

## Introduction

MY INTEREST IN GENDER studies in the Gospel of Matthew has spanned the period from 1987 to the present. Throughout that time I have worked with social-science models to interpret the stories of women in Matthew. My initial efforts involved the use of *macrosociology*, a branch of sociology that focuses on human societies themselves in contrast to *microsociology*, which concentrates on individual components or features of a particular society. Both approaches are concerned with the study of individuals, families, classes, and social issues such as crime, race relations, religion, politics, and gender but *macrosociology* analyzes those components and others in relation to the larger social systems or societies of which they are a part.

Put another way, I wanted to understand the topic of gender in Matthew not in isolation but in association with the polity, economics, religion, education, and kinship ties of Palestinian society of the first century as they in turn were informed and governed by Rome and the values and socio/political ideology of Greco-Roman society. I believed that too often, whether right or wrong, gender analysis tended to be isolated and/or divorced from the greater cultural fabric found within a gospel like Matthew and its contextual setting within the Mediterranean social world.

Further, coming from the opposite direction, I wanted to do my work freed as much as possible from the influences of my own social world—twenty-first century America, an advanced industrialized society enmeshed in individualism and a democratic social ideology. In other words, my purpose was to examine the stories of women in Matthew from the inside out, that is, to refrain as much as possible from forcing upon the writing a peripheral template derived from my social world. When a template was deemed necessary, I wanted to acknowledge its us-

age deliberately and to take pains that its contours were consistent with social systems in Greco-Roman society. There is a need to examine both the “trees” and the “forest”—the trees being the social, historical, and literary data relevant to the topic of gender in the Gospel of Matthew and the forest being the social realities of an advanced agrarian society like ancient Rome of which Matthew was an integral part.

My first exposure to macrosociology came from Marvin Chaney at San Francisco Theological Seminary in a doctoral seminar on the origins of early Israel and the rise of Israel’s monarchy. Chaney introduced me to the compelling work of Gerhard Lenski, whose interest in societal types was first set forth in his seminal book entitled *Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification*. Lenski also wrote a textbook, originally coauthored with Jean Lenski, that has gone through ten editions and is now coauthored with Patrick Nolan, titled *Human Societies: An Introduction to Macrosociology*. My reading of Lenski, along with others such as Gideon Sjoberg’s *The Preindustrial City: Past and Present*, came to have relevance for my interests in the topic of gender. In the initial stages what stood out was the importance of the Greco-Roman household, the basic social unit of advanced agrarian societies encompassing in ever-widening but inter-related circles families, villages, towns, cities, and empire.

## TWO PREVIOUS STUDIES AND THE USE OF A MACROSOCIOLOGICAL MODEL

This background led to the publication of an article in *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, “The Household: A Major Social Component for Gender Analysis in the Gospel of Matthew.”<sup>1</sup> In this study I examined gender-specific household behavior in Matthew through three steps: (1) the creation of an advanced agrarian model of the status and roles of women (and men); (2) the application of that model as a comparative index of household data in Matthew; and (3) an examination of exceptional (deviant) examples to the model. I found that the Gospel presupposed a rigid, hierarchical, authority-centered social structure largely based on the paradigm of the ancient Mediterranean household. I also found that exceptional or deviant behavior did exist including Matthew’s message about hierarchical authority within the Jesus group, Matthew’s emphasis upon the kingdom’s

1. Love, “The Household.”

## Introduction

new surrogate family,<sup>2</sup> and his treatment of women by Jesus. However, I was reticent to label the Matthean community<sup>3</sup> an egalitarian group. That seemed anachronistic. True, there were two actualities that existed: one following advanced agrarian normative behavior and the other the Matthean exceptions (deviant behavior), but it appeared, given that tension, that the writing did not burst the societal boundaries of the household of advanced agrarian societies. The Gospel of Matthew seemed very much at home in its social world.

One facet of the household model included a number of gender expectations related to private and public space.<sup>4</sup> A woman's place primarily was within the private space of the household where she managed that realm through the delegated authority of her husband. Conversely, the public realm was primarily male space which had corresponding social implications in the political, educational, and public religious spheres of advanced agrarian societies. Variations and exceptions to these macro-social generalizations needed to be taken into account, but in the end a public/private gender distinction remained a legitimate working model for my analysis.

But, could this distinction be identified and hold true in Matthew? Women's roles within the household had been established but what about the place of women in public settings? Was there a way to identify the place of women in public settings? I concluded that there was and subsequently published a second article in *Biblical Theology Bulletin* titled "The

2. Guijarro ("The Family in the Jesus Movement," 115) provides a definition of a surrogate family. "A 'surrogate family' is a group of people that, not having an actual kinship relation, relate to each other as if they did. This type of fictive kinship was and is very common in traditional Mediterranean societies because of the centrality of the family in them. Because of this the majority of significant relationships follow the model of kinship relations."

3. We will use the term "community" rather than "church" (16:18; 18:17) to identify the Matthean Jesus group. This is because the word "church" for most Americans is quite different from churches that existed in the first century. Our choice is to distance the Matthean community from contemporary churches, which in fact derive from Constantine's Nicea. Duling ("Matthean Brotherhood," 164) has chosen the term "brotherhood." His reasoning is similar: "the *ekklesia* translated by English 'church' has become overloaded with Christian content."

4. See Sjoberg, *The Preindustrial City*, especially chapters 1–4, 6; Malina, *New Testament World*; Elshtain, *Public Man, Private Woman*; MacMullen, "Women in Public in the Roman Empire"; Corley, "Were the Women around Jesus Really Prostitutes?"; idem, *Private Women, Public Meals*.

Place of Women in Public Settings in Matthew's Gospel: A Sociological Inquiry."<sup>5</sup>

In this study, I did a gender analysis of the place of women among three character groups: the disciples, the crowds, and the religious leaders as they were taught by Jesus or interacted with him in three representative public places: the mountain in the Sermon on the Mount (5:1—7:28), the boat in the Parables Discourse (13:1–52), and the clash between Jesus and the authorities in the temple (21:12—23:29). To interpret the data I used two gender-specific analogies to provide a social index: a macrosociological model of the public status of women in advanced agrarian societies and a social summary of the public place of women in the culture represented by the Mishna, a legal literature thought by many scholars to have emanated from the Pharisees, Jesus' major opponents in Matthew. I found that the religious authorities paralleled advanced agrarian gender expectations without variation; they were all men reinforced by their orientation to the law and their manner of framing questions and religious issues. The disciples were like and unlike the religious authorities. Like the authorities, they were male and were authority figures, teachers, and leaders in the community (28:18–20). In this respect the disciples followed advanced agrarian norms and mishnaic practice for those who study and teach the law. Unlike the authorities, however, the disciples were not to exalt themselves by seeking places of hierarchical power and titles of honor. Rather, their role was to be characterized by humility, their standard of greatness was to be found in children, and their paradigm for faith and service was found among the women and other marginalized persons scattered throughout the writing. At this point Matthew's community seemed to run counter to the crystallized social stratification of the Jerusalem Temple, the synagogue, mishnaic culture and advanced agrarian societies as a whole. But, it appeared that the disciples in the role of teachers<sup>6</sup> depicted some level of male hierarchy within the community, albeit one that eschewed patriarchal authoritarianism.

Matthew's community worked with two tensions: (1) all were "brothers," but (2) the disciples appeared to have had a special standing as teachers. The third group, the crowds, opened a real but limited alternative for women. Both the women in the crowds and the women who

5. Love, "The Place of Women."

6. The role of teaching is given to the disciples only in 28:20. Before that time only Jesus teaches (7:28–29; 23:8).

## *Introduction*

followed Jesus from Galilee were examples of faith. Jesus acknowledged their presence, considered them worthy, treated them as persons, and received their hospitality and ministry. Their faith and faithfulness was juxtaposed to that of the disciples. Their religious status stood counter to that of women in mishnaic culture. No longer were men the only ones who could come before the Lord. Circumcision had been set aside. No longer were women attached to males for their public religious identity. Jesus, as God's presence within the community was the basis for that significant social change. All persons—men, women, children, and non-Israelites<sup>7</sup>—were invited to the eschatological marriage feast and belonged to God's new household. All were part of an inclusive universalism. No longer was ancestry, family role, religious patronage, or socio/economic status the basis for religious standing before God. All were members of the new surrogate household because what counted was obedience to the word of God. Thus, the writing's treatment drew upon the new as well as the old. The old was the androcentric framework; the new was the inclusion of women and men in the new surrogate community. These two, equally real, social realities seemed to complement one another in an unusual social dynamic tension.

### AREAS AND QUESTIONS NOT ANSWERED

However, I was not satisfied with my study to this point. There was uneasiness over whether the two social realities actually complemented one another. Also, there was much more to the topic of women in Matthew than the household and the location of women in public teaching settings. As a result, a flood of questions surfaced as I explored other materials and asked how best to get at that data through the use of social-scientific models. My journey in using other models was helped greatly by the work and guidance of S. Scott Bartchy, Dennis C. Duling, John H. Elliott, Philip Esler, K. C. Hanson, Bruce J. Malina, Jerome H. Neyrey SJ, John J. Pilch, Douglas E. Oakman, Carolyn Osiek, Richard L. Rohrbaugh, and Ritva H. Williams.

For example, what about the women mentioned in the writing's opening genealogy: Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, and the wife of Uriah (Matt

7. In this study, we will use the terminology "non-Israelite" instead of "Gentile." Matthew, as possibly all of the New Testament documents, is ethnocentric in character. Israelites considered all others simply as non-Israelite.

1:4–6)? What was their significance within the genealogy and was that significance limited to the genealogy itself? Were these exceptional persons (to borrow the words of Herman Waetjen) an essential “key” to understanding the writing as a whole?<sup>8</sup> Or, what about women healed by Jesus such as Peter’s mother-in-law (8:14–15), the girl restored to life (9:18–19, 23–36), the woman suffering from hemorrhages for twelve years (9:20–22), and the Canaanite woman’s daughter (15:21–28)? Could social-scientific inquiry assess these stories? If so, what would that mean? Does Matthew’s redaction remove us farther from the historical period of Jesus as a healer than Mark as maintained by scholars like H. J. Held?<sup>9</sup> Or, what about the period of the Evangelist forty or fifty years after the death of Jesus; how would these accounts be heard by the Matthean community? Using the language of Ulrich Luz,<sup>10</sup> do the narratives function as “transparencies” of the Matthean community? Certainly during the time of the Evangelist the community was in transition as it clashed with a Pharisaic party following the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE. Old external/internal boundaries had been crossed or were being challenged due to the Matthean community’s separation from the synagogue and Pharisaic-led Judaism (21:28–23:39) such as a rejection of the dietary laws of the Pentateuch (15:11) and an acceptance of a mission that called for baptism without circumcision (28:19–20). Internally, the community needed to confront “false prophets” (7:15–23), take into account the faith of the “little ones” (18:6–7, 10–14), face up to the “little faith” of the disciples (6:30; 8:26; 14:31; 16:8; 17:20), deal with community disputes (18:6–20), meet head-on leadership issues (16:18–20), take into account its future (chapters 24–25), and cope with a community made up of good and bad followers of Jesus (13:24–30, 47–50; 22:1–14). But, did those uncharted waters also consist of a social struggle within the community? Was Jesus’ millennial vision for “structurally”<sup>11</sup> marginalized persons being carried out? What about the social standing or inclusion of marginal Israelite and non-Israelite women within the community? Before we proceed some thoughts on marginality are in order.

8. Waetjen, “The Genealogy as the Key to the Gospel according to Matthew.”

9. Held, “Matthew as Interpreter of the Miracle Stories.”

10. Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 2.

11. Duling describes four different kinds of marginality. Duling, “Matthew as a Marginal Scribe”; also see Billson, “No Owner of Soils.”

## Introduction

### EXCURSUS ON MARGINALITY

We begin with a definition of “marginality” used among social-science scholars. Gino Germani defines marginality as “the lack of participation [exercise of roles] of individuals and groups in those spheres in which, according to determined criteria, they might be expected to participate.” “Lack of participation” in this definition refers to “the inability of persons to conform to expected social roles with respect to sex, age, civil life, occupation, and social life in relation to levels of status in the social system.” Duling, building on the work of Germani and Billson, has identified four concepts of marginality: (1) structural marginality, (2) social-role marginality, (3) ideological marginality, and (4) cultural marginality. Of these four concepts, three are applicable to our study—structural marginality, ideological marginality, and cultural marginality. The second concept, social-role marginality, is actually a subtype of “structural marginality” and is as Duling notes “more difficult to demonstrate in antiquity because upward social mobility was often limited or non-existent, with the exception of certain subgroups, for example, the Roman military or in religious sects and voluntary associations.”<sup>12</sup> This leads us to an elaboration of the other three concepts.

#### *Structural Marginality*

Structural marginality refers to structural inequities in the social system, that is, some persons are in the center and some are on the periphery. It is analogous to vertical social stratification. Persons from any level of the social hierarchy can be considered marginal if they are denied access to the goods and services they might be expected to receive.<sup>13</sup> Usually, however, it is those who are on the margins, the socially and economically disadvantaged or oppressed—the poor, destitute, and expendable peoples, as well as women in certain contexts, who are structurally marginal. Duling refers to this as “*involuntary marginality*” because such individuals and groups—due to race, ethnicity, sex, “underdevelopment,” and the like—are not able to participate in normative social statuses, roles, and offices and their obligations and duties. As a result they fail to share in both material

12. Duling, “Ethnicity, Ethnocentrism,” 137.

13. Germani, *Marginality*, 49.

and nonmaterial resources available to other members at the center of society. They experience themselves as being personally alienated.<sup>14</sup>

Duling identifies an extensive list of examples in Matthew that includes forced laborers, day laborers, some slaves, tenant farmers, the poor, the destitute in need of alms, eunuchs, those who are ritually unclean, lepers, a woman with a hemorrhage, the women who follow Jesus, the diseased and infirm, the blind, the lame, the deaf, the dumb, the deformed, paralytics, demoniacs, epileptics, bandits, and prostitutes.<sup>15</sup> He further believes that the parable of the sheep and the goats (Matt 25:31–46) offers a paradigm for structurally marginal persons.<sup>16</sup> Applicable to our study are the woman with a hemorrhage (9:20–22) and the woman who anoints Jesus’ body for burial (26:6–13). We classify the women who follow Jesus (27:55–56, 61; 28:1–10) under two categories—“ideological marginality”<sup>17</sup> and “structurally marginal.”<sup>18</sup> This leads us to the second concept, “ideological marginality.”

### *Ideological Marginality*

Ideological marginality, following Billson,<sup>19</sup> refers to those who willfully desire to affiliate with a nonnormative group. This marginality concept is derived from Victor Turner’s analysis of rites of passage.<sup>20</sup> Persons in this category are initiates “who are temporarily separated (usually physically) from the larger society and its statuses and customs.” They are “marginal” or “liminal” (Latin *limen*: “threshold”).<sup>21</sup> Following Turner, Duling describes such persons or groups as “status-less, role-less, spontaneous, sexless, and anonymous. They experience a certain egalitarianism and intense comradeship, or what is today called ‘bonding,’ in part due to their common, temporary separation.”<sup>22</sup> Turner designates those who attempt to routinize this concept institutionally as belonging to an “ideological

14. Duling, “Matthew and Marginality,” 648; Germani, *Marginality*.

15. Duling, “Ethnicity, Ethnocentrism,” 138.

16. *Ibid.*

17. Reasons for this classification are given in chapter 7.

18. See chapter 7.

19. Billson, “No Owner of Soils.”

20. V. Turner, *The Ritual Process*.

21. Duling, “Ethnicity, Ethnocentrism,” 137.

22. *Ibid.*, 137–38.

## Introduction

*communitas*,” or “voluntary “outsiderhood.”<sup>23</sup> Duling calls this “voluntary marginality” because the individuals and groups do so consciously and by choice. They “live outside the normative statuses, roles and offices of society because they reject hierarchical social structures.” He adds, “Though freely chosen, they will eventually share in some of the same conditions as involuntary marginals.”<sup>24</sup>

Duling believes that the Gospel of Matthew sets forth several types of groups who possibly represent voluntary marginality. One example is the disciples and the mission charge in Matthew 10:9–15. Another example is the more settled community described in Matthew 23:8–10. Such groups, following Victor Turner’s description of liminality, are in limbo.<sup>25</sup> They are “neither here nor there,” they are “betwixt and between.”<sup>26</sup> Turner characterizes this liminal phase by the term *communitas*, “a status-less, roleless phase marked by spontaneity, concreteness, intense comradeship, and egalitarianism.”<sup>27</sup> “Persons in this phase are often considered sexless and anonymous, sometimes symbolized by nakedness.”<sup>28</sup> *Communitas* for Turner is also anti-structural, that is, there are no fixed “relationships between statuses, roles, and offices.” Anti-structure is marked by “spontaneous, immediate, concrete” relations—persons who “are not segmentalized into roles and statuses but (existentially) confront one another.” However, Turner warns that “the spontaneity and immediacy of *communitas* . . . can seldom be maintained for very long. *Communitas* itself soon develops a structure.”<sup>29</sup>

Turner distinguishes among three kinds of *communitas*: (1) *existential* or *spontaneous* *communitas*, (2) *normative* *communitas*, and (3) *ideological* *communitas*. *Existential* or *spontaneous* *communitas* is approximately what the hippies were in the 60s—what they would call “a happening,” and what William Blake might have called “the winged moment as it flies,” or, later, “mutual forgiveness of each other.”

23. V. Turner, *Drama, Fields, and Metaphors*, 266.

24. Duling, “Matthew and Marginality,” 648; V. Turner, *The Ritual Process*.

25. V. Turner (*The Ritual Process*), sets forth a common pattern of three phases of the ritual journey: separation, liminality (marginality), and aggregation. For our developed rite of passage model see chapter 7.

26. *Ibid.*, 95.

27. *Ibid.*, 127, 132.

28. Duling, “Matthew and Marginality,” 646.

29. V. Turner, *The Ritual Process*, 132.

*Normative* *communitas*, takes place when under the influence of time the need to mobilize and organize resources, and the necessity for social control among the members in pursuance of these goals takes place to the extent that the existential *communitas* is now organized into a perduring social system. *Ideological* *communitas* is a label one can apply to a variety of utopian models of societies based on existential *communitas*.<sup>30</sup>

Voluntary marginal groups in Matthew illustrate *ideological* *communitas*,<sup>31</sup> but as we will demonstrate in future chapters there are signs of the movement of these groups toward *normative* *communitas*. In this movement, there are “pressures toward hierarchy—that is, there appear to be “those who are more equal than others.” One example, Duling believes, is seen in those labeled as apostles (10:2), prophets (5:10–12; 11:9; 10:40–42; 12:57; 21:11, 23–27; 23:29–36; all of the formula quotations, including Ps 78:2 and 110:11 are from “prophets”), teachers (5:19; 28:20), scribes (13:52; 23:34), righteous men (10:41–42), and wise men (23:34). Another example is the special honor given to Peter by Jesus that suggests a transfer of authority (16:17–19). Duling concludes, “Thus, like its rivals, the Pharisees, the Matthew group is not simply a non-hierarchical *communitas*, but is on its way toward a hierarchical structure (*normative communitas*).”<sup>32</sup> If this is so, how do the stories of women, which fit the concept of involuntary marginality, fit into the social realities of this larger voluntary marginal community’s transition? Are they included? Do they participate in this state of transition? Do their stories help us “wipe away the fog” so we can see through the text to the author’s social historical context?

Who then in Matthew belongs to the category of ideological marginality? Duling suggests the author of Matthew may fit this category. Also, we affirm in chapter 7 that the twelve disciples and the women who follow Jesus choose to do so voluntarily and when other considerations are taken into account we identify them among the “ideologically marginal.”

30. Ibid.

31. Duling, “Matthew and Marginality,” 659–62.

32. Ibid.

## Introduction

### *Cultural Marginality*

Cultural marginality, advanced by Park,<sup>33</sup> Billson,<sup>34</sup> Stonequist,<sup>35</sup> and Schermerhorn,<sup>36</sup> refers to persons or groups who are “condemned” to “live between two different, antagonistic worlds without fully belonging to either.”<sup>37</sup> Such persons are ‘caught between two competing cultures.’ They experience isolation, identity confusion, and alienation.” They are “unwittingly initiated into *two or more* historic traditions, languages, political loyalties, moral codes, or religions, one of which is more dominant.”<sup>38</sup> Those who are culturally marginal “do not fully assimilate; they are said to be ‘in-between,’ to have ‘status incongruence.’”<sup>39</sup> Duling argues that the Matthean author possibly is a *culturally marginal* scribe in a *culturally marginal* community. “He was between two or more historic traditions, languages, political loyalties, moral codes, and religions.”<sup>40</sup> We affirm in chapter 5 that the Canaanite woman (1 5:21–28) fits this category of culturally marginalized persons. However, we believe she also is structurally marginal.<sup>41</sup> Having finished our thoughts on marginality, we return to the narrative of my scholarly journey.

## HEALING STORIES OF WOMEN

I focused my attention first on the healing stories of the hemorrhaging woman (an Israelite) and the Canaanite woman (a non-Israelite) (Matt 9:20–22; 15:21–28). To do this I explored what it meant for Jesus to be a healer in Palestine of the first century CE. How was illness experienced and treated in societies like the Roman Empire? Who did Jesus heal? Were those healed primarily from among the “poor”—the farmers, artisans, and

33. Park, “Human Migration and the Marginal Man.”

34. Billson, “No Owner of Soils.”

35. Stonequist, *The Marginal Man*.

36. Schermerhorn, “Marginal Man.”

37. Park, “Human Migration and the Marginal Man.” We follow Duling, “Ethnicity, Ethnocentrism,” 138.

38. Stonequist, *The Marginal Man*, 3 as cited by Duling, “Ethnicity, Ethnocentrism,” 138.

39. Schermerhorn, “Marginal Man,” 407, cited by Duling, “Ethnicity, Ethnocentrism,” 138.

40. Duling, “Ethnicity, Ethnocentrism,” 138. See as well Senior, “Between Two Worlds,” 1–23.

41. See chapter 5.

outcasts? Where did Jesus's healing activity take place? Was it primarily located in rural environs? Or, did different kinds of illness or bodily affliction make a difference? Matthew recounts that Jesus healed or restored to life lepers, paralytics, demon possessed persons, the dead, a woman with a blood flow, blind persons, deformed and lame persons, and one who was moonstruck (epileptic).

Further, did Jesus's method of healing make a difference? Some he touched; others he healed by his word or command. Did the location of a healing make a difference? For example, were there divergent social implications if a healing took place in a house, in a synagogue, in open space, or among the tombs? For example, Peter's mother-in-law was healed in the private space of Peter's house (8:14–17). Similarly, the ruler's daughter was restored to life in the private space of the ruler's home (9:18–19, 23–26). But, the stories of the woman with hemorrhages and the Canaanite woman were located in open/outdoor space without the accompaniment of male intermediaries or representatives. Did the healing of women in open, public space have political import? Or, for that matter, would the healing of any woman have had political consequences for Jesus? If so, what would this possibly have meant for the period of Jesus or the time of the Evangelist?

Armed with these questions I first examined Matthew's version of the hemorrhaging woman, concentrating on the period of Jesus. Did Matthew's redaction of Mark's account lead one closer to or farther away from the historical Jesus? To do this I utilized two social-scientific models in addition to the advanced agrarian model of my earlier work: healing in non-Western societies, and a taxonomy of illness based on degrees of impurity. Further, I worked with what social-science scholars refer to as four foundational social domains—politics, economics, religion, and kinship (family). These four social spheres, especially politics and kinship, proved useful in examining the location of the woman's healing in open space. This helped demonstrate that there were political implications for Jesus even though his healing work was primarily within the folk sector of Palestinian, Israelite society.

Both models were set within the wider social context of the pivotal value of Mediterranean society of the first century, honor and shame. The healing model, a systems-theory approach, was designed to answer the question as to how illness was experienced and treated in societies such as the social world of Jesus, a system quite different from the biomed-

## Introduction

cal approach largely operative in societies such as the United States and northern Europe. This model demonstrated that sickness was connected to two broader phenomena: religious/cosmological forces and social relationships/interpersonal conflicts. Patients and healers in the Palestinian culture of Jesus were embedded in a cultural system in which the whole system, one that included witchcraft, sorcery, and spirit aggression, was the basis of healing. The second model, a taxonomy of impurity, depicted how purity rules pertaining to the body had a much wider symbolic meaning that could include pollution boundaries related to the public, Israelite, social domain. The results of this study were published in English under the title “Jesus Heals the Hemorrhaging Woman.”<sup>42</sup>

Using the two models, I concluded that Matthew’s redaction of the woman’s story, located entirely in public open space, originated in the time of Jesus’ activity. My hypothesis was demonstrated in a combination of the woman’s faith, her identity as an Israelite outcast, the location of the healing in open space, and the violation of the Second Temple’s purity boundaries. Those factors coalesced to validate the woman’s identity as a structurally marginal Israelite in need of healing (Matt 10:1–16)—the heart of Jesus’ theocratic mission to Israel. This made a number of significant differences for both the woman and Jesus.

In the study of the Canaanite woman and her daughter, published under the title “Jesus, Healer of the Canaanite Woman’s Daughter in Matthew’s Gospel: A Social-Scientific Inquiry,”<sup>43</sup> I used the same two social-scientific models. I found that Matthew’s version of this story, rather than being an account laden with “Christian missionary theology and concerns” and therefore the “creation by first generation Christians,”<sup>44</sup> also originated with Jesus. My major argument, based on the insights of the political and kinship social domains and the model of impurity, centered on Jesus’ statement to the disciples, “I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (15:24). From a social-scientific perspective that statement had historical probability because it made direct and immediate political sense of Jesus’ mission to establish an Israelite theocracy (10:5; 15:24). Jesus, accordingly, faced a purity dilemma: a non-Israelite woman had made her appeal to him based on the core value of God’s

42. Love, “Jesus Heals the Hemorrhaging Woman.”

43. Love, “Jesus, Healer of the Canaanite Woman’s Daughter.”

44. Meier, *A Marginal Jew*, 660–61.

## JESUS AND MARGINAL WOMEN

mercy, probably the central value of Jesus' mission to Israel.<sup>45</sup> By doing so, the woman challenged the weaker purity boundaries of Jesus' inclusive strategy only to Israel.

This study examined the social location of the woman, as well. Was she a prostitute? To answer that question I created a model of prostitutes in advanced agrarian societies and found that probably the woman was a prostitute, especially in light of other gender data in Matthew. Beyond that question, I pursued three more questions:

1. What did it mean in social terms for her daughter to be healed?
2. What did it mean for her to penetrate dangerous social-political boundaries, open space, male territoriality, and the ethnocentric barriers that separated Canaanite and Israelite heritages?
3. What did it mean for her in the end to give praise to the "God of Israel," whose healing power had been mediated through an Israelite healer?

Matthew's redaction complicated the heart of Jesus's theocratic mission in that as an Israelite healer Jesus had served as a patron or benefactor of an outcast non-Israelite woman. By acknowledging the woman's "great faith" Jesus placed her alongside the Israelite woman who had suffered from hemorrhages.

### HEALING STORIES AND THE EVANGELIST'S COMMUNITY

However, those two studies did not address the period of the Evangelist. How might they have functioned as "transparencies" of the Matthean community? Did the stories supply a social window that possibly depicted an internal community's struggle over the standing and inclusion of structurally marginal Israelite and non-Israelite women? Again, utilizing the same two models I re-examined the accounts. The process and results of those studies were presented as papers at professional meetings of the Context Group and the Society of Biblical Literature and now are integrated into the materials of this volume.

I found that the hemorrhaging woman served as an example (along with others in the healing stories of Matthew chapters 8 and 9) of the

45. Matthew's consistent appeal is that Jesus' mission is legitimated out of the prophetic tradition of Hosea, "I desire mercy not sacrifice" (9:13; 12:7).

## Introduction

continued need of pastoral instruction within the Matthean surrogate kinship group regarding the standing and inclusion of marginalized Israelites. The community apparently was not adequately following the Evangelist's vision of Jesus' healing activity. Like Jesus the community was to welcome impartially those marginalized persons labeled as examples of the lost sheep of Israel (10:6; 15:24)—“helpless” Israelites without a shepherd (9:36). This was so because the woman's story, based on the deeds and words of Jesus, constituted an example of great faith and discipleship for the community.

Similarly, I found that the Canaanite woman's story also served as a social transparency that required corrective behavior within Matthew's community. The memory of Jesus's cutting encounter with this strong and wise woman held up a new authoritative social norm that not only disclosed pollution within the community but also rendered pastoral instruction to Matthew's surrogate household. The Evangelist's community needed to address whether and how it would include persons like this woman within the community. She was an example of a solitary non-Israelite bereft of male agency in a society that devalued both women and daughters. Most probably she was among the poorest of the poor, probably a prostitute; most surely she was an outcast in a society that, organized along purity lines, carefully avoided contact with such persons. Further, her story appeared to advance the social irregularities of the non-Israelite women of Matthew's genealogy (1:3–6). In addition, her communication with Jesus probably identified her as a capable and worthy woman of wisdom, a foreigner who gave praise to the God of Israel.

Like the foreigners spoken of by the prophet Isaiah who had joined themselves to the Lord (Isa 56:6), this woman should also receive “an everlasting name” (Isa 56:7; Matt 21:13) in the kingdom's community. Her example, therefore, was decidedly different from that of the centurion (8:5–13) who, as a respected male household leader, carried the freight of the anticipated non-Israelite mission.<sup>46</sup> The woman's example did not even hint of that mission. However, if Matthew's community was a

46. We recognize that the centurion possibly is an Israelite auxiliary officer. A scholarly debate exists over the meaning of the term *ethnē* in Matthew. Often, it designates a group of non-Israelites. But that is not always the case. For example, David C. Sim argues that in Matthew's final mission statement (28:18–20), Jesus sends his disciples to all Israelites among non-Israelites. See Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism*. For the opposite point of view, see Senior, “Between Two Worlds.”

prosperous, mixed congregation of Israelite and non-Israelites still struggling over non-Israelite inclusion, it would be one thing to socially embrace an established, respected householder like the centurion, but quite another matter to receive non-Israelite women with dubious, polluted social credentials. The vision of the Evangelist's surrogate kinship group called for the practice of the God of Israel's core value of mercy, as Jesus did. This meant that it, too, needed not only to maintain weak structural boundaries but to broaden those boundaries as it followed an inclusive strategy that welcomed structurally marginal non-Israelite women of "great faith" (15:28). Such social behavior probably would have engendered criticism by the synagogue which in turn would have heightened the socio-political separation of the two groups. Thus, this woman's story provided a transparency of a community struggling over a radical non-Israelite inclusion essential to the vision of Jesus' new surrogate household.

#### THE GIRL WHOM JESUS RESTORES TO LIFE

At that point my investigation of the two healing stories was complete, except for the girl that Jesus restored to life (9:18–19, 23–26). This account was different from the previous healing stories in that its location was not in public/open space but in the private location of a household. Accordingly, even though I continued to use the model of degrees of impurity I examined the girl's restoration to life only from the perspective of the Evangelist's community, a surrogate group belonging not to the political social domain but to the kinship social domain. This decision was reinforced by Matthew's redaction. Instead of connecting the ruler's story to Jesus' return to Galilee after the healing of the Gerasene demoniac as in Mark (5:21) and Luke (8:40), Matthew instead associated it with the earlier banquet scene that also was located in the private space of the house (9:10; see 9:9–17). Matthew's redaction opened and closed the material from 9:10 through 9:26 featuring private/household space with the exception of the incident with the hemorrhaging woman who was healed not in the house but in open public space. Matthew's concern, therefore, from an anthropological perspective was for the community, a matter reinforced as well by his identification of the father as a "ruler" and not as a "leader of the synagogue" as did Mark (5:22) and Luke (8:41).

The ruler's need for Jesus' mercy in behalf of his daughter was so great that he was willing without invitation to cross the boundary of a

## *Introduction*

private banquet attended by Jesus, his disciples, and moral and social outcasts. That social reality, as well as the healing of the hemorrhaging woman, would be heard in tandem by Matthew's community. Further, the community would know that the ruler and the woman were polar opposites—a respected household leader and an outcast woman. These two entwined but divergent recipients of God's mercy would serve as visionary examples of the radical inclusion of Israelites whose new home was Jesus' surrogate household.

Light was also cast on the two women, the girl and hemorrhaging woman, because both were addressed by Jesus as "daughters," a reminder to the community that belonging to the surrogate kin group of the kingdom entailed a significant social leveling. All persons of this alternative group had parallel standing because all were recipients of God's gracious patronage. Social disparities did not matter whether the reason for marginalization was illness, death, age, male agency, or lack thereof. The community, like Jesus, should be committed to the healing, restoring of life, and including of all.

### THE WOMAN WHO ANOINTS JESUS AT BETHANY

After the healing stories I then turned to the account of the woman who anointed Jesus at Bethany (Matt 26:6–13). In this story Jesus was the unexpected recipient of a grateful client. By anointing Jesus at Simon's house the woman crossed the frontier of public to private space and that action portrayed a difficult and controversial navigation among several forbidden and/or marginal boundaries. The story's setting was important because it was situated between two scenes located in public locations: (1) the plot to kill Jesus by the Judean religious leaders in the palace (26:3-5) and (2) the agreement between Judas and the religious authorities in the temple to betray Jesus (26:14–16). From another perspective, the woman's story involved four points of view concerning Jesus' death: (1) the chief priests' and the elders' who conspired to arrest Jesus by "stealth and kill him," (2) the woman's who out of devotion to Jesus engaged in a positive honor challenge by pouring an alabaster jar of ointment on his head as he reclined at table, (3) the disciples', who, angered by the woman's act, believed the ointment should have been sold and its considerable proceeds given to the poor, and (4) Judas' who betrayed Jesus before the chief priests. The woman's story, therefore, did not stand alone. It was situated in

a larger and most vital social context. However, because it did take place in the private kinship domain and not in the public, political sphere, I treated the story at the level of the Evangelist's *Sitz im Leben*.

To interpret the story I carried forward insights related to the political and kinship domains. In addition I utilized two social-scientific models: (1) patronage and (2) a taxonomy of degrees of impurity understood within the "pivotal value of Mediterranean society of the first century"—honor and shame.<sup>47</sup> This was the first time I had used a patronage model but it was justified in light of the obvious patron-client ties of Jesus and the woman. Jesus, I affirmed, had been and was presently broker of the kingdom's resources to her. We do not know the exact form of the good she previously received. But as a grateful client she anointed Jesus. I then applied the models to the four groups, but with each application I emphasized the woman's position in relationship to the religious-political elite, the disciples, and Judas.

Following the purity model, I found that the woman was probably a marginal person, perhaps a woman of "questionable reputation." Following the patronage model, I affirmed that the woman's "good work" substantiated her client relations with Jesus. Her lavish deed honored her broker and solidified the dyadic bond between them even as it riled the disciples. Finally, Matthew's Jesus interpreted the woman's anointing as a prophetic work that prepared his body for burial (26:12). This was significant because Matthew's later redaction omitted that the women went to the tomb to anoint Jesus's body. Matthew, therefore, treated the deed as a singular prophetic act and the woman as a prophet. As a prophet and client of God, she was juxtaposed to the religious elite and the city of Jerusalem which killed the prophets. As a prophet she was harassed by the disciples and treated without honor within Jesus' surrogate family. At the same time, however, she was approved of and defended by Jesus. As a prophet she belonged to the heritage of prophets cited fourteen times by Matthew that included Isaiah, Micah, Jeremiah, David and Zechariah. Thus, as the Canaanite woman most probably was a woman of wisdom who taught Jesus, this woman was a prophet who, although she never spoke a word, taught the disciples by her prophetic deed. Prophets and sages were two significant ways of beholding women in a writing that apparently stressed the leadership of teachers, wise persons, and prophets.

47. Malina and Rohrbaugh, *Synoptic Gospels*, 269–72.

## Introduction

If the teachers are males, it should not be forgotten that marginal women served as examples of wisdom and prophecy, which implied also the role of teaching.

### THE WOMEN AT THE CROSS AND TOMB

The final inquiry involved a social-scientific reading of the three references to women as followers of Jesus in Matthew's passion and resurrection narratives (27:55–56, 61; 28:1–10). The first citation (27:55–56) stipulated “many women” were present, “looking on” at Jesus's crucifixion “from a distance.” Among the “many” three were identified: Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joseph, and the mother of the sons of Zebedee—James and John. All of these women followed Jesus from Galilee and ministered to him. The second reference (27:61) at the tomb of Jesus narrowed the number to two, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, and identified them alongside a wealthy male from Arimathea named Joseph. The third and more extensive account at the tomb comprised only the two women who had witnessed Jesus's burial, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary. They came “to see” the tomb (28:1) but not to anoint Jesus, because that had been accomplished by the woman at Simon's house in Bethany. Guided by the angel, the women were instructed to hasten and tell his disciples that Jesus was resurrected and that he would precede them to Galilee where they should meet him. Leaving the tomb the women were greeted by Jesus who reiterated their unique task given by the angel. The striking exclusion from all of these scenes was the twelve male disciples who had deserted and betrayed or denied him but who now became the object of the women's mission.

For this material I did not set aside such previous models as honor and shame and degrees of impurity, but I employed as my central comparative paradigm a rites of passage model, a combination initiation/death ritual, because I believed that it best illumined why the women suddenly and inexplicably appeared in Matthew's narrative and provided an essential linkage between Jesus and his disciples after his resurrection. The disciples, following this model, were in transition (state of *liminality*). This state began at the time of their call by Jesus (state of *separation*) and would last ultimately until the return of the Son of Man—but more immediately until they were recommissioned (state of *aggregation*) as teachers by Jesus for a universal mission (28:16–20). The temporal (from

call [4:18–22] to commission [28:16–20]) and geographical (from Galilee [4:12] to Galilee [28:16]) lines of this transitional process were broken and/or interrupted decisively shortly before the death of Jesus (26:56). At that critical juncture, the disciples' desertion, a break in their initiation as Jesus' neophytes took place. That break created a vacuity that was filled by the women who alone provided the indispensable temporal and geographical connections to the disciples' aggregation on the mountain in Galilee. Within that initiatory process the women also underwent their own *liminal* transition and aggregation.

Beginning with the disciples I drew upon seven characteristics of the *liminal* state as set forth by Arthur van Gennep, Victor Turner, and Terence Turner. Those characteristics were

1. Death to the world
2. An occasional loss of names
3. An engagement in tasks that involved prohibitions, pain, humiliation, and risk
4. An inter-structural association marked by simplicity
5. Participation in a "structureless realm" in which sexual distinctions did not apply
6. The participation in sacred places of concealment that link the initiates with the deity, and
7. Dangerous boundary ambiguities involving purity infractions.

I then applied the seven characteristics to the women who followed Jesus and found that these women probably underwent six of the seven characteristics, the exception being a changing of their names, an attribute that applied only to Peter. Thus, in their role as Jesus' neophytes the women at the cross and the tomb demonstrated in their own right their faithful and complete initiatory preparation as Jesus' followers. In doing so, they finished the interrupted temporal ("from that time," 4:17; 16:21) and geographical (Galilee) lines of the ritual process due to the male disciples' desertion. In other words, they alone supplied the vital and indispensable bond for the realization of Matthew's purpose (28:16–20). That transformative initiation at the pivotal moment of Jesus' crucifixion, however, began with the woman who anointed Jesus at Bethany. It was then carried

## Introduction

forward by the women and especially by Mary Magdalene and the other Mary in their newly appointed task to communicate with the disciples to join Jesus in Galilee.

### REASSESSMENT LEADING TO MY THESIS

My investigation of the stories of the women called for a reassessment of aspects of my earliest studies of the household and women in public locations. Before I saw the agrarian household and Jesus' surrogate household as standing in tension but ultimately complementing one another due to the pervasive social reality of the "agrarian mould." I now see that the Matthean community most probably was being challenged by what Max Weber identifies as a routinization of charisma.<sup>48</sup> Would Matthew's community regress to the gender and social stratification realities indigenous to the larger Palestinian and Greco-Roman societies? The Evangelist, accordingly, in telling the stories about women (and others as well) was rekindling for the Jesus group the unconventional vision of the new surrogate family of God that stood diametrically opposed to the values and structural lines of the larger society. The community needed this pastoral instruction.

How else could one see the social/political position of Jesus as an Israelite healer? The hemorrhaging woman that he healed was a structurally marginal Israelite. The outcast Canaanite woman was not only a structural/cultural marginal—*doubly* so, a woman and a non-Israelite<sup>49</sup>—but also a *wise* woman who became Jesus' teacher. The girl was restored to life and her father signified the opposite pole of the household in agrarian societies, but their story paralleled that of the hemorrhaging woman. Social leveling among those who followed Jesus ran deep and wide. Within Jesus' surrogate family outcasts without households were lifted up and traditional elite households were brought down so that there might be social/religious reciprocity within the community due to the universal experience of God's mercy. That same message was carried forward in the story of the woman who anointed Jesus. In the end an unnamed outcast woman was designated a prophet by Jesus because her preparations of his body for burial constituted a prophetic act. This was so in spite of the disciples' criticism of her lavish anointing. By her visionary behavior she

48. See Weber, *Economy and Society*.

49. Anderson, "Matthew: Gender and Reading."

## JESUS AND MARGINAL WOMEN

taught the disciples, but they apparently were not ready or willing to see the meaning of her prophetic example as interpreted by Jesus. Finally, the women at the cross and tomb not only displayed faithful discipleship but uniquely functioned to fill the void of the male disciples' desertion of Jesus. They alone finished the interrupted lines of the ritual process of the male disciples and supplied a vital and indispensable bond to the realization of Matthew's purpose. The *Gestalt* configuration of these four women's stories heard within the larger tapestry of the writing served to warn a relatively wealthy, urban community not to capitulate to the magnetic, powerful influences of gender differentiation and stratification so pervasive to advanced agrarian social norms.

### PREVIOUS GENDER STUDIES OF THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

A number of studies have been done on gender in Matthew that have contributed to this field of inquiry and that have greatly benefited my own work. The unique contribution I bring to this topic is the analysis of most of the Gospel data through the use of multiple social-scientific models that provide an in-depth study of the stories of women in the Gospel.

Antoinette C. Wire employs macrosociology to explore "the meaning of gender in Matthew's Gospel," by reconstructing "the gender roles characteristic of scribal communities within advanced agricultural societies,"<sup>50</sup> and her analysis provides a basis for "evaluating how Matthew's gender construction is congruent and/or deviant within its social world."<sup>51</sup> Her conclusion, that the Matthean community exhibits deviant behavior but that conduct is couched within a pervasive patriarchal worldview, is similar to mine concerning the household. However, she does not address in depth the stories about women nor does she use multiple models to interpret the data.

Feminist rhetorical literary-critical analysis is applied to the Gospel in two studies by Judith A. Anderson, the first of which is an analysis of the writing as a whole, and the second is an investigation of the birth narratives in Matthew and Luke.<sup>52</sup> Anderson, by exploring the symbolic power of gender, discerns a pervasive androcentric perspective within

50. Wire, "Gender Roles in a Scribal Community," 87–121.

51. *Ibid.*

52. Anderson, "Matthew: Gender and Reading"; and *idem*, "Mary's Difference."

## Introduction

Matthew that she believes is couched in a “patriarchal social, political, religious, and economic” world view. For her, “the presence of such a view is not surprising given the pervasiveness cross-culturally of a male ideology that defines male as the norm, as “self,” and female as “different,” “anomalous,” or “other.” This binary opposition appears homologously in oppositions such as culture/nature, order/disorder, and public sphere/domestic sphere.”<sup>53</sup> Mary and other women of the Gospel fulfill extraordinary roles, Anderson holds, while remaining in subordinate and auxiliary positions to men.<sup>54</sup> Matthew’s exceptional treatment of women is played out within the boundaries of a patriarchal worldview.<sup>55</sup> Anderson and Wire, through the use of different methodologies, arrive at similar results. Their commendable efforts, however, do not probe the stories of women. Neither do they ask whether the Evangelist’s community is struggling over Jesus’ social vision of a new surrogate family.

Writing from a theological perspective, Jane Kopas surveys examples of women in the Gospel. The Gospel struggles “to incorporate women moving from the periphery to greater public involvement and from being victims and survivors to being disciples and leaders.”<sup>56</sup> In a redactional study, Maria J. Selvidge examines Matthew’s treatment of women against the violent background of the Matthean community.<sup>57</sup> Both Kopas and Selvidge utilize the text of the Gospel to provide contemporary theological insights. They see Matthew as an ally for human rights and the dignity and authentic existence of women today.<sup>58</sup>

A leading feminist reading of Matthew is the work of Elaine Wainwright. Her initial study, *Towards a Feminist Critical Reading of the Gospel according to Matthew*, is carried forward in her treatment of women in Matthew in the feminist commentary, *Searching the Scriptures, Volume 2*. Her most recent expansion of the theme is found in *Shall We Look for Another: A Feminist Re-reading of the Matthean Jesus*. These works advance a “*basileia* vision” of Jesus for a new age by utilizing Matthew’s first-century image of the scribe who is “trained” for the implementation of the

53. Anderson, “Mary’s Difference,” 183.

54. *Ibid.*, 185.

55. Love, “The Household.”

56. Kopas, “Jesus and Women in Matthew,” 13.

57. Selvidge, “Violence, Woman, and the Future.”

58. See Tolbert, “Introduction.”

“*basileia* vision,” an image that provides “a key to the narrative and theological worlds which the Matthean Gospel constructs.”<sup>59</sup> She recognizes that her work is not complete—in fact using her own words, “it has barely begun.”<sup>60</sup> Unfinished is the “difficult task of reconstructing the history of the Matthean community so that it is a history of women and men . . .”<sup>61</sup> My study carries forward another step in this journey. Not to be forgotten is Wainwright’s publication of Jesus as a healer titled, ‘*Women Healing/ Healing Women: The Genderisation of Healing in Early Christianity*’.

Useful for my work is the study by Sharon Ringe, “A Gentile Woman’s Story” located in the *Feminist Interpretation of the Bible*, edited by Letty M. Russell. Ringe identifies the Canaanite woman as an outcast prostitute, a finding that parallels my research. She also treats Matthew in the first volume of *Searching the Scriptures*, jointly edited by Ringe and Carol Newsom.

A book-length study by Parambi Baby, titled *The Discipleship of the Women in the Gospel according to Matthew*, asks whether it is possible “to speak of a discipleship of women” in the Gospel.<sup>62</sup> Baby contends that male religious Catholic exegesis has tended to underplay the significance of women in the gospels, whereas feminist studies, both Catholic and Protestant, have resulted in “forced exegesis.” Baby seeks to offer “a balanced and systematic approach to the question of the discipleship of women.”<sup>63</sup> Whether that is accomplished along with the purposes of opening new frontiers and addressing issues about discipleship in the early community remains problematic.

Significant gender or family analysis of Matthew within larger works include Kathleen Corley’s chapter in *Private Women, Public Meals: Social Conflict in the Synoptic Tradition*, families in Matthew within the larger tapestry of *Families in the New Testament World* by David Balch and Carolyn Osiek, and the treatment of Matthew by Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza in her well-known work, *In Memory of Her*. Balch and Osiek set their study within the Mediterranean cultural value of honor and shame. Not to be forgotten is an article by Celia Deutsch, “Wisdom in Matthew:

59. Wainwright, “The Gospel of Matthew,” 67.

60. Ibid.

61. Ibid.

62. Baby, *The Discipleship of the Women*, 9.

63. Ibid, 10.

## *Introduction*

Transformation of a Symbol.” Most of these studies are not social-scientific in nature and the one that is, works only with macrosociology in the formation of a working model. My work, therefore, fills a distinct place in a growing body of literature.

### APPROACH

Having set forth the journey and thesis of my research and a review of the literature I now encourage the reader to examine the development of my analysis. Chapter 2, “The Household in Matthew,” introduces what is meant by social-scientific modeling and is followed by an examination of gender-specific behavior in Matthew by means of a macrosociological model of the household.

Chapter 3, “Women and Men in Public Settings in Matthew,” extends and deepens the findings of the household model set forth in chapter 1 by examining the place of women among three character groups: the disciples, the crowds, and the religious leaders as they are taught by Jesus or interact with him in three representative public settings: the mountain in the Sermon on the Mount (5:1—7:28), the boat in the Parables Discourse (13:1–52), and the temple in the clash between Jesus and the religious authorities (21:12—23:29). In addition to the household model in advanced agrarian societies, I add a parallel microsocial index of women in mishnaic culture. These two chapters set the stage for the four stories about women.

However, before those stories are examined, the reader is introduced in chapter 4 to three additional models that are utilized more than once in the stories about women—(1) honor and shame, (2) healing in non-Western societies, (3) a native taxonomy of illness—degrees of impurity.

Three other models, (1) patronage, (2) prostitutes in advanced agrarian societies, and (3) an initiation/death rites of passage are employed but once, and their constructions are reserved for the particular story in which they are used.

The models used in each chapter are set forth in the following diagram.

### CHAPTERS AND THE MODELS THEY EMPLOY

Chapter 4—“Three Essential Models”—three models used more than once are described:

## JESUS AND MARGINAL WOMEN

1. Honor and shame,
2. Healing in non-Western societies,
3. A native taxonomy of illness—degrees of impurity.

Chapter 5—“Jesus Heals the Hemorrhaging Woman and Restores a Girl to Life” employs the three models constructed in chapter 3.

Chapter 6—“Jesus heals the Canaanite Woman’s Daughter” employs the three models set forth in chapter 3. In addition a fourth model is employed: a macrosociological model of prostitutes in advanced agrarian societies.

Chapter 7—“Why do You Trouble the Woman? The Woman Who Anoints Jesus at Bethany” employs the models of (1) honor and shame and degrees of impurity. In addition a patronage model is utilized.

Chapter 8—“Jesus and the Women at the Cross and Tomb” employs only an initiation/burial rites of passage model.

After chapter 8 I summarize my findings and engage in hermeneutical reflection concerning how the Gospel of Matthew’s treatment of women might be used profitably today.

Finally, I am indebted to many who have patiently helped my research over a twenty-year span. But most of all I am grateful and indebted to my wife, D’Esta, whose insights, suggestions, and inspiration have helped me far beyond what words convey.