were allowed to exercise leadership roles and to bear witness or whether there were any attempts to "silence" them.

INTRODUCTION - NOTES

1. Origen, Against Celsus LV, ANF, vol IV, p. 453.
2. See D.C. Bass (1982).
3. See R.R. Ruether (1983), pp. 41-45, 216-232 for an outline of three major directions in contemporary feminism. She defines these as liberal, socialist/Marxist, and romantic/radical.
4. See S. de Beauvoir (1983), pp. 16-21 for a discussion of woman as 'other'.
5. Some of these theories will be dealt with below in our examination of feminist hermeneutics. This thesis does not, however, address the modern issue of the ordination of women.
6. By use of the term 'patriarchy', feminists usually refer to a system where all the social roles and most character traits are ascribed according to sex and the positions of highest status and most highly prized characteristics e.g. intelligence, initiative, emotional strength and rationality are reserved for men. Here men are allowed to define themselves through a wide range of activities while women are defined almost exclusively in socio-biological terms as wife and mother, and are relegated to the home and family life. The feminine qualities which are approved of and considered feminine are those which are useful in serving, nurturing and home-making.
7. See Ruether (1985), p. 118. For a criticism of Ruether's interpretation of the prophetic movement see Christ (1977), pp. 206-207.
8. Thus Russell (1985), p. 11.
9. See also E.H. Pagels (1976 and 1980) and R.M. Gross (1976) among others for a discussion of the feminine aspect of the divine.
10. See Kraemer (1983), p. 128.
11. This list is obviously not exhaustive and many of the more detailed exegetical works will be referred to in the chapters on each individual evangelist.
12. Alsup is a recent example (1975). He is concerned with establishing the literary gattung of the traditional layers of the resurrection stories. See also P. Benoit (1969), C.F. Evans (1970), N. Perrin (1977) Fuller (1980) and P. Perkins (1984) for an examination of the resurrection stories which consider the similarities and differences between the various gospel accounts.
13. See Farley in Russell ed. (1985), p. 41.
14. See JSOT (1982); Semeia 28 (1983); Interpretation 42 (1988). See also A.Y. Collins, ed. (1985).
15. Thus Fiorenza (1982), p. 33.
16. See particularly M.A. Tolbert (1983), pp. 117f. who notes that the history of biblical scholarship bears out this theory. She points to the work of A. Schweitzer and his comments on the quest for the historical Jesus. More recently we also have the comments of Bultmann and his concept of pre-understanding (Vorverständnis).
17. Thus Fiorenza (1982), p. 34. See also (1983b), p. 302.
18. See Ruether (1985), pp. 112-113.
19. See Fiorenza (1982), pp. 35f. Here Fiorenza points to the two-fold way in which scholars translate androcentric language - as generic and gender specific. She notes that while exegetes assume the Pauline address ἀδελφοί includes brothers and sisters, they translate the term only as brothers. Leadership titles are also assumed to apply only to men even when we have evidence to the contrary. On this particular point see also B. Brooten (1977 and 1980).

20. See Fiorenza (1985), pp. 56f.
21. Ibid.
22. Many scholars assume that while 1 Cor 11:2-16 refers to women the remainder of 1 Cor 11-14 deals with male charismatics and male prophets. See Fiorenza (1982), p. 37.
23. See *ibid.*, p. 37.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 40f.
25. See Fiorenza (1985), p. 60.
26. In the course of the thesis we shall be referring to the authors of the gospels as Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, the second, third and fourth evangelist, and so on. The use of these terms is purely formal, and does not of itself presuppose any specific identifications with historical figures.

CHAPTER ONE

WOMEN IN THE EARLY CHURCH

In our examination of the role and status of women in the early church we will concentrate on the information provided by the New Testament writers and the early church fathers. Since Christianity did not, however, emerge in a vacuum, it is also important by way of introduction to say something briefly about the position and status of women in the ancient world.¹

We recognise at the outset that there are various problems associated with any attempts to compare Christian women with their female contemporaries. Christian women were also sometimes Roman women, or even converts from Judaism. There is the problem of which sources we should use and which statements we should accept as authoritative comments, reflecting the prevailing attitudes of the period. We also have to recognise that much of our material comes from different historical periods and indeed many of the statements regarding women may be prescriptive rather than descriptive.²

Looking first at women in Judaism it is fair to say that most comparisons between women in Christianity and their Jewish contemporaries have emphasised the negative aspect of the Jewish attitude toward women,³ without allowing room for pluriformity or variety in practice.⁴ It is also suggested that these studies do not take into account the significance of the law for Judaism and its assignment of woman to the private sphere and man to the public domain.⁵

The main roles open to Jewish women of this period were, therefore, as a wife and mother,⁶ and it was a situation where male children were looked upon more favourably than girls.⁷ A daughter was under the control of her father⁸ who arranged her marriage⁹ and then passed her over into the care of her husband.¹⁰ Furthermore, all women were expected to marry.¹¹ Within marriage women were, however, protected by the Ketubah¹² and the issuing of the get¹³ in the event of divorce was yet another attempt to provide women with a measure of security.¹⁴ Marital fidelity was assumed, at least on the wife's part, within Judaism, and adultery was defined in male terms.¹⁵

In the sphere of civil and criminal law, women were treated equally.¹⁶ It is disputed, however, whether women were allowed to bear

witness. The Jewish historian Josephus would suggest that their witness was not accepted. He states:

From women let no evidence be accepted, because of the levity and temerity of their sex.¹⁷

It is difficult to decide whether Jewish women were secluded,¹⁸ although the general consensus seems to be that if they were seen they were certainly not to be heard,¹⁹ and they are a snare to men.²⁰ Exceptions to this portrait do, however, appear and we read of Beruriah, wife of Rabbi Meir, who is known as a scholar.²¹

Turning briefly to the role of Jewish women in religion, we note that they were not expected to fulfil all the positive and time-bound ordinances which men were expected to fulfil, and neither could they make up the minyan.²² Instead family duties took precedence and we recall here the notorious statement of Rabbi Eliezar:

If any man gives his daughter a knowledge of the Law it is as though he taught her lechery.²³

Although it is usually accepted that women were segregated in the temple, it is disputed whether this segregation was in practice in the synagogues of the first century C.E.²⁴

To sum up then, Jewish women did not, on the whole, exercise leadership roles or serve as witnesses within the community. The main roles open to them were as a wife and mother, and on the whole women's sphere of influence remained within the home.

When looking at the position of women in Greece and Rome it is important to stress that the situation here is very complex and there were differences between historical periods, social classes and geographical location.²⁵ As with Jewish women, most of our information concerns women of the ruling classes.²⁶

The two main centres for evidence concerning the position of women in classical Greece are Sparta and Athens. It is usually accepted that Spartan women had more freedom than their Athenian counterparts,²⁷ and this is linked to the fact that Sparta was a militaristic society where women had an important role to play as childbearers.²⁸ As part of this emphasis on eugenics, Spartan women were, therefore, given physical training though it is uncertain whether they received any other form of education.²⁹ All Spartan women were expected to marry,³⁰ however, since their husbands were frequently away at war they had more freedom than Dorian women.³¹ The failure of the Spartan system is sometimes

attributed to this failure to control women.³²

Athenian women were divided into three groups - citizens, concubines and companions or foreign women.³³ Although it is accepted that Athenian citizen women were politically and legally inferior, it is disputed whether they lived in oriental seclusion.³⁴ We do know that Athenian women were expected to marry,³⁵ and they were under the control of men.³⁶ Once again, adultery is defined in male terms,³⁷ though it is fair to say that in Athens there was no stigma attached to divorce.³⁸ These women were expected to occupy themselves indoors and there are frequent warnings which discouraged contact with women.³⁹

This picture of women in Sparta and Athens is not the complete picture of women in Greece. Later, during the Hellenistic period, the position of women in Macedonia and Greece improved a great deal.⁴⁰ We read here of increased involvement of women in the public domain and of the activities of the Macedonian queens Arsinoë, Bernice, Eurydice and Olympias.⁴¹

Looking briefly at the involvement of women in religion and cult in Greece it is important to note that this possibly provided the only legitimate reason for women in Classical Greece to leave the home.⁴² Women were involved in the worship of Athena at Athens,⁴³ Aphrodite at Corinth,⁴⁴ the ecstatic worship of Dionysus,⁴⁵ and the worship of Demeter, particularly the Thesmophoria festival.⁴⁶

Having seen that women in Greece only achieved a limited role in the public sphere and their main roles were as a wife and mother, we will now conclude our survey of women in the ancient world by looking at the position and status of women in Rome. Once again, most of our information concerns wealthier women, in this particular instance the Roman matron.⁴⁷ Like their Greek counterparts, Roman women were under the custody of males, particularly the pater familias, although his extensive powers were gradually curtailed.⁴⁸ There were various types of marriage in Rome,⁴⁹ and the minimum age when girls married was twelve years old.⁵⁰ Roman matrons were, however, allowed to be mistresses of their own household,⁵¹ and they were free to accompany their husbands on public occasions.⁵² Either party could initiate divorce in Rome although in practice the system tended to favour men.⁵³

Within the religious sphere, Roman women were allowed to participate in various native cults as well as the imported oriental

cults. They were eligible to serve as vestal virgins,⁵⁴ and they were particularly attracted to the cults of Ceres, Bacchus, and Isis.⁵⁵

Having briefly reviewed the status of women within the ancient world, it is difficult to make generalisations about their treatment. What we can say, however, is that in many cases, women were seen primarily as wives and mothers and, in most instances, they had no leadership roles to perform. It is usually suggested that the evidence of women was not accepted by the Jews and this is supported by Justinian at Rome.⁵⁶ If women did have power in the public domain, as was the case with Roman women, it was usually only exercised through their husbands. In both Judaism and in Greek philosophy there exist the comments of Rabbi Judah and Thales respectively which refer to a prayer of thanksgiving that they were not born a woman.⁵⁷ Thus, in spite of various limited responsibilities and freedoms granted to women, on the whole they remained second class citizens in the ancient world, and there was no real equality with men.

Having examined the wider background against which we must view the attitudes toward women which we find reflected in the crucifixion, burial and resurrection stories, we must now look at the situation in the early church. There are numerous estimates of the role and status of women in the early church and many have their roots in comparisons with women in the Graeco-Roman world. According to J.A. McNamara, "Early Christianity grew out of a religious milieu that was rarely favourable to women", and moreover "the early Christians were not exempt from the predispositions of their contemporaries".⁵⁸ McNamara accepts that while the primitive community offered women a better relationship with their 'brethren' than they were to have in later centuries, the decline in their status began quite early, and there are certainly no recognised mothers of the church.

This opinion is one which is shared by E. Schüssler Fiorenza, among others. She comments:

Already in later New Testament times, male-centred interpretation and editing of earlier traditions both played down and covered over the important roles of women at key points in Christian beginnings, either because their roles were seen as unimportant or as threatening.

Patristic interpretation managed to present itself as the historically prior "Orthodox" view, while whatever the church fathers did not like, such as equality of women in church leadership, was branded as "heresy" which mutilated the

ancient faith.⁵⁹

For certain writers then some kind of sexual equality was recognised as part of the Jesus movement and practiced among the first Christian missionaries. This equality, however, soon gave way to a gradual patriarchalisation of church offices and institutions. Hence writers such as M. Boucher can even claim that within the New Testament itself we have two views of women. One view is subordinationist, placing woman in a secondary position to man in the created order, and seen in texts such as Col 3:8; 1 Pet 3:1-6; 1 Tim 2:4-5, 11-15; Eph 5:22-4; 1 Cor 11:3-16 and 1 Cor 14:33b-36. The second view of the role of women advocates equality between the sexes and is to be found in texts such as 1 Pet 3:7; 1 Cor 11:11-12 and Gal 3:28.⁶⁰

The curious situation we face here is that within the New Testament we have the juxtaposition of two apparently divergent theories on the status of women. We could suggest that the subordinationist view of women represents that part of the Christian teaching which was taken over from Judaism and the Graeco-Roman world. The new Christian element is then the equality of all before God. The alternative is to see both views as essentially Christian. This means that texts such as Gal 3:28 represent an earlier Christian attitude of equality of all before God. However, this teaching was never allowed to become more than a theological ideal as the realities of living with the Graeco-Roman world meant that Christians such as Paul were forced to curb excessive female responses to their newly found freedom. Hence the subordinationist view was a Christian response and beyond this a Christian concession to pressure from a Roman public opinion that was suspicious of excessive public activities by women.⁶¹

In attempting to decide on the role and status of women within the early church we will first examine the evidence of the New Testament itself before looking at the writings of the church fathers. We recognise that there are various factors which we should be aware of in attempting such a study. There is the problem of attempting to discover what actually happened within the Christian movement during the dark period of 30 - 50 CE. The first written records of the Christian church are the Pauline writings which do not appear until the 50's - 60's CE and Acts was not written until the 90's. Again we must also note that these writers were not attempting to give a definitive account of the development of the early church. In the case of Paul's letters these

were written in answer to particular problems which arose within individual churches. Women's issues were only dealt with when they represented a problem for a particular community (e.g. 1 Cor 11:2-16 and 14:33b-36). Similarly Acts is not an objective account of the spread of Christianity and the work of every Christian missionary. It is primarily concerned with the work of Peter and Paul and deals with the spread of Christianity from Jerusalem to Rome.⁶²

Another problem we face in reconstructing the role and status of women in the early church is deciding which sources we should use. Fiorenza suggests that inclusion of the non-canonical texts as part of our source material would yield a different estimate of the status of women in the early church than that suggested by the canonical writings.⁶³ It has even been suggested that it was because of the leadership roles afforded to women in these movements that they were branded as heretical.⁶⁴ We must be aware of these questions when we evaluate the material below, and we will also bear them in mind when we carry out our detailed analysis of the crucifixion, burial and resurrection stories.

Finally, we should not treat either the New Testament material or the writings of the church fathers as objective reports of the development of the early Christian movement. As redaction criticism has shown us, the gospel writers selected, redacted and arranged the material before them according to their own theological opinions. We must not assume that this redactional process overlooked the references to women in the early Christian movement. Once again we need to ask: were women marginal figures in the early church or were they redacted out of the traditions? We will begin by looking at women in the early church as they are represented in the New Testament.

A. THE ROLE AND STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE EARLY CHURCH

In examining the role and status of women in the early church we will be primarily concerned with the evidence of Acts and the Pauline epistles. The references to women in the gospels will be dealt with in the individual chapters on the women in the crucifixion, burial and resurrection stories, where they have a bearing on our present study.

Our treatment of women in the early church will be developed along the lines suggested by our introduction. We will first examine those passages which suggest an 'equality' of women with men in the church and

then we will address ourselves to those references which appear to support a 'subordinationist' view of women.

We recognise at the outset that there has been a recent upsurge of interest in the apostle Paul, and in particular in his attitude to women.⁶⁵ This rather heated debate has been responsible for the appearance of some less than helpful, anachronistic terms and phrases such as : 'Paul, the patron Saint of feminism',⁶⁶ 'Paul: Chauvinist or Liberationist',⁶⁷ and 'misogynist' or even 'anti-feminist'.⁶⁸ None of these rather emotive references has helped to advance this debate a great deal. The issue of Paul's attitude toward women is a complicated one and is only made worse by the fact that for some of the passages under discussion, such as 1 Cor 11:2-16, the meaning is anything but clear. As we will see, scholars are also divided over the question of which passages are genuine Paul and which are interpolations. Among the views we will consider here are that passages such as 1 Cor 11:3-16 and 14:33b-36 are merely "... one aspect of a post-Pauline reaction against what can be termed the "radical egalitarianism" of Paul himself."⁶⁹

It is generally recognised that Paul was a gifted visionary, a theologian, a teacher and an organiser, but there are many who would question his position on social matters. For A. Cameron "... no amount of special pleading will make Paul into an advocate of social reform."⁷⁰ Paul's failure is explained by C.F. Parvey as a difficulty to adapt his social thought to conform with his radically new theology, and she concedes that he was "socially a product of his time."⁷¹

Several scholars have, therefore, attempted to explain this apparent contradiction between Paul's teaching and its implementation. R. Scroggs reminds us that the apostle was not operating in a vacuum, but within the immediate and difficult situation of the early church. We must, therefore, view passages in context as answers to particular problems and often expressed in situations of conflict, i.e. within the cut and thrust of debate.⁷² Hence it is hardly surprising that the apostle may have appeared to be "all things to all men",⁷³ as he battled over against the legalists on the one hand and libertines on the other.⁷⁴ Thus we have the unusual situation that

When Paul fought with those who defended the old - his bold vision of the new expressed itself most strongly as in Gal. 3:28. When he discerned the overstatement of the new he spoke up for the old, as in Corinthians.⁷⁵

There are also those who would explain Paul's dilemma in terms of

the conflict between his rabbinical training, which believed in female subordination, and his Christian vision which believed in equality.⁷⁶ Finally, E. Pagels explains the apparent ambivalence in Paul's teaching in terms of his "eschatological reservation" and a "fear of diversity and disorder".⁷⁷ In R. Ruether's view, put another way, there is a "... contradiction between equality in the eschatological order and subjugation in the patriarchal order of nature."⁷⁸

Having introduced various scholarly opinions on the role and status of women in the early church, we will now examine the material for ourselves before reaching any conclusions.

1. Equality of Women?

The question of the equality of women in the early church is related to several references to women in Acts and the Pauline epistles. It has even been suggested that Christianity had possibly more success among women, particularly those of the middle and upper classes, than other religions of the day.⁷⁹ There are numerous references to women throughout Acts, and even before Paul is converted to Christianity we read that he applies to the synagogue in Damascus for permission to arrest any male or female members of the church (Acts 9:1-2). This would suggest women were not insignificant members of the early church and is reinforced by the reference in Acts 17:11-12 where we are told that women examined the scriptures as well as men. These references to women are particularly interesting in view of what we have learned about the role of women in Judaism and in the Graeco-Roman world.

In Acts we also read that women are members of house churches. There is a reference to the house of Mary, among others, where many gather together in prayer (cf. Acts 12:12). Several notable female converts are also mentioned in Acts and the epistles. There is Lydia, the seller of purple goods in the city of Thyatira (Acts 16:14). At Joppa there is a woman named Tabitha who is full of good works and acts of charity (Acts 9:36-43). However, although we read of wealthy women converts, proselytes or godfearers in Acts, there are no references to women missionaries or preachers. According to Fiorenza, the author of Acts, therefore, only presents one side of the picture of the role of women in the church, and this picture must not, therefore, be taken as a description of the real situation. These women are rather "... the tip of an iceberg in which the most prominent women of the early Christian

missionary movement surface, not as exceptions to the rule but as representatives of early Christian women who have survived androcentric redactions and historical silence."⁸⁰

For a more accurate description of the role of women in the church, we should include the Pauline references to his female missionary co-workers such as Prisca, Junia, Phoebe, Mary, Tryphena, Tryphosa and Persis. We will pay close attention to these women who laboured alongside Paul, and particularly the terms used to describe them such as δῆκονος and ἀπόστολος. We will also include the references to female prophets. Our examination of the equality of women in the church will then focus on Gal 3:28 and the significance of the statement that in Christ "there is neither male nor female." Finally, we will look at 1 Corinthians 7 and Paul's teaching on marriage to see if the early Christian movement offered women any alternative to the patriarchal marriage structures which we have found elsewhere in the ancient world.

(a) Women in the house churches and wealthy female patrons

In our examination of the role of women in the ancient world we saw that women's public appearances were sometimes limited. In Judaism, for instance, women were restricted to a particular section of the temple.⁸¹ Among the early Christians, however, women were recognised as important members of the early house churches.⁸² Paul refers to Prisca and Aquila whose home was a centre of Christian fellowship and teaching (1 Cor 16:19; Rom 16:5). In Philemon 2, Paul greets Apphia 'our sister' together with Archippus and refers to the church in their house. In Col 4:15 he greets Nympha of Laodicea and the church in her house. Finally, in 1 Corinthians he mentions that his letter was written in reply to a report Paul received from the people of Chloe's household (1 Cor 1:11).⁸³

This involvement of women in the house churches of the early Christian church suggests that women were an integral part of that movement and supports the conclusion that the later household codes were a patriarchal reaction against the leadership of women.⁸⁴

We must also briefly draw attention to the wealthy female converts who supported the early Christian movement and these include Lydia and Tabitha.⁸⁵ These women offered financial assistance, probably in a manner similar to the women of Lk 8:1-3. However, as we will suggest in our exegesis of Mk 15:40-1, the ministry and service of women in the early church was not merely limited to offering financial assistance,⁸⁶

although there may well have been a reaction against this earlier interpretation of the type of service women could offer.

(b) Women as co-workers

Paul mentions numerous women who were his missionary co-workers without implying that they were either dependent on him or inferior to male missionaries. Paul uses the same terms of both male and female co-workers. Prisca is described as a 'co-worker', Apphia is referred to as a ἀδελφή (αδελφός), Phoebe is both δίακονος and πρεσβυτέρα, and Junias is an ἀπόστολος.⁸⁷ Finally, in Phil 4:2f. Paul refers to Euodia and Syntyche who had laboured side by side with him for the gospel.

Prisca is referred to together with her husband in both Acts and the epistles, and remarkably she is referred to first, suggesting perhaps that she was more important than Aquila (cf. Acts 18:2f., 26; Rom 16:3).⁸⁸ This couple were tent makers and Paul worked with them in Corinth (Acts 18:3). They had been expelled from Rome during the edict of Claudius against the Jews, and in Rom 16:3 Paul tells us that they risked their lives to save him. Finally, we are told that they are responsible for the conversion of Apollos (Acts 18:26).

According to J.M. Ford "... one cannot emphasize sufficiently the role which women played in the early church...".⁸⁹ She follows this statement by referring to the work of Phoebe who is described in Rom 16:1f. as both δίακονος and πρεσβυτέρα. Ford interprets πρεσβυτέρα as indicating that Phoebe had a position of authority and responsibility within the church. Fiorenza supports this recognition of Phoebe's status and she rejects the exegesis of these titles by male exegetes which play down their significance.⁹⁰ As we will see below, while the ministry of females may later have been limited to caring for the poor, the sick and women, there does not seem to be any suggestion that this was the case here. When we examine Mk 15:40-1 and parallels, we will once again ask what kind of δίακονος/service Mark envisaged for the women of his community.

Another husband and wife team who are mentioned by Paul are Junia and Andronicus (Rom 16:7). Here again attempts have been made to play down the role of women in the church and Junia has been interpreted as a shortened form of the male name Junianus.⁹¹ The interesting feature about this woman is that she is described as an apostle. Paul has already defined an apostle as one who had witnessed the resurrection and

then been commissioned to teach (cf. 1 Cor 9:1f.). As we will see in our study of the stories of the crucifixion, burial and resurrection, the women of the gospels also fulfilled this criterion.⁹²

Finally, when we look at the writings of the church fathers and other so called 'heretical' groups, we also learn of Thecla, a woman missionary who works alongside Paul. One reason which has been given to explain why women do not appear as frequently in later descriptions of leadership roles is that while in the early church possession and the exercise of charismatic gifts are based on the 'power and will of God', later these were institutionalised and localised in certain offices which excluded women.⁹³ We have already mentioned the suggestion that the exclusion of women from ministry in the church was possibly related to their involvement in 'heretical' groups and we will discuss this point below.

(c) Female prophets

There were female prophets in Christianity and Acts 21:9 mentions the four daughters of Philip who are described as prophets. In Corinthians Paul mentions the important role of prophets in the church, and in 1 Cor 11:2-16 we are told that women also prophesy. In the book of Revelation, this author prophesies against the female prophet Jezebel (2:20). Finally, as we will see later, among the Montanist sect in particular, women assume a role as prophets, and this is a practice which is condemned by the church fathers.

(d) Galatians 3:28

This text has been hailed as Paul's 'freedom manifesto', the 'Magna Carta of Humanity' and the 'locus classicus of Paul's teaching'.⁹⁴ Given our introductory comments on the problem of the juxtaposition of statements of equality and subordination in the New Testament, various scholars have attempted to show in what way Paul envisaged that there is neither male nor female in Christ. Many would suggest that this formula marks a complete break with the prevailing attitudes of both the Jewish and Gentile view of women. Jews daily gave thanks that they were neither born a gentile, a woman or a boor,⁹⁵ and this is supported by the statement attributed to Thales which gives thanks that "... I was born a human being and not a beast, next a man and not a woman, thirdly a Greek and not a barbarian."⁹⁶

According to R. Jewett, who sees a development in Paul in the direction of sexual liberation, this statement belongs to Paul's 'equality in principle stage with residual patriarchy.'⁹⁷ Many writers believe it is necessary, therefore, for us to appreciate the time at which Paul wrote Galatians and the situation he addressed here when assessing the significance of Gal 3:28.⁹⁸ It is the opinion of B. Witherington that Paul's opponents in Galatia were Judaizers who were not only insisting on circumcision, but that women had a duty to marry so that they may become full members of the church.⁹⁹ Others suggest Paul is quoting a baptismal formula.¹⁰⁰ For W. Meeks, Gal 3:28 represents a 'ritual reunification formula' which was developed most fully in the later androgynous myths of gnosticism.¹⁰¹ H.D. Betz argues along similar lines when he notes that in Gal 3:28 the sexes are named in the neuter. This indicates to him that not only are the social differences between man and woman removed here, but also the biological differences.¹⁰²

In view of Paul's later problems at Corinth, which many would interpret as an over-enthusiastic reaction to comments of Paul such as Gal 3:28, many scholars prefer to see the removal of distinctions between male and female here in terms of women's social emancipation. For some it is the elimination of the subordinate status of women, that is, the situation of woman being a minor under the law, which is at issue here.¹⁰³ It is recognised that perhaps Paul did not realise clearly all the implications of this statement of equality and the fact that belief in Christ radically affects one's view of the male/female relationship.¹⁰⁴ R. Scroggs would prefer to say that what Gal 3:28 means is that Paul has consistently destroyed any value judgements made on the basis of distinctions between males and females. The distinctions within the community still remain, as 1 Corinthians 12 indicates, but what has changed is that "Each person in the eschatological community stands equal beside his neighbor."¹⁰⁵

For Fiorenza the ramifications of Gal 3:28 are that if it is baptism and no longer circumcision which is the primary rite of initiation then "... women became full members of the people of God with the same rights and duties."¹⁰⁶ Male and female is interpreted in terms of Mk 10:6 and no longer is male and female understood in terms of marriage and gender relationships:

Women and men in the Christian community are not defined by their sexual procreative capacities or by their religious, cultural or social gender roles, but by their discipleship and

empowering with the Spirit.¹⁰⁷

Unlike the mystery cults and perhaps some branches of gnosticism, it is not 'anthropological oneness', but 'ecclesiastical oneness' which Paul has in mind here.¹⁰⁸

The problem for the early Christians was that they were not a community which had withdrawn from the world, but rather they remained within the social context of the Graeco-Roman world. For some, therefore, Paul refrained from making any real assessment of male and female roles.¹⁰⁹ It is the appearance of the later household codes which speaks out most clearly against any drastic alterations in the relationship between men and women in the Christian community. According to J.E. Crouch, it was probably the pneumatic excesses (presumably in places like Corinth) which threatened the stability of the Pauline church and ensured that Christianity adopted a more traditional approach to the question of male/female roles.¹¹⁰ Paul is, therefore, delivering his teachings and writing his epistles out of a particular cultural and sociological framework which was inevitably reflected in the statements he delivered.

(e) 1 Corinthians 7

In our examination of the role and status of women in the ancient world, we saw that the position of women in marriage was an important indicator of the general attitude toward women in the ancient world. 1 Corinthians 7 represents Paul's most extended treatment of the subject of marriage.¹¹¹ We have included our examination of this chapter in our section on the equality of women. However, although the monotonous form of parallelism of the statements addressed to husbands and wives within 1 Corinthians 7 is very striking, we do not wish to reach any conclusions on the issue of equality in marriage until we have carried out a detailed analysis of the text.

It is also important to note that 1 Corinthians 7 does not just deal with the subject of male and female relationships, but also addresses the questions of Jews and Greeks and slaves and freemen. Even a cursory reading of the text will help us to see 1 Corinthians 7 in its proper context and allow us to suggest some important factors which should influence our exegesis. Thus, "Everyone should remain in the state in which he is called" (v. 20), and "those who marry will have worldly troubles" (v. 28). The reason for these warnings is because "the

form of this world is passing away" (v. 31). The key to Paul's thinking in this chapter is his "eschatological perspective."¹¹² Beyond this he is not trying to lay any constraints on the Christians at Corinth, but instead is concerned with promoting "good order".

Since many scholars have spoken out on Paul's views as expressed in 1 Corinthians 7 we will begin our study here by listing the main scholarly opinions before examining the text in detail for ourselves. C.K. Barrett comments, "... in Paul's view, the most fortunate state is that of the unmarried person who is under no pressure to marry; less desirable is that of the married person who must express his sexual nature and does so within marriage ..."¹¹³ According to G. Bornkamm, "In the detailed discussions of 1 Cor 7 one looks in vain for a positive appreciation of love between the sexes or of the richness of human experience in marriage and the family."¹¹⁴ D.E.H. Whiteley declares, "It is popularly believed that St. Paul's attitude to marriage was "morbidly ascetic". The word "ascetic" is justified, "morbid" is not."¹¹⁵

Such interpretations are rejected by J. Moiser who believes they are not justified and "Commentators have done Paul a grave injustice by ascribing to him ideas and teachings that are not his. Some try to excuse him for what they regard as a mistaken ascetic zeal, others merely condemn him for his misogynism. All are wrong."¹¹⁶ Scroggs would go even further and according to him, "Nowhere does he (i.e. Paul) say sex is evil or that marriage is wrong in and of itself. It is a legitimate union between two people who desire and care for each other."¹¹⁷

The reason why such varied interpretations are conceivable is due to the nature of 1 Corinthians 7. According to D.S. Bailey, the apostle is not giving a definitive statement of his own teaching and position, but this is simply a collection of answers to questions which were submitted by the church at Corinth. Paul is merely giving his enquirers guidance on specific points.¹¹⁸

Most scholars are agreed that 7:1a 'Now concerning the matters about which you wrote...' refers to a written inquiry from the Corinthian church. This letter could have been delivered by Stephanus, Fortunatus and Achaicus (16:17f.), or via Chloe's people (1:11).¹¹⁹

We must, therefore, try to understand Paul's remarks in the context in which they were written, which was primarily a situation where the apostle was answering the question(s) of the Corinthian group. Some scholars believe there is only one question lying behind this chapter and

that is 1 Cor 7:1b, 'Is it good for a man not to touch a woman?'.¹²⁰ A. Robertson and A. Plummer believe the question to be 'Is marriage allowed?'.¹²¹ Tertullian, however, understood the question to be whether or not marital intercourse is desirable, and the church father comments, "It follows that it is evil to have contact with her (a woman); for nothing is contrary to good except evil."¹²² J.C. Hurd also puts forward the theory proposed by W.G.H. Simon who believed that four separate questions lie behind 1 Corinthians 7. In vv. 1-9 (i) in the case of married people ought sexual relations to be abandoned? (ii) in the case of those who are not married ought they to aim at the celibate life? In v. 10 (iii) is divorce allowed? (iv) In vv. 12-16 what about a marriage in which one partner is converted to Christianity while the other remains a heathen?¹²³

Moiser considers that our investigation is made easier if we interpret the question as one which would trouble 'strong' Christians, and that is whether they or the weaker Christians are correct in their evaluation of the marriage tie, given that the end is approaching?¹²⁴ M.L. Barre also prefers to link the question with the Parousia. In 1 Corinthians 7 we are faced with questions of people who are concerned about their actions in the light of the imminent Parousia. Should the married refrain from any further sexual contact (vv. 2-7)?; should the unmarried remain celibate at all costs (vv. 8-9, 25-38)? or, under what circumstances would it be advisable for them to marry?¹²⁵

Further attempts to interpret 1 Corinthians 7 have involved the division of this material into several sections,¹²⁶ and there are many problems which arise in the course of this chapter. These involve the status of marriage and virginity; periods of abstinence within marriage; divorce; mixed marriage; and anxieties related to the married state. As we have already mentioned, Paul also has to confront the problem of circumcision/uncircumcision, and slaves/freemen in vv. 17f. In vv. 36f. the unmarried are once again Paul's concern and there are particular exegetical problems concerning the identity of the individuals being addressed here.

Perhaps the best way forward with this tricky passage is to briefly attempt to reconstruct the situation of the church at Corinth. As a city, Corinth was in the valuable position of controlling the land route between north and south and the sea route between east and west. Old Corinth had been destroyed by the Romans in 146 BCE and was refounded as

a Roman colony roughly one hundred years later by Julius Caesar. Corinth was a cosmopolitan city and the immoral reputation of the old city of Corinth was well known.¹²⁷ We will not go into details here about Paul's visits to Corinth, suffice to say that while he laid the foundation stone of the church here (3:10), he had hoped that others would build on his work. The results were, however, less than satisfactory. In 1:11f. we find that the church has split into factions.¹²⁸ Paul is also forced to write to the Corinthians on several occasions in order to deal with the problems which arise in the Corinthian church.¹²⁹

The situation at Corinth was that certain Christians were calling themselves 'pneumatics' or 'spiritual ones' and believed they possessed wisdom (1:17; 2:5; 4:6, 8, 10). They appeared to despise Paul and the naivety of his teaching (1:17-2:8), since they had left behind the milk of his teaching for the solid food of deeper wisdom (3:1f.). These Christians believed they had already attained fullness, and could, therefore, look down upon their fellow Christians (4:6, 8, 10).

This possession of a deeper wisdom separated the elite 'spiritual ones' from the weaker Christians and the result was disunity in the church at Corinth. Those who believed they were already fulfilled expressed their freedom in either libertine or ascetic lifestyles, following Paul's own theoretical principles (cf. Gal 5:1), though not perhaps his pragmatism. This in turn led to the notorious case of immorality referred to in 1 Cor 5:1-5. In 1 Cor 6:12f. we learn that certain Christians feel free to mix with prostitutes, and in 8:1-13 and 10:14-11:1 Christians eat meat sacrificed to idols.¹³⁰ Even at the celebration of the Lord's Supper there were divisions between rich and poor Christians. In chapters 12-14 we are told that the spiritual ones believed themselves to be in possession of spiritual gifts and could speak in tongues. Finally, as a result of an over-emphasis on realised eschatology (4:8), certain Christians appear to deny the future resurrection of the dead (15:12).

How we classify this behaviour has long been the subject of debate. A number of scholars explain this behaviour as being heavily influenced by the sort of thought which characterised later gnosticism and is "enthusiastic" in expression.¹³¹ Some would even go as far as to call this group Gnostics.¹³²

Paul's relation to this group is problematic since we must admit that on several counts, Paul is himself inclined to sympathise with their

views. He agrees that for those who have knowledge idols are nothing and Christians can eat anything (10:26), though he restricts his own liberty for the sake of the weak (8:13; 10:28). Paul places a high value on spiritual gifts, though he believes the Corinthians have overestimated the benefits of glossalia (chaps 12-14). This has led Hurd to argue that the Corinthians against whom Paul now writes in 1 Corinthians 7 have simply remained faithful to the more enthusiastic emphasis of Paul's original preaching, when he himself presented the gospel in terms of knowledge and wisdom, and had himself valued glossalia much more highly.¹³³ This view leads us to conclude that the Corinthian errors were simply unbalanced developments of views which Paul himself held.¹³⁴

Since it is only by a detailed examination of the passage that we will be able to ascertain whether or not Paul was basically in agreement with an ascetic 'proto-gnostic' or 'gnostic type' group we will now look at the text itself.

The issues which are raised in vv. 1-7 concern marriage and the practice of celibacy for a particular period. When we examined the attitudes to marriage in Judaism and the Graeco-Roman world, we noted that there were many pressures on both men and women to marry. In Judaism all males were expected to marry, and there were penalties for those that did not.¹³⁵ Only the Essenes, among the Jews seemed to have allowed any form of celibacy.¹³⁶ Among the ancient Greeks it was a similar situation and men and women were encouraged to marry.¹³⁷ The Romans were no different and everyone was induced to marry and provide children.¹³⁸ This is the immediate background against which we must view the comments on marriage in vv. 1-7.

In v. 1 the phrase *περὶ δε ὧν ἐγράψατε* can be interpreted as a quotation formula and when Paul uses the phrase *περὶ δε* in 1 Corinthians, he is usually commenting on matters mentioned by the Corinthians in their letter (cf. 7:25; 8:1; 12:1; 16:1, 12). Linked with our interpretation of 7:1a is v. 7:1b and the phrase *καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ γυναικὸς μὴ ἄπτεσθαι* 'It is well for a man not to touch a woman'.¹³⁹ W.E. Phipps points out that there is much uncertainty as to whether Paul is a) asserting his position in his own words; b) quoting a slogan of some Corinthians which he accepted; or c) quoting a Corinthian slogan that he rejected.¹⁴⁰

Taking each theory in turn we note that the early church fathers certainly interpreted Paul on the basis that 1 Cor 7:1b is the apostle's own position,¹⁴¹ and this is a view shared by a number of New Testament

scholars. Origen, a third century Greek father, was the first to favour the second interpretation that 1 Cor 7:1b is a quote from the Corinthian letter which Paul is endorsing.¹⁴² This interpretation fits well with the style of 1 Corinthians where Paul replies to a number of problems on which his help has been solicited. Other scholars prefer to see 7:1b as Paul's quotation of the Corinthian slogan which he then rejects,¹⁴³ and hence 7:1b-2 reads, '... you say 'it is good for a man not to have intercourse with a woman'. I say that each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband because of the danger of prostitution.' A number of scholars have interpreted 7:1 in this way.¹⁴⁴

The first thing we can say about vv. 2-5 is that it is presumed here that monogamy was the usual form of marriage. In v. 2 marriage is recommended because of the temptation to immorality, either as a grudging acceptance, or possibly looking back to 6:12-20. As we have already learned of one case of fornication at Corinth (cf. 5:1), taken together with this verse and the general tone of the letter, Barrett suggests that a good deal of disreputable behaviour had penetrated the church here.¹⁴⁵

In v. 2 Paul recommends marriage lest the Christian is tempted to immorality. Furthermore, to ensure that sexual urges are fulfilled, each partner is justified in claiming his or her conjugal rights.¹⁴⁶ The most striking feature of this passage is the exact parallelism and the recognition of the woman's rights. Paul would not have been out of step with his own time had he stopped with the judgement that the woman's body belonged to the man.¹⁴⁷

Our main problem with this section centres on v. 5 which allows temporary celibacy, by mutual agreement, for the purpose of prayer.¹⁴⁸ This was not a practice favoured by the Jews,¹⁴⁹ although among the oriental cults, temporary chastity was not uncommon, and castration was practiced in the worship of the Great Mother. Stoic morality and Pythagorean philosophy also demonstrated a concern for sexual asceticism.¹⁵⁰ Perhaps the most famous group of virgins are the vestal virgins of Rome who remained chaste for their thirty years of service. However, since these virgins involved so few Roman women we can hardly see celibacy as a real option for Roman women.¹⁵¹

As regards the practice of asceticism within Christianity, some scholars would argue for its existence at a very early stage in order to account for the influence which could have produced the situation of 1 Cor 7:1.¹⁵² Others, however, would prefer to show that 'consecrated

virginity' was not a customary way of life in the most primitive Christian communities.¹⁵³

Moving on to v. 6 the tricky question here is to what was Paul referring? a) to the whole section?; b) to v. 2?; c) v. 5b?; or d) v. 5? We would agree with Barrett here that d) is the most likely option, and Paul is making a concession to ascetics who may agree not to cohabit for a time in order that they may pray.¹⁵⁴

Finally, in v. 7 Paul concludes this section by noting his desire that the Corinthians should be like himself, though he admits each person has his own gift. According to K. Niederwimmer, 1 Cor 7:1b is Paul's own view and what Paul means here is that marriage is not a charisma but the sign of the lack of charisma, namely, whoever is obliged to marry lacks the charisma of continence.¹⁵⁵ Moiser disagrees, and argues that charisma means a divine gift of any sort and not necessarily continence.¹⁵⁶

How are we therefore to interpret vv. 1-7? We believe the clue to this passage is provided by H. Chadwick who sees this chapter in terms of Paul's oscillating argument with a rigidly ascetic movement. The apostle is showing us a masterpiece of his ingenuity where he combines an ability to almost agree with his opponents while at the same time he also demonstrates an ability to put forward practical recommendations which are not easy to reconcile with the theory he had virtually adopted.¹⁵⁷

Paul has received a letter from the Corinthians in which they assert that marriage is not for the Christian and on this point Paul agrees with them that it is better for a man not to touch a woman. The apostle has, however, a number of qualifying notes to add. These are that husbands and wives must not separate and neither should they withhold conjugal rights without the other's consent. The situation at Corinth was probably that Christian husbands and wives were demonstrating their pneumatism and superior position by renouncing sex, and Paul warns them of the dangers of this position.

On the one hand Paul is anxious to safeguard the lifelong nature of marriage, and even to assert the positive value and obligations of marriage. On the other hand, he is anxious to assure the Corinthian ascetics that at heart he agrees with them. In Chadwick's view, this section is the nearest Paul gets to anything like a positive evaluation of marriage in this chapter.¹⁵⁸ Marriage is basically a concession to weakness, and he would prefer everyone to be like himself. The

conclusion we reach, therefore, is that the ascetic principle is the perfect ideal for Paul, but certain practical considerations make concessions necessary.

Having made some general observations on marriage, Paul now gives more detailed instructions on the unmarried and the widowed in vv. 8-9. The question Paul faces is the possibility of marriage for the unmarried.¹⁵⁹ Paul begins by stating the general principle that everyone should remain in the state in which they are called (v. 8). Presumably Paul had no wife at the time he wrote 1 Corinthians.¹⁶⁰

Paul's problems once again focus upon sexual impulses. Barre sees the unmarried here as a group of overconverted Christians who took Paul's ideal of celibacy too far and refuse to see marriage as a valid option.¹⁶¹ This is why Paul puts so much effort into trying to convince different groups of Christians that they should marry (vv. 8-9, 36), or continue with normal married relations (v. 5).

In his thorough study of the phrase 'to marry or to burn',¹⁶² Barre shows that scholars have long inserted the term 'cannot' where it is not warranted to imply that some Corinthians were incapable of resisting sexual temptation, and hence should take the lower path of marriage.¹⁶³ Barre believes in contrast, however, that Paul states if some are not controlling their sexual appetites they should marry, lest they burn in hell.

Once again the view is reinforced that marriage is less desirable than celibacy. Less desirable than those who need marriage, however, are those who need marriage as a means of expression, but attempt to do without it.¹⁶⁴

This naturally leads us on to the next question and what of those who are married but feel they do not need marriage - should they therefore be able to obtain a divorce and live separately? (vv. 10-11).

In this section, Paul gives advice based on the words of Jesus.¹⁶⁵ Since it is rare for Paul to refer to the sayings of Jesus, we must ask why he does so here. It could be because Paul did not know many of Jesus' sayings, or that he only quoted Jesus' teaching when he knew it differed from the rabbis.¹⁶⁶

Some scholars see Paul's use of different words χωρίζομαι/separate, of the wife, and ἀφίημι/divorce, of the husband reflecting the fact that Jewish law only allowed the husband the right of divorce.¹⁶⁷ It is unlikely, however, that Paul would not be familiar with the Roman

practice whereby the woman could initiate divorce proceedings.¹⁶⁸ Paul enjoins Christians who do divorce to either remain single or remarry their original partners.¹⁶⁹ Finally, Moiser sees no repetition here if we see vv. 2-7 referring to those who are married now, and vv. 10-12 referring to those who were married at the time of their conversion.¹⁷⁰

In vv. 12-16 Paul turns his attention to the rest and it is disputed whether the group addressed here by the phrase τοῖς λοιποῖς refers to all those not previously mentioned;¹⁷¹ to Christians involved in mixed marriages;¹⁷² or to those Christians abandoned by their Christian partners in vv. 10-11.¹⁷³

It is our preferred interpretation that Paul is facing a new situation which was not faced by Jesus, and that is mixed marriages by Christians and pagans. In the Corinthian church, possibly influenced by ascetic teachers, Christian partners were separating, or at least suspending conjugal relations, and in this respect, mixed marriages were more liable to dissolution.

Why mixed marriages in particular should be susceptible to separation is understandable in the light of 6:12-20 where Paul demonstrated to Christians that their bodies are members of Christ and should not, therefore, be made members of a prostitute. This could have led Christians married to unbelieving partners to ask if they were allowed to have sexual intercourse with someone who is not of the body of Christ.¹⁷⁴

Paul's reply is that such mixed marriages are not regarded as being in all circumstances indissoluble since the Christian ethic could not be imposed on a partner. If a mixed marriage breaks down, however, the unbelieving partner must be free to depart. The important thing is that a Christian partner must do nothing to dissolve the marriage since the sanctity of one Christian parent extends to the children, and the believing partner should not, therefore, be concerned that the children will be tainted. A Christian partner may also be able to convert the pagan partner and, therefore, has a clear missionary role.¹⁷⁵

Paul now states the general rule on which his remarks in vv. 1-16 were based, that everyone should remain in the position in which they were called. In vv. 17-24 Paul deals with the problem of Jews/Greeks and freemen/slaves. In spite of the tendency to allow the male/female issues of 1 Corinthians 7 to dominate our studies we must also recognise that these three elements of male/female, Jew/Greek and freemen/slaves are

connected.

What Paul stated in Gal 3:28 would have had serious implications for Graeco-Roman society if it had been put into practice. The hellenistic economy was a slave economy.¹⁷⁶ The family structure was based on a sharp distinction between male and female roles, and cultural distinctions were important.¹⁷⁷ Behind this particular section of 1 Corinthians probably lies a situation of chaos whereby the Corinthians were attempting to establish new social patterns based on their understanding of Christian freedom, and which they believed was grounded in Pauline teaching.

In reply to this interpretation, Paul states that the believer who is married or is a slave, is not, at least for the present, free from the conditions which would normally bind them. He goes on to stress that a married person does not suffer any disadvantage in the Lord because they are married, and neither does the slave because he is in servitude. Slaves should not seek to be released from their bondage, and neither should the married seek to be released from their marriage bonds. Those who are married do not sin, and their relationship with their marriage partner does not affect their relationship with God. Paul encourages Christians to continue in their calling (cf. Rom 11:29; Phil 3:14; 2 Thes 1:11). It is the problem of unity and right order in the church which is in the forefront of Paul's mind here (v. 35).

In vv. 25-35 Paul begins by referring to the virgins. Exactly who the virgins are will be discussed below when we look at v. 36f., since apart from a passing reference to them in v. 28 and v. 34, they are not mentioned again until vv. 34f.¹⁷⁸

As we have stated, it is our opinion that the clue to Paul's teaching on marriage and celibacy, and indeed the whole of chapter 7, is Paul's eschatological teaching, and the reaction of the Corinthians to this teaching. According to C.L. Mearns, we can discern a radical change in Paul's eschatological outlook from an earlier form of Christian hope which would have focused on the continuing process of judgement.¹⁷⁹ This belief may have led Christians to believe that the general resurrection had largely been accomplished through adult believers conversion-baptism.¹⁸⁰

It was, therefore, in response to this over-realised eschatology that Paul replies with an apocalyptic eschatology to express what E. Käsemann has called 'eschatological reservation'. He writes that "...

Paul is absolutely unable to speak of any end of history which has already come to pass, but, he does however, discern that the day of the End-time has already broken."¹⁸¹ There remains in Paul a tension between the 'already' and 'not yet' aspects of his eschatology. He refers to the 'present distress' (7:26), to tribulation of the flesh (7:28), and to people divided in their allegiances. God had deliberately shortened the time and the *σῆμα* of this world is passing away (7:29-31). Taken together with chapter 15, however, we realise that the future is also a very important aspect of Paul's eschatology.

Paul's advocacy of celibacy is to be understood on the grounds that the married will experience greater tribulation during the eschatological ordeal than the unmarried (1 Cor 7:28b; cf. Mk 13:17 & par.) Christians have enough to worry about in view of the 'impending distress' without incurring the added anxiety of family responsibility (7:32).¹⁸² The celibate person, at least in Paul's eyes, has more freedom to dedicate to Christian ministry.

This passage presents us with several problems since on the surface Paul appears to contradict what he has previously said about marriage. If we think, however, of sexual relations representing the pull of the old world which is passing away, we can understand why the 'strong' Christians have rejected marriage.¹⁸³ Against this position, Paul stresses that celibacy is not the only option for the community because the time when men and women will not be sexual is for the future. The tension in 1 Corinthians 7 represents a conflict in Paul's own thought between the realised and 'not yet' aspects of his eschatology. Paul believes in the ascetic ideal, and marriage is bondage to the old world which is fading away; yet because of the fear of disorder which may result from the reconstruction of society along eschatological lines, Paul introduces a note of eschatological reservation.

In Moiser's view, vv. 36-40 must qualify as one of 'the most difficult and refractory passages in the entire Pauline corpus'.¹⁸⁴ In particular, our difficulties here centre on the unexpressed subject of v. 36 and who is meant by the virgin. Various suggestions have been made: 1) The man in the sentence is a father, 'his virgin' is his daughter, and *ἐάν ἡ ὑπέραχμος* means 'if she is at the age of marriage'. The advice that Paul is giving is, therefore, if a father thinks he is treating his daughter unfairly by not allowing her to marry, he should give his consent. This interpretation should be rejected since there has been no

previous mention of parental duties, it involves some awkward changes of subject, 'at the age for marriage' is a less probable rendering of the Greek *ὑπέραχμος*, and the word virgin does not mean daughter.¹⁸⁵

2) The man and the woman (i.e. his virgin) have entered a spiritual marriage and Paul is suggesting that if the strain is greater than the man can bear, marriage is allowed. This solution is rejected since Paul has already dealt with the question of celibacy within marriage in vv. 1-7.

3) J.M. Ford has suggested that Paul is dealing here with a possible case of levirate marriage (cf. Dt. 25:5-10), and the word does not, therefore, mean virgin, but a young widow.¹⁸⁶ Furthermore, the adjective *ὑπέραχμος* means of marriageable age, and may refer to a Mishnaic passage which states that the levirate law only applies when the girl has reached puberty.¹⁸⁷ Barrett points out several objections to this interpretation:- a) the Greek noun *παρθένος* means virgin and not widow; b) the Greek adjective *ὑπέραχμος* does not mean the age of puberty; and c) there is nothing in the paragraph to suggest that the point under discussion here is some obscure point of Jewish law.¹⁸⁸

4) The most favoured interpretation of this obscure reference is that the man and woman involved here are a betrothed couple who are on the point of getting married, but decide to abstain because they have come under the influence of ascetic teaching at Corinth.¹⁸⁹ This interpretation is supported by the fact that it agrees with Paul's advice on marriage in vv. 2, 6, and 9.¹⁹⁰

Finally, we see no problems in accepting a change of subject in vv. 39-40 and the division of this chapter has shown us that this jumping from subject to subject is typical of Paul's often irregular way of presenting arguments. The apostle now deals with the problem of a woman whose husband has died,¹⁹¹ and his concluding statement is that she is under no obligation to remarry.

To sum up, on the basis of 1 Corinthians 7 we believe that Paul had a negative view of marriage. Though he accepts marriage as binding, and is revolutionary in his equal treatment of men and women in marriage, Paul nevertheless views marriage basically as a safety valve for sexual desires. For Paul the celibate state is the higher state (vv. 7, 8, 26, 28), and he recommends those who are unmarried or widowed not to enter into marriage. Paul's theological argument that those who are married are not equally dedicated to the Lord since their loyalties are divided,

does not square, however, with the practice of the missionary movement. We have already mentioned the work of missionary couples like Prisca and Aquila and Andronicus and Junia. In view of this evidence, perhaps we should interpret Paul's comments that celibacy is the best state for missionary work, as an expression of his own personal opinion, and not the general belief of the early church.

Summation on the equality of women in the church

We must now briefly draw together the points we have made on the question of the equality of women in the early church. We have read of women who were involved in the house church movement and as wealthy converts. More significantly there are also references to the female co-workers of Paul. It would, therefore, appear that at least during the early period, women were actively involved in the work of the church, and there is no hint here that their work was limited to caring for the poor or women. Galatians 3:28 represents the highpoint of the Christian attitude of the equality of all before God. However, as we have just seen in 1 Corinthians 7, there would appear to be some qualifications to Paul's teaching on equality, and celibacy is preferred to marriage. Since the early Christians were living in a world where most would be expected to marry, we can appreciate their dilemma here. Paul himself realised the dangerous consequences of his teaching, and he, therefore, introduces a note of "eschatological reservation", in order to restrain some of the more enthusiastic members of the Christian community. At the end of the day, Paul's primary concerns were decency and order rather than equality at all costs. These factors will obviously be an important backdrop for our literary examination of the stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb, and once again we will pay particular attention to any attempts to eclipse the role of women in the developing tradition. Beyond this we will also want to see if the men are written back into these stories.

2. Subordination of Women?

As we have already suggested, Paul had problems working out the social implications of his theological statements. We have encountered the problems caused in relation to the question of the proper relationship between men and women in 1 Corinthians 7. At Corinth there were also problems with incest (5:1-13) and some Christians were even mixing with

prostitutes (6:1-20). Our particular interest here concerning the question of the subordination of women in the early church are those two passages which have subsequently had a great deal of influence on the roles and type of ministries open to women in the church. These passages are 1 Cor 11:2-16, which deals with the issue of women praying and prophesying in public; and the outburst of 1 Cor 14:33b-36 which states that women should keep silent in church. We will examine both passages in detail before briefly looking at 1 Tim 2:9-15 and any other relevant passages, including the household codes.

(a) 1 Cor 11:2-16

This passage is set within a section of 1 Corinthians (chaps. 11-14) which deals with the problem of pneumatic worship in the community. Most of the major commentaries on 1 Cor 11:2-16 assume this section deals solely with the problem of women's appearance at worship. While we recognise that the emphasis here is on women, this passage is nonetheless concerned with the appearance of both men and women in the assembly.¹⁹²

1 Cor 11:2-16 has been the subject of a great deal of scholarly debate and it is recognised that it is not one of Paul's 'most lucid patterns of logic'.¹⁹³ The general impression is summed up by Scroggs who comments, "In its present form this is hardly one of Paul's happier compositions. The logic is obscure at best and contradictory at worst. The word choice is peculiar; the tone, peevish."¹⁹⁴

The apparent contradiction between the attitude toward women expressed in this passage and Gal 3:28 has led certain scholars to propose that the absence of any inherent unity in this passage is due to the fact that it is an interpolation.¹⁹⁵ Others would reject such "surgical solutions" and believe that to a large extent the failure to perceive Paul's logic here is due to a misunderstanding of the problem he faces at Corinth. It is only when we look at the situation of the Corinthian church that we will elucidate the meaning of this difficult text.¹⁹⁶

The confusion surrounding this text is, therefore, tied up with the fact that scholars are unable to agree on the nature of the problem Paul was facing here. Was Paul facing a situation where women were going unveiled, and against this he insists that they should wear veils when praying or prophesying?¹⁹⁷ Or was the problem at Corinth related to how women should wear their hair?¹⁹⁸ It is difficult for us to glean from

the text the precise details of the controversy. Paul deals with the issue in a manner which assumes the Corinthians are acquainted with the problem, and as in many of Paul's letters, we are left with only one half of the correspondence. The manner in which Paul treats this problem, appealing to tradition, scripture, natural law, and finally, to the custom of the churches, would also suggest that even Paul himself is not convinced of the logic of his proposal, whatever that may be.

Scholars have suggested that v. 2 is an example of Paul responding to information he has received from the Corinthian church in the form of a letter of inquiry to the apostle which raises a number of questions.¹⁹⁹ Alternatively, Paul could have been acting on information supplied by a number of possible sources; from Chloe's people (1:11), or from Stephanus, Fortunatus and Achaicus (16:17f.). This inquiry was made necessary by a situation in the Corinthian church, which according to certain scholars, was a result of 'enthusiasm'. A particular group of Christians at Corinth believed themselves to be freed from the constraints of the body and were now living in a state of unconditional moral freedom which allowed them to erase the signs of sexual differentiation.²⁰⁰ Acting on the basis of Gal 3:28 women were abandoning sexual distinctions and donning the attire of the opposite sex,²⁰¹ while men were adopting the appearance of women.²⁰²

Paul begins in v. 2 with the words Ἐπαινῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, he praises the Corinthian Christians for their conduct in keeping the traditions which he has handed on to them. If we accept this praise at face value, Paul's words here are in direct contrast to his censure in v. 17. We can then interpret vv. 2-16 as Paul's support for the Corinthian church. These Christians hold fast to the tradition of the church.²⁰³ J.P. Meier would argue that Paul's use of the word παράδοσις in the context of 1 Cor 11:2-16 suggests the degree of importance which the apostle attributed to this subject since the apostle's appeals to tradition elsewhere are connected with important issues such as the eucharist and the resurrection (11:23; 15:1).²⁰⁴ This verse prepares the way then for v. 16, and Paul's appeal to the custom of the churches.

The praise of v. 2 may not, however, be as straight-forward as we think, and Paul could be using this phrase with an ironical and sarcastic tone - the Corinthian Christians may think they are keeping to the tradition of the church, but the reality is different. Paul begins, therefore, in v. 3 to correct the Corinthians with the phrase θέλω δὲ

ὁμῶς.²⁰⁵ This is the sense in which we would prefer to interpret Paul's comments. He is offering some new insight on a problem which faced the church at Corinth.

Paul now jumps straight into the argument without further explanation, and states in v. 3 that the head of every man is Christ,²⁰⁶ the head of every woman is man, and the head of Christ is God.²⁰⁷ Interpretations of this passage are heavily influenced by the meaning attributed to the word κεφαλή. Certain scholars point to the LXX translation of κεφαλή for the Hebrew word rosh (head), and note that the word carries connotations of leadership or authority.²⁰⁸ Others would prefer to understand κεφαλή in terms of Greek literature where it means source or origin, and not lordship.²⁰⁹ This interpretation is supported by vv. 8f. which show Paul is thinking of man as the source of woman's existence (cf. Gn 2:18-23), and the passage is not, therefore, necessarily subordinationist. The ambiguity of this word is also heightened by the play Paul makes on the metaphorical and literal use of κεφαλή.

In vv. 4f. Paul suggests that a man praying or prophesying κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων shames the head of him, while a woman praying or prophesying ἀκατακαλύπτῳ shames the head of her. Before going on to deal in more detail with Paul's intentions here, and the various interpretations of these phrases, we should note that Paul here assumes the right of women to pray and prophesy in the Christian assembly.²¹⁰ Paul did not deny that women could function in this role, or that their status was in any way inferior to men, but that men and women were to be distinct from one another in the assembly.

The problems of this passage are related to the translation of κατὰκαλύπτω as "to veil", and the references to men and women's hair. We need to be aware here of veiling practices of this period and the customary practice concerning the arrangement of hair.

The first thing we note in this passage is that Paul does not use the normal Greek word for veil, κάλυμμα.²¹¹ Instead he speaks of woman being ἀκατακαλύπτῳ which is usually translated unveiled or uncovered.²¹² When we look at ancient veiling customs for women, we are immediately confronted with a variety of practices for women in the ancient world.²¹³

Moving on to the difficult phrase κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων in v. 4, our exegesis of this section is helped somewhat if we accept the interpretation of J. Murphy-O'Connor that it means 'down upon the head',

linking this verse with v. 14, and it is shameful for men to have long hair.²¹⁴ A further indication that we are not dealing here with veils, but with hairstyles, and in particular the binding of hair, is given in v. 15 where women are given long hair instead of a veil as a covering. This has led scholars to suggest that the problem at Corinth was not connected with veiling practices, but with improper hairstyles. The text should, therefore, read that what is shameful is for a woman to have uncovered hair, and for a man to have hair hanging down from his head.

Ancient Greek and Roman custom was for a woman to wear her hair tied up in an elaborate manner.²¹⁵ It was not so much the length of a woman's hair which was important, but the manner in which she wore her hair.²¹⁶ Having unbound hair was as shameful as having it shaved off. While we can point to evidence which indicates that in certain circumstances a woman's hair was loosed, sometimes to indicate her shame, we can no longer say with any certainty what was disreputable about shorn hair.²¹⁷

To turn to the question of men's hair, we can state that it was usual for Greek men in this period to have short hair. According to Murphy-O'Connor, long hair was associated in this period with homosexuality, and he rejects the idea that Jewish men at this time normally wore their hair long.²¹⁸ The interpretation of this section is, therefore, tied up with the issue of the binding of hair.²¹⁹

The troublesome practice at Corinth was, therefore, a blurring of the distinctions between the sexes with the dishonour arising from an appearance suggestive of the other sex. Men were behaving in an unmasculine manner by wearing their hair long, and women were behaving in an unfeminine manner by having their hair cut short.²²⁰ This theory is supported by the evidence from later Encratite Christianity where women might be expected to make themselves male by adopting the dress and hairstyle of men.²²¹ The distinctions of the old creation were no longer in force, and Gal 3:28 was a present reality. As we have already suggested, however, we are unable to say why it was shameful for a man to have his head covered and why it was shameful for a woman to have her head uncovered.

How are we to understand vv. 7-9 - man is the image and glory of God, woman is the glory of man, and woman was created because of man? These verses could be a reference to the Urzeit/Endzeit theme. The reference to Adam as the image and glory of God is a reference to Gn 1:26. This refers to the period before the fall. According to the

Apocalypse of Moses chapter 20, Eve was also originally clothed with this glory but she lost this through her sin.²²²

The references to woman as the glory of man and the creation of woman from man represent a shift in Paul's thought between Gn 1:27 and Gn 2:18-23.²²³ In this passage Paul is thinking of humanity in its fallen state, where sexual distinctions exist.²²⁴ Reconciliation has, however, been made possible through Christ. The problem which arises for the Christians at Corinth is whether this is a future reality (1 Cor 15:49b), or a present experience (2 Cor 3:18).

This is the background against which we should interpret v. 10. Paul opens the verse with the phrase διὰ τοῦτο, for this reason, and thereby refers back to the arguments he has just presented. He then states that a woman ought to have ἐξουσία, the authority on her head. Once again, scholars are divided on the interpretation of this word. Why should a woman have authority on her head?

Many scholars would agree with M.D. Hooker's rejection of Kittel's interpretation of this word on the basis of its links with an Aramaic root, holding that it would be wrong to presuppose such linguistic knowledge in Corinth.²²⁵ J.B. Hurley interprets the word in a passive sense, it is a symbol of a woman's subjection to her husband's power over her.²²⁶ This is not, however, in line with the general New Testament usage of the word which more commonly denotes power, right or freedom of choice.²²⁷ In line with this interpretation, most scholars interpret the word ἐξουσία in an active sense. According to A. Padgett, it represents the freedom of a woman to choose her own hairstyle.²²⁸ For Hooker and Barrett it represents the new authority given to a woman under the new dispensation to do things which were not formerly permitted to her.²²⁹

Any interpretation of ἐξουσία is, however, tied up with the ambiguous phrase διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους, and once again we are faced with several possible explanations of what this means. Certain scholars interpret the reference to the angels in terms of Gn 6:1 where the sons of God prey upon the daughters of men.²³⁰ Women need protection against these marauders, and hence they should have a covering on their head for protection.²³¹ In the Testament of Reuben, it is the women themselves who are the prime culprits in the Watcher legend.²³² B. Prusak believes that we should not prematurely reject the influence of the pseudepigraphal myths in 1 Cor 11 and he concludes that the veil was not worn lest the angels fall again, but as a brand of shame or a scarlet

letter for woman having caused the fall of Adam and the angels.²³³

J.A. Fitzmyer rejects the identification of the angels with the fallen angels of Gn 6:1f. This interpretation implies a weakness on the part of women which is a notion Fitzmyer believes interpreters have introduced themselves to the passage. It is his opinion that Paul is speaking of women's subordination, and nothing is said about weakness. It is also not unusual, he argues, for ἀγγέλος with the definite article to designate bad or fallen angels in the Pauline writings. Moreover, according to Fitzmyer, sexuality is never attributed to any of the good angels in Jewish or Christian writings of this period.²³⁴

The reference to angels is only understandable for him in terms of the Qumran community where angels are present at sacred gatherings to ensure that correct order is upheld. A woman who prays with her head uncovered is like one with a bodily defect who should be excluded from the assembly.²³⁵ Women should rather pin their hair up as a sign of both their spiritual power and their control over their heads.

For Scroggs, Hooker and Barrett, the angels are guardians of the created order who would be offended by variations from the principle of v. 3.²³⁶ Meanwhile, a more recent interpretation sees the angels as human messengers who are forced to wear a veil.²³⁷ G.B. Caird would reject both of these explanations and prefers to see this reference in terms of 1 Cor 6:2 - the angels are guardians of the old pagan order which will shortly come under judgement. A woman wears authority on her head, either a veil or hair, not because of any unchanging natural decree, but out of deference to accepted conventions of the society in which she lives.²³⁸

Once again the interpretations of this phrase are legion, and whichever interpretation is preferred will have quite definite implications for how we view the passage as a whole. On the basis of the information given, it is our opinion that ἐξουσία should be interpreted in an active sense of the new authority given to woman under the new dispensation. For our understanding of the phrase διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους we are indebted to Murphy-O'Connor.²³⁹ In his view, Paul usually attributes two functions to angels - they serve as mediators of divine law (Gal 3:19), and they observe what is going on in the world (1 Cor 4:9). It is the duty of these angels to report any infringements of the law (cf. Jub 4:6; 1 Enoch 99:3). Women, by praying and prophesying in public, were doing things which were incompatible with the understanding of women

based on Gn 2:18-22.²⁴⁰ In Paul's view, however, women had full authority to act as they were doing, but needed to convey their new status to the angels who were on the look-out for breaches of the law.

Padgett sees vv. 10-12 presenting problems for scholars in their relation to vv. 4-7.²⁴¹ How can these verses be reconciled with what has gone before? Are they a complete antithesis of Paul's previous arguments? Some scholars consider Paul is now toning down the harsh demands he has made upon women by claiming that ultimately men and women will be equal in the Lord. The previous demands that women should wear their hair in a particular manner are linked to the cultural demands of Paul's day,²⁴² or Paul's Jewish background.²⁴³ Hooker and Fitzmyer would prefer to see Paul's directions here in terms of the need for women to reflect the proper order of creation and not reflect the glory of man while she is present in the assembly.²⁴⁴ Finally, Padgett himself would prefer to dissect the passage on the basis that vv. 3-7b are Paul's description of Corinthian beliefs and practices, and vv. 7c-16 are his opposition to customs and beliefs which deny women the right to wear her hair as she chooses.²⁴⁵

What we can say is that Paul is now concluding his argument by emphasising what is important which he does by opening v. 11 with the word *πλὴν*.²⁴⁶ Paul then goes on to stress the equality of men and women. In the Lord woman is not 'different' from man nor man from woman.²⁴⁷ Paul makes an appeal to the common sense of the Corinthians in v. 13, to natural order in v. 15, and to church tradition in v. 16. He is using a mixture of scripture, philosophy and an appeal to what has happened in the church, probably because he himself realised his argument was not convincing.

To draw together the points we have made, in 1 Cor 11:2-16, Paul recognises the right of women to take part in worship and this is an important point given the role of women in other religions of the day. What he does insist on here, however, is that women do not try to obscure their 'symbolic' differences with men, but that they wear their hair bound up as a sign of their new 'authority' and status, and in line with the customs of the day. Paul is ultimately concerned with decency and order in the community and to this end he requests that the Corinthians moderate their behaviour. Once again, Paul introduces a note of eschatological reservation to his teaching and so Christian practice once

again is altered to reflect the general opinion of the social milieu which was contemporaneous with the composition of the epistles.

(b) 1 Cor 14:33b-36

This passage represents one of the most startling outbursts against women in the Pauline epistles,²⁴⁸ and this has led to comparisons with Jewish and Greek parallels.²⁴⁹ This passage not only contradicts the teaching of Paul elsewhere in Gal 3:28 and in the more immediate context of 1 Cor 11:2f., but also seems to ignore unmarried women in the community and those women with non-Christian husbands.²⁵⁰ According to H. Conzelmann and others, 14:33b-36 is an interpolation. It upsets the context; interrupts the theme of prophecy; spoils the flow of thought; contradicts 11:2f.; and has linguistic peculiarities which make it more similar to the deutero-Pauline tracts such as 1 Tim 2:12 and the household codes.²⁵² Conzelmann, therefore, sees in this regulation "... a reflection of the bourgeois consolidation of the church, roughly on the level of the Pastoral Epistles..."²⁵² Finally, he points out that v. 37 does not link up with v. 36 but with v. 33a. Scroggs would add a note here that it is hardly possible that Paul would appeal to the authority of the law as he does in v. 34a.²⁵³

While these arguments for an interpolation are supported by the limited manuscript evidence which places v. 33 after v. 40, Barrett does not, however, find the evidence compelling.²⁵⁴ Some scholars, including M. Evans, therefore, read 1 Cor 14:33b-36 as a Pauline text and try to explain what Paul meant by silence. Evans gives several possible interpretations. These include that what Paul allows at Corinth is inspired speech such as prayer, prophecy and speaking in tongues, he merely forbids all other forms of speech, particularly asking questions. Another suggestion examined by Evans is that Paul forbids speaking in tongues, and yet another is that wives are not allowed to interrupt meetings.²⁵⁵ J. Daniélou prefers to interpret 14:33b-36 as forbidding women from teaching in the community and he believes this is suggested by the use of *λαλεῖν* in v. 34. Furthermore, he sees no contradiction between this command and 11:2-16 since for him the prophetic role is essentially concerned with prayer, whereas teaching involves giving instruction, and it is the latter role which women are not allowed to perform in the church.²⁵⁶

If we do not accept 1 Cor 14:33b-36 as an interpolation based on

textual evidence we would suggest that it is rejected on theological grounds. This text contradicts both 11:2-16 which accepts the participation of women in worship in the assembly, and the spirit of equality which is expressed in Gal 3:28. We agree with Barrett that no amount of special pleading can show that in 1 Cor 11:2-16 Paul merely expressed a grudging acceptance of women's participation in the assembly.²⁵⁷ Neither is it convincing to suggest that this present text is not concerned with praying and prophesying but with inspired speech.²⁵⁸

(c) Women in the Household Codes

Our final texts concerning the subordination of women are the so called 'household codes' of the deuterio-Pauline school. These codes were known in both Judaism and Hellenism and are concerned with upholding the proper form of order in the patriarchal household.²⁵⁹ It is thought they were taken over by the early church with the most primitive example being Col 3:18-4:1. These codes particularly focus on the duties of subordinate members of the family which demand that each group conforms to the demands of society in their various relationships. Wives are, therefore, instructed to submit to their husbands (1 Tim 2:11). They are not allowed to teach or have authority over men (1 Tim 2:12). Instead they must keep silent (1 Tim 2:12), dress moderately (1 Tim 2:12), and be known by their good deeds (1 Tim 2:10). Women, we are told, will only be saved through childbearing because while man was created first, woman sinned first (1 Tim 2:13f.). According to Meeks, therefore, "The second generation of the Pauline school was not prepared to continue the equivalence of role accorded to women in the earlier mission."²⁶⁰

Since these authors were speaking out against women in the church, ordering them to be quiet, and forbidding them to teach, it follows that certain women in the church must have already assumed such roles for themselves. The early church must have had a reason for taking over the household codes and applying them to their own communities. J.E. Crouch suggests that the situation was one where there were various local expressions of what he calls 'enthusiastic tendencies', such as those we have already encountered at Corinth. Furthermore, it is these tendencies which were to later develop into full blown gnosticism.²⁶¹ Crouch argues that the situation at Corinth should indicate to us that women were particularly prey to over-enthusiastic reactions to Paul's teaching (cf.

1 Cor 11:2f. and 14:33b-36), and this is reinforced, he believes, by 2 Tim 3:6.²⁶² The worry of the early church was that these enthusiastic responses would undermine the basic structures of society and there may even have been an apologetic note in injunctions to submissiveness such as 1 Pet 2:13-3:7.²⁶³

Women were, therefore, gradually excluded from the structures and leadership of the church which were given over to men and modelled on the patriarchal family structure. Thus a bishop is to be a male who has married only once. He must have shown that he is able to manage his own household, which includes controlling those who are under his power and, therefore, subordinate to him (1 Tim 3:2f.). Finally, the church itself is even referred to as the 'household of God' (1 Tim 3:15).

Women were not excluded from the church altogether, and they were allowed to offer service as widows.²⁶⁴ According to 1 Tim 5:9f. these women would be enrolled in a register if they were over sixty years old. Their conduct must be above reproach. They must only have married once, have brought up their children well and also performed numerous good deeds. Younger widows are discouraged since they might remarry in the future and they tend to be 'idlers', 'gadabouts', 'gossips' and 'busy bodies'. Thus, in the opinion of Fiorenza, women have been reduced to 'powerless fringe groups' or have been made to conform to the 'feminine stereotypes of patriarchal culture.'²⁶⁵ Even widows were only accepted to serve in the church, if they 'had overcome their femaleness by becoming virgins.'²⁶⁶

Summation on the subordination of women

The passages we have looked at on the subordination of women would suggest that in some instances there was a conservative reaction in the early church against the 'enthusiastic' response of some Christians, particularly women, to the Pauline statements of equality such as we find in Gal 3:28. The earlier examples of women co-workers and wealthy female patrons who shared with Paul in the teaching of the gospel are no longer in evidence. Instead women are instructed to tone down their attempts to remove distinctions between males and females (1 Cor 11:2-16), and they are instructed to be silent in the churches (1 Cor 14:33b-36 and 1 Tim 2:12). They are urged to return to their submissive roles as mothers and wives, and if they are to offer any ministry, it should only be to serve other women (1 Tim 5:9f.). Any teaching role women may have is limited

to instructing young women on how they should love their husbands and children (Tit 2:4). We have suggested that the reason for this change of direction in the Christian church was a conservative reaction to the threat posed by the enthusiastic response in various local churches. This response was seen as one which was threatening to undermine the basic structures of society. Finally, it is interesting to note here that in order to ensure women did return to their traditional roles, the deuterio-Pauline writers did not shrink away from appealing to the Eden myths and suggestions of women's innate inferiority in the order of creation.

Conclusion on the role and status of women in the early church

In our introduction to the role and status of women in the early church, we drew attention to the comments of scholars that the primitive Christian community offered women a better relationship with their 'brethren' than they were to have in later centuries. This improved relationship was reflected in texts such as Gal 3:28 which advocated equality between the sexes. It was reinforced in the references to the female co-workers of Paul, to women's involvement in the house church movement, and to the wealthy female patrons.

We also recognised, however, that even Paul's teaching included comments which could not easily be reconciled with this doctrine of equality. Although 1 Corinthians 7 expends a great deal of effort in appealing to the equal rights and obligations of both men and women in marriage, Paul appears to favour the celibate state, and marriage is somehow distracting. The key verse in 1 Corinthians 7 is, therefore, v. 20, and everyone should remain in the state in which he was called. Paul is ultimately concerned with good order (1 Cor 7:35). The over-enthusiastic responses of certain groups of Christians to Paul's teaching are discouraged (1 Cor 11:2f. and 14:33b-36). Finally, in the deuterio-Pauline literature, we have the introduction of the household codes which are used to reinforce an appeal to order and the reinstatement of the patriarchal form of the household to Christianity. The only roles for women are as wives and mothers, and beyond this their only service in the church is to instruct and serve other women. These developments will have obvious implications for our study of the women at the cross in particular. We will, therefore, need to examine how each evangelist deals with the 'Marcan' reference to the service of the women (Mk 15:40-1), and note any literary attempts to either qualify or indeed remove

this statement.

Before going on to examine our texts of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb we will now finally look at the teachings of the church fathers to see whether the developments we have noted above are continued.

B. WOMEN IN THE CHURCH FATHERS

According to R. Gryson:

From the beginnings of Christianity, women assumed an important role and enjoyed a place of choice in the Christian community. Paul praised several women who assisted him in his apostolic works. Women also possessed the charism of prophecy. There is no evidence, however, that they exercised leadership roles in the community. Even though several women followed Jesus from the onset of his ministry in Galilee and figured among the privileged witnesses of his resurrection, no women appeared among the Twelve or even among the other apostles.²⁶⁷

Gryson does, however, qualify this statement to a certain extent and he accepts that the early church extended from the first century CE to the sixth century CE, that is from Clement of Rome to Gregory the Great. Its sphere of influence extended from Ireland to Egypt and from North Africa to the shores of the Black Sea. Therefore, according to him, we should suspect that the concept of woman varied from one period to another and from one place to another.²⁶⁸

We have already suggested that there was a tension in the church of the New Testament period between notions of the 'equality' or 'subordination' of women. We need to look now at the material of the church fathers to discern whether they reflect a similar conflict in their attitudes toward women.

We will begin by looking at the general attitudes toward women in the patristic writings including interpretations of the creation stories and the fall to discern whether or not the predisposition to denigrate the nature of women in the New Testament is taken up by the early fathers of the church. The implications of these views for the redemption of women represents the other side of this coin, and these too will be examined.

The attitude of the fathers toward marriage gives us an insight into the extent to which, if any, Christian marriage enhanced the social position of women. As we have already noted, marriage was usually the only option available to women in the ancient world, but as we will see

below, virginity was an alternative for Christian women in this period. What implications did this ascetic lifestyle have for women's status in the early church?

Ministerial roles were open to women in this period, and in particular we will examine the groups widows and deaconesses. Problems with these groups focus upon whether or not these two ministries occurred simultaneously, and if the answer is yes, were they two distinct groups, or did they share the same ministry?

Finally, no study of the early church would be complete without reference to so called 'heretical' movements.²⁶⁹ These groups, which were firmly denounced by the church fathers in the third century CE, pose the interesting question - were they rejected as heretical because of their freer attitude towards women? In other words, what were the social implications for women of the doctrines espoused by movements such as the Gnostics or the Montanists?

(a) General Attitudes towards Women - dualism, creation, the fall and redemption.

The early Christian church was influenced by classical dualistic anthropology which divided the individual into soul and body and equated these divisions with male and female. Life is seen as a continual struggle whereby the soul tries to escape from its imprisonment in the body.

This doctrine presented problems for the fathers since they accepted the biblical concept that the created physical order of the Old Testament is essentially good, even though they gradually came to affirm a pessimistic view about the possibilities for the world and accepted a doctrine of redemption which was world fleeing.²⁷⁰

Origen, a Greek theologian of the third century CE, tried to ease the conflict between these two beliefs by spiritualising creation. The material creation was the result of the fall, and was preceded by a heavenly spiritual creation. Redemption is, therefore, a return to the first heavenly created order.²⁷¹ This view is condemned by the church since it was too similar to gnostic beliefs. According to R.R. Ruether, however:

Despite its body-affirming doctrine of creation, both Greek and Latin Christianity remained committed to a Platonized spirituality and eschatology that defined redemption as the rejection of the body and the flight of the soul from material, sensual nature. The patristic view of woman fell

between the two stools of this ambivalence about the goodness of the body and sexuality."²⁷²

The crucial text for the creation of mankind was Gn 1:27, 'So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them'. Gregory of Nyssa, a fourth century Greek father, interpreted this verse to refer to God who is a monism and has no sexuality. The reference to bisexuality in the second part of the verse is, therefore, secondary and refers to the fall.²⁷³ In the resurrection there will be neither male nor female as in Gal 3:28. Bisexuality is seen to represent man in his fallen state, and is responsible for man's falling into sin and death. Redemption is a return to the original monistic state.

Gregory of Nyssa further believed that the soul relates to man's divine nature and is similar to, but not identical with God.²⁷⁴ The body represents mutability - it was created from the 'nothingness' which existed before the world and man's fall into sin is a step back into nothingness.

Augustine, the famous Latin father of the fourth century, interprets Gn 1:27 in a different sense. Augustine assimilates maleness into the monism and makes femaleness, rather than bisexuality, the image of the lower corporeal nature. Man alone is in the full image of God. Woman is only in the image of God when she is taken with man from whom she was made. This view is justified by Augustine who interprets Gn 1:17 together with 1 Cor 11:3-12:

How then did the apostle [Paul] tell us that the man is the image of God, and therefore he is forbidden to cover his head; but that the woman is not so, and therefore she is commanded to cover hers? Unless, forsooth, according to that which I have said already, when I was treating of the nature of the mind, that the woman together with her own husband is in the image of God, so that the whole substance may be one image; but when she is referred to separately in her quality as a *help-meet*, which regards the woman herself alone, then she is not in the image of God; but as regards the man alone, he is the image of God as fully and completely as when the woman too is joined with him in one."²⁷⁵

Eve is, therefore, the corporeal side of man and is his helpmeet, but only in so far as she helps in the task of procreation.²⁷⁶

John Chrysostom, a fourth century Greek father, also interprets Gn 1:27 to refer solely to man and the reference to woman is simply a reference ahead of time to woman's creation in the next chapter. More significantly, he did not view man in God's image in terms of his

intelligence or rational faculties as other church fathers did, but in his ability to exert power over, to govern, dominate and wield authority. This wielding of authority conveniently meant the subjection of woman to man.²⁷⁷

According to 2 Cor 11:3 and 1 Tim 2:12 it was Eve who was responsible for leading Adam into sin, and the church fathers, aided by the use of the pseudepigraphical myths of the intertestamental period, developed this theme.²⁷⁸ Justin Martyr, familiar with the watcher legend of 1 Enoch, which amplifies Gn 6:8, certainly believed this to be the case:

(God) committed the care of men and of all things under heaven to angels whom He appointed over them. But the angels transgressed this appointment, and were captivated by love of women, and begat children who are those that are called demons; and besides, they afterwards subdued the human race to themselves ... and among men they sowed murders, wars, adulteries, intemperate deeds, and all wickedness.²⁷⁹

Irenaeus prefers to use the Adam and Eve story of Genesis 3 with embellishments from the Apocalypse of Moses and the Life of Adam and Eve. Here Adam is relieved of the responsibility for sin and the blame is pushed onto Eve and the serpent. Satan is a fallen angel whose sin was possibly the refusal to worship man as the image of God.²⁸⁰ Satan, envious of man's position of lordship over creation,²⁸¹ and wishing to get even with God, attempts to corrupt God's image which is only possible through Eve.²⁸² It is Eve, therefore, who is responsible for sin and death.²⁸³ For both Justin and Irenaeus the balance is restored by Mary whose obedience atones for Eve's sin.²⁸⁴

Clement of Alexandria and Origen, Alexandrian fathers of the third century, connect the first sin with sexuality and this leads them on to develop a prejudice against women.²⁸⁵ Tertullian is even more vehement in his attachment of the blame for the first sin to Eve:

You are the devil's gateway: you are the unsealer of that (forbidden) tree: you are the first deserter of the divine law: you are she who persuaded him whom the devil was not valiant enough to attack. You destroyed so easily God's image, man. On account of your desert - that is, death - even the Son of God had to die.²⁸⁶

Even women's appearance is a snare to trap men, and Tertullian agrees with 'Paul's' directive that women should wear veils in the assembly, "It is right that that face which was a snare to them [angels] should wear some mark of a humble guise and obscured beauty."²⁸⁷

While Augustine did not consider the woman alone responsible for

the fall, the mind (i.e. man) must have given his consent, he nonetheless did not allow woman to appear any less blameworthy.²⁸⁸ According to Ruether, the result of these doctrines meant that

This assimilation of male-female dualism into soul-body dualism conditions the definition of woman both in terms of the order of nature and in terms of the condition of the fall. In the order of nature woman is essentially subordinate to the man, just as the body is essentially subordinate to the mind in that right ordering of body to spirit that is defined as "original justice."(!) But because ascetic spirituality defined sin as the disordering of the flesh to the spirit, which made the mind the subject of passions, the equation of woman with body also made her peculiarly the symbol of sin. This double definition of woman, as submissive body in the order of nature, and "carnality" in the disorder of sin, allows the Church Fathers to slip somewhat inconsistently from the second to the first, and attribute an inferiority in women that is sinful to woman's "nature".²⁸⁹

The problem now facing the fathers was if woman's very nature is sinful, then she is irredeemable, or she can only be redeemed by transcending her female nature and becoming male. For Augustine and Jerome, mankind will be resurrected in both male and female bodies, but these will lack all sexual libido and in particular the female will be deprived of the organs related to intercourse and reproduction.²⁹⁰ In our discussion of virginity, we will see how this attitude toward sexuality was worked out by the fathers. We must first of all, however, look at the attitude of the fathers toward marriage, bearing in mind that according to their doctrines of creation and the fall sexuality is often viewed as the result of sin.

(b) Marriage

As we have already seen, in both Jewish and Roman societies, an elaborate system of family laws had been developed to ensure women would supply offspring to continue the lineage of the husband or father.²⁹¹ Both Jews and Romans assumed women would spend most of their lives as married people, and if they were either married or divorced, they would remarry as soon as possible.

When we turn to the New Testament and the teachings of Jesus and Paul, we find no trace of the concept of marriage as a great institution of social preservation. Marriage is primarily a union between two people for sexual relief and the production of children. This attitude was based on Gn 2:24, "Therefore a man leaves his father and his mother and cleaves to his wife, and they become one flesh." Women belong to their

husband's, but not to their husband's families, while men belong to their wives (1 Cor 7). In the Synoptic gospels we read that it is because of this God-given plan that divorce is prohibited (Mk 10:9). Furthermore, Christians are expected to be monogamous and a bishop must only have one wife (1 Tim 3:3).

Despite the conformity of a large number of Christians to the norms of family life, there was a tendency to view the family as a necessary evil. While the orthodox leaders opposed the gnostic trend to reject the sexual act altogether, they were nonetheless themselves drawn towards asceticism. By reviewing the attitudes of two fourth century church fathers we will attempt to understand how certain church fathers viewed marriage.

John Chrysostom was an unmarried church father who held rather ambivalent views of women. On the one hand, like St. Jerome, Chrysostom had a coterie of female followers who had dedicated themselves to celibacy and to whom he wrote numerous encouraging letters. On the other hand, Chrysostom also expressed a negative attitude toward women in general. According to E.A. Clark, 'power politics' is the key to understanding Chrysostom's view of all human relationships which are expressed in terms of dominance and submission.²⁹²

Chrysostom applied the image of the ruler and the ruled to the marriage relationship, believing equality only produced strife.²⁹³ The only point on which couples were equal was that extra-marital relationships were forbidden to both parties.²⁹⁴ The woman's role in marriage was one of service and Old Testament models of the ideal wife include the widow who is praised for providing food for Elijah.²⁹⁵ The husband as 'head' contributed spiritual qualities to the marriage, whereas the woman as 'body' could only contribute material services such as sexual ones which prevented the husband from seeking out prostitutes. Marriage is seen by Chrysostom as bondage.²⁹⁶

On the issue of childbearing, Chrysostom is less clear. The difficult passage here is 1 Tim 2:14-15, "and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor. Yet woman will be saved through bearing children, if she continues in faith and love and holiness, with modesty." If women were saved through childbearing, what about widows and virgins whom Chrysostom believed had chosen a higher form of life? Chrysostom also considered that it was concupiscence, not reproduction which was the cause of the fall, and finally, it is not

woman but God who is responsible for procreation.

Augustine's attitude toward marriage is connected with his interpretation of the fall which was the result of the sin of lust, signifying the revolt of the body against the mind. Marriage is, therefore, only allowed as a channel for sexual desires and is an inferior state to virginity bearing fruit only thirty-fold, compared with sixty-fold for widowhood and one hundred-fold for virginity.²⁹⁷

Once again a wife must be subject to her husband who is instructed to love her in the same sense as he must love his enemies. A husband is to love his wife's spiritual nature whilst he despises her physical nature which is carnal and polluting:

... a good Christian is found, in one and the same woman to love the creature of God, whom he desires to be transformed and renewed; but to hate the corruptible and mortal conjugal connection and sexual intercourse: i.e. to love in her what is characteristic of a human being, to hate what belongs to her as a wife.²⁹⁸

The sexual act is less polluting when it is performed in a 'depersonalised' manner, simply for the purpose of procreation and not for carnal pleasure. Sex is defined in a masturbatory sense, and there is no room for any personal love relationship. Woman merely services this need and is an object to be used by man.²⁹⁹

The cumulative effect of these attitudes toward the married state is a denigration of marriage which is seen to bind the individual to the anxieties of this world (cf. 1 Cor 7:32f.). The church fathers looked upon marriage as a necessary evil. For John Chrysostom it was another opportunity for a man to exert his power over his submissive wife and it was an outlet for sexual desires. Augustine, on the other hand, thought that sexual desires were themselves the cause of sin. These were to be suppressed and the sexual act became an impersonal part of the reproductive process. The impact of these ideas on the social status of married women in the early church was such that their position not only was not improved in this period, but compared with the increase in the legal rights and personal autonomy of women under Roman law, we can say that it fell into decline.³⁰⁰

(c) Virginity

Virginity as the superior form of the Christian life did not become an instant ideal for the early Christians but was curbed in the early centuries by a need for discretion in the face of persecution. In the

first few centuries, married Christians included the clergy. This did not deny the fact, however, that marriage was primarily seen as a state of bondage from which the only escape was celibacy. Virginity was, furthermore, an opportunity for women to transcend the constraints of marriage which placed limitations on the female sex.³⁰¹ Martha may have been praised for her work in the house, but it was Mary who had chosen the better part which was not to be taken from her (Lk 10:38-42).

The celibate state offered women relief from the two-fold curse of Gn 3:16, subjection to the husband and the problems of childbearing. Chrysostom believed virginity offered rewards not only in the afterlife, but in the experience of peace and tranquility which "was a present reality for the virgin freed from the anxieties and turmoil of married life. There were many freedoms open to the virgin and in the view of Chrysostom, Olympias is the model female celibate. This woman is praised for her discrete behaviour and reservation in the face of newly found freedom, Olympias does not push herself forward demanding public attention. In Chrysostom's mind there was no possibility for virgins to be freed from the prohibition against associating with the opposite sex which only becomes a reality in paradise.³⁰²

Among the early fathers, Jerome in particular is seen as the champion of the celibate woman.³⁰³ This father of the Western church was counsellor to a coterie of celibate women, the most notable of them being Paula. These women had either never lost their virginity, or like Paula they had vowed themselves to a continent lifestyle after the death of their husbands.³⁰⁴ Jerome frequently writes to these women and his letters abound in sexual fantasies. Ruether considers them to be the result of the repression of sexual desires which the ascetic movement dealt with in two ways:

... first by a pruriency that exercised a perverted sexual libido through constant excoriations of sensuality in ascetic literature; second, by a sublimation of sexual libido that rejected it on the level of physical experience, but allowed it to flourish on the level of fantasy, elevated to represent the ecstatic nuptials of the bridal soul with Christ.³⁰⁵

In terms of Freudian psychology, therefore, Jerome expresses his own repressed sexual fantasies under the guise of anti-sexual polemics.

The result of this elevation of the position of woman through celibacy was that the fourth century CE saw a flood of women ready to denounce their familial obligations, and Augustine has to counsel the African matron, Ecducia to restrain herself. Ecducia had managed to

extract a vow of continence from her husband, and was disposing of her personal property autonomously. Augustine's letter to her appeals to the natural law of woman's subjection to man and he proclaims that it is a sin for her to refuse the debt of her body to her husband. Woman does not have her own head, but it is her husband who is her head.³⁰⁶

Other fathers also made appeal to the nature of woman which is unfitting and because of woman's uncleanness she is thereby excluded from positions of authority in the church. Women reach the celibate state, not as men do by affirming their body, but by denying their femaleness. The female ascetic must debase her physical image so she does not appear as a woman before men.

The problem for the fathers was essentially one of their own creation. By debasing marriage and the marriage act, the fathers were devaluing the main role open to women. Virginity offered a golden opportunity for the personal development of a Christian woman. This alternative was not allowed, however, to mean that women, by freeing themselves from their husbands, were now able to act independently. It has been the policy of the church throughout the centuries to ensure female ascetics are still subject to the authority of the male hierarchy of the church.

(d) Martyrdom

Martyrdom was yet another way in which women could achieve a semblance of equality with men. In the second century, Justin Martyr described the death of a woman who had been betrayed to her persecutors by her husband who would not support her efforts to reform his lifestyle.³⁰⁷ Cyprian of Carthage tells us of a third century lady Bona:

who was dragged by her husband to sacrifice, who did not pollute her conscience, but as those holding her hands sacrificed, she herself began to cry out against this: 'I have not done it!'³⁰⁸

For John Chrysostom, martyrdom is yet another means whereby a woman may become masculine. One woman, Domine, is called a priest by this father who records how she drowned with her daughters in a river after she had baptised them.³⁰⁹

By the fourth century, however, persecution of the church had ceased and with the acceptance of Christianity as the religion of the empire, martyrdom likewise ended.

(e) The Ministry of Women in the Early Church

The question of the ministry of women in the church is a subject which is very much the question of the day in church circles at the moment. However, although women were baptised and were allowed to participate in the eucharist in the early church, there were also strong prejudices expressed which showed that the fathers were not favourably disposed toward women's participation in the ministry. Thus Hippolytus of Rome, wrote in his Apostolic Tradition (215 CE):

Let women stand in the assembly by themselves, both the baptized women and the women catechumens. But after the prayer of the faithful is finished the catechumens shall not give the kiss of peace for their kiss is not yet pure. But the baptized shall embrace one another, men with men and women with women. But let not men embrace women. Moreover let all the women have their heads veiled with a scarf but not with a veil of linen only, for that is not sufficient covering.³¹⁰

Women were excluded from participating in the emerging priesthood because they were considered to be polluting and, therefore, ineligible to approach the altar. Tertullian never tired of appealing to New Testament texts which demanded that women remain silent in the church:

It is not permitted for a woman to speak in the church; but neither (is it permitted her) to teach, nor to baptize, nor to offer, nor to claim to herself a lot in any manly function, not to say (in any) sacerdotal office.³¹¹

While women were allowed to attend the assembly, they were instructed to sit behind the laymen.³¹²

The texts of 1 Cor 14:34f. and 1 Tim 2:11-15 obviously influenced the degree to which women were allowed to participate in the early church, and according to Gryson, the only ministries open to women were widows or deaconesses.³¹³ Whether these were two different ministries, and if so, what relationship they bore to one another, are issues which are still debated by scholars. More significant perhaps as far as B. Prusak is concerned, they are evidence that a woman could only gain stature in the Christian community by the degree to which she was removed from any sexual exercise.³¹⁴

In view of this evidence we will, therefore, focus our study of the ministry of women in the early church on widows and deaconesses.

(i) Widows

We read in both the Old and New Testaments that widows belong to an oppressed class who are to be cared for.³¹⁵ In Tit 2:3-4 and 1 Tim 5:3-10 widows should be models of perfection and they have a mission to teach

younger women. The Apostolic fathers of the second century CE echo this sentiment that the widows are oppressed and should be assisted by the Christian community. This ideal is summed up by Polycarp in his epistle to the Philippians:

"And let the presbyters be compassionate and merciful to all bringing back those that wander, visiting all the sick, and not neglecting the widow, the orphan, and the poor..."³¹⁶

According to Polycarp, widows are the 'altar of God',³¹⁷ and Ignatius speaks of them as 'the virgins called widows'.³¹⁸ These references, however, tell us little about the ministry of widows, though Hermas does describe the work of a woman called Grapte who is a widow. It is Grapte's responsibility to pass on knowledge of a revelation to widows and orphans.³¹⁹

By the beginning of the third century CE, widows began to emerge as a definite institution.³²⁰ Tertullian states that a widow cannot be enrolled into the 'order' if she has been married twice,³²¹ thus indicating that in his view they were ranked among the clergy. He believed that a woman could be admitted to this group on the terms of 1 Timothy - she had to be at least sixty years old, married once, and should have raised her children properly.³²² Evidence from the third century Greek fathers, Origen and Clement of Alexandria, confirms the incorporation of widows into the clergy, and they are listed together with bishops, presbyters and deacons.³²³

The third century Didascalia Apostolorum³²⁴ once again reaffirms the concern that widows are to be assisted.³²⁵ They are aged women who have their own place in the assembly,³²⁶ and among this group there are those who are appointed to the order of widows. A widow should have a quiet temperament and concern herself with praying for her benefactors and the whole church.³²⁷ Widows are not encouraged to teach:

it is not required nor necessary that women should be teachers, and especially about the name of Christ and about the redemption of His passion. Indeed, you have not been appointed to this, O women, and especially widows, that you should teach, but that you should pray and entreat the Lord God. For He, the Lord God, Jesus Christ our teacher, sent us the Twelve to instruct the people and the nations. And there were with us women disciples, Mary Magdalene and Mary the daughter of James, and the other Mary, and he did not send (them) to instruct the people with us. If it were required, indeed, that women should teach, our teacher Himself would have commanded these to give instruction with us.³²⁸

Widows are to be obedient to the bishop and deacons are not to act without their permission.³²⁹

By the fourth century, the Ecclesiastical Canons of the Apostles³³⁰ refers to three widows who are appointed. Two of these women persevere in prayer while the third one cares for the sick.³³¹ The Canons of Hippolytus, a fourth century pseudepigraphical recasting of the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus, states that widows are not to be ordained because ordination is solely for men. Widows are to pray, care for the sick and fast.³³²

To sum up, widows are women who fall into two groups; those who are appointed and widows generally. A widow is someone of advanced age and has been widowed only once. These women were then expected to adopt a continent lifestyle and devote themselves to prayer, fasting, and visiting the sick. Widows were not ordained but appointed, they had no real liturgical services to perform, and they were forbidden to teach.

(ii) Deaconesses

According to H.W. Beyer³³³ the order of deaconesses rose quickly in the church. The problematic text is 1 Tim 3:8-12. Are the women mentioned here merely the wives of deacons, or were they deacons themselves?³³⁴ Pliny the Younger, writing to Trajan concerning the Christians comments that:

On this I considered it the more necessary to find out from two maid-servants who were called deaconesses, and that by torments, how far this was true³³⁵

In the third century Origen lends support to the inclusion of women in the diaconate when he comments on the text of Rom 16:1 involving Phoebe:

And thus this text teaches at the same time two things: that there are, as we have already said, women deacons in the Church, and that women, who have given assistance to so many people and who by their good works deserve to be praised by the Apostle, ought to be accepted in the diaconate.³³⁶

Deaconesses are mentioned together with widows in the Didascalia. Their functions are similar to those of a deacon and like him they must assist the bishop in his pastoral work. The deaconess ministers to the sick in cases where it would offend the pagans to see a male deacon go into the house of a female. These women were also responsible for anointing women before they were immersed in the waters of baptism, though they were not allowed to baptise themselves. That some women did assume this prerogative is suggested by the Didascalia:

About this, however, that a woman should baptize, or that one should be baptized by a woman, we do not counsel, for it is a

transgression of the commandment and a great peril to her who baptizes and to him who is baptized. Indeed, if it were lawful to be baptized by a woman, our Lord and teacher Himself would have been baptized by Mary His mother. Now He was baptized by John, like others also of the people. Therefore do not bring danger upon yourselves, brethren and sisters, by acting beyond the law of the Gospel.³³⁷

The Apostolic Constitutions³³⁸ adds to the duties of a deaconess the job of welcoming women at the doors of the church, helping at the baptism of women, and acting as an intermediary between women and the clergy.

And as we cannot believe on Christ without the teaching of the Spirit, so let not any woman address herself to the deacon or bishop without the deaconess.³³⁹

These women were, therefore, expected to carry out their duties in the service of other women. It is also interesting to note that according to the Constitutions these women were ordained members of the clergy. The form of the prayer of ordination for deaconesses differs from that for deacons and appears to underline the idea that women are somehow unclean. Part of it reads:

do Thou now also look down upon this Thy servant, who is to be ordained to the office of a deaconess, and grant her Thy Holy Spirit and "cleanse her from all filthiness of flesh and spirit", that she may worthily discharge the work which is committed to her to Thy glory³⁴⁰

Female deacons were, therefore, the only women to receive a true ordination in the early church. Their functions included assisting at the baptism of women and visiting sick women, in both cases for reasons connected with the preservation of the dignity of the men normally associated with the performance of these tasks.

The conclusion we are left with is that women had a very limited ministerial role in the early church. However, as Tertullian suggests, the so called 'heretical' groups possibly offered women greater opportunities to minister:

The very women of these heretics, how wanton they are! For they are bold enough to teach, to dispute, to enact exorcisms, to undertake cures - it may be even to baptize.³⁴¹

We will now look at the position of women among these groups to conclude our study of the position of women in the first few centuries CE.

(f) Heretical groups and their attitudes towards women

When we ask what evidence exists to indicate that women exercised important leadership roles in the 'heretical' groups of the first few

centuries we are immediately confronted with certain problems. Most of the evidence we have for these groups comes from the heresiologists as any material written by the 'heretics' was subsequently destroyed by the early church in its efforts to stamp out heresy. Furthermore, it is hardly likely that the church fathers would have been entirely objective in their heated polemics against the various heretical movements of the day. Our efforts are further hampered by recent finds such as the Nag Hammadi texts, for while they tell us a considerable amount about the theology of these various heretical groups, they tell us little or nothing about their ecclesiastical organisation.

The evidence presented below is, therefore, of a very partial nature and must obviously be limited in its scope.

Among the gnostic systems, Marcion, if he can be called a gnostic, discussed the creation of the world in terms which suggested that creation was the work of the demiurge and the alien God of goodness, the father of Jesus Christ, was not involved. Christ was sent to save people from this world, but while people are in it they should reject its evil ways, practice asceticism, and denounce marriage and reproduction. We know very little about the role of women in this church, but according to Apelles, a disciple of Marcion, a woman named Philimene not only accompanied him on his trips, but she also taught.³⁴²

Another group, the Carpocratians, adopted a libertine lifestyle, being indifferent to the things of this world. This group appealed to Mary Magdalene, Martha and Salome as guarantors of their tradition. A woman named Marcellina represented the group in Rome. The son of Carpocrates, Epiphanes, espoused the ideal of Gal 3:28 and argued for the equality of all women, even within the marriage relationship.³⁴³

The sect which seemed to give the most prominent role to women was the Montanist group. Their leader Montanus was accompanied by the two famous prophets Maximilla and Priscilla. Didymus the Blind argues against this prophetic leadership:

Scripture recognizes as prophetesses the four daughters of Philip, Deborah, Mary, the sister of Aaron, and Mary, the mother of God, who said, as recorded in the Gospel: "Henceforth all women and all generations shall call me blessed". But in Scripture there are no books written in their name. On the contrary, the Apostle says in First Timothy: "I do not permit women to teach", and again in First Corinthians: "Every woman who prays or prophesies with uncovered head dishonours her head". He means that he does not permit a woman to write books impudently on her own authority, nor to teach in the assemblies, because by doing

so, she offends her head man; for "the head of woman is man and the head of man is Christ". The reason for this silence imposed on women is obvious: woman's teaching in the beginning caused considerable havoc to the human race; for the Apostle writes: "It is not the man who was deceived, but the woman.³⁴⁴

Another gnostic, Marcus, is reported to have had great success among women and Irenaeus attacks him for seducing many of the women in Lyons. Marcus involved these women in 'manipulations' over the eucharist and wine, and is supposed to have enthused them with the spirit of prophecy.³⁴⁵

E. Pagels draws our attention to another aspect of Gnosticism which was to characterise God in both male and female language. She claims this is generally absent from the Old Testament where God has no female consort, and is usually described with masculine epithets.³⁴⁶ In gnosticism, God can either be male or female, and the divine mother can be referred to as Holy Spirit or Divine Wisdom.

The image of the androgynous ideal, the unification of opposites, is recognised as a prime symbol of salvation for gnostic groups.³⁴⁷ This belief is enshrined in the gnostic ritual of sacred marriage, which the heresiologists assumed meant sexual relations were involved. According to Meeks, whatever the gnostics did in the marriage sacrament, it clearly distinguished them from those who were merely baptised or anointed.³⁴⁸ The individuals concerned experienced a subjective transformation of their consciousness which is sometimes expressed as making two into one. It is interesting to note that in the Gospel of Thomas, Logion 114, the two are made one when the female becomes male:

Simon Peter said to them: "Let Mary go out from among us, because women are not worthy of Life". Jesus said: "See, I become a living spirit (πνεῦμα), resembling you males. For every woman who makes herself male will enter the Kingdom of Heaven.³⁴⁹

Fiorenza does not, however, believe that gnosticism used these categories to designate real men and women, but to refer to the 'cosmic-religious' principles or hierarchies. While she admits that some extreme gnostic groups demand the destruction of the feminine principle, in others salvation means the reunification of male and female principles in the androgynous ideal.³⁵⁰

The question of women's leadership among gnostic groups focuses on the traditions of resurrection witness. As we will see in later chapters, the four canonical gospels recognised Mary Magdalene as a resurrection witness. We will also suggest that the women's role was

gradually eclipsed in the resurrection tradition as the men were redacted in. In the non-canonical traditions, these developments are reflected in an interesting antagonism concerning the validity of resurrection witness which is reflected in debates involving Mary Magdalene and Peter in particular.

The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, a collection of second and third century texts, recount the conversions of a number of women to ascetic Christianity. In this literature women emerge as superior to men in virtue, determination, and courage, often to the discredit of the apostles themselves.³⁵¹ One of the best known legends is that of Paul and Thecla - a female missionary who is converted by Paul.³⁵² Not only does Thecla take a vow of continence, but like the many other women in these legends, she renounces her family. Thecla is tortured for her beliefs, but escapes martyrdom and baptises herself.³⁵³ Paul then commissions Thecla as a missionary.

It is the view of R.S. Kraemer that women were attracted to this form of ascetic Christianity because it offered an escape from traditional sociosexual roles, even if these women were still defined in terms of the male apostle.³⁵⁴ Though hesitant to see such a clear cut demarcation between orthodox and heretical beliefs, Pagels believes it was the social consequences of gnostic beliefs which led the orthodox church to reject these groups as heretics.³⁵⁵ For her the evidence does seem to indicate that two very different patterns of sexual attitudes emerged within the orthodox and the gnostic literature. Furthermore, the gnostic teachings were seen as a threat to the orthodox description of God corresponding to a description of human nature which authorises the social pattern of male domination.³⁵⁶

To sum up then, the position of women within the heretical groups does seem to have been at variance with the position of women in the mainstream church tradition. The so called heretics appear to have been more honest in their renunciation of the present world as inherently evil and following through this doctrine in the practical response of either denying marriage and reproduction altogether, or adopting an indifferent libertinism. God is depicted in female language as the divine mother which indicates that female qualities were not viewed by the heretics as intrinsically evil or polluting.

Women were allowed to take up roles including prophecy and missionary activities within these communities. The attacks made on

women such as Thecla, who renounced their former lifestyle and adopted a life of sexual continence, are perhaps a clue as to why these groups were denounced so strongly. The heresies were a threat to the male hierarchy of the orthodox church because they undermined the social structures such as those we saw in the household codes.

Conclusion

Influenced by their views of creation and the fall, the church fathers often displayed a tendency to denigrate the very nature of women. This did not, however, mean that women were rejected out of hand, but the 'virgin' could remain as the image of the ideal woman, even if the price paid for this was a denial of femininity. This veneration of the celibate state for women reached a climax in the fourth century and the cult of the Virgin Mary. This unfortunately did very little for the position of women in general, representing as it does the impossible ideal of being both a virgin and a mother.

For the majority of women the main option, therefore, was marriage, in which they were to experience the domination of their husbands. A wife has no personal autonomy, but is subject to her husband who is her head. The third image of woman in the church fathers is of the whore, who represents the carnal nature of woman and who caused man to fall into sin.

The combination of these three images - the virgin, the wife and the whore, sum up how the early church fathers viewed women. Being naturally polluting this sex was, therefore, denied access to the priesthood, and the only ministerial roles open to women were the widow or the deaconess. Both of these roles, however, demanded the removal of their office holders from any sexual exercise.

Having finally briefly reviewed the role of women in the heretical sects, we can say that the church fathers present only one side of the question of the role and status of women in the early church. They selected materials and used the bible to reinforce their own particular attitudes towards women and female leadership in the church. Moreover, they have been used over the centuries to justify and reinforce the male leadership of the church, though this position has come under increasing attack in recent years.³⁵⁷

CONCLUSION ON WOMEN IN THE EARLY CHURCH

In our examination of the role and status of women in the early church of the New Testament period and the church fathers, we have considered the statement that women enjoyed better relationships with their brethren in the primitive community than they did in subsequent years. This situation of equivalence of male/female roles was seen in the involvement of women in the house church movement, as wealthy female patrons, as co-workers and missionaries, and ultimately in Gal 3:28. With 1 Corinthians 7, however, we also became aware that the apostle Paul was unable to translate his theological teachings into social realities and his comments on the role of women were influenced by his concern for both unity and right order in the Christian community. The texts of 1 Cor 11:2f. and 14:33b-36, originally addressed to counteract an over-enthusiastic response in the Corinthian church to Pauline teachings such as Gal 3:28, were taken up and taken much further in the subsequent Christianised household codes and the teachings of the church fathers.

What we therefore witness in the early church is a tension between 'equality' and 'subordination'. Women are encouraged in their roles as wives and mothers and it was unfortunate for them that the church fathers in particular did not have a very encouraging attitude to the positive aspects of the marriage relationship. We would also suggest that the refusal of the church fathers to admit women to any roles other than those of the widow or deaconess was influenced by a particular conception they had of women that they were somehow distracting to men, and also in some way unclean.

This then is the immediate background against which we will review the crucifixion, burial and resurrection stories of the canonical and non-canonical gospel traditions. We have already suggested that it is a context which involved a struggle with various 'heretical' groups and it is particularly of interest to us that the debate involved the disputed question of women's ministry in the Christian community. When we ask how does a particular evangelist portray the women in the closing scenes of the gospel we will bear in mind the portrayal of women in the ancient world and within the early church. This will obviously influence our assessment of whether a particular presentation is intended to be positive or negative. It will also enable us to decide whether the women in the resurrection stories can be seen as representatives of the absent male disciples and beyond this whether any identification with those male

disciples was intended to enhance or detract from the role of women in the Christian communities to which the gospels were addressed.

CHAPTER ONE - NOTES

1. Many studies of women in the early church begin in this way. Cf. J. Leipoldt (1955); E. and F. Stagg (1978); E.M. Tetlow (1980); B. Witherington (1981); S.E. Dollar (1983); M. Evans (1983).
2. For a recent discussion of the issues in method of historical reconstruction see B.J. Brootten (1985). For a discussion of the nature of the Mishnaic material on women see J. Neusner (1980), vol. V, p. 24. Neusner comments here that the Mishnah is concerned with women's social relations and the accompanying property relations. It deals with a world that is not fully realised and is, therefore, more prescriptive than descriptive. Finally, he warns us of the danger of taking the opinion of individual rabbis and assuming it is representative of rabbinic attitudes in general.
3. See L. Swidler (1976) and E. and F. Stagg (1978). For a general treatment of women in Judaism of the period roughly comparable with that of the New Testament period cf. I.J. Peritz (1898); G. Delling (1931); S.W. Baron (1952); Leipoldt (1955); R. Loewe (1966); J. Jeremias (1969); C.F. Moore (1971); J. Hauptmann (1974); C.G. Montefiore and R.H. Loewe (1974); E. Koltun, ed. (1976); M. Meiselman (1978); J.B. Segal (1979); J. Neusner (1980).
4. Not only should we consider the statements of the rabbis which we find in the Mishnah but we should also include the opinions of Josephus and Philo. There are also the practices of the Essenes and in particular the conflicting evidence of Josephus concerning whether or not they were allowed to marry. See B.J., ii, 120-121, 160-161, LCL, pp. 369, 385.
5. According to Meiselman, woman and man were created by God for each other, man being incomplete on his own. It is natural that they should marry and their attitude toward one another must be one of hesed, loving-kindness. Woman has a particular capacity for tzniut - privacy - an inner directed orientation of her life, and it is within the home that she should transmit the experience of what it is to be Jewish. See (1978), pp. 1-18. Thus in the opinion of R. Yossi, "I have never called my wife 'my wife', only my home." (B. Shab. 118b).
6. In Judaism it is the mother, not the father who passes on membership of the Jewish religion (B. Yeb. 23a).
7. Thus in B. Qid. 82b we read, "Happy is he whose children are males, and woe to him whose children are females". The birth of a son was seen as a greater reason for rejoicing than the birth of a daughter, and it is to the former only that the father has a duty to teach torah (B. Qid. 29a). The only connection women had with torah was enabling their sons to study.
8. See M. Sot. 3:8. A man was able to sell and betroth his daughter whereas a mother was able to do neither. A daughter did not have rights of inheritance. It was, therefore, the heirs of the deceased who had a duty to maintain his daughters (M. Ket. 4:6). However, if a man died and left sons and daughters and the property was small, then the daughters received maintenance and the sons had to go a-begging (M. Ket. 13:3).

An underaged daughter had no right to possessions of her own and anything she earned through her work belonged to her father (M. Ket. 4:4). If a daughter was violated it was to the father that damages should be paid (M. Ket. 4:1).
9. If she was underage, the daughter could refuse and stay at home until puberty (M. Ket. 4:4). After twelve and a half, marriage.

money on betrothal belongs to the father (Cf. B. Ket. 46b; B. Qid. 3b). If the girl's father died before she was twelve and a half, she could refuse a marriage arranged by her mother and brothers (M. Yeb. 13:1-2). The only encouraging signs regarding a daughter's status were that she could not be betrothed against her will (B. Qid. 2b), and when she was actually married, though her father had not previously been liable for her maintenance, her husband was obliged to both maintain and ransom her (M. Ket. 4:4).

10. The Jewish husband had to give his wife her conjugal rights (M. Ket. 5:6), provide her with food, clothing and shelter, redeem her if she was taken captive, and offer medical care and burial facilities (M. Ket. 4:4, 8-9).
11. Marriage was highly regarded by the rabbis and the high priest could not officiate on the Day of Atonement unless he was married (M. Yom. 1:1). The rabbis considered that not only was marriage important for procreation, but a good wife brings her husband good cheer (B. Ber. 57b). Indeed, if a man's wife dies it is even as if the temple were destroyed in his day.

The perfect wife in Judaism is Rachel, wife of Rabbi Akiba. We read that not only did she forfeit her inheritance to marry against her father's will, but she lived in poverty for twelve years while her husband was away studying. Her reward was that when her husband returned he told his students that all he and they had acquired really belonged to her. See B. Ket. 62b-63a.

12. The Ketubah is a document outlining the marriage settlement for a woman in the event of divorce or the death of her husband. If the woman was a virgin when she was married she is entitled to 200 zuzim and 100 zuzim if she was not a virgin at the time of marriage (M. Ket. 1:2). A husband could, however, add to this sum if he wished (M. Ket. 5:1).
13. The get was a written divorce document and there were elaborate rules on how they should be written. For a recent discussion of Jewish practice see M. Hilton and G. Marshall (1988), pp. 119f.
14. According to the Mishnah a woman is freed by two means, by death or divorce (M. Qid 1:1). Jewish divorce law was based on Dt 24:1-4 but the rabbis disagreed on the interpretation of some "indecent" (M. Gitt. 9:10). It is generally accepted that the more liberal interpretation of the school of Hillel won the day. Thus G.F. Moore (1971), p. 124.

It was usually the husband who initiated divorce proceedings (M. Gitt. 9:10). See also, however, R. Yaron (1960); P. Sigal (1975); and B.J. Broton (1982a; 1983). These scholars point to evidence which suggests women could divorce their husbands.

15. The fact that men were not forbidden per se to have extra-marital relationships has its origins in the Old Testament where a man can only commit adultery against a marriage other than his own (cf. Ex 20:10; Dt 5:17). The punishment for adultery was death (B. San. 74a). However, it is suggested that there was a gradual relaxation in the implementation of the death penalty. See L. Swidler (1976), pp. 151f.
16. Both males and females are judged in the same way with equal rights to seek legal retribution. If a woman commits a crime she is treated the same way as a man (B. Qid. 35a). During the Mishnaic period there was also an improvement in women's status as regards inheritance and in the case of a man dying with a small estate, the daughters had the right to maintenance before the sons (M. B. B. 9:1). If a woman lost her husband through death or divorce she was allowed to keep her ketubah (M. Ket. 4:2), although a widow could

- not inherit from her husband. See EncJud, 'widow', ad. loc.
17. See Ant. iv, 219, LCL, vol. IV, p. 581. A woman's witness was, however, accepted in a number of instances. See, for example, M.Sot. 6:4. 9:8. For B. Witherington (1984), p. 9 it is, therefore, going too far to suggest that a woman's word was accepted only in rare instances. See also Swidler (1976), pp. 115-116 who refers to a Jewish tradition which explains why women are not qualified to bear witness on the grounds that Sarah laughed. As we will see later in our examination of the apocryphal material, this reference to Sarah was also used against women by the early Christians.
 18. The freedom of women to appear in public probably varied between rural and urban areas. In the countryside we read of women who draw water (M. Ket. 1:10), help as shopkeepers (M. Ket. 9:4) and work in the fields (M. B. M. 1:6). According to Philo, women should remain indoors De. Spec. Leg. iii, 169, LCL, vol. vii, p. 581. See also 3 Mac 1:18-19; 4 Mac 18:7.
It is also disputed whether Jewish women wore the veil when they did venture out. See J. Jeremias (1969), pp. 359f.; J.B. Hurley (1981), pp. 254-271; E. Marmorstein (1954-5).
 19. See M. Aboth 1:5 where R. Jose b. Johanan advises that he who talks much with womankind brings evil upon himself. According to M. Qid. 4:12 a man was forbidden to be alone with a woman, and in M. Ket. 7:6 we read that a woman who conversed with a man in the street could be dismissed without her ketubah.
 20. According to R. Hillel where there are many women there is much witchcraft (M. Aboth. 2:7). For R. Joshua a woman would rather have a single measure of food with wantonness than nine measures with continence (M. Sot. 3:4). See Swidler (1976), pp. 79f. for a list of negative evaluations of women.
 21. See D. Goodblatt (1975) for a review of the Beruriah traditions. According to the tradition Beruriah is even said to have studied three hundred laws from three hundred teachers in one day.
 22. See A. Goldfeld (1975), especially p. 245 where she is critical of the rabbinic treatment of women in the halakah. According to the Mishnah, women are obliged to fulfil all negative and non time-bound observances (M. Qid. 1:7). They did not, therefore, have to pray three times a day, observe annual pilgrimages, reside in sukkahs or act as representatives of the community (M. Sukk. 2:8; B. Ber. 17). According to R. Loewe (1966), pp. 41f., this was because such obligations would interfere with a woman's household obligations and certain biological functions such as menstruating and pregnancy. Finally, see M. Shab. 2:6 for the positive commandments women were expected to fulfil.
 23. M. Sot. 3:4.
 24. In the temple women were restricted to the court of women. See Josephus, Ant., XV, 418f., LCL, vol viii, p. 203. See also B.J. Brooten (1982). Here Brooten examines the archaeological evidence for the existence of synagogue galleries and suggests that it is at its best scanty and ambiguous. She, therefore, concludes that while it is possible that a few Palestinian synagogues did have galleries, there is no reason to assume that they were used to separate men and women in worship.
 25. See S.B. Pomeroy (1975), pp. ix-xii.
 26. This point is made by S. Treggiari (1976), p. 76.
 27. According to Pomeroy, Dorian women, in contrast to Ionian women, enjoyed many freedoms, and among the Dorians the Spartans were the most liberated of all. See (1975), p. 136.

28. Thus J. O'Faolin and L. Martines (1979), p. 25. The Spartan system was developed in the seventh century BCE by Lucurgus with the aim of producing a first rate breed of men to defend Sparta. Thus the main role for women was to produce children and many of the laws relating to women are concerned with this subject. See J. Donaldson (1907), p. 26. In support of this the law of Lycurgus forbade inscriptions of the deceased on a tomb except for a man who died at war or a woman who died in childbirth. See Plutarch, Lycurgus xxvii, The Parallel Lives, LCL, vol. i, p. 287.
29. The idea behind physical training was to weed out the weaker women so that only the healthy partners were chosen to hopefully produce healthy children. See Plutarch, Lycurgus, xiv, 2-3, LCL, vol. i, pp. 246-247. Although Xenophon and Plutarch suggest women were only offered physical education, Plato also notes that Spartan women prided themselves on their learning and culture. See Protagoras, 342D, LCL, vol. ii, pp. 195-196. See also S. Guettel Cole (1980), pp. 129-155, esp. 138.
30. It is difficult to know at what age Spartan women were expected to marry. According to Plutarch, Lycurgus, xv, 4, LCL, vol. i, p. 251 this was before the body reached its height of perfection. See also W.K. Lacey (1968), p. 138, n. 50.

It is also uncertain how Spartan marriages were arranged. There is a suggestion that there was a form of marriage by capture. See Plutarch, Lycurgus, XV, 3, LCL, vol. i, pp. 249-251.
31. Spartan women were not expected to carry out household tasks but to supervise the performance of these by other women. Maidservants were responsible for rearing children and making clothes while their mistresses ran the household. See F.W. Cornish (1905), p. 519. According to Aristotle, Spartan women managed their husbands' affairs and by his day they owned two fifths of all the land. See Politics, II. vi. 5-11, LCL, pp. 135-9.
32. See Pomeroy (1975), pp. 38-39 who notes a tendency here to anticipate the Roman practice of connecting the vigour of the state with the virtue of the women, and political weakness with moral degeneracy - particularly of the women.
33. In the opinion of K.J. Dover (1973), p. 69, it is impossible to make generalisations about the position of women in Athens as this varied with social class.
34. Some scholars would argue that although Athenian women were hidden away they were nonetheless held in high esteem. See V. Ehrenberg (1946), pp. 65-66; (1962), pp. 201-203; W.K. Lacey (1968), pp. 340-341.

The seclusion theory has been challenged by a number of scholars led by A.W. Gomme (1925). He suggested that such a conclusion was inconsistent with the evidence of the representations of women in Attic art and drama. This conclusion has been supported by D.C. Richter (1971). See also H.D.F. Kitto (1966), pp. 219-236; C.T. Seltmann (1955) and (1956), pp. 102-116. A more reserved conclusion is put forward by M.B. Arthur (1976). She suggests here that women's seclusion was probably a cultural idea which in all likelihood reflected actual practice in only the most general way (p. 389).
35. See H.J. Wolff (1944) for an examination of marriage law in ancient Athens. There is no certainty about the age at which Athenian girls married. See Lacey (1968), p. 162 who suggests fourteen as the possible age for marriage. According to Xenophon, Oeconomicus, vii. 5, LCL, p. 415, Isomachus was about thirty when he married his wife of fourteen. The reason for early marriage was because of the

- necessity for virgin brides and a belief that women were lustful. See Aristotle, Politics, vii. xiv, 5, LCL, p. 621. See also R. Flaceliere (1965), p. 59 who notes that girls were married off as soon as they obtained puberty. Finally, for Richter (1971), p. 4 this large age gap explains the paternalistic attitude of Athenian husbands.
36. Women were always under the control of a man who acted as their guardian. This was usually the girl's father, and on his death the control passed to the next of kin. When a girl married, the authority passed to her husband, and on his death the widow was either under the control of her sons, her original guardian, or her husband's heirs.
 37. A woman taken in adultery was excluded from participating in religious ceremonies and was automatically divorced. See Lacey (1968), p. 115. In both Sparta and Athens a woman could leave her husband and take her property to her guardian. Thus Cornish (1905), p. 519.
 38. If a husband wanted to divorce his wife he simply sent her from his house. However, if a woman wanted to divorce her husband, she needed the intercession of a male relative to bring the case before the archon. Finally, although a woman was free to remarry after divorce, she could not take her children with her.
 39. See Xenophon, Memorabilia, II. vii. 2-14; Oeconomicus, iii. 10-15. See also Plato, The Republic, V. III, LCL, vol. V, pp. 433f. where women are described as female watchdogs who remain indoors incapacitated by the breeding of the whelps.
 40. Here women were involved in their husband's affairs, they built temples, founded cities, commanded armies and held fortresses. See W. Tarn and G.T. Griffith (1952), p. 98; Pomeroy (1975), pp. 120f., (1984).
 41. These women exercised considerable power, especially through their sons. They are also famous for their dynastic intrigues. Olympias was involved in struggles against rival wives, mistresses and their children to ensure Alexander succeeded to the Macedonian throne. From the time of Arsinoë the queen's head appears on coins with her husband's. See Tarn and Griffith (1953), p. 56. See also G.H. Macurdy (1927) who argues that the power of women like Eurydice, Olympias and Cleopatra was the result of their own character and politics rather than a tradition of woman power in old Macedonia.
 42. This point is made by I. Zeitlin (1982) in her discussion of the Thesmophoria festival. For a review of the literature on women and religion in Greece see R.S. Kraemer (1983).
 43. See Pomeroy (1975), pp. 57f. on women in Athens including the worship of Athena and the mysteries of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis.
 44. The temple of Aphrodite at Corinth was staffed by one thousand female slaves dedicated to her worship. See F.F. Bruce (1971), p. 18. See also C. Inwood Sourvinou (1978).
 45. According to R.S. Kraemer (1979), investigations into the role of Dionysus have often appealed to the emotional temperament of women which it is claimed is suited to the ecstatic enthusiasm, fertility themes and fertility magic which are considered to be more appropriate to women rather than men.
 46. See M.B. Arthur (1977); B. Lincoln (1979); S. Guettel Cole (1980).
 47. Women in Rome were roughly divided into three classes - citizens, foreigners and slaves.
 48. See M. Johnston (1957), pp. 106-109 and J.A. Crook (1967). Strictly speaking all those living in a man's household were his property.

49. For a discussion of Roman marriage practices see J.P.D. Balsdon (1962), pp. 179f.; U.E. Paoli (1983), pp. 114-116.
50. See P. Hopkins (1964-5) who discusses the various suggestions and concludes that it does not seem to have been a precondition of Roman marriage for girls to have reached puberty.
51. The Roman matron was held in high regard. She was not restricted to any women's quarters, but could move freely within the household. She did not perform household tasks but supervised slaves. She was also responsible for the supervision of her children's early education. See Johnston (1957), pp. 137-139.
52. Although Roman women went to parties and banquets, women were not encouraged to join in drinking sessions. See Juvenal, Satires VI, 413-433, LCL, p. 119. See also Satires VI. 346, LCL, p. 111 where a man is instructed to "put a lock and keep your wife indoors".
53. If a husband was divorcing his wife for immoral conduct then he had the right to keep half the dowry and he automatically kept the children in any divorce case. Barrenness was also used as grounds for divorce and in this instance it was usually seen to be the fault of the women. For details on Roman women see Pomeroy (1975), pp. 149-189. On unhappy marriages and divorce see Balsdon (1962), pp. 209-223.
54. See Pomeroy (1975), pp. 206f. for women in Roman religions. See also M. Beard (1980). Since there were only six vestal virgins at any one time they were not representative of the majority of Roman women.
55. The involvement of women in this cult is strongly criticised by Juvenal. See Satires, VI. 511-541, LCL, pp. 125-127.
56. See Justinian, Institutes, 2. 10. 6, ET J.A.C. Thomas (1975), p. 112.
57. See W. Meeks (1974), pp. 165-208, especially pp. 167-168.
58. See J.A. McNamara (1976), p. 145.
59. Thus Fiorenza (1983a), p. 394.
60. See (1969), p. 50f. Boucher accepts that the doctrine of subordination was first taught in Judaism. She also proposes, however, that the doctrine of equality was also first taught in Judaism.
61. Thus Fiorenza (1983b), pp. 411-412.
62. The assessments of Luke-Acts such as Acts 4:32 which suggests the early church was an 'uncorrupted virgin' have long been disputed. Cf. J.B. Lightfoot (1887), pp. 292-374, W. Bauer (1972); J. Dunn (1977).
63. See Fiorenza (1982) for an excellent summary of a suggested 'feminist' hermeneutics.
64. Thus E. Pagels (1980), pp. 3-27
65. See R. Jewett (1979) for a full bibliography.
66. Thus G.B. Caird (1972), p. 268.
67. See R. Scroggs (1972b), p. 307.
68. Thus E. and F. Staggs (1978), p. 162. The Staggs see four areas of tension in Paul: 1) within Paul himself; 2) between his vision and its implementation; 3) within the situation in the churches - with the threat of legalism on the one hand and libertinism on the other; and 4) between personhood and roles in the structures of church and society.
69. Thus W.O. Walker Jr. (1983), p. 101f.
70. See A. Cameron (1980), p. 63. Cameron looks at the question of the prominence of women in the spread of Christianity from the perspective of a classicist, and asks: was the relationship of the 'functional equality' of men and women in the church so unusual.

- when compared with the status of women in Graeco-Roman society as a whole?
71. Thus Parvey (1974), p. 127.
 72. See R. Scroggs (1972a) and (1974) and the reply to these articles by E. Pagels (1974).
 73. This is taken from the title of an article by H. Chadwick (1954-5). He sees Paul's dilemma to be both apologist to the Gentiles and defender of orthodoxy within the one church.
 74. There has been a great deal written on the nature of Paul's opponents with various suggestions. Were they Jews or perhaps zealots? R. Jewett (1970). Were they the representatives of the primitive Urgemeinde? S.G.F. Brandon (1951); were they Judaizers - either Palestinian Jewish Christians, J.B. Lightfoot (1887), H.J. Schoeps (1961), or Gentile Judaizers? J. Munck (1959). Were they antinomians or libertines? Or were they Gnostics? Thus W. Schmithals (1972); W. Bousset (1970).
 75. Thus K. Stendahl (1966), p. 33.
 76. Thus V.R. Mollenkott (1981), p. 103. See also E.A. Leonard (1950), p. 311. It is Leonard's opinion that Paul not only retained the Jewish view on the inferiority of women, but through his writings greatly influenced the early Church in the suppression of women.
 77. Thus Pagels (1974), p. 545f.
 78. Thus Ruether (1978), p. 173.
 79. Parvey (1974), p. 143. There has been a great deal of discussion in recent years on the social world of the early Christian church. See particularly J.G. Gager (1975); R. Scroggs (1975); G. Theissen (1976).
 80. Cf. Fiorenza (1983), p. 168.
 81. See above on Judaism.
 82. For an interesting article on the significance of the house churches in Christianity see F.V. Filson (1939). Filson points out here that there are five ways in which a study of the early house churches furthers our understanding of the apostolic church. These include the fact that they allowed the followers of Jesus to have a distinctively Christian form of worship; the existence of several house churches in one city possibly explaining why we read of party strife in the apostolic age; the light they throw on the social status of the early Christians; and the attention paid to family life in some of the early writings of the church.
 83. See Fiorenza (1987), pp. 394f. who suggests that Chlōe possibly had a leadership role in the church at Corinth.
 84. See Fiorenza (1979a), p. 33.
 85. On the role of Lydia in particular see W.D. Thomas (1972). It is not only in Christianity that we read of women followers and supporters. See W. Meeks (1974), p. 172 for their role among the Epicureans.
 86. For a bibliography on the ministry of women in the New Testament see A. Lemaire (1973), pp. 163-4.
 87. For a general discussion of Paul and his co-workers see E.E. Ellis (1970-1).
 88. Cf. L. Schottroff (1983), p. 424, who draws out attention to attempts which have been made to alter this placing by naming Aquila first.
 89. Cf. J.M. Ford (1977), p. 132.
 90. Thus E.S. Fiorenza (1979a), p. 35. We reject the interpretation of R. Gryson, since we do not accept that there is any suggestion in Paul that in the case of Phoebe, diakonos refers to a specific service and not to the general service of God. See R. Gryson.

- (1976), p. 3.
91. See B. Brooten (1977).
 92. See Fiorenza (1979b), pp. 84-90. She notes here that according to Paul, all those Christians were apostles who could fulfil two conditions; they had to be eye witnesses to the resurrection, and commissioned by the resurrected Lord to missionary work. She notes that Luke qualifies this criteria in Acts when a male is chosen to replace Judas.
 93. This is the view of W. Munro (1974). According to Munro, while we must assume that Paul broke out of the confines of Jewish patriarchy, we must also recognise that he very soon became committed to a form of patriarchal legalism which became basic to early Catholicism.
 94. Thus Stagg (1978), p. 163; P.K. Jewett (1976), p. 142; Fiorenza (1983a), p. 205.
 95. See B. Men. 43b.
 96. See Boucher (1969). Diogenes Laertius 1.33 (Thales), LCL, I p. 35.
 97. Cf. Jewett (1979), p. 64.
 98. This point is raised by B. Witherington (1981), p. 594f. See also B. Hall (1974), pp. 51-2.
 99. Ibid.
 100. Cf. Scroggs (1972a), pp. 291-3 and W. Meeks (1974), pp. 180-3. This is a formula repeated elsewhere in the Pauline literature (cf. 1 Cor 12:12f and Col 3:9-11) and signifies baptism into the one body of Christ which unites pairs. See also Fiorenza (1983a), p. 208f. for details on the form critical analysis of this verse.
 101. See Meeks (1974), pp. 188-197.
 102. Thus Betz (1979), p. 196.
 103. Thus Parvey (1974), p. 132f. According to Jewett (1979), p. 67, Paul is arguing in Corinthians for a differentiation of sexual identity and in Galatians for an equality of honour and role.
 104. P.K. Jewett (1976), pp. 442f.
 105. Thus Scroggs (1972), p. 288.
 106. (1983a), p. 210.
 107. Ibid., pp. 212-213.
 108. Thus ibid., p. 213f.
 109. Thus Cameron (1980), p. 64.
 110. See Crouch (1972), p. 144.
 111. According to M. Evans (1983), p. 64, apart from passages where Paul is dealing specifically with the husband-wife relation, he has very little to say about the relation between men and women as such.
 112. See ibid., p. 70.
 113. See Barrett (1971), p. 161.
 114. Thus Bornkamm (1975), pp. 207-208.
 115. See Whiteley (1974), p. 215.
 116. J. Moiser (1983), pp. 103-4.
 117. See Scroggs (1972), p. 296. Thus, according to Scroggs, Paul does not think that sex is all there is to marriage. He also points out that except for v. 14, nothing is said about procreation.
 118. See D.S. Bailey (1959), p. 13.
 119. See W.G. Kümmel (1975), p. 272. J.C. Hurd believes that this reference is the reason that more scholars have attempted to reconstruct the Corinthians' questions concerning marriage than have attempted to formulate their inquiries on any other topic (1965, p. 154).
 120. According to J. Moiser (1983), pp. 104-5, if we take v. 1b as a quotation from the Corinthian letter, then it is likely that Paul's remarks are all made to answer a single question or statement. He

- further considers that this is borne out to a certain extent by the distinction between v. 1b and v. 2 which is indicated by a change of vocabulary (v. 1 ἄνθρωπος - γυνή and in vv. 2-4 ἀνὴρ - γυνή)
121. See A. Robertson and A. Plummer (1911), pp. 132-33.
 122. Thus Tertullian, On Monogamy, iii (ANF, iv, p. 60).
 123. See (1965), p. 157.
 124. Thus Moiser (1983), p. 105. He also hypothesises that the question put here is put by the same group of people as those Paul chiefly addresses in chapters 8-10, 12-14 and 16.
 125. See M.L. Barre (1975-6), p. 198.
 126. See Moiser (1983), pp. 105f. He divides the chapter into two distinct sections: 7:1-24 is the first pericope introduced by περὶ δὲ and 7:25-40 is the second, also introduced by περὶ δὲ.
See also H. Conzelmann (1975), p. 114, who divides the chapter up as follows: 1) vv. 1-7, general observations on marriage. 2) vv. 8f., an address to the un-married. 3) vv. 10-11, advice to the married. 4) vv. 12-16, advice on mixed marriages between Christians and pagans. 5) vv. 17-24, which deal with the question of principle which marks out the eschatological norm for the whole area of concern. 6) vv. 25-38, three approaches to the question of virginity (vv. 25-28, 29-35, 36-38), and finally 7) vv. 39-40, advice concerning widows. Finally, see J.K. Elliot (1974-5), p. 219 for a similar explanation of the subdivisions of 1 Corinthians 7.
 127. Thus Barrett (1971), pp. 2-3.
 128. Cf. Dunn (1977), p. 276. Dunn notes that this passage is frequently understood to mean that there were four parties at Corinth - a Paul party, and Apollos party, a Peter party and a Christ party. Cf. also J. Munck (1959) chapter 5, who suggests that there were no parties at Corinth, merely bickering within the community. Finally Dahl (1967), pp. 313-35 suggests that there were two factions - a pro-Paul party and a faction hostile to Paul.
 129. There are many theories regarding the various components of the Corinthian correspondence which is generally accepted to be a conflation of several letters. For reconstruction theories see G. Bornkamm (1975), pp. 244-6; Barrett (1971), pp. 11-17; Jewett (1979), pp. 58-9.
 130. See also 1 Cor 8:4f. which suggests that Paul sympathises with their viewpoint.
 131. For a discussion of what we mean by the term 'Gnostic' cf. R. Mc.L. Wilson (1977-8).
 132. See Kümmel (1975), p. 274f., and those cited there. The strongest supporter of the theory that Paul's opponents were gnostics is W. Schmithals (1972).
 133. Thus Hurd (1965), pp. 108f.
 134. Cf. J. Dunn (1977), pp. 275f.
 135. See M. Qid. 4.13 which prohibits an unmarried man to teach his children, and 4.14, which prohibits him to herd cattle.
 136. See Josephus, E.J., 11, 120-121, LCL, p. 369.
 137. See above on women in the ancient world.
 138. Cf. McNamara (1979), p. 575f. who draws our attention here to the pressures on women to marry within the Jewish and Roman world. Both societies see the family as the basic unit and a woman's role within marriage is primarily to provide children.
 139. Cf. Moiser (1983), p. 106. Moiser also asks: what does Paul mean by καλόν? He reviews the appearance of the word in the Pauline literature and finds several interpretations, depending on the context: morally good, commendable, pleasant, desirable,

- acceptable, advantageous, expedient, and finally, profitable. See Conzelmann (1975), p. 115 who prefers to interpret καλόν in a comparative sense, 'it is better'.
140. See Phipps (1982), p. 125. His ultimate decision is in favour of the third argument.
 141. Thus Tertullian, On Monogamy xi (ANF, iv, p. 66); Jerome, Against Jovinian I:vii (ANF and PNF 2nd. series, vi, p. 350); Augustine, Confessions II:iii (ANF and PNF 1st. series, i, p. 55).
 142. Cf. C. Jenkins (1908), pp. 500-1.
 143. See Snyder (1976-7) who discovers a proverb in 7:16 which he believes clarifies the entire argument of the chapter in that Paul begins by citing a mutilated saying of his adversaries rather than by setting forth his own assumptions.
 144. Thus Phipps (1982); W. Schrage (1976), pp. 215-7; R. Scroggs (1972), p. 296; D.R. Cartlidge (1975), p. 223. According to Cartlidge p. 224, 1 Cor. 7:1 tells us that the Corinthians are sexual ascetics and they consider this praxis mandatory for the Christian life.
 145. Thus Barrett (1971), p. 155.
 146. Cf. R. Loewe (1966), pp. 39-42 for a discussion of Jewish conjugal rights.
 147. Cf. E. Pagels (1974), p. 541.
 148. See M. Ber. 2.5, 'A bridegroom is exempt from reciting the Shema on the first night, or until the close of the (next) Sabbath if he has not consummated the marriage'.
- The Shema is the first word of a group of three passages from the Old Testament (Dt 6:4-9; 11:13-21; Num 15:37-41) which must be recited every morning and evening.
149. See A. Isaksson (1965), pp. 45-65.
 150. See Bailey (1959), pp. 4-5.
 151. Cf. S.B. Pomeroy (1975), pp. 213f.
 152. Thus D. Balch (1973-4). In this study, Balch addresses several questions including; what ascetic influence could have produced 1 Corinthians 7 and what kind of theology would support it?
 153. Thus J.M. Ford (1963-4).
 154. Barrett (1971), pp. 157-8.
 155. Thus Niederwimmer (1974).
 156. See Moiser (1983), pp. 106-7; R. Bultmann (1959), p. 325.
 157. Thus H. Chadwick (1954-5), pp. 264-5.
 158. Ibid., p. 265.
 159. See Hurd (1965), p. 167. See also Moiser (1983), p. 108 who translates &vwpoc here as widowed (unmarried now) rather than the more neutral unmarried (at any time in the past). It is his opinion that this translation coheres well with the immediate context (and the widows) and the passage as a whole. It also receives some support, he argues, from the fact that Paul devotes a special section to virgins (male and female) in vv. 25f.
 160. It may be going too far to suggest that it is unlikely that Paul would never have been married. See also 1 Cor 9:5 which suggests Paul was not accompanied by a wife on his missionary journeys.
 161. See Barre (1974), p. 198.
 162. See ibid., pp. 197-8 where Barre discerns at least five different uses of πυρὸςθαῖ and its Hebrew equivalents in Jewish religious thought before Paul and in the New Testament: 1) literal; to be on fire or burning with fire. 2) figurative; applied to the word of Yahweh in its tested, 'tried-and-true' trustworthiness. 3) figurative; applied to the righteous as "tested" or "purified" by Yahweh (through various trials and afflictions). 4) figurative;

applied to the chosen people or the enemies of God insofar as they are deserving of the fiery judgement of Yahweh; therefore to burn in penal fire. 5) figurative; used in connection with words such as θυμοί στεν ἄγμοί to express the idea of being aflame with strong emotion.

Of these five uses Barre shows that 2) is confined to relatively few passages in the Old Testament and 5) is virtually unattested in sacred Jewish writings outside of the Maccabean books. Moreover, in the New Testament - apart from the two Corinthian passages (1 Cor 7:9 and 2 Cor 11:29) the verb and its nominal form only occur in eschatological contexts, and never in the sense of 5).

163. See *ibid.*, pp. 199-201.
164. Thus Barrett (1971), p. 161.
165. Cf. Mk. 10:2-12 and par. For a recent discussion of Jesus' teaching on marriage, celibacy, adultery and divorce see B. Witherington (1984), pp. 18-32.
166. While Jewish law allowed divorce, the rabbis themselves disagreed on the grounds for divorce. (See above).
167. See J.K. Elliot (1972-3), pp. 223-4.
168. Cf. D. Daube (1956), pp. 362-5.
169. This recalls Dt 24:1f. where a divorced woman is not allowed to remarry her husband if she has had sexual relations with another man. In the later Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, we are made aware of the consequences of women separating from their partners, and the social comments this arouses.
170. Thus Moiser (1983), pp. 108-9. The clue given here, according to Moiser, is the perfect tense of the verb 'to marry'.
171. See Barrett (1971), p. 163.
172. Thus Conzelmann (1975), p. 71.
173. Moiser (1983), p. 109.
174. See Justin Martyr, Second Apology, II(ANF, i, pp. 188-189). This church father tells us of a Roman matron who converts to Christianity and against the advice of her friends she presents her husband with a 'bill of divorce' and separates from him because he continues to live an 'intemperate' lifestyle.
175. See Elliot (1972-3), p. 225 who considers that v. 16 is meant to be taken with v. 15 and, therefore, sounds a pessimistic note.
176. See Aristotle, Politics I, 1252a LCL, p. 5, where he remarks that slavery is natural.
177. See Meeks (1974). According to Meeks, however, the role and status of women were changing in Hellenistic society of imperial times. Thus, "The traditional social roles were no longer taken for granted but debated, consciously violated by some vigorously defended by others." (p. 179).
178. See G. Dellling, 'παρθένος', TDNT, ad. loc.
179. See C.L. Mearns (1984).
180. This interpretation is supported by Hurd (1965), p. 285. According to him, the Christian community were proleptically living in the kingdom and this was expressed in spiritual marriages, women unveiled (or with short hair) and speaking in church, speaking in tongues, and freedom from the law.
181. See E. Käsemann (1969), p. 133.
182. See D. Balch (1983). Here Balch discusses the contribution of Stoic ideas to Paul's discussion and emphasises the theoretical ideal of equality between husband and wife in Stoic texts.
183. To support their view these Christians could appeal to the word of Jesus in Mk 12:25 and par. Cf. E. Pagels (1974), pp. 540f. who

mentions various gnostic groups who appealed to the example of Paul the ascetic. See also W. Meeks (1974).

184. Thus Moiser (1983), p. 114.
185. See Barrett (1971), pp. 182-3.
186. See Ford (1963-4).
187. Cf. M. Nid. 5.6. See also J. M. Ford (1967).
188. See Barrett (1971), p. 184.
189. See H. Chadwick (1954-5), p. 267. Chadwick also draws our attention here to a dramatic scene in the Acts of Thomas (12) where Jesus, Thomas' identical twin, persuades a bride and groom on their wedding night to think better of their carnal intentions of consummating their marriage.
190. Cf. Elliot (1972-3), pp. 220-3 who interprets the whole section, vv. 25-38, in terms of advice to engaged couples.
191. This subject is also dealt with in Rom 7:2.
192. Cf. H. Conzelmann (1975), p. 181 "Women in Divine Worship"; and compare with C.K. Barrett (1971), p. 246 "The Christian Assembly: Men and Woman". See also the recent work of R. Oster (1988) which deals with the male issue in 1 Cor 11:2-16.
193. Thus W. Meeks (1974), p. 200.
194. See Scroggs (1972), p. 297.
195. This was suggested by W.O. Walker Jr. (1975) and (1983) and rejected by J. Murphy-O'Connor (1976). A defence of Walker's thesis is to be found in L. Cope (1978).
Walker (1975) suggested that: 1) the whole of 11:2-16 is an interpolation; and 2) that it consisted of three originally separate texts (i) pericope A found in vv. 3, 8-9, and 11-12 (ii) pericope B, vv. 4-7, 10, 13 and 16 (iii) pericope C, vv. 14-15; and 3) none of these pericopal interpolations are from the hand of Paul. Another interpolation theory is suggested by G.W. Trompf (1980) who argues for an interpolation theory on the basis that vv. 2-16 breaks the flow of 1 Cor. 10 and 11 which are linked together by the theme of eating and drinking. He studies the passage in detail and notes the appearance of words not usually found in the Pauline literature; the use of Pauline words in an uncharacteristic manner; and on the theological side, ideas which are not Pauline.
These arguments are rejected by J. Murphy-O'Connor (1976) and (1980); J.P. Meier (1978). In addition see Murphy-O'Connor (1988).
196. Thus Murphy-O'Connor (1980), p. 482f.
197. The traditional interpretation of this pericope has been to suggest that Paul is insisting pneumatic Christians wear the veil according to Jewish custom. See S. Lösch (1947); A. Jaubert (1971-2); A. Feuillet (1975); Meeks (1974); Scroggs (1974).
198. See J.B. Hurley (1972-3); W.J. Martin (1970); A. Issakson (1965), pp. 165f.; J. Murphy-O'Connor (1980), pp. 488f.
199. Paul appears to be replying to a series of issues raised in a letter written by the Corinthians e.g. 1 Cor 7:1; 8:1, 12:1; 16:1, or perhaps delivered/reported to him by Chloe's people (1:11). See also here J.C. Hurd (1965), pp. 90f.
200. Cf. Conzelmann (1975), p. 182. On Paul's opponents at Corinth see W. Schmithals (1969), pp. 237-43; J.C. Hurd (1965), pp. 96-107.
201. Thus Meeks (1974), p. 201.
202. See here Scroggs (1972), p. 297; J. Murphy-O'Connor (1980), pp. 485f.
203. For a discussion of tradition cf. Buchsel 'παράδοσις', TDNT ad. loc. For Paul's use of 'tradition' see J. Dunn (1977), p. 68.
204. Thus Meier (1978), pp. 215-6.
205. See Padgett (1984), p. 78 who suggests this phrase is the positive

- form of the more typical double negative, 'I do not want you to be ignorant brethren', (1 Cor 10:1; 12:1).
206. We could interpret this reference to Christ as the head of men in his work as the agent of creation (cf. 1 Cor 8:6). Taken together with Col 1:16 and 1:18, the sense here is then of Christ as the grounds of all being - in him all things were created. 2 Cor 5:17 might be more in line with Paul's Christology. Christ is the cause of the new creation.
 207. Paul hints here at a subordinationist Christology, though we need not necessarily view this in an ontological sense, but rather a functional sense. Christ is the one who has been sent (Gal 4:4-5) to redeem the world (1 Thes 1:10; Gal 2:20).
 208. See also S. Bedale (1954), p. 213. In the LXX *Kephalé* appears 281 times as the translation of *ro'š*, which is used in the sense of 'chief' or 'ruler'. R. Scroggs shows us that *ro'š* occurs 20 times in Numbers. When it is used literally, it is always translated *kephalé*, but when it is used of an authority figure (7 times), *kephalé* is not the translation, instead we have *archōn* or *archēgos*. Cf. Scroggs (1972), p. 534, n. 8.
 209. See H. Schlier, 'κεφαλή, ἀνακεφαλαιόμοι', *TDNT*, ad. loc.
 210. Several scholars reject 1 Cor 14:34-6 as Pauline for a number of reasons and we will examine this text below.
 211. On the veiling of women in the Ancient Near East, see A. Oepke, 'καλύπτω, κάλυμμα, ἀνακαλύπτω, κατακαλύπτω, ἀποκαλύπτω, ἀποκάλυψις', *TDNT*, ad. loc.
 212. Cf. Num. 5:18.
 213. Cf. Hurley (1972-3), pp. 193f.
 214. See Murphy-O'Connor (1980), p. 484. See *BAG*, p. 406. *Kata* usually means down or against. A number of scholars, therefore, interpret this phrase in terms of long hair. See also J.B. Hurley (1972-3).
 215. See J.P.V.D. Balsdon (1960), pp. 24-25.
 216. Jewish women braided their hair and pinned it up so it formed a kind of tiara on their head (Judith 10:3; 16:8). The effect was heightened with gold, jewellery, ribbons or gauze. Cf. *Str-B*, 3, 428f.
 217. Shorn hair is a sign of mourning in the Old Testament, cf. Dt 21:12; Job 1:20; Jer 7:29; Mic 1:6.
For Greek customs see W.J. Martin (1979), p. 234. Martin informs us that the practice of cutting hair was a religious rite among the Greeks - vestal virgins and all Greek girls did it when they reached puberty. Martin suggests that some Hellenized Jewesses may have copied their Greek neighbours. See also Fiorenza (1983a), p. 227 who draws our attention to the practice of women allowing their hair to flow freely during ecstatic worship of oriental divinities.
 218. Thus Murphy-O'Connor (1980), pp. 485f. The idea that Jewish men must have worn longish hair appears in *Str-B*, 3, p. 441. This is dismissed by Murphy-O'Connor who believes it is based upon an interpretation of M. Nazir by Rashi which is unproven. According to Murphy-O'Connor, the tractate Nazir proves the contrary. Since long hair was a sign of a Nazarite (LXX Num 6:7), and the minimum period for a vow was thirty days (M. Nazir 1:3, 6:3), then it would, therefore, follow that if Jews normally wore their hair long, thirty days growth would have passed unnoticed. He concludes that Ezek 44:20 probably ruled the day.
 219. In Lev 13:45, unbound hair is the sign which publicly shows a leper to be unclean. Num 5:18 prescribes that a woman accused of adultery be marked publicly by the loosing of her hair.

220. According to Padgett (1984), pp. 77f. the Corinthians were complaining to Paul that some men and women (possibly Priscilla and others), were not wearing their hair in a dignified Greek manner which is bound up. Men are also warned that they should not wear their hair long or bound up in a feminine manner.
221. Cf. Acts of Paul and Thecla in E. Hennecke, NTApoc, vol. 2 (1963), pp. 353-64, esp. p. 364.
222. In 21:6 of the Apocalypse of Moses, Adam also sins and is deprived of the glory of God. At the end time, however, the righteous will again possess the glory of God. According to 2 Baruch 51:10, man's nature will then be like the angels. For a fuller discussion of the Urzeit/Endzeit theme, see R. Scroggs (1966), pp. 27-29 and 47-49.
223. See Conzelmann (1975), p. 186. This does not mean that woman is simply the image of God. Cf. G. Kittel, 'δοξέω, δόξα, δοξάζω, συνδοξάζω, ἐνδοξος, ἐνδοξαίω, παράδοξος', TDNT, ad. loc.
224. These sexual distinctions do not necessarily imply inferiority. Cf. P. Tribble (1978), pp. 89f. who offers a more egalitarian interpretation of Gn 2 than it usually receives at the hands of scholars.
225. See M.D. Hooker (1963-4), p. 413.
226. Thus Hurley (1972-3), p. 207.
227. See W. Foester, 'ἐξουσίς, ἐξουσία, ἐξουσιάζω, κατεξουσιάζω', TDNT, ad. loc; BAG p. 277.
228. See Padgett (1984), pp. 71f. He links the interpretation of ἐξουσία with ἔχω to give the meaning of possessing the ability or right to perform some act.
229. See Hooker (1963-4), p. 415; C.K. Barrett (1971), p. 255.
230. Cf. Str-B. 3, pp. 437-440, for Jewish views of angels.
231. Cf. Barrett (1971), p. 253. Barrett raises the interesting point that it is difficult to see what protection a veil would offer and he also wonders why women would be particularly susceptible while praying and prophesying.
232. Test. Reuben 5:5.
233. See B. Prusak (1974), p. 99. See also Tertullian, Against Marcion V, viii, ANF, III, p. 445. He states, "What angels? In other words, whose angels? If he means the fallen angels of the Creator, there is great propriety in his meaning. It is right that that face which was a snare to them should wear some mark of a humble guise and obscured beauty."
Tertullian was the first church father to understand 1 Cor 11:10 as a reference to evil angels. The idea that woman was a constant source of temptation was not, however, unfamiliar to the Jews. Cf. M. Kid 4:12.
234. Thus J.A. Fitzmyer (1957-8). This would be in line with Mk 12:25. There is evidence from the pseudipigrapha, however, that angels were seen as sexual beings. Cf. 1 Enoch 9:6; Jub. 4:22; 5:1f.; 2 Baruch 56:10f.
235. These arguments are rejected by Murphy-O'Connor (1980), p. 496.
236. Cf. R. Scroggs (1972), p. 300; M. Hooker (1963-4), pp. 410f.; C.K. Barrett (1971), p. 254.
237. Thus Padgett (1984), pp. 81-2.
238. G.B. Caird (1972), p. 278.
239. See (1980), pp. 496f.
240. Cf. here J.B. Segal (1979).
241. Thus (1984), pp. 73f. Padgett sees vv. 4-7 representing the restrictions placed on the Corinthian Christians, and vv. 10-12, therefore, represent the freedoms.

242. Thus Murphy-O'Connor (1980), p. 486.
243. See Conzelmann (1975), pp. 182f.
244. Thus Fitzmyer (1957-8), pp. 48f.; Hooker (1963-4), pp. 410f.
245. Thus Padgett (1984), p. 83.
246. BAG, p. 675.
247. We agree here with Kürzinger's interpretation (1978).
248. For a recent discussion of this passage see R.W. Allison (1988).
249. See V.R. Mollenkott (1981) who draws attention to Meg 23a where women are not permitted to read Torah. See also Conzelmann (1975), p. 246, n. 57 who draws attention to the Graeco-Roman background where the role of women in the public assembly is questioned.
250. Therefore, we reject the interpretation of Fiorenza (1983a), p. 231 that Paul is here only directing himself to wives and not to all the women in the assembly. Fiorenza believes this interpretation is confirmed by 1 Cor 7:32-35 which suggests that not all women in the community were married or had husbands.
251. Thus Conzelmann (1975), p. 246; G.W. Trompf (1980), p. 209. Barrett (1971), pp. 330-332 is more reserved. R. Jewett (1979), p. 59. W.O. Walker Jr. (1983). According to R. Gryson (1976), p. 7 it is a Jewish Christian interpolation. See also R. Scroggs (1972), p. 284, n. 4. According to Scroggs it comes from the same hand as the deutero-Pauline tracts - the household codes.
252. Thus Conzelmann (1975), p. 246.
253. Scroggs (1972), p. 284.
254. Thus (1971), p. 332.
255. See Evans (1983), p. 96.
256. See J. Daniélou (1961), p. 10 and R. Gryson (1976), pp. 82-3 who inform us that John Chrysostom interpreted 1 Cor 14:33b-36 in the sense of teaching.
257. See (1971), p. 331.
258. Ibid., p. 332.
259. We find these in 1 Tim 2:8-15; Col 3:18-4:1; Eph 5:22-6:9; 1 Pet 2:13-3:7 and Tit 2:1-10. On the origin and intention of the household codes, see J.E. Crouch (1972); D. Balch (1981) and E. Lohse (1971), pp. 154-63.
260. See (1974), p. 208.
261. Thus Crouch (1972), pp. 122f.
262. See Fiorenza (1983a), pp. 245-50, where she notes that most of the 'household codes' are contained in Christian writings which were addressed to the churches in Asia Minor. Fiorenza, therefore, explores the role and status of women in Asia Minor as an important backdrop which may explain why such reactionary measures were felt to be necessary.
263. See D. Balch (1981), esp. pp. 81-116. He argues, "Persons in Roman society were alienated and threatened by some of their slaves and wives who had converted to the new, despised religion. So they were accusing converts of impiety, immorality and insubordination. As a defence, the author of 1 Peter encouraged the slaves and wives to play the social roles which Aristotle had outlined; this he hoped would shame those who were reviling their good behaviour (3:16; 2:12). The conduct of the slaves was not expected to convert masters. However, the author hoped that the wives would convert their husbands by laudable behaviour." (p. 109).
264. On forces at work within the church to limit the ministry of women see E. Carroll (1975) esp. pp. 673f.
265. See Fiorenza (1983b), p. 407.
266. Ibid.
267. Gryson (1976), p. 109.

268. Thus Gryson, *ibid.*, p. xv. For a review of the literature of the church fathers and their comments on the role and status of women see E.A. Clark (1983).
269. Cf. W. Bauer (1972) and J. Dunn (1977). Both writers point out that orthodoxy and heresy do not stand in relation to one another as primary to secondary, but in many regions heresy was the original manifestation of Christianity.
270. This conflict was brought to a head in the second century CE struggle between the church and gnosticism.
271. Origen, *De Principiis* II, viii, 1 ANF iv, p. 286.
272. Thus R.R. Ruether (1974), p. 153.
273. Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Making of Man*, XVI, N and PNF, 2nd series, V, pp. 404-406.
274. Gregory of Nyssa is careful not to identify the soul with the divine nature in case he is accused of gnosticism.
275. Augustine, *On the Trinity* XII, vii, 10, N and PNF, 1st series, III, p. 157.
276. Augustine, *On the Grace of Christ and on Original Sin*, II, 40, N and PNF, 1st series, V, p. 251.
277. Chrysostom, *Homily XXVI*. 1 Cor. XI.2, N and PNF, 1st series, XII, pp. 153-4.
278. For a detailed discussion of the influence of the pseudepigraphical literature on the interpretations of the fall, see B.P. Prusak (1974).
279. Justin Martyr, *II Apology*, V, ANF, I, p. 524.
280. Thus Prusak (1977), p. 82.
281. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, IV.xi, 3, ANF, I, p. 524.
282. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, V.xxi.1, ANF, I, pp. 548-9.
283. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, V.xix.1, ANF, I, p. 547.
284. Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho*, C, ANF, I, pp. 248-9.
285. Clement, *Stromata*, III. xiv-xvii, ANF, II, pp. 399-400.
286. Tertullian, *On the Apparel of Women* I,i ANF, IV, p. 14.
287. Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, V,viii, ANF, III, p. 445. The idea that woman was a constant source of temptation to man has already been mentioned.
288. Augustine, *The City of God*, XIV. chap. 11, N and PNF, 1st series, II, p. 272.
289. R. Ruether (1972), p. 100. This characterisation of woman as 'carnal' led the fathers to associate traits of sexuality, materialism and maliciousness with woman's mind; and chastity, patience, wisdom, justice and equality with masculinity.
290. Augustine, *The City of God*, XII.chap. 17, N and PNF, 1st series, II, p. 496.
291. See J.A. McNamara (1979) who discusses the attitude toward marriage among the Jews and Romans and considers how the Christian attitude differed.
292. See E.A. Clark (1977).
293. Chrysostom, *Homily xxxiv*. 1 Cor. 12:8, N and PNF, 1st Series, XII, p. 204.
294. Chrysostom, *Homily*. 1 Cor. xii.1, 2, N and PNF, 1st series, XII, pp. 168-175.
295. Chrysostom, *Homily*, XLII. 1 Cor xv.47, N and PNF, 1st series, XII, pp. 255-258.
296. For Paul's views on this topic see E. Pagels (1974), p. 542.
297. Cf. Mk 4:20; Tertullian, *Against Marcion* V.xv ANF, III, p. 462; Augustine, *Of Holy Virginity* 45, N and PNF, 1st Series, III, p. 434.
298. Augustine, *Our Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, 41, N and PNF, 1st

- series, VI, p. 18.
299. The danger Augustine faces here is the charge of Manicheanism. (The Manicheans were a sect which rejected marriage altogether in favour of asceticism). Augustine defended himself by arguing that marriage is honourable because of its good ends, even though the means are debasing.
 300. See R. Ruether (1972), p. 108.
 301. Thus McNamara (1976), pp. 145-58.
 302. Cf. E. Clark (1977), p. 19. Clark discusses Chrysostom's failure to understand why men and women are not allowed to integrate freely, even though he is aware that this was not the case in the early church. Chrysostom believed that the early church represented an era when angelic conditions existed (Gal 3:28), and the present age was one of dissoluteness, for which women were probably to blame. Clark points out that the church father does not think to question or blame the conservatism of post-biblical Christianity for the change in freedom allowed to women.
 303. See R. Ruether (1974), pp. 169-176.
 304. See R. Ruether (1979) for a detailed account of female asceticism in the early church.
 305. Thus Ruether (1972), p. 167.
 306. See Ruether (1974), pp. 159-160.
 307. Justin, II Apology, I, ANF, I, p. 188.
 308. Cyprian, Epistula, 24. See McNamara (1976), pp. 149-150 who quotes this text.
 309. Chrysostom De Ss Bernice et Prosdoce 6 (P G, 50, 638-9). See *ibid*.
 310. Hippolytus, Apostolic Tradition xviii, 2-5 in G. Dix (1968), p. 29.
 311. Tertullian, On the Veiling of Virgins, IX, ANF, IV, p. 33.
 312. Didascalia XII, A. Vööbus (1979), p. 131.
 313. Cf. Gryson (1976), p. xiii. This is a comprehensive study of the ministries of women in the early church.
 314. See Prusak (1977), p. 81.
 315. Cf. Ex 22:22f.; Is 1:23; Jer 5:28, Job 22:9. There is constant complaint against those who wrong the widow; Is 10:2; Ez 22:7; Job 24:3. People are warned against mistreating this group; Ex 22:22; Dt 24:17; Jer 22:3. For the New Testament cf. Acts 6:1-2; 9:39.
 316. Polycarp, Epistle to Philippi, VI, ANF, I, p. 34.
 317. Polycarp, Epistle to Philippi, IV, ANF, I, p. 34.
 318. Ignatius, Epistle to Smyrneans, Conclusion, ANF, I, p. 92.
 319. See Hermas, The Shepherd, II, iv.3, The Apostolic Fathers, LCL, vol. II, p. 25.
 320. Cf. J. Daniélou (1961), pp. 16-17. Daniélou believes that the ministry of widows was turned into an institution in the third century CE because of the activities of women in the heretical movements.
 321. Tertullian, To his Wife, I, vii, ANF, IV, p. 43.
 322. In ancient Rome there was a certain degree of honour offered to the Univira, a woman who had been widowed about fifty or sixty years old, and had only been married once.
 323. See Clement, The Instructor III. xii, ANF, II, p. 294. For Origen see Gryson (1976), pp. 25-26.
 324. This was written in Syria and although the Greek text is lost, a Syriac version from the beginning of the fourth century is extant. The Didascalia is a source for the first six books of the Apostolic Constitutions.
 325. Didascalia chapter IX, Vööbus, p. 101.
 326. Didascalia chapter XIV, Vööbus, pp. 141f.

327. Didascalia chapter XV, Vööbus, pp. 143f.
328. Ibid., Didascalia chapter XV, Vööbus, p. 145. The fact that Christ did not appoint women as members of the twelve and, therefore, there is no precedent for women priests, is an argument echoed in many present day debates concerning the ordination of women.
329. Didascalia chapter XV, Vööbus (1979), p. 149.
330. Also called The Apostolic Church Order, this is a fourth century Greek document found in Egypt. It purports to be instructions of the Lord to his disciples.
331. Ecclesiastical Canons of the Apostles 21, 1-2. The canons also make an interesting note on the general question of the ministry of women:
 Andrew said: (It would be) very good, my brethren, if we established ministries for the women. Peter said: Having given commandment and directions concerning all these things, we have come thus far. Now we will give careful teaching concerning the oblation of the Body and Blood. John said: You have forgotten, my brethren, that our Teacher, when He asked for the bread and the cup, and blessed them, saying: "This is My Body and My Blood", did not permit these (the women) to stand with us. Martha said (concerning Mary): I saw her laughing between her teeth exultingly. Mary said: I did not really laugh, only I remembered the word of our Lord and I exulted; for you know that He told us before, when He was teaching: "The weak shall be saved through the strong". Cephas said: We ought to remember several things, for it does not befit women that they should stand up for prayer, but that they should sit down on the ground. James said: How then with regard to the women can we fix any ministry, except that they strengthen and keep vigil for those women who are in want? (ECA 24, 1-28, 1).
- See Gryson (1976), pp. 46-7.
332. Canons of Hippolytus, chapter 9.
333. See H.W. Beyer, 'διακονέω, διακόνια, διάκονος', TDNT, ad. loc.
334. Cf. Daniélou (1961), p. 14 who believes it is clear that the women mentioned in this section are clearly distinguished from the wives of deacons, and while the description is parallel to deacons, we must understand deaconesses. This term is meant in the technical sense of an ordained ministry, but in the opinion of Daniélou, it is inferior to its male counterpart.
335. See J. Stephenson (1968), p. 14.
336. Origen, Commentary on Romans 10, 17 quoted in Gryson (1976), p. 31.
337. Didascalia chapter XV, Vööbus, p. 151.
338. The Apostolic Constitutions are one of the largest canonical and liturgical collections of antiquity. They go back to the fourth century CE.
339. Apostolic Constitutions II.xxvi, ANF, VII, p. 410.
340. Apostolic Constitutions VIII.xx, ANF, VII, p. 492. Compare this with the prayer for deacons (VIII.xviii, ANF, VII, p. 292).
341. Tertullian, On Prescription Against Heretics, XLI, ANF, III, p. 263.
342. Tertullian, On Prescription Against Heretics, XXX, ANF, III, p. 257.
343. See Fiorenza (1979), p. 46.
344. Didymus, On the Trinity, III, 41:3, as quoted in Fiorenza (1979), p. 43.
345. See Irenaeus, Against Heresies, I.vii, ANF, I, pp. 325-6.
346. E. Pagels (1976). See also S. Heine (1987), pp. 106-123 especially

p. 117. Here Heine critically examines Pagel's assumptions on Gnosticism and suggests that she does not say clearly enough that the creator God of gnosticism, whom the reader involuntarily imagines as being the God of the Christian Bible, is not identical with the Unimaginable, the pure light, and thus the supreme God of the gnostics.

347. Cf. Meeks (1974), pp. 189-197.

348. Ibid., p. 191.

349. See NTApoc, I, p. 299.

350. E.S. Fiorenza (1979), p. 50.

351. S.L. Davies (1980).

352. Cf. NTApoc, I, pp. 353-364.

353. NTApoc, I, p.362.

354. R.S. Kraemer (1980), p. 304.

355. (1976), pp. 299f.

356. Ibid., p. 302.

357. For a recent discussion on the role of women and ministry see A. and L. Swidler (1977); A.M. Gardiner (1976).

CHAPTER TWO

WOMEN IN MARK'S ACCOUNT OF THE CRUCIFIXION, BURIAL AND EMPTY TOMB

In this chapter we will begin our analysis of the role and status of women in the scenes of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb with an examination of these texts in Mark's gospel. It has long been noted that the passion narrative is of great importance for the interpretation of Mark's gospel as a whole.¹ In his three passion predictions in particular, Mark highlights the three crucial events in the latter stages of Jesus' ministry as the crucifixion, burial and resurrection (8:31; 9:31; 10:33). Since these three scenes involve the three texts under consideration in this thesis, our attention is immediately drawn to the importance of the interpretation we give to these texts, both in terms of their immediate context, and within the gospel as a whole.

It is our intention to concentrate our study on the literary questions associated with Mk 15:40-1, 42-7 and 16:1-8 and we will not, therefore, discuss the question of the historicity of the empty tomb story at this point. By approaching the text in this manner we do not thereby deny the important links between the literary and historical aspects of the text, and indeed, a text often reflects an historical situation which may be important for its interpretation.² It is our opinion, however, that attempts to discover the historical background for the empty tomb story in particular do not complete the task of understanding the intention behind Mark's inclusion of the pericope at this point in the gospel. We will, therefore, begin by considering the literary perspective of the text before moving on to the historical question, which must methodologically take second place.³

The literary approach to the text has seen an explosion in methodological approaches over recent years, reaching back to the work of source critics in the middle of the nineteenth century.⁴ A major development in this field was form criticism, which viewed the evangelists as collectors and editors of traditional material which had a distinct *Sitz im Leben* in the early Christian communities.⁵ In form-critical terms the evangelists were primarily scissors and paste editors who contributed very little theologically to the material they handled. With the advent of redaction criticism after world war two, the

evangelists began to be viewed more as authors in their own right, and it was recognised that the particular theological concerns of the evangelist impregnated the paste with which he glued together the various narrative units of the gospel.⁶

While early redaction criticism was concerned mainly with questions of how the particular evangelist altered the traditions he received and was, therefore, limited in scope, later redaction critics opened more exciting avenues when they addressed questions such as the selection, arrangement, editing and modification of the material by the evangelist.⁷ The obvious problem we face here in terms of Mark's gospel is that we have no extant sources, and hence a certain amount of redaction criticism has focused in particular on the seams which the evangelist has provided to link together the originally separate pericopes he includes in his gospel.⁸

The next stage of literary criticism of the gospels has been to try to develop a theology of the gospel as a whole, and, using the methods of modern secular literary criticism, seeing the gospel as narrative rather than redaction.⁹ The evangelist Mark is, therefore, seen as a creator rather than an editor.¹⁰ The new literary critics study the text of Mark in terms of its structure and composition, and building on the work of the earlier redaction critics, they then move on to consider questions of protagonists and plot, with the evangelist as a genuine author.¹¹ If Mark did use various traditions in the composition of his gospel, it is argued he did so in line with a consistent and systematic rhetoric. In literary critical terms, the text of Mark is, therefore, studied as a 'mirror' rather than a 'window' into the world though we are not denying that by viewing the text in this manner it thereby becomes a window and we can view reality in a different manner.¹²

Since we will be primarily concerned here with the literary questions associated with Mk 15:40-1; 42-7 and 16:1-8 we consider it important to outline briefly some of the newer literary techniques we will be using in our final analysis of these three Marcan texts. We will indeed include in each section a verse by verse analysis of the text, dealing with questions of possible source and redaction. Beyond this, however, we will also view each text in terms of its final form and meaning, and in terms of the gospel as a whole. On the basis of our analysis of each section, particularly the empty tomb narrative, we will then make judgements about the gospel and revise these accordingly. In

all of this it is hoped that we will come to appreciate how "... unconscious literary artistry and conscious literary purpose go hand in hand to make the Gospel of Mark an extraordinarily effective text."¹³

The newer literary criticism of the gospel has introduced the element of reader response criticism which is particularly concerned with how the reader perceives the text. We will not attempt here to describe this feature in detail, but briefly state some points which are pertinent to our study.¹⁴ In terms of reader response criticism, there is both an 'implied author' and an 'implied reader' of a text. The 'implied author' is not the author himself, but the author as he wants to present himself to the reader in terms of the role he adopts as narrator." In terms of Mark's gospel, this refers to the perspective from which he presents the actions of his story. More specifically Mark usually reports events in his gospel from the perspective of an omniscient observer, and he is, therefore, seen as a reliable commentator. To reinforce this view, from an early point in the gospel we realise that Mark's point of view is closely identified with that of the central character Jesus. At certain points in the narrative he is even able to penetrate the mind of Jesus, and express his thoughts and feelings, and in 5:30 for example, we read "Jesus, perceiving in himself that power had gone forth from him," (cf. also 2:8; 6:34; 8:17; 10:21; 14:33). In this way Mark gains the readers' trust and influences the evaluation of characters, their actions and their motivations.¹⁵ Finally, by using distance in his characterisation, Mark encourages his readers in either sympathy with, or alienation from the characters in his plot. This is particularly evident in Mark's treatment of the disciples, and by careful control of emphasis and evaluation, Mark influences the readers' judgements about the disciples with possible repercussions for the readers' judgements about themselves.¹⁶

Repetition is another important literary technique by which Mark adds forcefulness to his narrative, emphasising themes and providing continuity in the narrative, with echoes of previous scenes being recalled.¹⁷ An example here are the passion predictions in 8:31; 9:31 and 10:33. By use of repetitive language and the tension created between arousal of expectations and their fulfilment, Mark forces his readers to turn these predictions over in their minds, and ponder their significance. Emphasis is added by the fact that both the first and second predictions prepare us for the climactic third prediction, which

by its notable variation in structure, hits us all the more forcefully.¹⁸

This fondness for threefold repetition in Mark, including repetition of narrative structure, verbal threads, common themes, conflict, characters and setting, is particularly striking in the passion narrative.¹⁹ We are reminded three times of Judas' betrayal (14:10, 18, 44),²⁰ Jesus approaches his sleeping disciples three times in Gethsemane (14:37, 40, 41),²¹ Peter, one of the special group of three confidants, denies Jesus three times (14:68, 70, 71),²² Pilate asks the crowd three important questions (15:9, 12, 14), and finally even the crucifixion is divided into three hour intervals (15:25, 33). Against this background, it is possible to suggest, therefore, that the three references to the women as witnesses in 15:40, 47 and 16:1 are not an indication that Mark is uniting three originally separate traditions,²³ but part of a deliberate literary technique to emphasise the presence of the women through repetition.

Another literary technique favoured by Mark is intercalation, where Mark interrupts one scene to insert material from another story to heighten the dramatic impact of the story, and sometimes in the process creating an element of suspense.²⁴ In Mk 5:21-43 the story of the raising of Jairus' daughter is interrupted by the healing of the woman with a flow of blood, and we are invited to interpret these miracles in terms of this relationship. It is probably not without significance then that the woman in the first story has had a flow of blood for twelve years (5:26), while in the second story the girl is twelve years old (5:42). Similarly the reference to the woman's faith, which nevertheless leaves room for fear and trembling (5:33),²⁵ contrasts with Jesus' command to Jairus not to be afraid, only to believe (5:36).

The practice of using related stories as parenthesis to enclose a major unit is also used by Mark. The important central section on discipleship 8:31-10:45, for example, is framed by two miracles involving blind men (cf. 8:22-6 and 10:46-52).²⁶ Thus the disciples' failure to have their eyes opened to the necessity of Jesus' suffering and death, contrasts starkly with the opening of the eyes of the blind men, and in particular the reaction of Bartimaeus who is prompted to follow Jesus on his way to Jerusalem.

All these factors of narrative rhetoric combine to make Mark's gospel a complex and purposeful composition, revealing the author as

someone who "works selectively with traditions and creatively with a definite theological project in mind."²⁷ As we will realise in our examination of our three Marcan texts, the gospel story of Mark is developed with close attention to plot and characters, with conflict being an important ingredient. For our study of the women in the final scenes of the gospel we will be particularly interested to see how Mark portrays this group. Does he present them in a positive or negative light? Are they present as representatives of the absent disciples? If so, should we, therefore, see this as a positive or negative identification? Or alternatively, are the women representatives of a group in the Marcan church with whom he was at odds, possibly one even tracing its origins and authority back to the Jerusalem Urgemeinde? These questions are just some of the important issues we will raise in the following study, and the answers we give will have an important bearing on the conclusions we reach regarding the meaning and significance of 16:1-8 in particular.

A. THE CRUCIFIXION - MARK 15:40-1

In Mk 15:40-1 we are told that there were women watching the crucifixion from afar among whom were Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joses, and Salome. We are also told that these women were with Jesus in Galilee where they had ministered to him. This information that there were women present at the crucifixion is in agreement with the other gospels, and is not surprising if, as we hope to demonstrate later, Matthew and Luke used Mark as their source. It is noteworthy, however, that in Luke's account there is also a reference to all Jesus' acquaintances (23:49), and John includes the Beloved Disciple among those who witness the crucifixion (19:25). The other noticeable difference between the Synoptics and John is that whereas in the Synoptics the women stand 'μακρόθεν', at a distance, in John they stand 'παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ', at the cross.²⁸

This standing away from the cross has been explained in historical terms arising from fear of being punished by the Romans for approaching the cross of a criminal.²⁹ Perhaps, however, a better explanation for the positioning of the women is to be found in terms of Mark's gospel, and the women 'standing at a distance' is a sign of their 'fallibility as followers' of Jesus. For, although like Peter earlier, the women still follow Jesus, they too are not brave enough to remain at his side, but

follow at a distance (cf. 14:54).³⁰

Mark introduces the women at the crucifixion by telling us that they were 'θεωροῦσαι', beholding or contemplating the scene. This verb is repeated again in 15:46 and 16:4 and reminds us of the women's role as witnesses to the events of the crucifixion, burial and discovery of the empty tomb.³¹ It is also worth noting here that 'seeing' is an important verb in Mark's gospel and means more than a literal seeing, being rather the ability to perceive the mystery of the Kingdom of God (Mk 4:11-12).³² Throughout the gospel the disciples in particular are encouraged to both see and understand, and although they do indeed see, they repeatedly fail to understand (cf. for e.g. 8:17-21). This inability to see on the part of Jesus' disciples is, moreover, contrasted with those who do see, particularly the blind man who gradually receives his sight (8:22-6).³³ The urgency of this ability to 'see' is emphasised in chapter 13 where the disciples are encouraged to 'watch', not only as earlier for the leaven of the Pharisees (8:15), but also for the events of the end time (13:33-7). Finally, and most significantly, the disciples of Jesus fail to watch with him in Gethsemane and thus we realise the climax of the gospel also sees a deepening of the inability of the disciples of Jesus to perceive both him and his message in the right manner.³⁴

What does this watching motif, therefore, mean in terms of Mk 15:40-1? Quite simply it means that the three watching women can, therefore, be contrasted with the three male disciples, Peter, James and John who fail to watch with Jesus in Gethsemane. Another clue to the significance of the role of the women in Mark's narrative is found in Mk 14:50. After the disciples have failed Jesus in Gethsemane and Judas has betrayed him, Mark tells us that they all forsook Jesus and fled. The fact that the narrative continues with a reference to Peter does not detract from the significance of this flight, for even Peter denies Jesus. Thus only the women remain as witnesses, though as we have already pointed out, even they are not willing to stand beside the cross, but watch from 'afar'.

Our examination of vv. 40-1 will deal with the problems of the discrepancies in the naming of the women in 15:40, 47 and 16:1, the identification of these women, and the significance of v. 41, 'αὐὲ δτε ἦν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ καὶ διηχόνουν αὐτῷ καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ αἱ συναναβᾶσαι αὐτῷ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.'

The identification of the women in Mk 15:40-1, 47 and 16:1 has

caused problems for those who have made a serious attempt to discover their identity. Some scholars including R. Bultmann explain the repetition on form critical grounds, the women are identified afresh in 16:1 because the passion narrative originally had nothing to succeed it,³⁵ and the empty tomb is, therefore, independent from the burial.³⁶ Bearing in mind the difficulties of identifying pre-Markan sources, it is important to note here that even if we were able to argue for the independence of the empty tomb tradition, we would not necessarily be led to conclude that it is, therefore, a secondary tradition. The empty tomb story could simply have circulated independently from the passion. Neither can we explain 15:40 as an editorial construction resulting from a fusion of 15:47 and 16:1 since this does not explain the designation 'the younger' and the fusion of what would normally read the wife of James and the wife of Joses into one woman, the mother of James and Joses.³⁷

One of the main problems, therefore, with Mk 15:40, 47 and 16:1 are the discrepancies between the lists of women in Mark. V. Taylor has attempted to explain this discrepancy on the grounds that there were originally two separate traditions with the first mentioning only Mary Magdalene and Mary of Joses, and quoted in 15:47, and the second including Mary Magdalene, Mary of James and Salome, and quoted in 16:1. Mk 15:40 is, therefore, a combination of these two lists.³⁸ Without moving beyond the text of Mark and discussing possible sources, we can, however, find another solution to this problem and one which we believe is more acceptable. It is our opinion that rather than 15:40 representing a fusion of 15:47 and 16:1, both 15:47 and 16:1 presuppose the existence of 15:40 and the woman identified in 15:40 as the mother of James and Joses is recalled by either son in the following texts.³⁹

This latter point leads us on to the question of the identity of the women. According to Taylor, the women in Mark could represent women known to a particular church centre, that being the Jerusalem church.⁴⁰ Others speculate on the different women mentioned in each gospel and various attempts have been made to harmonise the accounts.⁴¹ E.L. Bode suggests that a more preferable solution would be to identify two groups of women, those associated with the life of Jesus, including those associated with his family, and those who were converts. Bode concludes that the variation in the names of the women between the different gospels possibly reflects a diversity of tradition rotating around some

fixed names such as Mary Magdalene and the other Mary.⁴²

This suggestion has a lot to recommend it, especially when we look at the variations between the gospels in the identification of the women at the crucifixion. In Matthew the women who are present include Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joseph, and the mother of the sons of Zebedee. The mother of the sons of Zebedee, having already been mentioned in the gospel (cf. 20:20), was, therefore, known to the Matthean community. Luke does not specifically identify the women who witness the events of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb until 24:10, and among his group the only name which differs from Mark is Joanna, who was previously introduced in 8:1-3 as one of a group of women who followed Jesus in Galilee.

Mary Magdalene is, therefore, the only woman whom we can positively identify as belonging to all four gospels. It is interesting to note that while in Jn 20:1f. she appears alone at the tomb (though she significantly speaks in the plural in v. 2), in Mark's lists of the women she appears at the head of each list. This suggests two possibilities - either Mark was responsible for an individualisation of a tradition which singled out Mary Magdalene as a resurrection witness (a trend continued in John and the Apocrypha), or alternatively, Mark could have been setting Mary Magdalene over against the other women in his list.⁴³

It is the opinion of G.W. Trompf that this was exactly Mark's intention and the woman with whom Mark intended us to contrast Mary Magdalene is Mary the mother of James the less and Joses.⁴⁴ This second woman is, furthermore, to be identified with the mother of Jesus, and is a representative of the Jerusalem church.

Trompf argues his case based on an examination of Mark's gospel as a whole. He points out that Mark has earlier identified Jesus' mother in a similar manner (cf. 6:3),⁴⁵ and he concludes that the link between these two verses is "... too coincidental and too important theologically to be overlooked."⁴⁶ To support this identification, Trompf also notes that James the brother of the Lord would probably have been associated with more than one resurrection tradition (cf. 1 Cor 15:7).⁴⁷ As for the negative association of the mother of Jesus with the Jerusalem church, Trompf draws our attention to the portrayal of Jesus' family in Mark's gospel and the evangelist's attempts to separate Jesus from his physical family (p.310).⁴⁸ Finally, he believes that the identification of Jesus'

mother is supported by John who would otherwise be the only evangelist to identify the mother of Jesus at the crucifixion.⁴⁹

The problem of identifying the women at the scene of the crucifixion is, therefore, a complicated issue. The suggestion that the women represent two groups of women, those who followed Jesus during his life, and converts to the Marcan community, while attractive, is not one that we can either prove or disprove, due to a lack of evidence either way. Trompf's detailed arguments that Mark has singled out Mary Magdalene as a witness over against Mary the mother of Jesus, a representative of the Jerusalem church, is also not a solution which we would accept, though we do agree with his identification of the second woman as the mother of Jesus. It is, however, difficult to see why, if Mark wanted us to contrast these two particular women, Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Jesus, he would have included Salome, a figure who was subsequently ignored or replaced by the later evangelists.⁵⁰ The argument that Mark portrays the family of Jesus in a negative light is one which we will discuss below, and we will merely comment here that this is not the only interpretation we can place on 3:31-5 and 6:1-6. Perhaps, more to the point, in terms of the Marcan narratives of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb, it is difficult to see how we are meant to contrast the actions of Mary Magdalene with those of any of the other women. The women in these Marcan narratives, rather than acting as individuals, act collectively. They speak with one voice (cf. 16:3), they have the same doubts, and perhaps most significantly, they all flee from the scene of the empty tomb (cf. 16:8).

Having briefly examined some of the main arguments for the identification of the women in Mk 15:40, and bearing in mind how the later evangelists handled this scene, we consider the most likely solution to be that Mark was probably dealing with women known to his church centre. Beyond this, all that we can say about any notions of a pecking order is that by placing Mary Magdalene first, Mark may either consciously or unconsciously have been responsible for a later individualising of the tradition which singled her out as an important female witness to the resurrection.

One problem still remains, however, and that is, that Mark has not previously mentioned either Mary Magdalene or Salome in his gospel, though Lk 8:1-3 tells us that Mary was a convert who followed Jesus in

Galilee. Indeed, Mark has only identified two women by name in his gospel - Mary the mother of Jesus in 6:3-4 and Herodias in 6:17f, and both women are referred to in a pejorative manner.

W. Munro has written an article on Mk 15:40-1 drawing our attention to the fact that women suddenly appear in Mark's gospel as a group who had followed Jesus while he was in Galilee, and they are prominent from now until the end of the gospel at 16:8. Munro questions why the women are mentioned at this point and not before. She also asks why they are mentioned at all, and what part did they play in Mark's 'redactional view'.⁵¹

To answer these questions she begins by examining the appearances of women prior to 15:40. This brief survey indicates to Munro that women are rarely mentioned in Mark's gospel. Women are hidden by the androcentric bias of Mark's culture which viewed women only in terms of their relation to men, ie. they are mothers, wives or daughters, except in rare instances. Women are also obscured by the androcentric language of the gospel which uses masculine forms of common gender, especially in crowd scenes, for example πολλοί (many), αὐτοί (they), ὄχλος (crowd), and ἄνθρωποι (people).⁵²

Even though Mark is aware of a female presence among Jesus' followers, Munro believes Mark did not consider that women properly belonged to the public ministry (p.227). Women, therefore, appear in the seclusion of the home and three quarters of the miracles involving women take place inside the house. The one exception is the healing of the woman with the flow of blood which is also noteworthy in that it is one of the two miracles granted to a woman. Though women's presence can be inferred from the presence of children in crowd scenes (cf. 9:35-7; 10:13-16), Munro concludes that the cumulative effect of this evidence points to a deliberate attempt on Mark's part to obscure female presence in Jesus' ministry. The reason for this suppression is perhaps found in early Christian embarrassment over women's involvement in Christianity, and Munro points to the canonical and non-canonical gospels which hint at the offence and scandal connected with Jesus' relations with women (p.235).⁵³

In answer to Munro's conclusions, we will briefly examine the gospel of Mark for ourselves to see if there is room for another interpretation. Before doing so, however, we would challenge the statement that androcentric language necessarily excludes women. As E.

Schüssler Fiorenza has pointed out, androcentric language can also be inclusive of women, though it does not mention them specifically. Thus the Pauline address 'brothers' is usually understood to refer to both brothers and sisters in the Christian community, and Christianity was not a male cult like the Mithras cult. Taking up a specific instance, where Paul refers to women in 1Cor 11:2-16, Fiorenza notes that this was because women's behaviour was causing particular problems. This does not mean, however, that in the remainder of 1Cor 11-14 Paul refers only to male charismatics and prophets.⁵⁴

Munro's point that women are rarely mentioned in the gospel, except in terms of their relationship to men is a valid one. In reaching this conclusion, however, she does not consider that fact that apart from John the Baptist, the disciples, and the family of Jesus, few males are specifically named in Mark's gospel. Indeed, prior to the passion narrative only Jairus (5:22f), Herod (6:14f) and Blind Bartimaeus (10:46f) are identified.

Munro also draws our attention to the fact that when Mark does refer to healings of women these usually take place in the home. We can make two points here to help us understand the reason for this state of affairs. Firstly, given the cultural conditions of the day it would have been usual for women to have remained in the home, as Jewish women tended to live a secluded life.⁵⁵ Secondly, Mark's reference to the women cured inside the house need not necessarily be an objective comment, and we must bear in mind the importance of the house motif in Mark's gospel. The house is a special setting in Mark's gospel, and is almost always redactional. It is here that the disciples receive their private instruction (cf. for e.g. 7:17; 9:28; 9:33; 10:10),⁵⁶ and over against the synagogue and temple, it is the 'architectural space' with which the Marcan reader can most readily identify as the true place of healing, teaching and fellowship.⁵⁷

There are four miracles in Mark's gospel involving healings of women which have been connected with the disputed question of Mark's use of cycles or miracle catenae.⁵⁸ Whatever our conclusions are on Mark's use of sources, we note that these miracles are part of an important section in the gospel which illustrates Jesus as a man of action. The whole section is one involving a number of journeys, and is linked together by motifs including the boat, the lake, the house, and feeding. According to W.H. Kelber, we can summarize this section in the following

way:

Throughout the course of the mission around the lake the theme of ethnic unity is accompanied by a noticeable pattern of sexual parallelism. Prior to the apostolic commission and Jewish designation Jesus showed individual concern for a man in the east (5:1-20) and two women in the west (5:21-43), prior to the Gentile designation he attended to two women (7:24-30) and now a man (7:32-7), in the east. The unity of the Kingdom embraces Jew and Gentile, as well as man and woman on either side.⁵⁹

While the question of whether Mark intended us to see such strict parallelism between a Jewish and Gentile mission is disputed,⁶⁰ the significant point about Kelber's comments for our purposes is that he treats the miracles involving women in terms of their place in the continuing narrative of the gospel. Thus it is not without significance that the opening of the gospel involves an exorcism of an unclean spirit from a man (1:21-8), and the healing of Simon's mother-in-law (1:29-32).

We have already commented upon the intercalation of the healing of Jairus' daughter and the cure of the woman with a flow of blood (5:21-43). It is also worth pointing out that this is the only miracle in Mark which takes place on a woman's initiative (5:28-9), the woman is cured outside the house,⁶¹ and she is close enough to touch Jesus. Thus Jesus challenges the laws of menstrual cleanness.⁶² Beyond this the healing of this woman is emphasised by Mark in his use of dramatic tension and the repetition of the verb 'ἅπτω' to touch. Mark, therefore, introduces the miracle with the comment that physicians have spent twelve years trying to cure this woman, and by doing so he involves the reader in speculating whether or not Jesus will be able to affect a cure. The verb 'ἅπτω' is repeated in vv 28, 30 and 31 underlining the significance of the woman's contact with Jesus. The woman's knowledge is shared and endorsed by Jesus, and thus a positive response is encouraged from the reader. When Jesus then asks the futile question, 'τίς μου ἥψατο', who touched me?, we realise this is not so futile, and it allows us to witness an exchange between Jesus and a woman whose perceptions are so closely identified with his.

The final miracle involving a woman in Mark is the exorcism on behalf of the Syro-Phoenician woman (Mk 7:24f.). This miracle follows a section on ritual purity associated with food regulations (7:1-23), and it is not without significance that a very rare conversation between Jesus and a woman is strongly associated with feeding metaphors.

According to R.M. Fowler, we are repeatedly denied the luxury in

Mark's gospel of taking references to food and drink as literal, straight-forward references. More often than not, they involve controversy, and more particularly, this usually involves the disciples of Jesus.⁶³ Whereas earlier controversies over eating focused on disputes with the opponents of Jesus, the Scribes and the Pharisees (cf. chps. 2-3), as the gospel story develops, this controversy widens to include the disciples (cf. chps. 6-8) who particularly fail to understand the miracles of the feedings of the multitudes (8:14-21). We hear no more direct references to bread in Mark's gospel until the passion narrative, when it is the time of 'unleavened bread', and therefore, symbolically there is no longer any danger from the leaven of the Pharisees.⁶⁴ There does, however, still remain a threat to *table* fellowship with Jesus, and indeed a climactic point is reached in the deterioration of the relationship between Jesus and his disciples, when the betrayal is predicted.

Against this background the discussion about food with the Syro-Phoenician woman takes on a new significance. The echoes of feeding metaphors, particularly the phrase 'χορτασθήναι τὰ τέκνα' with the reference to the children being satisfied in v. 27 directly recalls both of the feeding miracles (cf. 6:42 and 8:8). Although Jesus' comments to the woman may appear harsh,⁶⁵ the message is clear - one loaf is sufficient to feed both Jew and Gentile, there are to be no distinctions.

Turning to the references to women in the teaching of Jesus, many scholars draw our attention to Mk 3:20-1, 31-5 and Mk 6:1-6, concluding that Jesus had a negative attitude towards his physical family.⁶⁶ Both texts appear to be an example of a rare instance where Mark supplies information regarding Jesus' relations with his own family. While this may be the case, as we have already pointed out, we are not concerned here with questions of the historicity and possible place in the life of Jesus, but with Mark's use and understanding of these two passages in the light of his community's concerns.

Beginning with Mk 3:20-1, 31-5, we have here yet another example of Mark's intercalated stories.⁶⁷ The reaction of Jesus' family in trying to seize him, believing him to be beside himself, is comparable with the scribes charge that Jesus is possessed by Beelzebul.⁶⁸ This pericope involving Jesus' family is very strange in that 3:20 is not followed by an attempted seizure, though this hostility is presupposed but not emphasised in 3:31-5. Moreover, the story does not end by telling us if

the family got to see Jesus, and the outcome of this encounter, but with the climactic saying of vv. 34-5. Thus it is possible to argue that as in 6:1-6 the key to the pericope lies in a particular comment of Jesus.

Examining 3:31-5 in more detail we once again encounter Mark's use of repetition and the phrase 'mother and brothers' is repeated five times in this short scene, though the order is significantly reversed in v. 35 and sister is added. This variation in structure draws the reader's attention to the widening scope of the application of the family metaphor in Mark. Jesus' climactic announcement in vv 34-5 that his true family are those around him (περὶ αὐτόν) is all the more remarkable, according to R.C. Tannehill, because his own mother and brothers are outside waiting to see him.⁶⁹ Mark has Jesus ask the obvious question 'who are my mother and brothers?', and we immediately realise that the answer is not at all obvious. The delay in v. 34c further heightens the suspense, and Jesus 'καὶ περιβλεψάμενος τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν κύκλῳ καθημένους λέγει' before supplying an answer himself. The ἴδε in v. 34b recalls the ἰδοὺ of v. 32 and the message Mark delivers is that the physical family is replaced by a spiritual family.

Moving beyond the text itself the conclusion scholars reach concerning this story is that the tension expressed here reflects a tension in the church, and as Mark indicates elsewhere in the gospel, the radical demands of discipleship have inevitable family implications which can lead to possible divisions.⁷⁰ This tension does not, however, necessarily reveal an animosity towards the relatives of Jesus, and the connections with Mk 10:28-30 indicate this was not the only point of the story.⁷¹

Turning to the rejection of Jesus at Nazareth, Mark brings home the point that opposition to Jesus was encountered from his own family, though it is possible that the pericope is built around the climactic proverb of v. 4 and a prophet is not without honour except in his own country.⁷² This story is also overlaid with confusing details and the reaction of the people to Jesus' teaching in v. 2 is described as astonishment at both his teaching and powerful deeds, though we are not specifically told of any deeds which Jesus did here. It is also difficult to understand why the relatives of Jesus are offended at him. Finally, Mark alone among the gospel writers refers to Jesus as the son of Mary which was very unusual since men were not normally referred to in terms of their relationship to their mother, but perhaps not so unusual

if he was preparing us for 15:40f.

Having examined the narrative technique of Mark's gospel and the manner in which he emphasises the role of women as significant characters in his unfolding plot, we will now appreciate the significance of the anointing of Jesus by an unnamed woman in Mk 14:1-12. This anointing by a woman, like the earlier offering of the poor widow, identifies these two females as exemplary figures in the gospel and they contrast with villainous men.⁷³ The anointing of Mk 14:1-12 stands at the introduction to the passion narrative,⁷⁴ and is bracketed by a reference to Jesus' external enemies' resolve to do away with him (vv 1-2), and the disaffection among his disciples and the decision of Judas to betray him (vv. 10-12). Thus the contrast is between hostility and faithfulness, and according to T.A. Burkill, this is a concrete example of genuine Christian devotion.⁷⁵ Not only does the anointing take place 'inside' the 'house', but as E. Struthers Malbon points out, we cannot fail to miss the irony of the juxtaposition of the unnamed woman who gives up money for Jesus and enters the house to honour him (14:3-9), and Judas, the man who takes up money and leaves the house to betray Jesus (14:10-11).⁷⁶

The anointing pericope is also significantly the last 'meal' in Mark before the last Supper, and if we read the gospel as a continuing, sequential narrative, then this meal will have something to say about the final meal. What this anointing tells us is that an unnamed woman exemplifies the type of service Jesus demanded of his disciples (cf. 8:22-10:52). It is also worth adding that while at this meal an unnamed woman serves Jesus, at the final meal a named disciple betrays him. Beyond this we note that this anointing is associated with the burial of Jesus and, therefore, taken together with Mk 16:1, we have yet another example of Mark's framing technique. As to how we interpret this relationship we will leave this question until we look at Mk 16:1 in more detail.

A final point in our survey of women in the gospel of Mark assesses the significance of Munro's comment that even if the women did follow Jesus, they were not among the twelve disciples who were chosen to be the ones to whom the secret mysteries of the Kingdom were revealed.⁷⁷ This special position for the disciples is often highlighted by scholars to the exclusion of the significance of the ὄχλος, the crowd in Mark. It is the opinion of P.S. Minear that not only did Mark have a special interest

in the ὄχλος,⁷⁸ but they are also important followers of Jesus (cf. 2:15; 3:7; 5:24; 9:38; 10:32; 11:9; 15:41), who are included in the secret teaching of 4:10f.⁷⁹ Thus even if the women are not included among the twelve, there is still room for the possibility that they were associated with the crowds who followed Jesus and were, therefore, recipients of his special teaching (10:1, 46; 11:18).

Our final survey of Mk 15:41 involves a discussion of the terms used to describe the women. Mark informs us first of all that the women had followed 'ἡκολούθουν' Jesus while he was in Galilee. The use of the verb 'ἡκολούθειν' is important since it implies more than a physical following and also indicates a mental allegiance.⁸⁰ As we have already noted, this verb is used by Mark to refer to both the disciples (1:18; 6:1; 8:34; 10:21), and the crowd. Indeed the whole gospel is marked by a sense of motion particularly from 8:27 onwards. Jesus calls his disciples to 'follow me' (cf. 1:17; 1:20; 2:14), and although some are unable to do so (eg. the rich young man of 10:21), others take up the challenge (10:52).⁸¹ More significant perhaps is the fact that this journey is to Jerusalem, and it is, therefore, intimately connected with the passion and death of Jesus, and the women have, therefore, come up (συνῆλθον) with him to the place of his execution. Finally, in terms of the literary structure of the gospel this 'coming up' has very positive connotations and contrasts with those who have 'come down' from Jerusalem (cf. for e.g. 3:22).

Applied to the women in particular, Mark tells us that they had followed Jesus while he was in Galilee (Mk 15:41) i.e. it has retrospective significance. Beyond this, however, we think of Mark 16:7 and the command to go and tell the disciples and Peter that Jesus is going ahead of them to Galilee. If, as we will argue below, Galilee refers to the present Gentile mission of the church, is Mark asking us to link together these two references and, therefore, the women who followed Jesus could have a role to play in the post-resurrection period? We will leave our answer to this question until our discussion of 16:1-8.

Moving on to the reference to service we are introduced to the type of discipleship which the women typify. According to H.C. Kee, the use of 'διακονεῖν' in this present context means the women performed menial tasks.⁸² In terms of Mark's interpretation of discipleship, this is a possible interpretation for Mk 1:31, and the reference to Simon's mother-in-law. Table service is not, however, the only meaning of διακονεῖν and

it can also refer to service in a wider sense of loving assistance rendered to a neighbour.⁸³ In the crucial central section of Mark's gospel 8:22-10:52 he repeatedly emphasises the type of service Jesus demands of his followers, they are to deny themselves, and take up their cross (8:34). The gospel involves a danger to life and, furthermore, it is a call to servanthood and not leadership.⁸⁴ The women in Mark have both served Jesus, and by following him to Jerusalem they have endangered their lives.

Summation

Having completed a very lengthy examination of Mk 15:40-41 it is not our intention here to repeat all the arguments we have put forward in our interpretation of these verses. Rather, what we hope to do is to assess the general impact of what we have learnt in terms of how we now perceive the role of women in the gospel of Mark, and not only at the scene of the crucifixion. As v. 41 indicates, the appearance of the women here is meant to be seen retrospectively in terms of the gospel as a whole.

Looking at Mark's gospel as a continuing and developing narrative with the writer as a genuine author, we can appreciate how he has used numerous literary techniques and devices to emphasise the role of women in the gospel. The women in 15:40 are introduced as those 'watching' the crucifixion, and we saw the importance of this verb in the gospel. What we will want to know from the further appearances of the women is, do they see in the correct way, that is with understanding? The evangelist has encouraged us to identify with the women at the cross in that they have replaced the male disciples who have fled (14:50). However, our identification with the women is not total and we learn that the women too are 'fallible followers', and though they watch, it is only at a distance. We also could not fail to miss the significance of the 'three' watching women, and with the later repetition focusing upon their three appearances, we will see this motif underlined. In terms of who exactly the women are, we are prepared to accept the identification of the second woman as the mother of Jesus. Although Mark may have been responsible for a later individualisation of the tradition by placing Mary Magdalene first, we cannot say at this point whether this was deliberate on his part.

Beyond this we also examined the role of women in Mark's gospel and what emerged was a very positive treatment of women who, like their male counterparts, are the recipients of miracles, some of which take place

'inside' the 'house'. Women are also involved with the important theme of feeding and meals in the gospel, and in the pericope of the anointing woman we saw the true disciple who serves Jesus.

Most of this interpretation has focused upon the text of Mark, and even in our treatment of Mk 3:20-1, 31-5 and 6:1-6 we did not make judgements about any possible reference to Jesus' historical family. It has been our intention throughout, rather, to discuss the text in terms of its literary impact and what this might have meant to Mark's readers. The message we have, therefore, received is that Mark had something definite to say to his community about the role of disciples and the manner of their service, and he did not hesitate to use women as examples of both. We cannot, however, fail to appreciate the radical content of this message for the Marcan community bearing in mind our introductory chapter on the role and status of women in the ancient world and the early church.

B. THE BURIAL - MARK 15:42-7

The burial of Jesus in Mark is carried out by Joseph of Arimathea with the women watching the events. Joseph is described as a respected member of the council who was looking for the Kingdom of God. This description is more reserved than the other gospels and in Matthew and John he is described as a disciple (cf. Mt 27:57; Jn 19:38), with Luke identifying him as a good and righteous man who had nothing to do with the plot to kill Jesus (23:50). If, as we will argue later in our examination of the other gospels, Matthew and Luke in particular were using Mark as their source here, the only conclusion that we reach is that the later evangelists were not happy with the Marcan account. We would also suggest in view of the fact that Joseph becomes a disciple, that the later evangelists were embarrassed by the absence of the male disciples,⁸⁵ and by identifying Joseph as a disciple they thereby wrote the male disciples back into the plot.

It has been suggested that the best clue to Joseph's identity is to see him as one of the minor characters in the passion narrative who undergoes a dramatic role reversal.⁸⁶ However, we feel this is reading too much into the Marcan account of Joseph's actions and perhaps more attention should be given to the more conservative assessment of R.E. Brown who tries to do justice to the Marcan portrayal of Joseph by interpreting it in terms of the Marcan passion narrative and Jewish and Roman attitudes

toward the burial of the executed, rather than in terms of Mark's literary descendants Matthew and Luke. Seen in these terms, Joseph's actions in Mark are closer to Acts 13:27-29 and possibly Jn 19:31 where Jesus is buried by his enemies and thus Joseph is fulfilling the requirements of the law.⁸⁷ Matthew and Luke have therefore read something completely different into their Marcan story.⁸⁸

We will now briefly examine the text before deciding on the significance of this burial for the watching women of v. 47.

Mark has already introduced the burial of Jesus by Joseph in v. 42 with a typical Marcan use of the genitive absolute adding a link of time.⁸⁹ It was now about 4 pm and this information, therefore, sets the scene for the burial and explains the urgency of Joseph's actions.⁹⁰ The fact that Joseph is responsible for burying Jesus further highlights the absence of the male disciples, who, unlike the disciples of John, do not carry out the burial procedures (cf. Mk 6:29). It would be wrong to conclude, therefore, that Mark has no reason for inventing Joseph since his introduction here could be associated with Mark's negative portrayal of the disciples. The description of Joseph's actions as being 'courageous' may possibly further condemn the male disciples who have not shown courage and instead abandoned and even denied Jesus.

vv. 44-5

Only Mark has the questioning of the centurion over whether or not Jesus has already died, and while this can be explained naturally, since those who were crucified could linger on for two or three days, it is possible that Mark is making a theological point: The darkness of the hour of Jesus' death is emphasised, and the centurion who has previously confessed Jesus to be the Son of God (cf. 15:39) now bears witness to his actual death.⁹¹ The use of σῶμα (body) in v. 43, therefore, contrasts starkly with the πτώμα (corpse) of v. 45. This scene also prepares us for 16:1f. and apologetically answers the question of whether Jesus was really dead and, therefore, actually rose from the dead.⁹²

v. 46

Mark informs us that after the body has been granted to Joseph, he takes it, wraps it in a σινδών and places it in a rock hewn tomb which is sealed with a stone.⁹³ By repeating the verb for closure ἀποκυλίω and its cognates in v. 46 (προσεκύλισεν), 16:3 (ἀποκύλισει), and 16:4 (ἀνοχέκυσται), Mark links together the stories of the burial and empty tomb. This emphasis on linking the two scenes is also seen in the

repetition of the verb 'τίθημι' in this present verse (κατέθηκεν), in v. 47 (τέθειται) and in 16:6 (έθηκεν).⁹⁴ Mark does not, however, tell us that Jesus' body is anointed, and since this is the intention of the women in 16:1, yet another link is forged between the two scenes.⁹⁵

v. 47

The witness of the women to the burial of Jesus also fits into this pattern of related verbs connecting the stories of the burial and the empty tomb. Thus, the women 'Μαρια ἡ Μαγδαληνή καὶ Μαρια ἡ Ἰωσήτος' saw where he was laid έθεώρουν ποῦ τέθειται'. The women are in their usual role as watchers, and by telling us that they have observed where Jesus was laid, Mark sets the scene for 16:1f. and the women's visit to the tomb.⁹⁶ It is difficult to explain the absence of Salome from the list of watching women, though it may perhaps be an indication that even subconsciously Mark is beginning the trend which later placed great significance upon Mary Magdalene as an important female resurrection witness. More significant perhaps, by not portraying Joseph as a disciple, Mark allows the women to continue to stand in for the male disciples.⁹⁷ This even leads some scholars to conclude that he is, therefore, honouring those who were normally either ignored or despised.⁹⁸

Summation

The significance of the burial in Mark lies primarily in the lack of development of the character of Joseph of Arimathea who is simply described as an honourable councillor who was looking for the Kingdom of God. The women therefore continue in their role as the Marcan replacement for the male disciples who have fled, and the reference to their witnessing, together with a number of other literary references in 15:42-47, serves to underline the links between this narrative and that of 16:1-8.

C. THE EMPTY TOMB - MARK 16:1-8

The pericope of the empty tomb in Mk 16:1-8 has caused many problems for scholars. While it is generally recognised that the main features of the pericope as it stands in Mark are the appearance and message of the young man and the reaction of the women, there is no general agreement on a pre-Markan tradition. Bode's excellent summary of the literature indicates that there is only agreement on vv. 2 and 8a,⁹⁹ and this leads J.D. Crossan to wonder if this lack of consensus suggests there was no pre-Markan empty tomb pericope.¹⁰⁰

Attempts to isolate a pre-Marcian tradition behind Mk16:1-8 are further hampered by the absence of unambiguous signs of the narrative's development. Even though there is a large amount of Marcian vocabulary in this section, some scholars have been led to conclude that:

...the history of the pre-Marcian resurrection tradition, if there was one, is shrouded in mystery and cannot provide a sound foundation for interpretation of the narrative in its final form.¹⁰¹

This question of the age of the tradition behind Mk 16:1-8 has also been linked to the question of its relationship to the passion narrative.¹⁰² In Taylor's view the detailed reference to the women indicates that 16:1-8 stands apart from the passion narrative proper, and this view, he believes, is supported by the character and contents of the pericope.¹⁰³ It is also possible, however, to argue the opposite, and the literary links between the two traditions, including the similarity in references to the women and the stone at the entrance to the tomb, indicate a connection and favour a conclusion for continuity of the narrative.¹⁰⁴ J.E. Alsup interestingly points out that even if we do accept the empty tomb tradition to be independent from the passion narrative, this does not mean it is a late tradition, and indeed, the contextual difficulties which he finds in the narrative suggest the contrary to him.¹⁰⁵ The main argument for the secondary nature of 16:1f., the repetition of the names of the women, need not necessarily imply a second tradition. Finally it is the opinion of U. Wilckens that Mk 16:1-8 is a necessary part of the Marcian passion narrative, since without it the gospel would end in defeat and death.¹⁰⁶

This lack of consensus in establishing a pre-Marcian empty tomb tradition supports our attempts to establish the meaning of Mk 16:1-8 on the basis of the internal evidence of the gospel. We will, therefore, examine the empty tomb story in terms of its narrative composition. An important part of this work will obviously focus on the enigmatic ending of Mk 16:8, and the question whether, as most scholars would today agree, the evangelist deliberately ended his gospel at this point. Beyond this we should also establish what this ending means in terms of Mark's narrative and whether or not it is a meaningful ending in terms of the unfolding plot of the gospel. Also associated with the question of the ending of the gospel and the flight of the women is the vexed question of what evaluation Mark thereby gives to the role of the women within the empty tomb narrative. Are we meant to evaluate the flight negatively,

that is the disciples never got the message of 16:7 and were, therefore, not rehabilitated, or is the ending of the gospel left open for us the readers to supply our own conclusion? In either case we will have to decide whether Mk 16:1-8 is parenesis or polemic. That is was Mk 16:1-8 an anti-resurrection tradition representing an attack on Mark's theological opponents,¹⁰⁷ or was it intended as encouragement to the Marcan community which was also struggling with the call to discipleship?¹⁰⁸

As with the previous sections we will carry out a verse by verse analysis of the text before drawing together the threads of our argument and in particular reaching a conclusion on the intended meaning of 16:8.

1. v. 1

Mk 16:1 opens with the naming of the women afresh and their intention to buy spices in order that they might anoint the body of Jesus is stated.¹⁰⁹ The other gospels agree with Mark that it was a visit by the women to the tomb which sets in motion the events of the first day of the week, and though they differ in details, this would hardly be surprising if Mark was their source.

This repetition of the women's names, though slightly at variance with the other two references to the women in Mk 15:40 and 47, has the effect of emphasising once again the role of the women in the three final scenes of the gospel.¹¹⁰ There is also an emphasis in the text on the movement of the women to the tomb (v. 1 ἐλθοῦσαι, v. 2 ἔρχονται ἐπὶ), inside the tomb (v. 5 εἰσελθοῦσαι εἰς), and away from the tomb (v. 8 ἐξελθοῦσαι... ἀπὸ),¹¹¹ and by the use of this repetitive terminology Mark introduces a feeling of continuity and movement to the narrative of 16:1-8, which is also a theme developed throughout the gospel as a whole. This feeling of continuity is reinforced by the reference to the passing of the sabbath and Crossan notes that the threefold time references in 15:42 (ὁ ἐστὶν προσάββατον), 16:1 (διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου), and in 16:2 (μικρὰ τῶν σαββάτων), Mark's chronology is harmonised with the three days of the prophecies in Mk 8:31; 9:31; 10:33.¹¹²

The main problem with Mk 16:1, however, centres on the motivation for the women's visit which is in order that they might anoint the body of Jesus (ἵνα ἐλθοῦσαι ἀλείψωσιν αὐτόν). This motivation has been contrasted with Mt 28:1 in particular where the women go to see (θεωρῆσαι) the tomb. Given Mark's interest in the women's witnessing the events of the crucifixion and burial, and his repeated use of the verb

θεωπέω, it is significant that he does not repeat the verb here. Why did Mark state that the women's intention was to anoint the body?¹¹³

We consider the answer to this question lies in the Marcan narrative and the previous anointing of Jesus by an unnamed woman. Since both these stories involve an attempt by women to anoint the body of Jesus, and both are associated with his burial and absence (14:8 and 16:6), there are obvious links between these two anointings and this is reinforced by their framing of the passion narrative.¹¹⁴ Not only does 16:1 recall the previous anointing where the actions of the unnamed woman are directly contrasted with the failure of Judas in particular, but we now ask will this group of women be successful in their intentions and thereby further condemn the male disciples who have fled?

2. v. 2

With v. 2 our attention is focused upon the intention of the women to anoint Jesus in Mk 16:1-8, and the women set out for the tomb. There is a confusing time reference in this verse and λίαν πρωί suggests a time before sunrise and ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου indicates a time after sunrise. There are various explanations for this confusing reference,¹¹⁵ but perhaps the most acceptable is that offered by J. Jeremias who suggests that when two time references are given in Mark in what appears to be a pleonasm, the second is intended to determine more exactly the first.¹¹⁶ This pattern is used elsewhere in Mark (cf. 1:35; 4:35; 10:30; 13:24; 14:12, 43), and in this particular verse it indicates that morning means after sunrise.¹¹⁷ We have already noted Mark's repetition of the reference to the sabbath and his emphasis on the women's approach to the tomb. The reader is now transposed to the tomb and expects the anointing to follow.

3. vv. 3-4

Verses 3 and 4 introduce a note of delay and surprise to the Marcan narrative. Mark alone among the gospel writers refers to the women's reflection about the removal of the stone. This 'inside view' allows the reader to consider the women's dilemma and the possibility that their intention to anoint the body will be thwarted. It further allows the reader to consider the possibility that the anointing of 14:2f. is to be the only anointing of the body of Jesus. The questioning of the women is phrased in such a way that it recalls the sealing of the tomb (cf. 15:46) and connects the burial with the discovery of the empty tomb.

In v. 4 Mark solves the problem of the women's dilemma over the

stone and, therefore, satisfies one expectation, but he thereby involves the reader once again with the possibility of a second anointing. Again the emphasis is on the women's witnessing with the use of ἀναβλέψασαι and θεωροῦσιν and there is another reference back to the burial with the unsealing of the tomb.

Most critical examinations of these verses have focused on the closing phrase ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα (cf. Mt 27:60), and whether or not it should come at the end of v. 3 as an explanation for the women's question rather than at the end of v. 4. The arguments in favour of its present setting do, however, seem to be more in line with Marcan narrative technique. Thus the phrase could be an example of Mark's loose sentence structure, and the explanatory γὰρ which he uses here in an attempt to clarify the women's questioning has the usual effect of leading only to greater obscurity (cf. 2:15; 6:14-16).¹¹⁸ Alternatively this explanatory phrase could be a deliberate interruption of the text and a delaying technique which further arouses the reader's interest and involvement with the text as they wait to see what happens next.¹¹⁹ What did the women see in the opened tomb?

4. vv. 5-7

In vv. 5-7 the young man in the tomb is introduced together with his message and this is followed in v. 8 by a description of the effect this has upon the women. Thus with vv. 5f. the climax of the Marcan narrative is reached. Mark begins in v. 5 with a typical use of parataxis and the repetition of the verb ἐρχομαι.¹²⁰ We are told that the women enter the tomb,¹²¹ and see a young man sitting on the right. The reader, who has been led to expect the body of Jesus to be inside the tomb, is suddenly introduced to a young man sitting in his place.

The νεανίας is an enigmatic character who makes a sudden appearance in Mk 16:5 and he has been interpreted in a number of ways, including an identification with John Mark of Jerusalem,¹²² and an angelic messenger.¹²³ Other scholars prefer to highlight the christological and baptismal significance of this character and he either represents Christ,¹²⁴ or the Christian community.¹²⁵ H. Waetjen, lays much greater significance on the links between Mk 14:51-2 and 16:5 and the fact that the young man of Mk 14:51 does not appear in the other gospels. The key to 16:5 lies in 14:51f. and both passages are interpreted in the light of the Joseph story of Gn 39:11-12 and 41:39-43. Moreover, not only does the νεανίας have a christological function, but according to Waetjen, he

also represents for Mark a fundamental shift in eschatology, and marks the beginning of the end time.¹²⁶

Whatever Mark intended us to understand by the reference to the young man, it is likely that our interpretation should be linked to the only other reference to a νεανίας in the gospel, Mk 14:51-2.¹²⁷ Perhaps a clue is to be found in the women's reaction to this figure which is one of astonishment (ἐξεθαμβήθησαν).¹²⁸ Previously in the gospel θαμβέιν (1:27; 10:24; 10:32) and ἐθαμβεῖσθαι (9:15) have been used to describe a reaction to either Jesus' authoritative teaching (10:24) or his miraculous powers (1:27). Indeed, in 14:33 Jesus himself is ἐθαμβεῖσθαι. By use of this verb to describe not only the reaction of others to Jesus, but to describe Jesus' inner feelings, Mark indicates this is a positive reaction. The use of this verb in vv. 5 and 6, therefore, emphasises the women's response was a typical human feeling when faced with the awesome power of God.¹²⁹

The young man's greeting to the woman in v. 6 'ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐταῖς' contrasts with the women's questioning among themselves on the way to the tomb in v. 3 καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτάς. The earlier questioning which indicates the women's powerlessness is now contrasted with the revelations of the young man. Once again we note that the women's reaction is echoed in the young man's command μὴ ἐθαμβεῖσθε. The women are then reprimanded by him for seeking (ζητεῖν) Jesus, and while the use of this verb could imply a criticism of the women since it is used elsewhere in the gospel in a derogatory sense, (cf. 1:37; 3:32; 8:11; 11:18; 12:12; 14:1, 11, 55),¹³⁰ we do not believe this was the case here. The present context, plus the announcement of the young man do not indicate a rebuff of the women.¹³¹

The description of Jesus as τὸν Ναζαρηνὸν underlines the connection between the earthly Jesus who came from 'Galilee', the resurrected Lord, and the women's role as witnesses while he was in 'Galilee' (15:41). These same women witness to the empty tomb and are about to be given the message that Jesus will meet his disciples in 'Galilee'. It is the opinion of K.E. Dewey that by the use of the title τὸν Ναζαρηνὸν (1:9 & 16:6) Mark has deliberately framed the gospel with references to Galilee and he thereby underlines the fact that Jesus is travelling from Galilee to Jerusalem and back again. To reinforce this conclusion she adds that the reaction of the women in 16:5-6 (ἐξεθαμβήθησαν, μὴ ἐθαμβεῖσθε) parallels the reaction of the crowd to Jesus the Nazarene in 1:27

(ἐθαμβήθησαν).¹³²

The young man's message does not, however, end in a reference to the resurrection, and the negative statement οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, but also includes a command to the women to tell the disciples that Jesus has been raised and is going before them to Galilee where they will see him as he had promised them.¹³³

Before discussing Mk 16:7 in detail, we must first establish who exactly the young man of Mk 16:5-7 represents. It is our opinion that while the clue to Mk 16:5 probably lies in 14:50-1, the angelus interpres was not, however, a Marcan interpretive element, since without the announcement that Jesus had risen, the gospel ending is incomplete, and the prophecies of 8:31; 9:31 and 10:33-4 remain unfulfilled.¹³⁴ Beyond this, however, it is quite likely that Mark has not dealt objectively with the tradition of a witness at the tomb and the significance of this young man, νεανίας, is to be found within the gospel. We, therefore, agree with Tannehill that the young man is neither a prefigurement of the risen Jesus, a Joseph figure, nor a symbol of the Christian baptismal initiate. He is most likely a dramatisation and concretisation of the flight of the disciples and contrasts with Jesus who does not flee, but is arrested and crucified. In terms of 16:5-7, the young man indicates the possibility of the rehabilitation of the disciples and the restoration of their relationship with Jesus.¹³⁵

Verse 7 has been responsible for a large number of scholarly articles with most arguing that it is a redactional insertion.¹³⁶ This argument is usually based upon its similarity to 14:28 which is also considered to be either a Marcan creation or an insertion of an independent logion. In Bultmann's view these verses are footnotes taken up by Mark from the tradition to prepare the way for a Galilean appearance of Jesus.¹³⁷ According to M. Dibelius, 16:7 does not belong to the story of the empty tomb, and Mark has joined the tomb story with other traditions in the church.¹³⁸ W. Pannenberg believes the unmotivated ἀλλὰ at the beginning of v. 7 shows that material has been added here that did not originally belong to the tradition.¹³⁹ Finally, L. Schenke, in particular, gives five main reasons why 16:7 is an addition - 1) It introduces a thought independent of v. 6; 2) ἡγερθη is not mentioned further; 3) 14:28 is an insertion; 4) v. 7 does not correspond with the women's reaction; and 5) v. 7 introduces the apostles and switches from indirect to direct speech.¹⁴⁰

Even if we do accept this verse as Marcan redaction as most scholars do, we still have to appreciate the full narrative impact of the ending of this gospel where v.8 appears to indicate that the women disobeyed the command of v.7.

In this verse the women are instructed to tell the disciples and Peter that Jesus is going before them to Galilee.¹⁴¹ The reference to the disciples and Peter is sometimes interpreted 'especially' Peter,¹⁴² and it can be understood to refer backwards to the denial,¹⁴³ and/or forward to the role Peter will play in the post-resurrection period.¹⁴⁴

The use of the verb προάγειν has caused a lot of difficulties for scholars.¹⁴⁵ This verb can be understood in both a spatial and a temporal sense, i.e. Jesus either leads the disciples to Galilee or he goes ahead of them. According to C.F. Evans, the idea of Jesus leading the disciples to Jerusalem, to be present at the scene of his rejection and death, is matched by a reverse leading from Jerusalem to Galilee, and hence he suggests:

προάγω must be translated 'I will go at your head' in correspondence with Mk 10:32, and the word 'Galilee' must be taken in a symbolical sense to mean the Gentile world.¹⁴⁶

A lot of discussion of Mk 16:7 has also revolved around the reference to Galilee and whether Mark thereby intends to exclude Jerusalem as the site of post-resurrection appearances. The importance of Galilee for Mark has been noted by several scholars,¹⁴⁷ and is summed up by T.J. Weeden:

In Mark, Galilee is a theological - geographical sphere where Jesus' public ministry occurred, where his parousia will occur and where his ministry is carried on in the interim by the church. As such the boundaries are not limited by the geographical region of Galilee but extend beyond to include the regions of the gentile world.¹⁴⁸

As to whether or not Galilee replaces Jerusalem as the place of the resurrection appearances, we note that it is just as likely that the Lucan and Johannine traditions referring to Jerusalem are motivated by theological concerns as the Marcan Galilean tradition.¹⁴⁹ Furthermore, we do not consider that 16:7 is primarily a reference to the Parousia,¹⁵⁰ or the resurrection,¹⁵¹ but to the continuing mission of the church which will have Jesus at its head.¹⁵² This statement, therefore, implies the restoration of the disciples, and taken together with 14:28 anticipates the shift from possible failure to possible faithfulness.¹⁵³ Finally, even if we admit that Mk 16:7 is heavily influenced by Marcan theological concerns, an interpretation supported by the way the evangelists feel

free to alter it, it is our conclusion that the empty tomb story probably included some kind of announcement. Without this element it is hard to appreciate what the story would have meant either to the first Christians or to Mark himself.

5. v. 8

If the previous verses in Mk 16:1-8 have caused problems for scholars, verse 8 in particular has seen a flood of commentaries dealing with the issue of whether or not this is the original conclusion to Mark's gospel, and if so what does it mean? Of particular interest to scholars is the enigmatic καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδέν εἶπεν ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ. This verse involves two main statements, the women fled from the tomb ἔφυγον and they said nothing to anyone, καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδέν εἶπεν, with two subsidiary γάρ clauses to explain them, because τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις had come upon them, and because ἐφοβοῦντο.

Beginning with the question of the Marcan ending there are few scholars today who would deny that "with this abrupt statement the gospel as we know it ends",¹⁵⁴ and this is supported by the fact that both Matthew and Luke diverge from their Marcan source at this point.¹⁵⁵ Those who argue that the gospel as it now stands is incomplete, point to the fact that it is inconceivable that the evangelist would have ended with no post-resurrection stories, especially since 14:28 and 16:7 indicate the author was aware of the existence of such stories.¹⁵⁶ As T.A. Boomershine points out, however, the gospel itself does not lead us to conclude that it was incomplete,¹⁵⁷ and more significantly, elsewhere in the gospel promises are recorded without an express mention of their fulfilment.¹⁵⁸ If, as we believe, 14:28 and 16:7 refer primarily to the Galilean mission, then we would not expect a continuation of the gospel beyond this point.

In the past, the strongest objections to the Marcan ending were based upon linguistic analyses of this verse. It was argued that a book could not end with the conjunction γάρ,¹⁵⁹ or with the verb φοβεσθαι.¹⁶⁰ Since the use of both these words has been demonstrated to be in line not only with Marcan usage,¹⁶¹ but also possible in classical Greek,¹⁶² these arguments have been considerably weakened. Finally, the psychological argument that Mark would not have left his readers with such a conclusion will be dealt with below.¹⁶³

As we have already mentioned Mk 16:8 ends with two explanatory clauses. This narrative technique is not an unusual feature of Mark's

gospel. Elsewhere Mark uses the explanatory γὰρ clause to explain something surprising or confusing. Boomershine points out, however, that the explanatory γὰρ in Mark often raises more questions than it solves (cf. 6:48-52; 14:1-2), and in this respect 16:8 is no different. This γὰρ clause is enigmatic, encouraging reflection back to earlier elements in the narrative as well as pointing forward to possibilities of what may happen in the future.¹⁶⁴

Mark begins in v. 8 by telling us that the women came out and fled from the tomb, and this action is explained because τρομος and ἔκστασις had come upon them.¹⁶⁵ The use of the verb ἔκστασις recalls Mk 5:42, and those who witness the miracle of the raising of Jairus' daughter react in a similar way, indicating this reaction is a typical response to the miraculous work of Jesus. This verse also brings to mind 10:32, and the disciples fear and astonishment as they follow Jesus up to Jerusalem.

Mark also adds that the women said nothing to any one because they were afraid, and with this abrupt statement the gospel ends. This comment οὐδενὶ οὐδέν εἶπεν has been interpreted in a number of ways.¹⁶⁶ Those who take the text literally would agree with Weeden's conclusion that we are to read 16:8 in terms of the women's identification with the male disciples, who in turn are viewed in a negative manner by Mark, representing a theological position of which the evangelist disapproves.¹⁶⁷ Thus he concludes: "the disciples never received the angel's message, thus never met the resurrected Lord, and consequently never were commissioned."¹⁶⁸

An alternative interpretation of 16:8 is proposed by N.R. Petersen who agrees with Tannehill in believing Mark leaves open the possibility of the rehabilitation of the disciples. If this restoration were not envisaged and the disciples did not come to their senses then it would lead us to doubt the reliability of Mark as a narrator who has "... led us to believe that the reliable Jesus assumed, intended, and expected that they would."¹⁶⁹ Beyond this the silence of the women in 16:8 could be the ultimate irony associated with the messianic secret. Throughout the gospel we have read of repeated commands to silence, and now, in the event of Jesus' suffering and death, when the type of Messiah Mark envisaged is most clearly spelt out, the reaction is one of silence in response to the command to confess.¹⁷⁰

The silence of the women in Mark is also linked to the explanation that it was the result of fear. Once again Weeden believes that this

response is a negative one, and is due to cowardice. He, therefore, disagrees with the opinion first suggested by R.H. Lightfoot that it was a positive norm of judgement and a natural human reaction faced with the numinous power of God.¹⁷¹

We would agree with the interpretation of fear suggested by J.R. Donahue who interprets the fear of the empty tomb story in terms of the motifs of surprise, wonder, awe and fear which he suggests both span and unify the diverse elements of the gospel. For him, understood against this background, fear is therefore a symbolic reaction to the whole gospel which accompanies the revelation of God in Jesus.¹⁷² Confronted with such a revelation the only adequate human response is one of perturbation. When faced with the awesome power of the divine, human powerlessness is highlighted, and human beings can only be disconcerted.¹⁷³ This is highlighted in Mk 4:41, the disciples' reaction ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν is not a reaction to the storm itself, but to Jesus' miraculous power in calming it. In Mk 5:15 the herdsmen are afraid καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν, even though they are not in danger themselves we conclude, therefore, that their fear was connected with the curing of the demonic and so they are disconcerted when confronted by the power of one who can control such demons. We have already made reference to Mk 5:33 and the woman with the flow of blood who comes φοβηθεῖσα καὶ τρέμουσα to Jesus, even though we are told in 5:34 that she has faith. Mk 6:51 involves the disciples of Jesus in the episode of the walking on the water. It is significant that this episode ends with Jesus greeting his disciples and instructing them μὴ φοβεῖσθε. This episode, together with the transfiguration, is perhaps the closest parallel we have in the gospels to the resurrection appearance stories, and the fact that the transfiguration also ends with a reference to the disciples' fear ἔκφοβοι γὰρ ἐγένοντο underlines the fact that fear is an understandable human reaction to a heavenly epiphany. This again underlines the paradox of divine power and human powerlessness which runs throughout the gospel.¹⁷⁴

Having thus far interpreted Mk 16:8 as the understandable human reaction of a confused disciple faced with the reality of the resurrection, we must now look at the women's flight and silence. The flight of the women from the tomb, building as it does upon the earlier flights of the disciples and the naked young man, is not something which encourages a sympathetic identification with the women of Mk 16:1-8. It is rather the third and perhaps most inexcusable flight, since these

women carry with them the crucial message of the resurrection. What are we, therefore, as readers to make of this conclusion? Is this flight and silence to be taken at face value as the shocking response of disobedience to the divine command of v. 7?¹⁷⁵ Or is 16:8 in a sense an 'absent ending' and are we as readers being invited to interpret this 'authorial silence' of 'suspended ending' and so fill in the gaps created by this paradoxical conclusion?¹⁷⁶

We would suggest that if Mk 16:1-8 is to make any sense to the reader it must be understood in two ways. It is a narrative in which the structure and impact surely point away from the empty tomb itself. With 16:7 our attention is directed in anticipation to the future life of the community and the possibility of restoration. In 16:8 the 'fallibility' of the women looks backwards, retrospectively to the responses of the disciples throughout the gospel and presents us the readers with the challenge of how will we respond to this divine command.¹⁷⁷

While we would therefore accept the full narrative impact of 16:7 and 8, and the tension thereby created between prediction and fulfilment, we do not necessarily see the outcome as a foregone conclusion and one of promise and failure,¹⁷⁸ or indeed even promise and success. As with the message which is sown in the gospel and the challenges represented by the message of the Kingdom, there are many different possible reactions to the word which is sown. This message, building upon images of 'hiddenness', 'mystery', and the challenges to human perception and powerlessness, is part of the very fabric of the gospel.¹⁷⁹ We should not, therefore, presume to conclude that the women either succeeded or failed. The ending of the gospel is surely more ambiguous and complex. The women have served their narrative function in establishing for the reader the fact of the resurrection, the future responses to this challenge is the paradox of the gospel.

Summation

In examining Mk 16:1-8 we have tried to establish what traditions Mark possibly inherited and how he has shaped the material before him. It is hard to believe that Mark's gospel ended without reference to the resurrection, particularly in view of the unfulfilled prophecies of 8:31; 9:31 and 10:33-4, and it is, therefore, possible to suggest that Mark had some form of resurrection tradition. The question of whether Mark invented the empty tomb tradition to supply this ending is a more difficult question to answer. Having examined the Marcan narrative we

have discovered a number of Marcan narrative features, but we do not consider that these necessarily lead us to conclude that Mark was, therefore, responsible for the creation of the empty tomb tradition. The reason for the women's visit, to anoint the body, is obviously a Marcan introduction to the empty tomb narrative, since it not only fits in with Mark's own theological concerns, but the other evangelists feel free to omit this motif (cf. Mt 28:1).

Mark also probably introduced the women's questioning en route to the tomb since this too is linked to the anointing motif and is omitted by the other evangelists. Beyond this, this inside view encourages us to sympathise with the women as we wonder whether or not their intentions will be thwarted. The messenger motif is, however, probably traditional, since without this element the tomb story has no positive message, though as we have already suggested, Mark probably interpreted this motif in terms of the young man of 14:51. The message itself, that Jesus has risen, is the core of the narrative, though the Galilean reference fits Mark's theological intentions so well that it is hard to conclude it is not a Marcan addition. Finally, while all the gospels have the women fleeing from the tomb, Mark was responsible for the particular description of their emotions which we find in v. 8, and by stopping at this point he made these reactions all the more poignant.

CONCLUSION

How do we then make sense of Mk 15:40-1, 46-7 and 16:1-8? What do these texts mean in terms of Mark's perception of the role and status of women in these scenes and within the gospel as a whole?

As we suggested at the beginning of this chapter, we believe the interpretation of these three Marcan texts should be very closely associated with our interpretation of Mark's gospel as a whole. We, therefore, began in Mk 15:40-1 by taking up the retrospective reference to the women who had followed Jesus from Galilee and examined the role of women within the gospel.

As a result of this examination we saw that Mark made no distinction between male and female followers of Christ. Both males and females are recipients of miracles and, furthermore, by placing the miracles involving women within the house, Mark was not attempting to exclude women from the public ministry. The house is, rather, an important architectural space in Mark's gospel, and by placing scenes

involving women in this setting, Mark is affirming the significance of the status of women within the ministry of Jesus. Mark also does not hesitate to involve women with the important feeding metaphors in the gospel, and the dialogue between Jesus and the Syro-Phoenician woman in particular represents one of the most intriguing exchanges of the gospel. Finally, the anointing pericope gives us the ultimate example of a true disciple as one who serves without concern for reward and positions of status in the kingdom (contrast 10:35-45).

We also saw that the identification of the women in Mk 15:40-1 was linked to other references to women in the gospel, and we concluded that these women were probably known to the Marcan community. We identified the second woman as the mother of Jesus and beyond this felt that Mary Magdalene was beginning to take her place at the head of the list of these watching women.

Thus our conclusions were that for Mark these women 'come up' with Jesus to the place of his death and by 'watching' the events of the crucifixion, they are to a certain extent fulfilling the role of a true disciple. However, the women of Mk 15:40-1, like the male disciples, are represented as fallible followers, and while they remain with Jesus, they stand at a distance.

In Mark's treatment of the burial, we continue to see the women portrayed as 'watchers', and by not identifying Joseph of Arimathea as a male disciple, Mark continues to show no embarrassment over the women standing where the male disciples should have been.

Since we have just examined the question of Mk 16:1-8 in terms of what Mark possibly added to the tomb tradition, we will now concentrate on the question of what Mk 16:1-8 means when taken together with the two other texts being considered here, and the gospel as a whole.

We do not consider that Mark's intention in 16:1-8 was polemical, and the empty tomb story is not, therefore, an anti-resurrection tradition attacking Mark's theological opponents. We believe that the clue to all three texts lies in Mark's parenetical concerns, and indeed the portrayal of women in the gospel as a whole is bound up with the important Marcan theme of discipleship. The women of the three Marcan scenes of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb are, therefore, presented as fallible followers of Christ who, while they remain with him at his death, burial and resurrection, still stand at a distance, and ultimately flee from the scene. This, however, while the end of the

Marcan narrative as we have it, is not the end of the gospel story.¹⁸⁰ It is rather up to both the reader and the members of the Marcan community to supply the ending of the gospel, and thus allow for the possibility of restoration and rehabilitation.

Looking at Mk 16:1-8 in detail our conclusion is that the impression we get from reading this narrative is that it is a pericope which has a certain unity to it and one which builds up to a climax within itself.¹⁸¹ Given our introductory chapter on women in the early church the Marcan treatment of the women is very significant. We have already stated that the evangelist felt no embarrassment over a conclusion which left the message in the hands of the women. It is, therefore, reading too much into Mark to suggest that the silence of the women was to protect the pre-eminence of the male disciples or Peter as witness of the resurrection. Mark's gospel does not continue with a resurrection appearance story and this solution, therefore, falls into the trap of reading Mark's gospel in the light of its literary descendants. There is no hint in Mark that the women said nothing, except to the male disciples and, therefore, the public at large are informed via the preaching of the disciples rather than through the women's witness.

CHAPTER TWO - NOTES

1. We refer here to M. Kähler (1964), p. 80, n. 11, and the comment that Mark's gospel is a passion narrative with an extended introduction. See also N. Perrin (1977), pp. 19-20 who notes that the complex of three closely related narratives involving women in Mark - the crucifixion, the burial and the resurrection, should also be considered together as one continuous unit.
2. For instance Matthew may have introduced the guard at the tomb out of apologetic concerns to refute claims that the disciples of Jesus had stolen the body (Mt 27:62-66). We also note that discourse material may presuppose a situation which is important to its interpretation and indeed the situation itself may be reflected in the discourse. Thus the so-called 'controversy unit' in Mk 2:1-3:6 may reflect on actual conflict in the Marcan community.
3. For a discussion of the links between the literary and historical approaches to the text see R.C. Tannehill (1975), pp. 6-7.
4. On source criticism see B.H. Streeter (1936); W.R. Farmer (1976); W. Beardslee (1981). For a modern defence of the two source theory see C.M. Tuckett (1983).
5. On form criticism see R. Bultmann (1963); M. Dibelius (1934); G.N. Stanton (1975).
6. See R.H. Stein (1970; 1971). For a recent critical review of the contribution of redactional-critical studies on Mark see C.C. Black (1988).
7. According to N. Perrin (1974), p. 1, redaction criticism tries to uncover " ... the theological motivation of an author as this is revealed in the collection, arrangement, editing, and modification of traditional material, and in the composition of new material or the creation of new forms within the tradition of early Christianity."
8. See Stein (1970).
9. For a survey of modern literary critical techniques applied to the gospel see N.R. Petersen (1978a); a note of warning as regards Mark's creativity is sounded by J.C. Meagher (1975).
10. The creativity debate is an ongoing debate in Mark's gospel with certain scholars including E. Best (1974) arguing that Mark was a conservative redactor and others, including Petersen, Tannehill and W.H. Kelber, claiming that Mark was a genuine author.
11. See N. Perrin (1972a), pp. 9-10; see also D. Rhoads (1982b).
12. See Tannehill (1975), pp. 15f.
13. Thus Perrin (1972b), p. 373.
14. For a review of the current discussion see S. Mailloux (1977). See also W. C. Booth (1961).
15. For a more thorough examination of Mark's use of narrative point of view see N.R. Petersen (1978b).
16. See T.A. Boomershine (1981b), p. 227 for a very brief summary of narrative techniques.

Recent scholarship has recognized the significance of Mark's treatment of the disciples, though there is no agreement on whether the primary emphasis is on parenesis or polemic, and such conclusions are usually related to the perceived view of the purpose of the gospel as a whole. For parenesis see Best (1976-7), (1983), pp. 44-50; Tannehill (1977); D.J. Hawkin (1972); For polemic see J. Schreiber (1961); J.B. Tyson (1961). T.J. Weeden (1968) and (1971); W.H. Kelber (1972).

17. The importance of duality in Mark has been emphasised by a number

- of critics, most notably F. Neirynck (1972).
18. This repetitive structure continues in the teaching which follows the passion predictions. In Mk 8:34f. people are encouraged to deny themselves and take up the cross and follow Jesus. Forcefulness is added by the use of antithetic parallelism in the image of losing and saving one's life. See also G. Strecker (1968), p. 435 who considers that 8:31 is the original form of the passion prediction which Mark then reproduces three times.
 19. Mark's predilection for threefold units has been noted by numerous scholars. See T.A. Burkill (1963), p. 123, n. 16, p. 203, 205 and n. 36, p. 232 n. 24, p. 236, 243f.; D.E. Nineham (1972), pp. 389-90; K.G. Kuhn (1952-3), p. 264; E. Lohse (1964), p. 62; W.H. Kelber (1972), pp. 169-71; D. Dormeyer (1974), pp. 130-1, 153, 199, 213-14; N. Perrin (1977), pp. 25f.; R.A. Culpepper (1978), p. 584; D. Rhoads (1982b), p. 427, n. 10.
 20. If anything, Mark emphasises the betrayal by Judas and in v. 42 we read, "my betrayer is at hand", in v. 43, "immediately ... Judas came", and in v. 45 "and when he came, he went up to him at once". It is also significant that we are not told in Mark what happened to Judas after he betrayed Jesus. This contrasts with Mt 27:3f. Mark obviously did not feel it necessary to conclude the story of Judas, and this is a significant point in view of the arguments that Mark's gospel does not reach a satisfactory conclusion in 16:8.
 21. For this particular emphasis on the three-fold motif in Mark, see Kelber (1972), pp. 170f. who concludes that the watchfulness motif in the Marcan Gethsemane story is editorial. See also pp. 178f., 185f.
 22. On the role of Peter in Mark see Best (1978), esp. p. 557. For the denial see M. Wilcox (1970-71); K. E. Dewey (1976). The negative image of Peter in Mark's gospel is toned down by the later evangelists. In Mt 16:17-19 he is the rock upon which the church will be built and he is given the keys of heaven, having already walked upon the water (Mt 14:28-31). To complete this rehabilitation of Peter in Mt 28:16-20 he is one of those commissioned to preach the gospel. Luke also rehabilitates Peter and alongside the denial sequence he is also, possibly, present at the tomb (24:12) and he is the first person to see the risen Jesus (24:34). John likewise has Peter at the tomb (20:3-10) and in Jn 21 there is a story of the three-fold profession of love.
 23. According to Best (1965), p. 102, the three references to the women suggest Mark was putting together three sections which were once separate. See also M. Hengel (1963), p. 246 who notes that the three references to the women correspond to the died, buried and raised of 1 Cor 15:3-4.
 24. On intercalation see H.C. Kee (1977), pp. 54-6. We should also note that intercalation, while a Marcan device, need not necessarily mean that the pericopes themselves are, therefore, Marcan but rather that Mark intercalates them for effect. For example cf. 3:20-21/22-30/31-5; 5:21-24/25-34/35-43; 6:7-13/14-19/30f.; 11:12-14/15-19/20-25; 14:1-2/3-9/10-11; 14:53-4/55-65/ 66-72; 15:6-15/16-20/21-32.
 25. We note that the verbs (φοβέω) and (τρέμω) are used here in a positive sense and we encounter them again in Mk 16:1-8 when they are used to describe the reactions of the women who visit the tomb.
 26. For framing in Mark see Kee (1977), pp. 56-62.
 27. Thus Kelber (1976), p. 42.
 28. John's positioning of the woman beside the cross may have been

- influenced by the literary demands of the text and the conversation between the Beloved Disciple and the mother of Jesus. See C.K. Barrett (1965), p. 458 who points out that it would have been unlikely for the Romans to have allowed Jesus' friends to approach the cross. Mark may have been influenced by Ps 38. We would reject the suggestion of M.J. Selvidge (1983), p. 399. She suggests a translation - "But there were even women from afar watching" with the emphasis here on the place from which the women originated.
29. According to L. Schottroff (1982), pp. 5-6 crucifixion was also a punishment for friends and relatives since they were forbidden to bury the dead, and in the case of Jesus even more risk was involved since his crucifixion had political overtones. She also notes that women and children were known to have been crucified.
 30. According to E. Struthers Malbon (1983), the role of women in Mark's gospel is closely associated with the complex question of discipleship. In her opinion, the portrait of the followers of Jesus in Mark is both complex and composite: complex in portraying both the success and the fallibility of followers and composite in that they include not only the twelve, but the crowd and certain exceptional individuals, which means women.
 31. On the question of women's acceptability as witnesses see our previous references to the witness of women in Judaism.
 32. Thus R.P. Meze (1968), pp. 219-220.
 33. There are several verbs 'to see' used in this section. In v. 23 we have βλέπειν, in v. 24 ἀναβλεψας and ὁράω and in v. 25 we have διαβλέπειν and ἐμβλέπειν.
 34. In the gospel of Mark several groups fail to see Jesus in the correct manner beginning with the Pharisees and including Jesus' fellow citizens and disciples. Cf. Schweizer (1971), 'blindness', ad. loc. and (1985). The theme of 'watching' is a very important theme in Mark's gospel. See W.H. Kelber (1972), pp. 177, 179, 180, and esp. 183. It is his opinion that Mark has created this theme.
 35. Thus Bultmann (1963), pp. 284-5. A variation on this theme is the suggestion of E. Schweizer (1971), p. 360 that Mark possibly included the women in v. 41 to prepare us for 16:1 and the disciples of Jesus are the first to whom the true meaning of Jesus' resurrection is revealed. He concludes that the death of Jesus is not the end for the disciples, but represents the possibility of new life.
 36. Thus Dibelius (1934), p. 190; V. Taylor (1966), p. 602.
 37. Cf. W.L. Craig (1985), p. 51 and n. 52. Craig also suggests that the juxtaposition of their names is not useless duplication and the omission and reintroduction of Salome suggests the witnesses to the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb are being recalled. We reject Schottroff's argument that Mark is here speaking of four women. See (1982), p. 8.
 38. Thus Taylor (1966), pp. 651-653. See also P. Perkins (1984), p. 116. J.D. Crossan, would criticise the solution proposed by Taylor which he considers to be too mechanical and does not answer certain questions. Why, for instance, did Mark want to conflate 15:47 and 16:1 in 15:40 but thereafter show no interest in harmonising 15:47 and 16:1 in line with his inaugural conflation? Why, if Mark combined "Mary of Joses" in 15:47 with Mary of James in 16:1, does the text not read Mary of Joses and James, rather than the reverse? Thus (1973), p. 106. According to H. Graß (1970), pp. 182, 310, 15:40f. is the earlier tradition and is the origin of the names in all three lists. Finally, for R. Mahoney (1974), p. 109, 15:47 and

- 16:1 demonstrate that in all probability these two verses were part of Mark's tradition and were used by him in the composition of 15:40f. (See pp. 107-109 for his detailed argument).
39. This discrepancy over the names of the women disappears in both Matthew and Luke. The woman identified in Mt 27:56 as *μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήφ μητὴρ* is referred to thereafter as *ἡ ἄλλα μαρία*. In Luke the problem of confusion over the names does not even arise, and he identifies the women only once in 24:10.
 40. Thus Taylor (1966), p. 652. Taylor does not, however, support this suggestion with any hard facts, and it is possible to suggest, therefore, that this is mere supposition. It would also be difficult to see why Mark would have used only a tradition of the Jerusalem church, unless he was presenting these women in a negative light. According to Crossan (1973), p. 112 there is a polemical thrust in Mark's gospel which is tied up with the disciples and the relatives of Jesus whom he considers the women represent.
 41. This harmonisation of the four accounts of the resurrection is found in the works of J. Lilly (1940); E.A. Mangan (1945); J.W. Wenham (1984). For a harmonisation of the names of the women see P. Benoit (1969), pp. 189-190 and R.E. Brown (1972), pp. 905f.
 42. Thus Bode (1970), p. 13 and n. 4. A similar suggestion is made by J. Daniélou (1968), pp. 218-219. Daniélou even suggests that there was possibly opposition between these two groups at a later stage. He points to Acts where a group of 'widows' are closely linked to the 'Hebrews' i.e. the relatives of Jesus, and the 'Hellenists'.
 43. This pecking order is suggested by M. Hengel (1963) and he also points out here that Mary Magdalene has the same relation to the group of women that Peter has to the apostles. As we will see in our later study of the apocryphal gospels Mary Magdalene becomes a very important female witness for the resurrection.
 44. See Trompf (1971-2).
 45. Ibid., p. 309. See also J. Lambrecht (1974), p. 252 for this suggestion. *We, therefore, reject the view of Taylor (1966), p. 598 that Mark would not have used such circumlocution in referring to the mother of Jesus on the grounds that it is a theological anachronism. It is reading into the texts a Mariology representative of a much later period than that in which the gospels were written.*
 46. Ibid., p. 310.
 47. See the apocryphal tradition where Jesus appears to James in the Gospel of the Hebrews. Thus *NTApoc* Vol. 1, p. 65.
 48. According to Crossan (1973), p. 108, the pre-Markan tradition had only Mary of Magdala, Mary the mother of James and Salome at the cross and at the tomb and Mark himself added *καὶ Ἰωσήφ* in 15:40 and created the new verse in 15:47 to repeat this. His reasons for doing so were to identify this woman with the mother of Jesus and create a deliberate link with the relatives of Jesus in 6:3. See below for a discussion of Jesus' relations with his physical family.
 49. While we accept the identification of this woman as Mary the mother of Jesus, we are not prompted by a desire to ensure Mark and John agree, but rather our identification is primarily supported by an examination of Mark's gospel.
 50. Even though Salome is omitted in Mk 15:47 we are still not persuaded by Trompf's arguments. It is also interesting to note here that in the Gospel of Thomas, Salome describes herself as a disciple of Jesus. See B. Gärtner (1961), pp. 134-135.

51. Thus Munro (1982). See Nineham (1972), p. 431 who also comments on the abrupt appearance of the women at this point in the gospel as does H. Hendrickx (1984), p. 100. For an examination of the role of women in Mark, see also J.J. Schmitt (1981) and Malbon (1983). According to Malbon Mark delays explicit reference to the women disciples or followers until that moment when the true meaning of discipleship and followership can be understood (p. 42).
52. For example cf. Mk 15:41 with 10:32f. which included women. But would the Marcan reader have done so?
53. Beyond this Munro also suggests that the women of 15:40-41 could signify a female group connected with, and supportive of, the authorities whom Mark opposes. The women, like the twelve, represent the leaders of the Jerusalem church. See *ibid.*, p. 238. For embarrassment over the role of women in the early church see our introductory chapter.
54. Thus Fiorenza (1982), pp. 35-40. According to Schottroff (1982), p. 4, Mark probably intended us to include women in the references to the disciples in general and she, therefore, interprets Marcan language as inclusive. This argument is rejected by Schweizer in his critical review of Schottroff's article. See (1982), pp. 29f.
55. Cf. our earlier references to the role and status of women in Judaism.
56. As we have already pointed out in our introduction the house was also an important meeting place for the early Christians. Cf. F.V. Filson (1939).
57. This is the suggestion of Malbon (1985). It is also significant that, as the gospel progresses, the house replaced both the temple and synagogue as the place of true learning.
58. Cf. P.J. Achtemeier (1970) and (1972).
59. See Kelber (1974), p. 61.
60. Thus G.H. Boobyer (1953).
61. See our earlier references to women in Judaism where we noted that it is suggested that it was not usual practice for Jewish women to move about freely in public; according to Schmitt (1981), p. 230, Mark admires not only the woman's faith but her ingenuity and boldness.
62. Cf. Lev 15:19-33 regarding a menstrual discharge which renders a woman and anyone touching her unclean. See also Lev 5:3 concerning unwitting contact with uncleanness which makes a person guilty once it is known.
63. See Fowler (1981), pp. 132-148 for the importance of food in Mark. See also J. Dewey (1973) on the significance of 'eating' and 'fasting' in the controversy stories.
64. See V.K. Robbins (1976), pp. 27-28.
65. On the Syro-Phoenician woman see D. Smith (1900-1); J. Ireland Hasler (1933-34); J.D. Smart (1938-9); T.A. Burkill (1966) and (1967); R.A. Harrisville (1966); J.D.M. Derrett (1973). For a feminist reading of this story see S.H. Ringe (1985).
66. This view is illustrated by J.D. Crossan (1973) who interprets the animosity shown towards Jesus' relatives as an attack upon the authority and jurisdiction of the Jerusalem church. Crossan's work is reviewed by Lambrecht (1974). It is his opinion that Mark was not so much creating a polemic against Jesus' family who represent the Jerusalem church, or attempting to give more historical information regarding Jesus' family. What Mark is attempting here, according to Lambrecht, is giving instruction to Christians on true kinship and discipleship which had to reckon with divisions within the family. See esp. pp. 257-258. This conclusion is one which is

- supported by Best (1975-6).
67. The following study develops the ideas presented in Tannehill (1975), pp. 165-71. For intercalation here see also Best (1975-6), p. 309.
 68. It has been suggested that Mk 3:20-1 was not originally associated with 3:31-5. Cf. H. Wansbrough (1971-2), pp. 233-235.
 69. Thus Tannehill (1975), p. 167. This whole theme of those 'inside' and those 'outside' is taken up in Mk 4, esp. vv. 10-12.
 70. See Best (1975-6), esp. 316f.; Lambrecht (1974).
 71. As we have already seen, Crossan (1973) believes Mark displays animosity towards the relatives of Jesus which is connected with an attack upon the authority of the Jerusalem church. See likewise Kelber (1974), pp. 25-6, 53-4. Finally, according to Best (1975-6), p. 314, Mark was not out to deliberately vilify the family of Jesus and as a whole he has a conservative attitude to the tradition he uses.
 72. Cf. E. Grässer (1969-70), p. 6. Mark seems to have added 'own kin, own house'.
 73. Thus Malbon (1983), p. 39.
 74. Cf. Lk 7:36f. As we will argue later we believe that Mark deliberately placed this pericope at the beginning of the passion narrative to provide a contrast with 16:1f..
 75. See Burkill (1963), p. 229.
 76. Thus Malbon (1983), p. 40..
 77. Thus Munro (1982), pp. 228-229.
 78. See Minear (1972). See also Weeden (1971), pp. 22-3 who notes that the introduction of the crowd is a literary device used by Mark to dramatize the popularity of Jesus with the masses in contrast to the reaction of the Jewish leaders. Finally, see R. Meyer, 'ὄχλος', TDNT, ad. loc.
 79. See C.H. Turner (1924-5), esp. pp. 227, 234, 237. Best (1976-7), pp. 390-393 and the literature cited there. Finally, for Malbon (1983), pp. 31f. both the crowd and the disciples are special groups for Jesus and both are fallible.
 80. Cf. E.J. Pryke (1978), pp. 40-1; See also G. Kittel 'ἀκολουθέω', TDNT, ad. loc.
 81. See Kelber (1974), pp. 69-85. The whole gospel is a series of entries and exits. Jesus enters houses, boats, synagogues, towns and the temple. Finally, the women enter and leave the tomb. This theme of movement runs throughout the gospel and adds a tone of urgency to Mark's message. Moving beyond the gospel we also note that not only were early Christians 'followers' of Jesus, but in Acts Christianity is referred to as 'the way'. Paul also appeals to various communities to 'walk' in the right direction, and finally, for John Jesus is 'The Way'.
 82. According to Kee "It cannot be inferred from these passages that women occupied the leading offices in the community of Mark, but rather that the menial (sic) tasks they performed were regarded as praiseworthy and as fully compatible with God's purpose for his people." (1977), p. 91. See also Schweizer (1971), p. 360 who notes that this is the only place in the gospel where discipleship of women is mentioned apart from Lk 8:1f.
 83. See H.W. Beyer, 'διακονέω, διακονία, διάκονος', TDNT, ad. loc. See also Schottroff (1982), pp. 10-12 for διακονία in Mark.
 84. For a discussion of this section 8:22-10:52 see Best (1976-7).
 85. This embarrassment of the later evangelists is seen even in their treatment of the crucifixion and in Luke all Jesus' acquaintances (male) witness the event.

86. Thus Kelber (1976), pp. 172-176, esp. 175.
87. See R.E. Brown (1988). Brown explains Joseph's looking for the Kingdom of God in terms of the $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ of v. 43, which suggests to him that there were others besides Joseph looking for the Kingdom of God. He then reminds us of the scribe who asks Jesus about the commandments and admires Jesus' knowledge of the law but does not specifically follow him. We are told in 12:34 that this man was not far from the Kingdom of God. Brown, therefore, classes Joseph as a similar pious believer.
88. According to R.H. Fuller (1980), pp. 54-55, the original story of the burial was probably that found in Acts 13:29 and Jesus is buried by his enemies. He suggests that if this was the original tradition then the easiest way out for Christian piety was to make one of the councillors, Joseph of Arimathea, perform the burial not as an act of hostility, but as an act of charity. Fuller even floats the idea that Joseph was perhaps a member of the Sanhedrin who buried Jesus as the final hostile act. Cf. n. 87.

H. Hendrickx disagrees with the usual scholarly view which identifies Joseph as a member of the Sanhedrin. He points out that Mark usually refers to groups within the Sanhedrin such as the chief priests, the scribes and the elders and not to the group as a whole. Furthermore, 15:43 is the only instance where $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ is used in the gospel. Beyond this, Hendrickx points out that 'councillor' was not a technical expression current among the Jews, and in the two pages of the LXX where it is used (Job 3:14; 12:17), it does not mean a member of the Sanhedrin, but a VIP. Finally, having dismissed its occurrence in the works of Josephus as supporting a technical interpretation, Hendrickx argues that a councillor could be a member of the Sanhedrin, or a member of any local court. Thus (1984), p. 129.
89. See Taylor (1966), p. 599 who considers that the burial of Jesus by Joseph of Arimathea belongs to the best tradition. According to Bultmann (1963), p. 296, this section is an historical account which makes no legendary impression other than vv. 44-47. For Pryke, on the other hand, the witnessing of the burial by the women is part of the tradition as are vv. 44 and 45. Thus (1978), pp. 23 and 175. See also Neirynck (1972), p. 96.
90. For the problems associated with this Marcan time reference see Nineham (1972), p. 433. He draws attention here to the fact that the day in question was also the day of preparation for Passover. For Mahoney (1974), p. 111, the urgency should be related to the coming of nightfall rather than to sabbath restrictions. Both Matthew and Luke alter their Marcan source at this point with Matthew omitting ' $\delta\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\acute{\alpha}\beta\beta\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ ' and Luke simplifying it in 24:54.
91. Cf. Jn 13:30 for another possible symbolic use of the darkness/night theme associated with evil.
92. This apologetic note is more obvious in Jn 19:33f. For the redactional character of these two verses see I. Broer (1972), pp. 165-170. Finally, it is also worth noting that Mark has now given us a three-fold witness to the death of Jesus (Pilate, the centurion and Joseph).
93. Note $\sigma\iota\nu\delta\omega\nu$ is also used of the young man in 16:5.
94. See Neirynck (1972), p. 81. For Mahoney (1974), p. 115 the final clause of 15:46 is undoubtedly related to the question the women put to themselves in 16:3 and since 15:47 is only an extension of the thought, and 16:3 seems more integral to the narrative, he suspects Mark himself added the former to prepare for the latter.

95. Unlike Matthew, Mark has no guard.
96. See Taylor (1966), p. 602 who believes the reference is appended and does not belong here. In his opinion it may well have been the introduction to 16:1; E. Schweizer (1971), p. 361 sees the significance in the reference to the names here as an indication that this story was formerly told by itself. For Nineham (1972), pp. 432-3, 435 the reference was appended due to a desire to show that the same people who saw the entombment also saw the empty tomb and, therefore, there was no confusion over which tomb held the body of Jesus. Finally, for Hendrickx (1984), p. 133 15:47 was probably in the Marcan tradition, though it did not belong to the earliest stratum and forms a bridge to 16:1.
97. This contrasts with our earlier examination of the limited roles afforded to women in Judaism.
98. Thus Schweizer (1971), p. 363; C.E.B. Cranfield (1952), p. 284.
99. Thus Bode (1970), p. 25 and n. 1.
100. For a Marcan creation we have Crossan (1976), p. 135; N.Q. Hamilton (1965), pp. 416f. According to Crossan the suggestion that Mark created the empty tomb story is confirmed by three 'interlocked' and mutually supportive arguments: (1) there are no empty tomb versions before Mark; (2) all those after Mark derive from him; (3) the empty tomb is completely consistent with and required by Marcan redaction theology. For Taylor (1966), pp. 602-603 the empty tomb narrative is constructed by Mark himself on the basis of tradition, although not that of an eye-witness. According to L. Schenke (1968) Mk 15:42-7 was originally separate from the tomb tradition. Mk 16:1-8 was in turn an aetiological cult-legend which explains a service held at the tomb by the Jerusalem church. See also W. Nauck (1956), pp. 261-3. Finally, see Perkins (1984), p. 94 who defends the authenticity of the tomb story with the nucleus being a visit to the tomb by some female disciples who left perplexed. She does not consider that this nucleus included an angelophany.
101. See T.A. Boomershine (1981b), p. 226 n. 4.
102. See W.L. Craig (1985), p. 57. R. Pesch (1977) argues that the empty tomb was in all likelihood a conclusion, or at least part of, the pre-Markan passion story. According to W. Marxsen (1969), p. 76, Mark probably appended 16:1-8 to the passion narrative furnished him by the tradition since according to him this story conflicts with 15:42-47 in many details.
103. Thus Taylor (1966), p. 602. Bultmann (1968), pp. 284-5 argues that Mk 16:1-8 is a secondary formulation not originally linked to the preceding material. This, he believes, is supported by the naming of the women afresh and their intention to anoint the body which, he argues, does not agree with Mk 15:42-47 where there is no hint that the burial is incomplete. See M. Dibelius (1934), p. 181 who agrees as does Fuller (1980), pp. viii and 52.
104. Thus Bode (1970), p. 19 and n. 1.
105. See Alsop (1975), p. 90 and n. 269.
106. Thus Wilckens (1968), pp. 51-76, esp. 71f.
107. According to E. Bickermann (1924) 16:1-8 is a translation or removal story which stresses the absence of the body; Hamilton (1965) sees 16:1-8 as a substitute for an appearance story with the intention being to focus on the Parousia rather than the resurrection appearances; Weeden (1971), pp. 108-109 would not go as far as Hamilton in seeing 16:1-8 as an anti-appearance tradition. Instead Mark wanted to stress the resurrection, but not through "proofs" as the θεός ἀντίπαλοι opponents might have demanded.
108. See Tannehill (1977); Petersen (1980).

109. The names in 16:1 are omitted in Codex Bezae and two (or three) Latin codices, and according to Turner (1926-7), pp. 13f. the omission is correct; it is also Wilkens' view that the names of 16:1 are a later insertion and they were deliberately composed to separate 16:1-8 from 15:47 and so avoid any suggestion that the women violated sabbath law. See (1970), pp. 57f; the idea that the triple naming and anointing motivation support the independence of the tomb visit and the burial narrative is taken up by Bode (1970), pp. 21-23. See also Fuller (1980), p. 52.

We agree with Alsup here that the most likely explanation for this repetition is that it is superfluous in the light of 15:40 and 47 and is an indication of a seam not present in the former tradition. See Alsup (1975), p. 90, n. 269. We would also add that as we have already pointed out, repetition itself, is an important feature of the gospel.

110. Cf. Best (1965), p. 102. The textual correction omitting $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\delta\iota\omicron\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$ to $\Sigma\alpha\lambda\omega\mu\eta$ is rejected on the grounds that the more difficult reading is to be preferred.

111. Thus Neirynck (1972), p. 81.

112. See Crossan (1976), p. 147.

113. Those who understand the text to be an historical report argue that the anointing would have been impossible because of the Palestinian climate; see Bode (1970), p. 14 and n. 2 for those against the anointing theory. For the Jewish practice of anointing see Str-B 2 53. Other scholars defend an historical anointing arguing that the climate would not have rendered such an anointing impractical; see Cranfield (1966), p. 464 who admits that such an act, though strange, is not incredible, especially if prompted by love. See also Craig (1985), p. 52. According to L. Schottroff (1982), pp. 5-6 the anointing would not have included the whole body but only the head and feet. Others still defend the anointing as being part of the original tomb narrative since it 'appears' to be contrary to Mark's own narrative. Thus Taylor (1966), pp. 602 and 604; Bode (1970), p. 16.

See Fuller (1980), pp. 55-56 who points out that if Acts 13:29 is a more original version of the burial then there may have been no anointing of the body in the original burial story and it is the Marcan burial and not the empty tomb narrative which is responsible for the inconsistency between the two pericopes.

We reject Mahoney's conclusion that the anointing motive is part of the pre-Markan tradition. Thus (1974), p. 144. What we will argue is that seen in terms of Marcan irony, the anointing motif need not be a pre-Markan theme, and it is possible, and indeed probable, that Mark himself was responsible for the anointing motif.

114. See A. Farrer (1951), p. 134 who sees the two anointings as obvious parallels; see also Perrin (1977), pp. 31f., 34-35 who not only draws attention to the fact that the women take over the role in the gospel narrative which we might have expected the disciples to play, but he also points to the framing of the passion narrative by the two anointings.

115. Some scholars see the second reference as a later addition. Thus L. Brun (1914), p. 356; L. Schenke (1968), p. 60; G. Herbert (1962), pp. 67-8 prefers a symbolic interpretation and the references to time are an allusion to Mal.4:2 "But for those who fear my name the sun of righteousness shall rise with healing in its wings." Mark, therefore, intends his readers to understand that with the resurrection of Jesus, the darkness of the

crucifixion has been overcome. Since Mark does not use the sun in a symbolic sense elsewhere in his gospel, we see no reason to believe he was doing so here.

Taylor's view that ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου is a primitive corruption arising from a misunderstanding of the Aramaic negah, which could be used dramatically to refer to the beginning of the Jewish day at sunset, is a possibility (1966), p. 605.

116. Thus Jeremias (1974), pp. 17-18. According to D. Rhoads and D. Michie (1982a), p. 47, repetition of time references where the second adds precision and clarifies the first, is an important part of the Marcan literary technique of two-step progression.
117. Crossan interprets λῆαν πρῶτῃ as referring to the dawning of the new Galilean mission (16:7) and recalls the inaugural dawn in 1:35. Beyond this he also notes that as Peter and those who were with him (1:36) wanted to keep Jesus on that first morning, so they fail him now (16:7-8), (1976), pp. 146-7.
118. Thus Pryke (1978), p. 61. We reject Herbert's suggestion that the removal of the stone represents the removal of Pharisaic legalism and the links drawn between Mk 16:3-4 and Mk 11:23 (1962), pp. 68-9. According to C.H. Bird (1953), the γὰρ clauses in Mark are a recognisable element of Marcan style by which the evangelist alludes to familiar Old Testament passages. We do not, however, consider this is always the case, and in some instances the allusion was probably to other parts of the gospel. As Fowler points out, the explanatory γὰρ clauses in Mark often have the appearance of an afterthought providing background information needed if we are to understand the preceding statement and this explanation would seem to fit here. See (1981), p. 163-4.
119. By reading ἣν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα at the end of v. 4 the first part of v. 4 parallels v. 3. See C.F. Evans (1970), p. 77 who sees these words as setting the scene by hinting at the greatness of the miracle which occurs. For Mahoney (1974), p. 147 and n. 23 this verse forms the climax of the original pericope without vv. 5-7 and concluding with 16:8.
120. The unnecessary repetition which is a feature of Marcan redactional style, leads Taylor to conclude that Mark is writing freely, and every word of this verse belongs to Marcan vocabulary, (1966), p. 606.
121. The entering here at first appears unnecessary, but in view of the importance of ἐλθεῖν in Mk 16:1-8 we realise Mark is making a theological point here.
122. See J.H. McIndoe (1969), p. 125 who comments "Mark records only what he personally witnessed with regard to the resurrection, namely, the empty tomb and his own encounter with the women, and left it at that. Such an interpretation would tend to confirm the trustworthiness of Mark's historiography." According to Alsup (1975), p. 90, n. 267 such a conclusion is highly unlikely.
123. Many scholars have interpreted νεανίας in this manner. See here Cranfield (1952), p. 284; (1959), p. 465; (1966), p. 465. According to him the purpose of the angel's presence was to link the actual event of the resurrection with the women and although human eyes were not allowed to witness the resurrection the angel saw it. See also Herbert (1962), p. 69; Taylor (1966), p. 606; Benoit (1969), p. 247; Bode (1970), p. 27; Evans (1970), p. 77; Schweizer (1971), p. 372; Nineham (1972), p. 444; Fuller (1980), p. 51. For Mahoney (1974), p. 148 the context, description and function all support the angelic identification. Finally for P. Perkins (1984), p. 118 and Craig (1985), p. 53 this interpretation

is evident from the description of the young man's clothes and the women's reaction. It is also important to point out that this is how the other evangelists interpreted Mark.

124. Thus Culpepper (1978), p. 596 and Kelber (1976), pp. 174-175 both identify the young man at the tomb as Jesus based on their interpretation of Mk 14:50-1. The flight of the young man who is almost seized but escapes naked, leaving his linen cloth behind, parallels what happens to Jesus, who is also seized (14:44, 46) and is wrapped in a linen cloth (15:46), from which he escapes by resurrection. Finally, see also Vanhoye (1971).
125. See R. Scroggs and K.I. Groff (1973) who interpret Mk 16:1-8 as a resurrection announcement story. For them the young man represents the Christian initiate at baptism. The flight in 14:51-52 symbolises 'dying' with Christ and the reappearance of him in the new garment in 16:5 symbolises 'rising' with Christ. See also F. Kermode (1969), pp 901-902 who refers to the work of A. Farrer and the Old Testament echoes we find here as well as to the cross references we have with Mk 13 where in the last days *man will not* have time to turn back and take his mantle. Finally, for Crossan (1976), p. 148 the young man represents the Marcan community including Mark himself.
126. Waetjen, therefore, concludes "The contrast between the fleeing Joseph, who leaves behind his clothes and is unjustly disgraced on the one hand, and the exalted Joseph, who wears splendid garments and is exalted to vicegerant on the other hand, is matched and reproduced by Mark in 14:51 and 16:5" (1965), p. 120.
127. See Farrer (1951), pp. 141, 174 and 334. According to H. Fleddermann (1979), p. 415 the pericope of the flight of the naked young man is a continuous commentary on 14:50, it is a dramatisation of the universal flight of the disciples. It fits in to the theme of the disciples' failure to understand and accept the passion of Jesus and their consequent falling into unbelief. For Fowler (1981), p. 169 the *νακτός* at Gethsemane and the tomb are 'presumably' *the same person, though he admits this is an enigmatic character whose presence and function in the gospel is difficult to explain.*
128. The verbs *ἐξεθαμβήθησαν* and *ἐθαμβεῖσθαι* are exclusively Marcan and are usually omitted or changed by the other evangelists. Thus Crossan (1976), p. 148; Kelber (1972), pp. 175-176. According to Mahoney (1974), pp. 148-49 the use of *ἐξεθαμβήθησαν* to describe the reaction of the women dispels any lingering doubt that the women have to do with the supraterritorial.
A final point worth making here is that we are not told whether the women are astonished at the young man or his message.
129. See D. Catchpole (1977).
130. See Herbert (1962), p. 70 who interprets *ζητεῖν* in a derogatory sense. For Schweizer (1971), p. 372 'man's' action, though full of devotion, is meaningless here.
131. This rebuff is not as negative as it first appears, especially when contrasted with the Lucan parallel which is much more negative and the two men begin reproaching the women "Why do you seek the living among the dead?" (24:5). See Marxsen (1970), p. 42 who notes that the resurrection is mentioned before attention is drawn to the empty tomb. According to Evans (1970), p. 78 there is no particular emphasis in Mark on the emptiness of the tomb and the empty tomb interprets the resurrection and not vice versa. As we will see later for both Luke and John the emptiness of the tomb becomes an important feature of the story.

132. See Dewey (1976), pp. 99-100, though we note that the precise title τὸν Ναζαρηθὸν is not used in 1:9, in both 1:9 and 1:24 Jesus is referred to as coming from Nazareth. We also note that the resurrection is not described here in line with other New Testament writings, and by the use of the typical passive ἡγερθῆναι Mark emphasises it was an act of God. Thus Mahoney (1974), pp. 150f. For the idea that the end of the gospel is looking back to the beginning see also Best (1983), p. 132. Finally we also note parallels here with Peter's speech in Acts 4:10.
133. According to Meye (1969), p. 42 with the reference "as he told you" the evangelist stresses that all that is happening here fulfils the words of Jesus and to underline this fact Meye points to Mk 13:31.
134. According to Alsup it is impossible to think of this story circulating without the important interpretive element of the 'angel' and his declaration. (1975), p. 93 and n. 273. Those against the angelic message being part of the original tomb story include Benoit (1969), pp. 260-61; Bode (1970), p. 20 and Fuller (1980), pp. 69f.
135. See Tannehill (1977), p. 403. See also Fleddermann (1979) who would agree with this interpretation for 14:50-51 but not for 16:5.
136. Thus Creed (1930), p. 180; Dibelius (1934), p. 190; Bultmann (1963), p. 285; Schreiber (1961), p. 176; Marxsen (1969), pp. 75-81; Bode (1970), pp. 35-37. According to Evans (1970), p. 78 this verse is without doubt a Marcan construction since the "as he told you" presupposes knowledge of a Marcan passage, Mk 14:27-31, esp. v. 28 which may also have been an isolated logion. Alsup (1972), p. 92 and n. 271; Mahoney (1974), p. 156 considers it most likely that this verse is an insertion. See also Weeden (1979), p. 46; Best (1978), p. 555; (1981), pp. 199f.; Lindemann (1979-80), p. 308; Fuller (1980), pp. 51 and 57.
137. Bultmann (1963), p. 285. This conclusion is supported by Wilckens (1968), p. 71. See also A.T. Lincoln (1989), p. 285.
138. Thus Dibelius (1934), p. 190.
139. See Pannenberg (1980), p. 102. Elsewhere in Mark the word ἀλλὰ is used in seams, cf. 1:44a; 3:27; 9:13; 13:24. See also Catchpole (1977), pp. 3-4 who points out that the narrative would read entirely smoothly if v. 8a followed v. 6. Cf. Craig (1985), p. 53. He is one of the few scholars who would challenge the view that 14:28 is an insertion to which 16:7 refers, and he bases this challenge on the fact that scholars normally argue that vv. 27 and 29 read smoothly without it. As Craig himself points out, however, this is the weakest reason for suspecting an insertion. Moreover, he considers it futile to object that Peter only takes offence at v. 27 and not v. 28. V. 28 indicates that the suffering of v. 27 should not be treated in isolation and the image of the shepherd is continued in v. 28. The death of the shepherd leads to the scattering of the flock and its ingathering.
140. Thus Schenke (1968), pp. 43-47.
141. We note the use of the double imperative ἀπαγαγε ... εἰπάτε τοῖς μαθηταῖς. According to Lindemann (1979-80), p. 306 the effect is to divert attention away from the tomb to the place where Jesus will be seen. The women are not, therefore, instructed to bring the men to the tomb. See also Hendrickx (1984), p. 139 who notes that because the disciples have behaved in such a cowardly way they are not called disciples from the Gethsemane incident (14:32) until now.
142. Thus Bode (1970), p. 31; Crossan (1976), p. 149; Fuller (1980), pp. 57-58. For Mahoney the specific mention of the disciples and Peter

- shows that appearances and not the parousia are meant as the object of ὁψονταί, and this also hints that faith in the resurrection of Jesus will not be grounded on the women's testimony but on that of the disciples. See also Cranfield (1952), pp. 288-89 who objects here that if the reference to Pater was intended to mark him out as the chief of the apostles the order would possibly have been different and read 'Peter and the other disciples'.
143. Thus for example Cranfield (1959), p. 467; R.H. Lightfoot (1938), p. 57; Taylor (1966), p. 607.
 144. Thus 1Cor 15:5. See also Luke/Acts. According to Best (1978), p. 556 Mark probably composed v. 7a as well as v. 7b and Peter's name is retained or introduced by him not to attack him but in order to show special favour towards him and to balance the unfavourable impression created by the denial.
 145. Cf. Evans (1954). See also Best (1981), p. 200. We note here that προάγειν is the same verb as that used in 14:28 and with this we have a further cross reference linking the two verses.
 146. Thus Evans (1954), p. 5. According to Fuller (1980), p. 62 Galilee is the place from which the mission goes out to the Gentiles. See also Best (1965), pp. 174-76. We would also like to draw attention to Mk 10:32 at this point where we have προάγειν used in the sense of following Jesus. Translated to the missionary situation of the Marcan church it is also interesting to note that the ones following Jesus in Mk 10:32 are afraid.
 147. For the importance of Galilee in Mark see Boobyer (1952-53); Burkill (1963) appendix; Marxsen (1969), pp. 54-95.
 148. Thus Weeden (1971), p. 110 n. 11. See also Schreiber (1961), pp. 173-78 who examines in more detail the references to Galilee in Mark as the place of the Gentiles.
 149. See Conzelmann (1961), pp. 93 and 202.
 150. Thus Lohmeyer (1936), pp. 10f.; Lightfoot (1938), pp. 55-65; Weeden (1971), pp. 111-17. According to Marxsen (1969), p. 85 if we interpret 16:7 in terms of the parousia then this helps us to understand the silence of 16:8. For if v. 7 refers to the parousia then its coming cannot be referred to after v. 8 and the phrase "see him" is, therefore, in the future. (See also pp. 75-95). We also note here that Mark has already used ὁψεσθε twice in connection with the parousia (cf. 13:36; 14:62). It is important to remember that in his later work Lightfoot modified his earlier interpretation of 14:28 and 16:7 and saw them more in terms of the continuing mission of the disciples. Thus (1962), pp. 106f.
 151. Thus Cranfield (1952), p. 293; Stein (1973-4); Catchpole (1977), p. 4; Fuller (1980), p. 63. According to Best (1965), p. 176 "Unless then there is some definite reason for regarding XVI.7 as referring to the Parousia it is easier to refer to the Resurrection/Exaltation and to a present fulfilment". Here Best draws on the image of Jesus as the shepherd who leads his people.
 152. Thus Lightfoot (1962), p. 116; P. Carrington (1952), p. 58; Boobyer (1952-3); Evans (1954). See Best (1965), p. 127 who sees the reference to the Gentile mission in 16:7 as an attempt by Mark to carry further his campaign against Peter and the Jewish Christian kerygma which has no place in the Gentile mission. See also Best (1970), pp. 335-36.
 153. Thus Tannehill (1979), p. 83. See also Best (1983), p. 47.
 154. Thus Taylor (1966), p. 609. For a comprehensive bibliography and discussion of the textual-critical problems see W.G. Kümmel (1979), pp. 98-101. See also B.M. Metzger (1964), pp. 226-229; Evans (1970), pp. 69-75; Weeden (1971), pp. 45f.; Fuller (1980), pp.

64f.; Best (1983), p. 72.

There are three main areas which are discussed in connection with the ending of the gospel: (a) the MSS tradition; (b) the ending with a conjunction and (c) MSS loss, mutilation or suppression.

Others suggest that Mark's gospel did end with appearance stories. According to E. Linnemann (1969) the stories of vv. 15-20 were possibly part of the original ending of the gospel. See also Trompf (1972) who argues that Mark probably continued with something similar to Mt 28:9-10. For an examination of the Mk 16:12-20 see W.R. Farmer (1974) and the critical review by J.N. Birdsall (1975); J.K. Elliot (1971); K. Aland (1970); W. Schmithals (1972).

More recently Lincoln has pointed out that there is no virtue in being a purist and treating Mk 16:1-8 in either purely literary or historical terms and any treatment of this text has to make an historical judgement regarding which is to be the accepted ending of the narrative. See (1989), p. 284.

155. Thus Evans (1970), p. 68; Perrin (1977), p. 21.

156. We must not, however, consider Mark in the light of the other gospels since this violates the integrity of Mark by forcing the gospel to harmonise with its literary descendants. Thus Weeden (1979), p. 46. According to Schenke (1968), pp. 47-53 16:8a would have been a satisfactory conclusion to the original tomb story and he suggests that v. 8b was added together with v. 7.

There are various scholars who are unhappy with accepting that Mark ended his gospel at 16:8. We have already mentioned several and add the voices of several others at this point. According to Bultmann (1963), p. 285 the gospel probably continued beyond 16:8 and included appearances of the risen Jesus in Galilee. For Cranfield (1966), pp. 470-71, while we cannot be certain, it is most likely that Mark intended to include at least one resurrection appearance. Taylor (1966), p. 609 claims that the opinion that ἐφοβούντο γὰρ is not the intended ending still stands. Schweizer (1971), p. 366 has to conclude that it is necessary to assume the conclusion *has been lost, and finally, for C. J. Reedy (1972), p. 197 the pattern of the gospel points to something beyond 16:8.*

157. Thus Boomershine (1981b) et passim. See also Meye (1969), pp. 37-39 who points out that the abrupt ending of Mark does not appear to be such a strange feature when we take into account the abruptness of the Marcan beginning. See also Lightfoot (1962), pp. 80-97 who also attempts to interpret Mark 16:1-8 as a meaningful pericope in terms of the narrative of the gospel as a whole. According to Creed (1930), p. 177 the narrative becomes more incoherent if we continue after 16:8 and taking vv. 7 and 8 together the ending as we have it is a satisfactory one. If the gospel continued either the lost conclusion continued with a story of the women or made a fresh start with the disciples and their vision. Creed concludes that it is hard to combine either of these suppositions with vv. 7 and 8. In v. 8 the women have been effectively dismissed from participation in events, while v. 7 urgently demands their intervention. This represents an incoherence in the narrative. If we stop at 16:8 Creed holds that the incoherence remains latent, but if we try to continue after 16:8 it becomes intolerable. Finally, for L.J.D. Richardson (1948) we should not so much be asking whether a book can end with γὰρ but rather could Mark's gospel end with a thought such as that expressed in the final sentence.

158. E. Best (1976-7), pp. 400; (1983), p. 73. In 1:8 Mark points forward to Pentecost although the fulfilment is not narrated and in 1:12f. we are told that Jesus is tempted without being directly informed that he resisted that temptation.
159. Scholars began here with examples of sentences or short papyri ending with γὰρ. See C.H. Kraeling (1915); H.J Cadbury (1915); R.R. Otley (1926); Lightfoot (1938), p. 38), pp. 10-11. Finally see P. Van der Horst (1972) who argues that it is possible to conceive of a book ending thus.

See also Perrin (1977), pp. 21-22 who notes that while ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ may be a grammatically barbarous ending, it is nevertheless possible that the evangelist could have ended his gospel in this way.
160. See Richardson (1948).
161. Thus Pryke (1978), pp. 44-5. See also Lightfoot (1938), pp. 9-19; (1962), pp. 86f. for a reply to such linguistic arguments which object to 16:8 as the original conclusion.
162. See Van der Horst (1972), p. 123.
163. This view, that the gospel is incomplete, is expressed by W.L. Knox (1942), pp. 22-23 who concludes:

To suppose that Mark originally intended to end his Gospel in this way implies both that he was totally indifferent to the canons of popular story-telling, and that by pure accident he happened to hit on a conclusion which suits the technique of a highly sophisticated type of modern literature. The odds against such a coincidence (even if we could for a moment entertain the idea that Mark was indifferent to canons which he observes scrupulously elsewhere in his Gospel) seem to me to be so enormous as not to be worth considering. In any case the supposition credits him with a degree of originality which would invalidate the whole method of form-criticism.
164. Thus Boomersshine (1981a), p. 217.
165. According to Evans (1970), p. 79 and Catchpole (1977), p. 6 16:8 is clearly a piece of Marcan redactional language and we would agree with the conclusion that it is to be related to Mark's theology as a whole and would suggest that it governs our interpretation of the significance of Mk 16:1-8. See also Bode (1970), p. 37 who comments on the distinctive and abundant use of fear related words in the gospel and his conclusion that such reactions to a divine action or teaching constitute a special Marcan trait. For Farrer (1951), p. 177 the women enact the first part of the prophecy in 14:27-28. They don't deliver the message about the gathering of the flock but instead run from the sepulchre like frightened sheep. See also W.C. Allen (1946), p. 47 who sees no reason to read into this description anything like terror.
166. Note the use of the double negative here. Some scholars conclude that the silence of the women was only temporary; so C.F.D. Moule (1955-6); Cranfield (1966), p. 469. Bode gives five possible interpretations of the women's silence. (1) The silence explains why the late legend of the empty tomb was for so long unknown. (2) the silence is part of Mark's messianic secret theme. (3) The silence was temporary, provisional and conditional. (4) The silence is apologetic and keeps the official witness of the resurrection, the apostles, free of any connection with the empty tomb and the testimony of the women. (5) The silence is a paradoxical reaction to the divine commands. See (1970), pp. 39-44 and the literature cited there. See also Craig (1985), pp. 65-66, n. 72 who reviews all of the solutions proposed by Bode and finds

- (3) the most probable. For ourselves we will suggest below that the silence of the women leaves the conclusion of the gospel open. We do not consider that Mark was concerned to preserve the independence of apostolic testimony, though as we will see, this did not prevent the other evangelists interpreting Mk 16:8 in this way.
167. This negative conclusion is influenced by the tendency to view Mark 16:1-8 in terms of Mark's negative characterisation of the disciples. Thus Tyson (1961); Weeden (1968; 1971); Perrin (1971) and (1977), pp. 32-33.
 168. See Weeden (1979), p. 50. For Crossan (1976), p. 149 what this means is that the Jerusalem community led by the disciples and especially Peter has never accepted the call of the risen Jesus communicated to it via the Marcan community. The gospel, therefore, ends in a juxtaposition of Marcan faith in 16:6-7 and Jerusalem failure in 16:7-8 and to this extent 16:1-8 is, therefore, an anti-resurrection tradition since the Jerusalem disciples are not commissioned and do not have the resurrection announced to them. For a similar view see also Waetjen (1968). See also Kelber (1972), p. 186 who concludes that the women, like the disciples, have failed Jesus. Finally, for Schottroff (1982), p. 18 the women at the tomb represent the male disciples and with v. 8 we learn that those who are in the wrong place fail their commission.
 169. Thus Petersen (1980), p. 161. See also Tannehill (1979), pp. 83f. Moving on beyond the work of Petersen Best suggests that by emphasising the empty tomb and the statement that Jesus had risen, Mark turns thought on the resurrection away from the idea of a number of discrete and isolated appearances to some or all of the disciples and the possibility is here that Jesus can be present at all times with all who believe in him. (1983), p. 74.
 170. We have already mentioned the interpretation of Mk 16:8 in terms of the messianic secret and simply refer here to the discussion of this suggestion by Boomershine (1981b), pp. 233f. For an interesting examination of irony and paradox in Mark see J.R. Donahue (1978), pp. 381-2.
 171. Thus Lightfoot (1962), p. 88; Allen (1946); Cranfield (1952), pp. 259f.; Meze (1969); Catchpole (1977). For Schottroff (1982), pp. 19-20 this fear is associated with the fear of future persecution. The 'negative' ending of the gospel as she sees it is also associated with this fear motif and the Marcan community is still scattered with fear and persecution very much in their minds.
 172. Thus Donahue (ibid.), p. 380f. It is interesting to note that Mark uses φοβεῖσθαι in the third person plural imperfect tense passive voice elsewhere in the gospel (cf. Mk 9:32; 10:32; 11:18, 32; 16:8). Thus Weeden (1971), p. 49 and n. 46. For fear in Mark see also Allen (1947); Bird (1953), p. 185; Perkins (1984), p. 122; J.L. Magness (1986), pp. 93f.; Lincoln (1989), pp. 286-287.
 173. See J.I.H. McDonald (1989), pp. 58-9, 68-73 and n. 56. See also Catchpole (1977), pp. 7f.
 174. See McDonald, ibid., p. 59.
 175. See Lincoln (1989), p. 289 who comments that it would be hard to make the women's disobedience and failure any clearer. See also Kelber (1985), p. 36.
 176. See Magness (1986) who places more emphasis on 16:7 rather than 16:8 and points to a suspended ending rather than an actual ending to the narrative of the gospel.
 177. This existentialist interpretation of the ending of Mark is

suggested by Lindemann (1979-80). It is suggested here that Mark edited the grave story in such a way to show that for him belief in Christ is not the result of seeing the resurrected Jesus and the acceptance of a report - one cannot build a faith on someone else's experience. Faith in Mark's sense is the consequence of hearing the message that the crucified Jesus has risen. The book therefore concludes with the message which the women receive in the same manner as the reader. As far as the evangelist was concerned there was really nothing more to be said. (See especially p. 317).

- 178. Thus Lincoln (1989).
- 179. See McDonald (1989), pp. 55-59.
- 180. See Petersen (1980), p. 152.
- 181. Thus Mahoney (1974), p. 142.

CHAPTER THREE

WOMEN IN MATTHEW'S ACCOUNT OF THE CRUCIFIXION, BURIAL AND EMPTY TOMB

Having examined Mark's account of the women at the scenes of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb, we will now turn our attention to Matthew's treatment of these texts. We have already stated that it is our considered opinion that Mark's story of the empty tomb was the earliest narrative version of the tradition, and in the following chapters we will examine the relationship of the other tomb stories in the light of this thesis. Since Matthew's version is the closest to Mark we will now concentrate on this text.

As before, we will deal mainly with the literary questions associated with Mt 27:55-6, 57-61; 28:1-10 and 11-15. Once again we reiterate our point, that we are not thereby denying the important links between the literary and historical aspects of the text. We believe, rather, that historical questions must methodologically take second place to the literary questions. Questions such as whether the story of Mt 27:57f., for example, is an apologetic legend which may reflect an historical situation are, therefore, beyond the scope of this present study.

In approaching the Matthean texts of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb, we accept the solution to the Synoptic problem which holds that Matthew had access to the earliest gospel Mark, and he used this as a basis for his own work. In addition, Matthew and Luke both included non-Markan material from the sayings source, usually designated 'Q', and Matthew supplemented this with his own material, which may or may not have been his own composition.¹

The obvious advantage of this approach is that we can now build upon our knowledge of Mark's stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb. We can observe how Matthew has handled this source, and in particular any modifications, alterations, omissions or insertions he has made. These post Marcan developments are interesting, not only for the light they shed on Matthew's subsequent handling of the material, but also for what they tell us about Mark. Are our conclusions regarding Mark's discipleship theme and the acceptance of women as fallible followers alongside the male disciples born out by the treatment these

texts receive at the hands of Matthew? We should also note a word of caution here with regard to our conclusions on Matthew's redaction, and beware of the temptation of over-interpreting the evangelist's alterations which may not always have been motivated by a theological tendency.² We must constantly re-examine conclusions on individual verses in terms of the theology of the gospel as a whole in order to develop a coherent argument of how Matthew perceived the role and status of women in his gospel.

Beginning with a more general comparison between the Matthean and Marcan texts, perhaps the most obvious difference between these two stories of the empty tomb is that Matthew not only has an account of the women at the tomb, but also an appearance tradition. This is, furthermore, linked to the empty tomb tradition in that the women are met by Jesus en route from the tomb to the disciples.³ Since we have already shown that Mark's story represents the earliest tomb tradition, we must now establish whether the christophany to the women was a redactional enlargement to link the tomb tradition and the appearance traditions, and beyond this was Mt 28:9-10 itself also the creation of the evangelist; i.e. was Matthew involved in editing or composing the christophany to the women?

Dealing more specifically with the texts themselves, it may or may not be significant that Matthew has altered the names of the women involved in the stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb. In Mt 27:56, the mother of the sons of Zebedee is substituted for Mark's Salome (cf. Mk 15:40 and 16:1). In addition, the second woman in the Marcan list is referred to as the mother of James and Joseph in 27:56, and thereafter we read only of 'the other Mary'.⁴ These alterations raise a number of questions which we will need to examine. For instance, did Matthew omit Mark's Salome and substitute the mother of the sons of Zebedee because this woman was more familiar to his church, or simply because he had introduced her redactionally in 20:20? More significantly perhaps, in terms of our suggestion that in Mark we possibly see the beginning of an emphasis on the role of Mary Magdalene in the tradition - does the continued positioning of her at the head of the list of women, plus the abbreviation of the third woman to 'the other Mary' in 27:61, support our earlier hypothesis?

It is also interesting to note that in Matthew's gospel, Joseph of Arimathea is now described as a disciple of Jesus (27:57). Was this part

of an attempt to rehabilitate the male disciples? If so, does the new Matthean element of the guard at the tomb (27:62-6), and the emphasis on their reaction at the tomb (28:4), further detract from the female role in Mt 27:55-56, 57-61 and 28:1-8? Or, alternatively, does the Matthean christophany to the women (28:9-10) mean that Matthew has taken an apparently 'negative' Marcan ending where the women have fled in fear saying nothing to any-one, and transformed it into a more positive, joyful experience, where not only are the women first to witness the empty tomb, but also the first to see the risen Lord?

In our analysis of Mt 28:1-8 we will also examine the different motivation for visiting the tomb which is to 'see' (28:1) and not to anoint as in Mk 16:1. We will also note the heightened dramatic effects of this account - the earthquake, the descent of the angel of the Lord and his removal of the stone, as well as the omission of the reference to Peter in the angelic message. Finally, moving beyond Mark, we will examine Mt 28:9-10 not only in terms of whether Matthew was responsible for creating this incident, but also in terms of the obvious links between Matthew and Jn 20:11-18 and the appearance to Mary Magdalene.

We have already introduced some of the questions we hope to raise in our study of the Matthean narratives as we deal with these texts on a literary level. We will be primarily concerned with determining whether in this redaction Matthew was responsible for eclipsing the role of the women in his Marcan traditions. Since this question obviously requires us to engage ourselves in a more detailed study of women in Matthew's gospel, we will, therefore, look at the gospel retrospectively, and as a whole, before reaching any hasty judgements about Matthew and his view of the role and status of women. We will begin by analysing the evangelist's treatment of the characters in his gospel in terms of how they are portrayed in both word and deed. Do the women in this gospel represent the things of God or men, i.e. are the women presented in a positive or negative light? Do the women at the cross represent the absent disciples, or is Joseph of Arimathea the Matthean representative for the fleeing disciples? Alternatively, are the women and Joseph independent characters in their own right, or should we treat them as sub-characters in a more definite plot to put the blame for the death of Jesus firmly at the door of the Jewish authorities?

As we have stated, we are not only concerned here with establishing how Matthew used Mark, but beyond this, and a very important part of our

study, we hope to build up a coherent picture of where these redactional alterations fit into the theological tendencies of the gospel as a whole. Therefore, when we deal with the questions raised above, we must also ascertain where these questions fit into Matthew's wider concerns of christology, discipleship and ecclesiology. That is, did Matthew deliberately redact women out of the text, or was he, for example, more concerned with christological questions, which in turn meant that the women were overshadowed and necessarily redacted out of the tradition as their role was eclipsed?

A. THE CRUCIFIXION - Mt 27:55-6

According to N. Perrin, Matthew's version of the women at the scene of the crucifixion involves minimal alteration of the Marcan tradition, the only real change appears in the lists of the women, and Mark's Salome is substituted by the mother of the sons of Zebedee. Perrin then concludes that, "Whatever the reason, for this change, it is not theologically significant."⁵

Matthew agrees with Mark that three women watch the crucifixion from afar, and furthermore, it is these women who were with Jesus in Galilee and had ministered to him. This agreement with Mark is not surprising, especially, as we will argue, if Matthew used Mark as his source. What is more interesting perhaps is that the reference to the many others (πολλὰι) has moved, and no longer occurs at the end of the reference to the women as an incidental piece of additional information that there were others at the cross. Instead, Matthew's introduction to the women refers to many women watching from afar who minister, and who have followed Jesus from Galilee and only then does he refer to the specific group of three women. It is possible to argue that this may be the beginning of a trend, continued in Luke, where attention is drawn away from the specific group of three or more women, by first of all including an earlier reference to a larger group of anonymous women, and then as in Lk 23:49 by referring to all Jesus' acquaintances (male).⁶ This process is then taken further in the Fourth Gospel by the inclusion of the Beloved Disciple at the foot of the cross, though whether the primary motivation here was to eclipse the role of the women remains to be seen.

Finally, we also note at the outset that there is no specific mention in Matthew of the women's having followed Jesus to Jerusalem.⁷

We will now examine the text of Mt 27:55-6 bearing in mind not only Perrin's comments, but also the other issues we have raised in connection with the Matthean redaction of his Marcan text.

1. v. 55

It is the opinion of R.H. Gundry that Matthew has altered the Marcan account of the burial of Jesus to encourage Christians to care for their persecuted fellows.⁸ Thus, he argues, Matthew emphasises the women's presence at the cross by omitting the Marcan $\chi\alpha\iota$ and inserting his favourite $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\tau$. It is, however, also possible to argue that this is more likely to reflect a more general Matthean redactional tendency to make Mark's vaguer chronological and topographical references more specific, rather than any intended emphasis on the women's presence.⁹

We would not, therefore, agree with Gundry's interpretation of the Matthean alteration of Mark's $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\eta\ \tau\alpha\lambda\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\iota\alpha$ to $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \Gamma\alpha\lambda\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\iota\omicron\varsigma$, as representing an advance on Mk 15:41 and the women are travelling with Jesus to the place of his execution, a journey which would necessarily involve risk.¹⁰ If this were so, it would be difficult to explain why Matthew omitted Mark's specific reference to Jerusalem. Why also, if Matthew was motivated by an interest in heightening the women's position of risk, did he not alter the reference to the position of the women, and have them standing $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\tilde{\omega}$ as in Jn 19:25? Is it not perhaps more likely that Matthew has altered $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\eta\ \Gamma\alpha\lambda\iota\lambda\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}$ to $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \Gamma\alpha\lambda\iota\lambda\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ to provide an echo with $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\ \mu\alpha\chi\rho\acute{\omicron}\theta\epsilon\nu$? Matthew thus altered his Marcan text at this point for literary effect with the emphasis on $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ and not because of any other motive.¹¹ Finally, the reference to the women standing at a distance may indicate a rebuff of the women, and, as we argued in Mark, the women's distance from the cross is a sign of their 'fallibility as followers'. Although the women follow Jesus, they are not brave enough to remain at his side, but follow at a distance.¹²

Having mentioned that there were many women at the cross, albeit standing afar, Matthew continues to agree with Mark that these are 'watching' women. In our analysis of Mark's gospel, we then went on to point out that for Mark 'seeing' is an important verb, and is closely related to those who truly understand the gospel. Furthermore, those who 'see' and understand are to be contrasted with the disciples of Jesus who do indeed see, but repeatedly fail to understand the teaching and mission of Jesus. We were also able to show that the three watching women

contrasted with the three male disciples who failed to 'watch' in Gethsemane. Finally, since the male disciples had now fled, only the women remained in Mark as followers, although, like Peter, they too are fallible and follow only at a distance.

This interpretation of the watching motif does not, however, apply in Matthew's case, since to begin with the three women are not mentioned until v. 56 and, therefore, any close parallel between the women and their watching is possibly lost in the Matthean redaction. We also noted in our survey of Mark that the verb *θεωπέω* is repeated in the burial account (Mk 15:47), whereas in Matthew the watching theme is not stressed and the women 'sit' opposite the sepulchre while the guards do the watching. It is possible to suggest that Matthew's use of the verb *θεωπέω* in 28:1 indicates that the women did have an important watching role in Matthew, but since the guard story preceded the visit of the women and, therefore, presumably even on literary terms dictated what could be done at the tomb, we would argue that this interest in the guards effected Matthew's redaction of the women.

We were also able to suggest in Mark that the women were possibly substitutes for the absent male disciples because, on the whole, Mark adopts a very critical and even negative attitude towards the male disciples of Jesus. We are not able to suggest this is the case with Mt 27:55-6. First of all, the description of Joseph of Arimathea as a disciple in the account of the burial would indicate that if Matthew had intended us to read *μαθητής* in this instance he would also have used the word here, since he obviously did not hesitate to do so in another closely related episode. Also, more significantly, Matthew's redaction of the disciples means that on the whole he presents them in a better light than the presentation of the disciples in Mark.¹³

Matthew's disciples are not simply chastised for their lack of understanding, but instead, they receive much more special instruction to help them understand where their knowledge falls short (cf. 13:51). Although it is possible that they may not yet understand, in Mt 15:16 and 16:9 we are also expressly told that they do come to full understanding (cf. 16:12 and 17:13). For Perrin even if we do retain the references to the disciples' lack of understanding, they are sometimes significantly given an ecclesiastical ring so that they now symbolise the comparative lack of faith among the members of the early church. In both the stilling of the storm (Mt 8:23-27//Mk 4:35-41) and the incident where the

disciples lose power (Mt 17:14-21//Mk 9:14-19), Matthew has introduced the ecclesiastical term "little faith", which alters stories of discipleship failure into allegories regarding the state of the church in his own day.¹⁴ This improved image is, of course, vital, since the commission of 28:20 to go and teach all nations is built upon the assumption that the disciples in Matthew have understood all they have been told.¹⁵ It is against this background that we must, therefore, view the Matthean stories of the failures of the disciples who also flee at the arrest (25:56), betray Jesus (26:47-56), fall asleep in Gethsemane (26:36-46), and ultimately deny him (26:57-75).¹⁶

Another important consideration in deciding whether the women represent the absent disciples could be the identification of Matthew's third woman as the mother of the sons of Zebedee. This woman has already been mentioned in the gospel as one who followed Jesus and who made a request on behalf of her sons (20:20).¹⁷ Thus this woman is not introduced in Matthew as a woman in her own right, but as a supplicant, the ideal mother who petitions on behalf of her sons. Since Matthew also specifically refers to James and John as the sons of Zebedee in the Gethsemane incident, is it not possible to suggest that Matthew is reminding us once again of the connection between this woman and the male disciples? She is their representative and her relationship to Jesus is, therefore, related to that of her sons.¹⁸

Moving on to discuss the remainder of vv. 55 and 56, we are told that it was this group of women who had followed Jesus from Galilee. By naming Jesus specifically, instead of repeating Mark's $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, Matthew gives christological emphasis to this report, and continues the general heightening of christology in the gospel as a whole. We have already discussed the alteration of $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\ \Gamma\alpha\lambda\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\iota\alpha$ to $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\delta\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \Gamma\alpha\lambda\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\iota\alpha\varsigma$ and we will only add here that if any change of meaning were intended, it was possibly only to underline the fact that the women had begun to follow Jesus on his journey to Jerusalem and not when he himself was ministering in Galilee.

Before addressing ourselves to any retrospective significance of this final phrase and what form of following or ministering was intended for the women in Matthew's gospel, we will briefly examine the identification of these three Matthean women, bearing in mind the suggestions we made regarding the women in the Marcan texts.

We have already pointed out that the identification of the women in

Mark has caused some problems for those scholars who have made a serious attempt to discover their identity. These problems are associated with the fact that little, if anything, is known about the women and the discrepancies which exist in the Marcan text between the lists of women (cf. 15:40, 47 and 16:1).

Mary Magdalene was the easiest woman to identify and we noted that she is the only woman common to all four gospels. Matthew, therefore, agrees with Mark by including her here and as with Mark Mary heads the list of women. We also suggested that Mark was possibly responsible for an individualisation of the tradition which singled out Mary Magdalene as a key resurrection witness. Matthew would also seem to support this trend since, not only does she appear at the head of Matthew's three lists of women, but in 27:61 and 28:1, she is mentioned along with 'the other Mary'. The third woman has been redacted out of 28:1 and the reference to the third woman has been abbreviated to read simply 'the other Mary'.¹⁹ The effect of such redaction is obvious. Matthew has continued the emphasis on Mary Magdalene, and in 28:1-10 she is the only individual whom we can recall with any exactitude.

As to the specific identity of this other Mary, we would suggest that the reference to her as μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήφ μητήρ, recalling as it does so precisely Mt 13:55, leads us to identify her as the mother of Jesus.²⁰ This woman is, therefore, identified with the second woman in the Marcan list. The omission of the Marcan τοῦ μικροῦ could be explained on the grounds that the third woman, the mother of the sons of Zebedee, would distinguish the present James.²¹

We have already referred to the third Matthean woman ἡ μητήρ τῶν διδύμων Ζεβεδαίου who replaces Mark's Salome.²² We have also previously mentioned Perrin's dismissal of this alteration as "theologically insignificant." Is it not possible, however, to see Matthew's alteration of Mark prompted by a combination of factors, including the obscurity of Salome, the prominence given to the sons of Zebedee, and perhaps a desire to parallel the reference to Mary as mother? We have suggested that Matthew's reference to the mother of the sons of Zebedee may be due to the fact that she has already been mentioned in the gospel and was, therefore, known to him. It is possible, then, to suggest that the evangelist was replacing a reference to a figure, perhaps unknown to him, by referring to a woman known to his community, albeit through her sons, or simply to his readers by virtue of her previous literary

introduction.²³ That this woman was of no particular importance to Matthew in her own right is suggested by the fact that he agrees with Mark in omitting the third woman in 27:61, and he himself redacts the third woman out of the tradition in 28:1. Were Matthew particularly interested in the mother of the sons of Zebedee, we would at least expect her to reappear in 28:1 as Salome reappears in the parallel Marcan account.

In view of our suggestion that the mother of the sons of Zebedee was known to the Matthean church it is, therefore, possible to suggest that the women in Matthew were women known to the church, and possibly even to the local community of the evangelist. This means the women in Matthew, like those in Mark, reflect the diversity of the tradition which circulated around fixed names such as Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, and in this instance the tradition was supplemented with the mother of the sons of Zebedee.²⁴ We can find no evidence in Matthew to support a theory of Mary Magdalene being set over against any of the other women since the opposition, if there were any, simply evaporated from the Matthean narratives, and the other Mary hardly seems a candidate for a rival church faction.

To sum up our examination of the three women in the Matthean lists, we can make several points. Accepting that Matthew had the Marcan lists before him, what he has done is to emphasise the presence of Mary Magdalene by keeping her at the head of his list. Beyond this, in his abbreviation of the second woman to the other Mary and his redacting out of the third woman, Matthew has taken up and developed further Mark's individualising of the tradition which placed Mary Magdalene first in the list of women.

Having dealt with the possible identification of the women in Mt 27:56, we must now take up the reference in v. 55 which was also probably taken over from Mark, and that is that the women had followed Jesus from Galilee and ministered to him. We, therefore, need to examine the role and status of women in the gospel as a whole in order to set the present references to women within the wider context of Matthew's theological concerns as an evangelist.

In our previous chapter on Mark, we discussed W. Munro's article on women disciples in Mark in which she asked how we were to account for this sudden appearance of women in the gospel of Mark? Munro questioned

Why these women were not mentioned before? Why are they mentioned at all; and what part did they play in Mark's redactional scheme?²⁵ Since Munro's article proved a very helpful basis on which to build our study of Mk 15:41f., we will use her treatment of Mark, and our subsequent discussion of this article, in our study of Matthew 27:55f.

Munro began by examining the appearances of women in Mark's gospel prior to the crucifixion reference of 15:40, and she concluded women were rarely mentioned in Mark's gospel. This situation was partly explained, according to Munro, by the androcentric bias of Mark's culture where women were largely seen in terms of their relationships to men. Women were also further obscured in the androcentric language of Mark's gospel which uses the masculine forms of common gender. Munro concluded that even though Mark was aware of a female presence among Jesus' followers, he did not consider women belonged to the public ministry. Women, therefore, appear in the seclusion of the home, and three of the four miracles involving women take place inside the house. Even though women's presence can be inferred from the crowd scenes in Mark, the cumulative effect of the evidence points to a deliberate attempt on Mark's part to obscure female presence in Jesus' ministry.

When we examined Mark's gospel for ourselves, however, we found there was room for another reality, and the Marcan presentation of the women was nowhere nearly as negative as Munro would have us believe. Since Matthew was able to use Mark's gospel as a source for his own work, we will be able to discern whether or not he redacted women into, or out of, his Marcan text.

Beginning with a comment on language, we accept the points made in our earlier chapter on the inclusive nature of androcentric language. While we do accept Munro's comment that women are rarely mentioned in the gospel, except in terms of their relationship to men, it is also true to say that few males, apart from John the Baptist, the disciples, and the family of Jesus, are specifically identified by Matthew prior to the passion narrative. Indeed, Matthew has redacted names out of his tradition. Jairus simply becomes the ruler of the synagogue (Mk 5:32//Mt 9:18) and there is no mention of Blind Bartimaeus (Mk 10:46), but rather two unidentified blind men are the subjects of the miracle in Mt 20:30f. The references to Herod are the only exception.²⁶

When we turn to the healing miracles in Matthew which involve women, we note that Matthew includes the four Marcan miracles -- the

healing of Simon's mother-in-law (Mk 1:29-31//Mt 8:14-15); Jairus' daughter (Mk 5:22-4, 35-43//Mt 9:18-19, 23-26); the woman with the haemorrhage (Mk 5:25-34//Mt 9:20-22), and the Syro-Phoenician/Canaanite woman (Mk 7:24-30//Mt 15:21-8). Matthew does not add any new miracles involving women.

When we examine Matthew's redaction of his Marcan material, however, we recognise certain features of this redactional work which appear to lessen the Marcan emphasis on the women. We noted in our study of Mark that the 'house' was an important architectural space in Mark, and it was not, therefore, without significance that three of the four miracles involving women in Mark are placed here. We cannot argue for such an emphasis in Matthew, for the house in Matthew is no longer the place of revelation and part of the theory of the messianic secret. By the way Matthew has chosen and frames parallel Marcan passages, it is obvious that for him the house is primarily a geographical term, and located at certain places in the Palestinian region.²⁷

Taking the miracle involving Peter's mother-in-law first, we note that the context of this miracle in Matthew chapter 8 reveals a christological purpose, and this is born out by the redaction of the miracle itself. This particular healing of a woman is grouped together with the cure of the leper in 8:2-4, and the healing of the centurion's servant in 8:5-13. All three miracles are further linked by Matthew's summary quote from the Old Testament in 8:17, "this was to fulfil what was spoken by the prophet Isaiah, 'He took our infirmities and bore our diseases'."

In recounting this miracle, Matthew displays his typical redactional style in relating the miracles by abbreviating the narrative and focussing on christology.²⁸ Matthew, therefore, omits the Marcan reference to the disciples' initiative in drawing Jesus' attention to the woman's condition, and indeed there are no disciples mentioned in the scene. Instead, our attention is focused on the interaction between Jesus and the woman. The christological emphasis is seen in that throughout, Jesus dominates as the initiator of the action, and he is the main subject of the pericope. It is he who enters the house, he who sees her need, he who takes her hand, only then does she rise and serve him. There is no description of the respectful approach of the recipient here,²⁹ and this is the only time in the gospel when Jesus takes the initiative in a miracle. Finally, by telling us the woman served Jesus,

we are reminded that she cared for Jesus' basic needs, and the use of the verb διαχονέω prepares us for its reappearance in 27:55.

In narrating the next two miracles involving women, Matthew continues the Marcan intercalation. These miracles appear in Matthew chapter 9, and are followed by the healing of the two blind men and the summary reference of Mt 9:35, "and Jesus went about all the cities and villages teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing every disease and infirmity." Once again this emphasises the christological significance of these miracles.

The miracle of the cure of Jairus' daughter is narrated in typical Matthean style. The magical element is not stressed, and there is no magical word or demonstration of the cure.³⁰ The real alteration to the Marcan text occurs in 9:18; the ruler approaches (προσελθὼν) Jesus and worships (προσκύνει) him. This is typical Matthean formula which stresses respectful approach to Jesus (cf. 8:14). There is no reference here to the ruler's name, and there are no disciples in the final scene, thereby concentrating attention on Jesus and the girl. The result is that Matthew has removed various elements of the narrative to focus attention once again on the actions of Jesus. Also, in typical Matthean style, the miracle itself is linked together with catchwords and we read in 9:18b, ἐλθὼν ἐπίθες τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐπ'αὐτήν, καὶ ζήσεται; 9:23 καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς and 9:25 εἰσελθὼν ἐκράτησεν τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς καὶ ἠγέρθη. This repetition also emphasises Jesus' authority as the instigator and controller of the interaction. It is also perhaps significant that by altering the diminutive form in 9:18 from χορδαῖον to θυγάτηρ, Matthew connects this miracle with that of the cure of the woman with the haemorrhage which follows (cf. 9:20-22).

The miracle of the cure of the woman with the haemorrhage recalls the previous miracle in the opening ἰδοὺ, and the woman approaching (προσελθοῦσα) Jesus in 9:20 is contrasted with the ruler of 9:18. As before, Matthew compresses the narrative details, and there is, therefore, no lengthy description of the woman's condition (cf. Mk 5:25-6//Mt 9:20), or vivid portrayal of the crowd scene with the woman seeking to conceal herself (Mk 5:29-33).³¹ There is, furthermore, no questioning by the disciples and the dialogue is strictly between Jesus and the woman, with the crux being 9:22, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωχέν σε.

The important Matthean emphasis on faith is, therefore, to the fore in this miracle.³² What Matthew has also significantly omitted here is

the Marcan reference to fear (Mk 5:33). One reason could be that in Matthew, fear is consistently understood as the expression of human unbelief and little faith which was certainly not the case here.³³

The cumulative effect of this Matthean abbreviation is to concentrate our attention on the interaction between Jesus and the woman, which also involves direct speech and is linked together by the clever use of repetition.³⁴ Matthew echoes the Marcan repetition of $\alpha\pi\tau\omega$, but as we have already noted, he emphasises the woman's faith and the faith of this woman contrasts with those in the gospel who are of little faith.

The final Matthean miracle involving a woman also emphasises the faith of the recipient, and this miracle is one of three miracles in Matthew where the supplicant cries out for help.³⁵ This miracle is the healing of the Canaanite woman's daughter Mt 15:21-8, which may be compared with the centurion's servant of 8:5-13. Where Mark has only one miracle involving a Gentile, Matthew adds another, and there are a number of other similarities between these two miracles. Both are healings at a distance,³⁶ and both include a lengthy conversation where faith is important. Matthew has typically removed Mark's house motif³⁷ which, as we have noted, is part of the messianic secret theme. Matthew then has his plea of the supplicant, and shows his fondness for literary echoes by creating the reference to the lost sheep of Israel in 5:24 which repeats Mt 10:6.³⁸ Matthew has developed the dialogue to emphasise the faith of the woman, and in 15:28 we read, "O woman, great is your faith! Be it done for you as you desire", and in typical Matthean style, there is only a brief reference to the sickness in 15:22. According to H.J. Held, this miracle consists for the main part of dialogue, and so the miracle itself merely appears at the end, almost as an afterthought.³⁹

Having examined the miracles involving women in Matthew, we must summarise their significance in terms of what they tell us about how Matthew perceived the role and status of women in his gospel. We have already mentioned that Matthew added no new miracles to his Marcan source, and in the case of the Canaanite woman, he even added a parallel miracle involving a Gentile man. This could suggest that Matthew was not happy with this one miracle to stand alone as an example of Jesus' mission to non-Jews. We have also noted that Matthew removed the Marcan house motif in 15:21f. which is not necessarily significant since in Matthew the house is not a special place of revelation. The other Matthean redactional features we noted were the editing out of secondary

characters, and the abbreviation of the narrative elements to concentrate on the dialogue, particularly that between Jesus and the recipients of the miracle. While these features themselves to a certain extent throw the women involved into a more central role in the narrative, we also pointed out that, if anything, this was only of secondary importance. The main thrust of the Matthean redaction of these miracles was rather to emphasise the christological significance of these narratives, and if anything, the women are only examples of faith in Jesus. This was demonstrated most clearly in the curing of Simon's mother-in-law, and in the healing of the centurion's servant where a parallel miracle involving a male is included in the gospel.

Briefly reviewing the presence of women in the remainder of Matthew's gospel, we note that he begins his work with a genealogy of Jesus which mentions four women, Tamar, Rahab, Ruth and Bathsheba (1:3-5).⁴⁰ The fact that Luke, the only other evangelist to include a birth narrative, mentions no women in his genealogy, leads us to ask why Matthew has rather surprisingly chosen to include these women here. There have been several hypotheses concerning the significance of these four women.⁴¹ One reason is that all these women were sinful and Matthew, therefore, included them because he wanted his readers to see that Jesus was born to save all sinners.⁴² Another suggestion is that these four women were regarded as foreigners and were included by Matthew to show that Jesus, the Jewish Messiah, had some Gentiles among his ancestors.⁴³ The third interpretation is that the women share in common two things with Mary - there is something unusual about their relationship with the men in their life, and they also took some action to help God's work in history.⁴⁴

With all these interpretations, it is obvious that what is read into the text by the reader is very important.⁴⁵ For the authors of the recent publication Mary in the New Testament, while each of the theories referred to has an element of truth in them, Matthew's ultimate purpose was probably to show that women were vehicles of God's messianic plan.⁴⁶ E.D. Freed also considers Matthew's overall plan, and, accepting that Matthew did not compose the genealogy or invent the story of the virgin birth, both are used by him for a purpose. This purpose, according to Freed, is to defend Jesus against the charge of illegitimacy. Matthew achieves this by inserting the names of four women into the genealogy. In each case, the behaviour of the woman was initially criticised, but as

Freed goes on to show, these women gradually achieved places of merit in Jewish tradition. The second thing Matthew does is to focus on the actions of Joseph who accepts Mary as his betrothed wife in spite of what has happened. It is because of this that Jesus can now be accepted as the Messianic son of David.⁴⁷

Moving on to the infancy narrative proper, most scholars would accept that it is Luke rather than Matthew who focuses upon Mary as the central character.⁴⁸ Mary is, however, mentioned in Matthew, and in 2:11 the wise men go in and find 'the child with Mary his mother', and in 2:13 Joseph is told to 'take the child with Mary his mother and go to Egypt'. Matthew also includes the Marcan passage on Jesus' true relatives (Mk 3:31-5//Mt 12:46-50). However, in his redaction of the rejection at Nazareth (Mk 6:1-6//Mt 13:53-58), the reference to the son of Mary has been altered to read, "is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary?" Joseph, although not specifically identified by name, has been written back into the Matthean narrative.

At certain points in the gospel Matthew does, however, also include references to women which are not found in Mark. In 13:31 the man sowing mustard seed is followed by the image of the woman mixing the leaven (13:33). Matthew alone states in 21:32 that not only tax collectors and sinners, but also harlots, will be able to enter the Kingdom of Heaven. Like Luke, Matthew takes over from 'Q' the female image "... How often would I have gathered your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings ..." (23:37).

Various judgement sayings also indicate that for Matthew, men and women will both be judged equally by God. In Mt 12:38-42 the Queen of the South will arise at judgement with the men of this generation and condemn them. Again in Mt 24:39-41, we read that when the Son of Man comes, the two men in the field are treated similarly to the two women grinding flour as one is left and the other is taken.

Matthew alone has the parable of the ten wise and foolish virgins (Mt 25:1-13) which may be compared with the parable of the talents, and is linked with the Parousia.⁴⁹ Whatever the later allegorical interpretation of this parable, it originally probably referred to the 'unexpected' aspect of the bridegroom's arrival with the warning being to 'be prepared'.⁵⁰ In Matthew, women too can be used to illustrate the message of the eschatological crisis, and they too can be criticised for not being prepared.

We have already mentioned the reference to the mother of the sons of Zebedee making a request on behalf of her sons in Mt 20:20. In Mark, this request is made directly by James and John (Mk 10:35-41). We consider, however, that Matthew was not thereby consciously introducing a female character, but deliberately toning down a Marcan passage where the disciples are cast in a bad light. Thus in Matthew, it is not the two disciples, but their mother who is driven by a thirst for honour and puts the request to Jesus. The fact that it is really the disciples who are the subjects of the conversation is reflected in the Matthean reply which is in the plural form.

The final narrative involving women in the gospel which we will look at is the anointing at Bethany (Mt 26:6-13//Mk 14:3-9). Matthew's story is in many respects similar to its Marcan parallel which we consider to be the source here. Matthew agrees with Mark in the setting and location of the narrative, immediately before the entry to Jerusalem, at Bethany, in the house of Simon. Matthew has the same framing as Mark, and there is a reference to the resolve of Jesus' enemies to do away with Jesus, and a reference to the betrayal by Judas. A number of significant redactional features do, however, bear out some of the points we have already made regarding Matthean redaction of Mark. In 26:6 for example, Jesus is identified by name, thus adding christological emphasis, which is also reinforced by the woman's respectful approach to Jesus.⁵¹ Mark's vague group of protestors are identified here as the disciples, and while this protest could imply their lack of understanding, the subsequent statement is seen as a furthering of the disciples' knowledge.⁵² This reference to the disciples could, however, be a clue to the significance of this pericope in Matthew. While it is possible to see the anointing as a Messianic anointing of Jesus before the passion, or an embarrassed attempt to explain why Jesus' body was not properly anointed on his death, this was not the main point of the story as it appears in Matthew. Given Matthew's ecclesiastical interest, it is rather more likely that by identifying the disciples, Matthew was addressing the message of the pericope to his own community, and he was, therefore, possibly stressing that adoration of Christ was superior to almsgiving.⁵³

The final reference to a woman in Matthew is the reference to Pilate's wife who is mentioned in Mt 27:19. This woman is, however, more of a foil to the Jewish leaders in the Matthean plot, and we do not hear of her again.⁵⁴

Before drawing together our conclusions on the role and status of women in Matthew's gospel, we must finally address ourselves to the point raised in Munro's article that women were not followers of Jesus in the sense that they were counted among the twelve disciples to whom the secret mysteries of the kingdom were revealed.⁵⁵ This conclusion is supported by J.D. Kingsbury who accepts that ἀκολουθεῖν involves both the notion of commitment and sacrifice but was not applied in this sense in 27:55, and he declares:

... in Mt. 27:55, Matthew, like Mark (15:14), employs ἀκολουθεῖν in the literal and local sense of accompaniment from place to place.⁵⁶

In view of the Matthean use of ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας instead of ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, we would perhaps agree with this conclusion here. Finally, in Mt 27:55, there is also a reference to the fact that the women who had followed Jesus from Galilee were ministering (διδάσκειν) to him. According to Kingsbury:

The appended notation that they (i.e. the women) were 'waiting on him' is not meant to characterize them as disciples of Jesus in the strict sense of the word but instead explains why they had been in his company.⁵⁷

While it is possible to see this ministry as representing an example of the Christian ministry to the persecuted, taken together with the remainder of the gospel, and in particular Matthew's redaction of Mk 16:8, this is not a likely conclusion here.⁵⁸

Summation

As before, we will not attempt to repeat all the arguments we have put forward in our assessment of the significance of Mt 27:55-6. We are more concerned rather with assessing the general impact of these verses and what they tell us about how Matthew perceived the role of women at the scene of the crucifixion, and beyond this, retrospectively within the gospel as a whole.

When we examined Mark's treatment of women at the crucifixion and within the gospel, we were able to note the use of various literary techniques which had the effect of emphasising the role of women in the gospel. By repeating the 'watching' theme, and linking this with 'understanding', we saw that the women in Mark had a role as 'fallible followers' who replaced the male disciples at the cross. Beyond this in the gospel women are recipients of miracles which are themselves closely associated with important Marcan themes.

Turning to Matthew, the general impression we gain of women in the gospel is that Matthew was not concerned with developing their role, and if anything, eclipsed their role in the text, though this was probably not the deliberate intention of the author. Thus, the four women of the genealogy were possibly included to answer charges that Jesus was not illegitimate. In the birth narratives, it is Joseph, not Mary, who is the central character. Matthew has also altered Mk 6:1-6 to read 'the carpenter's son'. In the redaction of the Marcan anointing it is the bystanders who are identified and not the woman, and their questioning directs our attention away from the woman's actions to focus upon the concerns of the Matthean community.

It is true that in reporting the story of the women at the cross, Matthew agrees with Mark that it is three women who watch from a distance. However, by moving the reference to πολλὰι, Matthew has possibly lessened the impact of the role of these three particular women. We are also not able to maintain Mark's portrayal of these women as representatives for the absent male disciples, and this is particularly true for the third woman in the Matthean list, who, if anything, is there as a reminder of this male group.

Taken against the background of the gospel as a whole, we cannot, therefore, maintain that Mt 27:55-6 possibly represents only a minimal alteration of the Marcan tradition. We did, however, note that by leaving Mary Magdalene at the head of the list, Matthew continues Mark's individualising of the tradition which placed her at the head of the group of women.

B. THE BURIAL - Mt 27:57-61

Turning our attention to the Matthean account of the burial of Jesus, we are immediately struck by the succinctness of the Matthean narrative compared with its Marcan parallel. Matthew agrees with Mark that it is Joseph of Arimathea who is responsible for the burial, but Joseph is no longer simply described as a respected member of the council who was looking for the Kingdom of God. Instead he is a disciple (μαθητής) of Jesus (Mt 27:57) as in John (cf. Jn 19:38). Since this description of Joseph is a development on Mark, we will be interested to see whether this represents a Matthean attempt to rewrite the male disciples into the plot. There is also no reference to Pilate's questioning of the centurion in Matthew (cf. Mk 15:44-5), nor to Joseph's removal of the

body from the cross (cf. Mk 15:46). Instead, here we are told of the purity of the linen, the newness of the tomb, and Matthew alone among the gospel writers tells us that the tomb itself belongs to Joseph. The Matthean story of the burial is then followed by a reference to the women sitting opposite the sepulchre, and we have the addition of the story of the guards at the tomb which is not found in any other canonical gospel. We will now examine the burial verse by verse before asking how Matthew's alterations have effected his presentation of the role of women at the burial.

1. v. 57

The Matthean account of the burial opens with δέ rather than καί which emphasises the contrast between day time and evening.⁵⁹ There is no ἤδη since Matthew also omits the reference to the day of preparation.⁶⁰ We are then introduced to Joseph of Arimathea who is described as ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος perhaps in line with Isaiah 53:9.⁶¹ This is a text already familiar to Matthew (cf. 8:17) and one where we are told that the servant of God will have his grave among the rich. The specific reference to the name (τοῦνομα), recalls v. 32 where Matthew has inserted ὀνόματι and could be Matthean repetition to emphasise the fact that it was this disciple who buried Jesus. The most interesting note concerning Joseph is, therefore, that he is a disciple of Jesus.

This description of Joseph as a disciple of Jesus is one of three times in the gospel when the evangelist uses the verb μαθητεύω (cf. 13:52; 28:19), and all of these instances, according to U. Luz, are probably redactional.⁶² It is most likely here that, rather than correcting Mark, Matthew was at this point interpreting his source, and as we have suggested, he was thereby rewriting the male disciples back into the tradition. It is true Matthew does not continue with the Marcan visit of the women to the tomb, and by including the guards at the tomb, and the christophany to the disciples in 28:16-20, it would appear that Matthew was not happy to leave his Marcan text as it stood, but rewrote the males back into the story.⁶³

2. v. 58

Since Matthew has broken the Marcan sentence, he now emphasises that it is this (οὗτος) man who approaches Pilate for the body of Jesus.⁶⁴ There is no reference to Joseph taking courage, nor to Pilate's questioning of

the centurion.⁶⁵ Matthew has, therefore, abbreviated his Marcan narrative, and by the removal of Pilate's questioning in particular, we are allowed to concentrate on the actions of the central character of Joseph.

The use of the word σῶμα prepares us for its use in the next verse, and contrasts with the two references to the body as it (αὐτό) in vv. 59 and 60. Thus, while Matthew does not follow Mark in using πῶμα, corpse, he nevertheless emphasises the fact that Jesus was now dead. Gundry sees Matthew's hand in the use of ἐκέλευσεν and ἀποδοθῆναι, and believes Matthew's wording was deliberately designed to echo 14:9, contrasting the fate of Jesus and John the Baptist.⁶⁶

It is interesting that Matthew has both John the Baptist and Jesus buried by his disciples. Mark only records that John is buried by his disciples (cf. 6:29), thereby making the omission by the disciples of Jesus all the more significant.

Given Mark's account of the burial of Jesus by a respectable Jew, Matthew has, therefore, added the details that it was a rich man, a disciple of Jesus, who approached Pilate and asked for the body.

3. v. 59

Joseph now takes the body (σῶμα) of Jesus and wraps it (αὐτό) in a clean (καθαρόν) sheet (cf. Jn 19:41). By referring to the newness of the cloth, Matthew has dispensed with Mk 15:46a and there is no need to refer to Joseph's purchase of the cloth. Since Matthew omitted Joseph's name at the beginning of v. 58, he now repeats it here. The effect of this verse is to emphasise Joseph's care for the body which he wraps in an unsoiled cloth.⁶⁷

4. v. 60

Matthew tells us that Joseph places the body in a new tomb (cf. Lk 23:53 and Jn 19:41),⁶⁸ which belonged to him.⁶⁹ This tomb is then sealed with a stone, and we are told that Joseph departs (ἀπηλθεν).⁷⁰ Once again the body is referred to as αὐτό, and not αὐτόν as in Mark, and thus the links between vv. 59 and 60 are maintained. We are told that Joseph deposits (ἐθήκεν) the body in the tomb, and the use of the verb here and in 28:6 links together the stories of the burial and empty tomb. The use of προσκυλίσας at the beginning of v. 60b prepares us for the main verb at the end of the verse, ἀπηλθεν, which in turn anticipates the guard at the

tomb. There is no anointing of the body in Matthew in line with Mt 26:6f.

The fact that Joseph places the body in a new tomb which belongs to him further highlights the action of Joseph who is even prepared to offer Jesus his own tomb, and fulfils the prophecy of Isa 53:9.

5 v. 61

Matthew now mentions that the women were sitting opposite the sepulchre. Like Mark, Matthew does not mention their presence at the burial until the end of the pericope, but unlike Mark he does not necessarily continue to emphasise the theme of the women witnessing the events, and he has substituted Mark's ἐθεώρουν ποῦ τέθειται with καθήμεναι ἀπέναντι τοῦ τάφου. As in Mark, Matthew has reduced the number of women from three to two, and this would seem to support our theory that in the canonical tradition the trend was to reduce the number of women at the tomb and beyond this to emphasise the role of Mary Magdalene at the head of the list. Matthew also significantly abbreviates the reference to the second woman at this point, and she is hereafter referred to as 'the other Mary'.⁷¹ The use of the singular ἡν even suggests to E. Schweizer that behind this verse could lie the reminiscence of a tradition in which Mary Magdalene appears alone at the tomb, as for example Jn 20:1f.⁷² Bearing in mind, however, the suggestions we have made above, it would appear that if anything the tradition was working in the opposite direction and we will again explore this suggestion when we look at John's gospel in particular.

The effect of this redaction in Matthew is, therefore, to concentrate our attention on Mary Magdalene who becomes the central character in the Matthean group of women.⁷³

Finally, the introductory ἡν δὲ ἔχει recalls v. 55 and adds to the continuity of the narrative. Furthermore, the women sitting opposite the tomb prepares us for the empty tomb story and the angel of the Lord who sits outside the tomb.

Summation

The effect of Mt 27:56-61 is, therefore, to heighten the role of Joseph of Arimathea who is no longer a devout Jew, but a disciple of Jesus. The significance of this description is that when we compare the Matthean burial with the Marcan account, and also with Mk 6:29 in particular,

Joseph, who is now a disciple of Jesus, acts as we would have expected the disciples to act. The added care for the body in Matthew, with the emphasis on the newness of the tomb and the new cloth, once again improves the image of this disciple who carefully and respectfully disposes of the body. Taken over against Mark, we would also suggest that the women are no longer present at the tomb in Matthew as representatives of the absent disciples. Joseph is the representative here. Beyond this, with the description of the women sitting opposite the sepulchre rather than 'watching' the events, Matthew may not be underlining their presence here as witnesses. As we will see in the Matthean story of the guard, this was because Matthew's witnesses are not primarily the women but the guards. Perhaps this evangelist was aware of developments in the early church which suggested to him that there was an embarrassment about the role given to women in Mark, and this redaction, therefore, fits in with the trends we have noticed elsewhere in the New Testament, or as we consider more likely, Matthew had apologetic concerns to the fore in the insertion of the guard story.

C. THE GUARD AT THE TOMB - Mt 27:62-6; 28:4, 11-14

Matthew does not continue with the discovery of the empty tomb, but with the story of the guard at the tomb which is found only here in the canonical tradition. We are now told that the chief priests and the Pharisees⁷⁴ go to Pilate and ask him for a guard to secure the tomb of Jesus (27:62-6).⁷⁵ This is followed up by a later redactional insertion into the Marcan story of the empty tomb which tells us of the guard's terrified reaction to the appearance of the angel of the Lord (28:4), and finally there is a report of some of the guards to the chief priests who subsequently bribe them. Matthew has, therefore, introduced a new element to the story of the women at the tomb, and that is the guard at the tomb.

Mt 27:62-66; 28:4, 11-14 have been designated an apologetic legend.⁷⁶ Discussions among scholars concerning the Matthean story of the guard at the tomb not only concern the problem of its historicity,⁷⁷ but also the relationship of this story to the similar narrative of the guard at the tomb found in the Gospel of Peter.⁷⁸ As with our previous treatment of the Matthean stories of the crucifixion and burial, we will not discuss here the question of the historicity of the guard at the tomb. Regarding the question of the relationship between Matthew and the

Gospel of Peter, B.A. Johnson has argued that the guard at the tomb story was a pre-Matthean tradition which was originally an appearance story.⁷⁹ The relationship between these two accounts is explained on the basis that they both go back to a common source, which is an empty tomb story where the women are not present.⁸⁰ This thesis is correctly challenged, we believe, by J.E. Alsup who considers that Matthew was responsible for the grave guard story. He concludes that:

The dramatization of the scene ... bespeaks matthean redactional characteristics and although one might be justified in assuming that Mt is following to some extent theological trends current in his community, the hypothesis that he is reworking an original appearance story needs more support than the kind of evidence the GP [Gospel of Peter] can muster.⁸¹

Turning to the Matthean text, we note that the Matthean guard story has already been prepared for in the watching guard of Mt 27:36 which is a Matthean insertion, replacing Mk 15:25. The opening in v. 62 contrasts the request of the chief priests and the Pharisees for a guard, and the women sitting opposite, and more precisely, it connects the Matthean narrative of the burial and the guards at the tomb. The time reference here is unusual and is a round about way of referring to the sabbath. We have already noted that Matthew omitted the reference to the day of preparation in Mk 15:42 and this was probably because he needed to use it in this present verse to avoid a direct reference to the sabbath.⁸² Although J. Jeremias cites instances where sabbath law could be broken, it would appear that Matthew was embarrassed to recount that the Jewish authorities approached Pilate on the sabbath.⁸³

The chief priests and the Pharisees tell Pilate of Jesus' prediction that he would be raised up after three days (v. 63),⁸⁴ and Matthew's inclusion of this quotation here and in v. 64 once again focuses our attention on 28:1f. The fact that Matthew includes the Pharisees only here in the passion narrative provides a link with 12:40 where they are among those who hear Jesus' prediction that the Son of Man would be raised after three days. The fear that the disciples might steal the body fits with Matthew's previous reference to the fact that it was a disciple, Joseph of Arimathea, who buried Jesus. The whole episode then concludes with the ironic comment of Pilate that if the Jewish authorities feel they are adequately able to guard the tomb, then they are free to do so.⁸⁵

This story of the guard at the tomb is then taken up briefly in the

redactional insertion of Mt 28:4, and the reaction of the guards to the appearance of the angel of the Lord.⁸⁶ The guards fall down as if dead,⁸⁷ and once again Matthew's irony is seen in the contrast between the crucified Jesus who lives, and the living guards who appear as though they are dead.

The grand finale of this story is the report of some of the guards to the chief priests.⁸⁸ Once again, there is a contrast between those entrusted with the true announcement in the repetition of ἀπογγέλλω in vv. 8 and 11. The bribery of the guards also recalls the earlier bribing of Judas, and apart from the parable of the talents, this is the only specific mention of money (ἀργύριον) in Matthew which makes the parallel all the more striking.⁸⁹

Summation

Since we have already stated that we are not concerned with questions of historicity, we will not speculate here on any possible situations in the Matthean community to which this particular pericope addressed itself. The guard at the tomb story must, therefore, be dealt with in terms of its position and significance in the literary text of the gospel. Viewed in such terms, then the story of the guard at the tomb to a certain extent detracts attention from the women at the tomb. Following as it does the story of the burial, the guard story breaks the connection between the women sitting opposite the sepulchre and their witnessing of the discovery of the empty tomb. Later, in the story of the empty tomb itself, by inserting a reference to the reactions of the guards, Matthew continues, albeit perhaps unintentionally, to detract from the role of the women who are no longer the only witnesses at the tomb. We would suggest the whole sequence of the guards at the tomb and their subsequent bribery serves an apologetic intent which may reflect an actual conflict in the early church.

D. THE EMPTY TOMB - Mt 28:1-8

In our examination of Mk 16:1-8, we noted that there were many problems associated with the study of these verses, particularly concerning the issue of source and redaction. We noted that there was no general agreement on what was the basic tradition, but beyond this lack of agreement among scholars it was also difficult to find examples of Marcan redactional style in these verses.

We quickly discovered that the main clue to the meaning of Mk 16:1-8 lay in the enigmatic ending of 16:8 itself, and to discover exactly what Mark intended us to read into this conclusion, we needed to interpret 16:1-8 in terms of the expectations generated by the gospel itself. We then had to decide whether the women's flight and silence represented a negative evaluation of their role. After a lengthy examination, we suggested that Mk 16:8 was a satisfactory ending and one which invited the readers to supply their own conclusions to the gospel in terms of whether they accepted the challenges and risks of the gospel.

Since we have already suggested that Matthew's narrative is our closest parallel to the Marcan tradition, we will begin our treatment of Mt 28:1-8 by noting how the evangelist has altered the Marcan tradition. When we look at Mt 28:1-8 the first thing we notice is that Matthew has kept the main features of the Marcan pericope, that is the appearance and message of the young man and the women's reaction to this message. Beyond this, Matthew has, however, changed the motivation for the women's visit to the tomb, which is no longer to anoint the body (Mk 16:1), but to see the tomb. Matthew also introduces two secondary developments to the Marcan tradition and these are in vv. 2-4 and 9-10. In Mt 28:2-4, we read of the descent of the angel of the Lord and the opening of the tomb. In 28:9-10 we have the second development of the tradition which is a christophany to the women. Matthew's gospel then concludes with a christophany to the male disciples (28:16-20). In studying Mt 28:1-10 we hope that by investigating how Matthew has developed his Marcan traditions, we will learn certain things about Matthew's gospel and the role of women. Beyond this, it is also important that we use these discoveries to reflect upon our conclusions on Mk 16:1-8 in the light of this new evidence. Finally, a useful note of warning is given here by F. Neirynck who advises us to be careful in concluding on the existence of anonymous traditions for Mt 28:1-10. He states that :

Many authors have Mt 28 (1), 5-7, (8) depend on the text of Mark (or at least on an early text very close to Mark), but never ask themselves if the redactional reflection on this text could provide a sufficient explanation for the double Matthean broadening, the descent of the angel and the appearance of Jesus to the women (vv. 2-4, 9-10).⁹⁰

1. v. 1

As with Mark, Matthew opens in 28:1 by naming the women afresh, though the motive for the women's visit to the tomb is not *ἵνα ἐλθοῦσιν*

ἀλείψωσιν αὐτόν as in Mark, but το θεωρῆσαι τὸν τάφον. Matthew, therefore, agrees with his Marcan source that it is a visit by the women which sets in motion the events of the first day of the week. Matthew's time reference ὁπὲρ δὲ σαββάτων is unusual. We have interpreted Mark's reference as "very early, when the sun had risen." Matthew's ὁπὲρ σαββάτων can be translated "after the sabbath"⁹¹ and possibly it is Matthew's way of avoiding any reference to the women breaking the sabbath law, i.e., the women came to the tomb after the sabbath was over.⁹² According to J.M. Grintz, Matthew 28:1 means that the women came to the tomb the night after the sabbath had ended,⁹³ and for Gundry this is to link the visit of the women with the guard story. The resurrection in Matthew, therefore, occurs right after the guard is set.⁹⁴

Matthew mentions only two women who visit the tomb as opposed to the three women of 27:55. He does not, therefore, follow Mark and reintroduce the third woman. Once again, Mary Magdalene heads the list, and the second woman is again referred to simply as 'the other Mary'. Matthew also does not take up the Marcan emphasis on the movement of the women to the tomb, inside the tomb, and away from the tomb.

We have already commented that Matthew altered the Marcan purpose for the women's visit to the tomb. As we mentioned in our Marcan chapter, we are not concerned with whether or not the anointing would have been possible, and we considered that the clue to Mark's motivation of the women lay in the previous anointing of 14:2-6. Matthew obviously did not wish to continue this association, and prefers to use θεωρέω.⁹⁵ Matthew had already got θεωρέω in his source for the crucifixion (27:55), though he did not use it at the burial (cf. Mk 15:47), and he had another Marcan reference to θεωρέω in Mk 16:4. It is, therefore, possible to suggest that given these examples, plus the angelic command in Mt 28:6, 'δεῦτε ἴδετε τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἔχειτο', Matthew would have assumed that the narrative was about seeing the tomb.⁹⁶ As we have already indicated, it is our opinion that the Matthean version is probably the more original.

Thus with v. 1 we have the introduction of the women and their intention to go to the tomb to see the grave. We now want to see what they will see when they get there.

2. vv. 2-4

What now follows is the first real departure from Mk 16:1-8. Instead of including the questioning of the women en route to the tomb τίς

ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον, Matthew has ἄγγελος γὰρ κυρίου... προσελθὼν ἀπεκύλισεν τὸν λίθον.⁹⁷ We suggested in our Marcan chapter that Mark himself possibly inserted the questioning of the women in order to encourage us to identify with their predicament. Matthew, therefore, feels free to omit this reference and instead is more concerned with what he feels is a gap in the Marcan narrative and he sees the need to answer the unanswered question - who moved the stone?⁹⁸ Matthew's reply is that it was the angel. The Marcan ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα is also omitted as Matthew has already referred to the size of the stone in 27:60. Instead, we now read of a σεισμὸς μέγας which again points to Jesus' majestic deity.⁹⁹

Matthew does not now refer to the women entering the tomb, nor does he explicitly say that they witness what has just happened.¹⁰⁰ Instead, we now have a description of the reaction of the guards. However, since the angelic reply of v. 5 reverts back to the Marcan address to the women, it would appear once again, that Matthew has allowed his concern for 'Jewish robbery theories' to influence his telling of the story.¹⁰¹

(a) v. 2

As we have already mentioned, the first dramatic note is sounded here in the great earthquake which recalls Mt 27:61, and according to E.L. Bode heightens the apocalyptic impression given by Matthew's redaction of the angelic appearance in v. 3.¹⁰² The explanatory γὰρ informs us that the reason for this earthquake is the appearance of the angel of the Lord. Since we have already encountered the angel of the Lord (cf. Mt 1:20, 24; 2:13, 19) at the beginning of the gospel, where he also has a mission to announce, Matthew has neatly connected the beginning and end of his work.

This angel is described as descending from heaven. He then approaches (προσελθὼν) the tomb and rolls away (ἀπεκύλισεν) the stone and sits on it.¹⁰³ The use of προσελθὼν reminds us of the typical Matthean formula for the respectful approach to Jesus and prepares the reader for the expected encounter with Jesus. Once again, the repetition of ἀπεκύλισεν links together the stories of the burial and empty tomb. According to R.H. Fuller, this is also the closest the canonical gospels get to narrating the resurrection.¹⁰⁴

(b) v. 3

The description of the appearance of the angel now follows. Matthew does

follow Mark to a certain extent, though of course the νεανίας is identified as the ἄγγελος κυρίου. Mark's καθήμενον ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς περιβεβλημένον στολὴν λευκὴν (16:5) is also slightly altered. Matthew has the enthronement motif with the angel sitting upon the stone (ἐκάθητο ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ).¹⁰⁵ In describing the dress of the angel Matthew's expression ἣν δὲ ἡ εἰδέα αὐτοῦ ὡς ἄστραπή καὶ τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ recalls the dress of John the Baptist.¹⁰⁶ Finally, Matthew's repetition of the dazzling appearance of the angel ὡς ἄστραπή ... λευκὸν ὡς χιών recalls the transfiguration (cf. 17:2f.).¹⁰⁷

(c) v. 4

The most surprising thing about the reaction to the angel in Matthew is that we are now told of the reactions of the guards rather than those of the women. Matthew has obviously inserted this verse into his Marcan narrative and the trembling of the women becomes the quaking of the guards which presents an effective contrast with the impressive appearance of the angel in v. 3. According to D. Hill, this was because "Unlike the women, they do not understand, and there is no message for them."¹⁰⁸

In Mark we are told that the women are ἐξεθαμβήθησαν, and we noted that the fear motif was very important. Indeed ἐξεθαμβήθησαν is picked up again in the Marcan reply in 16:6. This is not so in Matthew, and he omits the nouns τρομός and ἔκστασις found in Mk 16:8. Neirynck has already shown that these two Matthean omissions have good precedent in the Matthean redaction, and he also points out that it is particularly the subject 'the guards' which gives specific form to v. 4, and, indeed, to the whole passage.¹⁰⁹ The verb ἐσεισθήσαν recalls the σεισμός of v. 2, and both of these (vv. 2 and 4), recall the signs which, according to Matthew, attended the death of Jesus (cf. 27:51-54).¹¹⁰

What is important as far as we are concerned is that Matthew, by transferring the reactions of the women to the angelophany to the guards has thereby introduced the male characters of the guards at the tomb to the Marcan story of the women at the tomb. It is important to point out that the primary intention here was probably not to detract from the witness of the women, but to serve apologetic ends. However, as we will see later in the gospels of Luke and John, the presence of male enemies at the tomb to a certain extent paves the way for the introduction of male disciples at the tomb. Matthew's redaction therefore represents the

first move to introduce secondary witnesses at the tomb and whether intentional or not the effect, to a greater or lesser extent, is to draw attention away from the witnessing women.

3. vv. 5-6

Matthew begins by replacing Mark's λέγει αὐταῖς with his own ἀποκριθεῖς... εἶπεν. He then needs to reintroduce the women since he has not mentioned them since v. 1. The angelic command μὴ φοβεῖσθε replaces Mark's μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε. By beginning with this command, Matthew links the story of the guards and the women, and with the specific command μὴ φοβεῖσθε ὑμεῖς, we are reminded of the earlier reference to the fear of the guards.¹¹¹ The authority of the angel is also stressed in Matthew's use of the first person οἶδα γάρ... ἰδοὺ εἶπον ὑμῖν. Matthew also reverses the Marcan order, and now ζητεῖτε follows ἐσταυρωμένον and οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε is placed before ἡγέρθη to allow for the insertion of γάρ. Matthew then links even more closely the guards at the tomb story with the women at the tomb by the inclusion of καθὼς εἶπεν.¹¹² It is also interesting that this message is again repeated in the message to the disciples which Jesus also gives to the women in vv. 9-10.

The angel continues in Matthew by instructing the women to approach and see where Jesus had been laid. Matthew does not specifically tell us if the women entered the tomb, and indeed, the following verse suggests that they did not.

The effect once again is that although Matthew has included the angelophany to the women from Mark, the echoes with the guard story remind us that they are not alone at the tomb in Matthew. This is underlined by the fact that Matthew has altered the order of events in the angelic announcement with regard to the reference to the crucifixion and resurrection, thus emphasising the latter. The body of Jesus is not here because (γάρ) it has been raised, and any other interpretation of this fact, such as the theory that the disciples had stolen the body is, therefore, ruled out.

4. vv. 7-8

Verse 7 basically repeats the Marcan command of Mk 16:7 except that Matthew inserts the word ταχὺ to indicate how the women are to proceed. Matthew does, however, omit the special reference to Peter. This is a strange omission given the interest in the disciples and Peter shown by this evangelist.¹¹³ The reasons for the omission are unclear. It could

possibly be because Matthew intends this charge to lead up to a narrative involving a single appearance to all the disciples,¹¹⁴ or possibly because of an anti-Petrine polemic in Matthew.¹¹⁵ The final reference to seeing Jesus in Galilee presumably refers to the resurrection story of vv. 16-20 and beyond this to the Gentile mission.¹¹⁶

E. THE CHRISTOPHANY TO THE WOMEN - Mt 28:9-10

According to C.F. Evans, the purpose of the appearance to the women in Mt 28:9-10 is obscure. He suggests, however, that it was possibly intended to forge a connection between the tradition of the empty tomb and that of the resurrection appearances.¹¹⁷

Mt 28:9-10 represents the second Matthean development of the Marcan tradition, and the women who depart in fear and joy are interrupted in their mission by the appearance of Jesus. The women's reaction is to touch the feet of Jesus and worship him. Jesus then repeats the angelic command of v. 7. Problems with Mt 28:9-10 centre on whether or not Matthew has constructed this story out of motifs borrowed from the tomb story and other appearance stories,¹¹⁸ and if so, was this composition based on a desire to link together the empty tomb and appearance traditions.¹¹⁹ Another important issue is the relationship of this pericope to Jn 20:11-18. Are these two independent stories, or is one dependent on the other, and if so, which one?

The question of whether Matthew composed these verses is difficult to answer. Beginning with v. 9, the introductory καὶ ἰδού introduces Jesus¹²⁰ who greets the women by using χαίρετε, a customary Greek greeting used in Mt 27:24 and 26:49.¹²¹ The women's reaction is to take hold of Jesus' feet and worship him. The placing of ἐπράτησαν between two Mattheanisms, προσελθοῦσαι and προσεκύνησαν, suggests that this word was probably originally Matthean. According to Neirynck, we should not let ourselves be influenced too greatly by the Johannine parallel and should interpret this phrase in terms of the common motif of worship.¹²² Furthermore, if Matthew intended us to think of the women's gesture as part of the worship motif, then the comforting words of Jesus μὴ φοβεῖσθε are more easy to explain.¹²³

The instruction of Jesus to the women to go and tell τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς that he is going before them to Galilee recalls most clearly the angelic command of v. 7.¹²⁴ The statement of Jesus is made all the more redundant by the fact that in Matthew, unlike the Marcan parallel, we are

not told that the women depart in fear saying nothing to any-one, but run to announce the message to the disciples. According to Neirynck, however, if anything, the Matthean christophany to the women prepares us for the appearance in Galilee in a much more direct way.¹²⁵

The precise term τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς for the disciples, instead of the Marcan τοῖς μαθηταῖς (Mk 16:7, 8), or the Matthean οἱ δὲ ἐνδεξα μαθηταὶ (Mt 28:16), is not so unusual in Matthew. We have already been prepared for the use of this term for the disciples in Mt 12:46-50. In the Matthean version of this story regarding Jesus' true relatives, we are told that Jesus stretches out his hand towards his disciples ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητάς αὐτοῦ, and he says 'here are my mother and "my brothers"'.¹²⁶ Since Matthew has used the title 'my brothers' to indicate the disciples elsewhere in the gospel, the reappearance of the term here is not surprising.

Before concluding on Matthew's christophany to the women, we must briefly note the points of comparison between Mt 28:9-10 and Jn 20:11-18. These links are based upon four main arguments.¹²⁷ First the χαίρετε greeting of Mt 28:9, while not directly used in John, is nonetheless a fundamental element of the Johannine appearance where the recognition theme occurs. Those who argue that Jn 20:14-16 is essentially a recognition scene, and Mt 28:9-10 an appearance story would disagree with this argument. However, as Neirynck argues, it is possible to see Jn 20:16 as an expansion of Matthew, and when Mary Magdalene recognises Jesus when he calls her Μαριάμ, this presupposes the greeting formula (χαίρετε), which is normally followed by a proper name or a vocative.¹²⁸

The second point of contact is the Μαριάμ address of Jn 20:16, which recalls Mt 27:61; 28:1. Though the Matthean christophany involves a group of women, it is possible to suggest that John's source originally included a group of women,¹²⁹ and the concentration on Mary Magdalene is due to the Johannine tendency to individualise for dramatic purposes.¹³⁰ The Johannine μή μου ἄπω of Jn 20:17 is also compared with the Matthean ἐπράτησαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας. While the verb is different in each case, the interchangeable nature of these two verbs,¹³¹ plus the possibility of interpreting Jn 20:17 in the sense of prohibiting the continuance of an action, leads to the conclusion of a similarity of meaning in Matthew and John's use of these phrases.

Finally, and perhaps most persuasive of all, is the reference to the phrases τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου in Mt 28:10 and τοὺς ἀδελφοῦς μου in Jn

20:17. Though the message the women are asked to deliver may appear to be quite different,¹³² the similarity of this phrase, contrasting as it does with the use of μαθητής in Mt 28:7 and Jn 20:18 is very striking. Indeed, this phrase indicates not only that John was using a source which also lies behind Matthew, but perhaps that John was using the gospel of Matthew itself.¹³³

Summation

In discussing Mt 28:9-10, we have established that Matthew's source was basically Mk 16:1-8. Matthew developed this text at two main points - the expansion of the angelophany to the women in vv. 2-4 and the christophany of vv. 9-10. Matthew's reason for the women's visit to the tomb was probably more plausible than Mk 16:1, which, as we saw, fitted quite neatly into the theological tendencies of the gospel of Mark as a whole. Matthew has also redacted out the third woman from the Marcan text, once again supporting our suggestion that the tendency in the tradition was to individualise, and beyond this to concentrate on Mary Magdalene. To support this, the second woman is simply referred to as ἡ ἄλλη Μαρίας.

With vv. 2-4, we have the first broadening of Mk 16:1-8 and the development of the role of the angel in the empty tomb story answering the Marcan question - who rolled away the stone? The other significant feature of Mt 28:2-4 is the reintroduction of the guards and alongside the reference to the reactions of the women in v. 8 we have a reference to those of the guards in v. 4. ~~That Matthew was responsible~~ That Matthew was responsible for introducing the guard story to his Marcan source is supported by the fact that in v. 5, when the angel tells the women not to be afraid, he takes up the description of the guards which echoes the description of the women in Mark. The women are then told to go and tell the disciples that Jesus has risen. Matthew's omission of Peter here is difficult to explain, but possibly motivated by the group appearance of vv. 16-20.

The christophany to the women is the second broadening of the tradition in Matthew, and was probably Matthean in origin. In essence this incident adds nothing new to the narrative,¹³⁴ although it does underline the witness of the women at the tomb as they are met by the risen Jesus who reiterates the divine command.

We would agree with those scholars who suggest that in essence this

christophany owes its origin to the need to connect the two traditions of the empty tomb and the resurrection appearance stories, and thus overcoming the impasse created by Mark's abrupt ending.¹³⁵

The women are once again directed to report to the male disciples. Although we are not expressly told that the women fulfil this mission, this may be inferred from the fact that in 28:16f. we read that the disciples have gone to Galilee where they receive their commission directly from the risen Jesus.¹³⁶

There is, therefore, no hint of failure with regard to the women's role in the Matthean version of the tomb story. Furthermore by fulfilling their responsibility the women provide the necessary continuity which the Matthean narrative demands between the life of Jesus and the work of the church.¹³⁷

CONCLUSION

We must now draw together our suggestions on the narrative impact of the redactional alterations we have observed in Mt 27:55-6, 57-61 and 28:1-10. What do these narratives tell us about how Matthew perceived the role and status of women in the closing scenes of the gospel? Has Matthew built upon the positive treatment of women which we identified in the Marcan narratives, or has he taken up the possible negative aspects of the Marcan portrayal and developed these further by the reintroduction of various male characters?

In examining the gospel of Matthew retrospectively we did not identify any deliberate attempt here to detract from the role of women. Matthew was rather primarily concerned with the themes of christology, faith and discipleship, and ultimately it was these emphases which were responsible for subtly eclipsing the role of various female characters within the gospel.

Looking in particular at the scenes of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb we identified an interest here to fill in what Matthew obviously felt to be a gap in the Marcan narrative in 28:2-4, i.e. who moved the stone, and also to develop further other apologetic concerns. Thus one of the main differences we noted between Mark and Matthew was the guards at the tomb who, although not deliberately introduced to detract from the role of the women, nonetheless added male witnesses to

those present at the tomb. The guard story is then concluded in 28:11-15 and the christophany to the women is followed up with an explicit reference to the 'reporting' of the guards to the authorities of what they have observed at the tomb.

Matthew was also obviously to a certain extent unhappy with the absence of male disciples from the closing stages of the gospel. We interpreted his portrayal of Joseph of Arimathea as a disciple as an attempt to rewrite this group back into his Marcan narrative. Once again the primary motivation was probably not to downgrade the role of the women at the cross, however the subtle effect of this redaction was that the women in Matthew no longer stand alone as replacements for the male disciples and indeed a male disciple is here to represent that absent group.

We have already referred to the male guards at the tomb which also had the effect of adding male testimony to the witnessing women. However, in Matthew's treatment of the Marcan ending and his concern to link the empty tomb and his climactic appearance story of 28:16-20 we did see an enhancement of the role of the women at the tomb and this was the christophany to the women.

Thus the women in Matthew not only receive a message from an angel, but also from Jesus himself, although ultimately their role remains the same and they are messengers to the male disciples. It is only this latter group who receive a commission and, therefore, are identified as having a specific role to act with divine authority in baptizing and teaching. As we will see later in the Syriac Didascalia, these are two functions which are expressly forbidden to women.¹³⁸

Thus in conclusion what we can say about Matthew's treatment of women in the closing scenes of his gospel is that there does not seem to be an obvious deliberate attempt to downgrade the role of the women here although by rewriting the males back into the tradition the effect was to subtly overshadow their witnessing. Finally, by having only the male disciples as recipients of the divine commission perhaps Matthew reflects the tensions we have noticed elsewhere in the early church concerning the type of participation afforded to women within the various early Christian communities.

CHAPTER THREE - NOTES

1. According to G. Stanton, none of the other alternatives of the literary relationship between Matthew, Mark and Luke offers a more plausible and coherent account of the ways in which the evangelists handled their sources than this traditional view (1983), pp. 2-3.
2. Thus N. Dahl (1983), p. 48.
3. According in J.D. Crossan (1976), pp. 135f., there are four elements we can recognise in the post-resurrection tradition: women at the tomb; guards at the tomb; disciples at the tomb; and Jesus at the tomb. Mark simply has the women at the tomb. Matthew has the women, the guards and Jesus. If Lk 24:12-5 is authentic, then Luke has the women and the disciples and finally John has the women, the apostles and Jesus.
4. This reference to the mother of James and Joseph is complicated by the difficult Marcan textual variants (cf. Mk 15:40 and 47).
5. See N. Perrin (1977), p. 44.
6. See A.H. McNeile (1915), p. 425, who notes that by connecting ἡχολούθησαν and διακονοῦσαι with the journey to Jerusalem, Matthew has lost the distinction between these three particular women and the others which we find in Mark.
7. This possibly detracts from the 'risk element' which is suggested in Mark's narrative where Jerusalem is the place of Jesus' death.
8. Thus Gundry (1983), p. 578.
9. See Kümmel (1979), p. 107; cf. 14:23; 15:29; 19:2; 26:36, 71; 27:47.
10. See Gundry (1983), p. 579. We do, however, agree with him that the substitution of "Jesus" for "him" provides christological emphasis (p. 578).
11. For E. Schweizer, therefore, all that is claimed here is that these women, together with other women, had followed Jesus by joining him on his journey. See (1982), pp. 517-8.
12. This is similar to Peter, cf. Mt 26:58.
13. See G. Barth (1972), pp. 105f. Barth has dealt very comprehensively with Matthew's redacting out of the Marcan motif of the disciples' lack of understanding.
14. Thus Perrin (1977), p. 45.
15. See U. Luz (1983), p. 103.
16. It is interesting to note that Matthew alone refers to the suicide of Judas (27:3-10) perhaps to indicate his remorse.
17. The reference to a character earlier in the gospel who is referred to at a later event finds a parallel in the character of Nicodemus, found in the Fourth Gospel (cf. Jn 3:1 and 19:39).
18. See J.C. Anderson (1983), p. 20. Anderson also notes that while this woman accompanied Jesus to Jerusalem, like the women of 27:55-6, she is not privy to the private instruction given to the twelve. She approached Jesus after he took the disciples aside to predict the passion and resurrection in 20:17-19, and her only role is to request places of honour for her sons.
19. This redaction could have been motivated by a desire to avoid the discrepancies in the Marcan lists (cf. Mk 15:40, 47 and 16:1).
20. See Gundry (1982), p. 579 who would agree with this identification. Against this we have F.V. Filson (1960), p. 298 who argues that any mention of the mother of Jesus would hardly have referred to her without referring to her relationship to Jesus. Interestingly, W.C. Allen (1907), p. 297 quotes the example of Wellhausen, and going back to the Sinaitic Syriac text where both Mark and Matthew have the 'daughter' of James. As we will see, this interpretation

- was also favoured by the Syriac Didascalia.
21. Alternatively, the reference 'τοῦ μίχροϋ' may have been omitted on the grounds that it detracted from the status of James in the early Christian community, and in particular his leadership of Jewish Christianity (cf. Acts 15:13-21; 21:18; Gal 1:19; 2:9, 12). The use of the definite article before the name James may have compensated for this omission. Thus Gundry (1982), p. 579.
 22. We therefore disagree with Allen (1907), p. 297 and P. Benoit (1969), p. 189 who both identify Salome and the mother of the sons of Zebedee.
 23. For a recent discussion on the Matthean community see E. Schweizer (1983).
 24. See E.L. Bode (1970), p. 13 and n. 4.
 25. See Munro (1982).
 26. Matthew also mentions Herod in the nativity stories.
 27. Thus G. Strecker (1983), p. 71 and n. 12. He also refers us to several Matthean alterations of the Marcan house motif (cf. Mt 8:14; 9:10, 28; 12:46; 13:1, 36; 17:25).
 28. See H.J. Held (1972), pp. 165-300, esp. p. 241. This is a recognised comprehensive treatment of the miracles in Matthew.
 29. Matthew often inserts προσελθῶν to connote the divine dignity of Jesus who is approached with reverence. The only exceptions are 17:7, the transfiguration, and 20:16, a resurrection appearance. In both instances, Jesus has to approach the disciples because they are incapacitated.
 30. For a discussion of this miracle see Held (1972), pp. 180, 248, 253f.
 31. The crowd's presence is, however, implied in 9:20.
 32. See Held (1972), pp. 190f., 245, 275ff.; 288ff. on the importance of faith in the miracles.
 33. This will have important implications for our reflection upon Matthew's handling of Mk 16:8.
 34. According to V.K. Robbins, the first instance of repetition occurs when the woman presents her motive through speech which repeats the action in the narration. She touched the fringe of his garment, for she said to herself, 'if I only touch his garment, I shall be made well.' The second example of repetition occurs when Jesus repeats the woman's words 'I will be made well' with 'your faith has made you well.' The narrative then closes with the statement that the woman 'was made well from that hour.' This, according to Robbins, is an example of 'chain-link' repetition where words are linked together in a chain, and once a connecting link has moved to the next word, the previous word is repeated again, (1987), p. 505.
 35. Cf. Mt 15:22 and 20:30.
 36. Thus the setting in Matthew is a public one and contrasts with Mk 7:23f.
 37. It is interesting to note that Matthew alters Mark's house motif in several places, particularly when special teaching to the disciples is involved (cf. Mk 2:1//Mt 9:1; Mk 7:17//Mt 5:15; Mk 9:28//Mt 17:19; Mk 9:33-7, omitted in Mt 18:1-5 and Mk 10:10//Mt 19:1-12).
 38. Thus E.von Dobschütz (1983), p. 20.
 39. See Held (1972), pp. 197-8.
 40. For a feminist exegesis of Matthew's genealogy, see J.C. Anderson (1983), pp. 7-10. One of the main points she makes here is that in terms of gender, the genealogy of Jesus substantiates his patrilineal claim to the titles Christ, Son of Abraham and Son of David. The whole context is one of salvation history, and this in turn is viewed essentially in terms of male enterprise.

41. For a summary of the three most common interpretations see R.E. Brown (1978), pp. 78-83.
42. As E.D. Freed points out, however, the Jewish Christians to whom Matthew was writing no longer thought of those women as sinners but heroines. There is even evidence to suggest they had come to be regarded as distinguished women because they had done something beneficial for the Jewish people. For example, Rahab had helped the Israelites capture Jericho, and Bathsheba gave birth to Solomon, (1987), p. 4.
43. Thus Freed (1987), p. 4.
44. Thus for Anderson (1983), p. 10, the inclusion of the women in the genealogy foreshadows and explains Mary's role. These women point to, and at the same time come to terms with, the female production of the Messiah. Here God has acted in a radically new way, and more importantly, outside the patriarchal norm. She concludes, therefore, "although Jesus is Son of David through Joseph, he is Son of God through Mary."
45. In the first suggestion, the women are seen in terms of the Eve/Mary syndrome linking sin and sexuality. The second theory emphasises the Gentile background of the women, while ignoring their sexuality. The third suggestion stresses what the women have in common.
46. See R.E. Brown et al. (1978), pp. 82-83.
47. Thus Freed (1987), pp. 14-18.
48. For a discussion of the role of Mary in the birth narratives see R.E. Brown et al. (1978).
49. See J. Jeremias (1976), pp. 51-52. According to Jeremias, the parable is linked to the Parousia theme by the context (24:32-25:46 are categorised as Parousia parables) as well as by the immediate references of vv. 1 and 13. In v. 1, according to Jeremias, the $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ a favourite Matthean transition refers back to the Parousia mentioned in 24:44 and 50, and v. 13 also demands that Christians watch for they know neither the day nor the hour.
50. See *ibid.*, pp. 52-3. See also pp. 171f. for a discussion of Jewish wedding customs.
51. $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$ replaces the Marcan $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$.
52. Like the protestors in Mark, the disciples are angry at the waste of ointment which could have been sold and given to the poor. The omission of the repetition of ointment and 'for three hundred denarii', plus the definite article with the poor, further protects the disciples.
53. Thus D. Hill (1972), p. 333.
54. Cf. S.G.F. Brandon (1975), p. 155, who informs us that in later traditions the centurion having witnessed the death of Jesus then goes and reports what has happened to Pilate and his wife. The couple are so upset by the news that they both abstain from food that day. In later traditions, Procla, the wife of Pilate, is even canonised as a saint in the Eastern Church.
55. Thus Munro (1981), p. 229.
56. See J.D. Kingsbury (1978), p. 61.
57. See *ibid.*
58. In Mt 4:11, the angels minister to Jesus after the temptations. In 8:15, Peter's mother-in-law ministers to Jesus after she is cured. In 25:44, those on God's left in the parable of the sheep and goats ask, "Lord, when did we see thee hungry or thirsty or a stranger or naked or sick or in prison, and did not minister to thee?" Similarly in the chastisement of James and John in 20:25b-28 $\delta\iota\alpha\chi\omicron\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ is used in terms of service as ministering to physical

needs.

59. Thus Gundry (1983), pp. 579-80.
60. According to A.H. McNeile, this reference would be unnecessary for Jewish readers, (1915), p. 425. In terms of the Matthean use of his Marcan text we would suggest that Matthew is saving this reference to use in 27:62 where it is used as part of the Matthean apologetic; see Gundry (1983), p. 583 who stresses that Matthew has also created a succession of days here beginning with Jesus' crucifixion: the Preparation, the day after the Preparation, and "the evening of the Sabbath as day was developing into the first day of the week." He continues that by carefully highlighting this succession of days, Matthew points to Jesus' prediction that he will rise after three days, and this in turn is the only such prediction heard by the Jewish leaders.
61. It is suggested that Matthew possibly deduced that if Joseph was a respected member of the council, as his Marcan sources tell him, then he must have been wealthy. See C.H. Gibling (1975), pp. 406-420. Most scholars point to the links between Matthew and the 'Suffering Servant' of Isa. 53:9a. Thus Allen (1907), p. 298; A. Plummer (1909), p. 406; F.V. Filson (1960), p. 298; P. Benoit (1969), p. 215. According to Gundry (1983), p. 580, not only is *ἐνθρῶπος* a favourite Matthean word, but it is occasionally used as a term for the disciples (cf. 13:44) and for him this further supports the identification of Joseph as a disciple of Jesus who now shows his discipleship by ministering for the martyred Jesus. For a discussion of later legends concerning Joseph, see W. Barclay (1975), pp. 372-3.
62. See Luz (1983), p. 109. For a recent discussion of the concept of *μαθητής* in Matthew see H.J. Wilkins (1988).
63. We reject the interpretation of *ὅς καὶ αὐτὸς* to read, 'he (Joseph) as well as the women, had become a disciple of Jesus.' Thus McNeile (1915), p. 425.
64. According to McNeile, this approach fits in with the fact that friends were sometimes given the bodies of criminals for burial, and it would not have been difficult, therefore, for Joseph to approach Pilate as a Jew in a high position, (1915), p. 426.
65. See R. Mahoney (1974), p. 119, who suggests a reason for this omission, i.e. Matthew felt he could do without Mark's interpolation of 15:44f. because he had his own apologetic legend waiting in the wings (27:62-66).
66. Thus Gundry (1983), p. 581.
67. See Gundry (1983), p. 581, who notes parallels here where both Matthew and Luke try to improve on Mark. See also W.B. Barrick (1977), pp. 235f., who draws attention to Matthew's redaction of Mk 15:46 which emphasises the "body of Jesus." Barrick also points to the version of Isa 53:9a which is found in 1QSa and is interpreted by him to read, "and they made his grave with wicked (men), but his body (lay) with a rich (man)." If, as he argues, this interpretation of 1QSa is correct, then according to Barrick, this reference contains a version of Isa 53:9a which anticipates both Matthew's description of Joseph as a 'rich man', and the emphasis on the body of Jesus.
68. Cf. K.P.G. Curtis who has examined a number of similarities between Matthew and John in the burial and resurrection narratives and concludes that on this particular point Matthew was most probably John's source, (1972), p. 443. See also Benoit (1969), p. 216, who draws attention to these details as a reflection of the reverence, love and honour which are shown to Jesus in Matthew.

69. Cf. Gospel of Peter 6:24. Also possibly moving further in the direction of Isa 22:16 and 23:9. See I. Broer (1972), pp. 171-175 and 186.
70. In the Gospel of Peter, the stone is a great stone and it takes all who are there to push it against the entrance to the tomb.
71. As we have already suggested, this also conveniently avoids the difficulties with the Marcan textual variants.
72. See Schweizer (1982), p. 518.
73. We also note the use of μαρτιά here and in Jn 20:16.
74. The Pharisees are introduced here as a specifically named group for the first time in the developing passion tradition. See Mark 14-16 where they are never mentioned. According to R.H. Fuller (1980), p. 72 and n. 1 their insertion here is consistent with the anti-Pharisaic polemic sustained throughout the gospel.
75. According to R.E. Brown (1987), p. 331, one argument for seeing Mt 27:62-66 as an account which was possibly earlier than the story of the guard at the tomb in the Gospel of Peter, is that the Matthean account is more coherent in terms of a story which might arise among Jewish believers in Jesus. Thus the Matthean account where Matthew involves the Jewish priests and the Pharisees is no more than a request to Pilate so that only the Roman guards were at the tomb, is to be preferred to the GP 7:25-9:34. Here the Jewish elders and the scribes, together with a crowd from Jerusalem, guard the tomb.
76. Thus R.H. Fuller (1980), p. 73. See also H.F. von Campenhausen (1958), pp. 28f. for a brief discussion of this narrative.
77. Cf. W.L. Craig (1984), pp. 273-81. See also Fuller (1980), pp. 72-3 for evidence on the post-Easter nature of this legend.
78. See Alsup (1975), pp. 116-117. For Neirynck (1968-9), pp. 170-176, 184 and 190, the Matthean legend is developed solely from the Marcan text.
79. Cf. B.A. Johnson (1966).
80. Since we will argue in our treatment of the christophanies to the women in Matthew and John that it is more likely that the angelophany was developed into a christophany, we also think it unlikely that the guard story was originally a christophany.
81. Thus Alsup (1975), p. 117. See, however, J.D. Crossan (1985), pp. 125f.
82. Those who find some kind of embarrassment include Allen (1907), p. 299.
83. See Jeremias (1974), pp. 75-9. This contrasts with Jn 18:28 where the Jews are so afraid of becoming unclean that they do not even dare enter Pilate's place the day before. We also note Matthew's concern that the flight in the last days will not be on the sabbath (Mt 24:20).
84. According to Fuller, the story presupposes many earlier stages in the history of the tradition, including the earliest resurrection kerygma of the resurrection of Jesus from the dead on the third day, the story of the burial and the empty tomb in its Marcan form and the Jewish polemic against that story. See (1980), pp. 72-3. We also note that 'after three days' is a formulation of Mk 8:31 which Matthew previously altered to 'on the third day.'
85. See Gospel of Peter 8:28-9:34 which adds the details of the name of the officer on watch. Here it is the elders, scribes and soldiers who roll a stone against the tomb. The tomb is then sealed with seven seals and all then join in the watch. Finally, a crowd from Jerusalem comes to observe the scene.
86. According to Brown (1987), p. 332, Mt 27:62-28:15 represents the

combination of two stories; one regarding the soldiers guarding the tomb, and one dealing with the visit of the women to the tomb. The second story has been taken from Mark, and Matthew has affected the combination of the two by alternating the scenes as we see in 28:4. Support for this theory is found, argues Brown, in the infancy narratives.

87. Cf. Bode (1970), p. 52. We are reminded here that the effect on the guards is similar to the effect of Daniel's vision on him (Dan 10:8-9), and the vision of the son of man on the seer in Rev 1:17.
88. See Craig (1985), p. 374, who raises the historical questions associated with whether or not Roman guards would have reported to the chief priests.
89. For H. Graß (1970), p. 23, and J. Schniewind (1956), p. 278, behind this story of the guard there lie conflicts and discussions in the early church. For J. Daniélou (1968), p. 221, this is more likely an apologetic legend which was intended to refute Jewish tradition. See also Evans (1970), p. 82 who points to the apologetic nature of this tradition. Likewise Filson (1960), pp. 229-330; Bode (1970), p. 52; Evans (1970), p. 82.
90. Thus Neiryneck (1968-69), p. 171.
91. See BAG 606.
92. Thus Filson (1960), p. 301.
93. See Grintz (1960), pp. 37-38.
94. See Gundry (1983), pp. 585-586. See also Allen (1907), pp. 300-301; McNeile (1915), p. 431; Bode (1970), pp. 12-13. Among those who would argue that Matthew's timing is similar to Mark see G.R. Driver (1965), pp. 327-328.
95. This is also textually expected because of the guard at the tomb.
96. Thus Neiryneck (1968-9), p. 176, considers Matthew's version is the more original. See also Benoit (1969), pp. 225 and 245. Fuller (1980), p. 76 disagrees, and he assigns the words "to see the sepulchre" to Matthean redaction.
97. See Benoit (1969), pp. 246-7 who sees Matthew's text to be rich in the style of the Old Testament, and Matthew is illustrating here in imaginative language a reality which is both transcendent and inexpressible. Benoit also takes the opportunity here to comment on the restrained nature of the Matthean account when compared with the apocryphal gospels.
98. Thus M. Goulder (1974), p. 447. See also Fuller (1980), p. 74 who notes that the insertion of miraculous phenomena here is Matthean.
99. See Gundry (1983), p. 587.
100. See Plummer (1909), p. 416, who considers that the descent of the angel is witnessed by no-one.
101. Cf. C.K. Barrett (1956), p. 15 for Roman concern over grave disturbance.
102. Thus Bode (1970), p. 51.
103. Cf. the Gospel of Peter 9:37 where the stone rolls away itself. We also note here that Matthew uses ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ of God's throne in 23:22, and in his account of Jesus' entry to Jerusalem in 21:7.
104. Thus Fuller (1980), p. 74.
105. Matthew uses ἐνδύματα in texts peculiar to him (cf. 7:15, 22:11, 12).
106. Cf. 3:4. According to Bode (1970), pp. 50-51, Matthew has assimilated his description of the angel to phrases in Dan 10:6 and 7:9. Thus in Dan 10:6 there is a heavenly vision of a man with his appearance of lightning. Also, in the Theodotion version of Dan 7:9 the ancient of days is described as having raiment like white snow. See also R.H. Gundry (1967), p. 146.
107. It is also interesting to point out that the transfiguration was

- one of two occasions when Jesus is described as approaching (προσέλθων) his disciples because he has incapacitated them (cf. 17:7; 28:8).
108. Thus Hill (1972), p. 359.
 109. See Neirynck (1968-69), p. 173.
 110. We also think of the stilling of the storm pericope and 'Καὶ ἰδοὺ σεισμός μέγας ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ'. For an earthquake as an apocalyptic sign see Bode (1970), p. 51.
 111. See Lk 24:5 where instead of the 'I know you are looking', we have 'Why do you seek the living among the dead?'
 112. See Mt 27:63.
 113. Matthew also alters the reference from Peter to disciples in the fig tree story Mt 21:20//Mk 11:21. The rebuke of Peter at Caesarea Philippi is also much harsher in Mt 16:23. On the whole, however, Peter does occupy a special position in the gospel. On the ambiguous role of Peter see E. Schweizer (1983), p. 135.
 114. Thus Fuller (1980), p. 76. Goulder (1974), p. 447. If correct, this also indirectly supports our theory that Mark ended with 16:8 and had no post-resurrection appearance to Peter.
 115. J. Jeremias (1975), p. 307 suggests that there was a deliberate anti-Petrine group in the early church which took offence at the universalism of Peter (Gal 2:12b; Acts 11:2) and, therefore, displaced him from the role of having been the first to experience the Risen Lord.
 116. See Perrin (1977), p. 47 who sees no trace of the theme of discipleship failure in Matthew in connection with the women. According to C.A. Jarvis (1988), the women are models of discipleship and belief, and, therefore, models of encouragement to those who fear.
 117. See Evans (1970), p. 87.
 118. According to Alsop (1975), p. 114, this is the case here and he is supported by a number of scholars including Neirynck (1968-69), pp. 176f. who sees a combination of elements at work here. See also Bode (1970), p. 76; Evans (1970), p. 83; Fuller (1980), pp. 77f.
Other scholars would prefer to find a more direct link between Matthew and the lost ending of Mark. Thus Allen (1907), pp. 302-304; G.W. Trompf (1971-2); Gundry (1983), p. 591. Less certain is Schweizer (1982), pp. 522-3.
 119. This is suggested by Graß (1964), pp. 27-28. Fuller (1980), pp. 78-79 would agree here, though he adds the qualification that Matthew may possibly be using traditional material here. See also K.P.G. Curtis (1972) who argues that it is Matthew himself who first puts the reference to the disciples as ἀδελφοίς onto the lips of Jesus and he argues this is supported by the use of ἀδελφός elsewhere in the gospel. Finally, see O. Michel (1983), p. 30 who also sees Mt 28:9-10 as having the same preparatory function as the appearance to Mary Magdalene in the Fourth Gospel. Both gospels may recognize the women as witnesses, but it is the men who are commissioned.
 120. This formula is frequently found in Matthew (cf. 1:20; 2:13, 19; 3:16, 17; 17:3, 5). See Filson (1960), p. 302, who notes that it occurs four times in 28:1-10 and serves to mark the importance and striking character of the events narrated here.
 121. See Neirynck (1968-69), p. 177, who notes that Matthew twice adds this to Mark. See also Gundry (1983), p. 591 who identifies λέγων as a favourite Matthean word.
 122. See *ibid.*, p. 178. Neirynck notes that in the other gospels, the Risen One invites the disciples to touch his body (cf. Lk 24:39; Jn

- 20:27). Matthew does not have this motif in the christophany of 20:16-20. It is also interesting to note that in Matthew, worship is the gesture of the supplicant and we particularly recall the mother of the sons of Zebedee (20:20) and the Canaanite woman (15:25).
123. Ibid., p. 180. We also recall here the words of Jesus to Peter as he walks on the water, εἰς τὶ ἐδίστασας.
 124. See Gundry (1983), p. 591, who sees the list of Mattheanisms growing longer here. Meanwhile Schweizer (1982), p. 523 draws our attention to the connection between the phrase "to his brothers" and Ps 22:22, "I will proclaim your name to my brothers." This ties in, he believes, with the importance of Ps 22 in the passion narrative as a whole. For Curtis (1972), p. 441, Matthew has most probably used the conventional material (v. 9), and the angel's speech (v. 10) and created his own revised version of part of the angel's message.
 125. See Neirynck (1968-69), p. 182.
 126. In Mk 3:34-5 it is not clear who Jesus is looking at when he looks at those about him. Luke omits the look altogether (cf Lk 8:21).
 127. See J.E. Alsup (1975), pp. 108-114; Neirynck (1984), esp. pp. 166-171.
 128. Cf. Mk 15:18//Mt 26:49; Lk 1:28.
 129. We will explore this in our study of John. For the moment, see B. Lindars (1972), p. 595 and (1960-61), pp. 142-7, esp. p. 143.
 130. See R.E. Brown (1975), p. 999.
 131. Neirynck (1984), p. 168 finds a classic example in ἡψατο in Mt 8:15 and χρατήσας in Mk 1:31.
 132. This is, however, challenged by Neirynck (1983), p. 169.
 133. Thus Neirynck (1968-69), p. 170; Curtis (1972), p. 440.
 134. See Perkins (1984), p. 129.
 135. See Evans (1970), p. 83; Alsup (1975), p. 114.
 136. Thus Fuller (1980), p. 3.
 137. See Perrin (1977), p. 56.
 138. Cf. Didascalia XV, Vööbus (1979), pp. 145 and 151.

CHAPTER FOUR

WOMEN IN LUKE'S ACCOUNT OF THE CRUCIFIXION, BURIAL AND EMPTY TOMB

In our first two chapters on women at the scenes of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb we began with an analysis of Mark, the earliest narrative account of the empty tomb tradition. Since we consider Matthew's version to be the closest to Mark, the Matthean texts were then examined with close attention being given to the similarities and differences between Mark and Matthew's treatment of these texts.

In dealing primarily with the literary questions associated with this study, we were interested to see how Matthew dealt with the Marcan source and in particular any modifications, alterations, omissions or insertions he made. Beyond this we tried to determine Matthean theological tendencies. In this study we noted that the Marcan text had been developed to include an appearance tradition to the women (Mt 28:9-10), which we were able to establish was not taken from an independent source, but was rather a piece of Matthean compositional theology, creating a link between the empty tomb tradition and the appearance tradition. Matthew also introduced a male element into the tomb tradition, and the women now appear together with the guards and it is, moreover, the reactions of the guards to the angelophany and not those of the women which are recorded, unlike Mk 16:5. In our analysis of Mark's empty tomb tradition we suggested that in reporting the three incidents of the women, with the re-appearance of Mary Magdalene at the head of each list, Mark was possibly responsible for emphasising the role of this particular female witness. This suggestion was reinforced by Matthew's handling of the tradition and here Mary Magdalene continued at the head of the lists with the other women being redacted out of the tradition (cf. Mt 27:61 and 28:1).¹

In examining the account of the burial in Mark we asked whether Joseph of Arimathea's role in burying Jesus may have been intended to discredit the male disciples, who, unlike the disciples of John, failed to bury their dead master (cf. Mk 6:29). In this case we concluded that Joseph did not necessarily play this role. Any possible suggestion that Joseph of Arimathea's appearance was linked to the evangelist's portrayal of the male disciples was taken much further by Matthew, and here Joseph

himself is described as a μαθητής and we concluded that in this case this was part of Matthew's attempt to rehabilitate this group. The guard at the tomb in Mt 27:62-6 was not seen as a further ^{deliberate} attempt to redact the males back into the traditions of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb, although this was the inevitable effect of this redaction.

In examining the story of the empty tomb in particular, we noted that Matthew's motivation for the women's visit was to 'see' the tomb (Mt 28:1), and not to 'anoint' the body of Jesus (Mk 16:1), and we suggested that Matthew was probably more plausible here than Mark. We noted that Matthew had developed the empty tomb account by mentioning an earthquake and the descent of an angel, and he had also omitted the reference καὶ τὸ πέτρῳ from Mk 16:7. The empty tomb story in Matthew then concluded with an alteration of Mk 16:8 and instead of departing in silence, the women left in joy and haste to tell the male disciples. Finally, we have already mentioned that the women are met en route by Jesus (Mt 28:8-10), and Matthew closes his account with a christophany to the male disciples (Mt 28:16-20).

Our general conclusions regarding both gospels were that Mark had allowed the women to stand in his gospel as representatives of the male disciples. They were accepted as legitimate followers of Jesus, albeit 'fallible' ones, and ultimately they too, like the male disciples, abandoned Jesus (cf. Mk 16:8). In Matthew, however, we concluded that the women were not allowed to stand alone as representatives of the male disciples. Furthermore, we suggested that the description of Joseph of Arimathea as a male disciple was an attempt to redact the male disciples back into the tradition. The introduction of the guards, together with the emphasis on their reactions at the tomb, further detracted, perhaps albeit unintentionally, from the role of the women at the scene of the empty tomb. Finally, although the women received a christophany, we suggested that this scene primarily served to effect a link between the empty tomb tradition and the appearance tradition, and ultimately the disciples received their own christophany and they alone receive a commission from the risen Jesus, thus ensuring the independence of their resurrection faith from the tomb tradition and thus ultimately the women. In all of this it was, however, stressed that rather than redacting out the women, Matthew's primary motivation was probably to redact the men into the tradition, albeit with the inevitable result that the women's witness was thus overshadowed by the male witnesses.

This introductory review of the Marcan and Matthean treatments of our three texts is very pertinent to our present study in Luke, and in particular his more general portrayal of women. For some considerable time Luke's gospel has been noted for its favourable treatment of women and indeed, he has been referred to as the most sympathetic New Testament writer in dealing with women.² In reviewing Luke's treatment of women retrospectively we immediately note the considerable number of passages in Luke's gospel involving women. But before deciding that this means Luke was, therefore, necessarily more favourably disposed towards women, we must also consider judgements such as that of E. Schüssler Fiorenza who comments that Luke was an androcentric writer *whose subtle redaction attempted to disqualify women as resurrection witnesses.*³

As in our earlier chapters, before beginning our detailed examination, we will briefly note the changes in the Lucan text as compared with Mark's treatment of the scenes of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb in order to gain a general overview of these Lucan texts. Once again we are, therefore, accepting the solution to the Synoptic problem which holds that Luke had access to the earliest gospel Mark, and he used this as a basis for his own work. In addition, Luke also had access to non-Markan material in a sayings source, usually designated 'Q', and he supplemented this with his own special material, which may or may not have been of his own composition.

Beginning with the crucifixion, we note that in agreement with Mark, Luke has a group of women at the scene. These women are not, however, specifically identified as in Mk 15:40, and there is an added reference to all Jesus' acquaintances (male), πάντες οἱ γινώστοι αὐτοῦ (23:49). Luke agrees with both Mark and Matthew (Mk 15:40-1; Mt 27:55-6) that the women had followed Jesus from Galilee, but there is no reference to their previous service here, unless we include Lk 8:1-3 which would link the Easter stories with the Galilean ministry.⁴

In Luke's account of the burial, there is little variation from the Marcan account. Luke does, however, elaborate on the description of Joseph of Arimathea who now becomes a good and righteous man who had nothing to do with the death of Jesus (cf. Lk 23:50-1 and Mk 15:43; Mt 27:57). The tomb itself is now described as a tomb in which no one had previously been laid, agreeing with Mt 27:60, and going beyond Mk 15:46. Once again, although the women are witnesses to the event as in Mark and Matthew, Luke does not specifically identify them. Finally, Luke

mentions that the spices are prepared on the Friday evening, presumably because the sabbath was approaching (23:56). There is no specific reference here to an anointing of the body of Jesus for burial (cf. Jn 19:39f.), and instead Luke draws our attention to the Jewish custom that the women rested on the sabbath day according to the commandment.

In Luke's empty tomb story we do not begin with the naming of the women and instead this is left until the end of the Lucan empty tomb narrative (cf. 24:10). This list of women also differs from Mark, and here we have Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Mary the (mother) of James and the rest, implying there were more women than Mark's original group of three. In agreement with Mark, the women bring spices to the grave, though interestingly in Luke there is no further reference to an actual anointing. There is a different time reference here, and there is no parallel to the Marcan questioning of the women as to who would move the stone (cf. Mk 16:3). Indeed the stone itself is only mentioned for the first time in Lk 24:2.

According to Luke, the women then enter the tomb on their own initiative and, finding no body, they are perplexed (Lk 24:3-4). This is at variance with Mark where the women, noticing the stone has been moved, are met by a young man who invites them to enter the tomb, and with Matthew where there is no specific reference to the women entering the tomb (cf. Mk 16:4f.; Mt 28:3). The Marcan *καὶ εὐαγγέλιον* is not reproduced here, and instead we read of *ἀνδρες δύο*.⁵ The message in Lk 24:6 is also different from that recorded in Mk 16:6, and the reference to Galilee where the disciples will see Jesus is now a recollection of a prediction Jesus made while in Galilee about the resurrection. Finally, there is no reference to the Marcan fear motif and the silence of the women, who now depart to tell the eleven and the rest (*τοῖς ἑνδεκά καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς λοιποῖς*), even though their story is not believed.

The above list of similarities and differences between the Lucan and Marcan accounts of the empty tomb in particular have led scholars to suggest either that Luke was using Mark with editorial modifications,⁶ or alternatively, he had access to another source which he supplemented with Marcan additions.⁷ Whether we decide Luke was using Mark, or Mark together with some other source, will have obvious implications for how we view the Lucan narratives of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb. Throughout our analysis of the Lucan texts we will, therefore, have to decide whether we can explain the Lucan alterations of Mark on the basis

of particular Lucan theological concerns.⁸ If in the event we decide Mark was Luke's main source, which he then expanded, we will once again need to consider the implications of this conclusion for our evaluation of the Marcan and Matthean texts of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb.

Finally, beyond discussing the question of the relationship between Luke and the other Synoptic gospels, we will also have to consider the relationship between Luke and the Fourth Gospel, especially in respect of the relationship between Lk 24:12 and Jn 20:3-10. Does Lk 24:12 belong to the Lucan text, and if so what is the relationship between Luke and John? Or, was this tradition added to Luke's tomb tradition by Luke or a later redactor? Finally, is Jn 20:3-10 based on this tradition, or do both texts ultimately go back to a common source?

Beyond dealing with these specific questions, our ultimate aim in dealing with these texts will be to discern whether in his redaction Luke was responsible for further redacting women out of the empty tomb tradition, and if so, was this redaction intentional? Once again we will examine the role of women retrospectively within the gospel as a whole to establish a more general overview of how Luke interpreted the role and status of women within his gospel. Did he represent the most positive treatment of women in the New Testament, or is he a representative of later attempts within the early church to redact women out of the resurrection tradition?

A. THE CRUCIFIXION - Lk 23:48-9

The reference to the presence of women at the scene of the crucifixion in Lk 23:49 is not the first mention of women in the Lucan account of the crucifixion of Jesus. Luke has already referred to the weeping daughters of Jerusalem in 23:27-31 following upon the reference to Simon of Cyrene carrying the cross.⁹ The women here are warned by Jesus that they should not weep for him, but for themselves and the terrible fate which awaits them in the future.¹⁰ The interesting question here for our purposes is who do these women represent? Are they real or symbolic figures?

If the reference is to real women, then according to I.H. Marshall they are not the Galilean women who had followed Jesus, but local women who turned out to witness executions and provide opiates for condemned men.¹¹

It is also possible, and we consider it more likely, that, these

women are symbolic representatives for Jerusalem. This identification is supported by the double notation, the λαός and the women in vv. 27 and 28.¹² Since the Jerusalem narrative of Luke's gospel (19:28-24:53) indicates a preference for λαός in a series of passages where Luke distinguishes them as friendly Jews over against the leaders who are plotting to kill Jesus, it is possible to conclude that the λαός had special significance for Luke.¹³

Moving on from this earlier positive portrayal of the λαός, we must ask are the λαός and the women synonymous or distinct? According to J.H. Neyrey, these two groups are not to be identified and this conclusion is suggested by the identification of the women as 'daughters of Jerusalem.'¹⁴ For Luke, writing from a vantage point after CE 70, it is the women, 'the daughters of Jerusalem', as distinguished from the people, who are addressed in Lk 23:27-31. These women are, moreover, representatives of the element of Israel who continually rejected God's messengers and are, therefore, recipients of this divine judgement oracle.¹⁵

Seen against the wider background of the Lucan passion narrative, and the literary structure of this section of the gospel, the weeping women at Jesus' exit from Jerusalem, provide a striking contrast with Jesus' own weeping at his entry to the city in 19:41f. Beyond this we also recall the use of both weeping and turning motifs in the denial by Peter in Lk 22:54f. However, whereas Peter's weeping is to be interpreted as an act of repentance in view of 5:8f., the women's weeping is interpreted as a sign of the future condemnation of this stubborn remnant of Israel. Their futile action is, furthermore, a very forceful image of the failure of Jerusalem to heed the warnings to this city which are scattered throughout the gospel (cf. 11:49-51; 13:1-5, 34f.; 19:41-4; 21:20-1). It is also interesting to note here that the terrible fate Luke envisages for the women is a gratefulness for being barren. We have already seen that the position of women in both Judaism and the Graeco-Roman world was such that the main roles open to women were as a wife and mother. Seen against this background, Luke indirectly accepts this general (world) view.

The significance of this negative portrayal of the daughters of Jerusalem, as far as we are concerned, is that it creates an important backdrop for the appearance of the Galilean women at the scene of the crucifixion in Luke. This reference to the daughters of Jerusalem is,

moreover, not found in either Mark or Matthew, and the female figure who heads the passion narrative in both these gospels is the positive image of the woman who anoints Jesus. Since the anointing of Jesus occurs much earlier in Luke, the evangelist does not presumably intend his readers to connect this event with the death and burial of Jesus, and indeed, in the Lucan account there is no reference to the anointing of Jesus' body beforehand for burial (cf. Lk 7:36-50; Mt 26:6-13; Jn 12:1-8). Instead the immediate reference to females is to the rebuke of the women of Jerusalem.

Turning now to Lk 23:48-9 we note that Luke prefaces the references to the women at the crucifixion with a reference to the crowds who also watch at the scene of Jesus' death, together with πάντες οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτοῦ. Thus Mark's reference to the women has been expanded to include references to two other groups of people. The Marcan reference to the women watching from afar is retained, though the women themselves are not specifically identified at this point. In agreement with Matthew, Luke has ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας and not ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ. There is also no reference here to the fact that the women had followed Jesus to Jerusalem (cf. Mk 15:41). Once again, we will examine the text in detail before commenting on whether or not these alterations are theologically significant.

1. v. 48

Luke adds to his Marcan narrative a reference to a group of bystanders who react to Jesus' death by beating their breasts and departing.¹⁶ According to Marshall this is not a sign of repentance, but more likely an expression of grief at the death of a victim of execution.¹⁷ It is C.H. Dodd's opinion, however, that this is an editorial comment by Luke, though he does not expand on its theological significance.¹⁸

Since our comments in previous chapters on the role of women at the scene of the crucifixion have focused on their role as witnesses, we would suggest that the prefacing of the watching women in Luke by the watching crowds is probably significant. We have already suggested that Mark's important 'watching' theme was not developed further by Matthew, since not only were 'watching' and 'seeing' no longer the important theological verbs in Matthew that they were for Mark, but the Matthean redaction of Mk 15:40-1 to a certain extent has lost the nuances of the Marcan text. In Matthew's crucifixion scene the three women are not mentioned until 27:56, and thus any close parallel between the women and

their watching has lost some of its impact in the Matthean text (cf. Mt 27:55-6). This watching motif was further diluted in the Matthean report of the burial where θεωπέω is omitted and the women sit opposite the sepulchre while the guards do the watching. Here in Luke the watching women are mentioned only after a reference to a larger group (ὄχλος) who also watch the scene.

2. v. 49

Luke agrees with the other Synoptic writers over against John that the women were positioned away from the cross (ἀπὸ μακρόθεν) rather than beside it (παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ), and this suggests Luke was drawing upon Mark at this point.¹⁹ Luke does, however, agree with Jn 19:25 in the use of εἴστηκα, and this is just one of a number of parallels between the Lucan and Johannine stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb which we will examine below.²⁰ The reference to οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτῷ also agrees with John in that it suggests the women were not alone at the crucifixion, and other male followers of Jesus were present (cf. Jn 19:26). While we can accept that the particular group of three women were not necessarily alone in Mk 15:40//Mt 27:56, and ἐν αἷς suggests there were others present, the use of the feminine form in Mark and Matthew, as opposed to the masculine form in Luke, would suggest that these references are not interchangeable. According to Marshall, the Lucan reference is meant to include the disciples of Jesus and prepare us for the role of Joseph of Arimathea in the burial story.²¹ K.H. Rengstorf would, however, disagree and he even suggests that we should attribute some significance to the fact that Luke ceases to use μαθητής for the disciples of Jesus at the end of the Gethsemane story (22:45). From then on in Luke we read only of οἱ περὶ αὐτόν (22:49; 22:56, 58, 59), οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτῷ (23:49), οἱ ἐνδεκα καὶ πάντες οἱ λοιποὶ (24:9), αὐτοὶ (24:13) and οἱ ἐνδεκα καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς (24:33).²² While this leads Rengstorf to conclude that the only possible explanation for this is to mark a breach in the relationship between Jesus and his disciples, which is, furthermore, only repaired after the resurrection, we would suggest this should not mean that we can, therefore, interpret the women as acting for the disciples in Luke. Indeed, as our examination of the texts will demonstrate, if anything the women in Luke are joined by other males and ultimately the witness of the disciples in Luke is kept independent of the witnessing of the women (cf. 24:11 καὶ ἐφάνησαν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λῆρος τὰ ῥήματα

ταῦτα).

The fact that Marshall can suggest that Luke was able to include male disciples at the cross is due to the earlier omission by Luke of Mk 14:50 'and they all forsook him and fled'. We are not told in Luke that the male disciples abandoned Jesus upon his arrest. This sympathetic picture of the male disciples is also continued in the Lucan version of the Gethsemane scene. There is no repetition of the Marcan approach to the sleeping disciples three times (Mk 14:37, 39 and 41). Instead there is one prayer and one awakening, with the emphasis on understandable exhaustion in the face of great sorrow (cf. 22:45 par.). This lack of repetition has, therefore, diluted the ferocity of Mark's attack on the disciples. Furthermore, there is no contrast between the three men who fail to watch with Jesus in Gethsemane and the three women who watch at the crucifixion (Mk 14:33 and 15:40). Luke neither specifies the number of disciples involved in the Gethsemane scene nor the number of women at the crucifixion.

In more specific terms, Luke also softens the harsh Marcan portrait of both the betrayal by Judas and the denial by Peter, and both actions are seen as part of the divine plan, and the work of Satan acting through human agents (cf. Lk 22:3-6 and 22:31). Moreover, the betrayal by Judas is not mentioned by Luke at the same point as Mark who positions it at the beginning of chapter 14, and the betrayal by Judas is balanced in Mark by the actions of the Jewish authorities to kill Jesus on the one hand, and the anointing of Jesus for burial by the unnamed woman on the other.²³ Luke also omits the Marcan reference 'it would have been better for that man if he had not been born' (cf. Mk 14:21 and Mt 26:24). Thus, although Luke includes the three Marcan references to the betrayal in 22:3, 21 and 47, by making this action the result of Satan's evil doing, Luke has to a certain extent toned down the negative image of Judas presented in Mark.²⁴ Indeed, although Luke mentions the intention that Jesus will be betrayed by a kiss, he omits any reference to the act in progress (cf. Lk 22:47-53).

As regards the Petrine denial, Luke not only makes Satan ultimately responsible for this, but by the earlier reference to Peter's repentance in 5:8, the reader is prepared for the fact that Peter will repent and return to strengthen the brethren (cf. 22:32).²⁵ The fact that Luke specifically identifies three separate witnesses to the denial, one woman and two men,²⁶ need not be seen as an attempt to portray Peter's denial

more emphatically than the Marcan version, but rather Luke has Dt 17:6 and 19:5 in mind here.²⁷ Finally, Peter's act of repentance in the passion takes up an important Lucan theme of repentance which also recurs in Acts 10 at the admission of the Gentile Cornelius.

The reference to the women who accompanied Jesus from Galilee agrees with the Marcan text, but as we have already noted, Luke, unlike Mark, does not specifically identify these women.²⁸ Was this because Luke was aware of the discrepancies in the Marcan lists and he wished to avoid the difficulties these created? Or did Luke feel it unnecessary to identify the women afresh since he had already listed their names in 8:1-3? It is our opinion that while Luke's single reference to the women overcomes the problems associated with the three varying references given in Mark, Luke could just have easily mentioned these women at the beginning rather than at the end of his narrative. As for the question of unnecessary repetition, the fact that Luke identifies the women in 24:10 suggests he did not feel this was the case. Indeed the women of 24:10 do not exactly match those of 8:1-3.²⁹ Even though we can find a Lucan precedent for the practice of listing women at the end, rather than at the beginning of a narrative (cf. Acts 1:13), it is possible, in view of the other Lucan attempts to play down the role of the women as witnesses to the Easter events, to see something more than this behind Luke's redaction. By not identifying the women until 24:10, Luke thereby directs attention away from the role of the women in these narratives.

It is interesting to note here that Luke omits the Marcan reference to the διακονίᾳ of the women, he also omits the Marcan phrasing ἡκολούθουν ... συναναβᾶσαι, and although he uses the latter word in Acts 13:31 to refer to the resurrection witnesses, it is significantly only in reference to male witnesses.

Before discussing any retrospective significance of the term ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας we will briefly summarise the developments of the Marcan text which we find in Luke's version of the women at the cross. As with Matthew's version of Mk 15:40-1, one of the first alterations of the text in Luke is the lessening of the emphasis on the three particular women who 'watch' in Mark. However, whereas Matthew moves the reference to the others and πολλὰί, therefore, occurs much earlier in the Matthean text, Luke refers to two other groups before mentioning the women who also watch, namely the crowds and 'those known to him'. Luke does not, therefore, maintain Mark's emphasis on the watching women vis à vis the

male disciples who fail to watch, since as we have already noted, Luke has watered down Mark's criticisms of the male disciples, and here in particular we learn that watching is not a prerogative of the women alone.

As in Mark and Matthew, the women still stand 'from afar' and observe, but whether this implied any criticism of their watching we will decide below. Luke does not follow Mark and identify specifically who the women at the cross actually are, and he alters the reference ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ to read ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας. In reviewing Matthew's alteration of Mark, we suggested that the motivation for this alteration was probably literary, and the desire for ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας to balance with ἀπὸ μακρόθεν. Since Luke has, however, omitted any reference to the Marcan service (διακονεῖν) or following (ἀκολουθεῖν) of the women at this point, we must, therefore, examine the role and status of the women in the gospel in order to gain a general view of how Luke perceived the role of women in his gospel and more specifically in the scenes of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb.

In both of our previous chapters on women at the crucifixion we examined the scene of the women at the cross in terms of its retrospective significance for the role and status of women in the gospel as a whole. This examination was prompted by Munro's article on the women in Mk 15:40-1.³⁰

Since Luke has already mentioned women who followed Jesus while he was in Galilee in 8:1-3 we are probably even more justified in the case of the Third Gospel in asking how Luke portrays the women in his gospel. Are the women in the Third Gospel presented in a positive or negative light, and beyond this does the presentation of these women suggest we are to interpret their presence at the cross as being representatives for the male disciples of Jesus?

Once again, beginning with our comments on language, we note the inclusive nature of androcentric language. We cannot, however, accept any suggestion that women are rarely referred to in Luke's gospel, except in terms of their relationships to men. Attention has already been drawn to the sexual parallelism of the Third Gospel where " ... man and woman stand together, side by side before God. They are equal in honour and grace, they are endowed with the same gifts and have the same responsibilities."³¹ What we need to undertake in our evaluation of the gospel, however, is not just a review of the passages in Luke in which

women appear, but a critical evaluation of Luke's theological tendencies in order to discern what these passages tell us about how Luke viewed the women passages in his gospel.

In reviewing the gospel, we must also remind ourselves that Luke-Acts is a two volume work and this is a fact which has significance not only for the general portrayal of women but also for the redaction of Luke 24. We have already learned that women had an important part to play in Acts in the house church movement (cf. 12:12). Women were also able to offer financial assistance to the church (cf. 13:50, 17:4, 13) and husbands and wives were allowed to work together in the missionary situation (cf. 18:2, 18, 20). However, apart from the references to the four daughters of Philip who prophesy (Acts 21:9), we did not find any evidence in Acts to suggest that women were generally allowed to fulfil any teaching role. We must now look at the treatment of women in the gospel to see how Luke portrays women in the ministry of Jesus.

The first point we can make here is that women appear in this gospel who are not mentioned elsewhere in the Synoptic tradition, and these include both Elizabeth and Anna in the infancy narratives (cf. 1:5-25, 36-45, 57-62 and 2:36-38), the women referred to in 8:1-3, and Martha and Mary in 10:38-42.

The next section we considered in dealing with Mark and Matthew's portrayal of women were the miracles involving women. We pointed out here that both writers included four miracles involving women. These were the healing of Simon's mother-in-law (Mk 1:29-31//Mt 8:14-15); Jairus' daughter (Mk 5:22-4, 35-43//Mt 9:18-19, 23-26); the woman with the haemorrhage (Mk 5:25//Mt 9:20-22); and the Syro-Phoenician, Canaanite woman's daughter (Mk 7:24-30//Mt 15:21-8). Matthew did not add any new miracles involving women. Luke retains three of Mark's four miracles and adds two of his own, namely the healing of the bent woman on the sabbath in 13:10-17 and the miracle on behalf of the widow of Nain in 7:11-17. Luke omits the healing of the Syro-Phoenician woman's daughter and according to B. Witherington this was most probably because the evangelist found this miracle too offensive for his audience.³²

Examining these miracles as they appear in Luke we note that like Mark, Luke begins his account of the ministry of Jesus by including the reference to the cure of Simon's mother-in-law (cf. Lk 4:38-9). The miracle is reported in a manner similar to Mark's, although some changes are worth commenting on. As in Mark, Luke records that Jesus is told of

the woman, but unlike Mark, Luke gives no details of Jesus taking the woman's hand. Instead in Luke the emphasis is on Jesus' 'rebuking' the fever in a manner which will later be echoed in the Lucan accounts of the exorcisms of Jesus where Jesus 'rebukes' Satan. Thus in redacting this miracle Luke has emphasised a more general concern of the Third Gospel which is to present the ministry of Jesus as an attack upon the powers of Satan.³³ Luke then concludes by emphasising the immediacy of the cure and the woman serves Jesus. We suggested in Mark that the service intended here was probably table service. This is also probably the case here, and in Luke this service foreshadows the service offered by the women of 8:1-3, that offered in gratitude by the sinful woman of 7:36-50, and finally the service of Martha in 10:38-42.

Luke also includes Mark's intercalated miracles of the raising of Jairus' daughter and the healing of the woman with the flow of blood (cf. 8:40-56). He has, however, omitted certain Marcan details including the reference to the repeated efforts of the physicians to cure the woman (cf. Mk 5:26) and he simply states that she could not be healed by anyone. The speculation of the Marcan narrative which is then aroused over whether or not Jesus will be able to affect a cure is not, therefore, repeated here. Luke also omits the woman's questioning within herself, and instead the Lucan emphasis shifts to a public witness in the presence of all the people.³⁴ Once again the immediacy of the cure is underlined.

In addition to these miracles which appear in all three Synoptic gospels, Luke also has a further two miracles involving women, and both are furthermore linked with miracles involving men. The first miracle is the cure of the bent woman on the sabbath in 13:10-17 which has been linked with the cure of the man with dropsy in 14:2-6, since in each case Jesus accuses the Pharisees of being more helpful to an animal on the sabbath than to a human being. The second miracle, the raising of the widow's son at Nain in Lk 7:11-17 has been juxtaposed in Luke with the healing of the centurion's servant in Lk 7:2-10.

The healing of the bent woman on the sabbath in Lk 13:10-17 follows on from the story of the unfruitful fig tree (cf. 13:6-9) which has been cut down because of its unfruitfulness. Thus we can detect a similar theme here and unfruitful attitudes to the sabbath must also be removed. Most scholars would agree that Lk 13:10-17 is an independent narrative written by Luke himself and some would even go as far as to say that the

miracle itself is a development of the isolated saying in v. 15.³⁵ For our purposes it is interesting that Luke has chosen a woman who has been ill for eighteen years, who is then cured by Jesus who lays his hands upon her.³⁶ The fact that Jesus also uses the title 'daughter of Abraham' (cf. 19:9), further underlines the fact that the woman is an example in Luke of the liberation promised to the poor and oppressed in Lk 4:18-19 and, moreover, her cure also casts in a poor light the normally respected leaders of the Jews and the male ruler of the synagogue, who criticise Jesus' actions./³⁷

The final miracle involving a woman is the cure on behalf of the widow at Nain which reminds us of the previous miracle in Luke, the healing on behalf of the centurion in 7:1-10. This miracle, apart from being part of Luke's pairing stories, again recalls the Lucan theme of care for the oppressed, including widows and the poor.³⁸ It is also suggested that this miracle, like the previous one of 13:10-17, was created by Luke, being loosely based on similar Old Testament miracles, and in particular that of Elijah in 1 Kings (cf. 1 Kgs 17:8-16).³⁹ Setting aside questions of historicity, as it appears in Luke, the miracle is an expression of Jesus' compassion for a woman, and the touching the bier itself represents yet another challenge to the Jewish ritual obligations which are scattered throughout the gospel.⁴⁰

To sum up, the significance of these miracles is that Luke has taken over three of Mark's four miracles involving women and linked them with themes which run throughout the gospel. Thus the mother-in-law of Simon who serves is one of a number of women who serve in Luke. The weeping woman at Nain is the recipient of a miracle and contrasts with those women who later weep in vain in Jerusalem. Finally, the bent woman is also an example of Jesus' concern for the oppressed, an important theme in Luke's gospel. Luke has, however, omitted the miracle of the Syro-Phoenician woman, but by including two other miracles involving women, and the sexual parallelism these thereby involve, he demonstrates that for him both men and women were suitable recipients of the miracles of Jesus.

Moving on to the remainder of the women passages in the gospel, we will focus first of all on women in the teaching of Jesus, and then look at the women Jesus encountered in his ministry according to Luke's presentation of that ministry.

A number of Lucan parables have been noted for their sexual

parallelism and Lk 18:1-8 is one such example, being the parable of the obstinate widow and the obdurate judge. This parable has been compared with the one which follows in Lk 18:9-14 - the Pharisee and the publican. In both cases the central figure, an oppressed widow and a despised tax-collector, are held up as examples of prayer. According to C. Parvey, this suggests that Luke, rather than indulging in useless repetition, was addressing two separate groups of listeners, both males and females.⁴¹ While some scholars have questioned whether the eschatological content of this parable was original, J. Jeremias considers the problematic vv. 6-8 were probably authentic, and the point of the parable is persistence in prayer.⁴² The significant thing for us is that a woman is chosen to echo the cry of the disciples, who like her are left to survive in a difficult situation, possibly feeling they too have been abandoned. The message is one of reassurance that if a wicked judge will relent and vindicate the woman, how much more likely is it that God will hear the cries of his church.⁴³

The second parable involving female imagery is the parable of the lost coin in Lk 15:8-10 which falls in Luke's special section of chapters 15-19, and has led to this section being labelled the gospel of the outcast.⁴⁴ This parable is, moreover, one of three parables in this chapter which point to God's joy over the one repentant sinner or the lost, and in this particular example, the woman's activity itself is compared to the work of God.⁴⁵

The parable of the Leaven and the Dough in Lk 13:20-1, as we have already noted, also appears in Mt 13:33, and in both cases follows the parable of the mustard seed.⁴⁶ The purpose of both parables is to compare the kingdom of God with the final results in each case. Thus the small seed becomes a tall shrub giving shelter to the birds and the mass of dough is totally permeated by the leaven.

The final texts in Luke which refer to women are the judgement sayings where Luke reveals that both men and women will be judged by God. In Lk 11:31 we are told that the Queen of the South will arise at the judgement with the men of this generation and condemn them.⁴⁷ In Lk 17:34-5 the final separation involves women grinding with a handmill when one will be left and one will be taken,⁴⁸ paralleling the males who also will be judged (cf. 17:31f.). Finally, in 13:34-5, Jesus refers to himself as a hen who would have gathered her brood under her wing, but alas instead Jerusalem will be judged.⁴⁹

Having briefly reviewed women in the teaching material of Luke's gospel, we can say that for Luke both males and females are suitable images for the kingdom, and likewise both are liable to be judged. Beyond this it would seem that Luke also strove to present a sexual parallelism when speaking of both the rewards and punishments which would be received in the kingdom.

Looking briefly now at the women who appear in the ministry in Luke's gospel, we encounter Mary the mother of Jesus in the infancy narratives, together with Elizabeth her cousin, there are the women of 8:1-3, Mary and Martha in 10:38-40 and finally the anointing woman of 7:36-50.

We have already mentioned that the mother of Jesus is referred to in Mk 3:20-35 and Mk 6:1-6 and Luke includes both texts in his gospel. In reporting Mk 3:20-35 it is significant that Luke appears to present a milder form of rebuke than Mk 3:35 (cf. Lk 8:21) and in the Third Gospel the focus of the text is on relationships in the kingdom.⁵⁰ With regard to Mk 6:1-6 Luke has not only amplified this controversy pericope, but placed it at the beginning of his account of the ministry of Jesus and, according to J. Drury, it has, therefore, become an act of pious obedience, which witnesses to a higher valuation of family life than that which we find in Mark.⁵¹ The story now represents a shift from the old order to the new with the prophecy already fulfilled in Jesus and thus emphasising an important theological theme of this gospel.⁵² For our purposes it is also worth noting that Luke does not repeat the Marcan 'son of Mary', but here we have 'Joseph's son', and neither is there a reference to any brothers or sisters of Jesus.

Moving on to the infancy narratives it is interesting that in Luke's version of the birth and early childhood of Jesus women play a prominent role. Immediately after the prologue Luke refers to Elizabeth who is barren, and it is also recognised that this was a cause of reproach among Jewish women (cf. 1:25).⁵³ The Annunciation now follows and a parallel is created with both stories involving unusual conceptions. After this, according to Luke, Mary visits Elizabeth and it is, therefore, to a woman that the birth of the Messiah is first revealed (cf. 1:41-3). We then have the Magnificat in Lk 1:46-55.⁵⁴ This focus upon Mary in the Lucan birth narratives is continued later, and we read that it is Mary who is left pondering the significance of events in 2:19 and 2:51. Finally, there is also the reference in Luke to the prophecy

of Anna in 2:36-38 which neatly parallels the earlier prophecy of Simeon in 2:33-5.

Turning now to Lk 8:1-3, we have already commented that Luke has omitted the Marcan reference to the διακονία of the women in his account of Mk 15:40-1, though he already mentioned the service of women in 8:1-3. Our examination of Mark's understanding of the διακονία of the women revealed that he envisaged the role of women in his gospel to be more than table service, and it was a more general kind of service which was implied here. In view of this interpretation we need to examine Luke's understanding of διακονία to discern whether he limits the service of women to a kind of table service.

Lk 8:1-3 is generally recognised as representing a new section in the travels of Jesus;⁵⁵ and it follows on from the story of the woman with the ointment in 7:36-50.⁵⁶ This reference introduces a number of women who had been healed by Jesus and then follow him and his disciples, serving them from their own resources. According to Marshall, this reference to the women represents a fixed piece of tradition, since it is found in Mk 15:40 and reappears again in Lk 23:49, 55; 24:6, 10 and Acts 1:14.⁵⁷ Luke's reason for including the reference, according to both Marshall and Witherington, is that he wished to show that these women had been witnesses from the beginning of Jesus' ministry in Galilee, and were, therefore, valid witnesses of the resurrection for the church.⁵⁸ Fiorenza would, however, disagree, and, altering the weight of this argument, she considers that it was because the women were resurrection witnesses that Luke had to grudgingly admit their presence during the ministry.⁵⁹ This was because, according to Luke's own criteria an apostle, as one of those who witnessed the resurrection, must also have accompanied Jesus during his ministry (cf. Acts 1:21f.). Since Luke does not then admit women to the ranks of the apostles, but limits this to men (Acts 1:21), Fiorenza concludes that Luke redacts women out of the tradition.⁶⁰

This is supported in 8:3 with the qualification of the women's διακονία as τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, suggesting the women's service was in the form of financial support for the travelling missionaries.⁶¹ This conclusion is reinforced by the interpretation of Marshall when he concludes:

In that context (i.e. in the immediate context of the stories of the widow at Nain and the woman who anoints Jesus) the paragraph may have served to show how those who had been healed by Jesus demonstrated their gratitude to him to suggest

that Christian women too should perform hospitable duties in the church."⁶²

The Lucan understanding of the verb διακονία in terms of provision and support is, therefore, moving in the direction of the diaconate which we have found in the later Pastoral Epistles.

Before concluding our survey of women in Luke there are two other references to women in the ministry of Jesus which we need to consider. The first reference is to Martha and Mary in 10:38-42 which is located between the Lucan parable of the Good Samaritan and the Lord's prayer, and shows that there is more than one type of service in Luke.⁶³ The scene is a simple contrast between two women⁶⁴ with the significant point, as far as we are concerned, being that the attitude of Jesus towards Mary contrasts with what we have found to be both the Jewish and later church attitudes toward the role of women.

The final pericope we need to consider in Luke is that of the anointing woman in 7:36-50 which significantly appears in Luke just before the reference to the serving women of 8:1-3, and not at the head of the passion narrative as in Mk 14:2-10.⁶⁵ The anointing in Luke is also linked to the parable of the two debtors.⁶⁶ The occasion in Luke is still, however, a meal with the host being Simon, though he is no longer a leper but a Pharisee. The anointing which follows is also similar to Mk 14:3f. in that an unnamed woman anoints Jesus, and there is an objection to her actions. In Luke, however, the woman is identified as a sinner and she no longer anoints Jesus' head but his feet.⁶⁷ The aim of such Lucan redaction was, therefore, ultimately to illustrate the character of Jesus' mission to outcasts and sinners (cf. 7:34, 35). Thus in Luke it is not a woman who strengthens Jesus at the hour of his death but an angel.⁶⁸

Summation

To sum up our treatment of the role of women at the scene of the crucifixion in Luke, and retrospectively within the gospel as a whole, we will bring together the arguments we have presented in the preceding section and suggest some general conclusions on how Luke perceived the role of women within his gospel.

We began our examination of Lk 23:49 by noting that Luke had already referred to women in his passion narrative with the derogatory reference to the daughters of Jerusalem in 23:28. Thus in Luke the final female image which heads the passion narrative is not the praiseworthy

actions of the anointing woman as in Mk 14:2f., but rather women as representatives of the old order and Jerusalem who will ultimately be condemned for their failure to recognise the true significance of Jesus.

In our examination of the crucifixion itself, our general conclusions were that Luke had redacted women out of the text and beyond this he also wrote the male characters back into the plot. Going back to our earliest account of Mk 15:40-1 we established here that by using numerous literary techniques the evangelist Mark emphasised the role of women in this scene and within the gospel as a whole. Thus the women are described as 'watching' women and they stand at the crucifixion in the place of the male disciples who have fled (cf. Mk 14:50). Although these women are further described as watching 'from afar' and, therefore, to an extent are 'fallible witnesses', we also concluded from our examination of the gospel that Mark had something definite to say to this community about the role of disciples and the manner of their service, and he did not hesitate to use women as examples of both.

Moving on to Matthew's version of the crucifixion scene we noticed the beginnings here of an attempt to redact men back into the crucifixion with the inevitable result that the female witness was thereby overshadowed. Thus in Matthew the reference to πολλοί occurs earlier in the text, and the women are no longer necessarily seen as representatives of the absent disciples, with the mother of the sons of Zebedee, if anything, being more of a reminder of this absent group, rather than an independent witness herself.

Luke's version of Mk 15:40-1 omits any reference to the names of these women. Luke has also omitted the Marcan ἡκολούθουν ... συναναβῆσαι, and it is significant that when Luke later uses this second word of the resurrection witnesses it is used exclusively of males (cf. Acts 13:31). Luke also detracts from the witnessing of the women at the cross by referring to two other groups of witnesses - the crowds and those known to Jesus, and by omitting any reference to the fleeing disciples of Mk 14:50, Luke leaves open the possibility of male disciples being present here.

In examining the gospel itself we saw that for Luke women did, however, have a significant role to play, and he includes more women passages in his gospel than the other Synoptic writers. Luke's portrayal of women in the miracles showed that they were suitable examples of the important Lucan themes of liberation for the poor and oppressed and

freedom from the restricting sabbath regulations of the old order. In the teaching material Luke displays a form of sexual parallelism in his pairing of male/female stories, most notably the parable of the obstinate widow and the obdurate judge. Finally, female characters appear throughout the gospel with Mary and Elizabeth in the infancy narratives, the women of 8:1-3, Martha and Mary in 10:38-42, and the anointing woman of 7:36-50.

Does all this mean Luke was, therefore, more favourably disposed toward women than the other Synoptic writers? In reviewing the treatment of women in the ministry of Jesus we must conclude that Luke did not hesitate to use women as examples of both Jesus' teaching and healing. In Lk 8:1-3 there is even a reference to women who also possibly supported Jesus financially during his ministry in Galilee. However, linked with our examination of 8:1-3 we also suggested that on the whole the $\delta\iota\alpha\chi\omicron\nu\iota\alpha$ accepted from the women in Luke, was limited to financial help and table service. The one exception is the reference to Mary in 10:38-42.

Thus our conclusion has to be that on the whole Luke did not envisage that women served Jesus in more than a limited sense. As we will see below in our examination of the Lucan redaction of the empty tomb story, this interpretation of the $\delta\iota\alpha\chi\omicron\nu\iota\alpha$ of the women affected Luke's handling of this story and the subsequent resurrection appearance traditions. This redaction also fits in with the trends we have noticed elsewhere in the New Testament to limit the ministry of women in the church (cf. 1 Cor 14:33b-36; 1 Tim 2:9-15).

B. THE BURIAL - Lk 23:50-56a

The Lucan burial is quite straightforward, and in many respects parallels the Marcan version with various modifications and additions.⁶⁹ The Marcan time reference, therefore, appears at the end of the narrative rather than at the beginning (cf. Mk 15:42 and Lk 23:56). In spite of his own evidence to the contrary in Acts 13:28-30 which suggests that the Sanhedrin were responsible for burying Jesus, here in the gospel it is Joseph who carries out this act. Thus Luke develops Mark here, and he describes Joseph as a good and righteous man, who had nothing to do with the death of Jesus which differs from Mark and eases the conflict with Acts 13:28-30. There is no reference in Luke to Joseph's "taking courage" before his approach to Pilate. Luke also describes the tomb as

one in which no-one had previously been laid, and this is a reference not found in Mark, though as we have already pointed out, Matthew has a reference to a 'new tomb' (cf. Mt 27:60). Luke does not then conclude as Mark does by identifying the women by name and telling us they purchased the spices (Mk 15:47, 16:1). Instead, according to Luke, the women remain anonymous and we are told that they return home to prepare the spices and keep the sabbath rest.

1. v. 50

As we have noted, the Marcan time reference does not appear at the beginning of the Lucan burial narrative and instead is rather awkwardly transferred to the end of the narrative in v. 54, and it is interesting that this pattern is also found in Jn 19:42.⁷⁰ Joseph is, therefore, immediately introduced and he is described as a councillor in line with Mark, though Luke also adds that he was a good and righteous man and so emphasises his moral and spiritual qualities.⁷¹ This immediate emphasis on Joseph is supported by the use of ὁνόματι which is similar to Mt 27:57.

2. v. 51

Luke stresses it was this, οὗτος, man (cf. Mt 27:58), who, although a member of the council, did not agree with the verdict passed on Jesus. Luke thereby forestalls the objection which some might have asked in the light of Mark and Matthew, i.e. how could a member of the Sanhedrin be favourable to Jesus since they had all condemned him to death? According to Luke not all the members of the Sanhedrin condemned Jesus.⁷² Luke, therefore, interprets Mark by highlighting the role of Joseph, though he does not explicitly state that Joseph was a disciple of Jesus (cf. Mt 27:57; Jn 19:38).⁷³ Luke also includes the reference that Joseph was waiting for the kingdom of God,⁷⁴ and by introducing the reference to the city as a city of the Jews, he reminds his readers in an aside that there are still pious Israelites. According to Drury, Joseph is to be paired with his fellow councillor Gamaliel (cf. Acts 5) as a member of the little remnant of sympathetic Jews who form a link between the nation and the church in contrast with the larger national apostasy.⁷⁵

3. v. 52

Luke again stresses it is this, οὗτος, man who approaches Pilate to ask

him for the body of Jesus and there is no reference to the Marcan 'taking courage' or to the questioning of the centurion by Pilate. The use of οὗτος and προσέρχομαι is similar to Mt 27:58-9.

4. v. 53

As in Mark, there is a direct reference to taking the body down from the cross. Luke uses the same word as Mt 27:59 ἐντυλίσσω,⁷⁶ which is probably an improvement of Mark's colloquialism. Luke agrees with Matthew here in referring to the body as it, αὐτό, though he is not as consistent and this is shortly followed by him, αὐτόν.⁷⁷ As in Matthew, Luke also agrees that no-one had previously used the tomb, though the precise phrase in Luke οὐ οὐκ ἦν οὐδεὶς οὐπω κείμενος appears more emphatic with its double negative.⁷⁸ The effect is to underline Joseph's care of the body. There is no reference to any anointing of the body in Luke.⁷⁹ Luke also does not tell us that the tomb was sealed with a stone, and it is not until 24:2 that the stone is summarily introduced and forgotten about.⁸⁰

5. v. 54

Luke ends his account of the burial with the time reference he had omitted from v. 50. The word preparation refers to the day of preparation and is the day immediately preceding the sabbath. Although the phrase ἡμέρα ἣν παρασκευῆς can be used of the dawn,⁸¹ in this present case it probably means sunset and prepares us for what follows and the actions of the women in vv. 55-56a.⁸²

6. vv. 55-56a

The Lucan burial scene finally closes, like Mark, with a reference to the women who had followed Jesus from Galilee. We are told that these women witness the burial,⁸³ return home, and prepare spices before resting on the sabbath. This contrasts with Mk 16:1 where the women wait until the sabbath has passed before purchasing the spices.⁸⁴ It has been suggested that the change in Luke is due to a later reflection on the Marcan text and is an attempt to answer a difficulty raised by this section, namely why was the burial not completed on the Friday? The answer supplied by Luke is that Joseph and the women had tried to complete the burial on the sabbath but were overtaken by events. As a result they were obliged to wait until after the sabbath to complete the burial.⁸⁵ In any case, it

is worth noting that Luke does not specifically say that the women buy spices.⁸⁶ Finally, we agree with Marshall that v. 56a is the conclusion to the burial story with v. 56b the beginning of the empty tomb story and reflecting on what has previously occurred.⁸⁷

Summation

The significance of the Lucan story of the burial is that once again Luke has highlighted the role of a male character and thereby de-emphasised the role of the female characters in the story. The man responsible for Jesus' burial, the one 'named' Joseph is, therefore, immediately introduced and is now described as a good and righteous man who had nothing to do with Jesus' death. We are then told that Joseph approaches Pilate and asks for the body of Jesus which he carefully deposits in an unused tomb. Whether Luke intended us to see Joseph as one of Jesus' disciples is difficult to say, but by omitting the earlier reference to the burial of John the Baptist by his disciples (cf. Mk 6:29), Luke at least does not leave open the possibility that Jesus' disciples will be judged harshly. Moreover, the identification of Joseph as a good and pious Jew allows the reader to recall the daughters of Jerusalem, and Joseph stands over against them as the remnant who did not reject God's messenger. Finally, by once again omitting the names of the women, Luke focuses our attention on the actions of Joseph rather than on those who merely observe.

C. THE EMPTY TOMB - Lk 23:56b-24:12

In our previous study of the empty tomb story we began by looking at Mk 16:1-8 which we consider to have been the earliest narrative account of the story of the women at the tomb. We then compared this version with Mt 28:1-10, the closest Synoptic parallel to the Marcan narrative. In our examination of Mk 16:1-8, we noted that there were a number of problems associated with these verses, particularly with relation to the question of source and redaction. We concluded that while there was no general agreement on what constituted the basic tradition, beyond this scholars were unable to decide what exactly constituted Marcan redaction.

We soon discovered that the main clue to the meaning of Mk 16:1-8 lay in the enigmatic ending of 16:8 itself, and in order for us to discover what Mark intended us to read into this conclusion, we needed to interpret Mk 16:1-8 in terms of the expectations generated by the gospel

itself. We then had to decide whether the women's flight and silence in 16:8 represented a negative evaluation of their role. After a lengthy examination of Mk 16:1-8 we suggested that Mk 16:8 was a satisfactory ending and one which invited the readers to supply their own conclusion to the gospel in terms of whether they accepted the challenges and risks of the gospel.

Turning to Matthew's gospel we were interested to see how this evangelist handled the Marcan tradition. We immediately noticed a number of similarities and differences between the two accounts. Although Matthew kept the main features of the Marcan pericope, the appearance and message of the young man and the women's reaction to this message, there were also a number of differences between the Marcan and Matthean accounts of the women at the tomb. The reason for the women's visit was no longer to anoint the body of Jesus, but to see the tomb (28:1). Matthew also introduced two secondary developments to the Marcan tradition in vv. 2-4 and 9-10. In Mt 28:2-4 we are told of the descent of an angel of the Lord and the opening of the tomb, and in 28:9-10 there is a christophany to the women. Finally, Matthew then closed his Easter tradition with a reference to a christophany to the male disciples in 28:16-20.

In our detailed examination of the text we were able to show that, rather than suggesting Matthew had access to an independent source other than Mark, these Matthean alterations could be explained on the basis of Matthean theological reflection on the Marcan text. We had already suggested in our Marcan chapter that Mark himself had introduced the anointing motif in 16:1, and this was supported in Matthew by the use of *θωπεύω* in 28:1 which the evangelist probably felt justified in using on the basis of the angelic command of Mt 28:6 *ἴδτε τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἔκειτο* and the numerous references to *θωπεύω* in the Marcan text (cf. Mk 15:47; 16:4). Behind Matthew's omission of Mark's reference to the women's questioning en route to the tomb about who would move the stone (Mk 16:3), and the Marcan explanatory phrase *ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα*, we found support for our earlier conclusions that these were probably Marcan narrative features. Moving on to Mt 28:2-4, the descent of the angel and the opening of the tomb, we found a number of Matthean redactional interests here to suggest that the evangelist himself was responsible for this development, taking up themes expressed elsewhere in the gospel. Finally the christophany of 28:8-10 was also shown to be Matthean

composition, since in essence the incident added nothing new to the tomb story, but more importantly affected a link between the empty tomb tradition and the appearance tradition. The cumulative effect of these Matthean redactional alterations was, we decided, that Matthew had to a certain extent eclipsed the role of the women at the tomb. By introducing the guards at the tomb in 28:4 and the christophany to the male disciples in 28:9-10, Matthew redacted the men back into the tradition and in the process linked the tomb tradition with the appearance tradition.

Bearing in mind the points we have raised here, we will now briefly note the similarities and differences between the Lucan and Marcan accounts of the empty tomb. On the whole, the Lucan story of the tomb is similar to Mark, and once again the two main features are the angelic appearance and message, and the reaction of the women to this message. Luke does not, however, begin his account by identifying the women and we are not told who 'they' are until 24:10. This list of women also differs from Mk 16:1. We may assume that the motive for the visit was to anoint the body since the spices have been introduced in 23:56. However, it is also worth commenting that henceforth the anointing motif disappears from the narrative. There is no parallel in Luke to the Marcan questioning of the women en route to the tomb, and when they arrive here the order of events is also altered in Luke. Whereas in Mark the women are met by a young man, told to inspect the tomb, and then given a message, in Luke the women enter the tomb on their own initiative, discover the body is missing and only then do they notice the two men. The *ἄγγελοι* in Mark has, therefore, become *ἄνδρες δύο*, and beyond this the description of these men also differs from Mk 16:5. The message the women receive is also different in Luke and the prophecy that the disciples will see Jesus in Galilee in Mk 16:7 now becomes a report of what Jesus said in Galilee regarding his passion and resurrection.⁸⁸ The reaction of the women in Mark as one of fear and silence is also altered in Luke, and the women deliver the message to the disciples, though this is disbelieved. Finally, if Lk 24:12 is textually acceptable, Luke adds a reference to Peter at the tomb, and in 24:22-24 there is a reference to the empty tomb story in the Emmaus tradition.⁸⁹

In examining our Lucan text we will, therefore, need to decide how we are to account for these similarities with the Marcan text, and perhaps more importantly, how do we explain the differences between Luke

and Mark which are greater than those we have found in Matthew.⁹⁰ While some scholars would suggest that Luke has drawn on Mark with editorial modifications,⁹¹ others would point to the use of Mark with additions from other sources,⁹² and finally some would even suggest combining Mark with Luke's special source,⁹³ with the reason given that the differences are too great to argue for essentially Marcan dependence. Without pre-empting our detailed discussion of the text, we would suggest, however, that since the Lucan version is so close to Mark, and since the majority of alterations to the Marcan text could probably be explained on the basis of Lucan theological tendencies, it is difficult to argue that Luke was using an alternative independent source at this point.⁹⁴

1. vs. 23:56b-24:1

Before beginning his account of the empty tomb story, Luke informs us that the women rested on the sabbath in accordance with the commandment (cf. Ex 20:10; Dt 5:14),⁹⁵ and the δέ of 24:1, therefore, corresponds to the previous μέν which began the actions of the Sunday. Luke agrees with the other three gospels in referring to the sabbath as μίᾱ τῶν σαββάτων (cf. Mk 16:2; Mt 28:1; Jn 20:1), and he qualifies this by condensing the awkward time references of Mk 16:1 and 2 into the single phrase ὄρθρου βαθέως, while it was still early.⁹⁶ Luke does not name the women at this point, unlike the Marcan and Matthean parallels, and we would not know who they were if it were not for the preceding burial and the specific identification of the women in v. 10.⁹⁷ The links with 23:56 are reinforced with the use of ἐτοίμαζω and the women bring spices which they had prepared with them to the tomb.⁹⁸

Luke has, therefore, set the scene with this verse and a group of unnamed women go to the tomb. There are a number of links with Mark here, and the intention is presumably for the women to anoint the body, though interestingly Luke does not subsequently refer to this purpose. By not naming the women, Luke also does not develop the Marcan or Matthean emphasis on the named group of two or three women involved in the three narratives of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb.

2. v. 2

Luke refers to the stone for the first time in 24:2, and there was no previous reference to it in the burial narrative. This is a pointer in favour of the standard solution to the Synoptic problem and the stone is

only explicable in relation to the earlier account of Mk 15:42-7 which expressly emphasises it. Luke continues by omitting the Marcan reference here to the women's questioning en route as to who would move the stone. In view of the fact that Matthew also omits this reference we would suggest that this reaffirms our conclusion that this was a Marcan narrative comment. This comment in Mark, moreover, provided us with an 'inside view' and allowed the reader to consider the women's dilemma and the possibility that their intention to anoint the body would be thwarted. Luke simply states that the stone had been rolled away from the tomb. There is no emphasis here on the size of the stone, and the Marcan ἥν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα is, therefore, omitted. Once again this supports our observation that in Mark this explanatory γὰρ clause appears as a deliberate, yet typical, Marcan interruption of the text, serving as a delaying technique and beyond this arousing the readers interest and involvement with the text as they wait to see what happens next. Luke does not develop the text here unlike the Matthean reference to the earthquake and the descent of the angel (cf. Mt 28:2-4). Also, by omitting the Marcan emphasis on the observations of the 'watching' women with ὀναβλέψασαι and θεωροῦσιν in Mk 16:4, Luke does not take the opportunity to underline the women's role at the tomb.

3. v. 3

There now follows a very straightforward parallel in Luke - having found the stone, the women enter the tomb and do not find the body.⁹⁹ By the use of the phrases εὑρον δὲ τὸν λίθον in v. 2 and δὲ οὐχ εὑρον τὸ σῶμα, Luke concentrates our attention on what is or is not found at the tomb. According to R. Mahoney, it is here for the first time in the stories of the empty tomb that this pericope becomes that which the title ordinarily indicates - the discovery of the empty tomb.¹⁰⁰ Once again the Marcan emphasis on seeing and observing is not repeated and is instead replaced by finding. The Third Evangelist has also altered the order of events and whereas both Mark and Matthew begin with an angelic address, in Luke it is the emptiness of the tomb which is stressed,¹⁰¹ and this emphasis on the body is a theme taken up in the resurrection appearance stories in Luke (cf. 24:36f.).

4. v. 4

This verse begins here in typical Lucan style,¹⁰² and he refers to the

reaction of the women which is one of perplexity at the absence of the body of Jesus. Luke, therefore, avoids the confusion created by the Marcan parallel where we are not sure why the women are astonished - because of the appearance of the young man, or because Jesus is not here. However, if Luke clarifies the source of the women's perplexity, he also judges them harshly, for in the following verses the women are reminded that since Jesus had foretold his passion and resurrection, they should not have been seeking him in the tomb.

Luke now introduces not one (cf. Mk 16:5), but two men at the tomb. According to Bultmann, these figures are common in folklore,¹⁰³ and as we have already seen Luke himself displays an interest in pairing in the gospel.¹⁰⁴ Many scholars prefer to interpret the pair in terms of two-fold witness,¹⁰⁵ and A.R.C. Leaney identifies them with Moses and Elijah seeing a connection here with the transfiguration.¹⁰⁶ That Luke intends us to understand angels here is supported both by Lk 24:23 and the message the men deliver. Furthermore, these two men point forward to the two men at the ascension (cf. Acts 1:10).¹⁰⁷ The description of these men in Luke is more detailed than that of the young man in Mark, and according to E.L. Bode, suggests that for Luke something extraordinary is intended.¹⁰⁸ Finally, the presence of two angels at the empty tomb is also paralleled in Jn 20:12f. and the Gospel of Peter 9:36f. where they actually assist in the resurrection itself.

To sum up then, as in Matthew, Luke has felt free to alter Mark's νεανίας which we previously suggested was in any case a piece of Marcan interpretative exegesis, providing a literary echo with the previous young man of Mk 14:51. The scene in Luke is, therefore, set, and the reader waits for both the message of the two men and the reaction of the women to this.

5. v. 5

Luke now develops the fear of the women who, we are told, are terrified - ἐμφοβῶν.¹⁰⁹ The women react by bending their faces¹¹⁰ to the earth, and this could be due to fear,¹¹¹ or if taken with the following reproach, would mean do not look to the earth where the dead are, but look upwards where the living are.¹¹² This is followed in Luke by the angelic address to the women¹¹³ which does not begin as in Mark with a note of reassurance, but sounds like a reproach, and in W. Marxsen's opinion this was because it was indeed intended to be a reproach.¹¹⁴ The women are

rebuked for seeking the living among the dead (cf. Jn 20:15), and in this kerygmatic type formula there is an implied announcement of the resurrection.¹¹⁵ According to P. Benoit, here we find a theological statement which is very characteristic of Luke who, in speaking of the resurrection, is fond of applying the Pauline antithesis of death and life.¹¹⁶ Thus the women in Luke are in the wrong place and for the wrong reasons.

6. vv. 6-8

Following the rebuke, Luke continues with the angelic message which opens with the statement 'he is not here, but has risen'. There is a dispute regarding the authenticity of this text, but we tend to agree with J. Jeremias who concludes that it should be retained.¹¹⁷ Luke agrees with Matthew here in inverting the Marcan order which achieves a better climax. The message then continues with the instruction to the women to remember what Jesus had told them while in Galilee,¹¹⁸ and differs from Mark and Matthew where Galilee is referred to as the place of future happenings. The reason for this alteration is not, however, likely to be due to Luke's having access to an independent source, but is more likely to be an alteration to suit Luke's own geographical theology with the resurrection appearances limited to Jerusalem and its environs.¹¹⁹ According to C.F. Evans, "Galilee is a thing of the past to be remembered; Jerusalem is the centre from which the gospel is in Acts to go to the whole world, and Jerusalem in Luke's gospel and in Acts is the scene of the Lord's appearances."¹²⁰

As regards the actual prophecy itself, this would appear to have a complicated background, and is a combination of the three previous passion predictions in Lk 9:22, 44 and 18:33, which in turn were taken over from Mark with editorial modifications.¹²¹ This conclusion is supported by the fact that almost every word in vv. 6-7 is found earlier in Luke. Δεῖ is taken over from Mk 8:31 and appears in Lk 9:22,¹²² παραδοθῆναι appears in Mk 9:31//Lk 9:44 and Mk 10:33//Lk 18:32; εἰς χεῖρας in Mk 9:31//Lk. 9:44; ἀνθρώπων in Mk 9:31//Lk 9:44; ἁμαρτωλῶν, though found in Mk 14:41, is omitted by Luke and is used only here to qualify men in Luke's gospel; τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ is a Lucan editorial alteration of Mark's 'after three days', and also appears in 18:33 and 24:46; ἀναστῆναι appears in Mk 8:31 where Luke prefers ἐγερθῆναι Lk 9:22; Mk 9:31, omitted by Luke and Mk 10:34//Lk 18:33. Σταυρωθῆναι, however,

is not found in the earlier predictions in Mark or Luke, and both prefer ἀποκτανθῆναι.¹²³ The effect in Luke is, therefore, to emphasise important Lucan themes including Jesus as the living one, remembering the words of Jesus and stressing the necessity that God's plan must be fulfilled.

The significance of this prophecy for our purposes is that it is assumed that the women were present when Jesus spoke these words in Galilee, and thus they are able to bear witness to this prophecy even though Luke has failed to mention them in any of these scenes. The fact that Luke includes a rebuke of the women implies a criticism of their presence at the tomb, and thereby their witnessing role. This witnessing role itself is not stressed by the evangelist and he neither repeats the Marcan command to go and tell the disciples, nor is there any reference to whether or not the women believed what they had heard. Indeed, we are explicitly told by Luke that the women lower their eyes and, therefore, do not witness. This contrasts with the description of the ascension in Acts where the men look up to the sky while Jesus ascends (Acts 1:11).¹²⁴ Luke simply concludes the women remembered what Jesus had said. Their role in Luke is only as messengers to the disciples and no reactions of the women are recorded here. We, therefore, disagree with Bode and J. Plevnik that the women believe in the resurrection, as this means reading into the Lucan text what is not there.¹²⁵

7. vv. 9 and 11

According to Luke, the women depart from the tomb and go and tell the disciples. This reaction differs from the Marcan ending which we suggested was influenced by Marcan theological concerns, most notably the theory of the Messianic secret. Luke could not, however, accept Mk 16:8 as it stood, for as was the case in Matthew, Luke needed to supply a link with the appearance traditions which were to follow. In Matthew's case we saw this link provided in the description of the joy and haste with which the women departed to tell the disciples and the christophany they experienced en route. Luke tells us that the women depart from the tomb,¹²⁶ and report to the eleven, τοῖς ἑνδεκά, and the rest, τοῖς λοιποῖς. The fact that Luke uses the same verb as Matthew, ἀπαγγέλλω, need not imply dependence, and the use is probably incidental.¹²⁷ The phrase τοῖς ἑνδεκά is presumably because Judas had betrayed Jesus and was, therefore, no longer considered to be one of the twelve. It is also

interesting to note here that Luke has extended the group to whom the women report from Matthew's disciples to include the typical Lucan reference τοῖς λοιποῖς (cf. Lk 8:10; 19:9, 11; 24:10, Acts 2:37; 5:13; 17:19; 27:44), and this expansion is echoed later in v. 10 where the named women are joined by a wider group, αἱ λοιπαί. Once again we note the significant use of the masculine form in this reference of v. 11, and we recall the crucifixion scene where not only the women, but all those known to Jesus are mentioned.

The reaction to the women's message is a negative one and they are not believed as their report seems like an idle tale. We would disagree here with Evans who considers that this should not be taken to indicate that Luke attached little importance to the empty tomb story.¹²⁸ Instead we see here the beginnings of the scepticism motif which will reappear later in the apocryphal literature and indeed recurs even in the Lucan traditions in Acts 12:15 where Rhoda is thought to be mad. Thus Bode is correct in his conclusion that

One can see in the reaction of the apostles to the women's report something of an apologetic intent. For in rejecting the statement of the women Luke keeps the official witnesses of the resurrection independent of the women's story.¹²⁹

If our examination of Lk 24:12 indicates that this is a genuine Lucan text, then the text of Luke's gospel itself would tend to support this conclusion.

8. v. 10

Before concluding his narrative of the women at the tomb, Luke identifies the women, apparently as an after-thought. As we have already noted, this differs from the Marcan narrative of the empty tomb. It is true that by referring to these women who witness the resurrection as those who followed Jesus from Galilee, Luke forges a link between the empty tomb and 8:1-3.¹³⁰ We do not believe, however, that this was an attempt by Luke to emphasise the significance of the women's witness.¹³¹ As we stated above, we think it more likely that Luke was forced to refer to the women earlier in his narrative because of his understanding of the important links between resurrection witness and following Jesus in Galilee and, as we will see, his redaction of chapter 24 as a whole only serves to undermine the role of the women and indeed the empty tomb story itself as one of the Lucan resurrection narratives.

Though there are a number of textual difficulties with this

verse,¹³² there is no dispute over the names of the women mentioned.¹³³ Once again Mary Magdalene heads the list of women as in Mark and Matthew, reinforcing her position as an important resurrection witness. Luke has previously referred to Mary Magdalene in 8:1-3 where we are told seven demons had been cast out from her. We will not repeat our discussion of Mary in previous chapters but simply note that Luke uses the unusual reference ἡ Μαγδαληνῇ Μαρίᾳ which is not paralleled in the other gospels.

Joanna appears only here in the Synoptic accounts of the women at the tomb, although she has been previously mentioned by Luke in 8:1-3.¹³⁴ Since we have suggested that the tradition concerning the women involved in the tomb story probably revolved round two fixed names in this tradition, this would probably account for the substitution of Joanna here. Beyond this, since Matthew replaced Mark's Salome with a woman previously referred to in his gospel narrative, namely the mother of the sons of Zebedee, it is possible to suggest that Luke was doing the same here, and referring to someone already introduced to his narrative. We will not, therefore, speculate on whether Joanna represents a wealthy patron in the Lucan community or indeed possibly even a source for the evangelist himself,¹³⁵ though we have previously referred to wealthy female patrons who supported the church in our introductory chapter on women in the early church.

The third woman in the Lucan list is Μαρίᾳ ἡ Ἰακώβου which would normally be translated *the wife of James*. However, given Mk 15:40, 47 and 16:1, it is likely that the mother of James is intended.¹³⁶

Thus, of the three women in Luke, two directly match the Marcan women. Mary Magdalene's position at the head of the list supports our earlier suggestion that she was being singled out in the tomb tradition as an important resurrection witness. Bearing in mind that the women's testimony is not accepted in Luke, we will not fail to notice the literary echo which will later resound in the *Epistula Apostolorum*, where, not only is Mary Magdalene one of the two women involved in the tomb tradition, but her testimony is also disbelieved here too.¹³⁷ As for the reference to the rest of the women, αἱ λοιπαί, while this may echo Mark's ἐν αἷς in Mk 15:40, given the recent reference to τοῖς λοιποῖς in the previous verse, and in 24:33, it is more appropriate here to contrast these two groups rather than looking elsewhere for parallels. Finally, the use of the imperfect, ἔλεγον, could imply that the women

repeatedly tried to convince the disciples of the truth of their message./138

9. v.12

Having closed the empty tomb narrative on a negative note, and the women's testimony does not convince the disbelieving disciples, the text of Luke continues with a reference to a visit to the tomb by Peter in 24:12. This verse has been the subject of much scholarly debate, and although omitted by Western manuscripts, textual opinion today tends to argue in favour of its inclusion,¹³⁹ especially in view of the cross reference of 24:24 which otherwise refers to nothing.¹⁴⁰ Our suggestion would be to support the conclusions of F. Neirynck who sees 24:24 as the earlier reference which had been redacted by Luke to concentrate on Peter,¹⁴¹ and this is supported by the links which exist between Lk 24:12 and Jn 20:3-10.¹⁴²

There are a number of similarities between Lk 24:12 and Jn 20:3-10 including Peter's visit to the tomb, the reference to stooping down, seeing the linen cloths alone and returning home. However, Lk 24:12 is not inserted into the tomb tradition as is the case with Jn 20:3-10, but is rather added on to the end of the Lucan narrative. In John, Peter is not alone but is accompanied by the Beloved Disciple, and both disciples are also involved in a race to the tomb. Finally, in John the Beloved Disciple goes into the tomb first and then comes to belief, whereas in Luke, Peter enters the tomb, does not come to belief and departs from the tomb wondering to himself.

This list of similarities and differences between the two accounts begs the question what is the relationship between John and Luke? Are they both using the same tradition,¹⁴³ and if so which version represents the earlier form of that tradition?¹⁴⁴ Without pre-empting our study of John, we would suggest that the similarities between the two accounts requires some literary relationship. Lk 24:24 possibly represents the earlier form of this tradition, and both Lk 24:12 and Jn 20:3-10 are, possibly, later subsequent developments of the story of the disciples at the tomb.

We would suggest that Luke, or a later scribe, probably added 24:12 to the tomb narrative though we need to explain why it was included here. It would seem that given Luke's ending of the tomb narrative in 24:11, that the women's witness is disbelieved, the purpose here was probably to

supply an independent 'official witness' to the women's tomb story.¹⁴⁵ Beyond this Peter is singled out as the representative of this apostolic authority and this also probably prepares us for his role in the later appearance tradition (cf. 24:34, 36f.).¹⁴⁶ It is significant, however, that this visit by Peter to the tomb in Luke only serves to underline the fact that the empty tomb itself convinces no-one,¹⁴⁷ and all that has actually happened is that a male witness has been written into the narrative of the women at the tomb, even if in Luke we are not taken as far as in the Fourth Gospel where the two stories are combined.

Summation

Having reviewed Lk 24:1-12 in some detail, it is now time for us to draw together the points we have made above and assess the general impact of this narrative for the reader of the Lucan tomb tradition. The main points which emerge are basically that for Luke the empty tomb tradition has no real importance, and not only are the women not believed (24:11), but a male disciple also visits the tomb in v. 12 and again no-one is convinced of the resurrection.

Moving on to the details of the narrative, we note that Luke did not begin his tomb tradition like Mark and Matthew by naming the women, and further, by leaving their identification until v. 10, we suggested that he detracted from the role of the women at the tomb who are also not identified in the Lucan accounts of the crucifixion or burial. The motivation for the women's visit in Luke was presumably to anoint the body of Jesus, since we are told that they bring spices to the tomb (24:1). However, having referred to this intention, Luke does not again mention the subject and so again we are led to the conclusion that this reflects Luke's general lack of interest in the women's visit. There is no parallel in Luke to the Marcan questioning of the women en route as to who would move the stone, and indeed the stone itself is introduced to the narrative for the first time only in Lk 24:2. In 24:3, Luke tells us that the women enter the tomb and we drew attention here to the different order of events between Mark and Luke at this point.

What is more significant is that whereas Mark and Matthew continue the theme of witnessing women with the use of *θεωπέω*, in Luke it is only what the women either find (*εὕρησιν*), or do not find, which is important. The angelic messenger in Luke has now become two messengers in line with Lucan interest in twofold witness, and this could reflect an emphasis on

the authority of male witness over against that of females which we have seen in both Judaism and the Graeco-Roman world. The message itself has also been altered here to express Luke's geographical theology. The Lucan message, therefore, begins from a different point, and here the women are first reprimanded for looking here for Jesus and only then are they reminded of what Jesus has said. Luke then closes his tomb narrative by naming the women, and by naming Mary Magdalene at the head of the list he continues the emphasis on this resurrection witness as well as identifying her and the other woman common to all three Synoptic lists. Luke also, however, introduces the scepticism motif and the women's testimony is not believed in 24:11. This is a theme which we will encounter again in the later apocryphal narratives of the women at the tomb. Finally, even a visit by a male disciple to the tomb in Lk 24:12 does not lead to belief. The result is that by introducing a male at the tomb, Luke has provided a link between the empty tomb narrative and the appearance tradition (cf. 24:24), and in contrast to Mt 28:9-10, where the christophany to the women links the two traditions, Luke has instead chosen a male character.

CONCLUSION

We must now draw together our conclusions on Lk 23:48-9, 50-6 and 24:1-12 and ask: what do these texts mean in terms of Luke's general perception of the role and status of women in the gospel as a whole? As we have mentioned at several points during this chapter, the question of Luke's attitude toward women is one which has aroused varying assessments, from general champion of women's rights to charges of androcentric bias which attempted to disqualify women as resurrection witnesses.

In both our previous studies of the texts of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb we also examined the gospel retrospectively and reached different conclusions in each case. In Mark's gospel we saw that there was essentially no distinction between male and female followers of Jesus. Women were recipients of miracles and they were associated with important Marcan themes such as discipleship, the house motif and the feeding metaphors of the gospel. The watching women of Mark were, therefore, to be seen as acceptable, though 'fallible followers' of Jesus.

With regard to Matthew's gospel, we saw that in his redaction of Mark, Matthew probably unintentionally limited the role of women at the

scenes of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb. Thus the reference to the particular group of three women at the crucifixion in Matthew, is prefaced by the reference to the larger group. In terms of the *διδασκαλία* of the women in the gospel of Matthew, we also decided that, if anything, the type of service open to women in Matthew was probably table service. We also noticed that in Matthew the Marcan emphasis on Mary Magdalene as an important resurrection witness is continued, but by referring to the third woman in his list as the mother of the sons of Zebedee, if anything, Matthew's third woman stood only as a reminder of the absent disciples. This argument that the male disciples were being redacted into the tradition was supported by the description of Joseph of Arimathea as a *μαθητής* in Mt 27:57. Beyond this the Matthean guards at the tomb in 27:62-6 also introduced a male element to the burial tradition, and more significantly, by mentioning their reactions to the angelophany in 28:4, and not those of the women, Matthew continued to strengthen the male element in the Matthean narratives. Finally, we also noted that the Matthean development of the tomb tradition the christophany of 28:9-10 which essentially enhanced the role of the women in the resurrection tradition, primarily served here to forge a link between the empty tomb story and the appearance tradition. The christophany to the women in Mt 28:9-10 added nothing new to the tradition but merely repeated the angelic message of vv. 5-7 and it is only the male disciples who receive a commission to teach and baptise.

Taking Luke's gospel against this background, what we find here is that women appear throughout the gospel as both examples of Jesus' teaching and healing. Of the women who appear in the ministry in Luke we saw a number of male/female characters which were paired, including Elizabeth and Zechariah, and Anna and Simeon. In recounting the miracle stories Luke included three of Mark's four miracles involving women, and beyond this he associated the miracles involving women with his important theme of liberation for the poor and oppressed. The sexual parallelism of the Lucan teaching material has often been referred to and hence all we need to say is that the general impression we have of the gospel is one of a general representation of the equality of males and females.

When we look at our three particular texts of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb, we do not, however, reach the conclusion that Luke was as favourably disposed toward women as the previous two evangelists. In his account of the crucifixion, Luke refers to two other groups, the

crowds and those known to Jesus before mentioning the women at the cross who are significantly not named at this point. There is no mention of the women's previous service in Galilee in Lk 23:48-9. It is also our conclusion that the women at the cross in Luke do not stand there as representatives for the absent disciples. Luke has already omitted the Marcan reference to the flight of the disciples in Mk 14:50, he has toned down the Gethsemane scene of Mk 14:32-42, and he has even referred to the denial and betrayal in terms of Satan working through human agents, thereby to a certain degree absolving these disciples of some of their guilt. Thus when we come to 23:48-9 and the reference to those known to Jesus, we do not necessarily have to see the women at the foot of the cross in Luke as standing alone as representatives for the absent disciples.

In the Lucan version of the burial, the women are again not identified and the role of Joseph of Arimathea has to a certain extent been extended with an emphasis on his care for the body of Jesus which is now placed in a new tomb.

When drawing together our conclusions on the significance of the empty tomb story for Luke we cannot offer an adequate assessment of this story and the total effect of the Lucan redaction unless we consider Lk 24:1-11 within the context of Luke 24 as a whole. We have already pointed out that Matthew linked together the empty tomb story and the appearance traditions by composing a christophany to the women. Luke did not provide a similar link. Instead, what Luke gives us in 24:11 is a sceptical response to the witness of the women. In our summation section we showed that Luke continually undermined the significance of the tomb story in his redaction. We would go further here and suggest that this was not because he entertained 'spiritualised' views of the resurrection, and indeed the incident of 24:36f. would suggest the contrary. There was another reason why Luke played down the narrative of the empty tomb. This was that Luke was concerned to specifically deny the women a role as witnesses of the resurrection.

Scholars are correct to identify the Emmaus story as "a gem of literary art",¹⁴⁸ and as an example of Luke's artistic powers at their height.¹⁴⁹ This story is the high point of the Lucan resurrection narratives, and is the counterpart to the manifestation to the women in Matthew, and more particularly to Mary Magdalene in John.¹⁵⁰ Beyond this, with the flash-back of 24:22-24 the Emmaus tradition serves as a

second attempt to undermine the witness of the women at the tomb. It is not, therefore, without significance that in the only appearance story to refer to the empty tomb tradition, this reference serves only to further detract from the role of the women at the tomb as we are told that some of the women went to the tomb and reported to the disciples after which some of them went to inspect the tomb for themselves and also did not find the body.

Yet another attempt to overshadow the women at the tomb in Luke is the rather convoluted reference to Peter having seen the risen Jesus (24:34). Not only are we told, here, that Peter has visited the tomb, but at the end of what we the readers think is the first resurrection appearance story, we are also told that Peter was the first person to see the risen Jesus. Thus the person who emerges in the apocryphal tradition as the most prominent male witness of the resurrection over against Mary Magdalene in particular, is also made the first witness in Luke. According to Marxsen, Peter's activity as a leader in the early church may lie behind this reference, and it is interesting to note that in the second volume of Luke's work, Acts, Peter has a prominent role to play in the spread of Christianity.¹⁵¹

It is this latter point which we believe lies at the root of the Lucan redaction of chapter 24. Apart from stressing throughout that the suffering, death and resurrection of Jesus was the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy (cf. 24:7, 26, 44),¹⁵² Luke had another equally important point to put across in chapter 24. This was that the male disciples had fulfilled the criteria of apostleship. They had followed Jesus during his ministry and they were direct witnesses of his resurrection. Luke emphasises this final point most clearly during the commission when he has Jesus declare "You are witnesses of these things".¹⁵³ The male disciples do not depend on the witnesses of others, especially women, and according to Luke, they alone receive the missionary charge. Luke may have had to refer to the women at an earlier point in his gospel to show how they could be witnesses of the final scenes of the gospel, but in his redaction of 24:1-53, he gradually excluded their witness and denied them any participation in the missionary work of the church. The resurrection in Luke does indeed represent a transition to the era of the gift of the spirit and the missionary work of the church, but the only "authorization" appearance story is to men.¹⁵⁴

We would conclude by agreeing with the suggestion of both Fiorenza and E. Meier Tetlow that the role of women in the church of Luke may have been far greater than what was revealed in Luke-Acts¹⁵⁵. Indeed we would agree with them that in both texts the Lucan redactor was intentionally seeking to minimize the discipleship and apostolic activity of women. We have already noted some comparisons between the mission of women in Acts and the Pauline epistles and we have just seen this redaction extend to the altering of the received traditions of the cross, burial and empty tomb. As we suggested in our introduction this tension concerning the role of women was experienced in various Christian communities and the reaction here is similar to those developments we identified in the pastoral epistles.

CHAPTER FOUR - NOTES

1. In Mt 27:61 and 28:1 the mother of the sons of Zebedee does not reappear and the second woman is referred to simply as "the other Mary".
2. Cf. A.T. Robertson (1920), p. 238; H.J. Cadbury (1958), pp. 263f. and C. Parvey (1974), pp. 138f.
3. See Fiorenza (1983b), pp. 401-402. For Fiorenza this androcentric tendency becomes evident particularly in the Easter narratives. She points out that according to Paul the apostolate is not limited to the twelve, but includes all who received an appearance of the Lord and were commissioned (1 Cor 9:4). She suggests that not only does Luke limit the apostolate to the twelve, but he modifies the criteria mentioned by Paul and only males who had accompanied Jesus in his ministry from Galilee to Jerusalem and had become witnesses of his death and resurrection (Acts 1:21f.) were eligible to replace Judas as an apostle. As we will see below, in various ways Lucan redaction undermines the significance of the women's witnessing at the tomb.
4. We will discuss the Lucan reference to the women in 8:1-3 below. At this point we merely point out that in view of the previous footnote the inclusion of the reference to the women in 8:1-3 may itself have been the result of necessity. Because the women were witnesses at the tomb, and in view of his own criteria for being a resurrection witness, Luke needed to include a reference to the women during the ministry in Galilee.
5. As we will see below, the context here suggest that two angels are intended, and this is reinforced by Acts 1:10. We also note that two angels are mentioned in Jn 20:12f. and this could suggest Johannine awareness of Luke or the Lucan tradition.
6. Thus I.H. Marshall (1973); R. Bultmann (1963), p. 311; J.E. Alsop (1975), p. 114; E.L. Bode (1970), p. 70.
7. See E.E. Ellis (1966), p. 272; V. Taylor (1972), pp. 103-109; Marshall (1978), pp. 882-883.
8. For example, does the description of Joseph of Arimathea represent an attempt to portray him as an example of the faithful remnant of Israel? Does the sequence of events at the tomb with the emphasis on the absence of the body reflect anti-docetic interests? Do the two angels represent two-fold witness? Finally, is the angelic witness represented in terms of Luke's theological interest in Jerusalem? All of these issues will be raised below.
9. See Ellis (1966), p. 266 who sees a contrast here between the women who "lament" Jesus and Simon who "follows after".
10. For a review of the form critical analysis of this text see Marshall (1978), pp. 862-3; J.H. Neyrey (1983).
11. Thus Marshall (1978), p. 864. See also Str-B. vol. 2, pp. 52-53. P. Benoit (1969), pp. 166-167 also introduces us to two later traditions where Jesus encounters his mother and Veronica on the way to the cross. The encounter with the mother of Jesus indirectly supports our identification of her as one of the women at the foot of the cross. The tradition concerning Veronica is a late one, and appears in the fourth century as a combination of legends. Veronica was originally identified as the woman with the issue of blood who is later identified with Martha in the West and Bernice in the East (Veronica is a form of the same name). As we will see in the later apocryphal traditions, Bernice is identified as being present during the trial of Jesus. According to Benoit, in later legends she goes to see Tiberius bringing charges against

Pilate, and after learning the facts, Tiberius condemns his governor. We are also told that Tiberius is converted by seeing a picture of Christ which Veronica-Bernice had painted, and in some legends he even commissions the painting. Another tradition tells us that the imprint on the cloth is made by Jesus who uses it to wipe his face. Finally, as Benoit points out, we must remember none of this has any authority in the gospel but it is interesting to see how subsequent traditions developed.

12. Thus Neyrey (1983), p. 75.
13. See H. Strathmann, λαός, TDNT, ad. loc. According to Strathmann Luke accounts for more than half the references to λαός in the New Testament with 36 references in the gospel and 48 in Acts. The word is found in special Luke e.g. 1:10, 21; 7:1, 29 and it is introduced by him to passages taken from his two main sources (cf. 6:17; 8:47; 9:13; 18:43; 19:47; 20:9, 19, 26; 21:38; 23:35). He therefore concludes that it is a favourite word of Luke's. See also H. Conzelmann (1961), pp. 163-164.
According to J. Kodell (1969), Luke uses the word of both Jew (2:32; 7:16; 20:1; Acts 4:1; 12:11) and Gentile (2:31; Acts 18:10). Most often it appears only in a generic sense of "crowd" as an equivalent to ὄχλος (6:17; 7:24, 29; 9:12, 13; 18:36, 43; Acts 5:12; 13:31). Kodell also points out that Luke uses λαός for special emphasis in different parts of his writing. Thus it often appears in references to the Old Testament people of God or the "faithful remnant" awaiting the Messianic fulfilment (1:68, 77; 2:32; 3:15; 7:16). In the early part of Acts it is used of people who are responsive to the disciples (e.g. 3:11, 12; 4:1, 2, 10, 17, 21; 5:12) and later it is used of the enemies of the early Christians (21:28, 30; 26:17). Finally see also H. Flender (1967), pp. 132-5 who sees λαός as a favourite Lucan word expressing the historical continuity between Israel and the church.
14. See Neyrey (1983), p. 76. Here Neyrey gives many Old Testament examples as evidence for the linguistic basis of this identification.
15. See *ibid.*
16. Even Taylor (1972), pp. 94-5 agrees that it would appear that Luke was following Mark at this point. It may also be worth noting that Luke uses ὄχλος here and not λαός.
17. See Marshall (1978), p. 877. Cf. also Gospel of Peter 8:28 where the people murmur and beat their breasts saying "if at his death these exceeding great signs have come to pass, behold how righteous he was". Thus the people recognise their own fate will be worse.
18. Thus Dodd (1965), p. 137.
19. For Taylor (1972), p. 94 this verse may be a Marcan addition and of the eighteen words, nine are common to Luke and Mark and this reference stands just where it does in the Marcan parallel, at the end of the narrative. Taylor also suggests a possible dependence on Ps 38:11 καὶ οἱ ἐγγιστά μου μαχρόθεν ἐστήσαν and Ps 88:8 ἐμαχρόνας τοὺς γνωστούς μου ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.
20. See J.A. Bailey (1963), pp. 78f. As we will see below both Luke and John have the statement that no-one had ever used the tomb followed by the reference that the day was the day of preparation for the sabbath. Both gospels also refer to the stone for the first time in the narrative of the empty tomb (cf. Lk 24:2; Jn 20:1). Bailey would also point out that the picture of Jesus in Luke has been redacted to improve on Mark's representation of the passive and despairing Christ. The idea of presenting Jesus as one submitting himself for crucifixion, voluntarily and without

turmoil, confident in the knowledge that he was fulfilling his mission, is also paralleled in John where Jesus controls events right up to the end, (pp. 80-81). According to Marshall (1978), p. 877, the contacts between Jn 19:25f. and the differences in wording from Mark suggest that traces of a non-Markan source may lie behind this verse.

21. Thus Marshall (1978), p. 877.
22. Thus Rengstorf, μαθητής, TDNT, ad. loc.
23. Cf. Mk 14:10-21; Lk 22:3-23. According to Bailey (1963), pp. 42-43 Luke has the same sequence as John, a) sacramental act, i.e. the institution of the last supper; b) the prophecy of Judas' betrayal; c) the prophecy of Peter's denial; d) end of the scene. In Mark, on the other hand, the sequence is b-a-d-c.
24. Although Luke includes a reference to the death of Judas in Acts 1:15f., this event can be interpreted in terms of protecting the disciples, and Judas feels genuine sorrow for what he has done. We would also point out here that in Jn 13:27 Satan is also mentioned in connection with Judas and here we have another contact between Luke and the Fourth Gospel.
25. This is similar to the Johannine treatment of Peter and in Jn 13:37 and Lk 22:33, Peter claims he is willing to die for Jesus (contrast Mk 14:29 and Mt 26:33). Also both Lk 22:32 and Jn 21:15-17 tell of Peter's restoration. In both of these final references Jesus calls Peter Simon. For further comparisons between Luke and John see P. Parker (1962-3), esp. p. 321.
26. In Mt 26:57-75 it is two women and one man. Perhaps Luke again emphasises his interest in two-fold male witness, an idea in keeping with the practice of his day.
27. Luke also omits Mark's rebuke of Peter at Caesarea Philippi and at the transfiguration in Luke, Peter and those with him enter the cloud. To the second passion prediction Luke adds that "it was concealed from them" (Lk 9:45), thus protecting the image of the disciples to a certain extent. Finally, there is no parallel in Luke to the Marcan version of the rivalry between the sons of Zebedee (cf. Mk 10:35-45).
28. Certain mss add αὶ at this point.
29. The question of the identity of the women will be discussed below in our exegesis of 24:10.
30. Thus Munro (1982).
31. Thus Flender (1967), p. 10.
32. Thus Witherington (1984), p. 63.
33. The whole idea of the ministry of Jesus being part of a divine plan involving the defeat of Satan is one of the major themes underlining Conzelmann's study of the theology of Luke, (1961).
34. This point is made by V. Robbins (1987), p. 511.
35. Both Dibelius (1965).97 and Bultmann (1963), pp. 12ff. maintain that the isolated saying in v. 15 has probably been expanded in novelistic fashion. For a more detailed discussion of how Lk 13:10-17 fits in to Luke's narrative theology see M. D. Hamm (1987).
36. We note that in the miracle of the curing of Jairus' daughter, the girl is twelve years old and in the Marcan account Jesus takes the girl's hand (cf. Mk. 5:41).
37. For a development of the liberation theme see Hamm (1987), pp. 26-29.
38. Cf. Lk 2:36-38, the prophetess Anna; 18:2-5 the obstinate widow.
39. Thus Fuller (1968), p. 64; Bultmann (1963), p. 215.
40. Cf. 4:18-19, 24-27; 5:30-32.

41. Thus Parvey (1974), p. 139. This pairing in Luke was also noticed earlier by Cadbury (1958), p. 234. Moving beyond the parallelism in the parables, Cadbury also notes that the mother of Jesus corresponds to the father of John, and both receive the promise of the child and offer a song of praise. A man and a woman acknowledge the infant Jesus (Simeon and Anna). Apart from the pairing miracles, Cadbury sees further evidence of pairing in Luke-Acts. Here at Athens Dionysius and Domaris are listed as converts and in Macedonia we have a male and female host in Jason and Lydia. Two other sets of famous pairs are Ananias and Sapphira and Aquila and Priscilla. See also Flender (1967), pp. 9-10 who notes that the parallels occur mainly in the Special Lucan material.
42. See Jeremias (1976), pp. 153-157. Jeremias also comments that there are parallels here with Lk 11:5-8 where once again the message is persistence in prayer.
43. For a discussion of the legal issues involved here see J.D.M. Derrett (1977), pp. 32-47.
44. Thus T.W. Manson (1957), p. 282.
45. Thus Jeremias (1976), pp. 135-136.
46. This suggests possibly a Q source.
47. See parallel in Mt 12:42
48. Both Matthew and Luke give three examples here of what will happen on judgement day and both include the effects this will have on both men and women.
49. Also found in Mt 22:37-9. For a discussion of the form-critical grounds for this saying see Witherington (1984), pp. 46-47.
50. It is worth pointing out here that in our examination of Mk 3:20-35 we did not essentially interpret this pericope in terms of an attack upon the physical family of Jesus.
51. Thus Drury (1976), p. 63.
52. The idea that the ministry of Jesus marked the beginning of a new period in history has been advanced by a number of scholars, most notably Conzelmann (1961); Marshall (1970) and C.K. Barrett (1961).
53. Apart from referring back to our earlier reference to barrenness in Luke, see also M. Yeb 6.6. It is also worth mentioning that there are Old Testament echoes here and we remember the unusual births associated with important figures e.g. Sarah and Isaac (Gn 17:15f.); Samson (Jg 13:2-7) and Hannah and Samuel (1 Sam 1:5-6).
54. Some scholars would, however, attribute the magnificat to Elizabeth. See Drury (1976), p. 49.
55. Thus J.M. Creed (1959), pp. 112-113.
56. It is worth mentioning that both these references in Mark appear in relation to the passion narrative.
57. Thus Marshall (1978), p. 315. See also Conzelmann (1961), pp. 46-48 who suggests Luke has moved his Marcan reference because of his particular concept of witness.
58. Thus *ibid.*; Witherington (1979).
59. Thus Fiorenza (1977), p. 138.
60. See *ibid.*
61. Thus Cadbury (1958), p. 261; S. Heine (1987), p. 60; Witherington (1979), pp. 243f. This interpretation is challenged in a recent article by D.C. Sim (1989) who supports Witherington's arguments that this passage has suffered a long period of neglect at the hands of New Testament scholars. Sim challenges the women's ability to support the ministry of Jesus, and he points to the general position of women in Palestine where few would have access to independent income (pp. 52-53). He then goes on to suggest that the majority of these women must have been single since it was also

- rare for women to leave their husbands at this time, and married women in particular were not financially independent (pp. 53-54).
62. Thus Marshall (1978), p. 315. See, however, Sim (1989), p. 55, who disagrees with the conclusions reached by Witherington and others about the discipleship of women. The point Sim wishes to stress, therefore, is that we do not have enough evidence to claim that women attended to domestic tasks, and Lk 8:1-3 sheds no light at all on the discipleship role of Jesus' female followers (p. 60).
 63. Cf. also Jn 11:1-44 and 12:1-11.
 64. For a discussion of the family at Bethany see J.N. Sanders (1954-5).
 65. We have already pointed out in our chapter on Mark that this evangelist probably intended us to compare the anointing of 14:2-10 with the unsuccessful attempt of 16:1f.
 66. Analysis of the anointing pericope in Luke is both difficult and uncertain. Thus Bultmann (1963), pp. 20-21. We are not only concerned here with the relationship between Luke and Mark, but also with the question of whether Lk 7:36-50 is a unified whole or a combination of traditions. Dibelius (1965), p. 114 is uncertain. Bultmann, however, is more forthright, and for him Lk 7:36-50 is a combination of traditions with the original nucleus being the parable of vv. 41-43 and 47a to which the rest was added on the basis of Mk 14:3-9. See *ibid.* Finally see also Marshall (1978), p. 305; Creed (1959), pp. 109-110 who both hold that the anointing story represents an earlier tradition.
 67. The anointing of Jesus' feet emphasises the repentance theme developed in Luke's gospel. See Drury (1976), pp. 11, 69, 72, 76, 77, 88, 89, 90, 91, 116, 155, 158, 183.
 68. Thus Conzelmann (1961), p. 79.
 69. Thus Marshall (1978), p. 878. See also V. Taylor (1926), pp. 59f., (1972), pp. 99-101. According to the latter reference, Taylor suggests that points in the Marcan narrative which have no parallel in Luke have been omitted because of a Lucan desire to abbreviate the narrative. Luke has also polished the style of his source and added a number of explanatory comments. Thus we see that Joseph did not consent to the decision to kill Jesus.
 70. According to Marshall (1978), p. 879, this may reflect a different source. However, if Luke intends us to see the reason for the women's buying spices as completing a hurried burial, then the reference to the day of preparation at the end of the narrative makes their activity seem all the more necessary.
 71. The phrase "and behold a man" is typical Lucan style. Cf. 1:36; 19:2. According to Benoit (1969), p. 216, Luke's interest in Joseph's spiritual qualities is an example of the way he does justice to people he presents in his narrative, e.g. Zechariah (1:6) and Simeon (2:25) are also given generous characters. See also A.R.C. Leaney (1958), p. 287. For ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός Taylor points to Acts 11:4, (1972), p. 100. We could also add that this portrayal of Joseph in Luke prepares us for the introduction of Nicodemus in John.
 72. Thus Benoit (1969), pp. 216-217.
 73. According to E. Schweizer (1984), p. 364, Joseph's appearance in all four gospels proves that none of the disciples were present to perform this duty.
 74. It is the opinion of A. Plummer (1910), p. 541 that this does not imply that Joseph believed Jesus to be the Messiah.
 75. Thus Drury (1976), p. 117.
 76. Some mss add καθελὼν αὐτό A Δ pm; TR; Diglot. There are also a

- number of contacts here between John and Matthew against Mark. The Gospel of Peter 6:23 also adds here that the body is washed before being wrapped in linen.
77. Note Mark has $\pi\tau\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha/\sigma\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha$.
 78. See also Jn 19:41. According to Taylor this may reflect a knowledge of the Johannine tradition, but hardly requires a written source (1972), pp. 100-101. According to Ellis (1966), p. 270, Luke stresses the care shown for the body and for him a particular interest in the Lucan burial narrative is to stress the reality of Jesus' death over against docetic tendencies. As we will see below, this was also a feature of the Lucan version of the empty tomb and the resurrection appearances. See C.H. Talbert (1974), p. 113f. for the emphasis on corporeality in the Lucan passion and resurrection narratives.
 79. Contrast Jn 19:38f.
 80. As we will point out below, this is possibly a sign that Luke knew Mark. See B. Metzger (1964), p. 50 who draws attention to the fact that Codex Bezae adds here that after laying the body in his rock hewn tomb, Joseph put before the tomb a (great) stone which twenty men could scarcely roll.
 81. See M. Black (1967), pp. 136-138 who is unusual here in suggesting that the phrase referred to the breaking of day. Most would agree that it is a reference to either the lighting of lamps at sunset on the Friday or the appearance of the evening star. See Marshall (1978), p. 881; Benoit (1969), p. 217.
 82. See Plummer (1910), pp. 542-3 who draws our attention to the use of the phrase $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\beta\beta\alpha\tau\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\phi\omega\sigma\epsilon\nu$ - the dawning of the sabbath at sunset, and he points to a similarity here with the Gospel of Peter. In GP 2:5 when Pilate asks Herod for the body before the crucifixion, Herod replies "Brother Pilate, even if no-one had begged him, we should bury him, since the Sabbath is drawing on."
 83. Luke has $\epsilon\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\ \tau\omicron\ \mu\upsilon\mu\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu$. It is interesting that Luke reverts to the Marcan $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \Gamma\omicron\lambda\iota\lambda\alpha\iota\alpha\varsigma$ at this point. See also Plummer (1910), p. 543 who notes variant MSS traditions here which have $\delta\upsilon\omicron\ \gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\chi\epsilon\varsigma$ instead of $\alpha\iota\ \gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\chi\epsilon\varsigma$ which we would suggest reflects a knowledge of Mark and Matthew.
 84. It is the opinion of Taylor that the difference between Luke and Mark here is because they are following a different tradition (1926), p. 61. See also W. Grundmann (1966), p. 436. Finally, for Leaney (1958), p. 288, the reference to the women resting on the sabbath illustrates Luke's concern for his double audience of Jew and Gentile.
 85. Thus Fuller (1980), pp. 95-6. Fuller also suggest this indicates that Luke is, therefore, a later reflection on the tradition. See also Taylor (1972), pp. 101-103. According to G.R. Driver (1965), p. 329 burial procedures were not included among sabbath restrictions.
 86. See Benoit (1969), p. 217.
 87. Thus Marshall (1978), p. 881. See also Mahoney (1974), pp. 165-166 who notes that the connection between the burial and the empty tomb story has grown stronger in Luke and an indication of how well Luke has joined these two narratives together is to be found in the problems scholars face in trying to draw the line between the two episodes.
 88. According to N. Perrin (1977), p. 64, this is the most interesting redactional feature of Lk 24:1-11.
 89. According to Fuller (1980), p. 96, all these variations in detail suggest Luke is using an alternative version to the story in Mark.

Furthermore, this version is one which has a lot in common with the ascension story of Acts 1:10 where we have two angels whose function is to interpret an event after it has happened.

90. Thus Mahoney (1974), p. 165.
91. Thus Bultmann (1963), p. 287; H. Graß (1964), p. 35; Bailey (1963), p. 87.
92. K.H. Rengstorf (1937), p. 267.
93. Thus Fuller (1980), pp. 95-6; Taylor (1972), pp. 103-109. See also Ellis (1966), p. 272; Grundmann (1966), p. 439.
94. While Marshall is reluctant to conclude Luke was using a continuous source other than Mark at this point, the presence of Marcan and non-Markan material before and after this story for him strengthens the case for it here also. Thus (1978), pp. 882-3.
95. See Jeremias (1974), pp. 74-79 who points out that the actions of the women in preparing the body for burial would not have broken sabbath law (cf. M. Shab 23:5). According to S.G. Wilson (1983), p. 20, this is one of several places in the gospel where Luke either implicitly or explicitly affirms the validity of the law.
96. See S.G. Wilson (1973), p. 98. Wilson points out here that this is the last time reference we have in the gospel. See also Robertson (1920), p. 169 who feels that Luke's time references make his timing fit more correctly with later references to "on the third day". We reject Bailey's suggestion here that Luke has located the women's going to the tomb before sunrise to emphasise their zeal as this does not fit in with the redaction of Lk 24:1-11 as a whole. Thus (1963), p. 87.
97. Many MSS add καὶ τινες οὖν αἰτῶσι (TR; Diglot) probably because of v. 10 though the shorter text is probably the more original.
98. Note Luke does not maintain Mark's structure and the three-fold repetition of ἔρχομαι.
99. Some texts read τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ and it is suggested that this was an early insertion. Thus Plummer (1910), p. 547; C.F. Evans (1970), p. 102 sees this as an addition. See Jeremias (1974), pp. 145-152 for an alternative view.
100. Thus Mahoney (1974), p. 166.
101. There are some textual variants here and instead of εἰσελθοῦσαι δὲ there is a variant reading καὶ εἰσελθοῦσα (AC³W 1¹⁰ pm; TR; Diglot).
102. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν cf. 5:1 and 8:1.
103. Thus Bultmann (1963), p. 286. See also Fuller (1980), p. 95.
104. See Bode (1970), pp. 60-1 for a discussion in relation to 24:4.
105. Thus Ellis (1966), p. 272; Marshall (1978), p. 885; J. Plevnik (1987), p. 93. This is, however, rejected by Mahoney who does not consider that this is the function of the angels in Luke, (1974), p. 167.
106. See Leaney (1958), pp. 291-292.
107. See Fuller (1980), p. 96 who notes that the two angels serve the same function in Acts where they interpret an event after it has occurred.
108. Thus Bode (1970), p. 59.
109. ἔμφοβος is always accompanied by γίνεσθαι and almost always appears in Luke. Cf. 24:37; Acts 10:4; 24:25 and Rev 11:13. Thus Plummer (1910), p. 548.
110. See Marshall (1978), p. 885, who notes that some MSS have the singular here.
111. See *ibid.* See also Bode (1970), p. 59 who draws attention to the Old Testament where the recipient of a heavenly vision is often said to bow his face to the ground in veneration. He cites

- examples here such as Abraham (Gn 18:2; 17:3), Joshua (Jos. 5:14) and the parents of Samson (Jg 13:20). Finally, Bode also points out that this fear motif is present in the infancy narratives in the appearances of Gabriel to Zechariah and Mary (1:12-13, 29-30) and the angel of the Lord to the shepherds (2:9-10).
112. Thus Benoit (1969), p. 228. There may be a criticism here of the women's behaviour, and in Acts 1:11, the men look up towards heaven unlike the women here who look to the ground. For the importance of ζῶω in Luke see Bode (1970), pp. 61-2 and Marshall (1978), p. 885.
 113. See Evans (1970), p. 102 where he suggests that the two men speak as one reflecting a trait of popular writing, cf. Acts 9:38.
 114. Thus Marxsen (1970), p. 49. See also Plummer (1910), p. 548 who suggests a possible reference to Isa 8:19 may lie behind this rebuke.
 115. Thus Fuller (1980), p. 97. For Schweizer (1984), p. 366, this recalls a Jewish saying against necromancy, "Is it customary to look for the dead among the living and for the living among the dead?" Because Jesus is alive, in the same sense as God is alive, then he is not to be found among the dead. The notion of God being a God of the living is found in the gospel in 10:28.
 116. See Benoit (1969), p. 248. For Bode (1970), p. 62 the phrase is interpreted in terms of Lucan usage and it, therefore, means that Jesus, raised by the living God, now possesses a special life in a special way.
 117. See Jeremias (1974), p. 149.
 118. See also 24:6, 8. Since Luke has also omitted Mk 14:28 it was necessary for him to alter Mk 16:7.
 119. For the importance of Jerusalem in Luke see Conzelmann (1961), pp. 17-94; Perrin (1977), pp. 70f.; Marxsen (1970), p. 50; Bode (1970), pp. 62f.; Fuller (1980), p. 97.
 120. Thus Evans (1970), p. 92.
 121. Thus Evans (1970), p. 103; Bode (1970), pp. 63-64; Perrin (1977), p. 64.
 122. For the significance of δεῖ in Luke, see Grundmann, δεῖ δεόν ἐστι, TDNT, ad. loc. See also Bode (1970), pp. 64f.; Mahoney (1974), p. 168. The whole of the Lucan passion narrative is governed by the belief that certain things 'must' happen, and this is an important theological theme for Luke.
 123. σκαρπῶσθαι is used by Matthew in his passion predictions. Fuller (1980), p. 98, therefore, concludes that as a later redactor Matthew felt free to use it.
 124. Thus Benoit (1969), p. 248. There may also be a faint connection here between Luke and Jn 20:18f. where Mary Magdalene is possibly criticised for trying to hold on to the old 'earthly' Christ instead of moving on to the more spiritualised Christ of the church.
 125. Thus Bode (1970), p. 67; Plevnik (1987), p. 92.
 126. See Metzger (1964), p. 84, who notes that some MSS omit ἀπὸ τοῦ μνμείου.
 127. Thus Fuller (1980), p. 100.
 128. See Evans (1970), p. 104.
 129. Thus Bode (1970), p. 67. For the doubt motif see also Mt 28:17 and Jn 20:25. For an alternative view see P. Perkins (1984), p. 156. It is her conclusion that disbelief is not intended to indicate that the women's testimony failed and she interprets the flashback of 24:22-23 as confirmation of the reliability of the women's report. Thus for her the women's testimony provides one of the

- elements that moves the narrative forward toward its culmination.
130. See Marxsen (1970), p. 49.
 131. We, therefore, disagree with the conclusion of Marxsen (1970), p. 49 and Plevnik (1987), p. 92.
 132. See Marshall (1978), p. 887.
 133. According to Cadbury (1958), p. 83, Mark is the foundation for all lists of Jesus' brothers or disciples or women associates. For Fuller (1980), p. 95, Luke is combining two distinct traditions of the discovery of the tomb, and the similarities and differences between the women named by Mark and those identified by Luke support this conclusion.
 134. According to Marxsen (1970), p. 49, this link is deliberate and worthy of note.
 135. For a discussion of who Joanna might be see E. Moltmann-Wendel (1982), pp. 131-145. According to Robertson (1920), p. 75, Joanna may even have been a possible source for Luke and this is a theme taken up by L. Swidler (1979), p. 261. See also Fiorenza (1983b), pp. 439-440, who suggests Luke inserted her into the Marcan list in 24:10 because of his interest in wealthy women.
 136. We would also point out that like Mark, but unlike Matthew, Luke has not added τοῖς μύργοις here.
 137. See Epistula Apostolorum 10, NTApoc, vol. 1, pp. 195-196.
 138. This theme will reappear in the apocrypha where a number of women repeatedly try to convince the disciples though none of them are believed.
 139. For a discussion of recent studies see Grundmann (1966), p. 439; Bode (1970), pp. 68f. See also Jeremias (1974), pp. 149-151. The most recent author to argue against the authenticity of Lk 24:12 is R. Mahoney (1974), pp. 41-49.
 140. Thus Leaney (1955-6), p. 111. Leaney then goes on to consider other material in Lk. 24 which is found only in the western tradition, and by including v. 40 he then constructs a source which he considers was the basis for Lk 24:12, 30-40 and Jn 20:3-10, 19-22. There were two events narrated with the first involving Peter at the tomb and the second dealing with the disciples in the upper room. The appearance to Peter is reconstructed by Leaney to read:

But Peter got up and ran to the tomb, and stooped down and saw the bandages lying by themselves, and he went away wondering what had happened, for he did not yet know the scripture that he must rise from the dead.

According to Fuller (1980), p. 102, although Leaney's reconstruction is attractive, we should probably assign the last clause about Peter's ignorance of the scripture to Johannine redaction.
 141. See Neirynck (1984), p. 173. See also Neirynck (1972) and the literature cited there. We would also draw attention here to J. Muddiman (1972), p. 547 who gives an interesting interpretation to v. 24. According to him, "Cleopas and his companion have to minimise the importance of the visits to the tomb, which are not grounds for hope. They do this by reducing the women to anonymity, γυναῖκες τινες, and the same vague plural is used of the second visit, even though Peter went alone." He concludes, "it is unlikely that Luke would have sensed any discrepancy in the use of the plural here."
 142. Thus K.P.G. Curtis (1971). For Curtis this insertion is by a later redactor who sought to imitate Luke's style. According to Plummer (1910), p. 550, Lk 24:12 has the look of an insertion, and its source is probably Jn 20:3-10.

143. Thus P. Benoit (1969), p. 256; Leaney (1955-6); F.L. Cribbs (1971).
144. It is the opinion of both Fuller (1980), p. 102 and Marshall (1978), p. 888, that Luke had the tradition in its earlier form. According to Bailey (1963), pp. 91-92, Lk 24:12 is dependent on John and 24:24 is independent of John but dependent on the tradition. For Graß (1964), p. 34, Lk 24:12 is a resumé of John with the belief of the apostle omitted as Luke still had unbelief to refer to in 24:24, 38, 41. Finally, for Bode (1970), p. 70, both John and Luke represent the same basic tradition but Luke is previous to the text of John.
145. Thus Bode (1970), p. 68.
146. According to Alsup (1975), pp. 104-105, the association of Peter with the tomb is a secondary development of the original tomb story involving the women or Mary. He agrees that Peter is there as the representative of apostolic authority, but stresses that all we have here is an association of Peter with the tomb only in a secondary sense.
147. Thus Marxsen (1970), p. 50. For an alternative view see Fuller (1980), p. 103. For him, this change represents a shift in emphasis to mark the empty tomb as the primary cause of Easter faith. We would disagree with this conclusion since this is not supported by the Lucan redaction of the empty tomb story.
148. Thus Fuller (1980), p. 104.
149. See Creed (1959), p. 290. We could multiply the epithets used here but since the Emmaus tradition is not directly our concern we will stop with these two examples.
150. Thus Plummer (1910), p. 551.
151. See Marxsen (1968), pp. 33-34.
152. The idea of the 'necessity' of Jesus' ministry is a theme developed throughout the gospel as a whole. Cf. Lk 9:22; 13:33; 17:25; 22:37. For the idea of the necessity of suffering which gives way to glorification, see Flender (1967), pp. 30f.; Perrin (1977), pp. 66f.; Evans (1970), p. 96; Fuller (1980), pp. 110f.
153. According to R. Dillon, full faith in the resurrection is not expressed until v. 52. See (1978), pp. 18, 32, 40, 41, 44, 66, 67, 110, 111, 113, 147, 167.
154. See Marxsen (1968), p. 33 for this idea.
155. Thus Tetlow (1980), pp. 101-109, especially p. 109. Examining the work of Luke-Acts in terms of Conzelmann's three eras of salvation history she suggests that the discipleship of women is greatest in the period of Israel, much less during the ministry of Jesus and quite restricted in the period of the church. She considers that the reason for this is Luke's theology and his own position toward women and she concludes by agreeing with Fiorenza that, "it would seem that women had an important and active role in Luke's own late first-century community. This was such that he could not ignore the importance of women altogether, but, reacting negatively to their present active role, he could, through the theology of his gospel, attempt to argue for the restriction of women's role in the Church of his day" (p. 101). See also Fiorenza (1983b), pp. 401-402.

CHAPTER FIVE

WOMEN IN JOHN'S ACCOUNT OF THE CRUCIFIXION BURIAL AND EMPTY TOMB

In our examination of the Synoptic stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb we conducted a literary-critical examination of these three texts in each Synoptic gospel. We began with Mark's gospel, considering Mark to be the earliest Synoptic version of the empty tomb tradition, and beyond this the main source for both Matthew and Luke. We were interested to see here how both Matthew and Luke handled their Marcan source and particular note was taken of any modifications, alterations, omissions or insertions which were made. In each case we tried to determine the theological tendencies of the individual Synoptic writers, and by studying the cumulative effect of these redactional alterations, we began to see various patterns emerging which were important for deciding on the role and status of women within these scenes as they appeared in each gospel.

Beginning with the crucifixion scene in Mk 15:40-1 we noted that there is a reference here to a larger group of women who 'watched' the crucifixion from afar, *μαρτὶν*. Among this anonymous group of women three women are specifically named and these are Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joses and Salome. Mark also tells us that these were the same women who had both followed and served Jesus while he was in Galilee, and had now come up with him to Jerusalem. Our first question regarding the women of Mk 15:40 was: why were these women present at the crucifixion in Mark in place of the male disciples whom we would have expected to find there? This question was answered for us by the text of the gospel, and in Mk 14:50 we read that Jesus' male disciples all forsook him and fled when he was arrested as the Marcan Jesus had predicted even earlier in 14:27. Moving slightly backwards in the gospel, our attention was drawn to the episode in Gethsemane when 'three' of Jesus' male disciples failed him by falling asleep in his hour of need, and indeed, according to Mark, Jesus even approaches this group 'three' times, appealing to them to 'watch' with him. Returning to the watching women at the cross in Mark, we saw an obvious parallel here between the three men who failed to watch and the three women who comply with Jesus' earlier request, and are also significantly referred to 'three

times (cf. 15:47 and 16:1). We were then interested to learn whether these women would be able to 'see' in the correct manner, recognising that 'seeing' in Mark is used in more than a literal sense, and usually means being able to perceive the mysteries of the Kingdom of God (Mk 4:11-12).¹ While the two further stories involving women in Mark emphasised their role as watchers, we concluded that by referring to the watching women as watching from 'afar', Mark intended us to see the women as 'fallible followers' of Jesus and, therefore, not unlike the male disciples.

Our identification of the three women specifically named by Mark led us to identify the second woman as the mother of Jesus, and we also observed that Mary Magdalene headed each reference to the list of women in Mark, a position which may have been significant. Finally, the retrospective reference to the women's service in Galilee led us on to an examination of the role and status of women within the gospel of Mark, and our conclusions were that Mark had something definite to say to his community about the role of disciples and the manner of their service, and he did not hesitate to use women as examples of both.

Moving on to compare Matthew's redactional handling of Mark, we noted that Matthew did not introduce any male characters to the crucifixion scene and indeed he kept the Marcan reference to the three women who watch from a distance. However, by moving the reference to πολλὰ we concluded that Matthew possibly lessened the impact of the role of these three particular women. We were also not able to continue the suggestion that these women were necessarily to be seen as replacements for the absent disciples, and if anything, the third woman in Matthew, the mother of the sons of Zebedee, was there as a reminder of this male group. Finally, Matthew included Mark's retrospective reference to the service of the women in Galilee and he continued the reference to Mary Magdalene at the head of the list of women, supporting our earlier suggestion that she was already beginning to occupy a prominent role in the developing traditions of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb.

With our examination of Luke's version of the crucifixion, we began to see a much more pronounced attempt, not only to play down the role of the women at the crucifixion, but also to reintroduce the males to the scene. Luke does not, therefore, identify the women at the crucifixion, and it is not until 24:10 that we find out who they actually are. There is no reference to the Marcan ἡκολούθουν ... συναναβῆσαι.

More significant perhaps, Luke also introduces two other groups of witnesses at the cross, and these are the crowds and those known to Jesus (males).² Finally, by omitting any reference to the fleeing disciples of Mark 14:50, Luke leaves open the possibility that the male disciples could be those present at the cross.

Thus the general tendencies we noted in the developing tradition of the crucifixion were basically twofold. On the one hand, there was an interest in Mary Magdalene as the primary female witness in the story of the crucifixion. This tendency was also matched, on the other hand, by a rewriting of the Marcan tradition to introduce male characters at the cross, and as we have just noted with Luke in particular, the possibility is even left open for the disciples to be present. Beyond this, this redaction also parallels the general trends we have noticed in the early church where in some instances women are silenced and there is a movement towards the situation in the wider Jewish and Graeco-Roman sphere where women are discouraged from witnessing.

Moving on now to an examination of the developing tradition of the burial of Jesus, we noted that in the earliest account of Mk 15:42-7 the burial was carried out by Joseph of Arimathea who is described as an honourable councillor who was waiting for the Kingdom of God. This description of Joseph in Mark suggested to us that for this writer, Joseph was probably a respectable Jew.³ Beyond this, Mark closes his fairly straightforward account of the burial with a reference to the women who are once again specifically identified and described as 'watching' the scene. With Matthew's gospel we saw a very definite attempt to develop the role of Joseph of Arimathea with the description of him as a μαθητής (27:58), and this was interpreted as an attempt to correct Mark's possible slur on the disciples who do not "take courage" (cf. Mk 15:43), and, unlike the disciples of John, provide a proper burial for their master (cf. Mk 6:29). This redactional alteration in Matthew was accompanied by the introduction of the male guards at the tomb in Mt 27:62-66. The women in Luke's burial account are once again left unidentified and the integrity of Joseph is underlined (cf. Lk 23:50-1).

Thus very briefly, the main tendencies in the developing tradition of the burial were to emphasise the role of Joseph of Arimathea, and with Mt 27:62-66 we see an apologetic element being introduced to the narrative.

Without going into too much detail in our examination of the Synoptic stories of the empty tomb, we will now remind ourselves of the main features of each of these versions of the tomb story as they pertain to our present study of the role of women within these narratives. Beginning with the motivation for the women's visit to the tomb we suggested that Matthew's motivation 'to see' the tomb (28:1) probably represented, or was introduced, to create a more plausible form of the tradition than Mark's anointing motif (cf. Mk 16:1) which was probably in turn introduced to create a literary echo with 14:2f. With Lk 24:1f. we found ourselves less certain of the women's motivation for visiting the tomb, and although an anointing motif had been introduced with 23:56, we had to conclude that the lack of interest in any subsequent anointing reflected Luke's general lack of interest in the women's visit to the tomb. Mark's reference to the *σεβνία*, and his message was another feature which the evangelists felt free to alter, but more significant for our purposes was their treatment of Mk 16:8.

Matthew concluded his story of the empty tomb by including a christophany to the women (28:9-10) as they departed from the tomb in joy and haste to tell the disciples what they had seen and heard. However, this positive conclusion to the tomb story in Matthew also has to be taken together with the fact that Matthew subsequently omitted to say whether or not the women delivered the message to the disciples, though this may be inferred from the disciples departure for Galilee where they receive their own christophany in 28:16-20, thus ensuring the independence of their resurrection witness. With the reference to the guards in 28:4, Matthew had also begun the trend of introducing males to the tomb tradition.

Turning finally to Lk 24:1-10, we noted that Luke referred to the women by name only in v. 10, and although this detracted attention from the role of this specific group of women who are named at the outset in Mk 16:1 and Mt 28:1, by identifying Mary Magdalene at the head of this list, Luke continued, albeit perhaps unintentionally, to stress her role in the developing tomb tradition. Our general conclusions regarding Lk 24:1-10 were that for this evangelist at least, the empty tomb story had no real significance, and in 24:11 the women's witness is not accepted and is rejected as an idle tale.⁴ Furthermore, even though a male element is introduced to the tomb tradition in 24:12, the empty tomb again convinces no-one in Luke, and, if anything, the presence of a male

at the tomb served only to separate further the male and female witness of the resurrection as the link between the tomb tradition and the appearance traditions in Luke is now supplied by a male witness.

To sum up, what we can say about the Synoptic stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb is that we have noticed two main tendencies in the developing tradition. First of all Mary Magdalene emerges as an important female witness and she consistently appears at the head of the lists of female witnesses involved in each scene. The second, and more significant trend which we observed, was the tendency to write the male witnesses back into the tradition. Thus at the crucifixion in Luke there is a reference to male witnesses. In the burial story, Joseph of Arimathea is described as a disciple by Matthew, and this description probably reflected an attempt to write the male disciples back into this story. Finally, with the empty tomb story, we see numerous attempts to write the males back into the tradition. In Mt 28:5 there is a reference to the male guards and their reactions to the angelophany and while the primary reason for including them here was apologetic, their presence nonetheless subtly detracted attention away from the women. The silence of Mk 16:8 was interpreted differently by both Matthew and Luke. Whereas in Mt 28:9-10 the women depart in joy and haste to tell the male disciples and are met by Jesus, in Lk 24:11 their testimony is received as an idle tale and a male visit to the tomb is now recounted in 24:12. The cumulative effect of these developments suggests that the object was to keep the male witness of the resurrection independent from the women's witness. As we have already seen in our examination of the role and status of women in Judaism and the Graeco-Roman world, women's witness was not accepted as being on a par with male witness.⁵ We have also noted a parallel tendency within the early church to silence women (cf. 1 Cor 14:33b-36; 1 Tim 2:11). The end result for the gospel writers is that in both Mt 28:16-20 and Lk 24:12f. the disciples receive independent christophanies which protects the male witness of the resurrection from any reliance on female testimony, and indeed in Luke we even have a reference to the disciples appended to the story of the women at the tomb.

These conclusions on the tendencies at work in the developing tradition are the result of a thorough literary-critical analysis of the three texts currently being studied. They were first suggested by the

interesting lists of similarities and differences between the three Synoptic versions of each scene which are noticeable even after a cursory reading of the texts. Since we have already noted a number of parallels between these Synoptic texts and the Fourth Gospel, an examination of these scenes in John's gospel is therefore now appropriate as we continue our examination of the developing traditions of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb. This study is made more interesting by the fact that there are those who would challenge our earlier conclusion that Mk 16:1-8 is the earliest narrative version of the empty tomb story recorded in the gospels, and it is suggested that Jn 20:1f. represents a source both earlier and more reliable than that recorded by Mark.⁶ Thus our examination of Jn 20:1f. will continually need to refer to the question of priority, recognising that the task of unfolding the developing tradition will be a difficult one. It is recognised that the Johannine Vorlage of 20:1-18 is itself a very complex tradition, and not only does it represent a possible combination of traditions, but one which John has redacted in a very complex way.⁷

As with our previous chapters, we will begin by noting the general similarities and differences between the Johannine accounts of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb over against those stories as they appear in the Synoptic tradition.

Beginning with the crucifixion scene, we note that, in agreement with the Synoptics, women are present at the crucifixion in John, though their names appear to be different from those identified in the parallel Synoptic accounts (cf. Jn 19:25; Mk 15:40; Mt 27:55; Lk 24:10). In addition, the position of the women is different in John, and they no longer observe things from afar, but are positioned beside the cross. More significant perhaps is John's agreement with Luke that the women 'standing' there were not alone, and Jesus' male acquaintances are represented, though the figure of the Beloved Disciple is peculiar to John (19:26). John alone among the gospel writers then follows up this reference to the women by referring to the words of Jesus from the cross to the Beloved Disciple and his own mother (19:26-7).

In the account of the burial of Jesus Mark tells us that the spices are not brought until after the sabbath (16:1), according to Luke they are prepared on the Friday evening (23:56), while in John the anointing itself is completed on the Friday evening (19:39-40). In all three Synoptic gospels the person involved in the burial is Joseph of

Arimathea, and on this point John agrees, though he has referred to another possible burial by the enemies of Jesus (cf. 19:31) which is not paralleled in the Synoptic tradition.⁸ The description of Joseph of Arimathea in John as a secret disciple of Jesus (19:38) is similar to Matthew (cf. Mt 27:57). There is no reference to the Marcan "respected member of the council who was waiting for the Kingdom of God" (Mk 15:43), or to the Lucan portrayal of "a good and righteous man who had nothing to do with the plot to kill Jesus" (Lk 23:50). In addition, and peculiar to John, there is a reference to a second male involved in the burial of Jesus, Nicodemus. John is in agreement with Matthew and Luke that the tomb in which Jesus was laid was a new tomb (Mt 27:60; Lk 23:53; Jn 19:41), though he alone adds that it was situated in a garden. There is no reference to the sealing of the tomb in John (cf. Mk 15:46; Mt 27:50), and as in Luke the stone is mentioned for the first time in the story of the discovery of the empty tomb (Lk 24:2; Jn 20:1).

Finally, John, unlike the other gospel writers, does not refer to the women as witnesses to the burial, though he records that Mary Magdalene is able to go straight to the tomb on the Sunday morning. This fact, together with the previous reference to the stone, raises a question which we will attempt to answer below: did John know Mark 15:42f. and parallels?⁹

Moving on to the story of the discovery of the empty tomb, John tells us that one woman goes alone to the tomb (20:1f.). This numbering contrasts with the Synoptic accounts where there is a plurality of women (Mk 16:1f.; Mt 28:1f. and Lk 24:1f.) and we must question whether this is an indication that John had access to an independent empty tomb tradition. The use of the plural in v. 2 could indicate that John has introduced the singular reference to Mary Magdalene to an account which originally involved more than one woman. If this hypothesis is correct, then again we need to ask was John using a tradition independent of the Synoptics or the Marcan version of the empty tomb?

On the identification of the woman involved as Mary Magdalene we note that she is the only woman whom we can identify with any certainty as being common to all four accounts of the empty tomb. The time at which Mary sets out for the tomb is different in John and it is still dark (20:1), whereas in Matthew and Luke it is dawn and in Mark after sunrise. The motive for the visit according to Mark is to anoint the body, and Luke appears to agree with this, though he does not

subsequently refer to any attempt to anoint the body of Jesus after 24:2. In Matthew's version, the motive for the visit has altered and it is to 'see' the tomb (Mt 28:1). While John does not directly refer to a motive for Mary's visit to the tomb, he does refer to her 'seeing' (βλέπει) in 20:1 and weeping (κλαίουσά) in 20:11, suggesting a similarity with the Matthean account.

Unlike the Synoptic accounts, John does not now continue with the reference to the angelophany and the message and reaction of the women to this, but instead we have the story of the race of the disciples to the tomb in vv. 3-10. Our questions concerning Jn 20:3-10 will focus on whether or not these verses are an insertion to an originally continuous story of the discovery of the empty tomb (20:1 (2), 11f.), and the links between John and Lk 24:12 and 24. Is Jn 20:3-10 based directly on Lk 24:12 or a tradition underlying that verse? Or is Lk 24:24 the more original Lucan version, and if so has John developed this tradition by deliberately concentrating on the Beloved Disciple and introducing the story of the race to the tomb? A subsequent scribe is, therefore, responsible for introducing the Lucan manuscript tradition of 24:12 as a summary of Jn 20:3-10 which he knew.

Apart from introducing males at the tomb, John also appears to downgrade the angelophany (Jn 20:11-14a). Like Luke, John refers to two angels and not one angel at the tomb, but he does not have the angels deliver a message to the women as in the Synoptic versions. Instead this message is reserved for the christophany which follows in 20:14b-18. We, therefore, need to ask what layers of tradition were at work here. Was Jn 20:11-14a the more original version of the angelophany which the Synoptic tradition subsequently embellished? Or has the angel motif been significantly altered by John or someone before him in the light of the insert of vv. 3-10? Finally, it is also possible that the christophany of vv. 14b-18 supplanted the need for the message of the angels, and this could then be the source for any possible redactional work in John.

Our final comparison with the Synoptics are the similarities noted between Jn 20:14b-18 and Mt 28:9-10. John, like Matthew, has a christophany to the women following the discovery of the empty tomb, and in particular attention is drawn to the Johannine reference μή μου ἔπτευ which is compared with Matthew's ἐπράτησαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας, and the Johannine πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς μου with Matthew's τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου. The central question here is whether or not John is dependent on Matthew

28:9-10 which we have already shown to be a piece of Matthean compositional theology. The alternative is that John represents an independent tradition. Finally, the reaction of Mary Magdalene who rushes to tell the disciples (Jn 20:18) contrasts with the Marcan silence and agrees with Matthew and Luke, though there is no reference here to the Lucan disbelief of the disciples (cf. Lk 24:11).

This list of similarities and differences between John and the Synoptics leads us to ask: did John have access to the Synoptic traditions? The position adopted here, and one which we consider to be supported by a detailed analysis of the text, is that John was at least aware of the Synoptic tradition, and in particular the form of that tradition which appeared in Luke's gospel and also Matthew, if Mt 28:9-10 is Matthean and has links with Jn 20:11f. The advantage of this theory for our analysis of the Johannine scenes of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb is that if John was aware of the Synoptic traditions, then we can examine how he modified and altered this material and what omissions or insertions he has made. As always, our central concern will be to consider whether or not John's treatment of these narratives resulted in either redacting women out of, or into the tradition, or perhaps, less drastically, eclipsing their role, and thus to what extent he reflects or departs from the tendencies in the developing tradition which we have already noted in our survey of the Synoptic tradition.

A THE CRUCIFIXION - Jn 19:25-7

We have already pointed out in our introduction that the main elements of the Johannine crucifixion scene are the identification of the women who are positioned near the cross, and the reference to the Beloved Disciple and the ensuing conversation when Jesus entrusts his mother and the Beloved Disciple to the care of each other. We have also noted that this crucifixion scene in John is both similar to and different from the Synoptic accounts, and this has led C.K. Barrett to conclude that John was probably dependent on Mark, but that either he himself or an intermediary source altered this source markedly.¹⁰ R.E. Brown and C.H. Dodd, on the other hand, would prefer to see John as an independent tradition.¹¹ In the opinion of Brown, John differs significantly from the Synoptic reports and this conclusion he believes is born out by the fact that in the shared material John's vocabulary is very different from

the Synoptics and, for example, the names of the women are varied. Brown also notes that in the common material the sequence is different, and we have the reference to the women during the crucifixion and not as a sequel. We will examine the text for ourselves and decide whether these differences in John are due to the fact that he is either following an independent tradition or representing an alteration of the Synoptic traditions prompted by theological interests, before passing judgement on this relationship.

1 v. 25

As we have noted above, in John, the reference to the women is made during the crucifixion and not as a sequel as in the Marcan version. According to R. Bultmann, this is an alteration made by the evangelist who has brought the notice forward to make a connection for vv. 26f. which are, furthermore, of his own composition.¹² This suggestion is one with which we would tend to agree, and it is given limited support by Dodd who finds a hint of literary composition in the classical form of the sentence.¹³

There is no parallel in John to the Synoptic reference to the women who had followed and served Jesus while he was in Galilee and had now come up with him to Jerusalem and, although Luke had earlier referred to women who served Jesus in Galilee (cf. 8:1-3), both he and John agree in their silence here. Another difference between John and the Synoptics is the position of the women; and they no longer view from a distance but stand beside the cross, *παρὰ τῆ σταυροῦ*. We have already noted the possibility that the Marcan tradition (cf. Mk 15:40f.) was influenced by Ps 38:11.¹⁴ However, it is possible that John was aware of the Lucan tradition, and his *εἰστήχεισαν... παρὰ τῆ σταυροῦ* might read as a correction of Luke's *εἰστήχεισαν... ἀπο μακρόθεν*, rather than Mark. Bearing in mind the other similarities between John and Luke's accounts of the passion and resurrection we believe this is a distinct possibility.¹⁵ Theories which attempt to harmonise the Johannine and Synoptic accounts, suggesting the friends of Jesus stood near the cross but were later moved away are not convincing. We will also not concern ourselves here with whether or not John's positioning was historically less plausible than the Synoptics since such questions are beyond the scope of this thesis.¹⁶ We would, however, suggest that John knew the Synoptic tradition, possibly in its Lucan form, and he altered this to prepare for the

conversation which followed.

Apart from the positioning of the women at the cross, a further problem which concerns us here is the question of the number and identity of the women involved. Does the evangelist intend us to think of two, three or four women? While Bultmann considers that no answer can be given to the question of the enumeration of the women,¹⁷ others are not so quick to dismiss the problem, though it is realised that while identifications are easy to conjecture, they are impossible to ascertain with any certainty.¹⁸

As we have just stated, our first problem is to ascertain whether we are dealing with two, three or four women.¹⁹ If there are two women, then the text reads "his mother (Mary of Clopas) and his mother's sister (Mary Magdalene)". If there are three women, then the text reads "his mother and his mother's sister (Mary of Clopas) and Mary Magdalene ". The weakness with both of these theories is that while John never identifies Jesus' mother by name, we would suggest that he knew she was called Mary, and it is, therefore, unlikely that she would have a sister also called Mary.²⁰ The most acceptable solution is, therefore, that there are four women, two named and two unnamed, "the mother of Jesus, her sister, Mary of Clopas and Mary Magdalene ".²¹

Since the difficulties in identifying the Johannine women have been connected with the question of whether or not they are the same women as those mentioned in the Synoptic accounts, we will briefly recall the women mentioned there and discuss the *possible identifications*.

In the Synoptic accounts, there are only three women specifically identified, though we note that more than three women were involved as Mk 15:40 (πολλαί) indicates.²² The woman common to all three passion and resurrection stories is Mary Magdalene. In addition, Matthew and Mark have Mary the mother of James and Joseph/Joses, and Luke Μαρίας ἡ Ἰακώβου (24:10), which more than likely was meant to be in agreement with Mark's Μαρίας ἡ Ἰακώβου... μήτηρ. Mark then has Salome, Matthew the mother of the sons of Zebedee, and Luke Joanna.²³ The question which concerns us is whether or not John's list is derived from these lists, or is an independent list of women,²⁴ bearing in mind our earlier suggestion that the Synoptic writers probably had access to a tradition which revolved around two fixed names, and probably included others.

Various attempts have been made to identify the women in the Johannine list with those in the Synoptic tradition. Mary Magdalene

presents no problems since she is common to all four gospels, and beyond this it is interesting to note that for Mark, Matthew and John she appears only from the crucifixion onwards.²⁵ Brown considers that the reference to the mother of Jesus occurs only in John.²⁶ However, in our earlier chapter on Mark, we were able to show that the mother of James and Joses was to be identified with the mother of Jesus (cf. Mk 6:3).²⁷

The third woman in the Johannine list, Mary the wife of Clopas, (Μαρία ἡ τοῦ κλωπᾶ) is sometimes identified with the mother of James and Joses, but it is difficult to uphold such an identification.²⁸ One other suggestion is to identify Clopas with the Cleopas of Lk 24:18, and he is one of the two disciples walking with Jesus on the road to Jerusalem. Although the two names are different, and Clopas appears to have been a Semitic name, it may have been the equivalent of the Greek name Cleopas. While there is also further uncertainty whether it was the wife or daughter of Clopas who was intended,²⁹ the interesting point as far as we are concerned is that once again we have another possible echo of the Lucan traditions of the passion and the resurrection in John.

The final woman in our list, his mother's sister, (ἡ ἀδελφὴ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ) is identified with Salome or the mother of the sons of Zebedee by P. Benoit and J. Wenham who suggest that this means the sons of Zebedee were, therefore, cousins of Jesus, and if one of them was the Beloved Disciple, then this also explains why Jesus entrusted the care of his mother to this disciple. Furthermore, they argue that this close relationship of the sons of Zebedee to Jesus explains why they or their mother expected special favours in the gospel (cf. Mk 10:35f. and Mt 20:20).³⁰ For ourselves we should not be so confident in speculating about Jesus' family and relations, particularly when taking the Beloved Disciple as an historical figure, and using episodes recorded in the Synoptics, but with no Johannine parallels, to support such an identification in John. It is probably more likely that all we can say about this Johannine woman is that, if anything, she was possibly one of the women known in the traditions which circulated about the women involved in the passion and resurrection.³¹

While the various identifications suggested above are interesting, we tend to agree with Brown that they are most uncertain, apart perhaps for Mary Magdalene, and we would add the mother of Jesus. Since these are the only two women who appear in all four gospels, it is possible to suggest, therefore, that this identification of the women in John

supports our earlier suggestion that apart from these two women, the names of the other women frequently oscillated in the tradition.³² This interest in Mary Magdalene and the mother of Jesus is reinforced in John where henceforth the scenes involving women focus on these two characters, though the Johannine address *γύναι* could indicate John intended us to read more than a personal identification into these two women who are representative of Johannine types.³³

2 vv. 26-7

The earlier reference to the women in John, which as we have already commented, makes no reference to any previous service in Galilee, would seem merely to serve as an introduction to the scene which now follows in vv. 26-7. We have suggested that John possibly moved the reference to the women to an earlier point in his crucifixion narrative to accommodate this scene. There is also no further mention of two of the women of v. 25, and in John we now have a scene involving only the mother of Jesus, and later one where Mary Magdalene appears alone at the tomb. The tendency to omit or abbreviate references to female figures from the stories of the burial and empty tomb is also paralleled in the other gospels (cf. Mk 15:40 and 15:47; Mt 27:56 and 27:61 and 28:1). The Beloved Disciple is also introduced rather suddenly here in vv. 26-7, and bearing in mind our earlier suggestion that the Synoptic writers were embarrassed by the absence of male disciples at the cross, and subsequently wrote men back into the tradition (cf. Lk 23:49), it is possible to suggest a similar motive was at work here. However, given John's interest in this figure of the Beloved Disciple it is more likely that his primary concern was to write him into the tradition rather than either deliberately writing the women out or trying to overshadow them.

There are, therefore, numerous theories on the historicity of this scene, though few scholars would posit a pre-gospel written tradition behind Jn 19:26-7, and they usually attribute to the evangelist scenes where the Beloved Disciple appears since he is peculiar to the Fourth Gospel. The scene itself is also set apart from the previous material since not only does it break the links of time and place, but is also transfers our attention to a future scene as well as displaying an interest in the fortunes of subordinate characters, which is a feature rarely found in the passion narrative.³⁴ Furthermore, this scene also

contains characteristic elements of Johannine vocabulary and compositional features.³⁵

a v. 26

This verse opens with a reference to Jesus' seeing, ἰδὼν, his mother at the foot of the cross. This reference to Jesus' seeing contrasts with the Synoptics where it is the women who watch (cf. Mk 15:40; Mt 27:55 and Lk 23:49). In John, Jesus is in control of events, even up to the end (cf. 10:17-18 and 18:4f.). Moving beyond this scene we also note the importance of 'seeing' in the Johannine account of the discovery of the empty tomb and in the subsequent christophany where there are no less than seven references to those who see (cf. 20:2, 5, 6, 8, 12, 14, 18, 29).

Jesus' mother is not identified by name in John's gospel and in the only other scene involving her, the wedding feast at Cana (2:1-12), she is addressed in a similar manner, γύναι.³⁶ According to both Barrett and Brown, there was no harshness or disrespect implied by the use of this term,³⁷ and in John, Jesus uses it elsewhere as a polite form of addressing women (cf. 4:21; 8:10 (?); 20:13). Since in the previous Cana scene John displayed no hesitancy in referring to Mary as the mother of Jesus (cf. 2:1, 3, 5, and 12), and indeed, he has just identified this woman as the mother of Jesus, we cannot read into the use of γύναι an attempt to devalue the mother-son relationship. This suggests that γύναι has possibly a symbolic significance and we will discuss this point below in our assessment of the purpose and meaning of Jn 19:26-7. Moving beyond this present scene, the repetition of γύναι for Mary Magdalene in 20:13 allows us to connect these two incidents, and again helps us to see both women as representative types.

The reference to the disciple Jesus loved is peculiar to John and there is much scholarly discussion on the possible identification of this person.³⁸ It is usually concluded that John himself was responsible for introducing him to the narrative, and it is significant that this is the only time in the gospel where he appears without Peter.

The fact that John can refer to a male disciple at the scene of the crucifixion is made possible by the fact that he does not record the flight of the male disciples upon the arrest of Jesus, even though he has predicted this earlier in 16:32, hinting that he was possibly aware of Mk 14:27f. John is, therefore, in agreement with Luke's account of the

arrest of Jesus, though he goes beyond Luke and records that Jesus pleads with the soldiers to let his disciples go free (18:8).³⁹ Later, in the account of Peter's denial, we read that Peter gains access to the high priest's courtyard because the 'other disciple' who was present was known to the high priest (18:15). The emerging picture is one which is more favourable towards the male disciples than the parallel Marcan version, and not only do the disciples not flee, but it is Jesus himself, according to John, who makes representation on their behalf to the Roman authorities.

Since John does not have a direct parallel to the Synoptic Gethsemane scene, there is no embarrassing account of Jesus' approach to his sleeping disciples who fail to watch with him (cf. Mk 14:37f.), though again there are indications that John was possibly aware of this tradition (cf. 12:27f.; 18:1).⁴⁰

The treatment of the betrayal by Judas in John is similar to Luke where the harsh Marcan portrait is softened. Thus, as in Luke, the action is seen as part of the divine plan and the work of Satan acting through human agents (Lk 22:3 and Jn 13:2, 27a).⁴¹ The denial by Peter is recorded in John as it is in Luke, with the prediction by Jesus occurring during the Last Supper (Lk 22:31-34 and Jn 13:38).⁴² The negative implications of this denial are, however, toned down in 21:15-19, and the three-fold denial is matched by a three-fold affirmation of love.⁴³

To sum up, the effect of the above is to suggest that John did not share the negative portrayal of the disciples which we find in Mark, but rather, like Luke, he was concerned to present the disciples in a more positive light. Thus in spite of his own evidence to the contrary (cf. 16:32), John, possibly prompted by Luke, feels no embarrassment about including males at the cross, and in the numerous references to the disciples in the passion and resurrection stories we presume that according to him they possibly did not all flee but were present with Jesus (cf. 18:5; 19:26, 35; 20:3).

Finally, the phrase *ἴδε ὁ υἱός σου... ἴδε ἡ μήτηρ σου* according to Barrett recalls an adoption formula,⁴⁴ though Brown notes there is no exact parallel where the woman is mentioned first, and indeed, adoption formulae usually follow the 'you are' pattern rather than the Johannine 'here is'.⁴⁵

b v. 27

We are probably not intended to take this verse literally and assume the Beloved Disciple and Jesus' mother departed immediately, but understand it in terms of the Johannine 'hour', i.e. when Jesus returned to his father indeed, v. 35 suggests the Beloved Disciple was still present.⁴⁶

This leads us on to consider the possible meaning of this passage. Since historical questions are beyond the scope of our present study, and since Jn 19:25-7 would appear to be the focal point of the brief episode involving the women at the cross in John, we must ask: what possible meaning did John intend us to read out of this scene? Attention has been drawn to the fact that neither the Beloved Disciple nor the mother of Jesus have been given personal names here, and this has suggested that the significance of both figures lay in their respective roles.

A number of symbolic interpretations have, therefore, been given to Jn 19:25-7 beginning with the church fathers who interpreted this scene as a piece of biographical information telling us what happened to the mother of Jesus after his death, but more significantly also symbolising the perpetual virginity of Mary.⁴⁷ We would not, however, accept such a conclusion since elsewhere in the gospel John does not show any interest in biographical details. There are no birth stories in John, and at most only echoes of scenes which are recalled with more detail in the Synoptics.⁴⁸

A second interpretation of Jn 19:25-7 suggests it was primarily intended to highlight the role of the Beloved Disciple, the witness behind the Fourth Gospel, who is raised to the rank of Jesus' brother.⁴⁹ This supposes that ἴδε ὁ υἱός σου ... ἴδε ἡ μήτηρ σου was an adoption formula and does not account for why Mary is mentioned first. The greatest flaw in this interpretation is, however, that it fails to take into consideration Jn 2:1-12, the wedding feast at Cana, which we consider to have obvious links with this present scene.

Before discussing the connection between Jn 19:25-7 and 2:1-12, we must also briefly note two other interpretations of Jn 19:25-7. These are Bultmann's suggestion that Mary is a representative of Jewish Christianity which overcomes the scandal of the cross, and the Beloved Disciple who represents Gentile Christianity and honours the former from whence it came.⁵⁰ An interpretation favoured by Benoit is that Mary represents the church and here we are witnessing the birth of the church in John which is left in the care of Christians symbolised by the Beloved

Disciple.⁵¹

The interpretation which is suggested by Brown is perhaps the most acceptable since he not only dismisses such non-theological interpretations of 19:25-7 as "... misfits amid the highly symbolic episodes that surround the crucifixion narrative", but he also draws v. 28 into the discussion and Jesus' realisation that it has all now finished has something significant to say about the importance of this scene for the writer of the gospel.⁵² For Brown, the symbolic interpretation of 19:25-7 involves not only the suggested links between the mother of Jesus and the Beloved Disciple, but by using the word *γυναί*, and referring to Mary as the 'mother' of Jesus, - Brown believes that John also intended us to consider the earlier episodes of Cana in Jn 2:1-12 and the reference to the woman about to give birth in 16:21.

Brown sees a number of parallels which suggest to him a link between 19:25-7 and the Cana incident. In both scenes the mother of Jesus appears, she is called woman, there is a reference to the 'hour', an important Johannine theme, and the disciples figure prominently. For Brown the outcome of the Cana incident is that Mary was refused a role in the ministry of Jesus, and instead she finally receives her role at the foot of the cross in 19:25-7. The associated feelings of sorrow and loss at the death of a son are also drawn into the symbolism by Brown who envisages a role for Mary as Lady Zion who, after the birth pangs, brings forth a new people in Joy (cf. Jn 16:21; Isa 49:20-22; 66:7-11). Beyond this, Jesus' mother is also the new Eve to the prototype of Gn 3:15, and the hour of Jesus' death represents the fall of the Prince of evil (Jn 12:23, 31). Finally, Brown also sees an echo of this symbolism in Rev 12:5, 17 and the woman who gives birth to the Messiah in the presence of the dragon.

To sum up, for Brown the scene at the foot of the cross in John represents the new relationship which will bind Christians together, though we would not go as far as him and suggest the imagery extends to the church bringing forth children modelled after Jesus and the new relationship of love which must bind them to their mother.⁵³

Without trying to press the symbolism in Jn 19:25-7 too far, it is possible to suggest that the parallels of suffering and giving birth to a new relationship in John may echo the Synoptic symbolism of the new family of discipleship which replaces the natural family (cf. Mk 3:31-5 and 10:29f.). This eschatological relationship was understood in terms

of sacrifice and service, and by placing Mary at the foot of the cross John was also possibly dramatising the reorientation which was required of Mary who is now present at the hour of Jesus' death and receives a role denied to her during the ministry.⁵⁴

Our interpretation of Jn 19:25-7 would not, therefore, focus on arguments that Mary represented the church, since John's gospel does not on the whole betray an interest in the church as an institution. Instead, John was possibly making a statement here about the community of discipleship. Thus the mother who made unreasonable demands at Cana was rebuked because Jesus' 'hour' had not yet come, is now present at the 'hour' of his death and receives a new definition of the family in terms of Christian discipleship which was not one of asking for favours on the basis of a relationship (cf. Jn 2:1-12 and Mk 10:35f.), but rather recognising in suffering and death the possibilities for life.

Summation

As with our previous summaries it is not our intention here to repeat all the arguments we have presented above, but instead to highlight the main points we have made. In our survey of the Synoptic stories of the crucifixion we noticed two main tendencies in the developing tradition and these were to highlight the role of Mary Magdalene, as she heads the list of the women involved, and more significantly, to write the males back into the tradition (cf. Lk 23:49). With Jn 19:25-7, Mary Magdalene is interestingly transposed to the end of the list of women, and the mother of Jesus now heads the list in John. We would suggest that this was a deliberate alteration of the tradition in preparation for the scene which follows in John involving the Beloved Disciple and the mother of Jesus. John makes no reference to the earlier service of the women in Galilee and he also alters the positioning of the women to allow for the comments of Jesus from the cross, and so they now stand beside the cross and not 'afar off'. We did not feel it necessary to suggest an alternative source for John at this point, and we also accepted that the particular women identified in 19:25 could be accounted for in terms of the fixed tradition revolving around two fixed names, Mary Magdalene and the mother of Jesus, which we also find in the Synoptic tradition. Finally, the women in John are no longer described as watching the events, and in John it is Jesus who controls the scene. Instead, our attention is focused not on the watching women, but the listening pair,

the mother of Jesus and the Beloved Disciple, though even here Jesus controls events, and it is he alone who speaks.

With the introduction of the Beloved Disciple in Jn 19:26, we do not necessarily have a continuation of the tendency to introduce male witnesses to the crucifixion scene although this would be in line with the more positive portrayal of the disciples in the Johannine passion narrative. Finally, without recalling the various symbolic interpretations of Jn 19:25-7 we briefly note that John was saying something positive here about the nature of the family and discipleship. We will now look at the scenes of the burial and resurrection to see if John saw any further role for women within these contexts before drawing together the wider implications of this Johannine redaction for the role and status of women in the early church.

B THE BURIAL - Jn 19:38-42

The burial of Jesus in John has received various assessments regarding its relationship to the Synoptic versions of this incident. There are those, like Bultmann, who would argue that John's account differs markedly from the Synoptics with the evidence being that there is no parallel in the Synoptics to the request by the Jews, the enemies of Jesus, to remove his body from the cross.⁵⁵ However, if Acts 13:28-30 indicates that Luke was also aware of a tradition that Jesus was buried by his enemies, then the information in John is not as new as it first appears. This still leaves the problem of the apparent contradictions in the burial tradition in John where we have two requests for the body of Jesus, in 19:31 and 19:38 respectively. This has led scholars, such as Barrett, to argue that while there are undoubted contacts between John and the Synoptics, much of the material in the Johannine burial account is new.⁵⁶ Others, like Benoit and Brown, speculate on the possible divisions of the material between Synoptic-like parallels and non-Synoptic material, with Benoit going for three possible divisions of material; a non-Synoptic account in vv. 31-7 linked to an account with Synoptic parallels in vv. 39-42 by a connecting verse in v. 38.⁵⁷ Brown prefers a more simple solution and he sees two types of material combined here with the first in vv. 31b-37 and 39-40 having no Synoptic parallel, and the second in vv. 31a, 38, 41-42 being closer to the Synoptics. This second solution to the possible layers of tradition in the Johannine burial account has the advantage of separating the two requests for the

body of Jesus (cf. vv. 31b and 38) and the double reference to the removal of Jesus' body from the cross (cf. vv. 38 and 40).⁵⁸

In analysing the possible links between John and the Synoptic tradition we tend to agree with Neirynck who suggests that it is more desirable to speak of Johannine insertions into a Synoptic-type account of the burial.⁵⁹ This conclusion is supported by the parallels which exist between John's account of the burial and the three individual Synoptic accounts.

John shares with the Synoptics a reference to Joseph of Arimathea who makes a request to Pilate for the body of Jesus (Jn 19:38 cf. Mk 15:43; Mt 27:58 and Lk 23:52). He also agrees with Matthew in his description of Joseph as a disciple of Jesus (cf. Jn 19:38 and Mt 27:57). As in the Synoptics, Pilate grants the request in Jn 19:38 (cf. Mk 15:42; Mt 27:58) and Joseph, therefore, takes the body of Jesus from the cross (Jn 19:38; Mk 15:46; Mt 27:59; Lk 23:53). Beyond this, John agrees again with Matthew that Jesus' body is placed in a new tomb (Jn 19:41; Mt 27:60), and he supports the peculiar Lucan reference to the tomb as one in which no-one had previously been laid (Jn 19:41; Lk 23:53). Finally, as in Luke, there is no reference to the stone during the Johannine account of the burial and this feature is not mentioned until Jn 20:1 (cf. Lk 24:2).⁶⁰ The Johannine account then closes with a reference to the day of preparation which is also paralleled in the Synoptic tradition (cf. Jn 19:42; Mk 15:42; Mt 27:62 and Lk 23:54).

Moving on to the details in the Synoptic narratives which do not appear in John, and beginning with Mark, we see that there is no parallel to the reference that Joseph was an honourable councillor (cf. Mk 15:43). If, however, John intended us to see Nicodemus as his representative of the Sanhedrin who was involved in the burial, then this could explain why, if John had access to the tradition in Mark, he chose to omit this reference. We have also already seen that it is a feature of the developing burial tradition for writers to alter the description of Joseph, and both Matthew and Luke feel free to alter their Marcan source at this point. John also makes no reference to Mark's description of Pilate's astonishment at the death of Jesus and the subsequent questioning of the centurion (cf. Mk 15:44f.) However, we would suggest that the reference to the piercing of Jesus' side in Jn 19:33f. has already taken care of this point in John and established that Jesus was really dead. Finally, the Matthean guard at the tomb has been explained

as a peculiar Matthean development of the burial tradition.

Having discussed the features of the burial tradition which we have already traced to redaction, we now need to account for those features in the Johannine narrative which have no Synoptic parallels. These references include the fact that Joseph of Arimathea is described as a secret disciple in Jn 19:38 and there is the appearance of Nicodemus in 19:39f. as the second male figure involved in the burial. John's description of the wrapping of the body in the cloths and the anointing with oils also differs from the Synoptics and there is no parallel to the Johannine statement that this was the burial custom of the Jews. Finally, John alone tells us that the tomb was situated in a garden, and he then closes his account of the burial without referring to the women as witnesses.⁶¹

We will now examine in detail the Johannine account of the burial and decide if the above list of similarities and differences between John and the Synoptics supports our suggestion that John was aware of the Synoptic traditions. Since we have already noted a tendency in the developing burial tradition both to stress the role of Joseph of Arimathea and to introduce an apologetic note, we will also pay particular attention to any development of these narrative features.

1 v. 38

We have already mentioned that John has an earlier reference to a request of the Jews to bury Jesus, suggesting that he was perhaps aware of an early tradition that Jesus was buried by his enemies, and we see an echo of this tradition in Acts 13:28-30 and possibly even in Mark. With vv. 38f. we return to the tradition which is very similar to the Synoptics. The verse begins μετὰ ταῦτα which is a Johannine opening (cf. 6:1).⁶² We are then told that Joseph asks Pilate for the body of Jesus.⁶³ According to Barrett, and we would agree with him here, this section is probably drawn from Mk 15:43f.⁶⁴ There is no reference to Joseph's taking courage in John (cf. Mk 15:43).

Joseph is described by John as a disciple of Jesus, and according to K.P.G. Curtis, John is here following Matthew (cf. Mt 27:57), for whereas John frequently used the noun μαθητής (78 times), he nowhere makes a comparable description of discipleship to an individual outside the twelve.⁶⁵ This description of Joseph as a disciple again contradicts the Marcan account, and instead John agrees with Matthew and the male

disciples are written back into the tradition of the burial. Unlike Matthew, John also qualifies Joseph's discipleship which is secret because of his fear of the Jews, and according to R.T. Fortna, this is a Johannine insertion, being a frequent Johannine theme (cf. 7:3; 9:22; 12:42; 20:19).⁶⁶ Since John has previously spoken harshly of secret disciples it is possible that he was casting a slur on the character of Joseph. The immediate context would, however, suggest a different conclusion, and the evangelist supported Joseph's application for the body of Jesus. The secrecy motif could, therefore, explain why Pilate granted Joseph's request, i.e. he did not know that Joseph was a follower of Jesus.⁶⁷

John does not have the Marcan distinction of σῶμα/πτῶμα or Matthew's αὐτόν/αὐτό. Bearing in mind our previous reference to the incident of the piercing of Jesus' side, it would not have been necessary for John to emphasise the fact of Jesus' death since this had already been established. Finally, there is some manuscript variation here concerning ἦλθεν οὖν καὶ ἦρεν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ with some manuscripts (X N pc it sa) reading ἦλθον and ἦραν instead of the singular,⁶⁸ perhaps indicating an awareness of a tradition where Jesus was buried by his enemies, or possibly that John was aware that the women were present at the burial.

2 vv. 39-40

Nicodemus is now introduced to the burial story and we are reminded by John of his earlier appearance in 3:1f. where he comes to Jesus by night. In addition there is another reference to him in Jn 7:50. According to Brown, there is no reason why John should have invented a role for Nicodemus unless the tradition preserved a reference to the fact that a member of the Sanhedrin had been involved in the burial of Jesus, and Nicodemus was the only one known to John.⁶⁹ If, however, Nicodemus was not part of the tradition we have to explain why John referred to him at this point. The practice of introducing characters who had appeared earlier in the gospel is paralleled in the Synoptic stories of the passion and resurrection and in Matthew we have the reintroduction of the mother of the sons of Zebedee and in Luke Joanna reappears.⁷⁰

It seems unlikely, however, that John was simply using a figure mentioned earlier in the gospel to fill a gap, and perhaps the real reason behind the inclusion of Nicodemus here is that he had originally

come to Jesus by night. Thus Nicodemus makes a neat pair with Joseph since they are both secret disciples who now come forward to bury Jesus and, therefore, as it were come into light and risk identification.⁷¹

We are now told that they, presumably Joseph and Nicodemus, took, (ἐλάβον), the body of Jesus and wrapped it in sheets with spices, as was the custom of the Jews. The use of ὀθονίον is found only in John and is probably a diminutive of ὀθὼνη a linen cloth sheet.⁷² The use of the plural could indicate strips of linen cloth or bandages, and possibly John intended us to recall the appearance of Lazarus emerging from the tomb (cf. 11:44). The word for spices, ἄρωμα, echoes Mark and Luke's accounts of the anointing by the women (cf. Mk 16:1 and Lk 23:56). The amount of spices used by Nicodemus was probably due to Johannine interest in extravagant amounts, and Barrett recalls the large amounts of wine at Cana (cf. 2:6), and Dodd the large number of fish in 21:11, and in this instance concludes this was probably a sign of veneration.⁷³ The final phrase gives a suitable explanation for this detail, and Jesus was given a burial καθὼς ἔθος ἐστὶν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις. John, therefore, stresses that Jesus is given a proper burial, and there is no hint here that it was considered to be in any way incomplete.

3 v. 41

Only John among the canonical writers tells us that the grave was situated in a garden, and this is echoed by the Gospel of Peter 24.⁷⁴ This reference to a garden is the most likely connection for Mary mistaking Jesus for a gardener in John, and we do not need to rely on subsequent Jewish tradition that the body of Jesus was removed by a gardener for understanding the Johannine empty tomb story.⁷⁵

We have already discussed the fact that John shares with Matthew the reference to the new tomb, which was probably not a new piece of historical evidence, but part of the up-grading of Jesus' burial from a hostile act by his enemies to an act of devotion, prompted by an apologetic concern to show that Jesus was accorded the last rites as befits his status in the eyes of Christians.⁷⁶ John also shares with Luke the reference that the tomb was one in which no-one had previously been laid, and according to J.A. Bailey, John is following Luke here, and this is supported by Barrett who comments that the ugly collocation of sounds in both gospels suggests that John was dependent on Luke.⁷⁷ A final point here is that John uses the verb τίθημι to describe the action

of placing Jesus in the tomb, and by repeating this verb in vv. 42 and 20:3, the burial is linked to the discovery of the empty tomb.

4 v. 42

Finally, John adds the reference to the day of Preparation at the end of his account of the burial, as does Luke, explaining why it was necessary to dispose of the body so quickly. Though it was not allowed to bury on the sabbath, the disciples would have been able to wash and anoint the body on the sabbath (cf. M. Shab. 23:4-5).⁷⁸

Summation

Having examined the Johannine account of the burial of Jesus, we would conclude that there is nothing in this account, apart from possibly the reference to Nicodemus, which could not be attributed to reflection on the traditions which we have found in the Synoptic stories of the burial of Jesus. There is a definite interest in John to stress the location of the tomb (cf. vv. 41 and 42) and whether or not this emphasis reflects an actual conflict raging in the first century CE over the exact location of the tomb, we cannot fail to miss the apologetic content of this story.

As we will argue below, this apologetic note is a major feature of the Johannine discovery of the empty tomb, and Mary's repeated questioning about where the body could be (cf. 20:2, 13, 15) is balanced by the detailed comments concerning the interior of the tomb (cf. 20:5-7, 12).

There are no women involved in the Johannine story of the burial of Jesus. Instead two males are now responsible for witnessing the burial, and their actions foreshadow those of the two males who will witness the events of the empty tomb in 20:3f.

A final point here is that the contradiction between John and the Synoptics on the anointing motif need not be as strong as it first appears and indeed only Mark records that the intention of the women is to anoint the body of Jesus (cf. Mk 16:1f.). Luke follows Mark up to a certain point, but after 24:1 he makes no further reference to a desire to anoint the body. If, as we believe, Mark had a theological motive for seeing the women's intention thwarted, it is possible, as we have argued, to suggest that Mark introduced the anointing motif to the tomb story. Matthew's motive that the women went to 'see' the tomb is, therefore, more plausible. The consequences of such argumentation for John is that

his burial account need not necessarily contradict the Synoptic empty tomb stories, though that is not to say that John himself was not responsible for developing the details of the burial in Jn 19:38f.

C THE EMPTY TOMB - Jn 20:1-18

Before beginning our examination of Jn 20:1-18, it is necessary to remind ourselves of our conclusions regarding the Synoptic stories of the empty tomb. As with our previous studies of the crucifixion and burial we began our work on the empty tomb stories with an analysis of Mark's gospel. It was our opinion that Mark was probably the earliest empty tomb story, and furthermore, it was this text which provided the main source for both Matthew and Luke.

In our analysis of Mk 16:1-8 we encountered several problems particularly in relation to the question of source and redaction, and while we found it difficult to say at this point what probably constituted Marcan redaction, our survey of Matthew and Luke helped us to clarify certain points. The main clue to the meaning of Mk 16:1-8 was, we decided, the enigmatic v. 8 and the women's flight and silence. After a detailed study of the text, we suggested that Mk 16:8 was a satisfactory conclusion to the gospel, and this particular ending was one which invited the readers to supply their own conclusion to the story and respond to the risks and challenges of the gospel. The empty tomb story in Mark *did not, therefore, necessarily end on a negative note and* one which thereby gave a negative evaluation to the role of the women in that story.

Moving on to Mt 28:1-10, and paying particular attention to how this evangelist handled his Marcan tradition, we noted that Matthew kept the main features of the Marcan pericope. Thus in Matthew the main substance of the tomb story is the appearance and message of the young man and the women's reaction to this. Beyond this, there are also a number of differences between Matthew and Mark. The reason for the women's visit is no longer to anoint the body of Jesus (cf. Mk 16:1), but to 'see' the tomb (Mt 28:1), and we decided that Matthew's motivation was probably more plausible. Matthew also introduced two secondary developments to the Marcan tomb story in vv. 2-4 and 9-10. In Mt 28:2-4 we find a question answered and a gap filled in the Marcan narrative, and we are told who moved the stone. Finally, Matthew closed his account of the tomb story by telling us that while the women are en route to tell

the disciples they are met by Jesus. This christophany was attributed to Matthean redaction and was interpreted as essentially providing a link between the empty tomb story and the appearance tradition in Matthew 28:16-20.

Turning finally to Lk 24:1-11, we again encountered a narrative which repeated the main features of Mk 16:1-8, the appearance and message of the young man and the women's reaction to this. However, we also noted more differences between Luke and Mark than in the previous Matthean tomb story. In the Lucan narrative the women are not identified by name until the end of the empty tomb story (cf. Lk 24:10), and while there is a reference to their bringing spices in v. 1, suggesting an agreement with the motivation of Mk 16:1, there is no further reference to any anointing in Luke. The stone is also introduced for the first time to the burial and resurrection stories in Lk 24:2 and is summarily dismissed. Finally, after receiving the message, which also differed from Mark, the women go and tell the disciples who do not believe their witness, and in Lk 24:12 we have a visit by Peter to the tomb. Thus in Luke the empty tomb and appearance traditions are linked by a visit of a male disciple to the tomb.

The conclusions we reached regarding the role of the women in the Synoptic stories of the empty tomb were, therefore, twofold. First of all, Mary Magdalene headed the list of women in all three gospels, reaffirming her position as the primary female witness in the Synoptic traditions of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb. This position was underlined in Matthew where Mary Magdalene is accompanied only by the 'other Mary'. The second tendency in the tradition, and perhaps more significant for the position of women in these narratives, was the attempt to once again write the male witness back into the story. Thus in Mt 28:4 we are told of the guards' reactions to the angelophany, which are added to those of the women in v. 8. While the women in Matthew also received a christophany, we noted that the male disciples received their own independent christophany in Mt 28:16-20, and we are not explicitly told in Matthew that the women passed on their message to the disciples, though this is implied in 28:8.

Moving finally to Luke's gospel we saw that the attempts to write the men back into the tradition were much more obvious here. Thus the women are not mentioned by name until the end of the Lucan empty tomb narrative, and this identification, therefore, appears almost as an

afterthought. At various points in the empty tomb narrative Luke also appears to be disinterested in what is happening, and he omits to tell us about the outcome of the attempted anointing, and not only does the women's testimony convince no-one, but neither is the male witness at the tomb convinced of the resurrection. Luke has, therefore, provided his link with the appearance traditions by introducing a male witness at the tomb, and by stating that Peter is not convinced of the resurrection, Luke removes any possibility of the male witness of the resurrection resting on either the women's witness or even the empty tomb story itself.

We will now turn to Jn 20:1-18 and note how this writer deals with the empty tomb tradition, paying particular attention to the features we have mentioned above.

According to Jn 20:1-18, Mary Magdalene alone comes to the tomb while it is still dark and discovers that the stone has been moved. She then runs and informs Peter and the Beloved Disciple that the body of Jesus has been removed, and they in turn run to the tomb to verify this for themselves. Though Peter does not arrive first, he is the first to enter the tomb, followed by the Beloved Disciple. They both see the linen cloths lying where the body had been, and we are specifically told that the Beloved Disciple comes to believe. These disciples then return to their own homes. Mary Magdalene is now reintroduced and we are told that she stands weeping at the tomb. Looking inside she sees two angels where the body had been, and they ask her why she weeps. Mary repeats her message to the disciples. Turning around she sees Jesus himself, though she does not immediately recognise him. Mary is then given a message regarding the ascension which she has to deliver to the disciples.

Most scholars are generally agreed that this section is more difficult to analyse source critically than the passion narrative.⁷⁹ It is difficult to separate tradition and redaction since the whole passage is permeated by Johannine themes such as seeing and believing, the Beloved Disciple, calling Jesus by name and recognising his voice, misunderstanding, and ascension to the father. A number of inconsistencies in 20:1-18 suggest, however, that the passage is composite, and the two stories of Mary at the tomb and the disciples at the tomb are at best "imperfectly geared to one another."⁸⁰ For example, in v. 1 Mary is alone, but she speaks in the plural in v. 2. While she

concludes that the body is stolen in v. 2, it is not until v. 11 that we are actually told that Mary looks inside the tomb. In v. 12 Mary sees no cloths but two angels, while the Beloved Disciple and Peter see cloths but no angels. In the story of the race of the Beloved Disciple and Peter, we have a duplication in the description of these characters and at the end of this story there is no comment on the impact of the belief of the Beloved Disciple on either Mary or the other disciples. Finally, in v. 13 the angels do not advance the action of the story and in vv. 14 and 16 Mary is described as turning around twice.⁸¹

These inconsistencies in the Johannine empty tomb story have led scholars to suggest that Jn 20:1-18 involves three different stories. There is the visit of Mary Magdalene to the tomb in vv. 1-2, this is followed by the separate story of the race of the disciples in vv. 3-10, and finally there is the story of the angelophany and christophany in vv. 11-18. There are numerous theories on the composition of these three sections. From the lists of similarities and differences we have noted between John and the Synoptic stories, it is obvious that this section includes material which is very similar to the Synoptics.⁸² There is also material here which deals with topics in greater detail which are also mentioned more briefly in the Synoptics,⁸³ and finally there is material which appears only in John.⁸⁴

The identification of these three stories in Jn 20:1-18 is only the beginning of the problem of working out the different layers of tradition in John. According to Brown, vv. 1 and 2 represent an earlier version of the empty tomb story, vv. 11-13 are a later version, and the christophany to Mary Magdalene was originally a separate tradition.⁸⁵ Benoit sees three stages in the composition of Jn 20:1-18. Jn 20:1-10 represents a specifically Johannine narrative, and the contacts with the Synoptics are restricted to initial chronological references. The narrative itself reveals a meticulous concern for concrete detail which is carefully described in terms of its symbolic value, and here the fulfilment of scripture is an important theme. Jn 20:11a, 14b-18 has more connections with the Synoptic tradition and Jn 20:11b-14a is an insertion borrowed from the Synoptic tradition with the intention of connecting the previous two Johannine narratives with that tradition.⁸⁶

The more usual position is to divide 20:1-18 into separate traditions vv. 1, 11-18 and vv. 3-10.⁸⁷ It is disputed whether or not vv. 3-10 are an insert by either a redactor or John. According to

Bultmann, vv. 2-10 were inserted and the original conclusion of the angelophany was replaced by the appearance of Jesus to Mary Magdalene.⁸⁸ A lot of emphasis is put on attributing vv. 2-10 to the redactor by some scholars because of εἶδεν καὶ ἐπίστευσεν in v. 8, and the supposed anti-docetic tendency behind the inspection of the tomb.⁸⁹ Finally, G. Hartmann is adamant that there is underlying 20:1-18 a continuous narrative with the original version of vv. 3-10 involving Peter and Mary. The evangelist has, therefore, added the reference to the other disciple in vv. 2f. as well as the anabasis theme of v. 17. Furthermore, Hartmann also believes that it was the redactor who inserted vv. 11b-14.⁹⁰ Our conclusions regarding the composition of Jn 20:1-18 will be worked out in our detailed examination of the text.

Before turning to the text itself, one final problem which we have already mentioned is the question of the relationship of John's story of the empty tomb to that story as it appears in the Synoptic gospels. According to Barrett, John's narrative shows some traces of the literary influence of Mk 16:1-8, but in substance is independent of it.⁹¹ B. Lindars goes further and suggests that John is taking over the same traditions which the Synoptics had at their disposal and which existed in a variety of forms, and he has then rewritten these for his own purposes in a free development.⁹² However, bearing in mind the aporias we have mentioned above, our own position here would tend to agree with F. Neirynck who goes further than any of the previous writers and draws out the similarities between Jn 20:1-18 and Mk 16:1-8; Lk 24:1-11, 12 and 24 and Mt 28:9-10. He ultimately concludes that, "these Johannine sources are so Synoptic-like, so similar to the Synoptics, that Johannine dependence upon the Synoptic Gospels is just one step further."⁹³

The question we, therefore, need to keep very much in mind in our examination of Jn 20:1-18 is: what is the relationship between John and the Synoptic stories of the empty tomb? Is Jn 20:1f. with its reference to only one woman at the tomb a more original version of the empty tomb story than that which we find in Mk 16:1f.?

1 Mary Magdalene at the Tomb - Jn 20:1-2

In Jn 20:1-2, we have a brief description of a visit by Mary Magdalene to the tomb where, we are told, she finds the stone removed and so departs to tell the disciples that the body of Jesus has been stolen. This brief tomb story shares a number of features in common with the Synoptic

accounts of the empty tomb, although there are a number of differences which we will also need to explain if we are to prove that John's empty tomb story is essentially dependent on Mk 16:1f. and parallels. Beginning with the similarities between John and the Synoptics we note that John shares with Mark the reference $\mu\iota\grave{\alpha} \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \sigma\alpha\beta\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$. John also agrees with the Synoptics that it is a visit by a woman to the tomb which begins the events of the first day of the week, though we are aware that more than one woman was involved in the Synoptic versions of the tomb story. The reaction of Mary on finding the tomb empty in John is to run and tell the disciples, or more precisely Peter and the Beloved Disciple, that the body has been stolen and this reaction could be said to suppose the instruction of Mk 16:7.

The differences between John and the Synoptics include the motivation for the visit to the tomb which is not mentioned by John, though we can assume it was similar to Mt 28:1f. This disagreement with Mk 16:1f. is not as serious as it first appears, and the Synoptics themselves are not agreed on this point. John's exact time reference, $\pi\rho\omega\tau\acute{\epsilon} \sigma\chi\omicron\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$, is also not paralleled in the Synoptics. However, as we have already noted in our earlier chapters, each Synoptic writer gives a different time reference at this point. John does not now continue with the angelophany and the message to be delivered to the disciples. However, if as we believe, the angelophany of Jn 20:11f. originally followed on from v. 1, then this difference between John and the Synoptics is not as great as it first appears. Finally, the Johannine robbery theory is also a theme which we encountered in the Synoptic gospels, and it appears in the Matthean stories of the burial and empty tomb. We will now look at Jn 20:1-2 in detail to see if we can account for these differences between John and the Synoptics on the basis of Johannine redaction of the Synoptic stories of the empty tomb.

a v. 1

As we have already mentioned, John opens his story of the empty tomb with a similar time reference to that given in the Synoptics, $\mu\iota\grave{\alpha} \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \sigma\alpha\beta\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$. It was now the first day of the week, and, according to Barrett, the similarity between John and Mark here was probably because Mark was John's source at this point.⁹⁴ The more precise time reference, $\pi\rho\omega\tau\acute{\epsilon} \sigma\chi\omicron\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ differs in all four gospels, and was obviously not a fixed feature of the tradition. The use of 'still dark' in John may, however,

have been influenced by the Johannine version of the tomb story. While light is appropriate in the Synoptic stories where the women experience an angelophany and receive a message to deliver, darkness is more fitting in John where all Mary experiences is the emptiness of the tomb which she supposes to have been robbed,⁹⁵ and it is, therefore, only in the subsequent verse that there is a gradual "dawning" of what has happened.⁹⁶

In our previous chapters on the Synoptic stories of the empty tomb, and more particularly in the Marcan version of that story, we also noted an emphasis on the movement of the women to the tomb, inside the tomb and away from the tomb.⁹⁷ It is, therefore, interesting to note that in John's account of the tomb story there is a *similar repetitive emphasis* on movement. In vv. 1 and 2 Mary goes to the tomb and then to Simon Peter and the other disciple. In vv. 3-10, however, two characters are introduced to the Johannine narrative, and we would suggest that it is their movements which really concern the Fourth Evangelist. Thus, in v. 3, we are told that Peter sets out for the tomb, and at the end of that verse we are told that both disciples arrive there. The journey of these two disciples is then described in greater detail by John, and we are told that these two disciples run to the tomb, with the second disciple outstripping Peter and arriving there first, though he does not immediately enter. Peter then comes up and enters the tomb and he is followed by the other disciple. We would suggest that the significance of this description of the race to the tomb is that in John it is the movements of the male disciples which are important and not those of Mary Magdalene who is reintroduced to the narrative in v. 11, with no explanation being given for how she is now suddenly standing outside the tomb. The conclusion we draw from this is that in Jn 20:1f. the details of Mary's movements take second place to those of the two disciples involved in the race of Jn 20:3-10.

Moving on to the motive for Mary's visit, John gives no explicit reason for this, though it is possible that she went there to lament.^{97a} Since we have previously been told of the custom of mourning at the grave site in 11:31, it is possible that this was in John's mind here.^{97b} The motivation in Mark, which Luke follows up to a point, is to anoint the body, whereas in Matthew it is to 'see' the body. Since we suggested that Matthew's version is probably more plausible here than Mark, it is, therefore, no great problem to see John disagreeing with Mark on this

point, and in the use of βλέπει in v. 1 he may even be agreeing with the Matthean purpose for visiting the tomb.

John now tells us what Mary sees at the tomb, simply that the stone has been moved. This feature is interesting since John has made no previous reference to the stone in his account of the burial, and this introduction of the stone for the first time in the empty tomb story agrees with Lk 24:2. Surely such an unusual feature indicates awareness of the Synoptic empty tomb tradition, and perhaps even of that tradition as it appears in Luke's gospel.⁹⁸

Finally, we will not repeat our earlier discussions on the identity of Mary Magdalene, except to note that she is common to all four gospels as the primary female resurrection witness, and by referring to her alone in 20:1f. John, therefore, takes this individualisation process one step further.⁹⁹

b v. 2

We are now told that Mary runs and tells the disciples that the body has been removed.¹⁰⁰ According to Fortna, this verse is pre-Johannine, and essentially parallels the Synoptics, i.e. Mary's running from the tomb and the phrase 'where have they put him'.¹⁰¹ Both Fortna and Hartmann believe John adds the reference to the Beloved Disciple, and this is supported by the repetition of πρὸς plus the fact that the Beloved Disciple is peculiar to the Fourth Gospel.¹⁰² Thus it is suggested that the original source read αὐτῇ and not αὐτοῖς.

There is no explicit statement in John that Mary looked inside the tomb before she departed to tell the disciples. There is also no parallel at this point to the Synoptic angelophany and the message which has to be delivered. John does not even tell us what Mary sees, or does not see, of the body of Jesus; instead only the stone is mentioned. Since in essence this fact tells us nothing of real significance, only that the stone has been moved, it would seem logical to suggest that Jn 20:1-2a must originally have been followed by vv. 11f. where, as we would expect, the angelophany follows. We will return to this question below when discussing Jn 20:11f. and for the present merely raise the possibility of the two units being linked.

The following reference in John is to Mary's message to the disciples that the body of Jesus has been stolen, and this fits in very neatly with the pericope of Jn 20:3-10 which, with its emphasis on the

exact position of the cloths, was obviously intended to refute claims that the body of Jesus had been stolen. We would, therefore, suggest that the redaction of Jn 20:2 was influenced by Jn 20:3-10 and this would account for any differences between the Johannine message and that which the women have to deliver in the Synoptic stories of the empty tomb, which incidently also differs with each gospel. This redaction also suggests a conclusion that the redaction of Jn 20:1-18 as a whole was influenced by an apologetic desire to refute robbery theories and, therefore, establish that the tomb was empty because Jesus had been raised and for no other reason.¹⁰³

Mary's message to these disciples also refers to Jesus as 'Lord' and while this title does not appear in v. 16 where the title Rabbi is used, it is repeated in vv. 13 and 18, and some manuscripts would also support its inclusion in Lk 24:3.

Most debate on Jn 20:2 centres not on the content of Mary's message to the disciples, but on the much disputed use of the plural οἱ δὲ. It is suggested that this indicates Mary was not alone at the tomb in John, and other women accompanied her as in the Synoptics. Those who would like to deny any Johannine reliance on the Synoptic tradition explain this usage in a number of ways, including John's use of the plural for the singular elsewhere in his gospel,¹⁰⁴ Semitic usage,¹⁰⁵ or a Johannine tendency to concentrate on particular characters in a scene.¹⁰⁶ It does not seem necessary, however, to try and explain away this use of the plural, and we can account for its use here, even though the singular οἶδα is used by John in v. 13 and, therefore, appears to contradict the use of the plural in v. 2. We would suggest that the plural in v. 2 reflects John's reliance on the Synoptic tradition which he was redacting in order to emphasise the role of Mary Magdalene who is later the subject of the christophany in Jn 20:14f. The second reason why Jn 20:2 appears to be disjointed is that John had a second redactional interest and this was to accommodate the race story of vv. 3-10. We can also explain the use of the singular in v. 13 on the grounds that Mary is here answering a question put directly to her by the angels.

Finally, one small point, the repetition of the verbs ἀφω and τῆθηται recall the burial story and so add a feeling of continuity to the Johannine narrative.¹⁰⁷

Summation

To sum up, the story of the discovery of the empty tomb in Jn 20:1-2 is similar to the Synoptic tradition in that the tomb is found to be empty and the reaction is to rush off and tell the disciples. John does not, however, include more than one woman, and he has no angels at the tomb. The reference to the angels is not entirely omitted in John and forms the basis of a supplementary incident in 20:11f. The suggestion, therefore, that John's empty tomb narrative represents a more primitive form of this tradition than that found in the Synoptics is not one which we would necessarily accept, though we will leave our final judgement until we have discussed all the components of Jn 20:1-18. What we can say is that vv. 1-2 serve as an introduction for the two main characters in the Johannine empty tomb drama and, if anything, Mary's failure to understand serves as a characteristic Johannine foil for the confession of faith made by the Beloved Disciple, although she herself will have a more positive role to play later as the primary resurrection witness in the Fourth Gospel (cf. 20:14-18).¹⁰⁸

2 The Disciples at the Tomb - Jn 20:3-10

In the opinion of Dodd, Jn 20:3-10 is a story to which the evangelist attaches greater importance than he does to the previous story of the woman at the tomb, and, furthermore, it is a story told with great dramatic vigour and in considerable detail. Here in John it is, as Dodd emphasises, the disciples and not Mary or the other women who enter the tomb unlike the Synoptic parallels.¹⁰⁹ The two main questions which concern Jn 20:3-10 are: is it an insertion which interrupts an originally continuous story in 20:1 (2), and 11f.?; and, what are the links between Jn 20:3-10 and Lk 24:12 and 24?

First of all, we note that Jn 20:3-10 deals with the reaction of Peter and the Beloved Disciple to Mary's news that the body of Jesus has been removed from the tomb. These disciples race to the tomb, and while the Beloved Disciple arrives first, he remains outside and Peter enters the tomb first to discover the cloths neatly positioned. The Beloved Disciple then enters, there is a statement regarding his coming to faith and the fact that the scripture concerning the resurrection was not yet known. The two disciples then leave the tomb and return to join the rest of the disciples.

Thus the Johannine race story appears to up-stage the angelophany,

which is displaced and now becomes a brief supplementary incident. In John, the disciples go to the tomb to see for themselves and are not dependent on female witness of the tomb. Was John responsible for increasing the role of the male disciples? Most scholars would generally accept that John has added the reference to the Beloved Disciple.¹¹⁰ They are less certain, however, whether John has added the competition motif. If we accept that John has added the reference to the Beloved Disciple, then unless the race story originally referred to an unnamed disciple, we would have to accept that John has added the race motif.¹¹¹

According to Hartmann, Jn 20:3-10 was not an insertion but the original race story involved Peter and Mary.¹¹² The reason why Hartmann is prompted to make such a suggestion is because of the close links between the visit of Mary and the disciples race to the tomb. In our opinion, however, it is not necessary to see the visit of Mary so closely connected with the race story, but rather two separate traditions are being combined here, and v. 2 in particular shows signs of editorial work. We are, therefore, in agreement with J.E. Alsup who writes that

even if Jn himself is responsible for neither the composition of the "race story" in vv. 3-10 nor the first redactional union of the two tomb story accounts, but has taken over a tradition which he has then refined further, it is clear that the two separate and disparate stories which have been woven together are also chronologically discrete; the disciple-orientated version represents, namely, in structure and content interests which are both distinct from and subsequent to the Mary-orientated form.¹¹³

The race story is, therefore, according to Alsup, a later broadening of the witness to the empty tomb which adds the secondary support of the apostolic witness. This focus on male witness at the tomb brings us on to our second area of interest here and that is the relationship between Jn 20:3-10 and Lk 24:12 and 24.

It is generally accepted today that there are common traditions behind both John and Luke, and we have already mentioned a number of these.¹¹⁴ While the tendency in the past was to reject Lk 24:12 as an interpolation, and v. 24 as the tradition, there is growing acceptance today for the view that v. 12 is authentic Luke, being a redactional development of the traditional material in v. 24, deliberately concentrating on Peter.¹¹⁵ The links with Jn 20:3-10 are explained by seeing John's episode as a fabrication based on the kind of hint given in Lk 24:24.¹¹⁶

As regards Jn 20:3-10 and Lk 24:12 in particular the level of

verbal similarity requires some literary-critical explanation, and one which can explain the distinctive features of both texts.¹¹⁷ As regards the Johannine tradition, the peculiar features here are the reference to the other disciple, the race to the tomb, the details of the inspection of the tomb, and the reference to the belief of one disciple. On Luke's part there are three Lucanisms which are usually cited ἀνάστας, θαυμάζω plus accusative and τὸ γεγονός. Since John never uses ἀνάστας, this presents no problem to John's use of Lk 24:12 and indeed it could have easily been omitted in 20:3 or replaced by ἐζλήθην. While θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός is not used to describe Peter's reaction in John, some scholars would suggest that at least the verb θαυμάσεν was used to describe Peter's reaction in the traditional Vorlage and it was the basis for the later attribution of belief to the Beloved Disciple in 20:8.¹¹⁸

According to Neirynck, the un-Lucan elements of 24:12 most frequently cited, παρακύπτω and ὁδόνιον, can be explained in terms of John's dependence on Luke since the phrase παρακύψας βλέπει... τὰ ὁθόνια in 20:5 is identical with Lk 24:12 and there is probably no other traditional basis either for the second use of παρακύπτω in 20:11 or the references to ὁδόνια in 20:6 and 19:40. The reference ἐπὶ ἧλθεν πρὸς used only once in Lk 24:12 is also suggested to be another example of Johannine style, but according to Neirynck, ἀπέρχομαι is used only here with πρὸς αὐτούς, a phrase which is said to be foreign to John's style and most likely to have been adopted from 'he went home' in Lk 24:12. Finally, the only other rare element of 24:12, the historic present, which is a common feature in John, is, in the opinion of Neirynck, not enough to prove a pre-Lucan tradition.¹¹⁹

The conclusion we reach, therefore, is that John is probably dependent on Luke for his reference to the males at the tomb. If, according to Neirynck, Luke was responsible for introducing the reference to the males at the tomb, then this would support our earlier agreement with Alsup that the male witness is a secondary development broadening the spectrum of witness to the empty tomb.¹²⁰ The only difference between John and Luke is that, whereas Luke is content to leave his reference until the conclusion of the story of the women at the tomb, John inserts it into his Magdalene pericope. Thus in Jn 20:3-10 the examination of the tomb which is ascribed to the women in Lk 24:3 is transferred to Simon Peter and the Beloved Disciple. Beyond this we would also agree with Gardner-Smith that behind this form of the

tradition there lies a desire to make men, and not women, the chief witness of the resurrection.¹²¹

Turning briefly to the details of the text in John, we note that he begins in v. 3 with the singular ἐξῆλθεν and possibly he intended to echo Luke's ἀναστὰς since in 11:31 he uses both verbs.¹²² The going out is, furthermore, paralleled by a returning in v. 10 (ἀπελθόν).¹²³ The race to the tomb is a development of Luke's simple ἐδράμεν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον and in John we have a duplication of Peter and the Beloved Disciple throughout the race story with an interesting delaying tactic in the reference to the Beloved Disciple reaching the tomb first but not entering, thus heightening the dramatic effect of the narrative with the climactic reference to his coming to faith.¹²⁴ Beyond this, these duplicated references to the disciples and their race to the tomb, with the Beloved Disciple arriving first but not entering, Peter arriving later but merely observing the details, and finally the Beloved Disciple entering and believing, also suggest another conclusion. This is that Jn 20:3-10 is possibly a correction or qualification of a view that Peter was the primary resurrection witness, and while John does not want to challenge this directly, he modifies it by giving the Beloved Disciple priority.¹²⁵

Moving on, we note the reference to Peter's observance of the cloths in John, παρακύφας βλέπει, which also parallels the Lucan tradition and points forward to v. 11 where Mary Magdalene looks into the tomb.¹²⁶ Only John gives us details regarding the position of the cloths which suggests an anti-polemical perspective lying behind vv. 3-10. In v. 8 the reference to the Beloved Disciple 'seeing and believing' causes problems. According to Fortna, it is appropriation to the Beloved Disciple of Peter's reaction to the empty tomb story in the source, and he agrees with Hartmann and Neirynck that Peter's reaction was originally probably one of perplexity since it is otherwise hard to explain his return home.¹²⁷ Finally, the language of v. 9 also causes problems, and both Bultmann and W. Marxsen consider it to be a later gloss, while for Hartmann and Fortna it is pre-Johannine and probably referred to Peter and Mary.¹²⁸ In essence the verse seems to mean that the disciples came to the tomb, but if they had actually understood the scriptures then they would have realised that they need not have come here since Jesus would no longer be in the tomb. The disciples returning home echoes Luke and allows John to continue his story of Mary Magdalene.

Summation

In bringing together the points we have made above, we would suggest that Jn 20:3-10 is a later broadening of the witness of the empty tomb to include apostolic testimony. This story is linked to Lk 24:12 and John was probably responsible for developing the race motif with the introduction of the Beloved Disciple and his concern to emphasise the priority of his witness. The story of Mary Magdalene at the tomb was, therefore, redacted in v. 2 with an eye on this pericope. The contradictory references of the disciples looking into the tomb and seeing cloths but no angels, while Mary sees angels but no cloths, are a further indication that these pericopes were not originally linked, as is the sudden reference to Mary standing outside the tomb in v. 11. Concentrating on vv. 3-10, and the pericope of the race itself, the reason for its inclusion here would seem to be primarily apologetic and beyond this to give both male and female witness to the tomb.¹²⁹ A final and interesting feature here is that the Beloved Disciple has adopted the role of the angelus interpres of the Synoptics.

D THE ANGELOPHANY - Jn 20:11-14a

The story of the disciples' race to the tomb in John does not conclude with a reference to the disciples passing on their faith to others. Instead we have the rather surprising reappearance of Mary Magdalene at the tomb in v. 11. John does not tell us where she has come from, or indeed what she has been doing in the interval since she left the tomb in v. 2, and here we have yet another indication that John is trying to weave together two separate stories of Mary Magdalene and the disciples at the tomb.¹³⁰

Addressing ourselves specifically to the angelophany which follows in Jn 20:11-14a, we have to ask what layers of tradition are at work here. The Johannine angelophany is a very brief encounter with no angelic message, and in the opinion of Bultmann, it has become stage furniture with no significance.¹³¹ We have to ask, therefore, is Jn 20:11-14 the more original version of the angelophany which the Synoptic tradition has subsequently embellished, or has the angel motif been significantly altered by John or someone before him in the light of the insert vv. 3-10? Indeed, did the christophany in vv. 14f. supplant the need for the message of the angels, and is this, therefore, the source for any possible redaction?

The most persuasive answer to these questions is that Jn 20:11-14a was supplanted by the christophany of vv. 14f. This hypothesis would be supported if John knew Matthew and was, therefore, continuing a trend of replacing the angelophany with a christophany.¹³² While it is true that the angelophany has elements which almost directly parallel the christophany, i.e. Mary's weeping (vv. 11 and 15), what she sees (vv. 12a and 14b), what is said to her (vv. 13a and 15a), and her reaction to this (vv. 14a and 16c), the angelophany is not totally without significance in John. This encounter with the angels, which no longer includes the Synoptic message of the resurrection, prepares us instead for the direct encounter with Jesus. By repetitive emphasis on the various themes in the Johannine empty tomb story, we are gradually enlightened as to why Mary weeps, and what will stem her flow of tears - not the empty tomb, or an experience with angels, but a christophany.

Turning briefly to consider the text, we note that v. 11 resumes the pericope which had been interrupted in v. 2. Mary stands outside the tomb and weeps. We have already remarked on the significance of movement in the Johannine tomb story and once again we note the weeping motif which is repeated below. Mary's stooping into the tomb also echoes v. 5.¹³³ What Mary 'sees' in the tomb is interesting in that it differs from what the disciples saw when they looked inside, and this further supports our conclusion that we are dealing here with two separate pericopes. Mary sees two angels as in Lk 24:4, and the dressed in white echoes Mk 16:5, though we note there is no parallel here to the vivid descriptions of the angels which we find in the Synoptic tradition.¹³⁴ Instead it is the position of the angels which is important here, and they sit where the body of Jesus had been laid (cf. Mk 16:6).

Summation

The angelophany in Jn 20:11-14a would, therefore, appear to contribute nothing of significance to the Johannine story of the empty tomb. There is no parallel to the Synoptic reaction of the fear of the women, though the angelic question 'why do you weep?' could be taken as a replacement for the instruction 'do not fear' and also reminds us of the Lucan 'why do you seek?'. The repetition of Mary's answer of v. 2 in v. 13 is yet another indication that vv. 3-10 are an insert and it is quite likely that vv. 11f. followed on from v. 1. The real significance of the angelophany in John is, therefore, that it continues the trend we noticed

in Matthew where the angelophany is being replaced by the christophany. The difference is that while Matthew allows both incidents to stand together, John has allowed the second to influence the former, and by the time we get to the Epistula Apostolorum the angelophany has been completely replaced by the christophany.¹³⁵

E THE CHRISTOPHANY TO MARY MAGDALENE - Jn 20:14-18

Like Matthew, John includes a christophany to conclude the empty tomb story, though here only one woman is involved and the christophany takes place at the tomb and not as the women are departing. According to Dodd, the christophany to Mary Magdalene bears all the marks of an appearance pattern - Mary is at the tomb, Jesus appears to her, he greets her, she recognises him, and he gives a command to her.¹³⁶ Beyond this, however, Dodd also sees this pericope as one of the most moving of all the stories of the risen Christ, being distinct from the other 'concise' stories and he draws our attention to the dialogue in particular which he considers to be very significant.¹³⁷

The story begins in John with Mary turning round to see Jesus. The clumsy repetition of turning motifs here and in v. 16b suggests an awkwardness in the Johannine redaction which may have been due to John's trying to fit the christophany to the preceding angelophany. Mary then sees Jesus, though she does not immediately recognise him, and this feature is also echoed in Lk 24:16 with the disciples on the road to Emmaus. The main feature of the Johannine christophany is the verbal exchange which now follows and the address *γύναι* recalls the earlier reference to Mary the mother of Jesus in 19:26. Jesus then repeats the earlier question 'why are you weeping?' and he asks 'who are you looking for?' Mary's reply, assuming Jesus is the gardner, picks up on the earlier Johannine story of the burial which refers to the setting of the tomb in a garden (cf. 19:41), and we do not, therefore, need to look elsewhere for an explanation of this feature beyond seeing it as a typical example of Johannine misunderstanding.¹³⁸

Mary's reply once again repeats the robbery theory and it cannot be coincidence that this is repeated three times in 20:2, 13 and now in v. 15. We have already suggested that an apologetic motif underlines the Johannine tomb stories and this is also supported by the references to the exact position of the cloths in the tomb (cf. 20:5, 6, 7).

Jesus then addresses Mary by her name, and we are told that she

recognises him at this moment, recalling the Johannine motif of the Good Shepherd who calls his sheep by name, they hear his voice and recognise him (cf. 10:3f.). The title 'Rabbi' which Mary uses suggests to C.F. Evans that Mary has not realised the significance of Jesus' status and indicates a presumption that he has returned to his former life, and this he believes is supported by the rebuke which follows, 'do not touch me'.¹³⁹

This leads us on to the difficult instruction of Jn 20:17 which can be interpreted as stop touching me, or do not begin to touch me.¹⁴⁰ In view of what we have said above, it is our opinion that Mary is being instructed not to hold on to Jesus and to her previous relationship with him, i.e. with the Jesus of the flesh.¹⁴¹ Finally, the speech concludes with the instruction and the reason why Mary is to desist, she is to go and tell the disciples about Jesus with the message here couched in terms of John's $\chi\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma/\kappa\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$ christology.¹⁴²

One of the main problems with Jn 20:14-18 is the relationship between John and Mt 28:9-10. The similarities between these two stories leads us to ask is John dependent on Matthew or a tradition behind Matthew? Or is Mt 28:9-10 an abbreviation of a pre-Johannine tradition?¹⁴³

The links between the Johannine and Matthean christophanies are based on four main arguments. The first similarity is the $\chi\alpha\iota\acute{\rho}\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ greeting of Mt 28:9 which, while not directly used in John, is none the less a fundamental element of the Johannine appearance where the incognition/recognition theme appears. Those who argue that Jn 20:14-18 is essentially a recognition scene, and Mt 28:9-10 an appearance story, would disagree with this argument. However, as Neirynck argues, it is possible to see Jn 20:16 as an expansion of Matthew, and when Mary Magdalene recognises Jesus when he calls her by name, this presupposes the greeting formula $\chi\alpha\iota\acute{\rho}\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, which is normally followed by a proper name or vocative.¹⁴⁴ The second point of contact is the $\text{Μαρι\acute{\alpha}\mu}$ address of Jn 20:16 which recalls Mt 27:61 and 28:1. Though the Matthean christophany involves a group of women it is possible to suggest that John's source included a group of women,¹⁴⁵ and the concentration on Mary Magdalene is due to the Johannine tendency to individualise for dramatic purposes.¹⁴⁶ The Johannine $\mu\acute{\eta}\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\omega$ of Jn 20:17 is also compared with the Matthean $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\alpha\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha\varsigma$. While the verb is different in each case, the interchangeable nature of these two verbs,¹⁴⁷ plus the possibility

of interpreting Jn 20:17 in the sense of prohibiting continuance of an action, leads to the conclusion of a similarity of meaning.¹⁴⁸ Finally, and perhaps most persuasive, is the reference to the phrases τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου and τοὺς ἀδελφοῦς μου, Mt 28:10 and Jn 20:17 respectively. Although the message the women are asked to deliver may appear to be quite different, there is no agreement here between any of the gospels,¹⁴⁹ and the similarity of this phrase, contrasting as it does with the use of μαθητής in Mt 28:7 and Jn 20:18 is very striking. Indeed, according to Neirynck, this phrase suggests to him that not only was John using a source which also lies behind Mt 28:9-10, but possibly even Matthew himself.¹⁵⁰

Summation

The christophany to Mary Magdalene in Jn 20:14b-18 has, therefore, a number of parallels with Mt 21:9-10 and the suggestion we would make is that John was aware of this story which he has redacted to focus on the figure of Mary Magdalene and the theological message he wanted her to deliver. Since we have already shown that Mt 28:9-10 is a piece of Matthean compositional theology we do not need to look any further for possible sources for Jn 20:14b-18.

SUMMATION ON JOHN 20:1-18

Before concluding our study of the Johannine stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb, it is necessary to draw together the points we have made in our analysis of Jn 20:1-18.

We began by asserting that Jn 20:1-18 is made up of three separate units: Mary Magdalene at the tomb (vv. 1-2a); the disciples at the tomb (vv. 3-10); and the angelophany and christophany (vv. 11-18). We consider that John's empty tomb tradition is later than the Synoptic stories and at numerous points we have demonstrated John's knowledge of several Synoptic sources.

Jn 20:1f. is not, therefore, the more original version of the tomb story which was later expanded to include several women. Instead we consider John has redacted 20:1f. with an eye on the christophany of 20:14b and more importantly to provide a link with 20:3-10. Thus Mary Magdalene rushes quickly on and off stage and the way is left clear for the two disciples who are the main characters of the empty tomb narrative in John. Here it is Peter who witnesses the position of the burial

cloths while the Beloved Disciple both sees and believes. The reference to the disciples at the tomb in Lk 24:24 has been considerably expanded, and now interrupts the sequence of events at the tomb which we have come to expect from reading the Synoptic versions. The angelophany has, therefore, not only been moved and now follows the story of the disciples at the tomb, but in view of the faith of the Beloved Disciple, it has even become a redundant feature.

The christophany to Mary Magdalene also helps to displace the angelophany in John. Thus once again we hear Mary repeat her conclusion that the body has been taken away. By using this simple technique of repetition, the Fourth Evangelist emphasises the foolishness of Mary's statements which repeatedly misunderstand the significance of the empty tomb. It is only when Jesus reveals himself to Mary that she finally understands and her eyes are opened. There can be no doubt here that the dramatic climax in Jn 20:1-18 comes in v. 8 and the belief of the Beloved Disciple. The superiority of this witness is also reinforced later in the Thomas incident, and the utterance of Jesus "blessed are those who have not seen and yet believe." As regards Mary Magdalene in particular, her involvement in the colourless visit to the tomb in vv. 1-2 gives rise only to misunderstanding. This ultimately allows for her spiritual enlightenment at a later point when she recognises Jesus as the risen Lord and rushes off to announce to the disciples 'I have seen the Lord'.

CONCLUSION

What can we say, therefore, about the Johannine stories of the crucifixion, burial and resurrection in terms of how John's redaction of these stories has influenced our appreciation of the role and status of women in the closing scenes of the Fourth Gospel?

Beginning with the episode involving the women at the cross our examination of this incident in the Synoptic gospels suggested two tendencies were at work in the developing tradition. These were to place Mary Magdalene at the head of the list of women, and with Lk 23:49 to write the male witnesses back into the story.

While at first sight Jn 19:25 appears to reflect a tradition different from the Synoptics, on closer examination we decided that John was not using any new sources, but rather the differences between John and the Synoptics were the result of redactional alterations. Thus the

position of the women in John is now altered and they stand beside the cross and we decided that this change, together with the earlier reference to the women at the cross, was probably made by John in order to accommodate the conversation which follows in 19:26-27. As John's positioning of the women beside the cross was not interpreted as a conscious attempt to heighten the role of the women in this narrative, neither was the reference to the Beloved Disciple seen as an attempt to further the Lucan redacting in of male witnesses. John's primary concerns here were to show that Jesus was in control of events right up to the end, and to introduce an important character in the Johannine passion and resurrection stories. This is not to deny that the effect of introducing the Beloved Disciple at this point in the narrative, as well as the instructions addressed to him and the mother of Jesus, did not thereby detract a certain amount of attention away from the group of witnessing women.

Moving on to the burial story, we noticed that in John the women no longer witness this scene. In addition the Synoptic tendency to emphasise the role and character of Joseph of Arimathea is continued and he is a secret disciple accompanied by Nicodemus, another similar male figure. Finally, the burial story in John continues to emphasise the appropriateness of the burial accorded to Jesus.

Turning finally now to the Johannine empty tomb story we must assess how John's redaction of this tradition has influenced our perception of the involvement of women in the resurrection traditions.

The most obvious feature of the Johannine tomb story is that here it is only one woman, Mary Magdalene, who goes alone to the tomb in the Fourth Gospel and thus the other women of the Marcan tradition have been redacted out. We should not, however, conclude from this redaction that John was necessarily uninterested in the involvement of women at the tomb. It has been recognised for some time that a feature of the Johannine redaction is to focus on particular individuals who occupy centre stage. What may be more significant for our purposes is that, certainly as far as 20:1-2 goes, the Synoptic empty tomb story has become a colourless narrative as Mary Magdalene rushes quickly on and off stage leaving it vacant for the two main male characters. Furthermore the Magdalene's repeated cries of 'we/I do not know where they/you have

taken/laid him' (vv. 2, 13, 15) cannot fail to impress us as a typical use of Johannine irony and misunderstanding and so forces us to judge her reactions negatively.

We have already suggested that John's redaction of Mary's visit to the tomb was influenced by his concern to dovetail this visit with the visit of the male disciples. Here in the Fourth Gospel it is the movements of the Beloved Disciple and Peter to the tomb, inside the tomb, and away from the tomb which hold our attention. Mary Magdalene simply reappears outside the tomb after the disciples have departed with no explanation given for where she has been in the meantime.

It is also surely not without significance then that in John the disciples' visit to the tomb, a feature which we have recognised to be a secondary development of the tomb tradition, is no longer appended, but inserted into the female visit. The women's visit still remains the first visit to the tomb, but John does not then continue with the angelophany as we would expect, and instead we take up the race of the two males. The apologetic significance of this secondary visit was noted above as was the importance of 20:8 where we are expressly told that the Beloved Disciple comes to belief. The retrospective significance of this belief is then later underlined in 20:29 when Thomas is negatively compared with those who are blessed because they have not seen and yet believed. Mary Magdalene also saw, yet did not believe, whereas the Beloved Disciple did not see yet believed. John has made his point.

We cannot conclude our examination of the Fourth Gospel without recognising the positive conclusion to the involvement of Mary Magdalene in the Johannine resurrection stories.' It has already been pointed out that in the angelophany and christophany which follow Mary's non-recognition and attempt to the cling to the man Jesus may represent an element of misunderstanding. However it is obviously very significant that Jesus' meeting with Mary is the primary resurrection appearance story in John and this contrasts with other traditions in the early church which gave pride of place to a male disciple (cf. Lk 24:34; 1 Cor 15:5). Mary is also presented in John as a representative for the believing community and like his own in chapter 10 she recognises his voice and responds to his call.

We will now look at the treatment of women in the apocryphal stories of the crucifixion, burial and resurrection. Then we will draw

together these various treatments of women as we return to the questions and issues raised in our introduction by the various feminist theologians and the wider question of the role and status of women in the early Christian movement.

CHAPTER FIVE - NOTES

1. We note that *θεωπέω* is not used here. It is found in Mk 3:11, 5:15, 38; 12:41; 11:4. Mark uses a variety of discernment verbs throughout the gospel.
2. As we will see, the apocryphal gospels also evince the tendency to proliferate witnesses at the resurrection e.g. in the Gospel of Peter 8:28-33 a crowd comes from Jerusalem and the surrounding area to see the sepulchre.
3. For a discussion of the portrayal of Joseph of Arimathea in Mark see our earlier discussion above.
4. However, we note Luke's interest in the tomb of David in Jerusalem (Acts 2:29) and its use in the resurrection apologetic (Acts 2:29f.).
5. Only rarely was female testimony accepted in Judaism. See our introduction to women in the early church. See also Justinian, Institutes 2. 10. 6 in J.A.C. Thomas (1975), p. 112. Here women cannot witness a will.
6. We are aware that the whole question of the relationship between John and the Synoptics is an issue which has concerned scholars for a number of years. We will not repeat all the arguments here but refer to several examples of the discussion. Thus see P. Gardner Smith (1938); P. Borgen (1958-9); J.A. Bailey (1963); R.T. Fortna (1970); review by D.M. Smith Jr. in *JBL* 89 (1970), p. 501; F.L. Cribbs (1970) and (1971); J.M. Robinson (1971), pp. 232-268; W.G. Kümmel (1979), pp. 201f.; D.M. Smith (1979-80).
Among those who would support the antiquity of the Johannine tomb story we would cite J. Jeremias (1975), p. 304.
7. Thus R.T. Fortna (1970), pp. 134-5.
8. See, however, our earlier discussion of the burial by Joseph of Arimathea in Mark. Luke also appears to know of a tradition which referred to the burial of Jesus by his enemies (cf. Acts 13:28-30). In the Gospel of Peter 2:3-5 there is a more specific reference to the involvement of Herod in the burial.
9. R.H. Fuller (1980), p. 133 suggests that possibly only the mother of Jesus departs with the Beloved Disciples (v. 27) and the other women were present during the burial.
10. Thus C.K. Barrett (1965), p. 455.
11. See R.E. Brown (1972), p. 915, C.H. Dodd (1965b), pp. 126-129.
12. Thus R. Bultmann (1971), p. 666.
13. See Dodd (1965b), p. 127.
14. See Mark note 28.
15. For a detailed discussion of the similarities between the Lucan and Johannine traditions of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb see J.A. Bailey (1963), esp. pp. 78-102.
16. While Barrett (1965), p. 458 considers it improbable that the women would have been positioned near the cross, we consider John was probably motivated by the literary needs of the text at this point in the narrative.
17. See Bultmann (1971), p. 672.
18. This is the opinion of Barrett (1965), p. 458.
19. The whole question of the identity of the women and the possible links between the women in John and the women in the Synoptic parallels is dealt with very thoroughly by Brown (1972), pp. 904f.
20. We, therefore, agree here with J. Wenham (1984), p. 34 and n. 2. See also Brown (1972), p. 904.
21. Thus Brown, *ibid.* He also point out here that the sentence structure itself supports this conclusion. R.H. Lightfoot (1966),

p. 316 would even go as far as to contrast these four women with the four soldiers who have been mentioned earlier. This identification is supported by S.E. Dollar (1983), p. 141 who concludes that while one group administers death, the other group administers love. P. Benoit (1969), p. 189 also agrees on four women as does Barrett (1965), p. 458.

See also Dodd (1965b), p. 126 and n. 1 who notes here that there is no means of deciding whether John intends "three or four women. *Μαρία ἡ τοῦ κλωπᾶ* might equally well be an appositional clause, further defining *ἡ ἀδελφὴ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ*, or an additional name. He adds that while legend and conjecture have made play with cross references, positive evidence is lacking.

22. Cf. our earlier discussion on the identity of the women.
23. See Brown (1972), p. 904. He identifies Matthew's mother of the sons of Zebedee with Salome, but not with Joanna. According to Wenham (1984), pp. 34-5, the mother of the sons of Zebedee is to be identified with Salome who is also Mary's sister.
24. See Dodd (1965b), p. 126 who argues for independence. Brown agrees here believing that attempts to identify the women, and lack of success in doing so, are eloquent arguments against the thesis that John borrowed from the Synoptics. Thus (1972), p. 906.
25. It is interesting to note that in all the gospels except Luke, Mary Magdalene appears only from the crucifixion onwards. This may well support our earlier suggestion that Lk 8:1-3 was originally located in the crucifixion tradition as in Mark, and Luke has, therefore, subsequently transferred the reference to an earlier point in the gospel.
26. Thus Brown (1972), p. 905. See also Dollar (1983), p. 140. Arguing against such a conclusion we might suggest that if John was responsible for expanding the list of women in v. 25 in order to facilitate the addition of vv. 26-7, then we might have expected him also to include a reference to the Beloved Disciple at this point, i.e. he was also one of those standing beside the cross.
27. Cf. above.
28. This identification is suggested by Benoit (1969), p. 190.
29. See E.F.F. Bishop (1953-4) who interprets the reference as daughter. See also Brown (1972), p. 906 who reads the wife of Clopas.
30. Thus Benoit (1969), p. 190; Wenham (1984), p. 136. A strong argument against such an identification is that it assumes both the historicity of the figure of the Beloved Disciple and also that the scene at the foot of the cross actually took place.
31. We have already suggested that the reference to *πολλαί* in Mk. 15:40 and parallels, would suggest that there was a group of women, and as we have seen, each evangelist felt free to introduce different characters known to him. We will also notice a tendency in the apocryphal gospels to broaden the number of witnesses and to identify several women.
32. Thus Bultmann (1971), p. 672.
33. According to E.L. Bode (1970), p. 75, Mary Magdalene can speak for all women, even though the evangelist speaks only of her. This is because, according to Bode, we have here a Johannine concentration of a 'type' or a reaction into one person which also occurs elsewhere in the gospel with the presentation of figures such as the Samaritan woman, Nicodemus and Thomas.
34. Thus Dodd (1965b), pp. 127-8 who notes that such a feature is found only in the Matthean passion narrative where the story of the fate of Judas is interpolated into the transfer of the case to the Roman

court and the trial itself, and the report of the appearance of the departed saints in Jerusalem is also interpolated between the rending of the veil and the confession of the centurion.

See also B. Lindars (1977), p. 580 who comments that the vocabulary of vv. 26-27 is typically Johannine and shows no signs of a dependence on a source.

35. A. Dauer (1967) and (1968) notes that there are various examples of Johannine vocabulary here which suggest Johannine composition. In fact, both verses have ten elements of Johannine style including: the historical *οὐν*; the expression *ὁ μαθητὴς ὃν ἠγάπα*; the verb *παρίστημι* (Jn 18:22); the epithet *γύναι*; the phrase *ἰδὼν λέγει ἔδε*; the twice repeated *ἔδε* used in place of *ἰδοὺ*; the expression *ἀπ' ἐκείνης τῆς ὥρας*; the use of *εἰς* with *λαμβάνειν*; and the use of *τὰ ἱδία* in the sense of home.

36. See Lightfoot (1966), p. 317 who notes that with this double reference to *γύναι* John has effectively linked together the beginning and end of the gospel. Jesus used the title several times in the gospels when addressing women (cf. Mt 15:28; Lk 13:12; Jn 4:21; 8:10 and 20:13).

For a broad survey of the literature on Mary in the Fourth Gospel see R.E. Brown, K.P. Donfried, J.A. Fitzmyer and J. Reumann, eds. (1978),

See also R.F. Collins (1970) esp. p. 100 who draws our attention here to the particular designation "the mother of Jesus" (2:1, 3) or "his mother" (2:5, 12; 19:25). Collins notes that such epithets are more honourable titles than using Mary's own name and even among Arabs today it is common to call a woman who has born a son "the mother of (Jesus)". Finally, for J.M. Reese (1977), p. 311, the omission of the personal name of Mary in the Fourth Gospel continues the trend in the Synoptics to deal with Mary in terms of Jesus and his mission.

37. Thus Barrett (1965), p. 159 and Brown (1972), p. 99.

38. See C.K. Barrett (1965), pp. 97f.; R.E. Brown (1972), pp. xcii-xcviii. For a more recent study see R.E. Brown (1979). For a review of the major scholarly views on the Beloved Disciple see R. Mahoney (1974), pp. 70f. For an interesting parallel with the Old Testament figure of Benjamin see P.S. Minear (1977). Finally, E.D. Freed (1964) deals with the interesting variations in the Johannine references to this disciple.

39. Thus Jesus is the good shepherd of 7:18 caring for his flock.

40. This is the opinion of Lindars (1977), pp. 430-1 who believes that although John is not directly dependent on the Synoptic version of this tradition, he knew a variant form.

41. For Bailey (1963), pp. 29-31 the tradition attributing Judas' betrayal to the inspiration of the devil, entered the gospel tradition through the activity of the Third evangelist, and was taken over and elaborated by John. Bailey also notes that while John refers to the devil six times, only here does he use *οὐτανός*, whereas Luke uses this word five times. Finally John also tones down the betrayal by a kiss which builds upon Luke's previous omission of the agreement between Judas and his companions as to what the kiss signified.

42. Ibid., pp. 37-46.

43. It is generally recognised, however, that John 21 is not by the same hand as the person who wrote the Fourth Gospel. See R.E. Brown (1972), pp. 1077f. and the literature cited there.

44. Barrett (1965), p. 459.

45. Thus Brown (1972), p. 907.

46. Barrett (1965), p. 459 finds a hint of a suggestion here that we have an illustration here of the unity of the church which is gathered together by Jesus' death.
47. These suggestions are discussed by Brown (1972), p. 923.
48. Jn 10:20 possibly recalls Mk 3:31-5. We would therefore reject the suggestion of Dollar (1984), p. 144 that the Beloved Disciple represents John the son of Zebedee and Mary is being entrusted into the care of her nephew. The author of the Fourth Gospel is not, therefore, concerned here to reflect the Jewish practice where women are felt to be in need of protection and need to be provided for at every phase in their lives.
49. See Brown (1972), p. 923 who refers to Daur here.
50. See Bultmann (1971), p. 673. See also Marsh (1976), pp. 616-617.
51. He concludes, "... at this solemn moment, we are being shown the birth of the church; the church is born of Jesus on the cross, of his pierced heart and at this moment Mary is given the duty of caring for the church. From the time when, by conceiving and bearing him, Mary became the mother of Jesus, she had in principle been given this duty; at the moment when Jesus by his death in agony on the cross definitively brings the Church into being, she is there fulfilling her task of mother." Thus Benoit (1969), pp. 192-3. See also R.H. Lightfoot (1966), p. 316 who sees Jn 19:25-7 in terms of the care the members of the church should have for one another, and he points to 1 Cor 12:25 to support this interpretation.
52. Thus Brown (1972), p. 923.
53. Thus Brown (1972), pp. 925-6. According to R. Mahoney (1974), p. 103, the presence of Jesus' mother at the foot of the cross is an anti-docetic reminder that the Jesus who is about to die on the cross is a Jesus of the flesh. See also J.A. Grassi (1986), pp. 71-77 who sees Mary's role here as a double one. She is first of all a most important bearer of the tradition of the reality of Jesus' death, how he died, and, in a corrected manner, who he really was. Secondly she embodies this tradition in a living way by her maternal continuation of Jesus' love for his disciples.
54. This suggestion is also made by Brown (1975), pp. 697-698.
55. Thus Bultmann (1971), p. 667. See Dodd (1967), pp. 29f. concerning the primitive kerygma of Acts 13:16-41.
56. Thus Barrett (1975), p. 461. See also Borgen (1958-9), pp. 248-249 who reviews the evidence and concludes that the Synoptic version has been assimilated to an account otherwise peculiar to John. Mahoney (1974), pp. 104-5 decides that we cannot demonstrate the literary dependence of John on the Synoptics, though he accepts the tradition behind John's account is obviously in some way related to the Synoptics.
57. According to Benoit (1964), pp. 147f., Jn 19:31-37 is specifically Johannine, and apart from the opening comments, has no affinity with the Synoptic tradition. John's intention rather, is to strengthen the symbolic value of the narrative and show that the scriptures were fulfilled.
58. Thus Brown (1972), p. 958. See Mahoney (1974), pp. 122-124 who eases the contradiction by taking 19:31-7 together with the crucifixion while vv. 38-42 refer to the burial.
59. See Neirynck (1968-9), p. 189. Here Neirynck identifies these Johannine insertions as the character of Nicodemus ὁ ἐλθὼν πρὸς αὐτὸν νυκτὸς τὸ πρῶτον; the burial καθὼς ἔθος ἐστὶν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐνταφιάζειν; and the motif of χῆρος. Furthermore, the Johannine features in the 'Synoptic' verse on Joseph of Arimathea (μετὰ ταῦτα

διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἵνα ἔρη) show that v. 38 is not the product of another literary level. While the evangelist prefaces the account with a text peculiar to him, he sees the essential narrative motif provided by the Synoptics: ἐπεὶ ἦν παρὰσχευή, the reaction of Pilate: ἐθαύμασεν εἰ ἥδη τέθνηκεν and the intervention of the centurion (Mk 15:42-5). Finally, Neirynck notes the final links between John and Matthew: Joseph of Arimathea is a disciple of Jesus (Jn 19:38; Mt 27:57) and it is a new tomb (Jn 19:41; Mt 27:60).

This model of insertions into a Synoptic-type account of events also works very well for the apocryphal gospels as we will see below.

60. This is an interesting point showing knowledge of a prior account or tradition which mentioned it expressly.
61. See Dodd (1965b), pp. 138-9 for a detailed list of the similarities and differences between John and the Synoptics. Dodd concludes that there are few points of contact with the language of the Synoptics and these in themselves are not particularly striking.
62. Thus Fortna (1970), p. 131. Cf. μετὰ ταῦτα in Jn 3:22; 5:1, 14; 7:1; (21:1) and μετὰ τοῦτο in 2:12; 11:7, 11; 19:28. See also Barrett (1965), p. 162 and Bultmann (1971), p. 121, n. 6.
63. For Mahoney (1974), pp. 124-5, that Joseph ἠρώτησεν τὸν πῖλᾶτον is another sign of contact with the Synoptic tradition, even though the sentence structure is different and the Synoptics use ἡτήσατο. He points out that ἵνα ἔρη is good Johannine style; and τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ is the same in all four gospels.
64. Thus Barrett (1965), p. 465.
65. Thus Curtis (1972), p. 443. For Mahoney (1974), p. 124 this description in John is not likely to have come from Matthew, but is a similar step in the direction of what was understood as fitting.
66. See Fortna (1970), p. 131. It is suggested by some that John is attacking certain contemporaries here who were afraid to confess their faith in Jesus. Thus J.L. Martyn (1968), pp. 15f.
67. According to Mahoney (1974), p. 124, the reference to fear could be John's attempt at an apology or an excuse for Joseph. Cf. 9:22 and 20:19.
68. According to Bultmann (1971), p. 679, n. 9, the plural is probably the more original since it would be difficult to explain the change to the plural in view of the singular of Mk 15:46 and parallels.
69. See Brown (1972), p. 940 who notes that such a reminder is supplied most frequently for those who are peculiar to the Johannine tradition or who have a special role in that tradition, e.g. Mary of Bethany (11:2), Lazarus (12:1), Philip (12:21), Nathanael (21:2), the Beloved Disciple (21:20) - the exception he finds is Judas in 12:4. After a detailed examination of the reference to Nicodemus, Mahoney considers it most likely that this character entered the tradition behind the Fourth Gospel via the Synoptic figure of Joseph of Arimathea, (1974), pp. 127-131, esp. 130. For Sanders and Mastin (1968), p. 414, there is a suggestion here that in his crucifixion Jesus is drawing all men to himself (cf. 12:34). Finally, for D. Daube (1956), p. 316, Nicodemus was a Pharisee and his presence here is to guarantee that Jesus was buried according to Jewish practice.
70. Cf. Mt 20:20; 27:56 and Lk 8:3; 24:10.
71. For B. Lindars (1977), p. 584, the presence of Nicodemus at the burial can be taken as a hint that he has now fully committed himself to Christ crucified.
72. ὁὅςτις in the New Testament is peculiar to John (cf. 20:5, 6, 7

and in the Western Non-Interpolation in Lk 24:12). The plural suggests that strips of cloth or bandages were used. See BAG, p. 558. According to Barrett (1965), p. 465, the reference to this method of entombment to "as was the custom of the Jews", may be contrasted with the Egyptian method of embalming, and the Roman practice of cremation.

73. Thus Barrett (1965), p. 465; Dodd (1965b), p. 139, n. 2. According to Fortna (1970), p. 132, 40c is almost certainly a Johannine addition; Benoit (1969), p. 223 draws our attention to the fact that not long before Jesus was anointed with a pound of pure nard (cf. Jn 12:3), and here this is multiplied a hundredfold. See also Brown (1972), p. 960 where it is suggested that the amount of spices indicates this was a royal gift and continues the idea that Jesus is king.

74. We agree with Lindars here that it would be a mistake to attach symbolic significance to this reference to the garden. Thus (1977), p. 594. We, therefore, reject Lightfoot's suggestion of a connection and contrast between John's garden and the garden of Eden with the idea being that the events which caused the original fall are reversed here and once again the garden of Eden is open to men. See (1966), pp. 321-322.

Of more interest here is the echo Gardner-Smith finds with Luke, and while John has καὶ ἐν τῷ χώρῳ μνημεῖον καινόν, ἐν δὲ οὐδέπω οὐδεὶς ἦν τεθειμένος Luke reads καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν μνήματι λαξευτῷ οὐ οὐκ ἦν οὐδεὶς οὐπω κείμενος. However, we reject his conclusions that the echo is a distant one and we need postulate no other source for John's statement that the tradition soon established (Mt 27:60) that the tomb was a new one and, therefore, Jesus' body was not defiled by the proximity of any other corpse. Thus (1938), p. 71.

75. Thus Brown (1972), p. 943.

76. Thus Fuller (1980), pp. 132-133. See also Bultmann (1971), p. 680 who comments that the tomb was, therefore, suitable for the holiness of Jesus' body. We are also reminded here of the incident in Mk 11:2f. where Jesus rides into Jerusalem on an animal on which no-one has previously sat.

77. Thus Bailey (1963), p. 83; Barrett (1965), p. 465.

78. According to Marsh (1966), p. 624, the language of v. 42 certainly suggest that the arrangements were only temporary.

79. Thus Fortna (1970), pp. 134-141. See also Mahoney (1974), pp. 172-194 for a very comprehensive treatment of the most important scholarly opinions on the structure and origin of Jn 20:1-18.

80. See Mahoney (1974), p. 174 who notes that, "while this is obviously true of the Mary-episode in respect to the story of the disciples, it also applies to the latter in relation to the former, in the sense that the disciples-episode was probably not first composed for the express purpose of including it within, or prefixing it before, the other."

81. Thus Brown (1972), pp. 995f.; Bultmann (1971), p. 681.

82. Thus in vv. 1-2a Mary Magdalene goes to the tomb, finds the stone removed and then goes and tells the disciples; and in vv. 11f. she sees two angels. According to B. Lindars (1960-1), p. 147, John's sources cannot be confined to any one of the three Synoptic gospels. The Johannine account of the empty tomb, has rather affinities with Matthew, Mark and Luke, though he concludes that it is probable that John's sources are traditions which lie behind the Synoptic Gospels, and not the gospels themselves.

83. Thus Jn 20:3-10 has similarities with Lk 24:12, 24, and Jn 20:14b-

- 18 is similar to Mt 28:9-10.
84. In 20:2b Mary Magdalene relates her robbery theory to Peter; in vv. 3-10 we have the race of the disciples, and the reference to the Beloved Disciple; there are also those parts of vv. 14-18 which deal with Johannine theological interests such as the idea of Jesus ascending to the father. For Fuller (1980), pp. 131-2, John is independent from the Synoptics although he uses similar traditional material. Beyond this, there are, however, also affinities between the Johannine traditions and the special Lucan traditions, both in broad outline and specific detail. See also Dodd (1965b), p. 140.
 85. Thus Brown (1972), pp. 999. See also Hartmann (1964), p. 188.
 86. See Benoit (1960), pp. 147-148.
 87. Thus Lindars (1960-1), pp. 142f. He divides the Synoptic accounts of the tomb story into three main features: a) the women come to the tomb, and find the stone rolled away and the tomb empty. b) They see a young man or angel (two angels) who says that Jesus is risen. c) They go and tell the disciples. John has moved b) to the end of his story (20:11-18) and he has also expanded this section which is now combined with a christophany. Finally, a) is now followed in John by the disciples at the tomb. See also Bailey (1963), p. 90; Fuller (1980), p. 134 and O. Michel (1961), p. 35.
 88. See Bultmann (1971), pp. 681f.
 89. See F. Neirynck (1984), p. 163.
 90. See G. Hartmann (1964), pp. 197-220.
 91. Thus Barrett (1965), p. 466. He concludes, however, that it is quite possible that John is using traditional material, but he presents it in his own way. The result is that "the present passage shows dramatic writing of great skill and individuality." (p. 466).
 92. See Lindars (1960-1).
 93. See Neirynck (1984), p. 165.
 94. Thus Barrett (1965), p. 467. See also Lindars (1977), p. 599 who notes that this is an exact parallel to Mark, but does not go as far as saying where John gets his reference from. After a detailed statistical examination of Jn 20:1 with the Synoptic parallels, Mahoney concludes that the similarities between John and Mark and Luke in particular are "too many to be the result of coincidental choice or accident." (1974), pp. 202-207, esp. p. 204.
 95. Darkness is also an important Johannine symbol, cf. 13:30, see Brown (1972), p. 579. A similar point is also made by G. Herbert (1962), pp. 67-68.
 96. According to Lightfoot (1966), p. 332, whereas light is appropriate in Mk 16:1-8 which tells of divine love and triumph, in Jn 20:1-10 there is no angelic message, nor, with the exception of the Beloved Disciple (20:8), do those who come realise at first the significance of the empty tomb, and even the Beloved Disciple has a lot to learn (cf. 20:9). We reject harmonizations of John and the Synoptics such as the one offered by E.A. Mangon (1945), p. 199. Here it is suggested that Mark and John refer to two different stages of the same journey, and while John refers to the beginning of the journey when it is still dark, Mark is concerned only with the end of that journey, that is when the sun had risen and the women are at the tomb.
 97. This reference is located in the comments on Mk 16:1.
 - 97a. Cf. Gospel of Peter 12:50-13:57 which supplies a motivation.
 - 97b. We would not, however, identify the Mary of John 11 with Mary Magdalene and, therefore, reject the suggestions of Wenham (1984), pp. 28f. and Lindars (1960-1), p. 143.

98. Barrett (1965), p. 467 suggests John is aware of the Synoptic story while Borgen disagrees, and for him the stone is probably mentioned abruptly in John because the evangelist and the readers were so acquainted with this feature that no further explanation was necessary, (1958-9), p. 258.
99. See B. Lindars (1977), p. 595, who sees John as having three traditions concerning the resurrection at his disposal; one involves the women at the tomb (v. 1f.); one involves Peter at the tomb (vv. 3-10); and a third concerns an appearance of Jesus to his apostles (vv. 19-23). In each case he considers that John has expanded the tradition by bringing into it a particular person who is the real focus of the story. In the first, Mary Magdalene is central, in the second it is the Beloved Disciple, and in the third we have an anecdote regarding Thomas. W.L. Craig (1985), p. 53 sees the 'we' of v. 2 as a remnant of the tradition of more than one woman and he suggests that John focuses on the Magdalene for dramatic effect.
100. Mahoney takes this opportunity to point out that it is technically and dramatically easier to have one person rather than two hurry on and off stage twice in eighteen verses. He also suggests, and we would agree here, that John's emphasis on Mary Magdalene was probably because he had an eye on the meeting of 20:14bf. between Jesus and Mary Magdalene, (1974), p. 238. On grave robbery theories see Barrett (1965), pp. 467-8 and Bode (1970), p. 73.
101. Thus (1970), p. 135. Mahoney points out here that the impulse for the story of Mary Magdalene running to tell the disciples may have come from the commission of Mk 16:7. See (1974), p. 217.
102. See Fortna, *ibid.* and Hartmann (1964), p. 199. Note this is also the first time that the 'other disciple' is identified with the disciple whom Jesus loved.
103. Without wishing to emphasise the historical background here, we merely note in passing that Barrett refers to a decree of the emperor Claudius (41-54 CE) which was found at Nazareth and ordered that capital punishment should be the punishment for those found destroying tombs or removing bodies or displacing the sealing or other stones. See (1956), p. 15.
104. In 3:2, Nicodemus says, "Rabbi, we know that you". In 3:11, Jesus says, "Truly, truly, I say to you, we speak of what we know, and bear witness to what we have seen; but you do not receive our testimony." In 9:31 the man born blind claims that, "we know." In 14:5, Thomas protests, "Lord, we do not know where you are going; how can we know the way?" We have left out the reference in 21:24, but from the above list we can argue that Mary's "we know" is a manner of speech reflected elsewhere in John's gospel.
105. Cf. Jeremias (1975), p. 304, n. 9. See A.M. Hunter (1975), p. 21 who also suggests an Aramaic influence on John here.
106. We, therefore, recall figures such as Philip, Martha and Mary. According to Brown, the general tradition of the women at the tomb is preserved in Jn 20:1-2 and 11-13. These two passages are separate forms of the same tradition with vv. 1-2 representing the earlier form. The only non-primitive feature of this section is that the original group of women has been reduced to Mary Magdalene and the reason for this editorial reduction is the Johannine tendency to individualise for dramatic purposes, and also to prepare for the christophany of vv. 14f., (1972), p. 999.
107. The suggestion that some people removed (ἡρξαν) the body in v. 2 echoes the use of αἵψω in the burial story and Joseph's removal of the body of Jesus from the cross in 19:38. The use of τίθημι

- recalls the earlier use of this verb in 19:41.
108. Thus Fuller (1980), p. 135.
 109. According to Dodd (1965b), p. 141, the theological interest of this story is manifest in the climactic statement of v. 9 $\epsilon\iota\delta\epsilon\nu$ καὶ $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\nu$ and he draws attention to the importance of 'seeing' and 'believing' in the Fourth Gospel.
 110. Thus Fortna (1970), pp. 92 and 135; Brown (1972), pp. 1000-1002, 1004-1008; Hartmann (1964), pp. 199f. It is contested by S.S. Smalley (1973-4), p. 286 n. 4; while Bailey (1963), p. 91 remains unsure.
 111. After a lengthy examination Mahoney (1974) concludes that his suspicions are that the evangelist received no specific tradition with the skeleton of 20:6f. being attributed to a disciple or disciples, and he himself composed the whole scene from various elements of the story of the women's visit to the tomb. His reason for choosing disciples as the chief actors could possibly have been the hint given in Mk 16:7 or Lk 24:24. However, for Mahoney the race to the tomb should not be seen as a competition. He concludes: "The present arrangement, whereby the other disciple arrives first, glimpses the tomb's interior, then Peter arrives, enters, and fulfils his assignment, followed by the other disciple, whose faith forms the climax of the story has the following advantages: 1) the story is better woven together, so that the disciples' two assignments are two aspects of the same story and not two stories; 2) the burial cloths in the tomb's interior are brought more clearly to our attention; and 3) the general dramatic effect is much greater, delivering the other disciple's faith as a more convincing climax." (p. 250). Thus the function of Peter is to witness and the complementary function of the Beloved Disciple is to believe.
- For the race motif see also Fuller (1980), p. 135; A.R.C. Leaney (1955-6), p. 114, who identifies this pair with the pair in the Emmaus tradition. Brown (1972), pp. 1000-1002 suggests an unnamed companion. Bode (1970), p. 77 prefers to stress the chiasmic references to the two disciples. Finally, Fortna (1970), p. 136 sees the duplication of references as a clear product of John's redaction.
112. See Hartmann (1964), pp. 197 and 220; n. 57.
 113. Thus Alsup (1975), pp. 98-99.
 114. See Bailey (1963); Mahoney (1974), pp. 41f.; Neirynck (1984), pp. 172f. According to P. Parker (1962-3), p. 332, both evangelists had independent access to the same resurrection traditions.
 115. Cf. Fuller (1980), p. 135 who suggests Lk 24:24 is the earlier version of the disciples at the tomb with the purpose being to check the women's testimony. This tradition was then developed in two ways 1) Lk 24:12 and 2) Jn 20:3-10. Jeremias (1975), p. 305 sees Lk 24:12 as a brief matter-of-fact account which is to be preferred to Jn 20:3-10. For Craig (1985), p. 54, Luke and John share numerically the same tradition, and this is evident not only from the close similarity of 24:12 to John's account, but also from the fact that Jn 20:1 most nearly resembles Luke in the number, selection and order of the events narrated than any other gospel. See also Bailey (1963), pp. 95f. Arguing against such a dependence we have Brown (1972), p. 1000 and Benoit (1960), p. 142.
 116. Thus Lindars (1960-1), p. 146.
 117. See Neirynck (1968-9), esp. pp. 171-175. For Leaney (1955-6) they were both following a common source.
 118. Thus Hartmann (1964), p. 202.

119. Thus Neiryneck, *ibid.*, pp. 174-5.
120. *Ibid.*, p. 175.
121. See Gardner-Smith (1938), pp. 75-6. He tries to retrace the process by which the tradition developed. He suggests the earliest version of the women at the tomb is Mk 16:1f. - a group of women go to the tomb, fail to find the body of Jesus and have a brief interview with a young man who tells them that Jesus is not there. From this point the tradition developed along divergent lines. In the tradition Matthew has, the women see the angel descend from heaven and remove the stone. Luke's version differs in that the women now go to the sepulchre and see two angels who rebuke them for seeking the living among the dead. By the end of the first century, according to Gardner-Smith, the conviction had grown up that the evidence of the empty tomb rested on the testimony of two of the disciples, and the role of the women is almost forgotten. Mary Magdalene remains simply to bring the disciples to the tomb. Finally, although Gardner-Smith sees John as a later development of the tradition in Lk 24:24, he sees nothing in the Johannine narrative to suggest dependence on Luke.
122. See Neiryneck (1968-9), p. 175.
123. According to Hartmann (1964), p. 200, this originally referred to Peter and Mary.
124. Thus Lindars (1977), p. 601. See also P.S. Minear (1976) who suggests that the belief in v. 9 refers only to belief in Mary's testimony that the tomb is empty.
125. Thus Fuller (1980), pp. 135-6. Benoit (1969), p. 251 asks whether the two figures might even be symbolic with one representing the church and the other the synagogue. We have already referred to the opinions of Mahoney, cf. n. 111 above; for a more detailed discussion on the treatment of Peter in the Fourth Gospel see A.H. Maynard (1984); G.F. Snyder (1971).
126. Indeed, according to Bultmann it is actually possible that the description of what Peter sees in the grave in vv. 6f. originally belonged to the story of Mary Magdalene at the tomb, (1971), p. 682.
127. Thus Fortna (1970), p. 137; Neiryneck (1968-9), p. 177; Hartmann (1964), p. 802. Bultmann (1971), p. 684 would disagree, however, and he argues that if Peter had not believed we would have been told so. Brown (1972), p. 1005 sees the purpose here not so much to denigrate Peter as to exalt the Beloved Disciple who is an example for others to follow. Finally, for Barrett (1975), p. 74, the reference to believing in 20:8 is part of the identifying marks of the apostolic community. He, therefore, points to 20:29 and states: "blessed are those who have not seen, but believe (20.9); they can, however, be blessed because others have seen and believed (20.8)."
128. See Bultmann (1971), p. 685. See Marxsen (1970), p. 58 who concludes, however, that we cannot be definite; Hartmann (1964), p. 201; Fortna (1970), p. 138. It is suggested that Ps 16:10 is possibly the text referred to here.
129. Thus Dodd (1965a), p. 429; Benoit (1960), p. 149. See also the Gospel of the Hebrews, fragment 17, where the apologetic motif is taken even further and the Lord hands the linen cloth to the servant of the high priest. See *NTApoc*, vol. 1, p. 165.
130. According to Neiryneck (1984), p. 171 there are three possibilities here: 1) a later redactor inserted the angelophany which is said to have no real function in the story of Mary Magdalene; 2) the earlier angelophany has become superfluous because of the addition

- of the christophany; or 3) the composer of Jn 20:11-18 knew the Synoptics and carried further the displacement of the angel by Jesus himself which he found in Mt 28:9-10. Neirynck concludes that v. 11a was added by the redactor of the episode of the two disciples as a transition to the Mary Magdalene story (p. 178). See also Gardner-Smith (1938), p. 77, who sees v. 11 as an attempt to rejoin the Synoptic tradition.
131. Thus Bultmann (1963), p. 287, n. 1. This is supported by Evans (1970), p. 122 who sees the displacement of the angels by the Lord himself, evident in Mt 28:9f., here being carried further. Fuller (1980), p. 137 also describes the angels in similar terms as 'superfluous relics'. For Alsop (1975), p. 95, they are 'little more than decoration'. Finally, in the opinion of Benoit, they have become puppets with no real role though he asks what role could they have played since in John the Beloved Disciple and Peter have just discovered the empty tomb and at least one has come to faith and, indeed, Jesus himself is about to declare what has happened. (1960), p. 146.
 132. We do not, therefore, accept the argument that the angelophany in John is an insertion by a redactor since in essence it adds nothing new to the narrative and does not help the progression of the story.
 133. In the Gospel of Peter 13:55f. the women also "stoop" into the tomb.
 134. The only other reference to angels in John is in 1:51 where Jesus promises Nathanael he will see the heavens opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man. According to Lindars (1977), p. 604, John only refers to angels when he is reproducing a source, and Barrett would seem to agree here since he suggests John is drawing upon either the Synoptics or some very similar tradition (1965), p. 469.
 135. See NTApoc, pp. 195f.
 136. See Dodd (1967), pp. 18-20. According to Gardner-Smith (1938), p. 80, John is here working with a tradition that the woman who went to the tomb saw Jesus, and he sent by her a message to his brethren or disciples. Since the fact of the resurrection had been revealed to the disciples, Gardner-Smith believes John altered the original reference to the resurrection into a reference to the ascension, which he regarded not as a distinct event, but as the completion of the resurrection.
 137. See *ibid.* In the opinion of Brown, Mary Magdalene comes close to meeting the basic Pauline requirements of an apostle with her proclamation of the standard apostolic announcement of the resurrection, "I have seen the Lord", (1975), p. 692.
 138. See Fuller (1980), p. 137 for details of Jewish legends whereby the body is removed by the gardner. For the Johannine misunderstanding motif cf. Jn 7:35; 8:22; 13:27; 16:18.
 139. Thus Evans (1970), p. 122. He also sees Mary's address as an example of the crude misunderstanding which we find being used throughout the Fourth Gospel as the basis for an exposition of spiritual truth. For him Mary is like Nicodemus and others in that she understands the resurrection as restoration to a previous life. See also J.N. Sanders and B.A. Martin (1968), pp. 427-8.
 140. The use of the present imperative here is usually taken to mean that Mary is being dissuaded from continuing an action she has already begun - she is not to cling to Jesus. Thus Fuller (1980), p. 138; Brown (1972), p. 992. It could also mean that Mary is trying to touch Jesus and she is being instructed not to attempt

this act (cf. BDF 336³).

The problems with the interpretation of this phrase are also tied up with the later encouragement to Thomas to touch Jesus' wounds, and Dodd would like to interpret this phrase in terms of the explanation given in 17b - for I have not yet ascended to the father. For him, therefore, "While Christ's ascent, or exaltation, is fully accomplished on the cross ... it cannot be fully accomplished in relation to men and to human history until the resurrection, as return to His disciples, in this world, and at a particular time, is an established fact." For Dodd, then, the harsh words to Mary Magdalene are delivered because Jesus has not yet ascended. See (1965a), pp. 442-443. Finally, see Brown (1972), p. 993 for some more unusual interpretations of 20:17a.

141. Thus for Marxsen (1968), p. 61, the translation should read, "touch me not, *although* I am not yet ascended to my Father (i.e. you can still touch me, but at this particular moment I want you to do something else, that is:) go to my brethren and say to them ...". Thus for Marxsen, the emphasis lies in 20:17c and we should interpret the prohibition in terms of Mary's commission with the added idea that Jesus is tangible until he ascends to the father. This would also explain why Thomas is later invited to touch Jesus. For Lightfoot (1966), p. 331, Mary is asked not to cling to her previous physical relationship with Jesus; Lindars (1977), p. 607 points to the more positive aspect of the spiritual relationship which is a possibility in the future. Finally, Barrett (1965), p. 470 points out that John does not tell us when the ascension is supposed to have taken place in the meantime, and so his reading would be, "stop touching me (or attempting to do so), it is true that I have not yet ascended to the Father but I am about to do so ... this is what you must tell my brothers." Once again this interpretation is supported by the idea that we are now entering an era of new spiritual relationships with the risen Lord.
142. The $\chi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma/\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ theme is a characteristic feature of Johannine christology. See Fuller (1965), pp. 229-30. For Brown the present tense means that Jesus is in the process of ascending but he has not yet reached his destination. He points out, however, that we should not concentrate on the temporal implications of this statement, but rather look to the theological significance which indicates the passing nature of Jesus' physical presence in the post-resurrection appearances over against the permanent nature of his presence in the spirit. See (1972), pp. 994 and 1014-1017.
143. On the contacts between John and Matthew see K.P.G. Curtis (1972) who argues that Mt 28:9f. is redactional, and the Johannine story of the christophany to Mary Magdalene is dependent on it. See Neirynck (1984), pp. 166-171 who would agree here as would Evans (1970), pp. 83 and 87; Alsup (1975), pp. 108-114 esp. p. 114; Crossan (1976), pp. 139 and 142; Perrin (1977), pp. 47-48. Fuller (1980), p. 137 is more reluctant and would only go as far as suggesting a common tradition. For Bode, the Johannine story shows many signs of being developed by the help of words and themes from the Synoptic tradition and we would agree with his conclusion that the remainder is the result of the addition of Johannine motifs found elsewhere in the gospel (1970), p. 83. We would not, therefore, agree with Brown's assumption that John and Matthew are independent, (1972), p. 1000.
144. See Neirynck (1984), pp. 166-171, esp. p. 168.
145. See Lindars (1977), p. 595 and (1960-1), p. 143.

146. Thus Brown (1972), p. 999; Bode (1970), p. 75.
147. This argument if put forward by Neirynck (1984), p. 168 who points to the classic example of Mt 8:15 ἤφατο, which is different from the Marcan χρατήσας.
148. See above n. 140 for the possibility of interpreting μή μου ἄπω as a present imperative.
149. See, however, Neirynck (1984), p. 169 who suggests that the messages are not so different as they first appear. Evans (1970), pp. 123f. points out that here alone in the Fourth Gospel are the disciples referred to as the brethren of Jesus, with the evangelist pointing out that God is called his and their father and his and their God. However, as Evans goes on to point out, this simply picks up a dominant theme of the gospel. Even in the prologue there is a distinction between those to whom the logos came and those who did not receive him. To those who did accept him, the right is given to become sons of God.
150. Thus Neirynck (1984), p. 170. See also Curtis (1972), p. 440. Mahoney, however, would not go so far and suggests ultimately a common source. (1974), p. 223.

CHAPTER SIX

WOMEN IN THE CRUCIFIXION, BURIAL AND RESURRECTION ACCOUNTS OF THE APOCRYPHAL TRADITION

In our previous chapters on the canonical gospels and the role and status of women in the stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb, we focused mainly on the literary questions associated with these texts. By approaching the texts in this manner, and examining the similarities and differences between the various accounts, we were able to establish literary relationships between the four canonical gospels. Having established that Mark's story of the empty tomb was the earliest narrative version of the empty tomb we were then able to study developments in the tradition and isolate certain tendencies in the transmission process.

Beginning with the crucifixion scene we noticed two tendencies at work in the tradition and these were, in Matthew, to place Mary Magdalene at the head of the list of female witnesses, and more significant perhaps, in Luke and John there are male disciples at the cross. In Mk 15:40-1 there is a reference to a larger group of women who 'watch' the crucifixion from afar, among whom three women are specifically identified, Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joses and Salome. We are also told by Mark that these were the women who had followed and served Jesus while he was in Galilee and had now come up with him to Jerusalem. In our detailed examination of Mk 15:40-1 we saw a parallel here between the women who are present and 'watching' at the cross, and the male disciples who had both failed to 'watch' in Gethsemane and even abandoned Jesus upon his arrest.¹ However, although the women stand in Mark's gospel where we would have expected to find the male disciples, and are described as being among those who had 'followed' Jesus, we concluded that by referring to the women as watching from 'afar', Mark intended us to see these women as 'fallible followers', like the male disciples.

As we have already noted, Matthew's redactional handling of the Marcan crucifixion scene did not prompt him to introduce any male characters and he keeps the Marcan reference to the women watching from a distance. We are not, however, able to continue the idea that the three

watching women are replacements for the absent disciples, and if anything, the third woman in Matthew, the mother of the sons of Zebedee, is there as a reminder of that group. Finally, as in Mark, Mary Magdalene stands at the head of the list of the watching women in Matthew.

With our examination of the Lucan version of the crucifixion we noted a much more pronounced attempt not only to play down the role of the women at the scene of the crucifixion, but also to introduce males to this scene. Thus in Luke the women are not specifically identified until 24:10,² and there is also a reference to two other groups at the cross besides the women and these are the crowds and those known to Jesus (males). Finally, since Luke has earlier omitted the Marcan reference to the flight of the disciples (cf. Mk 14:50), the possibility is left open for the male disciples to be present at the cross. With the Fourth Gospel this possibility of a male disciple being present at the cross becomes a reality, and there is a reference to "the disciple whom Jesus loved" in Jn 19:26. Although John has a reference to a group of women at the scene of the crucifixion which is similar to the Synoptic tradition, the central feature of the Johannine crucifixion narrative is Jn 19:26-7 and the episode involving the Beloved Disciple and the mother of Jesus. In our examination of the Johannine crucifixion scene we concluded that John had altered the Synoptic reference to the women standing *παρὰ θέν* and they now stand *παρὰ τῇ σταυρῷ*. We decided that this feature represented a deliberate alteration of the tradition in John in preparation for the scene which followed in Jn 19:26-7, which was also probably composed by John. Finally, the list of women in Jn 19:25 could be accounted for in terms of our suggestion that there was a fixed tradition naming the women involved in the stories of the crucifixion, burial and the empty tomb which also revolved around two fixed names, Mary Magdalene and the mother of Jesus.

Moving on to our examination of the developing tradition of the burial the general tendencies we noted here were also twofold, and these were to develop the character of Joseph of Arimathea and to introduce apologetic motifs to the developing burial tradition. Thus in Mark, Joseph is described simply as an honourable councillor who was waiting for the Kingdom of God (Mk 15:43), in Luke he is a good and righteous man who had nothing to do with the death of Jesus (Lk 23:50-1), while in Matthew and John he has become a disciple of Jesus (Mt 27:57 and Jn

19:38).

The questioning of the centurion in Mk 15:44 as to whether Jesus had indeed died, was possibly the first hint we have in the gospels of an apologetic motif in the story of the burial, stressing the fact that Jesus really died and, therefore, really rose from the dead. This is taken further in Mt 27:62-66, in particular, where we have the story of the male guards at the tomb. Beyond this, Matthew also emphasises the care taken over the burial and we read that the body is wrapped in a 'clean' sheet and deposited in a 'new' tomb. This interest in the newness of the tomb is continued in Luke and John (cf. Lk 23:53 and Jn 19:41), though the Fourth Gospel alone mentions that the tomb is situated in a garden. While both Matthew and Luke continue with the Marcan reference to the women in the story of the burial, there is no reference to the women in John, and indeed a second male, Nicodemus, appears on the scene (cf. 19:39). Finally, with Jn 19:31 we have a suggestion that the enemies of Jesus might even have had a hand in the burial of Jesus.³

Our study of the discovery of the empty tomb in all four canonical gospels revealed that the main features of this story, at least in the Synoptic gospels, are the appearance and message of the young man and the women's reaction to this. The points on which the evangelists sometimes disagreed were: the women involved in the visit, their motivation for going to the tomb, the time of their departure for the tomb, what they saw there, the message they received, their reaction to this, and finally, the reactions, if any, of those they tell about what they have seen and heard at the tomb.

Beginning with the question of who actually visited the tomb we suggested that the Synoptic tradition of a group of women was probably earlier than the Johannine version, and John has redacted this earlier tradition to focus on the figure of Mary Magdalene who goes alone to the tomb (cf. Jn 20:1). Since Matthew had already redacted out the third woman in 28:1, and abbreviated the reference to the second woman, who is now referred to simply as 'the other Mary', we suggested that there was a tendency in the developing tradition of the empty tomb story to focus on Mary Magdalene as the primary female resurrection witness. This is taken further in Jn 20:14f. where she alone experiences a christophany, unlike Mt 28:9-10 where a group of women are involved. On the question of the women's motivation for the visit we decided that Mt 28:1 probably represented, or was introduced to create, a more plausible tradition than

Mark's anointing motif (cf. Mk 16:1), which was in turn probably introduced by Mark to create a literary echo with Mk 14:2f. Luke agrees with the Marcan motivation for the women's visit. However, his subsequent lack of interest in the attempted anointing after the reference to the spices in 23:56 was taken as one example of the general lack of interest in the women's visit to the tomb in Luke's gospel. The Johannine motivation was possibly to lament at the tomb as 20:11f. indicates, and we also noted the use of βλέπει in Jn 20:1 which agrees with the Matthean purpose for visiting the tomb.

Moving on to what the women see at the tomb we decided that the evangelists felt free to interpret the Marcan νεανίας and his message in terms of their own theology and they all differ in their redaction of this section of the empty tomb story.

With this very brief survey of the empty tomb story we now arrive at Mk 16:8 and parallels. We decided that with this enigmatic verse the first gospel originally concluded, and moreover this was a conclusion which left the ending of the gospel open. Thus the original empty tomb story comprised only a story involving women at the tomb. However, our analysis of the tomb stories in Matthew, Luke and John showed that there was a tendency at work in the developing tradition to broaden the witnesses at the tomb.⁴ Thus in Matthew we not only have women at the tomb, but also the guards (cf. Mt 27:62-66; 28:4 and 11f.), and in 28:9-10 there is a christophany to the women introducing Jesus to the story of the empty tomb. Luke does not conclude his tomb story with a christophany to the women and instead we read here of their testimony not being believed (cf. 24:11), and with Lk 24:12 and 24 another feature is introduced to the developing tomb tradition, and that is male disciples at the tomb. In John's gospel we have a combination of all of these features of the developing tradition and there is a story of a woman at the tomb in 20:1, 11-14, the disciples at the tomb in vv. 3-10 and finally Jesus at the tomb in vv. 14-18. The Johannine story of Mary Magdalene at the tomb has been redacted in such a way as to prepare for the story of the disciples at the tomb. The Johannine race of the disciples is also more developed than the brief references in Lk 24:12 and 24 and unlike the Lucan references, the Johannine story of the disciples at the tomb is inserted to the story of the women at the tomb, and not simply added on at the end. The christophany to Mary Magdalene in Jn 20:14f. is a development beyond Mt 28:9-10 where the Magdalene is

now involved in a dialogue with the risen Jesus, unlike the women of the Matthean christophany who are merely the silent recipients of a message. Finally, with the Johannine christophany, we see a further development in the tradition and the angelophany has become almost a redundant feature in the story of the empty tomb.⁵

It is with these redactional tendencies in mind that we will now turn our attention to the apocryphal traditions of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb while at the same time bearing in mind the comments of J.D. Crossan that "...you cannot understand what is included in the canon unless you understand what was excluded from it."⁶

In a recent article R.E. Brown drew our attention to two developments in the study of the New Testament which, though perhaps not intentionally, have none the less had the effect of seriously challenging the canonical writings of the New Testament, particularly the gospels.⁷ These two developments are first of all those studies which use the canonical writings to reconstruct an earlier stage of Christianity which they also claim was preferable to that reflected in the New Testament writings. Of interest to us here are the works of L. Schottroff and E. Schüssler Fiorenza which suggest Christianity was originally more radical in reversing existing patterns of social order and only subsequently developed patriarchal and authoritarian structures.⁸ The second area of research Brown highlights, is the work on the non-canonical writings or apocryphal gospels, which are used as evidence to show that Christianity was more rich and varied than suggested by those works represented within the New Testament canon.⁹ Scholars working in this area would claim that first century Christianity emerged out of an historical situation which was much more complex than we first imagined, and as the discoveries at Qumran have helped in our attempts to reconstruct Judaism in the period before 70 CE, so these apocryphal works have helped to shed light on the "twilight period of early Christian history."¹⁰

Before drawing our attention to some of the suggestions arising from these studies, which are pertinent to our present work, we must briefly define what we mean by the terms 'canonical' and 'apocryphal' texts. According to H. Koester these terms "... reflect a traditional usage which implies deep-seated prejudices and has far reaching consequences."¹¹ These prejudices and consequences are that while some apocryphal traditions at least are accepted by scholars such as W.

Schneemelcher to be almost contemporary with the canonical writings and written on the basis of these same traditions, the conclusion is usually that the apocryphal writings are those "... which from the point of view of Form Criticism further develop and mould the kinds of style created and received in the NT, whilst foreign elements certainly intrude."¹² Such prejudices regarding the dating of the apocryphal literature vis à vis the canonical texts are taken one stage further, Koester believes, by J.A. Fitzmyer who judges these texts to be "schlock that is supposed to pass for 'literature'."¹³

In order to clarify the problem of canonical versus non-canonical works we must return to our question of definition. The term canonical is perhaps easier to define than apocryphal and it is a Greek word, κανών which comes from a Semitic root with the basic meaning 'reed'.¹⁴ This is interpreted metaphorically in Greek to mean straight rod. The Greek κανών, therefore, represents the norm or standard by which other things can be judged. This word is used at least three times in the New Testament (Gal.6:18; 2 Cor 10:13-16),¹⁵ and in the church it came to mean the norm or standard of judgement.

The term apocrypha, on the other hand, refers to those writings the canonisation of which was not carried through. We have already referred to the opinion of Schneemelcher that while these writings by title or other such statements lay claim to be in the same class as the canonical writings, from the point of view of form criticism they are secondary to such works. We will obviously discuss this question in our detailed examination of each text and for the present simply draw attention to the question of the relationship between the canonical and non-canonical gospels which is still a hotly debated issue amongst New Testament scholars.¹⁶

The actual term 'apocrypha' is relatively late, and originally these works were known as extra-canonical or disputed writings which were to be read aloud, not in the church, but in the presence of catechumens. The word ἀπόκρυφος began to appear from the time of Irenaeus onwards and was taken over not from Jewish circles, but from gnostic circles. This designation, therefore, primarily referred to the secret writings of the gnostics.

The introduction of the term apocrypha into the church was, therefore, connected with the church's struggle with the 'heretics'. It is important for our study to realise that the apocryphal literature did

not originate in a vacuum, but must be evaluated in terms of the wider background of the struggles of the developing church in the first few centuries CE.¹⁷ Furthermore, this association of the word apocrypha with the gnostics led the ecclesiastical writers who used the term to evaluate it in a negative manner. It was given a fault-finding connotation with the result being that the term apocrypha fell into disrepute.

This background is important for our study of the apocryphal stories of the resurrection and helps us to appreciate why these texts in particular became a focal point of controversy. For E. Pagels the orthodox church gradually adopted a literal view of the resurrection which, while not necessarily present in all the resurrection accounts of the New Testament, was firmly established by the second century CE.¹⁸ Beyond this, the canonical New Testament and apostolic writings of the second century CE attempted to suppress strains of Christian thought and behaviour which survived only in the apocryphal literature. Thus, according to Pagels:

... when we examine its practical effect on the Christian movement, we can see, paradoxically, that the doctrine of bodily resurrection also serves an essential *political* function: it legitimizes the authority of certain men who claim to exercise exclusive leadership over churches as the successors of the apostle Peter. From the second century, the doctrine has served to validate the apostolic succession of bishops, the basis of papal authority to this day. Gnostic Christians who interpret resurrection in other ways have a lesser claim to authority: when they claim priority over the orthodox, they are denounced as heretics.¹⁹

Pagels explains the situation in the early church as one where there were rival claims for political and religious authority and in Jerusalem, James, the brother of the Lord successfully rivalled Peter's authority, with one tradition maintaining that it was James, and not Peter, who was the first resurrection witness.²⁰ The reaction of the orthodox church, was, according to Pagels, to recognise that only certain resurrection appearances conferred authority on those who received them and these were the appearances to Peter and the eleven.²¹ This in turn meant that resurrection witness was closed forever, and beyond this a line was established running from the apostles to their successors in an unbroken chain of witness. Exactly why this chain of authority was established was prompted, Pagels suggests, by the rival claims of gnostic Christians who insisted that resurrection, far from being a unique event in the past, represented how Christ's presence could be experienced in the present.²² Thus, for the gnostic, the resurrection experience is a

visualisation of a luminous heavenly body, which in the opinion of J.M. Robinson, was how the original Easter experience is recorded in the gospels. What happened subsequently was that while the gnostics developed this experience into a disembodied spirit, in the canonical presentation the emphasis was put rather on the fleshly risen body.²³

In the gnostic gospels the resurrection appearances are therefore described as visions received in dreams or ecstatic trances as in the Gospel of Mary where Mary Magdalene has a resurrection experience, which according to her was a vision in the mind:

I saw the Lord in a *vision* and I said to him, "Lord, I saw you today in a *vision*." He answered and said to me, "Blessed are you, that you did not waver at the sight of me. For where the mind is, there is the treasure." I said to him, "Lord, how does he who sees the *vision* see it through the soul or through the spirit?". The Saviour answered and said, "He does not see through the soul nor through the spirit, but the mind which is between the two - that is what sees the *vision*".²⁴

The political implications of such ideas are, for Pagels, that the gnostics, like the orthodox, claimed that whoever saw the Lord through an inner vision could claim that his or her authority equalled or surpassed that of the twelve and their successors. She asks us to consider the political implications of the scene we have just referred to in the Gospel of Mary which is followed by an incident where Mary is tackled by Peter and Andrew about her experience:

... Peter and Andrew, here representing the leaders of the orthodox group, accuse Mary - the gnostic - of pretending to have seen the Lord in order to justify the strange ideas, fictions and lies she invents and attributes to divine inspiration. Mary lacks the proper credentials of leadership, from the orthodox point of view: she is not one of the "twelve". But as Mary stands up to Peter, so the gnostics who take her as their prototype challenge the authority of those priests and bishops who claim to be Peter's successors.²⁵

As we shall see, the post-resurrection period was very important in gnostic literature, most probably because it was easiest to find here a setting for the esoteric teaching of Jesus which was delivered to a private group of disciples and was one of the methods commonly in use to bridge over the gap between the tradition of the church and the theology of the gnostics.²⁶

In our examination of the apocryphal gospels we will bear in mind the issues we have raised in our introduction taking up the points we have noted in our study of the canonical gospels, we will examine the role and status of women in the stories of the crucifixion, burial and

resurrection in the apocryphal traditions and decide whether women are portrayed in a positive or negative light. Looking more closely at the details of each text we will also be interested to see what role Mary Magdalene plays in the apocryphal traditions of the resurrection and the role of female witness in general vis à vis the witness of males. Was there, for instance, a tendency in the apocryphal tradition to write the males back into the narratives of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb, and if so, was this matched by a tendency in the opposite direction to downgrade the testimony of the women?

A. THE CRUCIFIXION

When we examined the canonical accounts of the role of women at the crucifixion we noted that while all four gospels mention the presence of women at the cross, Lk 23:49 adds a reference to 'all his acquaintances' (male) and John introduces the Beloved Disciple (cf. 19:26-7). The women were described as standing far off (Synoptics) or near the cross (John). Luke did not, however, identify these women, and among the canonical gospels we noted a tendency to alter the names of the women involved, though we decided that Mary Magdalene and the mother of Jesus were common to all accounts, with the Magdalene heading the list of women in Mark and Matthew.

The apocryphal writings were not primarily interested in the crucifixion of Jesus, except in so far as they were concerned to highlight the responsibility of the Jews or the Jewish authorities for the death of Jesus, and this is the case in the gospels of Peter and Nicodemus in particular. We will look at each apocryphal gospel which deals with the crucifixion and then draw together the information before deciding how they compare with the canonical gospels in their treatment of women.

1. The Gospel of Nicodemus

We begin with the Gospel of Nicodemus which is also known as the Acts of Pilate and is a work which we can date to the fourth century CE.²⁷ In this work we have the only reference to the women at the cross in the apocryphal gospels, and there is also an earlier reference here to a woman called Bernice who is among those who come forward and give testimony on behalf of Jesus during his trial. In 7:1 we, therefore, read:

And a woman called Bernice (Latin: Veronica) crying out from a distance said: "I had an issue of blood and I touched the hem of his garment, and the issue of blood, which had lasted twelve years, ceased" (Mk.5:25ff.). The Jews said: "We have a law not to permit a woman to give testimony."²⁸

This tradition picks up on a story reported earlier in Mark's gospel and even supplies a name for the woman. The refusal of the Jews to accept the testimony of the woman fits in with the points we made in our earlier discussion of the role and status of women in Judaism.²⁹ It is also interesting to note that the refusal to accept female testimony is also paralleled in the story of the empty tomb in Lk 24:11, where we are told that the women's testimony is not accepted by the disciples and instead is rejected as an idle tale.

Moving on to the Gospel of Nicodemus 11:1 we have a similar reference to Lk 23:44-48, and when Jesus dies, the multitudes react by beating their breasts and departing. More interestingly, perhaps, this reference is followed by a second reference to the wife of Pilate in 11:2 who has previously been mentioned in 2:1 in a manner recalling Mt 27:19. Thus the author of this work has moved beyond Matthew and we have a second reference to the wife of Pilate. We read here that when the governor and his wife are told of the death of Jesus by the centurion (cf. Mk 15:44), they are 'greatly grieved' and they neither eat nor drink for the rest of the day. This was undoubtedly part of the attempt to heighten the guilt and responsibility of the Jews for the death of Jesus and to exculpate the Romans.

It is only after the reference to Jesus' death that mention is made of the women at the cross in the Gospel of Nicodemus.³⁰ In 11:3 we read: "And his acquaintances had stood far off and the women who had come with him from Galilee, and saw these things." Thus, although the women are not specifically identified in this gospel, we are told that they are present at the cross together with other acquaintances. This writer therefore shares with Mark the reference to the women who had come up with Jesus from Galilee (cf. Mk 15:40-1). He also agrees that they are present at the cross 'watching' what is happening, and here too they stand (cf. Lk 23:49; Jn 19:25) at a distance. Beyond this the writer agrees with Luke that the women are not alone at the cross, and the reference to the women is prefaced by a reference to 'all his acquaintances' (cf. Lk 23:49). There is no specific mention of the disciples at the cross in the Gospel of Nicodemus, and indeed, only Nicodemus is available to come forward in 12:1 and be questioned by the

Romans about Joseph of Arimathea since the other twelve men who had defended Jesus during his trial were now in hiding. There is no apologetic note given here for why the disciples might be in hiding, though we note that unlike the canonical gospels, in the Gospel of Nicodemus the disciples give witness on Jesus' behalf during the trial.

Finally, there is no mention here that the women who are at the cross had served Jesus while he was in Galilee and here too the writer seems to be closer to Lk 23:49 than Mk 15:40.³¹

To sum up, the reference to the women at the cross in the Gospel of Nicodemus is very similar to Lk 23:49. Although the women are present at the cross, they are not identified by name, there is no reference to their previous service, and the male acquaintances of Jesus also stand there with them.

2. The Gospel of Peter

The Gospel of Peter must be one of the most debated texts among the apocryphal gospels with regard to the question of its relationship to the canonical gospels. Though no complete text of this gospel has ever been found, we do have a large fragment which was discovered at Akhmim in 1886-7, being a codex from the eight - ninth century CE. It is commonly held that this was the part of the Gospel of Peter referred to by Serapion, bishop of Antioch ca. 200 CE, who noted that this gospel was being read at nearby Rhossus.³² In addition there are also two small fragments of P. Oxyrhynchus 2949 which indicate the Gospel of Peter was in existence in Egypt ca. 200 CE.³³ The text of the Gospel of Peter which we now have includes most of the passion narrative, the story of Jesus rising from the tomb, and the beginning of a story of Jesus' appearance to the disciples at the sea of Galilee. There is a dispute over the dating of this gospel but the earliest date would seem to be 150 CE and the latest suggestion is the second half of the second century CE,³⁴ with Syria being the most likely place of composition.³⁵

As we have mentioned, the question of the relationship of the Gospel of Peter to the canonical gospels is still disputed today with scholars such as Crossan, B.A. Johnson and Koester arguing that it was antecedent to the canonical gospels.³⁶ The narrative style of the Gospel of Peter, taking the form of a report of Peter, exonerating Pilate and making Herod responsible for killing Jesus, and even more significant perhaps, its elaborate description of the resurrection including the

cross rising and speaking, have suggested to others that the Gospel of Peter is "...nothing but a secondary, late and possibly heretical composition."³⁷ Some scholars such as C.H. Turner would refer to the points of contact between the Gospel of Peter and the canonical gospels. He suggests that we do not have to show that this writer used all four canonical gospels equally to prove dependence.³⁸ Others such as Brown would prefer to argue along more structured methodological lines of enquiry and having reviewed the question of dependence from "Scriptural memory", "redaction" and the question of "a better flowing narrative", he stops short of arguing for a literary dependence and instead suggests oral dependence of the Gospel of Peter on some, or all of the canonical gospels. Finally, Brown himself admits that the Gospel of Peter is closer to Matthew than to any of the other canonical gospels.³⁹

Obviously we will examine for ourselves the question of the relationship between the Gospel of Peter and the canonical gospels when we look at the text in detail. However, having reviewed the arguments on both sides we would tend to agree with those who suggest dependence of the Gospel of Peter on the canonical gospels for reasons which we will outline below.

Returning to the story of the crucifixion in the Gospel of Peter, there is no reference here to the women at the scene. What we do have, however, is a reference to the disciples who are in hiding. In 7:26 Peter tells us: "But I mourned with my fellows, and being wounded in heart we hid ourselves, for we were sought after by them as evildoers and as persons who wanted to set fire to the temple."⁴⁰ According to P. Gardner-Smith, the disciples fear that they might be arrested has an early ring, and Peter might be preserving an early tradition.⁴¹ Another possibility is, of course, that Peter, aware of the Marcan tradition of the abandonment by the disciples, could be attempting to soften his harsh Marcan portrait by dwelling instead on their forlorn condition.⁴² Thus the flight of the disciples is not seen primarily in terms of cowardly fear for their own safety, but because they represented a political threat to the authorities. Finally, this suggestion is supported by the fact that in 7:27 we are told that the disciples spent this time in hiding fasting, mourning and weeping which would again support remorse on their part and a sympathetic treatment of this group by the writer of the Gospel of Peter.⁴³

3. The Gospel of Bartholomew

This gospel survives in a series of texts associated with the name of the apostle Bartholomew in Greek, Latin, Slavonic and Coptic. The earliest reference we have to the gospel is in Jerome and, as Schneemelcher concludes, the lateness and sparseness of the testimony, while not proof of the lateness of the apocryphon, could well be explained in that way.⁴⁴

Our particular interest in the Gospel of Bartholomew with regard to the crucifixion involves a reference to the betrayal by Judas in two Coptic fragments of the gospel. Here the first fragment tells us that it was Judas' wife who induced her husband to treachery while in the second, the seven month old child of Joseph of Arimathea, to whom Judas' wife served as nurse, besought his father to send the woman away since she and her husband had accepted the blood money. Thus the betrayal by Judas has been further excused in the apocryphal tradition, and the blame has shifted from Judas to Judas prompted by Satan (cf. Lk.22:3), to Judas' wife.⁴⁵

Summation

What are we to make of these accounts of the crucifixion, and how far do they support the tendencies in the tradition which we saw operating within the canonical gospels? These tendencies were, of course, to place Mary Magdalene at the head of the list of female witnesses in Mark and Matthew, and, more significantly, to write the male witnesses back into the tradition.

Beginning with the question of female witnesses, the first thing we noted was that only two apocryphal gospels refer directly to the crucifixion, and of these two, only the Gospel of Nicodemus mentions women at the cross. If the author of the Gospel of Peter knew the canonical gospels, and we believe he did, then as 12:52 may indicate, he was responsible for redacting the women out of his tradition. The author of the Gospel of Nicodemus, on the other hand, while mentioning the women, does not identify them, and he further de-emphasises their role, either intentionally or unintentionally, by referring to other acquaintances at the cross. There is no reference to the Marcan statement that these women had ministered to Jesus, though we do have a reference to a woman, Bernice, in the Gospel of Nicodemus, who, we are told, gives witness at the trial, although this testimony is rejected. There are also two wives mentioned in the accounts of the trial and death

of Jesus, and these are the wife of Pilate in the Gospel of Nicodemus and the wife of Judas in the Gospel of Bartholomew.

Turning to the subject of the fate of the male disciples, it would appear that the author of the Gospel of Nicodemus agrees with Mark in assuming the flight of the male disciples, though we are also told here that they give witness during the trial. This flight is supported by the Gospel of Peter, though as we suggested above, the intention in this gospel was probably to improve the image of the disciples by stressing that their flight was motivated by political factors and not cowardly fear. Finally, with the Gospel of Bartholomew, the betrayal by Judas is no longer due to his own actions, or the work of Satan, instead his wife is responsible, and it is interesting to note that in the second fragment, Joseph of Arimathea, another important male figure in the canonical tradition, is redacted into this earlier part of the passion narrative.⁴⁶

B. THE BURIAL

In our studies of the burial stories of the canonical gospels we noticed two tendencies in developing tradition, and these were to emphasise the role and character of Joseph of Arimathea and to introduce an apologetic note to the burial story.

Beginning with Joseph of Arimathea we noted that in all four canonical gospels he was involved in the burial of Jesus, though descriptions of him varied significantly. Thus in the earliest account of Mark, Joseph is described as a respected member of the council who was waiting for the Kingdom of God (cf. Mk 15:43), while in Lk 23:50 he has become a good and righteous man who had nothing to do with the death of Jesus. Matthew elaborates this description further, and Joseph is now a rich man who is also a disciple of Jesus (cf. Mt 27:57). Finally, in John, Joseph is a secret disciple for fear of the Jews and in this gospel he is helped by an accomplice Nicodemus. This is also the first reference to Nicodemus in the burial tradition, and from earlier references to him in John's gospel we are probably to assume that he is also a secret disciple of Jesus.

In Mark's gospel we are told that Joseph "takes courage" and approaches Pilate for the body, and we suggested this was part of this gospel writer's negative portrait of the disciples of Jesus who have not taken courage but fled. Mark then interrupts the burial proceedings by

recording that Pilate is astonished at Jesus' death and this is followed by the questioning of the centurion.⁴⁷ All the other canonical gospels agree with Mark's account of Joseph's approach to Pilate, where they differ is in the actual details of the burial. In Mk 15:46f. Joseph takes the body and wraps it in a linen cloth and deposits it in a tomb which is then sealed with a stone. In Matthew the cloth is now described as a "clean" sheet and the tomb is a 'new' tomb. Luke agrees with this description of the tomb as being new, but he describes it as 'one where no-one had previously been laid' (cf. 23:53). Finally, in Jn 19:41f. it is now a new tomb in which no-one has previously been laid, and we are also told that it is situated in a garden.

The accounts of the burial of Jesus in the canonical gospels also differ in other ways, and with the reference in Jn 19:31f. we have a hint of a burial by the enemies of Jesus, and this is echoed elsewhere in the canonical tradition with Acts 13:28 contradicting the previous account of Lk 23:50-56. We have already noted that Nicodemus appears only in John's gospel, and here he is involved in an anointing of the body on the Friday evening (cf. 19:39f.). In Luke the spices are only prepared on the Friday evening, while in Mk 16:1 we have our first reference to the spices on the sabbath. Mark, Matthew and Luke then close their accounts of the burial with a reference to the women who witness the events, though in John's account of the burial the women have been written out of the tradition. Finally, with Mt 27:62-66 we have the grave guard legend which is not found elsewhere in the canonical tradition.

In our examination of the accounts of the burial tradition in the apocryphal gospels we will, therefore, be interested to see how these writers narrate the burial of Jesus, and in particular we will be interested to see if we can find any parallels to the tendencies in the tradition which we have noted above. The two texts involved here are, once again, the Gospel of Peter and the Gospel of Nicodemus.

1. Gospel of Peter

Beginning with the Gospel of Peter 2:3 we read here that as in the canonical accounts, Joseph of Arimathea is the person responsible for the burial of Jesus. Also in line with the canonical accounts is the development of the character of Joseph and he is described as a friend of Pilate who had seen all the good that Jesus had done (cf. 6:23). The

actual request for the body of Jesus does not follow the crucifixion as in the canonical gospels but, instead, happens while Jesus is being crucified. Thus in this gospel Joseph's role in the burial is integrated even more closely with the story of Jesus' death.

A further significant point in the story of the burial in the Gospel of Peter is the reference to King Herod in 2:5 where we are told that if Joseph had not asked for the body, the Jewish authorities would have had to bury Jesus. This was because, we are told, the sabbath was drawing on and because of the requirements of the Jewish law (cf. Dt 21:22f.). While we have a faint echo here of Lk 23:6-12 which also tells us that Herod and Pilate became friends with each other, this description of the burial may be a development of an earlier tradition in the canonical gospels which mentions the possibility of a burial by the enemies of Jesus, though nowhere in that tradition is Herod specifically identified (cf. possibly Mk 15:43; Jn 19:31; Acts 13:28). Finally, on a more general point, the involvement of Herod develops a theme in the Gospel of Peter which is to involve the Jewish authorities more closely with the death of Jesus.

In the Gospel of Peter 6:23 we, therefore, read that it is the Jews, not Pilate, who deliver the body of Jesus to Joseph. We are then told that Joseph took the body, washed it and wrapped it in linen (6:24; cf. Mk 15:46f.), bringing it to his own tomb (cf. Mt 27:60), which was in a place called Joseph's garden (cf. Jn 19:41). Thus all of the features which we saw as redactional embellishments of the burial story in the canonical gospels are included in Peter, and he even goes one step further in telling us that the garden belonged to Joseph.

The burial story in Peter then closes with a story of the guard at the tomb in 8:28-33, and this is a feature found only here and in Matthew's gospel (cf. Mt 27:62-66). The story of the guard at the tomb in both gospels has been studied in order to answer the question of the relationship between these two gospels. It is generally recognised that the problems of dependency either way are hindered here by the fact that verbal similarities between the two accounts are practically nil.⁴⁸ For scholars such as Crossan, who would argue that the Gospel of Peter guard legend is the original story which was later used by Matthew, the story in the Gospel of Peter is, 'a self-consistent, self-coherent and self-contained unit'.⁴⁹ Brown, however, would argue the opposite, and he sees Mt 27:62-6 as being more 'coherent' in terms of a story which might arise

among Jewish believers in Jesus.⁵⁰

The problem of the relationship between the two texts is not an easy one to answer. We have already stated our view that the story of the women at the tomb was the first component of the empty tomb story, and features such as the guard at the tomb are, therefore, later developments concerned with broadening the witnesses at the tomb. Looking at the Gospel of Peter and Matthew respectively, what we have on the one hand is a situation where the guard at the tomb story is added on the tomb story in the Gospel of Peter, whereas in Matthew, the guard story is interwoven with the earlier story of the women at the tomb. This would tend to suggest that Matthew's gospel marks a later stage in the development than the Gospel of Peter. However, what we also have to bear in mind, is that the guard at the tomb story is more miraculous and vivid in the Gospel of Peter than the story in Matthew, suggesting that the development is the other way round, and the Gospel of Peter, therefore, represents a later stage in the development than Mt 27:62f.⁵¹

Looking briefly at the stories of the guard at the tomb, we note that in Matthew the story is that on the Saturday the chief priests and the Pharisees ask Pilate for a guard to secure the tomb, and this is to prevent the disciples stealing the body of Jesus and, therefore, fulfilling the prediction of Jesus that he would rise on the third day. Pilate's reply is "You have a guard of soldiers; go, make it as secure as you can." (Mt 27:65)⁵² The Jews then go off and secure the tomb with the guards being posted on duty.

Turning to the Gospel of Peter, we immediately note both similarities and differences with the Matthean story. Whereas in Matthew, it is the chief priests and Pharisees who ask for a guard, here it is the scribes, Pharisees and elders (8:28). The reason for the request in the Gospel of Peter is because the Jewish authorities have heard the people murmuring and beating their breasts (cf. Lk 23:47), and their action is, therefore, motivated by sympathy and not because of what "that imposter said" (Mt 27:63).⁵³ While both accounts mention that the fear is that the disciples may steal the body, in Matthew the priests fear the disciples may say to the people 'He is raised from the dead', and in the Gospel of Peter the people may suppose that he is raised from the dead. This is then followed in Matthew by a verbal reply of Pilate while the Gospel of Peter only records what happens subsequently. Another interesting feature, which may argue against the priority of the

Gospel of Peter, is that one of the Roman guards, the centurion Petronius, is named. The features of the seven seals, and 'all' those present helping to close the tomb are also unique to the Gospel of Peter, and again we would suggest a further development of the tradition of the guard at the tomb.

Having briefly reviewed the evidence for the links between Matthew's gospel and the Gospel of Peter, we would tend to disagree with the conclusions of Brown, who argues that rather than seeing one account as directly dependent on the other, we are probably dealing here with two forms of the same basic story. Matthew probably added to his tomb story, which he got from Mark, a story of the guards at the tomb, which possibly arose in popular circles, prompted in part by an apologetic attack on the Jews (cf. Mt 28:14). The Gospel of Peter is most probably an example of a more developed form of this story, which as we will see in our examination of the empty tomb story also involved the descent of angels, Jesus preaching to the dead, and, finally, his ascent into heaven.⁵⁴

2. The Gospel of Nicodemus

Moving on to the Gospel of Nicodemus it is interesting to note that while the involvement of Joseph of Arimathea is retained, the description of him as a councillor from Arimathea who was waiting for the Kingdom of God is very similar to Mark (cf. 11:3 and Mk 15:43). The account of the actual burial is also quite straight forward here, and Joseph asks Pilate for the body, takes it down from the cross and wraps it in a linen cloth, placing it in a rock hewn tomb (Mk 15:46), in which no-one has previously been laid (Lk 23:50-3).

If this were the end of the story we could conclude that the burial of Jesus has not been greatly elaborated in the Gospel of Nicodemus. The involvement of Joseph of Arimathea does not, however, end here, and according to this gospel, the Jews quiz Joseph concerning his involvement in the burial (12:1). In his defence, Joseph reveals the new details that the tomb is both a new one and the linen cloth was clean (cf. Mt 27:59-60). The stone is also mentioned here for the first time in the account. The Gospel of Nicodemus then continues with a reference to the imprisonment of Joseph by the Jews, and his subsequent rescue by Jesus who even takes him to the empty tomb to prove to him the reality of the resurrection (15:6).⁵⁵ Finally, this gospel also mentions a guard at the tomb (cf. 13:1).

Summation

Having reviewed both these accounts of the burial of Jesus, we note first of all that while these writers display a knowledge of the canonical accounts of the burial, or at least the stories contained in these gospels, they significantly omit any reference to the women. The Johannine editing out of the women is, therefore, continued. This redacting out of the women leaves Joseph of Arimathea to complete the burial rites and his role is not detracted from by the introduction of any other male accomplices. According to the Gospel of Peter, Joseph is able to obtain the body because he is a friend of Pilate. There is, therefore, no significant development of his character beyond a simple apologetic insertion. The Gospel of Nicodemus, on the other hand, represents the high point in the development of the role of Joseph and here he is no longer only involved in the burial, but is subsequently imprisoned by the Jews, rescued by the risen Jesus, and shown the empty tomb to prove the reality of the resurrection. Joseph of Arimathea has, therefore, become an important resurrection witness who convinces his fellow, doubting, Jews of the reality of the resurrection.

C. THE RESURRECTION STORIES

When we examined the resurrection stories of the canonical gospels, we noticed that these traditions took basically two forms, that is, stories regarding the discovery of the empty tomb and appearance traditions, with women being predominantly associated with the former. We have already stated in our introduction that we consider the Marcan empty tomb tradition to be the earliest form of this story, with the main features being the appearance and message of the young man, and the women's reaction to this. In agreement with Mark, the other canonical writers follow this order, and it is a visit by the women to the tomb which marks the beginning of the events of the first day of the week. This is not surprising if, as we believe, Mark was their source. Beyond this basic agreement, however, we noted several similarities and differences between these various accounts.

Beginning with the problem of who exactly went to the tomb, we noted that in the earliest account of Mk 16:1f. Mary Magdalene is accompanied by Mary the mother of James and Salome, and in Matthew this is abbreviated to Mary Magdalene and the 'other Mary'. Luke, however, does not identify the women until 24:10 and here they are Mary Magdalene,

Joanna and Mary the mother of James, together with the rest of the women. Thus Luke agrees with Mark and Matthew in his inclusion of Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, but he has added a reference to Joanna (cf. Lk 8:1-3). All three Synoptic writers are in agreement that these women were part of a larger group of female followers of Jesus.

When we turn to the Fourth Gospel we are immediately struck by the fact that Mary Magdalene now goes alone to the tomb (20:1), though we noted in our Johannine chapter that she significantly speaks in the plural in v. 2. It was our conclusion that John's concentration on the Magdalene was possibly influenced by the Marcan positioning of Mary at the head of his list of women and was motivated by the christophany in Jn 20:14f. which focused on Mary Magdalene as the single recipient. John, therefore, altered the Synoptic tradition to focus on one woman at the tomb.

The significance of the above variations in the identification of the women involved in the empty tomb stories of the canonical gospels is that from the earliest account of Mark, Mary Magdalene is recalled as a woman whose name was firmly fixed in the tradition. It is also possible to suggest that the mother of Jesus, identified as Mary the mother of James and Joses/Joseph, was also an important figure, but secondary to the Magdalene, since she never heads the list of women at the tomb. Thus, in our evaluation of the apocryphal stories of the empty tomb and resurrection traditions, we will be interested to learn whether Mary Magdalene has a primary role to play, and if this means the exclusion of other female characters. Since the Synoptic writers also mention other individuals such as Salome, the mother of the sons of Zebedee, or Joanna, we will be interested to learn of their subsequent fates, and indeed, if any new figures are introduced to the story of the women at the tomb.

A second feature of the tomb tradition which interests us is the motivation for the women's visit to the tomb. According to Mark, the women come to the tomb to anoint Jesus (16:1), and this is echoed, but not developed, in Lk 24:1. Matthew, on the other hand, suggests that the women come to see the tomb (28:1), and this would appear to be echoed in John, who, while not directly referring to the motivation for the visit, refers to Mary's seeing in 20:1 and weeping in 20:11. It was our conclusion, however, that Matthew and John probably represent a more plausible form of the women's motivation for the visit to the tomb and Mark altered this in order to establish a contrast between the women of

16:1 and the woman who anoints Jesus in 14:2f. In examining the apocryphal empty tomb stories we will, therefore, pay close attention to this feature to establish whether or not anointing is a motif which continues in the tradition.

There are also differences among the canonical writers regarding the time on the Sunday when the first witnesses come to the tomb. In John it is still dark, while in Matthew and Luke it is dawn, and in Mark it is after sunrise. Obviously any echoes of such timings will be noted as well as variations.

This time reference is followed by the information that while the women are at the tomb they witness one (Mt or Mk) or two angels, either inside (Mk, Lk, Jn) or outside the tomb (Mt). The women then enter the tomb and hear the angelic message (Mk or Lk), or this is heard later (Mt), and the gospels differ on the content of this message. According to Luke and John, Jesus has risen and will shortly appear, whereas in Mark and Matthew the message also includes a reference to Galilee, and in Mark Peter is singled out for special mention.

The women's reaction to this is to run away and either tell no-one about their experience, because they were afraid (Mk.), or pass the message on (Mt., Lk., Jn.). Whether the women are believed or not is another matter, and in John we are told that the disciples go to the tomb and check Mary's testimony (20:3-10), while in Luke we are explicitly informed that the disciples did not accept the witness of the women and "it seemed to them an idle tale, and they did not believe them." Finally, in Matthew and John, a female(s) is the first person to encounter the risen Jesus, while in Luke this honour is reserved for Peter.⁵⁶

What do we make of these variations? The first thing we noted was that the earliest version of the empty tomb story mentioned a group of women going to the tomb and finding no body there. These women then encounter an angelic messenger. The gospel writers differ here on the number of messengers and both Luke and John have altered the tradition. The greatest redactional involvement, however, concerns the message which is to be delivered, and in John, the angels significantly pass on no message and they have become mere 'stage furniture'. We suggested, therefore, that this down-grading of the angelophany was motivated by the inclusion of a christophany which appears in Mt 28:9-10 and Jn 20:14f., which in turn supplanted the need for the former. Thus, in Matthew's

christophany the risen Jesus merely repeats verbatim the words of the angel, and in John we have a further development with Jesus himself being the sole bearer of the resurrection message. The interesting point here will be to discover whether or not the apocryphal traditions continue this redactional trend and supplant the angelophany with a christophany.

Moving on to the reaction of the women, the earliest account, Mark, tells us that the women flee in fear saying nothing to any one, and with this stark comment the gospel ends. The other canonical writers were not satisfied with this ending, and Matthew, while not directly telling us that the disciples disbelieved the women, mentions the fact that some disciples doubted the appearance of Jesus (20:17). In John and Luke the scene is quite different. In Jn 20:3-10, the disciples race to the tomb to confirm the women's message, and in Luke 24:11 we are told the women's testimony is disbelieved. Thus we see a gradual introduction of the motif of the disciples' scepticism to the empty tomb tradition which further allows both Luke and John to introduce a broadening of the witness to the tomb. Males are now redacted into the tomb story, though perhaps not as thoroughly in Luke where their visit to the tomb is appended rather than inserted as is the case in the Fourth Gospel.

Finally, both Matthew and John close their accounts of the story of the women at the tomb with a christophany to the women. In our Matthean chapter, we were able to prove that this christophany was Matthew's own creation, and John is a further example of this trend to introduce Jesus at the tomb. We will pay close attention to any attempts in the apocryphal tradition to link together the empty tomb and appearance traditions.

More interesting for our purposes is that while both Matthew and John have an appearance to the women first, in Luke it is Peter who is the first to encounter the risen Lord (cf. 24:34).⁵⁷ Was this the beginning of a tension between the women, and possibly Mary Magdalene in particular, and the men, personified in Peter, regarding the primacy of their witness to the risen Christ?

The above summary of the canonical accounts of the empty tomb and resurrection stories involving women, therefore, raises a number of points which we will need to consider in our examination of the apocryphal stories of the resurrection. The procedure we will follow will be the same as that adopted above, and we will take each gospel in turn, bearing in mind the redactional trends we have highlighted in our

introduction. As always we will consider the question of the relationship, if any, between the apocryphal and canonical gospels. Finally, in our summation, we will draw together the evidence and assess how women were perceived in the apocryphal stories of the resurrection.

1. The Gospel of Peter

There is considerable information in the Gospel of Peter regarding the discovery of the empty tomb and the role of the women (cf. 8:28-11:49 and 12:50-7). The ending of the gospel in 14:60 also suggests that this incomplete gospel originally concluded with a christophany to the male disciples by the sea of Galilee.

Having established a guard at the tomb in 8:28-33, the author of this gospel now tells us that early on the morning after the sabbath, after dawn, a crowd comes from Jerusalem and the surrounding area to 'see' the sealed sepulchre (9:34). There is no mention of this crowd in the canonical gospels, though the timing of the visit is similar to Mk 16:1. We would suggest that the writer of the Gospel of Peter has extended the witnesses at the tomb to include this crowd. The motivation for the visit to see the tomb fits in well with the preceding material and recalls Mt 28:1.

In the remarkable scene which follows in 9:35-10:42, the resurrection itself is described and there is no parallel to this in the canonical gospels, though Crossan would suggest that if we accept the priority of the Gospel of Peter, then echoes of this scene are scattered throughout the canonical gospels.⁵⁸ Whereas in the canonical accounts the resurrection is inferred from the empty tomb, the message of the angel, and the appearance of the risen Christ, the text of 'Peter' gives details of what occurred in the night before the Sunday dawned. According to Turner, however, the starting point for this story was Mt 28:1 where the possibility exists that Matthew either indicated Saturday night, or thought he did.⁵⁹ What Peter, therefore, does is to amplify this by placing the angelic descent in the night in which the Sunday dawned. The author then makes clear what is happening by a loud cry in the heavens and the great brightness. The imagery here recalls the baptism of Mk 3:16 and parallels.⁶⁰

What we then see are two men (cf. Lk 24:4; Jn 20:12) who come down from heaven. There is not an elaborate description of these men, and this suggests a similarity with Mark's account which is developed in 9:37

when these young men enter the tomb.⁶¹ The fact that the men can enter the tomb has been made possible by the fact that the stone has rolled itself away from the door. This miraculous act appears to be a development of Mt 28:2 where the angel of the Lord moves the stone.⁶² According to Peter, the soldiers witness this event as the guards do in Mt 28:4. However, the reference to the elders in 10:38 is not found in the canonical gospels.

What now follows in 10:39-42 has no canonical parallel, and appears to be legendary embellishment of these gospel texts, for now three men come out of the tomb with two of them assisting the third and the cross following behind. We are told that the heads of the two men reach heaven, though the third man is the highest 'overpassing the heavens'. Finally, a voice is heard from heaven and the scene closes. Thus it appears that in the Gospel of Peter the resurrection and the ascension might have been combined.⁶³

This is not, however, the end of the story, and in 11:43-9 we have the report of the guards to Pilate and an attempt to bribe them, partially echoing Mt 28:11-15 and suggesting, to J.E. Alsup, that the description of the resurrection in Peter has "...the artistic brushstrokes of an apologist filling out the canvass of tendencies begun in Mt."⁶⁴

Whereas we would expect the Gospel of Peter to either end here or continue with the resurrection appearances, we are now surprised to read of an empty tomb story involving Mary Magdalene and her friends in 12:50f.⁶⁵ The Gospel of Peter tells us that early on the Sunday morning Mary Magdalene goes to the tomb. We have already noticed the importance of Mary Magdalene in the canonical stories of the passion and resurrection, and she appears three times in Matthew and Mark, and twice in Luke, though never alone. In John's gospel, on the other hand, while she appears together with the other women at the cross, Mary Magdalene is alone at the tomb. According to Turner, what the Gospel of Peter has done is to conflate the canonical accounts, and in line with the Synoptics, 'Peter' speaks of the women in the plural in 12:51, and in line with John he places Mary Magdalene in the foreground.⁶⁶ The description of Mary as "a woman disciple of the Lord, for fear of the Jews" is a further echo of John, recalling the description of Joseph of Arimathea in Jn 19:38.⁶⁷ Finally, the statement that Mary had "not done at the sepulchre of the Lord what women are wont to do for those beloved

of them who die" (12:50), possibly echoes Jn 19:40. The fear motif in this passage which is reported several times is typical of the Gospel of Peter where not only Mary, but the disciples also fear the Jews.

The motive for Mary's visit is to weep and lament at the tomb and this reminds us of Jn 20:1 and 11, though there could also be a hint of an anointing motif in the reference to the women placing what they have brought at the sepulchre (12:54). The fact that the women ask who will move the stone (cf. Mk 16:3-4) also supports this anointing theory, or that the author of this gospel was aware of the Marcan tradition and echoes it here.

When the women arrive at the tomb they discover the sepulchre is open and stooping down (cf. Jn 20:5 & 11) they see a young man (Mk 16:5) sitting in the midst of the tomb, clothed in a shining robe. This brief description recalls Mark's gospel and we have none of the elaborate details of the other canonical gospels. The message of the young man now follows in 13:56:

"Wherefore are ye come? Whom seek ye? Not him that was crucified? He is risen and gone. But if ye believe not, stoop this way and see the place where he lay, for he is not here. For he is risen and is gone thither whence he was sent."

The message begins in a manner similar to Lk 24:5, though the harsh rebuke of Luke is not directly recalled. The resurrection is announced as in the canonical gospels, but there is no command to deliver a message to the disciples. The reference to Jesus returning from whence he came recalls Jn 20:17. The episode of the women at the tomb in Peter then concludes by telling us that the women fled in fear as in Mk 16:8 and this is followed by the reference to a possible christophany by the sea of Galilee.⁶⁸

What is the significance of this empty tomb story in the Gospel of Peter? First of all, in view of the similarities we have demonstrated between the Gospel of Peter and the canonical texts, we would suggest that this author was familiar with these stories in the canonical gospels. We would, therefore, go beyond Turner who argues that these contacts between the Gospel of Peter and the canonical gospels suggest "... that contact is not simply the result of a single process of conscious borrowing *ad hoc* from documents mastered only for this special purpose, but the natural self-expression of a mind saturated with the language of the Christian Gospels."⁶⁹

More significant for our purposes is the treatment of Mary

Magdalene in the Gospel of Peter. She emerges here as the most important witness to the empty tomb tradition. The other women of the Synoptic accounts have become 'Mary's friends', continuing a trend which we saw in Mt 28:1, though Peter has not gone as far as John in eliminating this group altogether (cf. Jn 20:1). The description of Mary Magdalene as a "disciple of Jesus", is a possible development of Mk 15:41, and makes explicit what was implicit there. We will see elsewhere in the apocryphal traditions of the resurrection an emphasis on Mary Magdalene and her relationship with Jesus. For the moment we simply refer to the Gospel of Philip where support is given to this description of the Magdalene in the Gospel of Peter and we read "...There were three who walked with the Lord at all times, Mary his mother and her sister and Magdalene, whom they called his consort".⁷⁰

The story of the empty tomb in the Gospel of Peter does not, however, conclude with a message for the women to deliver, and instead we have a similar conclusion to Mk 16:8, where the women depart in fear. It is difficult to say what we are intended to read into this conclusion in terms of what meaning it had for the author of this gospel. What we can probably say is that the gospel concluded with a christophany to the male disciples, and thus the male witness was presumably kept independent of the testimony of the women at the tomb.

2. The Epistula Apostolorum

This work is nowhere mentioned in the literature of early Christianity. Nothing was known of its existence until the end of the nineteenth century, though we now have copies of the text in Coptic and Ethiopic, with one fifth century page of Latin. The date and origin of this book are also questionable though there are indications that it is from the second century.⁷¹ This is suggested by the fact that the work claims to be a letter of Christ to the disciples to warn them against the threat they face from the false apostles Simon and Cerinthus. H. Duensing also points to the free and easy manner in which the writer treats the New Testament, the questions raised regarding the end of the world, and the Lord's tomb to support this dating.⁷²

One of the most significant differences between this work and the canonical gospels is that, unlike these writings, which to a certain extent share the post-Easter setting, this entire gospel is written from the perspective of a post-resurrection appearance, and in view of its

length is, therefore, one of the most extensive appearance texts we now possess.⁷³

The involvement of the women in this text appears immediately after the reference to the burial, and certain named women come to the tomb with ointment (chp. 9). There is, however, a problem in identifying these women, and while the Ethiopic version names them as Sarah, Martha and Mary Magdalene, the Coptic text reads: "Mary, she who belonged to Martha and Mary (Magd)alene." That three women are intended by this final reference is supported by chapter 10 where the Coptic version mentions Martha among its list of women here. Thus, in line with the earliest gospel Mark, three women are involved in the tomb incident. The identification of these women is not, however, the same as Mark, and the position of the women in the lists is also different. Mary Magdalene no longer heads the list of women, though significantly she appears in both versions. As for the appearance of Sarah in the Ethiopic text, this is difficult to explain, unless as with Salome (Mk.), the mother of the sons of Zebedee (Mt.), or Joanna (Lk.), she represents a figure who was well known by the community to which this gospel was addressed. In the Coptic version, Sarah is replaced by Mary, whom we are told is related to Martha, the third woman who appears in both lists. How can we explain the appearance of these two women and their relationship?

In answering this problem we would suggest that the author of the Epistula knew of the stories included in the canonical traditions of Lk 10:38-42 and Jn 11:1-44, 12:1-12, where we are told that these two women are sisters and they belonged to a family who were close to Jesus. Indeed, according to Jn 12:1f. it is Mary, the sister of Martha, who is responsible for anointing Jesus before his death. In our previous discussions on the women in the canonical texts of the passion and resurrection we noted that there was another Mary involved besides Mary Magdalene, and she was identified as the mother of Jesus. However, given the confusion in the Marcan identification of this woman, and Matthew's subsequent abbreviation to 'the other Mary' in 27:61 and 28:1, it is possible to suggest that the present writer was responding to this uncertain reference.

It is a possibility, therefore, that the only 'other Mary' known to the writer of the Epistula was the sister of Martha and this explains why she is included here. The reference to Martha was, therefore, prompted by the inclusion of her sister Mary. The interesting point here is that

this author did not then identify this Mary with Mary Magdalene as later church writers did.⁷⁴

Both texts continue by telling us that the women took the ointment to pour "on his body, weeping and mourning over what had happened" (chap. 9), recalling both the anointing motif of Mk 16:1f. and the weeping of Mary Magdalene in Jn 20:11. The women approach the tomb and then discover that the stone, which has not previously been mentioned⁷⁵ has been rolled away, and they either open the door (Ethiopic), or simply look inside (cf. Jn 20:11; Gospel of Peter 13:55). The women find no body in the tomb (Lk 24:3), and thus the emptiness of the tomb is stressed.

Significantly the text now continues in chapter 10, not with an angelophany but with a christophany. Jesus appears to the women and asks them why they are weeping (Jn 20:14f.) since he is the one they are seeking (Jn 20:15; 18:4) and they are instructed: "But let one of you go to your brothers and say (Ethiopic: to them), (Mt 28:7), 'Come, our (Coptic: the) Master has raised from the dead' (Mt 28:10; Jn 20:17)." Thus, as we suggested in our introduction to the apocryphal resurrection traditions, the christophany introduced by Matthew and John, represented the beginning of a trend to supplant the angelophany, and it is interesting that for this particular section of the Epistula, the most frequently cited sources are these two canonical gospels. Beyond this point it is also significant to note that the instruction is for only one of the women to deliver the message. This could indicate the author's awareness that John only includes one woman at the tomb in his story.

The remainder of chapter 10 represents a very interesting development in the deliverance of the message of the women with the sceptical response of the disciples being stressed. Here not only does Mary (Coptic: Martha) go and tell the disciples and is disbelieved, but a second woman, Sarah (Coptic: Mary), is sent by Jesus and is also disbelieved. Finally, Jesus and the women go together to present themselves to the disciples who think Jesus is a ghost (Lk 24:37, 39). Thus the sceptical response of the disciples which we found in Lk 24:11 has been emphasised here.

Another interesting factor to note here is that there is also a reference that one of the disciples who doubts the resurrection message is Peter, the one whom we are told denied Jesus three times (chp. 11). The remainder of the Epistula is taken up with a typical question and

answer session between Jesus and his disciples in which Jesus reveals to them secret teachings concerning heavenly things.

To sum up, therefore, there are several interesting features of this particular version of the women at the tomb. The identification of the women in the Epistula is different from the canonical accounts, and in particular the sisters from Bethany, Martha and Mary, are introduced. The writer seems to be aware of the stories which appear in the individual canonical gospels, and this is reflected in the conflated account of the motivation for the women's visit which is both to mourn at the tomb and to anoint the body. The replacement of the angelophany with the christophany is a further development of the redactional trend begun in Matthew and John, and the embellishment of the scepticism of the disciples echoes Lk 24:11. The reference to the women returning to tell Jesus of the disciples' reaction may also reflect the tendency to introduce dialogue to the resurrection stories.⁷⁶ Finally, it is significant that the writer does not introduce male witnesses to the tomb tradition, and the link between the empty tomb story and the appearance tradition is a christophany to the women.

3. The Syriac Didascalia

This third century document exists in a Syriac version dating from the beginning of the fourth century CE and a Latin version dating from the end of that century. It is, however, no longer extant in the Greek original.⁷⁷

There are three references to women in this text which gives an extended treatment to the function and status of women in the church.⁷⁸ The first reference comes in chapter 15, and refers to the role of widows in the church. The second reference, in chapter 18, deals with the role of the deaconess, and the final reference, in chapter 21, concerns the role of women in the resurrection stories.⁷⁹

Beginning with the reference in chapter 15 we learn here that while widows have a ministry in the church, it is not to teach. There we read:

For He, the Lord God, Jesus Christ our teacher, sent us the Twelve to instruct the people and the nations. And there were with us women disciples, Mary Magdalene and Mary the daughter of James, and the other Mary, and he did not send (them) to instruct the people with us."⁸⁰

There are several significant points here. First of all, while women are denied a teaching role, we note that they are none the less described as

disciples, and thus once again what is implicit, in Mk 15:40-1, is made explicit. We also note that Mary Magdalene again heads the list of women and her important role as a resurrection witness will be reinforced elsewhere in this text when she also heads the list of female witnesses.

The curious reference to 'Mary the daughter of James' is explained by A. Vööbus as a misreading by the Syriac translator, and he points out that the Latin text correctly reads 'Mary the mother of James and Joseph'.⁸¹ The description of the third woman as the 'other Mary' recalls Mt 27:61 and 28:1. It is also interesting to note that the Greek text has a longer reading here, and we also have a reference to Salome who appears in Mk 15:40 and 16:1, and is an important figure in the Gospel of the Egyptians.⁸² Finally, with the fourth century Apostolic Constitutions we are given a glimpse of one writer's interpretation of the women included among those 'others' who followed Jesus, and in a longer list than that given above we have Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Martha and Mary the sisters of Lazarus, Salome and 'certain others'.⁸³

The second reference to women in the Didascalia occurs in chapter 16, where we learn of the justification for the role of the female deacon.⁸⁴ We read:

On this account, we say that the ministry of a woman deacon is especially required and urgent. For our Lord and Saviour also was ministered unto by deaconesses who were "Mary Magdalene, and Mary the daughter of James and the mother of Jose, and the mother of the sons of Zebedee", with other women as well.⁸⁵

Once again we see Mary Magdalene at the head of the list of women and there is a further misreading by the Syriac translator who translates two women, the daughter of James and the mother of Jose, instead of the one woman, the mother of James and Jose. It is also interesting that the mother of the sons of Zebedee appears both here and in chapter 21, and she was probably taken from the Matthean accounts of the women involved in the crucifixion or burial stories.

Moving on to the story of the empty tomb in chapter 21 of the Didascalia, we are told that the author is here quoting the Gospel of Matthew. The story of the tomb which is included here is that the other Mary and Mary Magdalene go to 'see' the tomb. A great earthquake occurs and the angel of the Lord descends and rolls away the stone.⁸⁶ Since this author has told us he is quoting Matthew it is interesting to note that the order of the women has been changed here, and this was because, according to Vööbus, there was a desire among Syrian Christians to secure

an appearance of Christ to his mother.⁸⁷ Once again, therefore, we have support for our earlier interpretation of the mother of James and Joses as the mother of Jesus. One final point on the women here is that in line with Matthew this author has redacted out the mother of the sons of Zebedee from his empty tomb narrative.

The text of the Didascalia continues with the unusual reference "again the Sabbath day", and according to Alsup, this was because the author was attempting to fit in a reference to the fate of Jesus in the tomb, before finally returning to his own account of the empty tomb story.⁸⁸ We are told here that Jesus appeared to Mary Magdalene and the daughter of James with Mary Magdalene significantly restored to her original position.

To sum up, this interesting account of the empty tomb story in the Didascalia allows us to suggest several things. First of all, the writer assumes we have knowledge of the canonical gospels. Secondly, in line with the canonical tradition, the women are the first to discover the empty tomb, and Mary Magdalene and the mother of Jesus are specifically identified.

We can, therefore, suggest that not only does Mary Magdalene continue to be an important resurrection witness, but there is perhaps evidence here of a certain tension between her role and that of the mother of Jesus.⁸⁹ Also, while the author of this work does not write the men back into the tomb story, the remainder of the work suggests a particular esteem for the apostles. The Didascalia is concerned with the teaching of the apostles and its status rather than with the teaching of Jesus, and, furthermore, this apostolic teaching does not appear to require the authoritative stamp of Jesus.⁹⁰

A final point worth noting here, on the subject of teaching, concerns who is allowed to carry out this task. What we have reflected in the Didascalia is the later situation in the church when people have had time to reflect on such passages as Mk 15:40-1; 1Cor 14:34 and 1Tim 2:11-12.⁹¹ The conclusion here is that while women have a role in the church, it is not a teaching role. This conclusion is hardly surprising in a text which upholds the authority and status of the apostolic teaching.

4. The Gospel of Nicodemus

According to Alsup, "Perhaps more than any other extra-canonical source this one discloses the creative imagination of the author in his handling of the canonical material."⁹² We have already referred to this fourth century work in relation to our discussion of the burial of Jesus, and we now turn to the unusual version of the empty tomb story found in this gospel.

In chapter 13 we read that the guard comes from the tomb to tell the rulers of the Jews what they have witnessed at the tomb. This is the first time we read of the events at the tomb in this gospel and the manner is directly reminiscent of Mt 28:2-4. An angel descends from heaven, rolls away the stone and sits on it. The appearance of this figure is of one who shines like lightning and snow, and the guards are in great fear and become like dead men (cf. Mt 28:4). The text continues:

"And we heard the voice of the angel speaking to the women who waited at the tomb: Do not be afraid. I know that you seek Jesus who was crucified. He is not here. He has risen, as he said. Come and see the place where the Lord lay. And go quickly and tell his disciples that he has risen from the dead and is in Galilee." (Mt 28:5-7).⁹³

The Jews then quiz the guards asking them which women were involved and when the guards reply that they do not know, they are reprimanded for not seizing the women. Finally, the Jews state that they do not believe the guards' story. The remainder of the resurrection story in the Gospel of Nicodemus concerns the fate of Joseph of Arimathea as well as an account of the ascension which is witnessed by three Jewish witnesses (15:5-16).

The significance of this account of the empty tomb story, in particular, lies in the fact that while the form is very different from the canonical accounts, the writer does seem to assume that the reader is aware of the canonical texts.⁹⁴ The women at the tomb are not, however, introduced at the beginning of the empty tomb story, but only when the angelic address is recalled. This message, together with the previous references to the stone and the appearance of the angel are very close to the Matthean version of the tomb story. The developments which are introduced to the tomb story in the Gospel of Nicodemus would suggest that time for reflection allowed the author to spell out what was implicit in the Matthean narrative. The questioning of the guards, therefore, includes references to the women, and the account of the

ascension is extended to include Jewish witnesses.

Thus the women at the tomb are only mentioned in passing, and their position in the Gospel of Nicodemus is only of significance in so far as they support the witness of the guards. There is consequently no attempt here to follow through whether or not the women delivered the message to the disciples. Instead the primary interest is to portray the Jews in a negative light and it is the Jews who do not believe the guards' testimony. In the Gospel of Nicodemus the doubting disciples, therefore, make way for the doubting Jews who are finally convinced of the error of their ways by Joseph of Arimathea.

5. The Sophia of Jesus Christ

This gospel is preserved in two Coptic manuscripts, the Papyrus Berolinesis 8502, which is a fifth century text discovered in Akhmim in Upper Egypt, and a manuscript from the middle or second half of the fourth century, which is part of the Nag Hammadi library.⁹⁵ The gospel was originally composed in Greek, and the name can be translated either as the wisdom of Jesus Christ, that is containing the special teachings of Jesus, or the Sophia of Jesus Christ, leaving open the possibility of understanding Sophia in terms of the celestial being who is the female aspect of the creative power.⁹⁶

The gospel adopts the typical gnostic form, and concerns the revelations of Christ after the resurrection to the twelve disciples, and more significantly, to the seven women who also followed Jesus as disciples into Galilee.⁹⁷ The place of revelation is a mountain which is called the 'place of ripeness and joy'. The group has come to this particular place with a series of questions which continue to perplex them, and Jesus replies to these questions which are put to him by several male disciples and Mary Magdalene, who is significantly the only woman specifically identified. The risen Jesus teaches these male and female disciples about the ... "Perfect One, the whole will of the holy angels and of the Mother, that the manly host (i.e. gnostics) may here be made perfect."⁹⁸ The dialogue continues with the disciples, presumably male and female, going out to preach. There is, therefore, no empty tomb story in this text, but seven women are included among those who meet the risen Jesus on the mountain and are among those commissioned by him to preach the gospel.⁹⁹

6. The Dialogue of the Redeemer

This text, which is only preserved in Coptic, is difficult to date and too little of it remains for us to be more precise than a general dating of the second or third century CE, possibly originating in Egypt.¹⁰⁰ It is composed of several sources, both canonical and extra-canonical and also addresses the wider questions of eschatology, soteriology and anthropology. This work follows the Sophia in the Nag Hammadi library and, like the former, is in the form of a question and answer session between the risen Jesus and his disciples, the twelve or the holy women. There are two references here concerning the questions of Mary, presumably Mary Magdalene, which are worth quoting. In the first we read in a discussion of the end time:

Mariam said, 'Thus about 'The wickedness of each day', and 'The labourer being worthy of his food' and 'The disciple resembling his teacher'.'. This word she spoke as a woman who knew the All.'¹⁰¹

And in a discussion on truth we read:

The Lord said, 'He who is from the truth does not die; he who is from the woman dies.' Mariam said, 'Tell me. Lord, why I have come to this place, to benefit or to suffer loss?' The Lord said, 'Because you (sing.) reveal the greatness of the revealer.'¹⁰²

Very briefly, therefore, we have in these two quotes an example of the privileged position of Mary Magdalene in relation to Jesus. She is considered to be a special follower who receives secret teachings.

7. The Pistis Sophia

This third century work is preserved in a fourth century Coptic version in codex Askewianus and relates to the esoteric teachings of the risen one to a combined group of disciples and holy women. The title itself, according to H.C. Puech, is probably an addition appearing only on one page of the manuscript, and he, therefore, suggests we give preference to the less significant, and more technical title, 'books of the Saviour'.¹⁰³ A prominent place in this work is kept for Mary Magdalene and John, and the Saviour declares:

But Mary Magdalene and John, the maiden, ¹⁰⁴ will surpass all my disciples and all men who shall receive mysteries in the Ineffable, they will be on my right hand and on my left, and I am they and they are I, ..."¹⁰⁵

Though the other women are mentioned in this writing, including the mother of Jesus, Martha and Salome, Mary Magdalene remains the dominant figure, and of the forty six questions put to Jesus, she asks thirty

nine. Moreover, Mary Magdalene plays a major part in the interpretation of these replies, and this arouses the hostility of Peter which is particularly evident in chapters 36 and 72. Mary's response to Peter's accusations is that she hardly dare interpret what the Lord has said. This argument between Peter and Mary continues to reflect the debate between the mainstream church and gnosticism on whether or not women have received apostolic revelation and are, therefore, legitimate transmitters of the apostolic tradition.¹⁰⁶

8. The Gospel of Mary

This second century writing is preserved in a fifth century Coptic translation of which only ten of the original eighteen pages remain.¹⁰⁷ It is composed in two distinct parts, the first of which records a conversation between the Saviour and his disciples. This section concludes with an exhortation by Mary Magdalene that the disciples should proclaim the gospel even though they are afraid:

Then arose Mary, saluted them all, and spake to her brethren; "Weep not, be not sorrowful, neither be ye undecided, for his grace will be with you all and will protect you. Let us rather praise his greatness, for he hath made us ready, and made us to be men."¹⁰⁸

In part two we begin with Peter asking Mary to share with the disciples the revelations she has received from the Saviour who loved her above all other women. Mary agrees and tells of her visions. The reaction of the disciples is not altogether a favourable one, and:

When Mary had said this, she was silent, so that (thus) the Saviour had spoken with her up to this point. But Andrew answered and said to the brethren: "Tell me, what think ye with regard to what she says? I at least do not believe that the Saviour said this. For certainly these doctrines have other meanings." Peter in answer spoke with reference to things of this kind, and asked them (i.e. the disciples) about the Saviour: "Did he then speak privily with a woman rather than with us, and not openly? Shall we turn about and all hearken unto her? Has he preferred her over against us?"¹⁰⁹

Mary's reaction to the above criticisms is to despair, and it is Levi who comes to her defence upbraiding Peter and Andrew. He argues, if the Saviour has made Mary 'worthy' who are we to reject her since "... he did love her more than us."¹¹⁰ This hint of an erotic relationship in the intimate communication between Jesus and Mary is taken even further in the Gospel of Philip where Jesus kisses Mary Magdalene frequently on the mouth.¹¹¹

To sum up, the attitude of Peter and Andrew to Mary recalls the

Pistis Sophia, but takes this antagonism one stage further, and here in the Gospel of Mary we have the highpoint of the antagonism between Peter and Mary Magdalene.

Summation

In our examination of the canonical stories of the empty tomb, we noted a tendency to place Mary Magdalene at the head of the list of female witnesses. This was effected in Mt 28:1 by editing out the third woman of Mk 16:1 and abbreviating the second woman to the 'other Mary'. In Jn 20:1 Mary Magdalene goes alone to the tomb. With the apocryphal stories of the empty tomb we continue to see an emphasis on Mary Magdalene as the primary female witness at the tomb. Thus in the Gospel of Peter *she goes* along to the tomb with a group of other women who are simply described as 'Mary's friends'. In the Syriac Didascalia, however, Mary Magdalene does not head the list of women at the tomb, although this writer says he is quoting Mt 28:1f. It is Mary the mother of James and Joseph who heads the list of women in the Didascalia. To explain this alteration we pointed to the suggestion of Vööbus that in the Syrian church there was an interest in making the mother of Jesus the primary female witness. This identification of the mother of James and Joseph with the mother of Jesus supports our earlier identification of these two women.

Looking elsewhere in the apocryphal stories of the resurrection we see that in a number of gospels Mary Magdalene is a primary figure in the question and answer sessions which typify gnostic stories of the resurrection. These accounts, particularly the Gospel of Mary, also reveal an antagonism between Mary Magdalene and Peter as resurrection witnesses, and we are reminded of the suggestion of Pagels that this antagonism reflected a debate between mainstream Christianity and gnosticism over who was acceptable as a legitimate resurrection witness.

Moving back to the other women involved in the empty tomb stories of the canonical gospels, we suggested in our earlier chapters that apart from Mary Magdalene and the mother of Jesus, the names of the other women varied in the tradition. Thus in Mark we have Salome, in Luke Joanna and in Matthew the mother of the sons of Zebedee. Since Joanna and the mother of the sons of Zebedee had appeared at an earlier point in each gospel we suggested that these writers were probably reflecting the uncertainty in the tradition regarding the identity of this third woman by replacing the Marcan Salome with a female figure already known to

them. In the apocryphal stories of the resurrection, the women who are identified are already known to us from the canonical gospels. In the *Epistula Apostolorum*, the Ethiopic version reads Sarah, Martha and Mary Magdalene with the Coptic including the two sisters from Bethany and Mary Magdalene. As we have already pointed out the Syriac *Didascalia* relied for its account of the empty tomb on Mt 28:1 and in an interesting reference in the fourth century *Apostolic Constitutions* a larger list of widows expands the *Epistula* reference to include Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, the sisters from Bethany, Salome and 'many others'. Apart from Sarah, therefore, all the women who appear in the apocryphal stories of the empty tomb, or in related references to service, are either mentioned in the canonical stories of the empty tomb or in another canonical story involving an empty tomb (cf. Jn 11:1-44).

The motivation for the visit to the tomb in the apocryphal gospels is similar to the canonical versions, and it is either to see the tomb or to anoint the body. The Gospel of Peter would appear to be close to the Marcan ending of the tomb story and the women depart in fear. The Gospel of Nicodemus tells us in a round about way that the women have a message to deliver to the disciples. More interesting, however, is the *Epistula Apostolorum* which takes up the theme introduced in Lk 24:11, the sceptical response of the disciples to the women's witness. Thus in the *Epistula* several women and, even Jesus himself, go to the disciples to try and convince them of the fact that the tomb is empty.

Another tendency which we noted in the Johannine story of the empty tomb was to replace the angelophany with a christophany, and this is taken one stage further in the *Epistula Apostolorum* where the angelophany is removed altogether and the christophany stands alone as the only message the women receive. Finally, as we have already mentioned, with the *Sophia of Jesus Christ*, the *Dialogue of the Redeemer*, the *Pistis Sophia* and the *Gospel of Mary*, the dialogic style of the gnostic stories of the resurrection is yet another development of the christophanies of the earlier canonical accounts where in Mt 28:9-10 the women are silent recipients, and in John Mary Magdalene speaks to Jesus.

There are no stories of the disciples at the tomb in the apocryphal gospels, though it is interesting to note that in one version of the tomb story, in the Gospel of Peter, 'all' the people go out to see the sepulchre, and in both the Gospel of Peter and the Gospel of Nicodemus there is a story involving guards at the tomb.

CONCLUSION

We must now draw together the various apocryphal stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb and assess how women are portrayed in these scenes.

Beginning with the crucifixion scene we noted a tendency in the canonical gospels, sometimes deliberate, to write the males back into this scene and in Luke's gospel all Jesus' acquaintances (males) are at the cross and in John it is the Beloved Disciple who is there. Of the two apocryphal gospels which refer to the crucifixion of Jesus, we noted that only one, the Gospel of Nicodemus, mentions women at the cross. If the author of the Gospel of Peter knew of women at the scene, as 12:52 may indicate, then he was responsible for redacting the women out. Both the Gospel of Nicodemus and the Gospel of Peter acknowledge that the male disciples are absent from the cross, but in the Gospel of Peter we saw evidence of an apologetic note here and the disciples are in hiding not out of cowardly fear, but because they represented a political threat.

There is no mention of the women at the cross having ministered to Jesus in the Gospel of Nicodemus, though we are told that they followed him. Moreover there is reference to a woman called Bernice who gives witness on behalf of Jesus during his trial although her testimony is not accepted by the Jews. There is a positive reference to the wife of Pilate in the Gospel of Nicodemus, and as part of the attempt to increase the blame of the Jews for the death of Jesus, both she and her husband are said to be grieving. The mention of the wife of Judas in the Gospel of Bartholomew was probably an example of the attempts begun in Luke and John to lessen the responsibility of Judas for the betrayal and here it is his wife who prompts Judas to carry out his evil deed.

With the story of the burial of Jesus in the apocryphal gospels, there is no reference to any women witnessing the event, and so the trend begun in the Fourth Gospel is continued here. In those gospels which do describe the burial we noted a very significant development of the character of Joseph of Arimathea. This builds upon the earlier canonical attempts to emphasise the character of Joseph and reaches a climax in the Gospel of Nicodemus where he becomes an important witness of the resurrection. The male presence at the tomb is further underlined by the references to the guards in both the Gospel of Peter and the Gospel of Nicodemus.

To conclude this chapter on the apocryphal stories of the

crucifixion, burial and empty tomb we will not repeat all the arguments we have made above. The main points we made in our examination of the canonical stories of the empty tomb were that Mary Magdalene was being singled out as a primary female resurrection witness and, beyond this, the males were being written back into the tradition. With the apocryphal stories of the resurrection we have the suggestion that these developments in the tradition possibly reflected an antagonism between the orthodox church which championed Peter as the primary resurrection witness over against the gnostics who looked to visionaries such as Mary Magdalene.

It is hardly surprising, therefore, that in a collection of writings which challenged orthodox succession there were no stories of the male disciples at the tomb. As we have already noted, attempts to write the male disciples back into the empty tomb story were part of an attempt to secure orthodox succession and protect male testimony from any dependence on female witness. It is also interesting to note that if the apocryphal gospels were aware of the empty tomb stories of more than one canonical gospel, and we believe we have shown that they were, Mark alone among the canonical writers has only the women at the tomb.

Thus the prominence given to Mary Magdalene as a resurrection witness in these gospels is indeed connected with the struggle between orthodoxy and heresy and the acceptability of *women as witnesses*. It is not without significance that it is with Peter, the champion of orthodox succession, that Mary has to argue her right to bear witness. The wider background against which these texts make sense is the continuing struggle within the early church where in certain instances women were gradually marginalised and not only were they "silenced", but their forms of practical discipleship were also restricted.

CHAPTER SIX - NOTES

1. Cf. Mk 14:50. This was also predicted earlier by Jesus in Mk 14:27.
2. There is no reference in Luke to the Marcan ἡκολούθουν ...συναναβᾶσαι though in Lk 8:1-3 mention has been made of women who served and followed Jesus.
3. See also Acts 13:28; R.H. Fuller (1980), p. 54f.
4. For a discussion of the broadening of the witnesses at the tomb see J.D. Crossan (1976).
5. See our chapter on John.
6. See Crossan (1985), p. 10.
7. Thus Brown (1987), p. 321f.
8. Thus L. Schottroff (1978); E. Schüssler Fiorenza (1979, 1983).
9. This was originally suggested by scholars such as W. Bauer (1934) who argued that orthodoxy and heresy do not stand in relation to one another as primary to secondary, but in many regions heresy was the original manifestation of Christianity. See also J.D.G. Dunn (1977), pp. 1-7.
10. Such is the opinion of R.Mc.L. Wilson (1982), p. 298. See also F. Bovon (1988) who suggests that we must learn to consider the gospels of the New Testament canon in the form in which they existed before 180 CE, in the same light in which we consider the apocrypha.
11. See Koester (1980), p. 105.
12. See NTApoc, vol. 1, p. 27.
13. See Koester (1980), p. 106. See also M.R. James (1924), p. xiv who defines the word apocrypha as false and spurious even though he admits he may be dealing with writings which may contain ancient and truthful elements.
14. For a discussion of the definition of canonical and apocryphal see NTApoc, vol. 1, pp. 21-28.
15. Phil 3:16 is a dubious reference.
16. See Brown (1987); Koester (1980). For one of the earliest discussions of the problem see also P. Gardner Smith (1926).
17. Thus NTApoc, vol. 1, p. 28.
18. See Pagels (1980), pp. 3-27. There are of course examples in the New Testament of a non-literal interpretation of the resurrection. In Lk 24:13-32 Jesus appears in another form to his earthly appearance, and in v. 31 he even vanishes from their sight. In Jn 20:14f. Mary Magdalene does not at first recognise Jesus until he speaks to her.
19. See *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.
20. See Gospel of Hebrews, NTApoc, vol. 1, p. 158f..
21. Thus Pagels (1980), pp. 9-10. See also E. Pagels (1978).
22. Thus Pagels (1980), p. 11.
23. See Robinson (1982), p. 11.
24. This translation of the Gospel of Mary is found in Robinson, *ibid.*
25. Thus Pagels (1980), p. 14.
26. This is the suggestion of C.H. Turner (1913), p. 181.
27. See NTApoc, vol. 1, p. 444f.
28. See *ibid.*, p. 457. It is also interesting to note that in the developing tradition within the Roman Catholic church, St. Veronica is the woman who wipes Jesus' face on the way to the cross and is left holding the imprint of his face on the cloth.
29. See our introduction to women in the early church.
30. This could be seen to support our earlier suggestion that the reference to the women at the cross comes at the end of the

- crucifixion scene in the earliest tradition as in Mk 15:40-1 and parallels (Mt 27:55-56; Lk 23:49) and John deliberately altered this tradition to prepare for the conversation which followed in Jn 19:26-7.
31. We suggested in our Lucan chapter that Lk 8:1-3 does not entirely explain away the omission of the reference to service in Lk 23:49.
 32. See *NTApoc*, vol. 1, p. 179f. See also Eusebius H.E. VI. 12, LCL, vol. ii, p. 41.
 33. See R.A. Coles (1972), pp. 15-16.
 34. See Brown (1987), pp. 338-340 who suggests the work can scarcely have been composed much after 150 CE. For a date in the second half of the century see R. Cameron (1982), p. 77.
 35. Thus Brown (1987), p. 325.
 36. See Koester (1980), pp. 127-8 who argues on the basis of scriptural citation and he is persuaded that from the beginning the passion of Jesus was probably never told without the framework of scriptural reference. Thus the Gospel of Peter written "sentence for sentence in the spirit of scriptural memory" is, therefore, earlier than the canonical gospels. J.D. Crossan (1985), pp. 123-81 outlines three stages in the development of the Gospel of Peter vis à vis the canonical gospels. See also B.A. Johnson (1966).
 37. Thus Koester (1980), p. 126. Most scholars today would not judge the Gospel of Peter to have a fully blown docetic Christology. For such an assessment of the Gospel of Peter see J.W. McCant (1984).
 38. See Turner (1913), p. 166.
 39. See Brown (1987), ad. loc.
 40. See *NTApoc*, vol. 1, p. 185.
 41. (1926b), p. 405.
 42. Thus V.H. Stanton (1900), p. 16.
 43. In Jn 20:11f. it is Mary Magdalene who weeps.
 44. See *NTApoc*, vol. 1, p. 484f.
 45. In the Didascalia chapter 21, the betrayal by Judas is mentioned in a prophecy of Jesus which recalls the canonical accounts. See A. Vööbus (1979), vol. II, p. 189. There is no reference to the failure of the disciples in the garden of Gethsemane in the apocrypha tradition. However, there is a reference to the denial of Peter during an account of the resurrection in the *Epistula Apostolorum* chp. 11. See *NTApoc*, vol. 1, p. 196.
 46. This development in attributing responsibility for the treachery moving from man to the devil to woman is interesting, particularly in view of how the general trend in the Judaeo-Christian tradition was to identify Eve/woman as the principal sinner in Genesis 3. For a discussion of how this Genesis tradition was developed, see B. Prusak (1974).
 47. This serves the same purpose as the piercing in Jn 19:34.
 48. Thus W.L. Craig (1984), p. 27.
 49. (1985), p. 152. B.A. Johnson (1966) bases his work on a form critical investigation of the tomb stories, and he concludes that the women at the tomb in the Gospel of Peter rests on a Vorlage which is prior to Mark, and there existed a second independent tomb story - the story of the guard at the tomb - which tells of witnesses to the removal of Jesus from the tomb. In the Gospel of Peter, an account of the witnessing of the resurrection by the Roman guard survives (an epiphany form). In Matthew the same account exists in truncated form, for in Matthew the material has been converted into an anti-grave robbery legend.
 50. Thus Brown (1987), p. 331. Note, Brown himself is at pains to stress the fact that he used the term 'coherent' and not

- 'historical'.
51. See Brown *ibid.* p. 332.
 52. There is a dispute here concerning whether a Jewish or Roman guard is intended. See Craig (1984), p. 274.
 53. See Crossan (1985), p. 151 who suggests that Luke takes his repentance motif here (cf. Lk 23:48) from the Gospel of Peter. However, we would also point to the suggestion of J. Drury that repentance is an important Lucan motif. See Drury (1976), 'repentance', *ad. loc.*
 54. Thus Brown (1980), p. 332.
 55. This rescue of Joseph is similar to Peter's escape from prison in Acts.
 56. Cf. also 1Cor 15:5.
 57. In the Gospel of the Hebrews, the first appearance is to James, NTApoc, vol. 1, p. 165.
 58. See Crossan (1985), p. 166f. See also Koester (1980), pp. 129-30 who suggests that the Gospel of Peter is an epiphany story which is preserved only in parts in the canonical gospels.
 59. Thus Turner (1913), p. 180.
 60. See also Robinson (1982), p. 14 who draws our attention to the luminous and non-visual nature of apocryphal stories of the resurrection.
 61. Crossan (1985), p. 157 concludes that the 'youth' in the tomb is an item which is 'quintessentially Marcan'.
 62. Crossan (1985), p. 166 argues for the opposite. However, we find Brown more convincing here, and he argues that the general Matthean tendency was, if anything, to heighten the miraculous. See (1987), p. 332.
 63. The story is paralleled in the Ascension of Isaiah, and in a gloss after Mk 16:3 in Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae. See Crossan (1985), p. 167f. for details.
 64. Thus Alsup (1975), p. 125. See also Crossan, *ibid.* p. 174f.
 65. See P. Gardner-Smith (1926a), pp. 268-9 for a detailed form critical explanation. Gardner-Smith sees two traditions being combined here.
 66. (1913), p. 171.
 67. See Brown (1987), pp. 334-335 who notes that it is a feature of the Gospel of Peter to use descriptions used of one person or group in the canonical gospels and apply them to someone else.
 68. This ending of the Gospel of Peter may well lend indirect support to our conclusion that Mark's Gospel originally ended at 16:8. See NTApoc, vol. 1, p. 187.
 69. Thus Turner (1913), p. 172.
 70. See R.Mc.L. Wilson (1962), p. 35. It is also worth noting that in the Johannine account of the crucifixion mention is made of the sister of Mary.
 71. See NTApoc, vol. 1, p. 189f.
 72. *Ibid.* p. 191.
 73. See J.E. Alsup (1975), p. 128.
 74. For an interesting discussion of the treatment of Mary Magdalene in the church tradition see E. Moltmann-Wendel (1982), pp. 61-92.
 75. This would suggest familiarity with the canonical gospels and we have already noted that in both Luke and John the stone is only mentioned for the first time during the story of the empty tomb.
 76. We saw the beginnings of this in the christophany to Mary Magdalene in Jn 20:14f.
 77. For a detailed discussion on the text see A. Vööbus (1979), vol. 1, pp. 1-68.

78. For a general discussion on the ministry of women and the Syriac Didascalia see R. Gryson (1976), pp. 35-43.
79. On the position of widows in the New Testament cf. Tit 2:3-4; 1Tim 5:3-10. For the position of widows in the early church see our introduction to women in the early church.
80. For the treatment of widows in the Didascalia see our introduction to women in the early church.
81. See Vööbus (1979) vol. II, p. 157 and Introduction, p. 53.
82. For the Gospel of the Egyptians see NTApoc, vol. 1, p. 166f. See also R.M. Grant and D.N. Freedman (1960), pp. 33-34 who refer to a development of the Gospel of the Egyptians found only in Clement of Alexandria. Here Salome asks how long will men die and she is told by Jesus as long as women bring forth. Salome replies that she has done well not to bring forth. The conversation ends with a reference to "the end" or the coming of the kingdom occurring when the two become one and the male with the female are neither male nor female.
 Salome also appears in the Gospel of Thomas as one of the women who asks Jesus a question along with Mary. In logion 61b she enquires after Jesus' true nature and during her conversation with Jesus she announces that she is a disciple of Jesus. See B. Gärtner (1961), p. 135.
83. See Gryson (1976), p. 56.
84. According to Beyer, TDNT, vol. I, p. 99, the order of deaconess rose quickly in the church. Many problems centre around 1 Tim 3:8-12 and whether the women mentioned are merely wives of deacons or deacons themselves. In the Didascalia their function is similar to that of a deacon and they are to assist the bishop in his pastoral work. The deaconess ministers to the sick in cases where it would offend pagans to see a male deacon go into the house of a female. These women are also responsible for anointing women before they are immersed in the waters of baptism, and they are not allowed to baptise themselves, though it is suggested that certain women did baptise themselves.
85. See Vööbus (1979), vol. II, pp. 157-8.
86. Ibid., pp. 190-1.
87. Ibid., and n. 106.
88. (1975), pp. 130-1.
89. Our attention was first drawn to a suggested tension between Mary Magdalene and the mother of Jesus by Trompf (1971-2).
90. Thus Alsup (1975), p. 130.
91. This whole question of the role and status of women has been dealt with in our introduction.
92. Thus Alsup (1975), p. 133. See also NTApoc, vol. 1, p. 444f.
93. NTApoc, vol. 1, p. 461. It is interesting that this verse in Mark and Matthew also appears as a resurrection rather than a parousia prediction.
94. We note that in the canonical gospels only John brings Joseph and Nicodemus together.
95. See NTApoc, vol. 1, p. 243f.
96. Ibid., p. 245.
97. Once again we note the typically gnostic description of Jesus' form which is of an invisible spirit, 'like a great angel of light'.
98. Thus NTApoc, vol. 1, p. 247.
99. Thus Fiorenza (1979), p. 52.
100. See NTApoc, vol. 1, p. 248f.
101. J.M. Robinson (1977), p. 235.
102. Ibid., p. 236.

103. NTApoc, vol. 1, p. 251.
104. The idea of becoming a virgin as part of the return to the pure state was common in Gnosticism. See R.A. Baer (1970), p. 75. See also Meeks (1974), pp. 194-5; A.T.J Klijn (1962), pp. 271-278.
105. NTApoc, vol. 1, pp. 256-7. A further example of the importance of Mary Magdalene is found in the Gospel of Thomas logion 114:
Simon Peter said to them: "Let Mary go out from among us, because women are not worthy of life". Jesus said: "See, I shall lead her, so that I will make her male, that she too may become a living spirit, resembling you males. For every woman who makes herself male will enter the kingdom of Heaven".
(NTApoc, vol. 1, p. 299).
106. Thus Fiorenza (1979), p. 54.
107. NTApoc, vol. 1, pp. 340-344. See also R.Mc.L. Wilson (1956-7), p. 237 who notes that the work falls clearly into two distinct parts and suggest two independent writings have been combined and 'Christianized'.
108. Ibid., p. 342.
109. Ibid., p. 242-243.
110. Ibid.
111. See Pagels (1980), p. 18. See also R. McL. Wilson (1962), p. 39.

CONCLUSION

We recognised at the outset of this thesis that our interest in the stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb was prompted by the questions and issues raised by the contemporary feminist movement concerning the role and status of women in the church today. After an introduction to feminist theology we examined the hermeneutical presuppositions of various feminist theologians. Our research then proceeded along traditional literary-critical lines of source, form and redaction criticism with an occasional input recognising the contribution of more recent developments in the field of wider literary criticism. It now remains for us to return to the questions and issues raised by feminist theologians and enter into a dialogue with them regarding our own particular observations and conclusions concerning the treatment and presentation of women in the stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb.

Before engaging with these scholars, and demonstrating how our distinctive reading of the data integrates with the overall enterprise of feminist hermeneutics, we must consider whether feminist theologians are justified in raising the question 'What does the New Testament have to say about women?' Can we expect any valid response to this question? If not, why not? If so, under what conditions?¹

Many feminist theologians would respond by saying that it is important for us to read these texts with such questions in mind since in various parts of the church today, particularly concerning the issue of the ordination of women, scriptural authority is being claimed for the exclusion of women from ministry. Thus, they would argue, in the light of practices such as scriptural "proof-texting" and claims for the support of "church tradition", these texts are already being invoked to support something which was not necessarily part of their original message and indeed they have been used in this way for centuries. These feminist theologians would argue that while the New Testament may well be cast in a patriarchal mind-set, and delivered to us through androcentric texts and translations, it is not intrinsically oppressive towards women. We must respond, therefore, by highlighting those parts of that tradition which offer a critique of patriarchy in order for the New Testament to

address us twentieth century readers and our current concerns about the role and status of women within the Christian tradition.

The various approaches to feminist hermeneutics have been reviewed in our introduction, although it is fair to say that there is no clear cut distinction in methodology and any feminist dialogue with the text may be influenced by more than one of the following perspectives. These approaches include rejecting the bible outright as being irredeemably patriarchal; asserting the essential validity and goodness of the biblical tradition which, it is argued, can be liberated from its androcentric language and patriarchal structures; and looking to texts about women to counteract famous texts used against women. We drew particular attention here to the work of L.M. Russell and R.R. Ruether who both look at the bible in general for that part of the tradition, usually located within the prophetic literature, which provides a theological perspective offering a critique of patriarchy. P. Tribble and E. Schüssler Fiorenza concentrate on texts about women in patriarchal societies with the intention that by remembering and reconstructing the experience of these women we can thereby learn something about ancient and modern women living in patriarchal cultures.²

According to S.M. Schneiders, what many of these critiques lack is a serious consideration of the 'foundational question' which to her mind is "... how can a text which is not just accidentally but intrinsically oppressive function normatively for a faith community?"³

Schneiders rejects the linguistic approaches to the text which, she claims, can only help us arrive at a negative value judgement. We can recognise that the bible is androcentric - it was written largely, if not exclusively, by men, for men and about men, in language which at the very least marginalises women or makes them invisible. It is 'pervasively patriarchal' and frequently sexist. Thus linguistic analysis can only confirm what we already know which is that "... the biblical text is highly problematic for anyone committed to women's participation in the shalom of God."⁴

Schneiders also questions historical-critical exegesis of the text and defines this as an approach which aims to deliver the meaning intended by the implied and/or real authors of the biblical texts for their contemporary audiences. She recognises the positive aspects of

work such as Fiorenza's which highlights the liberating potential of certain passages including Gal 3:28 and Jn 20:17. She welcomes the interpretations of silences which are often rhetorical clues to suppressed traditions regarding women in the early church and the attention drawn to the androcentric bias of authors, translators and exegetes. However, once again her conclusion is that this approach to the text cannot do other than "... establish that, to a very large extent, the meaning intended by the author is oppressive whether or not the authors intended it to be oppressive."⁵

Schneiders therefore belongs to that strain of feminist hermeneutics which is constantly re-evaluating the whole ideology of feminist biblical critique. Her own response is to ask how can a text speak normatively to a believing community which has criticised its ideology and found it morally wanting? For Schneiders the question raised by feminist criticism is, therefore, a hermeneutical question with theological implications. She is not concerned with what the authors of a text intended to say about women, or how the early church thought about or behaved towards women, although she recognises that answers to these questions may have a part to play in interpretation. Instead she asks "... whether the meaning of the Second Testament as it is decontextualized and recontextualized in the interpretation of successive generations is irredeemably and necessarily oppressive of women or whether and how it can offer liberating possibilities to the very people whose oppression it has legitimated."⁶

Her approach to the text which offers possibilities of liberation is to understand the text as a dynamic medium where the meaning given, or the interpretation of text, takes place as an event in the reader. Schneiders uses insights gained from reading the works of H.G. Gadamer and P. Ricoeur. Thus in her interpretation she tackles what seems to her to be the two main problems which face any contemporary feminist hermeneutical approach to the bible. These are the distance which exists between the text and the reader and the oppression which is intrinsic and not accidental to these biblical texts. Her response is to understand interpretation and the giving of meaning to the text as a dialogue whereby the text is continually open to new possibilities of interpretation and so can be normative for us today. Her approach is one of a 'hermeneutics of transformation' whereby the reader is not so much

responding to or attempting to identify with the author, but responding to an invitation which is extended by the text for the reader to enter into a dialogue with it.⁷

Like M.A. Tolbert, Schneiders has attempted to answer the methodological problem which is raised by feminist exegetes and that is: 'what have we achieved once we have identified the pervasively patriarchal nature of the biblical texts?' In Tolbert's analysis of the results of feminist biblical hermeneutics the situation is comparable to the Lucan parable of the Lost Coin. Discovery of the one lost coin of liberating themes, while indeed cause for joy and celebration, still leaves the other nine coins of patriarchy which seem overwhelming.⁸ Tolbert leaves us with the unanswered question of what do we do once we have applied an approach such as R. Bultmann's demythologisation, accomplished through Sachkritik. Once we have attempted to separate the essence or concept of a text from the particular objectification of it, might we not find that the reality of a message is inextricably bound to its particularity? Schneiders has offered us one way of going beyond this impasse which must face any serious feminist exegesis of the bible.

In response to Schneiders' criticisms of feminist historical-critical exegesis we would defend the positive nature of our own interpretation of the text which has used the tools and methods of traditional biblical criticism and been informed by the issues and concerns raised by feminist theologians. We hope that the results of our study of the text have done more than simply expose the oppressive nature of the biblical texts. We have also highlighted the liberating potential of certain passages and this exposure is an important aspect of feminist hermeneutics which should not be undervalued. Making us aware of cultural conditioning in the bible, although inimical to fundamentalist Christians, is accepted by many others as offering liberating potential.

We would also like to draw attention here to the 'value orientated' nature of Schneiders' own approach to the text which is to make the biblical text normative for us today and the contemporary discipleship role of women in the church and the individual believer. This is not to deny that her stated objective is important in that she recognises here why many feminist theologians feel justified in their concern to examine the presentation of women in the New Testament in particular. It is an issue which relates to the contemporary church and the liberation of both men and women. It allows us to address new questions to the text and at

the same time challenges the oppressive practice of the application of patriarchal patterns to the church by 'proof-texting' from scripture.

Turning now to the combined advantages of these various feminist approaches to the bible what we can say is that by posing fresh questions to the text they allow us to gain new insights which may highlight what was previously unnoticed or show the familiar in a new light. Thus we allow these texts to take on new meanings as we, the readers, enter into a relationship with the text before us. This is not to deny the importance of the historical situation in which the text was written, which may indeed have been patriarchal and oppressive, but to recognise the meaning of a text when approached by feminist theologians who bring specific questions and understandings with them to the act of interpretation. According to E.L. McLaughlin:

The search for a usable past begins with a new set of questions that arise out of commitment to wholeness for women and for all humanity. Following from new questions, this is a history that redresses omissions and recasts interpretations.¹⁰

One of the main contributions of feminist hermeneutics to our appreciation of New Testament texts and their interpretation has been the exposing of what Fiorenza terms 'the pretence of value neutrality and objectivity' of much of modern scholarship.¹¹ Thus she would agree that what an interpreter finds in a text may often be determined by what he or she is looking for. S. Heine has warned against the dangers of feminist theologians stressing contemporary women's experience as the basis from which we begin our scholarly exercise and she correctly draws attention to the 'terrifyingly simple prejudices' on both sides of the feminist debate.¹² While it is important to recognise the presuppositions of an interpreter, we would add a qualifying note here and suggest that we should aim at 'value neutrality' in our interpretation. In the final analysis any interpretation will be subject to the usual conditions of scholarly examination and testing of both hypothesis and conclusions which would guard against unjustified out and out apologetic.

Although there may be disagreement over what constitutes women's experiences, surely feminist theologians are right to draw attention to the subjective nature of all interpretation which is inevitably informed by the interpreter's own vested interests and concerns which, whether consciously or unconsciously, shape the resultant interpretation. This is what Tolbert would identify as the advocacy position of feminist

hermeneutics which as we have just suggested does not necessarily result in anarchy but is still subject to the usual scholarly criteria of critical examination of both argumentation and hypothesis.¹³ In Schneiders' approach to the text this leads her to set limits on the autonomy of the text and:

... the text means only what it *can* mean, not anything anyone might want it to mean, and what it can mean is determined by the linguistic content, structure and dynamics. It is no longer determined by the author's intention but its indeterminacy is not total for it remains not only a text, but *this* text.¹⁴

For Fiorenza the feminist perspective on interpretation also requires a particular appreciation of history where:

The past is not a continuum of given facts that we can rediscover by mere objective observation, but discloses itself to us only if we put specific questions to it. We historians never are able to free ourselves from our own experiential presuppositions or institutional interests and we should not attempt to do so. What makes our work interesting and fruitful are exactly the specific questions, concerns, insights and perspectives and commitments that compel us to study a certain epoch of the past or to chose from the complexity of historical reality those elements that enable us to make the causal link between the past and our world... Not value-neutrality but public consciousness and discussion of one's values, interests, commitments, presuppositions and social-political locations are required for historical discourse.¹⁵

In terms of our texts of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb we have made it clear that our approach has been informed by the questions and issues raised through the experience of reading various feminist hermeneutical works.

Among other things feminist hermeneutics ask us to recognise is that as androcentric texts Christian sources are theological interpretations, argumentations, projections and selections rooted in their patriarchal culture. We must begin, therefore, by recognising the androcentric language and culture which we encounter within these texts. In our examination of Mk 15:40-1, and particularly in terms of its retrospective significance, our interpretation was influenced by Fiorenza's suggestions that in order for us to appreciate this New Testament text we must recognise the inclusive nature of all androcentric language. We would also agree with her suggestion that androcentric language is inclusive of women, although it often does not mention them explicitly.¹⁶ Thus we

accepted that women were important characters in the Marcan narrative and by appreciating various examples of Marcan narrative technique we were able to discern some overall characteristics of the Marcan presentation of the female characters in this gospel. For the women at the cross this meant viewing them as 'fallible' followers who, like the male disciples, are included among the various people who respond to following Jesus and who also experience the tension between success and failure which this following inevitably involves.¹⁷

Our reading of feminist hermeneutics also drew attention to androcentric interpretation and editing of earlier traditions which both played down and covered over the important roles of women at key points in Christian beginnings. This was because, according to Fiorenza, they were seen as unimportant or threatening.¹⁸ We do not accept that feminist theologians should feel they need to prove that such exclusion of women is not justified by the use of feminist apologetics and attempts to point to texts which uphold the equality of women. It is important, however, that some sense of balance is introduced to counter the many centuries of male-centred interpretation and translations and we would support feminist theologians in their attempts to achieve this.

Having examined in turn the stories of the crucifixion, burial and resurrection in the four canonical gospels in particular, we identified an attempt in certain works to write the male disciples back into the developing traditions. Thus in Lk 23:49 there are now male disciples present at the cross together with the women, who are not specifically identified at this point. In Lk 24:12 we have a visit of the male disciple Peter, who goes to the tomb after the women have departed. Likewise the character of Joseph of Arimathea receives some attention and he is described respectively as a respectable Jew (Mk), a good and righteous man (Lk) and finally he even becomes a disciple of Jesus (Mt and Jn).

It was not, however, our conclusion that in all cases these redactional attempts to enhance the role of the male characters in the final scenes of the gospel were primarily motivated by a deliberate concern to write the women out of these narratives. The development of the character of Joseph of Arimathea may well have been associated with the concern to show that Jesus Christ received a fitting burial. Likewise the reference to the race of the male disciples to the tomb in

Jn 20:3-10 may have been prompted by a desire to refute grave robbery theories.

The important contribution of feminist hermeneutics here, is that, by identifying androcentric interpretation and editing of earlier texts, it draws our attention to the fact that these texts were products of patriarchal cultures. We are therefore made aware of the obscuring, repressing or even trivialising of women's presence whether it was the result of deliberate redaction or the unintentional effect of attempts to enhance the roles of certain male characters.

A reading of feminist literature has also complemented our experience of tradition and redaction criticism and made us aware of the importance of appreciating the significance of one passage when it is interpreted in the light of others. The empty tomb narrative of Mk 16:1-8 was therefore interpreted not only in terms of the narrative structure of this particular gospel but our appreciation of the Marcan empty tomb story was enhanced when we compared this text with its literary descendants. Thus while not denying the shocking impact of the Marcan ending, which comes to an abrupt conclusion, in the written text at least, with the silence of the women, we also noted that it was significant that for this writer it is the women who are allowed to stand as the final witnesses of the gospel. We accepted the invitation of feminist exegetes to interpret the silences regarding the women here and elsewhere in Mark, and taking one cue from Mk 15:40-1 we examined the gospel retrospectively and highlighted particular features of the presentation of the Marcan women.

Since Matthew, Luke and John all had resurrection appearance stories to recount, they are our first examples of attempts to interpret this Marcan silence in terms of either enhancing or detracting from the role of the women at the tomb. With Mt 28:9-10 we saw that the women departed from the tomb and while they are on their way to tell the disciples what they have witnessed at the tomb, they encounter the risen Jesus who repeats the earlier angelic command. We decided that while this christophany probably represented an attempt to link the empty tomb and appearance story of 28:16-20, it did not significantly effect this link by introducing any male witnesses at the tomb, and so the women are

not written out of the tradition in Matthew. However, we would also agree with feminist hermeneutics who would identify a subtle attempt here to edit out the women, since in Matthew there is no direct reference to the women's witnessing to the male disciples, though we may infer that they did so from 28:16f. where the male disciples are described as being en route for Galilee.

This examination of the Matthean redaction of the Marcan empty tomb story throws the Lucan redaction into sharp relief, since while the women do indeed tell the disciples here, their testimony is rejected as an idle tale and they do not accept the women's witnessing. This rejection is then followed by a reference to a visit of a male disciple to the tomb who, while also described as being perplexed, nonetheless serves as the effective narrative link in Luke between the empty tomb story and the Lucan appearance traditions. Finally, in Lk 24:22-24, the only resurrection appearance story to refer to the women at the tomb, we are told that the empty tomb convinces no-one. Even allowing for any possible anti-docetic intention of the Lucan redaction of the empty tomb story, we cannot overlook the significance of this editing for the role of the women in the Lucan narrative of the tomb. In drawing together our conclusions on the overall effect of the Lucan redaction of the stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb, we agreed with Fiorenza that when one analyses the Lucan stories of Easter we can identify particular androcentric redaction here which resulted in a subtle attempt to disqualify the women as witnesses.¹⁹

With Jn 20:1-18 we see that these redactional trends to silence the women did not necessarily represent a linear trend in the church which progressed unchallenged as women were gradually excluded from ministering. Here in John, as we have already mentioned, there are two males at the tomb, and as we saw in our detailed examination of the Johannine empty tomb narrative, it is their witnessing at the tomb which occupies centre stage. However, we did not conclude that the downgrading of the visit of the women in John was part of a deliberate attempt to edit out the women from the Johannine resurrection traditions. In Jn 20:14f. Mary Magdalene experiences both an angelophany and christophany which surely indicates that she occupies one of the places of highest privilege and honour in the Johannine resurrection stories.²⁰ Finally,

according to Jn 20:18, Mary not only tells the disciples what she has witnessed at the tomb, but also that she has seen the Lord and he has spoken to her.

Moving beyond our three particular texts of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb we also recognise the contribution of feminist exegetes who have drawn attention to the struggles taking place within the church concerning the role and status of women. This is what Fiorenza has termed 'counter-cultural beginnings' and the gradual adaptation of the early Christian movement to its patriarchal culture which is reflected in certain androcentric texts and translations.²¹ As Fiorenza points out, however, this struggle between diversity and attempts to impose order did not always result in injunctions to silence and submission for women. Thus, she suggests in both Mark's gospel, which appeared about the same time as the beginnings of the patriarchal household code trajectory in Colossians, and in John's gospel, which was written at a date similar to the pastoral epistles, we find examples of positive discipleship roles for women which contrast with developments elsewhere to suppress women's leadership and ministry.²² We would therefore agree with Heine that in recognising the portrayal of women as fallible followers in Mark, and the positive role given to Mary Magdalene in the Johannine resurrection narrative, we must appreciate that the situation regarding women in the early church was complex, and we should beware of making hasty, general conclusions.²³ We have already recognised that there was a tension in the early church regarding the question of equality or subordination of women which was essentially a power struggle. In many cases this struggle was eventually resolved so that women's witness was silenced or they were marginalised. However, as we have seen, in certain places, including parts of the Pauline church, in Mark and in John, women were given active discipleship roles.

We agree with feminist theologians that the position we need to adopt in our approach to the biblical text is a hermeneutics of suspicion. This will hopefully lead us to a 'hermeneutics of remembrance' as we recognise the variety of practice concerning the ministry of women in the early church as well as the attempts to silence them.²⁴

We must also be wary of further attempts which conclude from the references to Mary Magdalene in the apocryphal stories of the resurrection that these gospels deliberately wrote women back into the resurrection traditions because they were interested in women *per se*. We have suggested above that it is perhaps more likely that the main reason why women feature so prominently in these gospels as important resurrection witnesses, was not so much because these writers were concerned to highlight the roles of particular women, but because they were concerned to challenge claims to orthodox succession. Over against the orthodox claims to succession from Peter and other male apostles, Mary Magdalene stands out as the legitimate witness of certain heterodox groups. This is not, however, to deny the effect of such redaction which inevitably highlights the role of women in these resurrection narratives. In order for us to appreciate the overall presentation of women within the various heretical groups it is, however, necessary to refer back to our introduction and the references to the various ascetic practices of certain heretical groups which in some cases ultimately led to a denial of the feminine.²⁵

The aim of the main body of this thesis has been to concentrate on the literary questions raised by our study of the redaction of the stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb. We do of course recognise that this study also raised much wider questions regarding the role and status of women within the early church and by hinting at the tensions reflected in the various gospels concerning their individual portrayals of the women in the closing scenes of the gospel, we have suggested possible echoes with similar tensions experienced elsewhere in the church. However, it has not been possible here to present an analysis of these texts within their particular *Sitz im Leben* with regard to these wider questions. What we have tried to do, therefore, in our introductory chapter, is to set the scene for the background against which we must set this particular literary study. This would support the arguments of feminist exegetes that the New Testament texts did not emerge in a vacuum but rather, as with the Pauline texts in particular, we must recognise that much theological discussion took place against a background of the cut and thrust of debate. Seen against this background questions concerning the role and status of women were often worked out where there was a fear of diversity and the cries of oneness and unity

inevitably stifled expressions of enthusiasm, or deviations from the norm. Feminist theology challenges us to recognise cultural conditioning and reject it as being normative for us today.

One final issue needs to be raised here before we conclude our examination of the women at the tomb and this is why we have not included an examination of 1 Corinthians 15 in our study. While 1 Corinthians 15 is important in that we are given a list of resurrection appearances which significantly fails to mention women, it does not supply us with narrative accounts, and as such lies outside the ambit of this thesis which has been a study of narrative accounts of the women at the tomb. We do recognise that there are disputes today about whether or not the empty tomb is implied in 1 Corinthians 15.²⁶ We would also point out that this text is fundamentally a list of resurrection appearances to specific individuals which were used apologetically to justify specific commissions from the risen Jesus. The empty tomb stories, as we have already seen, did not serve the purpose of establishing the women as official witnesses of the resurrection, except perhaps, possibly in Mark. In the other three canonical gospels it is the male disciples who are commissioned separately by the risen Jesus and we have identified tendencies in the redaction of the tomb story to protect this male witness even further. Thus male disciples are introduced to the tomb story either deliberately as in Lk 24:12, or perhaps with the unintentional effect of an attempt to answer other apologetic needs as in Jn 20:3-10.

Feminist hermeneutics has enabled us to recognise and challenge head on the patriarchal ideology which pervades the New Testament. It has prompted us to raise questions about the marginality or otherwise of the women in the early church rather than accepting silences at face value. It has also allowed us to interpret our three particular texts against a background of the struggle for equality of women which was eventually resolved in terms of a gradual patriarchalisation of the church. We have, therefore, identified what feminists would term important 'counter-cultural' trends in both Mark and John which challenge developments elsewhere in the church to curtail the roles of women. We have recognised rhetorical clues in the text to interpret the silences about women and we have ultimately derived meaning from these silences.

We have also been made aware of how certain texts have been used to justify the exclusion of women from ministry, particularly through androcentric translations and interpretations. However, one particular note of warning has been sounded here and rather than presenting our thesis as an extreme apologetic for women, we have tended to make suggestions which recognise the hidden liberating potential of certain texts.

An important part of our task has therefore been to recognise the many different motives which influenced the redaction of the tomb stories. Thus, in Matthew, for example, the insertion of the male guards was probably influenced by apologetic and polemic rather than any deliberate attempt to redact out the women, which none the less was the subtle 'effect' of the introduction of these characters.

In the words of P. Perkins, it would appear that "... the genuine diversity of the New Testament witness already suggests that resurrection functions as a much more comprehensive symbol to draw together a number of perceptions, experiences and insights."²⁷ This is the hope for the future and women who are seriously engaged in drawing meanings from these texts. The bible is not a document of ancient history but on the contrary is accepted by many as holy scripture claiming authority and validity in the contemporary church. It must therefore be open to fresh interpretation because without this we will be unable to hear what is spoken and understand its meaning for us.

Thus, rather than seeing our approach to the text as being tied to any one particular feminist perspective, we recognise that our attempts at dialogue have been influenced by various literary critical perspectives which have all enhanced our appreciation of the biblical narratives. We would agree with Schneiders that the question of the role and status of women was not necessarily a conscious concern of the writers of the gospels, but this has not prevented us, or her, from appreciating the portrayal and characterisation of the women in these texts and deriving meaning from them. We have not approached the bible with the deliberate intention of looking at texts about women to use these as proof texts to qualify those texts normally used to support women's oppression. However, in our examination of our three stories involving women we have suggested that it is only when all the gospels are viewed together that we can appreciate the rich diversity of the

traditions about women in the early church. In our examination of women in the early church we did highlight stories of equality and subordination and we suggested that these reflected a tension concerning the role of women within the developing Christian community. Thus we have drawn attention to what Tolbert identifies as the profoundly paradoxical nature of feminist hermeneutics which both reveals God as liberator and helper as well as God as enemy.²⁸ Once again, however, we would return to our examination of women in the stories of the crucifixion, burial and empty tomb and suggest that while the question of the role and status of women was not a conscious concern of the New Testament writers, the very existence of such liberating texts supporting the equality of women would suggest that we should not reject the bible outright as irredeemably patriarchal. Feminist exegesis can be a useful tool in drawing attention to the presence of women in biblical narratives.

Our approach to the stories involving women in the closing scenes of the gospel cannot, therefore, be identified as part of that particular perspective of feminist hermeneutics which deliberately concentrates on texts which challenge the patriarchy of the bible. We have noted at various points throughout our study that the situation is more complex, and even within particular narratives we have identified both liberating and oppressive tendencies in the text. We have approached the New Testament from a perspective which has been primarily influenced by the work of Fiorenza and her hermeneutics of suspicion. We have not suggested that there is a timeless truth within these texts which we can unearth. Rather we have recognised that these texts are products of a particular era and as historically conditioned works we have examined them critically and in such a way that has recognised their androcentricism without excuse or evasion. This has enabled us to work fruitfully with the biblical tradition offering us an honest starting point for considering how these texts can have meaning for us today.

CONCLUSION - NOTES

1. See S.M. Schneiders (1982).
2. For two good reviews of the various feminist perspectives on the bible see C. Osiek (1985) and K.D. Sakenfeld (1985).
3. Thus Schneiders (1989), p. 4.
4. See *Ibid.*
5. See *Ibid.*
6. See *Ibid.*
7. See *Ibid.*, esp. pp. 5-9.
8. See Tolbert (1983), p. 124.
9. See *Ibid.*, pp. 124-126.
10. Thus McLaughlin (1979), p. 95.
11. For a detailed outline of Fiorenza's hermeneutical approach see Fiorenza (1982).
12. Thus Heine (1989), p. 2.
13. See *op. cit.*, p. 118.
14. See Schneiders (1989), p. 7.
15. See Fiorenza (1985), pp. 52-3. As we have suggested above we would take issue here with the suggestion of Fiorenza that we should not even attempt to free ourselves from our own experiences and interests.
16. See Fiorenza (1982), p. 35f.
17. For a discussion of discipleship in Mark in terms of fallible followers see E. Struthers Malbon (1982).
18. Thus Fiorenza (1983), p. 394.
19. See *Ibid.*, pp. 400-402.
20. For this assessment of Mary Magdalene's role in John see E and F Stagg (1978), p. 251.
21. See in particular here Fiorenza (1982), pp. 37-42.
22. See Fiorenza (1983), esp pp. 243-284, 315-333.
23. See Heine *op. cit.*, pp. 141-146.
24. Thus Fiorenza (1985), p. 57.
25. See also Heine *op. cit.*, pp. 106-123.
26. See W.L. Craig (1985) for a discussion of the question of the historicity of the empty tomb which includes an assessment of whether or not Paul either mentions or accepts the empty tomb in 1 Cor 15.
27. Thus Perkins (1984), p. 21.
28. See Tolbert, *op. cit.*, pp. 120-121.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

INTRODUCTION

(i) General Bibliography

- BALCH, D.
1981 Let Wives be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter. (Chico: Scholars Press).
- BASS, D. C.
1982 'Women's Studies and Biblical Studies: An Historical Perspective', JSOT, 22, pp. 6-12.
- BLUM, G. G.
1971 'The Office of Women in the New Testament', The Churchman, 85, pp. 175-189.
- BRENNAN, I.
1971 'Women in the Gospels', New Blackfriars, 52, pp. 291-299.
- BROOTEN, B.
1977 '"Junia ... Outstanding among the Apostles" (Romans 16:7)', in L. and A. Swidler eds. (1977), pp. 141-144.
1980 'Feminist Perspectives on New Testament Exegesis', Concilium, 138, pp. 55-61.
- BROWN, R. E.
1975 'Roles of Women in the Fourth Gospel', TS, 36, pp. 688-699.
- BROWN, R. E./DONFRIED, K. P./FITZMYER, J. A./REUMANN, J., eds.
1978 Mary in the New Testament. (New York: Paulist Press).
- BURNS, E.
1973 God as Woman, Woman as God. (New York: Paulist Press).
- CADY STANTON, E.
1895 The Women's Bible. (New York: European Publishing Co. Rev. edn. Edinburgh: Polygon Books).
- CARR, A.
1982 'Is a Christian Feminist Theology Possible?', TS, 43, pp. 279-297.
- CARROLL, E.
1975 'Women and Ministry', TS, 36, pp. 660-687.
- CHRIST, C. P.
1977 'The New Feminist Theology: A Review of the Literature', RSR, 3, pp. 203-212.
- CHRIST, C. P./PLASKOW, J.
1979 Womanspirit Rising: A Feminist Reader in Religion. (New York: Harper and Row).
- CLARK, E./RICHARDSON, H., eds.
1977 Women and Religion. A Feminist Source-book of Christian Thought. (New York: Harper and Row).
- CLARK, S. B.
1980 Man and Woman in Christ. (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Servant Books).
- COLLINS, R. F.
1970 'Mary in the Fourth Gospel', Louvain Studies, 3, pp. 99-142.
- COLLINS, S. D.
1972 'Towards A Feminist Theology', Christian Century, Aug. 1972, pp. 796-799.
1974 A Different Heaven and Earth. (Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Judson Press).
- DALY, M.
1968 The Church and the Second Sex. (New York: Harper and Row).

- 1973 Beyond God the Father: Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation. (Boston: Beacon Press).
- 1978 Gyn/Ecology. The Metaethics of Radical Feminism. (Boston: Beacon Press).
- DANIÉLOU, J.
1961 The Ministry of Women in the Early Church. (London: Faith Press).
- DAVIES, S. L.
1980 The Revolt of the Widows. The Social World of the Apocryphal Acts. (London: Feffer and Simons).
- de BEAUVOIR, S.
1983 The Second Sex. ET H.M. Parshley (London: Penguin Books).
- ERMARTH, M. S.
1970 Adam's Fractured Rib. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
- EVANS, M.
1983 Woman in the Bible. (Exeter: Paternoster Press).
- FARLEY, M.
1976 'Sources of Sexual Inequality in the History of Christian Thought', JR, 56, pp. 162-176.
1985 'Feminist Consciousness and the Interpretation of Scripture', in L.M. Russell, ed. (1985), p. 41-54.
- FERM, D. W.
1981 'Feminist Theology in America', SJT, 34, pp. 157-178.
- FLANAGAN, N. M.
1978a 'Mary in the Theology of John's Gospel', Marianum, 40, pp. 110-120.
1978b 'The Position of Women in the Writings of St. Luke', Marianum, 40, pp. 288-304.
- FLORA, J. R.
1981 'Biblical Feminism and the New Testament: A Review of Selected Literature', Ashland Theological Journal, 14, pp. 34-47.
- GARDINER, M. A.
1976 Women and Catholic Priesthood. (New York: Paulist Press).
- GOLDENBERG, N. R.
1979 Changing of the Gods. Feminism and the End of Traditional Religions. (Boston: Beacon Press).
- GOTTWALD, N. K., ed.
1983 The Bible and Liberation: Political and Social Hermeneutics. (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books).
- GRASSI, J. A.
1986 'The Role of Jesus' Mother in John's Gospel: A Reappraisal', CBQ, 48, pp. 67-80.
- GROSS, R. M.
1976 'Female God Language', Davka, 17, pp. 6-9.
1977 Beyond Androcentrism. New Essays on Women and Religion. (Missoula: Scholars Press).
- GRYSON, R.
1976 The Ministry of Women in the Early Church. (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press).
- HALL, B.
1974 'The Church in the World', Theology Today, 31, pp. 50-55.
- HARKNESS, G.
1972 Women in Church and Society: A Historical and Theological Inquiry. (Nashville: Abingdon Press).
- HEINE, S.
1987 Women and Early Christianity. Are feminist scholars right? ET J. Bowden (London: SCM Press).

- HENGEL, M.
1963 'Maria Magdalena und die Frauen als Zeugen', in Abraham unser Vater. Ed. P. Schmid (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- HOROWITZ, M. C.
1979 'The Image of God in Man - Is Woman Included', HTR, 72, pp. 169-206.
- JEWETT, P. K.
1976 Man as male and female. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
- KETTER, P.
1937 Christ and Womankind. (London: Burn, Oates and Washbourne).
- KNIGHT, G. W.
1977 The New Testament teaching on the role relationship of men and women. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House).
- KRAEMER, R. S.
1983 'Women in the Religions of the Graeco-Roman World', RSR, 9, pp. 127-139.
- KUNG, H./MOLTMANN, J.
1983 Mary in the Churches. Concilium 168.
- LAURENTIN, R.
1980 'Jesus and Women: An Underestimated Revolution', Concilium, 133, pp. 80-92.
- LEWIS, A. E., ed.
1984 The Motherhood of God. (Edinburgh: The St. Andrews Press).
- McFAGUE, S.
1982 Metaphorical Theology: Models of God in Religious Language. ((Philadelphia: Fortress Press)).
- MALY, E. H.
1980 'Women in the Gospel of Luke', BTB, 10, pp. 99-104.
- MEER, H. van der
1973 Women Priests in the Catholic Church? (Philadelphia: Temple University Press).
- METZ, J. B./SCHILLEBEECKX, E., eds.
1981 God as Father. Concilium 143.
- MOLLENKOTT, V. R.
1981 Women, Men, and the Bible. (Nashville; Abingdon Press).
- MOLTMAN-WENDEL, E.
1982 The Women around Jesus. ET J. Bowden (London: SCM Press).
- MUNRO, W.
1982 'Women Disciples in Mark', CBQ, 44, pp. 225-241.
- OCHS, C.
1977 Behind the Sex of God. Toward A New Consciousness Transcending Matriarchy and Patriarchy. (Boston: Beacon Press).
- OSIEK, C.
1985 'The Feminist and the Bible: Hermeneutical Alternatives', in A.Y. Collins ed. (1985), pp. 93-106.
- PAGELS, E. H.
1976 'What Became of God the Mother: Conflicting Images of God in Early Christianity', Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 2, pp. 293-303.
1980 The Gnostic Gospels. (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson).
- PAPE, D.
1977 God and Women. A Fresh Look at What the New Testament Says about Women. (Oxford: Mowbray Press).
- PARVEY, C. F.
1974 'The Theology of Leadership of Women in the New Testament', in R.R. Ruether, ed. (1974), pp. 117-149.
- PHIPPS, W. E.

- 1970 Was Jesus Married? (New York: Harper and Row).
- PLATT, E. E.
1977 'The Ministry of Mary of Bethany', TToday, 34, pp. 29-39.
- RUETHER, R. R.
1972 Liberation Theology. (New York: Paulist Press).
1974 Religion and Sexism. Images of Woman in the Jewish and Christian Traditions. Ed. R.R. Ruether (New York: Simon and Schuster).
1975 New Woman, New Earth: Sexist Ideologies and Human Liberation. (New York: Seabury Press).
1979a Women of Spirit. Female Leadership in the Jewish and Christian Traditions. Eds. R.R. Ruether, E. McLaughlin (New York: Simon and Schuster).
1979b Mary - The Feminine Face of the Church. (London: SCM Press).
1983 Sexism and God-Talk. Towards a Feminist Theology. (London: SCM Press).
1985 'Feminist Interpretation: A Method of Correlation', in L.M. Russell, ed. (1985), pp. 111-124.
- RUSSELL, L. M.
1974 Human Liberation in a Feminist Perspective - A Theology. ((Philadelphia: Westminster Press)).
- RUSSELL, L. M., ed.
1976 The Liberating Word: A Guide to Nonsexist Interpretation of the Bible. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press).
1985 Feminist Interpretation of the Bible. (Oxford: B. Blackwell).
- SAKENFELD, K. D.
1985 'Feminist Uses of Biblical Materials', in L.M. Russell, ed. (1985), pp. 55-64.
1988 'Feminist Perspectives on Bible and Theology. An Introduction to Selected Issues and Literature', Int, 42, pp. 5-18.
- SCANZONI, L./HARDESTY, N.
1986 All We're Meant To Be: Biblical Feminism for Today. (Nashville: Abingdon Press).
- SCHIERLING, M. J.
1980 'Women as Leaders in the Marcan Community', Listening, 15, pp. 250-256.
- SCHMITT, J. J.
1981 'Women in Mark's Gospel', The Bible Today, 19, pp. 228-233.
- SCHNEIDERS, S. M.
1982 'Women in the Fourth Gospel and the Role of Women in the Contemporary Church', BTB, 12, pp. 35-45.
1989 'Feminist Ideology Criticism and Biblical Hermeneutics', BTB, 1, pp. 3-10.
- SCHOTTROFF, L.
1982 'Maria Magdalena und die Frauen am Grabe Jesu', EvTh, 42, pp. 3-25.
1983 'Women as Followers of Jesus in New Testament Times: An Exercise in Social-Historical Exegesis of the Bible', in N.K. Gottwald, ed. (1983), pp. 418-427.
- STAGG, E./STAGG, F.
1978 Woman in the World of Jesus. ((Philadelphia: Westminster Press)).
- SAIVING GOLDSTEIN, V.
1960 'The Human Situation: A Feminist View', JR, 40, pp. 100-112.
- SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, E.
1975a 'Feminist Theology as a Critical Theology of Liberation', TS, 36, pp. 605-626.

- 1975b 'Mary Magdalene: Apostle to the Apostles', Union Theological Seminary Journal, April (1975), pp. 22-23.
- 1978 'Women in the Pre-Pauline and Pauline Churches', USQR, 33, pp. 153-166.
- 1979 'Word, Spirit and Power: Women in the Early Christian Communities', in R.R. Ruether, E. McLaughlin, eds. (1979), pp. 29-70.
- 1982 'Feminist Theology and New Testament Interpretation', JSOT, 22, pp. 32-46.
- 1983a In Memory of Her. A Feminist Reconstruction of Christian Origins. (London: SCM Press).
- 1983b '"You Are Not to Be Called Father": Early Christian History in a Feminist Perspective', in N.K. Gottwald, ed. (1983), pp. 394-417.
- 1984 Bread Not Stone. The Challenge of Feminist Biblical Interpretation. (Boston: Beacon Press).
- 1985a 'Remembering the Past in Creating the Future: Historical-Critical Scholarship and Feminist Biblical Interpretation', in A.Y. Collins, ed. (1985), pp. 43-64.
- 1985b 'The Will to Choose or to Reject: Continuing Our Critical Work', in L.M. Russell, ed. (1985), pp. 125-136.
- STENDAHL, K.
1966 The Bible and the Role of Women. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
- SWIDLER, L./SWIDLER, A., eds.
1977 Women Priests. (New York: Paulist Press).
- SWIDLER, L.
1971 'Jesus was a Feminist', Catholic World, 214, pp. 177-183.
1979 Biblical Affirmations of Woman. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press).
- STUHLMUELLER, C, ed.
1978 Women and Priesthood. (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press).
- TAVARD, G. H.
1972 Women in Christian Tradition. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press).
- TETLOW, E. M.
1985 Women and Ministry in the New Testament. (London: University Press of America).
- TOLBERT, M. A.
1983 'Defining the Problem: The Bible and Feminist Hermeneutics', in Tolbert, ed. (1983), pp. 113-126.
- TOLBERT, M. A., ed.
1983 The Bible and Feminist Hemeneutics. (Semeia 28. Chico: Scholars Press).
- TRIBLE, P.
1973 'Depatriarchalizing Biblical Interpretation', JAAR, 41, pp. 30-47.
1978 God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
1982a 'Feminist Hemeneutics and Biblical Studies', Christian Century, Feb. (1982), pp. 116-118.
1982b The Effect of Women's Studies on Biblical Studies. Ed. P. .
Trible (JSOT 22).
1984 Texts of Terror: Literary-Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
- WAHLBERG, R. C.
1975 Jesus According to a Woman. (New York: Paulist Press).

- 1978 Jesus and the Freed Woman. (New York: Paulist Press).
- WASHBOURN, P.
1977 Becoming Women: The Quest for Wholeness in Female Experience. (New York: Harper and Row).
- WILLIAMS, M. J.
1977 'The Man/Woman Relationship in the New Testament', The Churchman, 91, pp. 33-46.
- WITHERINGTON, B.
1979 'On the Road with Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Susanna, and Other Disciples -Luke 8:1-3', ZNW, 70, pp. 243-248..
1984 Women in the Ministry of Jesus. (Cambridge: University Press).
- YARBRO COLLINS, A.
1982 'New Testament Perspectives: The Gospel of John', JSOT, 22, pp. 47-53.
- YARBRO COLLINS, A., ed.
1985 Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship. (SBL Centennial Publications 10. Chico: Scholars Press).

(ii) Studies on the Resurrection

- ALSUP, J. E.
1975 The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition. (London: SPCK).
- BENOIT, P.
1969 The Passion and the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. ET B. Weatherhead (London: DLT).
- BODE, E. L.
1970 The First Easter Morning: the Gospel Accounts of the Women's Visit to the Tomb of Jesus. (Rome: Biblical Institute Press).
- EVANS, C. F.
1970 Resurrection and the New Testament. (London: SCM Press).
- FULLER, R. H.
1980 The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives. (London: SPCK).
- PERKINS, P.
1984 Resurrection: New Testament Witness and Contemporary Reflection. (London: Chapman).
- PERRIN, N.
1977 The Resurrection Narratives. (London: SCM Press).

CHAPTER ONE

(i) General Works on Women in the Ancient World

- BROOTEN, B. J.
1985 'Early Christian Women and Their Cultural Context: Issues of Method in Historical Reconstruction', in Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship Ed. A.Y. Collins (Chico: Scholars Press), pp. 65-91.
- CAMERON, A.
1980 'Neither male Nor Female', Greece and Rome, 27 pp. 60-68.
- DOLLAR, S. E.
1983 The Significance of Women in the Fourth Gospel. (PhD Thesis New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary), p. 7-80.
- DONALDSON, J.
1907 Woman: Her Position and Influence in Ancient Greece and Rome, and Among Early Christians (London: Longmans).

- EVANS, M.
1983 Woman in the Bible (Exeter: Paternoster Press), pp. 33-43.
- KRAEMER, R. S.
1983 'Women in the Religions of the Greco-Roman World', RSR, 9 pp. 127-139.
- LEIPOLDT, J.
1955 Die Frau in der antiken Welt und im Urchristentum (Leipzig: Koehler and Amelang).
- MEEKS, W. A.
1974 'The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity', HR, 13 pp. 165-208.
- STAGG, E./STAGG, F.
1978 Woman in the World of Jesus (Philadelphia: Westminster Press), pp. 13-100.
- TETLOW, E. M.
1980 Women and Ministry in the New Testament: Called to Serve (London: University Press of America), pp. 5-29.
- WITHERINGTON, B.
1981 Women and their Roles in the Gospels and Acts (PhD thesis Durham University), pp. 1-46.

(ii) Women in Judaism

- BAER, R. A.
1970 Philo's Use of the Categories Male and Female. (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- BARON, S. W.
1952-60 A Social and Religious History of the Jews. 5 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press).
- BAUMGARTEN, J. M.
1957 'On the Testimony of Women in 1QS^a', JBL, 76, pp. 266-269.
- BROOTEN, B. T.
1981 'Jüdinnen zur Zeit Jesu. Ein Plädoyer für Differenzierung', ThQ, 161, pp. 281-285.
1982a 'Konnten Frauen im alten Judentum die Scheidung betreiben? Überlegungen zu Mk 10,11-12 und 1 Kor 7,10-11', EvTh, 42, pp. 65-80.
1982b Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogues: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues. (Brown Judaic Studies 36: Chico: Scholars Press).
1983 'Zur Debatte über das Scheidungsrecht der jüdischen Frau', EvTh, 43, pp. 466-478.
- BOER, P. A. H. de
1984 Fatherhood and Motherhood in Israelite and Judean Piety. (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- COHEN, B.
1952 'Concerning Divorce in Jewish and Roman Law', PAAJR, 21, pp. 3-34.
- COHEN, J. D. S.
1980 'Women in the Synagogues of Antiquity, Conservative Judaism, 34, pp. 23-29.
- DANBY, H., ed.
1933 The Mishnah. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- DAUBE, D.
1959 'Concessions to Sinfulness in Jewish Law', JJS, 10, pp. 1-13.
- DELLING, G.
1931 Paulus' Stellung zu Frau und Ehe. (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).

- EPSTEIN, I., ed.
 1935-48 The Babylonian Talmud. 34 vols. (London: Soncino Press).
 1960-4 The Babylonian Talmud. Hebrew-English Edition in Selected Tractates. (London: Soncino Press).
- GOLDFELD, A.
 1975 'Women as Sources of Torah in the Rabbinic Tradition', Judaism, 24, pp. 245-256.
- GOODBLATT, D.
 1975 'The Beruriah Traditions', JJS, 26, pp. 68-85.
- HAUPTMANN, J.
 1974 'Images of Women in the Talmud' in Religion and Sexism: Images of Women in the Jewish and Christian Traditions. Ed. R.R. Ruether (New York: Simon and Schuster), p. 184-212.
- HESCHEL, S., ed.
 1983 On Being a Jewish Feminist: A Reader. (New York: Schocken Books).
- HILTON, M./MARSHALL, G.
 1988 The Gospels and Rabbinic Judaism. A Study Guide. (London: SCM Press).
- HURLEY, J. B.
 1981 Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective. (Leicester: Intervarsity Press).
- JEREMIAS, J.
 1969 Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus. ET F.H. and C.H. Cave (London: SCM Press).
- JOSEPHUS
 1926-65 Vita. Contra Apionem. Antiquites Judaicae. Bellum Judaicum. 9 vols (LCL, Greek-English Translation H.St.J. Thackeray et al. London: W. Heinemann Ltd.).
- KLEIN, C.
 1972 'Jewish Women in the Time of Mary of Nazareth', Bible Today, 60, pp. 746-752.
- KOLTUN, E., ed.
 1976 The Jewish Woman. (New York: Schocken Books).
- LACHS, S. T.
 1974 'The Pandora-Eve Motif in Rabbinic Literature', HTR, 67, pp. 341-345.
- LOEWE, R.
 1966 The Position of Women in Judaism. (London: SPCK).
- LOWY, S.
 1958 'The Extent of Jewish Polygamy in Talmudic Times', JJS, 19, pp. 115-135.
- MacDONALD, E. M.
 1931 The Position of Women as Reflected in Semitic Codes of Law. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).
- MARMORSTEIN, E.
 1954-5 'The Veil in Judaism and Islam', JJS, 5-6, pp. 1-11.
- MEISELMAN, M.
 1978 Jewish Women in Jewish Law. (New York: Ktav).
- MONTEFIORE, C. G./LOEWE, R. H.
 1974 A Rabbinic Anthology. (New York: Schocken Books).
- MOORE, G. F.
 1971 Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. Vols. 1-2 (New York: Schocken Books).
- NEUSNER, J.
 1978 'From Scripture to Mishnah: The Origins of Tractate Niddah', JJS, 29, pp. 135-148.

- 1979 'From Scripture to Mishnah: The Origins of the Mishnah's Division of Women', JJS, 30, pp. 138-153.
- 1980 A History of the Mishnaic Law of Women. 5 vols. (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- OEPKE, A.
'γυνή', TNDT ad. loc.
- PERITZ, I. J.
1898 'Women in the Ancient Hebrew Cult', JBL, 17, pp. 111-148.
- PHILO
1929-53 De Specialibus Legibus. 12 vols (LCL, Greek-English Translation F.H. Colson, G.H. Whittaker, R. Marcus. London: W. Heinemann Ltd.).
- PLASKOW, J.
1978 'Christian Feminism and Anti-Judaism', Cross Currents, 28, pp. 306-309.
- RUUD, I. M.
1985 Women and Judaism: A Selected Annotated Bibliography. (New York: Garland Publishing).
- SCHWEIZER, E.
1982 'Scheidungsrecht der jüdischen Frau? Weibliche Jünger Jesu?', EvTh, 42, pp. 294-297.
- SEGAL, J. B.
1979 'The Jewish Attitude towards Women', JJS, 30, pp. 121-137.
- SIGAL, P.
1975 'Elements of Male Chauvinism in Classical Halakhah', Judaism, 24, pp. 226-244.
- SWIDLER, L.
1976 Women in Judaism: The Status of Women in Formative Judaism. (Metuchen, NJ.: Scarecrow).
- WEDER, H.
1983 'Perspektive der Frauen', EvTh, 43, pp. 175-178.
- WIDOW
Enc. Jud. ad. loc.
- WOMAN, RIGHTS OF
Jewish Encyclopedia. ad. loc.
- WOMEN
Enc. Jud. ad. loc.
- YARON, R.
1960 'Aramaic Marriage Contracts - Corrigenda and Addenda', JSS, 5, pp. 66-70.
1966 'The Restoration of Marriage', JJS, 17, pp. 1-11.
- ZUCROW, S.
1932 Women, Slaves and the Ignorant in Rabbinic Literature. (Boston: Stratford Company).

(iii) Women in the Graeco-Roman World

- ADCOCK, F. E.
1945 'Women in Roman Life and Letters', Greece and Rome, 11, pp. 1-11.
- ARISTOTLE
Politics. (LCL. Greek-English translation H. Rackham: London: Heinemann).
- ARTHUR, M. B.
1973 'Early Greece. The Origins of the Western Attitudes Toward Women', Arethusa, 6, pp. 7-58.
1976 'Review Essay: Classics', Signs, 2, pp. 382-403.

- 1977 'Politics and Pomegranates: An Interpretation of the Homeric Hymn to Demeter', Arethusa, 10, pp. 7-47.
- BALSDON, J. P. V. D.
1960 'Women in Imperial Rome', History Today, 10, pp. 24-31.
1962 Roman Women: their history and habits. (London: Bodley Head).
- BARSTOW, A.
1978 'The Uses of Archaeology for Women's History: James Mellaart's Work on the Neolithic Goddess at Çatal Hüyük', Feminist Studies, 4, pp. 7-18.
- BEARD, M.
1980 'The Sexual Status of Vestal Virgins', JRS, 70, pp. 12-27.
- BONNER, R. J.
1906 'Did Women Testify in Homicide Cases at Athens?', Classical Philology, 1, pp. 127-132.
- CARCOPINO, J.
1941 Daily Life in Ancient Rome. (London: G. Routledge and Sons).
- CARTLEDGE, P.
1981 'Spartan Wives: Liberation or Licence?', Classical Quarterly, 31, pp. 84-105.
- CORNISH, F. W./BACON, A. J.
1905 'The Position of Women', in A Companion to Greek Studies. Ed. L. Whibley (Cambridge: University Press), pp. 516-523.
- CROOK, J.
1967 'Patria Potestas', Classical Quarterly, 17, pp. 113-122.
- CROIX, G. E. M. de Ste
1970 'Some observations on the property rights of Athenian women', Classical Review, 20, pp. 273-278.
- DIOGENES LAERTIUS
1925 Lives of Eminent Philosophers. 2 vols. (LCL Greek-English translation R.D. Hicks. London: W. Heinemann).
- DOVER, K. J.
1973 'Classical Greek Attitudes to Sexual Behaviour', Arethusa, 6, pp. 59-73.
- EHRENBERG, V.
1946 Aspects of the Ancient World. (New York: W. Sallock).
1962 The People of Aristophanes. (New York: Schocken Books).
- FARNELL, L. R.
1904 'Sociological Hypotheses Concerning the Position of Women in Ancient Religion', Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, 7, pp. 70-92.
- FLACELIERE, R.
1962 Love in Ancient Greece. (London: F. Muller).
1965 Daily Life in Greece at the Time of Pericles. ET P. Green (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson).
- FLANNERY, H. W.
1920 'Roman Women and the Vote', Classical Journal, 15, pp. 103-107.
- FOLEY, H. P., ed.
1982 Reflections on Women in Antiquity. (New York: Gordon and Breach).
- GALT, C. M.
1931 'Veiled Ladies', AJA, 35, pp. 373-393.
- GOMME, A. W.
1925 'The Position of Women in Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.', Classical Philology, 20, pp. 1-25.
- GOODWATER, L.
1975 Women in Antiquity: An Annotated Bibliography. (Metuechen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press).

- GUETTEL-COLE, S.
1980 'New Evidence for the Mysteries of Dionysius', GRBS, 21, pp. 223-238.
- HADAS, M.
1936 'Observations on Athenian Women', Classical Weekly, 29, pp. 97-100.
- HALLET, J. P.
1973 'The Role of Women in Roman Elegy: Counter-Cultural Feminism', Arethusa, 6, pp. 103-124.
- HARDY, E. R.
1970 'Priestesses in the Greco-Roman World', The Churchman, 84, pp. 264-270.
- HARRISON, A. R. W.
1968 The Law of Athens: Family and Property. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- HEYOB, S. K.
1973 The Cult of Isis among Women in the Greco-Roman World. (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- HOPKINS, M. K.
1964-5 'The Age of Roman Girls at Marriage', Population Studies, 18, pp. 309-327.
- INWOOD-SOURVINOU, C.
1978 'Persephone and Aphrodite at Locri: A Model for Personality Definitions in Greek Religion', JHS, 98, pp. 101-121.
- JOHNSTON, M.
1957 Roman Life. (Chicago: Scott, Foresman).
- JUVENAL and PERSIUS
1979 Juvenal and Persius. (LCL. Greek-English translation, rev. edn. G.G. Ramsay. London: W. Heinemann).
- KITTO, H. D. F.
1966 The Greeks. (London: Penguin).
- KRAEMER, R. S.
1979 'Ecstasy and Possession: The Attraction of Women to the Cult of Dionysus', HTR, 72, pp. 55-80.
1984 'Selected Bibliography on Women in Classical Antiquity', in Women in the Ancient World: The Arethusa Papers. Eds. J. Peradot, J.P. Sullivan (Albany: State University of New York Press).
- LACEY, W. K.
1968 The family in classical Greece. (London: Thames and Hudson).
- LEFKOWITZ, M. R./FANT, M. B.
1982 Women's Life in Greece and Rome. (London: Duckworth).
- LEITMAN, M./ZEISEL, W.
1977 'Univira: An Example of Continuity and Change in Roman Society', Church History, 46, pp. 19-32.
- LICHT, H.
1963 Sexual life in ancient Greece. ET J.H. Freese (New York: Barnes and Noble).
- LINCOLN, B.
1979 'The Rape of Persephone: A Greek Scenario of Women's Initiation', HTR, 72, pp. 223-235.
- MacMULLEN, R.
1980 'Woman in Public in the Roman Empire', Historia, 29, pp. 208-218.
- MACURDY, G. H.
1927 'Queen Eurydice and the Evidence for Women - Power in Early Macedonia', AJP, 48, pp. 201-214.
1935 'Julia Berenice', AJP, 56, pp. 246-253.

- MARSHALL, A. J.
 1975 'Roman Women and the Provinces', Ancient Society, 6, pp. 109-127.
- O'FAOLIN, J./MARTINES, L.
 1979 Not in God's Image: Women in History. (London: Virago Press).
- PALMER, R.
 1974 'Roman Shrines of Female Chastity from the Caste Struggle to the Papacy of Innocent I', Revista storica dell' antichita, 4, pp. 294-309.
- PAOLI, U. E.
 1983 Rome: its people life and customs. ET R.D. Macnaghten (London: Longman).
- PLASKOW, J.
 1980 'Blaming the Jews ... for the Birth of Patriarchy', Lilith, 7, pp. 11-13.
- PLATO
 1924 Laches; Protagoras, Meno; Euthydemus. (LCL. Greek-English translation W.R.M. Lamb. London: W. Heinemann).
 1930-5 The Republic. 2 vols. (LCL. Greek-English translation P. Shorey. London: W. Heinemann).
- PLUTARCH
 1914-26 Plutarch's Lives. 11 vols. (LCL. Greek-English translation B. Perrin. London: W. Heinemann).
- POMEROY, S. B.
 1973 'Selected Bibliography on Women in Antiquity', Arethusa, 6, pp. 125-157.
 1975 Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves: Women in classical antiquity. (New York: Schocken Books).
 1976 'The Relationship of the Married Woman to her Blood Relatives in Rome', Ancient Society, 7, pp. 215-227.
 1984 Women in Hellenistic Egypt: from Alexander to Cleopatra. (New York: Schocken Books).
- PRYTZ JOHANSEN, J.
 1975 'The Thesmophoria as a Woman's festival', Tremenos, 11, pp. 78-87.
- RAWSON, B.
 1966 'Family Life among the Lower Classes at Rome in the First Two Centuries of the Empire', Classical Philology, 61, pp. 71-83.
- REDFIELD, J.
 1978 'The Women of Sparta', Classical Journal, 73, pp. 146-161.
- RICHLIN, A.
 1984-5 'Invective Against Women in Roman Satire', Arethusa, 17-18, pp. 67-80.
- RICHTER, D. C.
 1971 'The Position of Women in Classical Athens', Classical Journal, 67, pp. 1-8.
- ROBERTS, L.
 1979 'The Unutterable Symbols of Ge-Themis', HTR, 68, pp. 73-82.
- SEGAL, C.
 1978 'The Menace of Dionysus: Sex Roles and Reversals in Euripides Bacchae', Arethusa, 11, pp. 185-202.
- SELTMAN, C. T.
 1955 'The Status of Women in Athens', Greece and Rome, 2, pp. 119-124.
 1956 Women in antiquity. (London: Thames and Hudson).

- SKOV, G. E.
1975 'The Priestess of Demeter and Kore and her Role in the Initiation of Women at the Festival of Haloa at Eleusis', Tremenos, 11, pp. 78-87.
- TARN, W. W./GRIFFITH, G. T.
1953 Hellenistic Civilisation. (London: E. Arnold and Co.).
- THOMAS, J. A. C.
1975 The Institutes of Justinian: Text, Translation and Commentary. (Capetown: Juta and Co.).
- TREGGIARI, S.
1976 'Jobs for Women', American Journal of Ancient History, 1, pp. 76-104.
- WENDER, D.
1973 'Plato: Misogynist, Paedophile and Feminist', Arethusa, 6, pp. 75-90.
- WHITE, R. E.
1898 'Women in Ptolemaic Egypt', JHS, 18, pp. 238-266.
- WIEAND, H. E.
1917 'Position of Women in the Late Roman Republic', Classical Journal, 12, pp. 378-392, 423-437.
- WOLFF, H. J.
1944 'Marriage Law and Family Organisation in Ancient Athens: A Study in the Interrelation of Public and Private Law in the Greek City', Traditio, 2, pp. 43-95.
- XENOPHON
1923 Memorabilia and Oeconomicus. (LCL. Greek-English translation E.C. Marchant. London: W. Heinemann).
- YARBOROUGH, A.
1976 'The Christianization of Rome: The Example of Roman Women', CH, 45, pp. 149-165.
- ZEITLIN, F.
1982 'Cultic Models of the Female: Rites of Dionysus and Demeter', Arethusa, 15, pp. 129-158.
- ZINSERLING, V.
1973 Women in Greece and Rome. ET L.A. James (New York: Abner Schram).

(iv) Women in the Early Church

- ALLISON, R. W.
1988 'Let Women be Silent in the Churches (I Cor. 14:33b-36). What did Paul Really Say and What did it Mean?', JSNT, 32 pp. 27-60.
- BAILEY, D. S.
1959 The man-woman relationship in Christian thought. (London: Longmans).
- BALCH, D. L.
1973-4 'Backgrounds of 1 Cor. VII: Sayings of the Lord in Q; Moses as an Ascetic ΘΕΙΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ in II Cor. III', NTS, 18 pp. 351-364.
1981 Let Wives be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter. (SBLMS 26, Chico Calif.: Scholars Press).
1983 '1 Cor 7:32-35 and Stoic Debates about Marriage, Anxiety and Distraction', JBL, 102 pp. 429-439.
- BARRE, M. L.
1975-6 'To Marry or to Burn: Πυρρσθαι in 1 Cor 7,9', CBQ, 36 pp. 193-202.

- BARRETT, C. K.
1971 A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. (London: A & C Black).
- BAUER, W.
1972 Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity. (London: SCM).
- BEDALE, S.
1954 'The Meaning of *Kephalē* in the Pauline Epistles', JTS, 5 pp. 211-215.
- BETZ, H. D.
1979 Galatians: a commentary on Paul's Letter to the churches in Galatia. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
- BORNKAMM, G.
1975 Paul. (London: Hodder & Stoughton).
- BRANDON, S. G. F.
1951 The Fall of Jerusalem. (London: SPCK).
- BOUCHER, M.
1969 'Some Unexpected Parallels to 1 Cor 11,11-12 and Gal 3,28: The New Testament and the Role of Women', CBQ, 31 pp. 50-58.
- BOUSSETT, W.
1970 Kyrios Christos. (Nashville: Abingdon).
- BROOTEN, B.
1977 '"Junia ... Outstanding among the Apostles" (Romans 16:7)', in L. and A. Swidler eds. (1977), pp. 141-144.
- BRUCE, F. F.
1971 1 and 2 Corinthians. (London: Oliphants).
- BULTMANN, R.
1959 Theology of the New Testament. Volume 1. ET K. Grobel (London: SCM).
- CAIRD, G. B.
1972 'Paul and Woman's Liberty', BJRL, 54 pp. 268-281.
- CAMERON, A.
1980 'Neither Male nor Female', Greece and Rome, 27 pp. 60-68.
- CARROLL, E.
1975 'Women and Ministry', TS, 36 pp. 660-687.
- CARTLIDGE, D. R.
1975 '1 Corinthians 7 as a Foundation for a Christian Sex Ethic', JR, 55 pp. 220-234.
- CHADWICK, H.
1954-5 'All Things to All Men (1 Cor. IX.22)', NTS, 1 pp. 261-275.
- CLARK, E. A.
1977 'Sexual Politics in the Writings of John Chrysostom', ATR, 59 pp. 3-20.
1983 Women in the Early Church. (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier).
- CONZELMAN, H.
1975 1 Corinthians. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
- COPE, L.
1978 '1 Cor 11:2-16: One Step Further', JBL, 97 pp. 435-436.
- CROUCH, J. E.
1972 The origin and intention of the Colossian Haustefel. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- DAHL, N. A.
1967 'Paul and the Church at Corinth in 1 Cor. 1.10-4.21', in Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox. Eds. W.R. Farmer, C.F.D. Moule, R.R. Niebuhr (Cambridge: University Press).

- DANIÉLOU, J.
1961 The Ministry of Women in the Early Church. (London: Faith Press).
- DAUBE, D.
1956 The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. (London: Athlone Press).
- DAVIES, S. L.
1980 The Revolt of the Widows: The Social World of the Apocryphal Acts. (London: Feffer & Simons).
- DIX, G.
1968 Hippolytus, Apostolic Tradition. (London: SPCK).
- DUNN, J. D. G.
1977 Unity and Diversity in the New Testament. (London: SCM Press).
- ELLIOT, J. K.
1972-3 'Paul's Teaching on Marriage in 1 Corinthians: Some Problems Considered', NTS, 19 pp. 219-225.
- ELLIS, E. E.
1970-1 'Paul and His Co-Workers', NTS, 17 pp. 437-452.
- EVANS, M.
1983 Woman in the Bible. (Exeter: Paternoster Press).
- FEUILLET, A.
1975 'La dignité et le rôle de la femme d'après quelques textes pauliniens', NTS, 21 pp. 157-191.
- FILSON, F. V.
1939 'The Significance of the Early House Churches', JBL, 58 pp. 105-112.
- FITZMYER, J. A.
1957-8 'A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor XI.10', NTS, 4 pp. 48-58.
- FORD, J. M.
1963-4 'Levirate Marriage in St Paul (1 Cor. VII)', NTS, 10 pp. 361-365.
1964-5 'St Paul, the Philogamist (1 Cor. vii in early Patristic Exegesis)', NTS, 11 pp. 326-348.
1967 'The Rabbinic Background of St Paul's Use of ἐπὶ ἑκκατὸν (1 Cor 7:36)', JJS, 17 pp. 89-91.
1977 'Women Leaders in the New Testament', in L and A Swidler eds. (1977), pp. 132-134.
- GAGER, J. G.
1975 Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity. (Engelwood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall).
- GARDINER, A. M., ed.
1976 Women and Catholic Priesthood: An Expanded Vision. (New York: Paulist Press).
- GOTTWALD, N. K., ed.
1983 The Bible and Liberation: political and social hermeneutics. (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books).
- GRAHAM, R. W.
1976 'Women in the Pauline Churches: A Review Article', Lexington Theological Quarterly, 11 pp. 25-34.
- GRYSON, R.
1976 The Ministry of Women in the Early Church. (Collegville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press).
- HALL, B.
1974 'Church in the World', TT, 31 pp. 50-55.

- HOOKER, M. D.
1963-4 'Authority on her Head: An Examination of 1 Cor. XI.10', NTS, 10 pp. 410-416.
- HURD, J. C.
1965 The Origin of 1 Corinthians. (London: SPCK).
- HURLEY, J. B.
1972-3 'Did Paul Require Veils or the Silence of Women? A Consideration of 1 Cor. 11:2-16 and 1 Cor. 14:33b-36', WTJ, 35 pp. 190-220.
- 1981 Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective. Leicester: Intervarsity Press).
- ISAKSSON, A.
1965 Marriage and ministry in the new temple. ET N. Tomkinson (Copenhagen: Lund).
- JAUBERT, M. A.
1971-2 'Le voile des femmes (1 Cor. xi.2-16)', NTS, 18 pp. 419-430.
- JENKINS, C.
1908 'Origen on 1 Corinthians', JTS, 9 pp. 500-501.
- JEWETT, P. K.
1976 Man as Male and Female. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
- JEWETT, R.
1970 'Conflicting movements in the early church as reflected in Philippians', NovT, 12 pp. 362-390.
- 1979 'The Sexual Liberation of the Apostle Paul', JAAR, 47 pp. 55-87.
- KÄSEMANN, E.
1969 'On the Subject of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic', in New Testament questions of today. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press), pp. 108-137.
- KRAEMER, R. S.
1980 'The Conversion of Women to Ascetic Forms of Christianity', Signs, 6 pp. 298-307.
- KÜMMEL, W. G.
1975 Introduction to the New Testament. ET H.C. Kee (London: SCM).
- KÜRZINGER, J.
1978 'Frau und Mann nach 1 Kor 11.11f.', BZ, 22 pp. 270-275.
- LAKE, K.
1970 The Apostolic Fathers. LCL, 2 volumes (London: W. Heinemann Ltd.).
- LEMAIRE, A.
1973 'The Ministries in the New Testament: Recent Research', BTB, 3 pp. 133-166.
- LEONARD, E. A.
1950 'St. Paul on the Status of Women', CBQ, 12 pp. 311-320.
- LIGHTFOOT, J. B.
1887 'St Paul and the Three', Excursus in St Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. (London: MacMillan & Co.).
- LOEWE, R.
1966 The Position of Women in Judaism. (London: SPCK).
- LOHSE, E.
1971 Colossians and Philemon. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
- LÖSCH, S.
1947 'Christliche Frauen in Korinth', TQ, 127 pp. 216-261.
- McNAMARA, J. A.
1976 'Sexual Equality and the Cult of Virginity in Early Christian Thought', Feminist Studies, 3 pp. 145-158.
- 1979 'Wives and Widows in Early Christian Thought', International Journal of Women's Studies, 2 pp. 575-592.

- MARTIN, W. J.
1970 '1 Corinthians 11:2-16: An Interpretation', in Apostolic History and the Gospel. Eds. W.W. Gasque, R.P. Martin (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), pp. 231-241.
- MEARNS, C. L.
1984 'Early Eschatological Development in Paul: The Evidence of 1 Corinthians', JSNT, 22 pp. 19-35.
- MEIER, J. P.
1978 'On the Veiling of Hermeneutics (1 Cor 11:2-16)', CBQ, 40 pp. 212-226.
- MEEKS, W. A.
1974 'The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity', HR, 13 pp. 165-208.
- MOISER, J.
1983 'A Reassessment of Paul's View of Marriage with reference to 1 Cor. 7', JSNT, 18 pp. 103-122.
- MOLLENKOTT, V. R.
1981 Women, Men and the Bible. (Nashville: Abingdon).
- MUNCK, J.
1959 Paul and the Salvation of Mankind. (London: SCM).
- MUNRO, W.
1974 'Patriarchy and Charismatic Community in 'Paul'', in Women and Religion: Papers of the Working Group on Women and Religion, 1972-1973. Eds. J. Plaskow, J.A. Romero. (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press), pp. 189-198.
- MURPHY-O'CONNOR, J.
1976 'The Non-Pauline Character of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16?', JBL, 95, pp. 615-621.
1980 'Sex and Logic in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16', CBQ, 42, pp. 482-500.
1988 '1 Corinthians 11:2-16 Once Again', CBQ, 50 pp. 265-274.
- NIEDERWIMMER, K.
1974 'Zur Analyse der asketischen Motivation in 1Kor 7', TLZ, 99, pp. 241-248.
- OSTER, R.
1988 'When Men Wore Veils to Worship: the Historical Context of 1 Corinthians 11.4', NTS, 34 pp. 481-505.
- PADGETT, A.
1984 'Paul on the Women in the Church: The Contradictions of Coiffure in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16', JSNT, 20, pp. 69-86.
- PAGELS, E.
1974 'Paul and Women: A Response to Recent Discussion', JAAR, 42, pp. 538-549.
1976 'What became of God the Mother? Conflicting Images of God in Early Christianity', Signs, Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 2, pp. 293-303.
1980 The Gnostic Gospels. (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson Ltd.).
- PARVEY, C. F.
1974 'The Theology and Leadership of Women in the New Testament', in R.R. Ruether ed. (1974), pp. 117-149.
- PHIPPS, W. E.
1982 'Is Paul's Attitude towards Sexual Relations contained in 1 Cor. 7.1?', NTS, 28, pp. 125-131.
- POMEROY, S. B.
1975 Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves. (New York: Schocken Books).

- PRUSAK, B. P.
 1974 'Woman: Seductive Siren and Source of Sin?', in R.R. Ruether ed. (1974), pp. 89-116.
 1977 'Use the Other Door: Stand at the End of the Line', in Swidler ed. (1977), pp. 81-84.
- ROBERTSON, A./PLUMMER, A.
 1914 A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark).
- RUETHER, R. R.
 1972 Liberation Theology. (New York: Paulist Press).
 1974 'Misogynism and Virginal Feminism in the fathers of the Church', in R.R. Ruether ed. (1974), pp. 150-183.
 1978 'The Subordination and Liberation of Women in Christian Theology: St. Paul and Sarah Grimke', Soundings, 61, pp. 168-181.
 1979 'Mothers of the Church: Ascetic Women in the Late Patristic Age', in Ruether/McLaughlin 1979, pp. 71-98.
- RUETHER, R. R., ed.
 1974 Religion and Sexism: Images of Woman in the Jewish and Christian Traditions. (New York: Simon and Schuster).
- RUETHER, R. R./McLAUGHLIN, E., eds.
 1979 Women of Spirit: Female Leadership in the Jewish and Christian Traditions. (New York: Simon and Schuster).
- SCHMITHALS, W.
 1962 Gnosticism in Corinth. ET J.E. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon Press).
 1972 Paul and the Gnostics. ET J.E. Steely (New York: Abingdon Press).
- SCHOEPS, H. J.
 1961 Paul: the Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History. (London: Lutterworth).
- SCHOTTROFF, L.
 1983 'Women as Followers of Jesus in New Testament Times: An Exercise in Social-Historical Exegesis of the Bible', in Gottwald ed. (1983), pp. 418-427.
- SCHRAGE, W.
 1976 'Zur Frontstellung der paulinischen Ehebewertung in 1 Kor 7,1-7', ZNW, 67, pp. 214-234.
- SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, E.
 1979a 'Word, Spirit and Power: Women in the Early Christian Communities', in Ruether/McLaughlin eds. (1979), pp. 29-70.
 1979b 'Women in the Early Christian Movement', in Women Spirit Rising. Eds. C.P. Christ, A.J. Plaskow (New York: Harper & Row), pp. 84-92.
 1982 'Feminist Theology and New Testament Interpretation', JSOT, 22, pp. 32-46.
 1983a In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins. (London: SCM).
 1983b 'You are not to be Called Father', in Gottwald ed. (1983), pp. 394-417.
 1987 'Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in I Corinthians', NTS, 33 pp. 386-403.
- SCROGGS, R.
 1966 The Last Adam. (London: Basil Blackwell).
 1972a 'Paul and the Eschatological Woman', JAAR, 40, pp. 283-303.
 1972b 'Paul: Chauvinist or Liberationist?', Christian Century, 89, pp. 307-309.

- 1974 'Paul and the Eschatological Woman: Revisited', JAAR, 42, pp. 532-549.
- 1975 'The Earliest Christian Communities as a Sectarian Movement', in Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Volume 2. (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp. 1-23.
- SNYDER, C. F.
1976-7 'The Tobspruch in the New Testament', NTS, 23, pp. 117-120.
- STAGG, E./STAGG, F.
1978 Woman in the World of Jesus. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press).
- STENDAHL, K.
1966 The Bible and the Role of Women: A Case Study in Hermeneutics. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
- STEPHENSON, J., ed.
1968 A New Eusebius. (London: SPCK).
- SWIDLER, L./SWIDLER, A., eds.
1977 Women Priests. (New York: Paulist Press).
- THEISSEN, G.
1970 'Itinerant Radicalism: The Tradition of Jesus Sayings from the Perspective of the Sociology of Literature', in Radical Religion: The Bible and Liberation. (Community for Religious Research and Education).
- THOMAS, W. D.
1972 'The Place of Women in the Church at Philippi', ExpTim, 83, pp. 117-120.
- TRIBLE, P.
1978 God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
- TROMPF, G. W.
1980 'On attitudes toward women in Paul and Paulinist literature: 1 Corinthians 11:3-16 and its context', CBQ, 42, pp. 196-215.
- VÖÖBUS, A.
1979 The Didascalia apostolorum in Syriac. (Louvain: Secretariat Du Corpus SCO Waversebann, 49).
- WALKER, W. O.
1975 '1 Corinthians 11:2-16 and Paul's Views Regarding Women', JBL, 94, pp. 94-110.
1983 'The "Theology of Woman's Place" and the "Paulinist" Tradition', Semeia, 28, pp. 101-112.
- WHITELEY, D. E. H.
1974 The Theology of St. Paul. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).
- WILSON, R. McL.
1977-8 'Slippery Words: Gnosis, Gnostic, Gnosticism', ExpTim, 89, pp. 296-301.
- WITHERINGTON, B.
1981 'Rite and Rights for Women - Galatians 3.28', NTS, 27, pp. 593-604.
1984 Women in the Ministry of Jesus. (Cambridge: University Press).

CHAPTER TWO

- ACHTEMEIER, P. J.
1970 'Toward the Isolation of pre-Markan Miracle Catene', JBL, 89 pp. 265-291.
1972 'The Origin and Function of the pre-Markan Miracle Catene', JBL, 91 pp. 198-221.

- ALLEN, W. C.
 1946 'St. Mark XVI:8. 'They Were Afraid'. Why?', JTS, 47 pp. 46-49.
 1947 '"Fear" in St. Mark', JTS, 48 pp. 201-203.
- ALAND, K.
 1970 'Die wiedergefundene Markusschluß? Eine Bemerkung zur textkritischen Arbeit', ZThK, 67 pp. 3-13.
- ALSUP, J. E.
 1975 The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition. (London: SPCK).
- BARRETT, C. K.
 1965 The Gospel According to John. (London: SPCK).
- BEARDSLEE, W.
 1981 Literary Criticism of the New Testament. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
- BENOIT, P.
 1969 The Passion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ. ET B. Weatherhead (London: Darton, Longman and Todd).
- BEST, E.
 1965 The Temptation and Passion: the Markan Soteriology. (Cambridge: University Press).
 1970 'Discipleship in Mark: Mark 8.22-10.52', SJT, 23, pp. 323-337.
 1974 'Mark's Preservation of the Tradition', in M. Sabbe, ed. (1974), pp. 119-133.
 1975-6 'Mark III.20, 21, 31-35', NTS, 22 pp. 309-319.
 1976-7 'The Role of the Disciples in Mark', NTS, 23 pp. 377-401.
 1978 'Peter in the Gospel according to Mark', CBQ, 40, pp. 547-558.
 1981 Following Jesus. Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark. (Sheffield: JSOT Press).
 1983 Mark. The Gospel as Story. (Edinburgh: T and T Clark).
- BICKERMANN, E.
 1924 'Das leere Grab', ZNW, 23, pp. 281-292.
- BIRD, C. H.
 1953 'Some $\chi\alpha\pi$ clauses in St. Mark's Gospel', JTS, 4, pp. 171-187.
- BIRDSALL, J. N.
 1975 'The Last Twelve Verses of Mark by W.R. Farmer', Review Article, JTS, 26 pp. 151-60.
- BLACK, C. C.
 1988 'The Quest for Mark the Redactor: Why has it Been Pursued and What has it Taught Us?', JSNT, 33, pp. 19-39.
- BODE, E. L.
 1970 The First Easter Morning. The Gospel Accounts of the Women's Visit to the Tomb of Jesus. (Rome: Biblical Institute Press).
- BOOBYER, G. H.
 1952-3 'Galilee and the Galileans in St. Mark's Gospel', BJRL, 35 pp. 334-348.
 1953 'The Miracle of the Loaves and the Gentiles in St. Mark's Gospel', SJT, 6 pp. 77-87.
- BOOMERSHINE, T. A.
 1981a 'The Narrative Technique of Mark 16:8', JBL, 102 pp. 213-223.
 1981b 'Mark 16:8 and the Apostolic Commission', JBL, 102 pp. 225-239.
- BOOTH, W. C.
 1961 The Rhetoric of Fiction. (Chicago: University Press).

- BROER, I.
1972 Die Urgemeinde und das Grab Jesu. Eine Analyse der Grablegungsgeschichte im Neuen Testament. (Munich: Kösel).
- BROWN, R. E.
1972 The Gospel According to John. (London: G. Chapman).
1988 'The Burial of Jesus (Mark 15:42-47)', CBQ, 50, pp. 233-245.
- BRUN, L.
1914 'Der Auferstehungsbericht des Markusevangeliums', Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 87, pp. 346-388.
- BULTMANN, R.
1963 The History of the Synoptic Tradition. ET J. Marsh (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).
- BURKILL, T. A.
1963 Mysterious Revelation. An Examination of the Philosophy of St. Mark's Gospel. (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press).
1966 'The Syrophonician Woman. The Congruence of Mark 7.24-31', ZNW, 57, pp. 23-37.
1967 'The Historical Development of the Story of the Syrophonician Woman (Mark vii:24-31)', NovT, 9 pp. 161-177.
- CADBURY, H. J.
1915 'Mark 16.8', JBL, 34, pp. 344-345.
- CARRINGTON, P.
1952 The Primitive Christian Calendar. (Cambridge: University Press).
- CATCHPOLE, D.
1977 'The Fearful Silence of the Women at the Tomb', Journal of Theology for Southern Africa, 18 pp. 3-10.
- CONZELMANN, H.
1961 The Theology of Saint Luke. ET G. Buswell (London: Faber and Faber).
- CRAIG, W. L.
1985 'The Historicity of the Empty Tomb of Jesus', NTS, 31 pp. 39-67.
- CRANFIELD, C. E. B.
1952 'St. Mark 16.1-8', SJT, 5, pp. 282-298.
1966 The Gospel according to Saint Mark. (Cambridge: University Press).
- CREED, J. M.
1930 'The Conclusion of the Gospel according to St. Mark', JTS, 31, pp. 175-180.
- CROSSAN, J. D.
1973 'Mark and the Relatives of Jesus', NovT, 15 pp. 81-113.
1976 'The Empty Tomb and the Absent Lord (Mark 16:1-8)', in Kelber ed. (1976), pp. 135-152.
- CULPEPPER, R. A.
1978 'The Passion and Resurrection in Mark', RevExp, 75 pp. 583-600.
- DANIÉLOU, J.
1968 'The Empty Tomb', Month, n.s. 39, pp. 215-222.
- DERRETT, J. M. D.
1973 'Law in the New Testament: The Syrophoenician Woman and the Centurion at Capernaum', NovT, 15, pp. 161-186.
- DEWEY, J.
1973 'The Literary Structure of the Controversy Stories in Mark 2:1-3:6', JBL, 92, pp. 394-401.

- DEWEY, K. E.
1976 'Peter's Curse and Cursed Peter', in Kelber ed. (1976), pp. 96-114.
- DIBELIUS, M.
1934 From Tradition to Gospel. ET B. Woolf (London: Nicholson and Watson).
- DONAHUE, J. R.
1978 'Jesus as the Parable of God in the Gospel of Mark', Int, 32, pp. 369-386.
- DORMEYER, D.
1974 Die Passion Jesus als Verhaltensmodell. (NTAbhNF 11, Munster: Aschendorff).
- ELLIOTT, J. K.
1971 'The Text and Language of the Endings to Mark's Gospel', ThZ, 27 pp. 255-262.
- EVANS, C. F.
1954 'I will go before you into Galilee', JTS, 5 pp. 3-18.
1970 Resurrection and the New Testament. (London: SCM).
- FARMER, W. R.
1974 The Last Twelve Verses of Mark. (Cambridge: University Press).
1976 The Synoptic Problem. (Dillsboro, North Carolina: Western North Carolina Press).
- FARRER, A.
1951 A Study in St. Mark. (London: Dacre Press).
- FILSON, F. E.
1939 'The Significance of the Early House Churches', JBL, 58 pp. 105-112.
- FLEDDERMANN, H.
1979 'The Flight of the Naked Young Man (Mark 14:51-2)', CBQ, 41 pp. 412-418.
- FOWLER, R. M.
1981 Loaves and Fishes. The Function of the Feeding Stories in the Gospel of Mark. (Chico, California: Scholars Press).
- FULLER, R. H.
1980 The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives. (London: SPCK).
- GÄRTNER, B.
1961 The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas. ET E.J. Sharpe (London: Collins).
- GRAB, H.
1970 Ostergeschehen und Osterberichte. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- GRÄSSER, E.
1969-70 'Jesus in Nazareth (Mark VI.1-6a)', NTS, 16 pp. 1-23.
- HAMILTON, N. Q.
1965 'Resurrection Tradition and the Composition of Mark', JBL, 84 pp. 415-421.
- HARRISVILLE, R. A.
1966 'The Woman of Canaan. A Chapter in the History of Exegesis', Int, 20 pp. 274-287.
- HAWKIN, D. J.
1972 'The Incomprehension of the Disciples in the Marcan Redaction', JBL, 91, pp. 491-500.
- HENDRICKX, H.
1984 The Passion Narratives of the Synoptic Gospels. (London: G. Chapman).

- HENGEL, M.
1963 'Maria Magdalena und die Frauen als Zeugen', Abraham unser Vater (Fest. fur O. Michel. Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp. 243-256.
- HERBERT, G.
1962 'The Resurrection-Narratives in St. Mark's Gospel', SJT, 15 pp. 66-73.
- HORST, P. W. van der.
1972 'Can a Book end with γὰρ? A Note on Mark XVI.8', JTS, 23 pp. 121-124.
- IRELAND HASLER, J.
1933-4 'The Incident of the Syrophoenician Woman (Matt. xv.21-28; Mark vii.24-30', ExpTim, 45 pp. 459-461.
- JEREMIAS, J.
1974 The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. ET N. Perrin (London: SCM Press).
- KÄHLER, M.
1964 The So-called Historical Jesus and the Historic, Biblical Christ. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
- KEE, H. C.
1977 Community of the New Age. Studies in Mark's Gospel. (London: SCM Press).
- KELBER, W. H.
1972 'Mark 14.32-42: Gethsemane. Passion Christology and Discipleship Failure', ZNW, 63 pp. 166-187.
1974 The Kingdom in Mark. A New Place and a New Time. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
1985 'Apostolic Tradition and the Form of the Gospel', in Discipleship in the New Testament Ed. F.F. Segovia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press), pp. 24-46.
- KELBER, W. H., ed.
1976 The Passion in Mark. Studies on Mark 14-16. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
- KERMODE, F.
1969 'The Structures of Fiction', Modern Language Notes, 84, pp. 891-915.
- KNOX, W. L.
1942 'The Ending of St. Mark's Gospel', HTR, 35 pp. 13-23.
- KRAELING, C. H.
1915 'A Philological Note on Mark 16.8', JBL, 34, pp. 357-358.
- KUHN, K. G.
1952-3 'Jesus in Gethsemane', EvTh, 12 pp. 260-285.
- KÜMMEL, W. G.
1979 Introduction to the New Testament. ET H.C. Kee (London: SCM Press).
- LAMBRECHT, J.
1974 'The Relatives of Jesus in Mark', NovT, 16 pp. 241-258.
- LIGHTFOOT, R. H.
1938 Locality and Doctrine in the Gospel. (London: Hodder and Stoughton).
1962 The Gospel Message of St. Mark. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- LILLY, J.
1940 'Alleged Discrepancies in the Gospel Accounts of the Resurrection', CBQ, 2, pp. 98-111.
- LINCOLN, A. T.
1989 'The Promise and the Failure: Mark 16:7, 8', JBL, 108, pp. 283-300.

- LINDEMANN, A.
1979-80 'Die Osterbotschaft des Markus. Zur Theologischen Interpretation von Mark 16.1-8', NTS, 26, pp. 298-317.
- LINNEMANN, E.
1969 'Der (wiedergefundene) Markusschluß', ZThK, 66 pp. 255-287.
- LOHMEYER, E.
1936 Galiläa und Jerusalem. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht).
- LOHSE, E.
1964 History of the Suffering and Death of Jesus. (ET. H.O. Dietrich, Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
- MCDONALD, J. I. H.
1989 The Resurrection: Narrative and Belief. (London: SPCK).
- McINDOE, J. H.
1969 'The Young Man at the Tomb', ExpTim, 80 p. 125.
- MAGNESS, J. L.
1986 Sense and Absence. (Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- MAHONEY, R.
1974 Two disciples at the tomb: the background and message of John 20.1-10. (Frankfurt: Peter Lang).
- MAILLOUX, S.
1977 'Reader-Response Criticism?', Genre, 10 pp. 413-431.
- MANGAN, E. A.
1945 'The Women at the Tomb', CBQ, 7, pp. 191-200.
- MARXSEN, W.
1969 Mark the Evangelist. (Nashville: Abingdon Press).
1970 The Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth. (London: SCM Press).
- MEAGHER, J. C.
1975 'Die Form-und Redaktionsungeschickliche Methoden: The Principle of Clumsiness and the Gospel of Mark', JAAR, 43 pp. 459-472.
- METZGER, B. M.
1964 The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption and Restoration. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- MEYE, R. P.
1968 Jesus and the Twelve. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
1969 'Mark 16:8 - The Ending of Mark's Gospel', BR, 14 pp. 33-43.
- MINEAR, P. S.
1972 'Audience Criticism and Markan Ecclesiology', in O. Cullman Fs. Neues Testament und Geschichte. Eds. H. Baltensweiler, B. Reicke. (Zürich/Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck)), pp. 79-89.
- MOULE, C. F. D.
1955-6 'St. Mark XVI.8 once more', NTS, 2, pp. 58-59.
- MUNRO, W.
1982 'Women Disciples in Mark?', CBQ, 44 pp. 225-241.
- NAUCK, W.
1956 'Die Bedeutung des leeren Grabes für den Glauben an den Auferstandenen', ZNW, 47 pp. 243-267.
- NEIRYNCK, F.
1972 Duality in Mark. Contributions to the Study of the Markan Redaction. (BETL 31, Leuven: University Press).
- NINEHAM, D. E.
1972 St. Mark. (London: Penguin Books).
- OTTLEY, R. R.
1926 'ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ Mark 16:8', JTS, 27, pp. 407-409.
- PANNENBERG, W.
1980 Jesus. God and Man. (London: SCM Press).

- PERRIN, N.
 1971 'The Christology of Mark: A Study in Methodology', JR, 51 pp. 173-187.
 1972a 'The Evangelist as Author: Reflections on Method in the Study and Interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts', Biblical Research, 17 pp. 5-19.
 1972b 'Historical Criticism, Literary Criticism and Hermeneutics. The Interpretation of the Parables of Jesus and the Gospel of Mark Today', JR, 52 pp. 361-375.
 1974 What is Redaction Criticism?. (London SCM Press).
 1977 The Resurrection Narratives. (London: SCM Press).
- PESCH, R.
 1974 'Der Schluss der vormarkinische Passionsgeschichte und des Markusevangeliums', in Sabbe ed. (1974), pp. 365-409.
- PETERSEN, N. R.
 1978a Literary Criticism for New Testament Critics. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
 1978b 'Point of View in Mark's Narrative', Semeia, 12 pp. 97-121.
 1980 'When is the End not the End? Literary Reflections on the Ending of Mark's Narrative', Int, 34 pp. 151-166.
- PRYKE, E. J.
 1978 Redactional Style in the Marcan Gospel. (SNTSMS 33, Cambridge: University Press).
- REEDY, C. J.
 1972 'Mk 8:31-11:10 and the Gospel ending', CBQ, 34, pp. 188-197.
- RHOADS, D./MICHIE, D.
 1982a Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
- RHOADS, D.
 1982b 'Narrative Criticism and the Gospel of Mark', JAAR, 50 pp. 411-434.
- RICHARDSON, L. J. D.
 1948 'St. Mark XVI.8', JTS, 49 pp. 144-145.
- RINGE, S. H.
 1985 'A Gentile Woman's Story', in Feminist Interpretations of the Bible. Ed. L.M. Russell (Oxford: B. Blackwell), pp. 65-72.
- ROBBINS, V. K.
 1976 'Last Meal: Preparation, Betrayal and Absence (Mark 14:12-25)', Kelber, ed. (1976), pp. 21-40.
- SABBE, M, ed.
 1974 L'Evangile selon Marc. Tradition et Rédaction. (BETL 34, Leuven: University Press).
- SCHENKE, L.
 1968 Auferstehungsverkündigung und leeres Grab. (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk).
- SCHMITHALS, W.
 1972 'Der Markusschluß, die Verklärungsgeschichte und die Aussendung der Zwölf', ZThK, 69 pp. 379-411.
- SCHMITT, J. J.
 1981 'Women in Mark's Gospel: An Early Christian View of Woman's Role', The Bible Today, 19 pp. 228-233.
- SCHOTTROFF, L.
 1982 'Maria Magdalena und die Frauen am Grabe Jesu', EvTh, 42 pp. 3-25.
- SCHREIBER, J.
 1961 'Die Christologie des Markusevangeliums', ZThK, 58 pp. 154-183.

- SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, E.
 1982 'Feminist Theology and New Testament Interpretation', JSOT, 22 pp. 32-46.
- SCHWEIZER, E.
 1971 The Good News According to Mark. (London: SPCK).
 1982 'Scheidungsrecht der jüdischen Frau? Weibliche Jünger Jesu?', EvTh, 42, pp. 294-300.
 1985 'Mark's Theological Achievement', in W.R. Telford, ed., The Interpretation of Mark. (London: SPCK), pp. 42-63.
- SCROGGS, R./GROFF, K. I.
 1973 'Baptism in Mark: Dying and Rising with Christ', JBL, 92 pp. 536-548.
- SELVIDGE, M. J.
 1983 '"And Those Who Followed Feared" (Mark 10:32)', CBQ, 45, pp. 396-400.
- SMART, J. D.
 1938-9 'Jesus, the Syro-Phoenician Woman - and the Disciples', ExpTim, 50 pp. 469-472.
- SMITH, D. S.
 1900-1 'Our Lord's Hard Saying to the Syro-Phoenician Woman', ExpTim, 12 pp. 319-321.
- STANTON, G. N.
 1975 'Form Criticism Revisited', in M.D. Hooker, C.J.A. Hickling eds., What about the New Testament?. (London: SCM Press), pp. 13-27.
- STEIN, R. H.
 1970 'The 'Redaktionsgeschichtlich' Investigation of a Markan Seam (Mc 1.21f.)', ZNW, 61 pp. 70-94.
 1971 'The Proper Methodology for Ascertaining a Markan Redaction History', NovT, 13 pp. 181-198.
 1973-4 'A Short Note on Mark XIV.28 and XVI.7', NTS, 20 pp. 445-452.
- STREETER, B. H.
 1936 The Four Gospels. (London: MacMillan and Co.).
- STRECKER, G.
 1968 'The Passion and Resurrection Predictions in Mark's Gospel', Int, 22 pp. 421-442.
- STRUTHERS MALBON, E.
 1982 'Galilee and Jerusalem: History and Literature in Markan Interpretation', CBQ, 44, pp. 242-255.
 1983 'Fallible Followers: Women and Men in the Gospel of Mark', Semeia, 28 pp. 29-48.
 1985 '"TH OIKIA AYTOY": Mark 2.15 in Context', NTS, 31 pp. 282-292.
- TANNEHILL, R. C.
 1975 The Sword of His Mouth. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
 1977 'The Disciples in Mark: the Function of a Narrative Role', JR, 57 pp. 386-405.
 1979 'The Gospel of Mark as Narrative Christology', Semeia, 16 pp. 57-95.
- TUCKETT, C. M.
 1983 The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis. (Cambridge: University Press).
- TAYLOR, V.
 1966 The Gospel According to St. Mark. (London: MacMillan).
- TURNER, C. H.
 1924-5 'Marcan Usage: Notes, Critical and Exegetical, on the Second Gospel', JTS, 26, pp. 225-240.

- 1926-7 'Marcan Usage: Notes, Critical and Exegetical, on the Second Gospel', JTS, 28, pp. 9-30.
- TROMPF, G. W.
1971-2 'The First Resurrection Appearance and the Ending of Mark's Gospel', NTS, 18 pp. 308-330.
- TYSON, J. B.
1961 'The Blindness of the Disciples in Mark', JBL, 80 pp. 261-268.
- VANHOYE, A.
1971 'La fuite du jeune homme nu (Mc 14,51-52)', Bib, 52, pp. 401-406.
- WAETJEN, H.
1965 'The Ending of Mark and the Gospel's Shift in Eschatology', ASTI, 41 pp. 114-131.
- WANSBROUGH, H.
1971-2 'Mark iii.21 - Was Jesus out of his mind?', NTS, 18, pp. 233-235.
- WEEDEN, T. J.
1968 'The Heresy that necessitated Mark's Gospel', ZNW, 59 pp. 145-158.
1971 Mark - Traditions in Conflict. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
- WENHAM, J. W.
1984 Easter Enigma. (Exeter: Paternoster Press).
- WILCKENS, U.
1968 'The Tradition-history of the Resurrection of Jesus', in C.F.D. Moule ed. The Significance of the Message of the Resurrection for Faith in Jesus Christ. (London: SCM), pp. 51-76..
1970 Auferstehung. Das biblische Auferstehungszeugnis untersucht und erklärt. (Stuttgart/Berlin: Kreuz).
- WILCOX, M.
1970-1 'The Denial-Sequence in Mark XIV.26-31, 66-72', NTS, 17, pp. 426-436.

CHAPTER THREE

- ALLEN, W. C.
1907 A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St Matthew. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark).
- ALSUP, J. E.
1975 The Post-Resurrection Appearance stories of the Gospel-Tradition. (London: SPCK).
- ANDERSON, J. C.
1983 'Matthew: Gender and Reading', Semeia 28, pp. 3-27.
- BARCLAY, W.
1975 The Gospel of Matthew. Vol. 2 (Edinburgh: St Andrews Press).
- BARRETT, C. K., ed.
1956 The New Testament Background: selected documents. (London: SPCK).
- BARRICK, W. B.
1977 'The Rich Man from Arimathea (Matt 27:57-60) and 1 QISA', JBL 96, pp. 235-239.
- BENOIT, P.
1969 The Passion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ. ET B. Weatherhead (London: DLT).

- BODE, E. L.
1970 The First Easter Morning. The Gospel Accounts of the Women's Visit to the Tomb of Jesus. (Rome: Biblical Institute Press).
- BORNKAMM, G./BARTH, G./HELD, H. J.
1972 Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew. ET P. Scott (London: SCM).
- BRANDON, S. G. F.
1979 The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth. (New York: Scarborough Books).
- BROER, I.
1972 Die Urgemeinde und das Grab Jesu. Eine Analyse der Grablegungsgeschichte in Neuen Testament. (Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 31. Munich: Kösel).
- BROWN, R. E.
1975 The Gospel According to John. (London: G. Chapman).
1987 'The Gospel of Peter and Canonical Priority', NTS, 33, pp. 321-343.
- BROWN, R. E./DONFRIED, K. P./FITZMYER, J. A./REUMANN, J., eds.
1978 Mary in the New Testament. (London: G. Chapman).
- CAMPENHAUSEN, H. F. von.
1958 Der Ablauf der Osterereignisse und das leere Grab. (Heidelberg: Carl Winter/Universitätsverlag).
- CRAIG, W. L.
1984 'The Guard at the Tomb', NTS 30, pp. 273-281.
1985 'The Historicity of the Empty Tomb of Jesus', NTS 31, pp. 39-67.
- CROSSAN, J. D.
1976 'The Empty Tomb and Absent Lord (Mark 16:1-8)', in The Passion in Mark: Studies in Mk 14-16. Ed. W.H. Kelber (Philadelphia: Fortress Press), pp. 135-152.
1985 Four Other Gospels. Shadows on the Contours of Canon. (Minneapolis: Winston).
- CURTIS, K. P. G.
1972 'Three Points of Contact between Matthew and John in the Burial and Resurrection Narratives', JTS 23, pp. 440-444.
- DAHL, N. A.
1983 'The Passion Narrative in Matthew', in Stanton ed. (1983), pp. 42-55.
- DANIÉLOU, J.
1968 'The Empty Tomb', Month 39, pp. 215-222.
- DOBSCHÜTZ, E. von
1983 'Matthew as Rabbi and Catechist', in Stanton ed. (1983), pp. 19-29.
- DRIVER, G. R.
1965 'Two Problems in the New Testament', JTS 16, pp. 327-337.
- EVANS, C. F.
1970 Resurrection and the New Testament. (London: SCM).
- FILSON, F. V.
1960 A Commentary on the Gospel According to St Matthew. (London: A & C Black).
- FREED, E. D.
1987 'Women in Matthew's Genealogy', JSNT 29, pp. 3-19.
- FULLER, R. H.
1980 The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives. (London: SPCK).
- GIBLIN, C. H.
1975 'Structural and Thematic Correlations in the Matthean Burial-Resurrection Narrative (Matt. xxvii 57-xxviii 20)', NTS 21, pp. 406-420.

- GOULDER, M. D.
1974 Midrash and Lection in Matthew. (London: SPCK).
- GRINTZ, J. M.
1960 'Hebrew as the Spoken and Written Language in the Last Days of the Second Temple', JBL 79, pp. 32-47.
- GRAB, H.
1970 Ostergeschehen und Osterberichte. (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- GUNDRY, R. H.
1967 The Use of the Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel. (Leiden: Brill).
1983 Matthew. A Commentary on his Critical and Theological Art. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
- HILL, D.
1972 The Gospel of Matthew. (London: Oliphants).
- JARVIS, C. A.
1988 'Matthew 28:1-10', Int 42, pp. 63-68.
- JEREMIAS, J.
1974 The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. ET N. Perrin (London: SCM).
1975 New Testament Theology. Vol. I ET J. Bowden (London: SCM).
1976 The Parables of Jesus. ET S.H. Hooke (London: SCM).
- JOHNSON, B. A.
1966 The Empty Tomb Tradition in the Gospel of Peter. PhD thesis Harvard University and summary HTR 59, pp. 447-488.
- KINGSBURY, J. D.
1978 'The Verb Akolouthein ("To Follow") as an Index of Matthew's view of his Community', JBL 97, pp. 56-73.
- KÜMMEL, W. G.
1979 Introduction to the New Testament. ET H.C. Kee (London: SCM).
- LINDARS, B.
1972 The Gospel of John. (London: Oliphants).
1960-1 'The Composition of John XX', NTS 7, pp. 142-147.
- LUZ, U.
1983 'The Disciples in the Gospel according to Matthew', in Stanton ed. (1983). pp. 98-128.
- McNEIL, A. H.
1915 The Gospel According to St Matthew. (London: Macmillan & Co).
- MAHONEY, R.
1974 Two disciples at the tomb: the background and message of John 20.1-10. (Frankfurt: Peter Lang).
- MICHEL, O.
1983 'The Conclusion of Matthew's Gospel: a Contribution to the History of the Easter Message', in Stanton ed. (1983), pp. 30-41.
- MUNRO, W.
1982 'Women Disciples in Mark?', CBQ 44, pp. 225-241.
- NEIRYNCK, F.
1968-9 'Les Femmes au Tombeau: Étude de la rédaction Matthéene (Matt xxviii 1-10)', NTS 15, pp. 168-190.
1984 'John and the Synoptics: The Empty Tomb Stories', NTS 30, pp. 161-187.
- PERRIN, N.
1977 The Resurrection Narratives. (London: SCM Press).
- PLUMMER, A.
1909 An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St Matthew. (New York: Scribners).

- ROBBINS, V. K.
 1987 'The Woman who Touched Jesus' Garment: Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of the Synoptic Accounts', NTS 33, pp. 502-515.
- SCHWEIZER, E.
 1982 The good news according to Matthew. (London: SPCK).
 1983 'Matthew's Church', in Stanton ed. (1983). pp. 129-155.
- SCHNIEWIND, J.
 1956 Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- STANTON, G., ed.
 1983 The Interpretation of Matthew. (London: SPCK).
- STRECKER, G.
 1983 'The Concept of History in Matthew', in Stanton ed. (1983), pp. 67-84.
- TROMPF, G. W.
 1971-2 'The First Resurrection Appearance and the Ending of Mark's Gospel', NTS 18, pp. 308-330.
- WILKINS, M. J.
 1988 The concept of disciple in Matthew's gospel as reflected in the use of the term Μαθητής. (Leiden: E.J. Brill).

CHAPTER FOUR

- ALSUP, J. E.
 1975 The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition. (London: SPCK).
- BAILEY, J. A.
 1963 The traditions common to the Gospels of Luke and John. (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- BODE, E. L.
 1970 The First Easter Morning. The Gospel Accounts of the Women's Visit to the tomb of Jesus. (Rome: Biblical Institute Press).
- BARRETT, C. K.
 1961 Luke the historian in recent study. (London: Epworth Press).
- BENOIT, P.
 1969 The Passion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ. ET B. Weatherhead, (London: DLT).
- BLACK, M.
 1967 An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. (Oxford: B. Blackwell).
- BULTMANN, R.
 1963 The History of the Synoptic Tradition. ET J. Marsh, (London: B. Blackwell).
- CADBURY, H. J.
 1958 The Making of Luke-Acts. (London: SPCK).
- CREED, J. M.
 1959 The Gospel according to St. Luke. (London: MacMillan).
- CONZELMANN, H.
 1961 The Theology of St. Luke. ET G. Boswell, (London: Faber & Faber).
- CRIBBS, F. L.
 1971 'St. Luke and the Johannine Tradition', JBL, 90, pp. 422-450.
- CURTIS, K. P. G.
 1971 'Luke xxiv.12 and John xx.3-10', JTS, 22, pp. 512-515.

- DERRETT, J. D. M.
1977 'Law in the New Testament: The Parable of the Unjust Judge', in Studies in the New Testament. Vol. 1, pp. 32-47 (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- DIBELIUS, M.
1965 From Tradition to Gospel. ET B.L. Woolf, (New York: Scribners).
- DILLON, R.
1978 From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word. Tradition and Composition in Luke 24. (Rome: Biblical Institute).
- DODD, C. H.
1965 Historical tradition in the Fourth Gospel. (Cambridge: University Press).
- DRIVER, G. R.
1965 'Two Problems in the New Testament', JTS 16, pp. 327-337.
- DRURY, J.
1976 Tradition and design in Luke's Gospel. a study in Early Christian historiography. (London: DLT).
- ELLIS, E. E.
1966 The Gospel of Luke. (London: T. Nelson & Sons).
- EVANS, C. F.
1970 Resurrection and the New Testament. (London: SCM).
- FLENDER, H.
1967 St. Luke: theologian of redemptive history. ET R.H. and I. Fuller (London: SCM).
- FULLER, R. H.
1968 Interpreting the miracles. (London: SCM).
1980 The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives. (London: SPCK).
- GRAB, H.
1964 Ostergeschehen und Osterberichte. (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- GRUNDMANN, W.
1966 Das Evangelium nach Lukas. (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalte).
- HAMM, M. D.
1987 'The Freeing of the Bent Woman and the Restoration of Israel: Luke 13.10-17 as Narrative Theology', JSNT, 31, pp. 23-44.
- HEINE, S.
1987 Women and Early Christianity ET J. Bowden, (London: SCM).
- JEREMIAS, J.
1974 The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. ET N. Perrin, (London: SCM).
1976 The Parables of Jesus. ET S.H. Hooke, (London: SCM).
- KODELL, J.
1969 'Luke's use of Laos, 'People', especially in the Jerusalem Narrative (Lk 19,28-24,53)', CBQ, 31, pp. 327-343.
- LEANEY, A. R. C.
1955-6 'The Resurrection Narratives in Luke (xxiv.12-53)', NTS, 2, pp. 110-114.
1958 A commentary on the gospel according to St. Luke. (London: A & C Black).
- MARSHALL, I. H.
1970 Luke: historian and theologian. (Exeter: Paternoster Press).
1973 'The Resurrection Narratives of Jesus in Luke', Tyn. B, 24, pp. 55-98.
1978 The Gospel of Luke. a commentary on the Greek text. (Exeter: Paternoster Press).

- MAHONEY, R.
1974 Two disciples at the tomb. the background and message of John 20.1-10. (Frankfurt: Peter Lang).
- MANSON, T. W.
1957 The sayings of Jesus. (London: SCM).
- MARXSEN, W.
1970 The Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth. ET M. Kohl, (London: SCM).
- McLACHLAN, H.
1920 St. Luke, the Man and his Work. (Manchester: University Press).
- METZGER, B.
1964 The text of the New Testament. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- MOLTMANN-WENDEL, E.
1982 The Women Around Jesus. ET J. Bowden (London: SCM).
- MUNRO, W.
1982 'Women Disciples in Mark?', CBQ, 44, pp. 225-241.
- MUDDIMAN, J.
1972 'A Note on Reading Luke 24:12', ETL, 48, pp. 542-548.
- NEIRYNCK, F.
1972 'The Uncorrected Historic Present in Lk. XXIV.12', ETL, 48, pp. 548-553.
1984 'John and the Synoptics. The Empty Tomb Stories', NTS, 30, pp. 161-187.
- NEYREY, J. H.
1983 'Jesus' Address to the Women of Jerusalem (Lk. 23.27-31) - A prophetic judgment Oracle', NTS, 29, pp. 74-86.
- PARKER, P.
1962-3 'Luke and the Fourth Evangelist', NTS, 9, pp. 317-336.
- PARVEY, C.
1974 'The Theology and Leadership of Women in the New Testament', in Religion and Sexism. Images of Woman in the Jewish and Christian Traditions. Ed. R.R. Ruether. (New York: Simon and Schuster), pp. 117-149.
- PERRIN, N.
1977 The Resurrection Narratives. (London: SCM).
- PLEVNIK, J.
1987 'The Eyewitnesses of the Risen Jesus in Luke 24', CBQ, 49, pp. 90-103.
- PLUMMER, A.
1910 A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark).
- RENGSTORF, K. H.
1937 Das Evangelium nach Lukas. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- ROBBINS, V. K.
1987 'The Woman who Touched Jesus' Garment: Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of the Synoptic Accounts', NTS, 33, pp. 502-515.
- ROBERTSON, A. T.
1920 Luke the historian, in the light of research. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark).
- SANDERS, J. N.
1954-5 'Those whom Jesus loved, John xi.5', NTS, 1, pp. 29-41.
- SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, E.
1977 'The Apostleship of Women in Early Christianity', in Women Priests. L. & A. Swidler. eds. (New York: Paulist Press), pp. 135-140.

- 1979 'Word, Spirit and Power: Women in Early Christian Communities', in Women of Spirit. Female Leadership in the Jewish and Christian Traditions. Eds. R.R. Ruether & E. McLaughlin. (New York: Simon and Schuster), pp. 29-70.
- 1983a In Memory of Her. A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins. (London: SCM).
- 1983b '"You Are Not to be Called Father": Early Christian History in a Feminist Perspective', in The Bible and Liberation: Political and Social Hermeneutics. Ed. N.K. Gottwald. (New York: Orbis Books), pp. 394-417.
- SCHWEIZER, E.
1984 The good news according to Luke. ET D.E. Green (London: SPCK).
- SIM, D. C.
1989 'The Women Followers of Jesus: The Implications of Luke 8:1-3', HeyJ, 30, pp. 51-62.
- SWIDLER, L.
1979 Biblical Affirmations of Woman. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press).
- TALBERT, C. H.
1974 Literary patterns, theological themes and the genre of Luke-Acts. (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press).
- TAYLOR, V.
1926 Behind the Third gospel: a study of the Proto-Luke hypothesis. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
1972 The passion narrative of St. Luke. (Cambridge: University Press).
- WILSON, S. G.
1973 The Gentiles and the Gentile mission in Luke-Acts. (Cambridge: University Press).
1983 Luke and the Law (Cambridge: University Press).
- WITHERINGTON, B.
1979 'On the Road with Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Susanna and Other Disciples, Luke 8.1-3', ZNW, 70, pp. 243-248.
1984 Women in the Ministry of Jesus. (Cambridge: University Press).

CHAPTER FIVE

- ALSUP, J. E.
1975 The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel-Tradition. (London: SPCK).
- BAILEY, J. A.
1963 The traditions common to the Gospels of Luke and John. (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- BARRETT, C. K., ed.
1956 The New Testament Background: selected documents. (London: SPCK).
- BARRETT, C. K.
1965 The Gospel according to St. John. (London: SPCK).
1975 The Gospel of John and Judaism. (London: SPCK).
- BENOIT, P.
1960 'Marie-Madeleine et les disciples au tombeau selon Joh. 20:1-18', in Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche, Fest. Für Joachim Jeremias, ed. W. Eltester (Berlin: Töpelmann), pp. 141-152.
1969 The Passion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ. ET B. Weatherhead. (London: DLT).

- BISHOP, E. F. F.
1953-4 'Mary Clopas - John XIX.25', Exp.Tim, 65, pp. 382-383.
- BODE, E. L.
1970 The First Easter Morning: The Gospel Accounts of the Women's Visit to the Tomb. (Rome: Biblical Institute Press).
- BORGEN, P.
1958-9 'John and the Synoptics in the Passion Narrative', NTS, 5, pp. 246-59.
- BROWN, R. E.
1972 The Gospel according to John (London: G. Chapman).
1975 'Roles of Women in the Fourth Gospel', TS 36, pp. 688-699.
1979 The community of the beloved disciple (London: G. Chapman).
- BROWN, R. E./DONFRIED, K. P./FITZMYER, J. A./REUMANN, J., eds
1978 Mary in the New Testament (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
- BULTMANN, R.
1963 The History of the Synoptic Tradition ET J. March (Oxford: B. Blackwell).
1971 The Gospel of John: a Commentary ET G.R. Beasley-Murray (Oxford: B. Blackwell).
- COLLINS, R. F.
1970 'Mary in the Fourth Gospel: A decade of Johannine Studies', Louvain Studies, 3, pp. 99-142.
- CRAIG, W. L.
1985 'The Historicity of the Empty Tomb of Jesus ', NTS, 31, pp. 39-67.
- CRIBBS, F. L.
1970 'A Reassessment of the Date of Origin, and the Destination of the Gospel of John', JBL, 89, pp. 38-55.
1971 'St. Luke and the Johannine Tradition', JBL, 90, pp. 422-450.
- CROSSAN, J. D.
1976 'Empty Tomb and Absent Lord (Mark 16:1-8)', in W.H. Kelber, ed. The Passion in Mark: Studies in Mark 14-16. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press), pp. 135-152.
- CURTIS, K. P. G.
1972 'Three Points of Contact between Matthew and John in the Burial and Resurrection Narratives', JTS, 23, pp. 440-444.
- DAUBE, D.
1956 The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London: University of London Athlone Press).
- DAUER, A.
1967 'Das Wort des Gekreuzigten an seine Mutter und den 'Jünger, den er liebte.' Eine traditionsgeschichtliche und theologische Untersuchung zu Joh. 19, 25-27', BZ, 11, pp. 222-239.
1968 'Das Wort des Gekreuzigten an seine Mutter und den 'Jünger, den er liebte.' Eine traditionsgeschichtliche und theologische Untersuchung zu Joh. 19, 25-27', BZ, 12, pp. 80-93.
- DODD, C. H.
1965a The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. (Cambridge: University Press).
1965b Historical tradition in the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: University Press).
1967a 'The Appearances of the Risen Christ: an Essay in Form Criticism of the Gospels', in Studies in the Gospels. Ed. D.E. Nineham (Oxford: B. Blackwell), pp. 9-35.
1967b The apostolic preaching and its developments. (London: Hodder & Stoughton).

- DOLLAR, S. E.
1983 The Significance of Women in the Fourth Gospel. (Th.D dissertation, New Orleans: Baptist Theological Seminary).
- EVANS, C. F.
1970 Resurrection and the New Testament. (London: SCM).
- FREED, E. D.
1964 'Variations in the language and thought of John', ZNW, 55, pp. 167-197.
- FORTNA, R. T.
1970 The gospel of signs: a reconstruction of the narrative source underlying the Fourth Gospel. (SNTSMS, 11, Cambridge: University Press).
- FULLER, R. H.
1965 The Foundations of New Testament Christology. (London: Lutterworth).
1980 The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives. (London: SPCK).
- GARDNER-SMITH, P.
1938 Saint John and the Synoptic gospels. (Cambridge: University Press).
- GRASSI, J. A.
1986 'The Role of Jesus' Mother in John's Gospel: A Reappraisal', CBQ, 48, pp. 67-80.
- HARTMANN, G.
1964 'Die Vorlage der Osterberichte in Joh 20', ZNW, 55, pp. 197-220.
- HERBERT, G.
1962 'The Resurrection-Narrative in St Mark's Gospel', SJT, 15, pp. 66-73.
- HUNTER, A. M.
1975 According to John. (London: SCM).
- JEREMIAS, J.
1975 New Testament Theology, vol 1, ET J. Bowden (London: SCM).
- KÜMMEL, W. G.
1979 Introduction to the New Testament. ET H.C. Kee (London: SCM).
- LEANEY, A. R. C.
1955-6 'The Resurrection Narratives in Luke (xxiv.12-53)', NTS, 2, pp. 110-114.
- LIGHTFOOT, R. H.
1966 St John's Gospel, a Commentary. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- LINDARS, B.
1960-1 'The Composition of John XX', NTS, 7, pp. 142-47.
1977 The Gospel of John. (London: Oliphants).
- MAHONEY, R.
1974 Two disciples at the tomb: the background and message of John 20.1-10. (Frankfurt: Peter Lang).
- MANGAN, E. A.
1945 'The Women at the Tomb', CBQ, 7, pp. 191-200.
- MARSH, J.
1976 Saint John. (London: Penguin).
- MARTYN, J. L.
1968 History and theology in the Fourth Gospel. (New York: Harper and Row).
- MARXSEN, W.
1970 The Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth. ET M. Kohl (London: SCM).
- MAYNARD, A. H.
1984 'The Role of Peter in the Fourth Gospel', NTS, 30, pp. 531-548.

- MICHEL, O.
1961 'Ein johanneischer Osterbericht', in Studien zum Neuen Testament und zur Patristik Fest für. E. Klostermann, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 77 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag), pp. 35-42.
- MINEAR, P. S.
1976 '"We don't Know where ..." John 20:2', Int, 30, pp. 125-139.
1977 'The Beloved Disciple in the Gospel of John', NovT, 19, pp. 105-23.
- NEIRYNCK, F.
1968-9 'Les Femmes au Tombeau: Étude de la rédaction Mattheène (Matt. xxviii 1-10)', NTS, 15, pp. 168-190.
1984 'John and the Synoptics: The Empty Tomb Stories', NTS, 30, pp. 161-187.
- PARKER, P.
1962-3 'Luke and the Fourth Evangelist', NTS, 9, pp. 317-336.
- REESE, J. M.
1977 'The Historical Image of Mary in the New Testament', Marian Studies, 28, pp. 27-44.
- ROBINSON, J. M.
1971 'The Johannine Trajectory', in Trajectories through early Christianity, Essays by J.M. Robinson and H. Koester (Philadelphia: Fortress Press), pp. 232-268.
- SANDERS, J. N./MASTIN, B. A.
1968 A commentary on the Gospel according to St. John. (London: A & C Black).
- SCHNIEWIND, J.
1914 Die Paralleelperikopen bei Lukas und Johannes (Hildesheim: Georg Olms).
- SMALLEY, S. S.
1973-4 'The Sign in John xxi', NTS, 20, pp. 275-288.
- SMITH, D. M.
1970 'R.T. Fortna: The Gospel of Signs (Review)', JBL, 89, pp. 498-501.
1979-80 'John and the Synoptics: Some Dimensions of the Problem', NTS, 26, pp. 425-444.
- SNYDER, G. F.
1971 'John 13:16 and the Anti-Petrinism of the Johannine Tradition', BR, 16, pp. 5-15.
- THOMAS, J. A. C.
1975 The Institutes of Justinian: Text, Translation and Commentary. (Capetown/Wynberg/Johannesburg: Juta and Co.).
- WENHAM, J.
1984 The Easter Enigma. (Exeter: Paternoster Press).

CHAPTER SIX

- ALSUP, J. E.
1975 The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel-Tradition. (London: SPCK).
- BAER, R. A. Jr.
1970 Philo's Use of the Categories Male and Female. (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- BAUER, W.
1934 Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity. ET (London: SCM, 1972).

- BOVON, F.
1988 'The Synoptic Gospels and the non-canonical Acts of the Apostles', HTR, 81, pp. 19-36.
- BROWN, R. E.
1987 'The Gospel of Peter and the Canonical Gospel Priority', NTS, 33 pp. 321-343.
- COLES, R. A.
1972 The Oxyrhynchus Papyri Vol. 41. Ed. G.M. Browne et al. (London: British Academy).
- CRAIG, W. L.
1984 'The Guard at the Tomb', NTS, 30 pp. 273-281.
- CROSSAN, J. D.
1976 'Empty Tomb and Absent Lord (Mark 16:1-8)', in W.H. Kelber ed. The Passion in Mark. Studies on Mark 14-16. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press), pp. 135-152.
1985 Four Other Gospels. Shadows on the Contours of Canon. (Minneapolis: Winston Press).
- DRURY, J.
1976 Tradition and design in Luke's Gospel. (London: DLT).
- DUNN, J. D. G.
1977 Unity and Diversity in the New Testament. (London: SCM Press).
- EUSEBIUS
1964 The Ecclesiastical History. (LCL, Greek-English translation J.E.L. Oulton. London: W. Heinemann).
- FULLER, R. H.
1980 The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives. (London: SPCK).
- GARDNER-SMITH, P.
1926a 'The Gospel of Peter', JTS, 27 pp. 255-271.
1926b 'The Date of the Gospel of Peter', JTS, 27 pp. 401-407.
- GÄRTNER, B.
1961 The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas. ET E.J. Sharpe (London: Collins).
- GRANT, R. M./FREEDMAN, D. N.
1960 The Secret Sayings of Jesus. (London: Collins).
- GRYSON, R.
1976 The Ministry of Women in the Early Church. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press).
- HENNECKE, E./SCHNEEMELCHER, W.
1963-4 The New Testament Apocrypha. 2 vols. Trans. R. McL. Wilson (Philadelphia: Westminster Press).
- JAMES, M. R.
1924 The Apocryphal New Testament. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- JOHNSON, B. A.
1966 'The Empty Tomb Tradition in the Gospel of Peter', HTR, 59 pp. 447-448.
- KLIJN, A. F. J.
1962 'The "Single One" in the Gospel of Thomas', JBL, 81 pp. 271-278.
- KOESTER, H.
1980 'Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels', HTR, 73 pp. 105-130.
- McCANT, J. W. Jr.
1984 'The Gospel of Peter: Docetism Reconsidered', NTS, 30 pp. 258-273.
- MEEKS, W. A.
1974 'The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity', HofR, 13 pp. 165-208.

- MOLTMANN-WENDEL, E.
 1982 The Women Around Jesus. (London: SCM Press).
- PAGELS, E.
 1978 'Visions, Appearances, and Apostolic Authority: Gnostic and Orthodox Traditions', Gnosis. Festschrift für Hans Jonas. Ed. B. Aland (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), pp. 415-430.
 1980 The Gnostic Gospels. (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson).
- PRUSAK, B.
 1974 'Woman: Seductive Siren and Source of Sin?', in R.R. Ruether ed., Religion and Sexism: Images of Women in the Jewish and Christian Traditions. (New York: Simon and Schuster), pp. 89-116.
- ROBINSON, J. M., ed.
 1977 The Nag Hammadi Library in English. (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- ROBINSON, J. M.
 1982 'Jesus: From Easter to Valentinus (or to the Apostles Creed)', JBL, 101 pp. 5-37.
- SCHOTTROFF, L.
 1978 'Das Magnificat und die älteste Tradition über Jesus von Nazaret', EvT, 38 pp. 298-313.
- SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, E.
 1979 'Word, Spirit and Power: Women in Early Christian Communities', in R.R. Ruether, E. McLaughlin, eds. Women of Spirit. Female Leadership in the Jewish and Christian Traditions. (New York: Simon and Schuster), pp. 29-70.
 1983 In Memory of her. A Feminist Reconstruction of Christian Origins. (London: SPCK).
- STANTON, V. H.
 1900 'The Gospel of Peter', JTS, 2 pp. 1-25.
- TROMPF, G. W.
 1971-2 'The First Resurrection Appearance and the Ending of Mark's Gospel', NTS, 18 pp. 308-330.
- TURNER, C. H.
 1913 'The Gospel of Peter', JTS, 14 pp. 161-195.
- VÖÖBUS, A.
 1979 The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac. Vols. I & II. (Louvain: Secrétariat Du CorpusSco Waversebaan 49).
- WILSON, R. McL.
 1956-7 'The New Testament in the Gnostic Gospel of Mary', NTS, 3 pp. 236-243.
 1962 The Gospel of Philip. (London: A.R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd.).
 1982 'Nag Hammadi and the New Testament', NTS, 28 pp. 289-302.

CONCLUSION

- CRAIG, W. L.
 1985 'The Historicity of the Empty Tomb of Jesus', NTS, 31, pp. 39-67.
- HEINE, S.
 1987 Women and Early Christianity: Are the Feminist Scholars Right? ET J. Bowden (London: SCM Press).
- McLAUGHLIN, E. L.
 1979 'The Christian Past: Does it Hold a Future for Women?', in Womanspirit Rising: A Feminist Reader in Religion Eds. C.P. Christ/J. Plaskow (New York: Harper and Row), pp. 93-106.

- OSIEK, C.
1985 'The Feminist and the Bible: Hermeneutical Alternatives', in Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship Ed. A.Y. Collins (Chico, California: Scholars Press), pp. 93-106.
- PERKINS, P.
1984 Resurrection: New Testament Witness and Contemporary Reflection. (London: Chapman).
- SAKENFIELD, K. D.
1985 'Feminist Uses of Biblical Materials', in Feminist Interpretation of the Bible Ed. L.M. Russell (London: B. Blackwell), pp. 55-64.
- SCHNEIDERS, S. M.
1982 'Women in the Fourth Gospel and the Role of Women in the Contemporary Church', BTB XII, pp. 35-45.
1989 'Feminist Ideology Criticism and Biblical Hermeneutics', BTB, 1, pp. 3-10.
- SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, E.
1982 'Feminist Theology and New Testament Interpretation', JSOT, 22, pp. 32-46.
1983 '"You Are Not to be Called Father": Early Christian History in a Feminist Perspective', in The Bible and Liberation: Political and Social Hermeneutics. Ed. N.K. Gottwald. (New York: Orbis Books), pp. 394-417.
1985 'Remembering the Past in Creating the Future: Historical-Critical Scholarship and Feminist Biblical Interpretation', in Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship Ed. A.Y. Collins (Chico, California: Scholars Press), pp. 43-64.
- STAGG, E./STAGG, F.
1978 Woman in the World of Jesus. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press).
- STRUTHERS-MALBON, E.
1983 'Fallible Followers: Women and Men in the Gospel of Mark', Semeia, 28, pp. 29-48.
- TOLBERT, M. A.
1983 'Defining the Problem: The Bible and Feminist Hermeneutics', Semeia, 28, pp. 113-126.