

*Spiritual Equals: Women in the Q Gender Pairs*

Sara Parks

Faculty of Religious Studies  
McGill University, Montreal

April, 2016

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree  
of PhD in Religious Studies.

© Sara Parks 2016

# Contents

Abstract.....	4
Résumé.....	4
Acknowledgements.....	6
Introduction.....	8
The Use of the Terms “Intellectual, Spiritual, and Religious” in this Project.....	14
On Method .....	15
On Method: Engaged Historical Criticism .....	15
On Method: Socio-Historical Claims from Literary Evidence .....	20
On Method: A Note on the Use of Gender as a Category .....	22
The Significance of Q for Women's History .....	24
Chapter Outline .....	29
Chapter 1: Background to Q and the Q People.....	35
A Brief Background to Q.....	35
Significance beyond the Synoptic Problem .....	37
“Q People” .....	39
Galilean Provenance .....	41
Sayings, Rather than Biography or Christology .....	43
An interest in the <i>Basileia</i> of God.....	44
Both Sapiential and Apocalyptic .....	46
Itinerant.....	49
Jewish Rather than Gentile .....	50
Subversive or Countercultural .....	52
Q People and Women: General Background.....	54
Chapter 2: Gendered Pairs in Q: Review of Literature.....	56
Introduction.....	56
The Pairs in Gospel Context: The Lukan Gender Pairs as Gateway .....	57
Divorcing Q’s Women from Gospel Women .....	58
The Pairs in Pre-Gospel Context: Review of Secondary Literature on the Q Gender Pairs.....	65
Perspective 1: Q’s Gender Pairs as Evidence for Gender Equality in the Early Jesus Movement .....	66
Luise Schottroff .....	66
Denis Fricker.....	68
Jean-Francois Racine .....	68
Perspective 1.5: Gender Pairs are Only Evidence of Equality in Keeping With Late Republic Equality.....	69
Alicia Batten .....	70
Kathleen Corley .....	73
Perspective 2: Gender Pairs not Evidence of Equality at All .....	73
Amy-Jill Levine .....	74
William Arnal .....	76

Evaluation and Conclusions.....	77
Chapter 3 Gendered Pairs in Q: Taxonomy and Individual Analysis.....	82
Definitions.....	82
Full Pairs .....	84
Shorter Pairs.....	87
Taxonomy: Full Pairs.....	88
Taxonomy: Shorter Pairs .....	89
Text and Analysis of Each Full Pair .....	90
Gender Implied .....	90
Q 12:24, 27 Ravens/Lilies.....	90
Q 11:11–12 Bread/Fish .....	92
Gender Overt.....	94
Luke 4:25–27 Many Widows including Zarephath/Many Lepers including Naaman .....	94
Luke 11:5–8/Luke 18:2–5 Persistent Friend/Persistent Widow .....	96
Q 11:31–32 The Queen of the South and the Ninevite Men.....	100
Gender Both Overt and Implied.....	101
Q 13:18–21 Mustard Seed/Yeast .....	101
Q 15:4–5a, 7–9 Lost Sheep and Lost Coin .....	104
Q 17:34–35 Two Men/Two Women.....	106
Texts and Analysis of the Shorter Pairs.....	108
Q 7:29-30? Tax Collectors and Prostitutes .....	108
Q 7:31–32 Fluting and Wailing .....	111
Q 12:51–53 Division in the Household .....	112
Q 14:26 Parents and Children .....	114
Chapter Conclusions .....	115
Chapter 4: Other Ancient Examples of Gendered Pairs: Where They Are Not and Where They Are.....	120
Summary of Chapters 2 and 3.....	121
No Direct Literary Ancestry for the Q pairs: Close Calls.....	125
Close Calls in the Hebrew Bible / Tanakh and the Apocrypha/Pseudepigrapha.....	126
Close Calls in the Tanakh and Apocrypha.....	126
Parables and Parallelism in the Tanakh and Apocrypha.....	127
Grammatical Gender and Parallelism in Hebrew Poetry .....	130
Close Calls in the Pseudepigrapha.....	132
Joseph and Aseneth.....	133
Close Calls in Other Hellenistic literature .....	135
Parables and Fables in other Hellenistic Writings .....	136
Close Calls in Rabbinic Literature: Arnal’s Scribal Wordplay .....	137
Summary of Close Calls: Gender Pairs as Innovation.....	140
Gender Pairs in Contemporaneous and Later Texts .....	141
The Afterlife of the Q Gender Pairs.....	141
Luke/Acts and Gender Pairs .....	142
John’s Gospel and Gender Pairs .....	144
Mark’s Gospel and Gender Pairs .....	147
Conclusion: Gender Pairing and the Historical Jesus .....	148
Multiple Attestation .....	149

Embarrassment.....	151
Dissimilarity.....	152
Conclusion .....	153
Conclusion .....	156
Future Directions .....	161
Sources Cited .....	165

## Abstract

Q is a text remarkably careful to address identical didactic material about the *basileia* to female and male recipients in turn. My research confirms that this rhetorical strategy in Q—the so-called gender doublets or *doppelgleichnisse*—is unprecedented in extant Hellenistic and early Jewish literature. Given that Q forms part of the earliest stratum of Jesus material, we can say with a degree of certainty that an early branch of the Jesus movement deliberately treated its male and female adherents with a striking degree of intellectual and spiritual equality. Moreover, one finds vestiges of this innovative gender-pairing in one instance in Mark's gospel and at the narrative level throughout the Gospel of John; therefore, this equal intellectual treatment of men and women very likely originates with the historical Jesus. This does not, however, indicate that Jesus or Q had an egalitarian programme or an overt aim of dismantling patriarchal norms. While Q's treatment of women does indicate *intellectual and religious* equality, it by no means promotes *social* equality. Typical societal gender roles remain intact and unchallenged, apart from a few exceptions. These exceptions include the disruption of familial loyalties if required for the sake of the *basileia*, and possibly the endorsement of both women and men as itinerant messengers. The "gender equality" present in Q is therefore circumscribed. Thus, the thesis of this project is that the gender parallel pairs are an innovation within the earliest Jesus movement which attests to a qualified equality between men's and women's religious practices and intellectual capacities, but does not attest to an anti-patriarchal programme or to "egalitarian" values. My thesis therefore offers a way through the somewhat divided feminist scholarship on the Q pairs, some of which tends to champion Q as an inspiring egalitarian and feminist project, a "discipleship of equals," over and against rigid patriarchy, and some of which condemns Q as androcentric. I offer a middle path wherein: although Q's encouragement of women's agency in specific instances is in keeping with a relaxing of restrictions on women that blossomed for a time in the Late Republic, Q's particular literary device of gender pairs is nevertheless an innovation that meant greater agency and greater public visibility in the lives of women in the movement. It is important to note that this innovation was not, as some would claim, over and against other Judaisms of the day. Nor was it part of a gender-egalitarian or anti-patriarchal programme on the part of Jesus or his early followers, as evidenced by Q's comfortable and frequent use of androcentric language and its overall retention of stereotypical social gender roles.

## Résumé

Q est un texte qui a pris soin de s'adresser identiquement aux destinataires masculins et féminins à leur tour en transmettant son matériel didactique sur la *basileia*. Ma recherche confirme que cette stratégie rhétorique dans Q—les soi-disant « gender doublets » ou bien *doppelgleichnisse*—est sans précédent dans la littérature hellénistique et juive. Étant donné que Q fait partie de la première couche de matériau Jésus, on peut dire avec un degré de certitude qu'une forme du début du mouvement de Jésus primitif traitait délibérément ses adhérents

masculins et féminins avec une égalité intellectuelle et spirituelle. De plus, on trouve des vestiges de ce jumelage innovant dans un cas dans l'évangile de Marc et et généralement au niveau narratif à travers l'évangile de Jean ; donc, ce traitement intellectuelle égale des hommes et des femmes a probablement son origine avec le Jésus historique. Cependant, cela ne signifie pas que Jésus/Q avait un programme égalitaire ou un but manifeste de démanteler les normes patriarcales. Bien que le traitement des femmes par Q indique l'égalité intellectuelle et religieuse, Q est loin de promouvoir l'égalité sociale pour les hommes et les femmes. Les rôles de genre typiques restent intacts et incontesté, en dehors de quelques exceptions. Ces exceptions comprennent la perturbation des loyautés familiales si nécessaire pour le bien de la *basileia*, et peut-être l'approbation des femmes comme des hommes comme messagères itinérantes. « L'égalité » des genres qui se trouve dans Q est donc limitée. Ainsi, la thèse de ce projet est que les paires de Q sont une innovation dans le premier mouvement de Jésus qui atteste d'une égalité qualifiée entre les pratiques religieuses et les capacités intellectuelles des hommes et des femmes, mais n'atteste pas d'un programme anti-patriarcal ou des valeurs égalitaires. Ma thèse propose ainsi un chemin à travers une discussion divisée sur les paires de Q, dont la moitié défend Q comme un projet inspirant égalitaire et féministe et un « apostolat des égaux » contrairement à un patriarcat rigide, et dont l'autre moitié condamne Q comme androcentrique. Je propose un chemin de milieu dans lequel : bien que l'encouragement de Q du pouvoir des femmes dans des cas spécifiques soit en accord avec une décontraction des restrictions sur les femmes qui a fleuri pendant un certain temps dans la République tardive, la figure de style des paires de genre de Q est néanmoins une innovation qui signifie plus de pouvoir et une plus grande visibilité publique pour les femmes du mouvement. Cela dit, cette innovation était ni, comme certains le prétendent, en désaccord avec les autres judaïsmes de l'époque, ni un programme égalitaire ou anti-patriarcale de la part de Jésus ou de ses premiers disciples. Ce dernier se traduit par une utilisation confortable et fréquente d'un langage androcentrique et sa rétention globale de rôles de genre stéréotypés.

## Acknowledgements

A PhD dissertation is a lonely endeavour but it is never endeavoured alone. At every stage of the process, from admission to convocation, there are individuals without whom the project would falter and fail. While it isn't practical or possible to list them all, I would be remiss not to thank the following supporters, each of whom in their way is a part of the reason this project exists today. Thank you, to:

Dr. Meredith Warren and Dr. Shayna Sheinfeld, who are so much more than my Writing Group, my fierce cheerleaders, and my pedagogical co-conspirators. May our "Mediterranean Triad" continue to enjoy the sweet wine of friendship, co-creation, and tracked changes for decades to come.

To the gang back home in Moncton who believed in me, even though it meant keeping us apart all these years, especially the McKee's Mills Girls and the Cowgirls. Thank you for being the brilliant kind of friends that time and distance don't tarnish.

To the rescue squad, KLo and Cath, for festive celebrations at every small success (sometimes literally one celebration per page), and especially to Kerry-Lin, who fixed me.

To Adrian and Andrea, for the hardest I've ever laughed.

To Dr. Matthew Anderson, for preparing me for my defense, in case there were any questions on Luther or limericks.

To Dr. Winston Parks and Shirley Parks, who have worked hard all their lives to support me financially, and, more importantly, who love me no matter what. Your unconditional love, which helps me imagine the love of God, is the steadiest I have ever known.

To Dr. Ger Oegema, my Doktorvater and mentor, the Q to my James Bond. You are the reason I didn't quit. I could write another dissertation on your lavish support and constant encouragement, but I will say only that if I ever have the honour of supervising graduate students and teaching undergrads, I will try to do everything exactly like you do. I am happily indebted to you for life.

To Dr. Ellen Aitken: you left us too soon. Your loss ripped a jagged hole in the lives of your students and colleagues. While we feel your absence so tangibly, we keep you vibrantly alive by trying to think as you would think, write as you would write, and, most importantly, behave justly and equitably, as you did in your classroom and in the world.

To the others at the McGill Faculty of Religious Studies, including my fellow graduate students past and present, the administrative assistants who hold the whole thing together and know all the answers, and to Dr. Patricia Kirkpatrick and Dr. Ian Henderson, who shaped me.

And finally, to Thomson House, the Atlantic Ocean, CBC Radio One, the Bay of Fundy, coffee, scotch, and cats, you're on every page. (To Sweet Pea, I'm sorry I deleted that part you wrote while napping on the keyboard, but it just didn't flow.)

My deep gratitude and affection to everyone mentioned here and many not mentioned. Take enormous credit for anything that shines herein. I alone take credit for the weak bits.



## Introduction

The words of Jesus of Nazareth have fascinated devotees and academics alike, in an unbroken line from antiquity to the present moment. By comparison, it is only recently that anyone has formally investigated how these teachings relate to women. Woman-centred and gender-aware approaches to Jesus' sayings material have emerged in the last half-century and continue to gain breadth and depth.<sup>1</sup> While the question of what Jesus had to say to and about women may have struggled at the academic margins at first, this is not the case today. Indeed, the relationship between women and the early Jesus movement is currently a vibrant topic of research.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, it is somewhat surprising that despite an unfailing interest in Jesus and a newly-flourishing interest in his relationship to women, few have systematically narrowed such

---

<sup>1</sup> See A. Yarbro Collins, ed. *Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship*, for a history of approaches to the question and a careful discussion of method (Chico: Scholars, 1985), as well as the introductory chapters to C. Meyers, ed. *Women in Scripture: A Dictionary of Named and Unnamed Women in the Hebrew Bible, the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books, and the New Testament* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2000).

<sup>2</sup> According to Sidnie Ann White, "interest in the role and status of women in Second Temple Judaism (and generally in Judaism and Christianity) has increased exponentially in the past twenty-five years." S. A. White, "Women: Second Temple Period," in *The Oxford Guide to People and Places of the Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 330. According to Cullen Murphy, in *The Word According to Eve*, "The Bible is famous for being the world's most overstudied book—overstudied by male scholars and commentators, that is to say. It has not, however, been overstudied by women. Indeed, until recently, it was studied by female scholars hardly at all, let alone by female scholars who were interested specifically in what the Bible had to say about women. This has changed, to put it mildly." (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1998), x. Volumes dedicated to uncovering the historical realities of women in antiquity are beginning to appear as well, such as, for example, Harvard University's masterful five-volume history of women from ancient goddesses to the twentieth century, *A History of Women in the West* (G. Duby and M. Perrot, series eds.; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994–1996).

questions in focus toward what is probably the earliest evidence for Jesus' treatment of women—the Q sayings source.<sup>3</sup> This oversight is despite the fact that Q is not only rich with references to women, but also boasts, as I argue herein, a unique literary device that highlights binary gender in an unmistakably deliberate way. This device, which I have labelled “parallel gender pairs,”<sup>4</sup> and others have termed “gender doublets,” is at the core of this project.<sup>5</sup>

The parallel gender pairs work as follows: there are two didactic pieces (such as similes about the *basileia* of God)<sup>6</sup> or parables in a row in Q. The two parables or sayings are verbally parallel—sometimes identical—except that one lesson features a male character or characters and the other features a female character or characters. Alternatively, masculinity and femininity (as constructed in the first century) are inferred more subtly, such as by mentioning two household tasks, one of which is normally done by the men of the day and the other normally performed by the women. Additionally, smaller-scale binary gendered pairing also occurs throughout Q, such as in passing phrases like “sons and daughters” or “brothers and sisters.”

---

<sup>3</sup> James Robinson states that Q “is generally agreed to provide the oldest surviving layer of material brought together by Jesus’ disciples.” J. Robinson, “The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus,” in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (ed. A. Lindemann; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001), 27. Gerd Theissen and Annette Merz describe Q as “certainly the most important source for reconstructing the teaching of Jesus.” G. Theissen and A. Merz, *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998), 29.

<sup>4</sup> See Chapter Three for a complete definition and description of the literary devices in question.

<sup>5</sup> Most people who discuss this literary device use either “gender doublet” or “gender couplet” to refer to what is more precisely a type of parallelism. I find the choice of the term “doublet” to be undesirable, due to its potential to cause confusion in the context of discussing Q, for the simple reason that “doublet” is a text-critical term used frequently in Synoptic studies to mean something else; there, a doublet is a repetition of the same verse in a different literary context. For this reason, I have chosen to discontinue the trend of referring to the parallel Q pairs as “doublets.” Likewise, I avoid the term “couplet,” simply because of potential confusion with its use in poetry. To me, it only makes sense to guide any future discussion of the gender parallelism in Q toward precision by using the terms “gender parallels,” “gender pairs,” or “parallel parable pairs.” These are the sorts of terms I have chosen to use throughout this project.

<sup>6</sup> Due to the frequency of the use of “Kingdom of God” language in Q and elsewhere, I refer to the movement surrounding Jesus of Nazareth as a “*basileia*” movement. I prefer to leave *basileia* untranslated since, as Schüssler Fiorenza notes, “it is difficult to translate the term *basileia* adequately because it can either mean kingdom, kingly realm, domain or empire, or it can be rendered as monarchy, kingly rule, sovereignty, dominion and reign. In any case it[s] English translation] has not only monarchic but also masculinist overtones” and this is all the more important since the *basileia* is a “central symbol” in Jesus’ movement. E. Schüssler Fiorenza, “Jesus of Nazareth in Historical Research,” pages 29–48 in *Thinking of Christ: Proclamation, Explanation, Meaning* (T. Wiley, ed.; New York: Continuum, 2003), 45.

I herein suggest that this rhetorical strategy in Q, which appears to intentionally treat male and female adherents with a specific type of equality,<sup>7</sup> is unprecedented<sup>8</sup> in previous Hellenistic and early Jewish<sup>9</sup> literature. Yet although these pairs in Q and their uniqueness in Greco-Roman literature seem like such a promising resource for the history of wo/men in early Jewish and early Christian<sup>10</sup> antiquity, there exists to date but a handful of feminist scholars who discuss this

---

<sup>7</sup> For the purposes of this project, I employ the terms “equality” and “egalitarian” in a limited sense—that is, as useful shortcuts for describing a process of “levelling” which brings members of separate social categories closer together in some way into a new, shared category that is less hierarchical. Wherever these words and their derivatives are used throughout, this will be the intended definition. I recognise that egalitarianism is a modern category of analysis, not an ancient one, and must be clearly defined in order to avoid anachronistic readings when attempting to describe social or literary phenomena in the ancient world that allow people to transgress their expected boundaries of class, gender, or status. See John H. Elliott, “Jesus was not an Egalitarian: A Critique of an Anachronistic and Idealist Theory” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 32 (2002): 75–91 for a critique of scholars who, in Elliott’s view, paint too rosy a picture of early Christianity at the expense of historicity. Elliott calls, rightly, for a definition of “egalitarian” by any who choose to use the term (76). For Q, cf. the “limited ‘egalitarian’ ideology” in tension with “social reality” in the Matthean and/or Q communities, described by Dennis Duling in “‘Egalitarian’ Ideology, Leadership, and Factional Conflict within the Matthean Group,” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 27 (1997): 124–137. This issue is discussed at greater length throughout Chapter 4.

<sup>8</sup> See Chapter 4 for my arguments toward establishing the innovative nature of the gendered parable pairs.

<sup>9</sup> For the purposes of this project, “early Jewish” refers to the area of scholarly study that coincides roughly with the Second Temple period, and is broadly applied, so as to include both geographical (e.g. Judaeans) and religious (e.g. Torah-abiding) designations. The terms “Judaism,” “Jewish,” or “early Jewish” are never used over and against the terms “Hellenism” or “Hellenistic” but are rather a specific subcategory within Hellenism, which I trust would please the late Martin Hengel, whose thesis on Judaism and Hellenism has been one of the most game-changing works in Second Temple studies, and remains to this day a well-used standard: M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus : Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2 Jh.s v. Chr.* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1973) and *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period* (1<sup>st</sup> English ed.; 2 vols.; London: SCM, 1974). As for the recent trend to refer to “Judaeans” rather than Jews, which took hold beginning with Steve Mason’s article (“Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History” *JSJ* 38 [2007]: 457–512), I instead follow Adele Reinhartz and others who prefer to continue to refer to Jews, with the caveat that ancient divisions between categories such as ethnicity and religion are not identical to our own (A. Reinhartz, “The Vanishing Jews of Antiquity” *Marginalia Review of Books*, 24 June 2014, n.p. [cited July 15, 2015]. Online: <http://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/vanishing-jews-antiquity-adele-reinhartz>).

<sup>10</sup> For the purposes of this project, “early Christian” refers to offshoots of the Jesus movement after such time as they began to be referred to as *Christianoi*, but it never excludes the possibility of Jewish membership, co-identity, or leadership, as my view of the “parting of the ways” is akin to Daniel Boyarin’s in terms of potentially late *terminus ad quem* and to Adele Reinhartz’ in terms of complexity and fluidity. See D. Boyarin, *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999) and A. Reinhartz, “A Fork in the Road or a Multi-Lane Highway? New Perspectives on ‘The Parting of the Ways’ Between Judaism and Christianity” in *The Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity and Other Greco-Roman Religions in Antiquity* (Studien zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, Bd 2; ed. G. Oegema and I. Henderson; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2005), 278–293. It is, of course, important to recognise the difficulty in designations for “Jewish” and “Christian” in the era before the “parting of the ways” coalesced. See the important essay by J. Lieu: “‘Impregnable Ramparts and Walls of Iron’: Boundary and Identity in Early ‘Judaism’ and ‘Christianity’” *NTS* 48 (2002): 297–313 as well as J. J. Pilch’s “Are there Jews and Christians in the Bible?” *HTS* 53/1 (1997): 119–125.

literary device in Q. These are addressed systematically in the literature review in chapter two, and I work to synthesise and clarify their sometimes disparate approaches and findings throughout this dissertation, in a way that should prove useful to future scholars of women in Q.

I have shown herein that the pairs do not have Hellenistic/Jewish literary precedent. However, there are what I believe to be vestiges of this innovative gender-pairing in literature that followed Q, namely, in a single verse in Mark's gospel and (at a broader narrative level) in the Gospel of John. Therefore, a standard criterion of authenticity in Historical Jesus Research—namely, that of multiple attestations in independent sources—may strengthen the notion that the gender equality preserved in Q can be linked to the historical Jesus.<sup>11</sup> Thus, although, in some ways, “Q puts us as close to the historical Jesus as we will ever be,”<sup>12</sup> I link this innovation in gender equality with Jesus not only on this basis of Q's temporal proximity to Jesus, but also by exploring the use of the criterion of multiple attestation in conjunction with binary gender-pairing. Highlighting possible vestiges of this rhetorical innovation in both Mark's and John's gospels alerts us to that the idea was “in the air” prior to its appearance in these sources. Given the lack of tenable literary roots for the gender pairs in early Jewish or Hellenistic works prior to

---

<sup>11</sup> I am well aware that the criteria of authenticity (and the heavily form-criticism based notion of “in/authentic” itself) have been challenged in recent years, with some scholars calling for their abandonment or at least their revision. See Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne, eds., *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity* (New York: T&T Clark, 2012). For a critique of the criterion of multiple attestation in particular, see Mark Goodacre, “Criticising the Criterion of Multiple Attestation: The Historical Jesus and the Question of Sources,” 152–172 in that same volume. However, in my view, criteria (such as that of multiple attestation in independent sources) remain useful, if not for examining precise textual transmission, then certainly for elucidating the historical development of ideas behind texts, especially when used alongside the findings from other recent approaches such as orality and memory studies. “The criterion of *multiple attestation* focuses on sayings or deeds of Jesus witnessed (i) in more than one independent literary source (e.g., Mark, Q, Paul, or John) and/or (ii) in more than one literary form or genre.” John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew, Volume 4: Law and Love* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 15.

<sup>12</sup> Burton Mack, *Who Wrote the New Testament: The Making of the Christian Myth* (New York: HarperCollins, 1995), 47.

Q, the criterion of dissimilarity strengthens this link between gendered pairing and Jesus of Nazareth.<sup>13</sup>

That said, while this project shows that the Q pairs and their traces in later independent early Christian texts do indicate a relationship between Jesus' *logia* and an interest in pairing binary gender in a way that sometimes implies spiritual—although not social—equality, a conclusion that Jesus programmatically advocated “egalitarian” values or had the dismantling of patriarchal<sup>14</sup> norms as a project does not automatically follow. Perhaps the disagreement between those feminist readings which use the sayings to argue for gender equality in the Jesus movement and those which do not see such equality in the pairs stems from overlooking the nuance that this project has uncovered—namely, that the equality which is implied in the Q pairs

---

<sup>13</sup> According to this criterion, also sometimes referred to as the “criterion of discontinuity,” the “material which can be shown to be dissimilar to characteristic emphases both of ancient Judaism and of the early Church” is flagged as potentially more likely to be authentic. (N. Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* [London: SCM, 1967], 39. John Meier, who uses the term “Discontinuity,” writes that this criterion “focuses on words or deeds of Jesus that cannot be derived either from the Judaism(s) of Jesus’ time or from the early church.” Meier, *A Marginal Jew, Volume 4*, 15.) In other words, if something placed in the mouth of Jesus cannot be traced to previous expressions of Judaism, as I demonstrate that the Q pairs cannot, nor to agendas of the later Christian Church, then the possibility that they are indeed authentic individual teachings of the teacher himself is heightened. While this criterion has rightly been criticised (see G. S. Oegema, *Apocalyptic Interpretation of the Bible* [New York: T&T Clark, 2012], esp. pp. 78–79) because its unbalanced use could lead to a reconstruction of the historical Jesus that is unrealistically dissimilar to the varieties of Judaism in and around the first century, I do advocate its use in conjunction with various other criteria (such as the criterion of embarrassment, of similarity, and of multiple attestation), which work together to avoid the recreation of an overly anomalous Jesus, especially in conjunction with other approaches, including those that incorporate recent paradigms of memory and orality.

<sup>14</sup> For the purposes of this project, the term “patriarchy” is defined as a paradigm of “father-rule,” that is, “the perspective of some powerful males over other males, and over most women and children.” A. Loades, “Feminist Interpretation,” *The Cambridge Companion to Biblical Interpretation* (ed. John Barton; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 82. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza’s brief definition is also applicable: “a male pyramid of graded subordinations.” *Bread Not Stone* (Boston: Beacon, 1995), xiv.

is not social equality, but is limited very precisely to one realm. The boundaries of that realm are difficult to define but they are herein described as intellectual,<sup>15</sup> spiritual,<sup>16</sup> and/or religious.<sup>17</sup>

My work on this topic establishes that Q represents an innovative didactic method that promoted equality or sameness between the genders (perceived as binary) on an intellectual, spiritual, and/or religious level, while on a social level it simultaneously reinforced gendered roles that were in keeping with the androcentrism<sup>18</sup> and kyriocentrism<sup>19</sup> of the day. My interpretation resolves a scholarly division between those who argue for a gender-levelling message in this sayings material and those who argue that Q, overall, is a text that reinforces and participates in patriarchy and androcentrism. By clarifying the nature of the levelling, I shift the conversation in such a way as to validate important arguments on both sides of the debate, and

---

<sup>15</sup> Intellectual: “1. Apprehended or apprehensible only by the intellect or mind (as opposed to by the senses), non-material, spiritual. 2.a. Of or belonging to the intellect or understanding.” Oxford University Press, *Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), n.p. (cited June 25, 2015). Online: <http://dictionary.oed.com/entrance.dtl>.

<sup>16</sup> Spiritual: “1.a. Of or relating to, affecting or concerning, the spirit or higher moral qualities, esp. as regarded in a religious aspect. (Freq. in express or implied distinction to bodily, corporal, or temporal.)” “4.a. Of or relating to, consisting of, spirit, regarded in either a religious or intellectual aspect; of the nature of a spirit or incorporeal supernatural essence; immaterial.” *OED*, n.p. (cited June 25, 2015).

<sup>17</sup> Religious: “2.a. Chiefly of a person: devoted to religion; exhibiting the spiritual or practical effects of religion, following the requirements of a religion; pious, godly, devout.” *OED*, n.p. (cited June 25, 2015). Before this work goes to publication, it will examine these concepts—namely, “spiritual, intellectual, and religious,” from emic first-century perspectives in addition to the etic categories applied herein. For more on this, see the section, “The Use of the Terms ‘Intellectual, Spiritual, and Religious’ in this Project,” immediately below.

<sup>18</sup> It is a given that the time period in question was male-dominated: “The major groups of texts of the Second Temple period are androcentric in focus, written by male authors for a male audience, and they mention women only rarely and usually in peripheral contexts.” White, “Women: Second Temple Period,” 331.

<sup>19</sup> Schüssler Fiorenza coined the term “kyriarchy” in order, in her words, “to connote a complex systemic interstructuring of sexism, racism, classism, and cultural-religious imperialism.” “Feminist/Women Priests – An Oxymoron?” *New Women/New Church*, (Fall 1995): 18. The neologism first appeared in *But She Said: Feminist Practices of Biblical Interpretation* (Boston: Beacon, 1992). According to Schüssler Fiorenza, the term “kyriocentric” describes “ideological articulations that validate and are sustained by kyriarchal relations of domination. Since kyriocentrism replaces the category of androcentrism, it is best understood as an intellectual framework and cultural ideology that legitimates and is legitimated by kyriarchal social structures and systems of domination.” *Jesus: Miriam’s Child, Sophia’s Prophet: Critical Issues in Feminist Christology* (New York: Continuum, 1995), 14. See also E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *Wisdom Ways: Introducing Feminist Biblical Interpretation* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2001).

demonstrate a means of highlighting the elements in the Q sayings that are woman-positive that does not entail supersessionism.

### *The Use of the Terms “Intellectual, Spiritual, and Religious” in this Project*

I use these three words somewhat interchangeably throughout this work in opposition to all the ways in which women and men are *not* construed as equal or similar in Q. This cluster of admittedly etic, yet nevertheless useful, concepts differentiates Q’s limited gender equality from absolute gender equality, as I will demonstrate in the following chapters. I argue herein that the gendered parable pairs assume that women hearers are not in any way different intellectually (i.e. in their ability to comprehend and apply the lesson), spiritually (i.e. in their capacity to enter into relationship with the other, whether divine or human, at a level other than physical and social), and/or religiously (i.e. in their value to the *basileia* movement and thus their implied value to God). When the words “intellectual, spiritual, and religious” are used herein, for the purposes of this work, I ask my readers to read them as meaning essentially “not material”<sup>20</sup> and “not social,” and bearing in mind the above definitions. In other words, these terms describe “internal” human traits, not visible to an external observer as an occupation or a garment might be, and not linked (at least not in Q) to gender. This juxtaposition between “spiritual” and “social” is employed by other scholars of women in Early Judaism and Christianity as well.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Note that this sense is built into the meaning of the word “spiritual” in the *OED*, which states that it is used frequently “in express or implied distinction to bodily, corporal, or temporal” and that the concepts of intellect and religion are likewise rolled into the concept of spiritual: “of or relating to, consisting of, spirit, regarded in either a religious or intellectual aspect.” *OED*, n.p. (cited June 25<sup>th</sup>, 2015).

<sup>21</sup> See, e.g., Colleen Conway, “Gender Matters in John.” Pages 79–103 in *A Feminist Companion to John: Volume II* (ed. Amy-Jill Levine; Cleveland: Pilgrim, 2003), 102.

In the context of previous texts from Greco-Roman Jewish antiquity and beyond, the gender pairs stand out as innovative for their overt and repeated use of matching masculine and feminine examples to teach an identical lesson. Yet, in this same context, the Q texts maintain unremarkable, status-quo expectations for externally visible gender roles such as occupational tasks and social relationships. This tension can be resolved by discerning that Q can remain silent on gendered social tasks, while at the same time radically transcending gender when it comes to the spiritual and intellectual capacities of a given individual.

### *On Method*

#### On Method: Engaged Historical Criticism

Because my primary interest in the text of Q is as an historian, my methods can be described as historical-critical to the extent that I “seek to understand the ancient text in light of its historical origins”<sup>22</sup> and still believe, despite recent shifts away from historical-critical scholarship, that the goal of working toward elucidating antiquity through a variety of methodological lenses is relatively possible and useful. In addition, because my secondary interest in the text is as a feminist, I describe myself, like Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, as “a ‘connected critic’ who speaks from a marginal location and that of an engaged position.”<sup>23</sup> In other words, while I am interested in discovering the import of the Q gender pairs vis-à-vis their first speakers, hearers, and compilers, it is also specifically in my interest as a woman and as a

---

<sup>22</sup> R. N. Soulen and R. K. Soulen, “Historical Critical Method,” in *Handbook of Biblical Criticism, Fourth Edition* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011), 89.

<sup>23</sup> E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *Rhetoric and Ethic: The Politics of Biblical Studies* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 19.



feminist<sup>24</sup> to uncover stories and experiences of ancient women, and, in so doing, to affirm and value modern women and “Wo/man.”<sup>25</sup> “Connected critics” who employ historical criticism with a sceptical eye, and make inquiries which are not necessarily standard, but which ask instead about those marginalised by, in, and around the artefacts in question.<sup>26</sup> Such interests are not necessarily new to historical criticism; for instance, many post-Shoah historical-critical biblical scholars might also be described as “connected critics” for their work to rectify a marginalisation of Jews by excavating the Jewishness of the early Jesus movement and its texts, and counteracting the anti-Jewish interpretive biases that had prevailed for centuries. In recent decades, while some postmodern interpreters have abandoned historical-criticism as overly confident about the possibility of scholarly objectivity,<sup>27</sup> others have nonetheless continued to hone and develop the method to fit contemporary needs and incorporate the contemporary

---

<sup>24</sup> Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza often jokes at speaking engagements that she gets her definition of feminism from a bumper sticker she once saw, which reads: “Feminism is the radical notion that women are people.” I agree with the simplicity and broadness of this definition, but I also more formally employ the definition set out by Alice Ogden Bellis in *Helpmates, Harlots, and Heroes: Women's Stories in the Hebrew Bible* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007), 6. Bellis defines feminism, broadly, as “a point of view in which women are understood to be fully human and thus entitled to equal rights and privileges.”

<sup>25</sup> Throughout this work, the term “women” means human beings of the female gender, whether biological or socially constructed. However, the term “wo/men” (with a slash), is to be understood as inclusive of both women and men. This is a neologism of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza; in her words: “In order to lift into consciousness the linguistic violence of so-called generic male-centered language, I use the term “wo/men” and not “men” in an inclusive way. I suggest that whenever you see “wo/men” you understand it in a generic inclusive sense. Wo/men includes men, s/he includes he, and fe/male includes male. Feminist studies of language have shown that Western, kyriocentric—that is, master, lord, father, male centered—language systems understand language as both generic and as gender-specific. Wo/men always must think at least twice, if not three times, and adjudicate whether we are meant or not by so-called generic terms such as men, humans, Americans, or citizens. The writing of wo/men with a slash re-defines wo/men not only in linguistic but also in socio-political terms” (“Critical Feminist Studies in Religion,” *Critical Research on Religion* 1/43 [2013]: 48–49).

<sup>26</sup> See for instance, Luise Schottroff’s statement on the use of historical-critical methods by feminist theology: “I will inquire about the genres of texts and about their contexts in the history of thought and religion as does historical criticism, but always from the critical angle I have indicated. I ask about the *Sitz im Leben* (setting in life), but within the broad social sense of a social history critical of patriarchy. I inquire about the contents of the message of Jesus and his disciples, female and male, but always in the context of the question about their liberating or oppressive function and the praxis associated with them. I take a skeptical view of the methods of literary criticism and tradition criticism associated with the so-called historical-critical method.” L. Schottroff, “The Sayings Source Q,” in *Searching the Scriptures 2: A Feminist Commentary* (ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza; New York: Crossroad, 1994), 510.

<sup>27</sup> Soulen and Soulen, *Handbook of Biblical Criticism*, 88.

understanding of the inevitable “situatedness” of every scholar.<sup>28</sup> Those who continue to identify as historical-critical scholars in postmodernity must do so with the humility that comes with the degradation of the notion of objectivity. In his recent monograph on gender and biblical interpretation, which critiques the possibility of historical-critical objectivity and the idea of textual agency, Dale Martin conveys this crumbling of the foundations of objectivity:

We must admit that we are without secure foundations for knowledge. In the end there are no guarantees that we or anyone else will not use the text unethically. There are no reliable foundations. The answer to that problem is not just to keep insisting that there are, but to learn to live faithful and ethical lives without secure foundations.<sup>29</sup>

The current project puts historical-critical methods to work in the ethical interests of elucidating women’s history, and with the humility that comes with insecure foundations. My own situatedness as a white ecumenical Christian Canadian, and a feminist, will unquestionably leave its mark on my findings.<sup>30</sup>

Schüssler Fiorenza’s “third thesis” on the ethics of interpretation suggests that to interpret ancient texts without an awareness of marginalisation and of one’s own participation in intersecting lines of oppression is essentially unethical. She closes the gap between “objective” scholarship and engaged scholarship:

To propose the ethics of interpretation as a new interdisciplinary area in biblical studies means to overcome the assumed dichotomy between engaged scholarship (such as feminist, postcolonial, African American, queer, and other subdisciplines)

---

<sup>28</sup> On the complementarity of historical-critical and postmodern approaches, see John J. Collins, *The Bible After Babel: Historical Criticism in a Postmodern Age* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005).

<sup>29</sup> Dale B. Martin, *Sex and The Single Savior: Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 16.

<sup>30</sup> I acknowledge the long history of and the diversity within feminisms and agree with Ogden Bellis: “No one definition would satisfy all feminists.” Bellis, *Helpmates, Harlots, and Heroes*, 6. My personal definition of feminism is the belief that all human beings have the right to be valued equally and to have a voice, regardless of their gender, and that a significant degree of one’s gender has traditionally been and continues to be socially constructed in a way that reinforces an oppressive system whereby those considered “women” are given less agency, less value, and less voice. My feminism is intersectional in that I do not believe that any emancipation based on gender will be long-lasting, meaningful, or ethical unless co-emancipation occurs across all categories, such as class, race, culture, ability, etc.

and scientific (malestream) interpretation. Whereas the former is allegedly using ethical criteria, the latter is said to live up to a scientific ethos that gives precedence to cognitive criteria. Instead, I would argue that a scientific ethos demands both ethical and cognitive criteria that must be reasoned out in terms of standard knowledge and at the same time intersubjectively understandable and communicable. To split off rationality from ethics opens the door for irresponsible scholarship that can nevertheless from a subjective point of view be quite ethical.<sup>31</sup>

In my view, for me to approach the texts of antiquity with an historian's goal but without a feminist's goal would indeed be irresponsible. In order to produce scholarship that is both cognitive and ethical, I assume that historical criticism and scientific rigour, such as they are, do not suffer from working in tandem with—and adapting to—an interest in the marginalised. This is not to say that male historical-critical scholars throughout the history of scholarship have not been engaged. This is simply to note that the practice of acknowledging one's engagement *overtly* is a means of legitimising and acknowledging as scholarly a concern for those marginalised by a text and its interpretations.

In the same work cited above, Schüssler Fiorenza also states, "if texts and discourses are studied without reference to human agency or socio-historical situation, then language and texts become a closed system that takes on the character of 'scientific law.'"<sup>32</sup> The claim that one can undertake historical work from a "neutral" or "unbiased" standpoint is problematic at best,<sup>33</sup> and violent at worst. Claiming scientific neutrality while ignoring minority voices is not only impossible, but also unethical. All scholarship is engaged and has political and socio-historical consequences; only some scholarship admits it.

---

<sup>31</sup> Schüssler Fiorenza, *Rhetoric and Ethic*, 195–196.

<sup>32</sup> Schüssler Fiorenza, *Rhetoric and Ethic*, 97. See also Schottroff, "The Sayings Source Q," 511: "In traditional Western theology it is considered 'scientific' to adopt a (supposed) posture of neutrality toward the object of research and to take no account of one's own context. This 'neutrality' conceals the patriarchal biases expressed by a theological discipline that imagines itself to be independent of its social context."

<sup>33</sup> As Achtemeier puts it, "there is no such thing as a neutral, historical-critical, scientific, objective interpretation of the Scriptures." E. Achtemeier, "The Impossible Possibility: Evaluating the Feminist Approach to Bible and Theology," *Interpretation* 42 (1988): 50.

Yet this inevitable engagement can exist while retaining respect for ancient historical evidence. To approach the question of women in Q as an historian and as a feminist means, for me, to attempt to recover as much as possible about ancient women, whether what we uncover reveals kyriarchal oppression, or moments of emancipation from forcibly gendered modes of being, or—more likely—a complex combination of both. Feminist scholarship has sometimes been criticised for analyses that use evidence selectively in an attempt to “redeem” patriarchal ancient literature for theological purposes,<sup>34</sup> although I think that the performance of theology allows for texts to function differently than does the performance of history, although great overlap is often possible. Comparing the secondary scholarship on women in Q becomes complicated because some scholars identify primarily as theologians and others seem not to identify in this way, although they may be historians who work from feminist perspectives. I have endeavoured to acknowledge this tension among my sources, and to allow the analysis of primary texts in this project to be guided primarily by the text of Q, rather than by a programme to redeem or condemn the Jesus movement at the outset. The project is feminist in that it seeks to understand the place of women in the Q sayings and to elucidate the historical situation of their first-century female audience members, but it is not theological in that it does not set out for certain outcomes, whether to expose patriarchy/kyriarchy in the text, or to uncover points of emancipation in the text. For me, describing the role women in Q with greater nuance is service enough to feminism. I have therefore made every effort to let Q and its surrounding literary

---

<sup>34</sup> For a scathing response to overly-optimistic feminist readings of the Jesus movements and early Christianity which take place at the expense of historical accuracy and with little to no sensitivity to the issue of anti-Judaism, see A.-J. Levine, “Second-Temple Judaism, Jesus, and Women: Yeast of Eden” in *A Feminist Companion to the Hebrew Bible in the New Testament* (ed. Athalya Brenner; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996), 302–331. From the same volume, see also Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, “In the Dangerous Currents of Old Prejudices: How Predominant Thoughts have Disastrous Effects and What Could be Done to Counter Them,” 342–348 and Edna Brocke, “Do the Origins Already Contain the Malady?” 349–354.

context guide the discovery and description of what might be said of women and Q, rather than evaluating whether Q's view of women is, on the whole, positive or negative by this or that modern feminist set of standards.

It is my hope that by the time the reader reaches the concluding chapter, it will become obvious that asking ancient texts to answer questions about ancient women is not simply a niche or fringe concern. Rather, it is only when asking questions from all possible angles and with diverse interests in mind that we uncover the fullest possible picture. For instance, as my research shows, examining the role of women in Q can also provide answers to longstanding text-critical questions about Q's so-called literary strata, can establish that the historical Jesus or someone in his earliest movement was a rhetorical innovator, and can help better position Q within a broader literary and social context.

### On Method: Socio-Historical Claims from Literary Evidence

For an historian of women in antiquity whose evidence is primarily literary, the question of how far the evidence may be allowed to reach must be addressed. Textual evidence can sometimes point to socio-historical realities for real women of the time, but at other times the nature and dearth of our evidence restricts us to the history of *attitudes* towards women. Since virtually all of our ancient literary evidence is male-authored and directed to a male audience, even texts that do focus on historical women or female characters may not offer any useful data for ancient women's sociological realities, and instead can only provide evidence for the expressions of ancient male authors.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> See Broton on this distinction: "Recognizing that, for women, the state of the sources is similar to that for men and women for the periods usually deemed prehistorical should elicit in us the shock necessary for rethinking the

The current project is one in which both of these aspects of women's history—social reality and historical attitudes—intersect. My examination of Q as an early stratum of the evidence for the Jesus movement will uncover not only some ancient attitudes toward women, but also the potential socio-historical reality for some actual wo/men in the first century—a so-called Q Community of early consumers of the sayings collection. Because Q points to a levelling of gender roles at a literary/rhetorical level, it may also imply such a levelling at a socio-historical level. What I mean is that these paired sayings which take real-life examples in order to teach a lesson imply, by their systematic inclusion of women from the context, that *there are women in the audience*. This means that, unlike with texts that are clearly by men for men, with the paired sayings of Jesus we can move more confidently from text to social reality, reconstructing something of the women mentioned therein, who are not mere symbols, tropes, or fantasies, but are reflections of the women hearers of the *logia*.

The process of moving from ancient literary data to ancient socio-historical realities is one which requires great humility and caution. “One cannot,” in Claudia Camp’s words, “make the error of equating ‘women’s roles’ with ‘female images,’ lest one equate historical or sociological data with literary creations.”<sup>36</sup> As Randall Chesnutt points out, “what is feasible for women in literary fiction is not necessarily feasible in social reality.”<sup>37</sup> Nonetheless, the tentative

---

way we use the sources. *Sources by men are also primarily about men*; they may have little or nothing to do with women’s activities or perceptions of themselves” (emphasis mine). B. Brooten, “Early Christian Women and their Cultural Context: Issues of Method in Historical Reconstruction,” in *Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship* (ed. Adela Yarbro Collins; Chico: Scholars, 1985), 67. Cf. Schüssler Fiorenza: “Ideas of men *about* women ... do not reflect women’s historical reality since it can be shown that ideological polemics about women’s place, role, or nature increase whenever women’s actual emancipation and active participations in history become stronger.” E. Schüssler Fiorenza, “Remembering the Past in Creating the Future: Historical-Critical Scholarship and Feminist Biblical Interpretation,” in *Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship* (ed. Adele Yarbro Collins; Chico: Scholars, 1985), 57.

<sup>36</sup> C. Camp, *Wisdom and the Feminine in the Book of Proverbs* (Decatur: Almond, 1985), 75.

<sup>37</sup> R. Chesnutt, “Revelatory Experiences Attributed to Biblical Women,” in *Women Like This: New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World* (ed. A.-J. Levine; Atlanta: Scholars, 1991), 123.

reconstruction of sociological history using literary evidence is a step that is commonly and necessarily taken by scholars undertaking a quest for the historical Jesus and one that, with caution, must also be undertaken in any quest for the women who surrounded and followed him. This study does use the Q sayings to move towards some cautious conclusions about women in the Jesus movement. Q is well situated to answer such questions, not only because questions about women should be asked of all ancient texts, and not only because Q is such an early piece of data for the Jesus movement, but most importantly because *Q itself invites such questions* by making women a deliberate focus, which, as I hope I have demonstrated herein, implies their significant presence in Jesus' audience.

### On Method: A Note on the Use of Gender as a Category

The choice to lift out gender as an interpretive lens, in an age when scholarship is making great strides toward a less topically segregated and more intersectional approach, warrants mention. The use of gender, particularly as a binary concept, as a separate category for analysis is waning, not only because it is an admittedly anachronistic lens through which to view antiquity, but also because it is being replaced by the more nuanced approaches, developed in sociological discourses in the 1960s and 1970s and in biblical studies in the 1980s by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza and others. Since Simone de Beauvoir first remarked that one is not born a woman, but rather *becomes* one,<sup>38</sup> great strides have been made toward an understanding that gender is, to a great degree, constructed socially. De Beauvoir did not imply that biological gender did not exist at all, but that the “behavioural characteristics and expectations inscribed on

---

<sup>38</sup> Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex* (New York: Vintage, 1973), 301.

female identity were culturally constructed to be the ‘other’ to ... male identity.”<sup>39</sup> Thus, the scholarly shift away from a gender dichotomy is one I fully support; a discourse that is more intersectional, postgendered, and interdisciplinary is blossoming.<sup>40</sup> However, as an historian of antiquity, I am careful to use not only these latest etic categories of analysis, but to also pay attention to the emic categories supported by ancient texts, particularly Q. In the case of the Q gender pairs, a focus on gender as a binary is warranted by the text itself. Q clearly highlights gender as a focus both in its content and its rhetorical strategy and participates actively in the bifurcation of gender. Since Q’s gender pairs repeatedly present their recipients with two parables that are verbally parallel except for small variables, and those variables are consistently related to gender, then the category of gender is a highly appropriate key to the interpretation of these texts, which construct gender as a male/female dichotomy even while employing rhetoric that in some ways closes a gap between male and female audience members. A series of verbally parallel parable pairs where the only variable is a gendered masculine/feminine binary clearly flags to the reader that gender is not only present in the text, but is one of its foci. While it is best practice to remain aware that we bring anachronistic questions and etic categories to antique

---

<sup>39</sup> Julia M. O’Brien, ed. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible and Gender, Volume 1 ASI-MUJ* (s.v. “gender”; New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 264.

<sup>40</sup> Cross-disciplinary scholarship is moving steadily towards postgender, intersectional models. On postgenderism, see George Dvorsky and James Hughes, “Postgenderism: Beyond the Gender Binary,” *IEET White Papers* (March 2008): 1–18. “Postgenderists contend that dyadic gender roles and sexual dimorphisms are generally to the detriment of individuals and society” (2). “Postgenderism is a radical interpretation of the feminist critique of patriarchy and gender, and the genderqueer critique of the way that binary gender constrains individual potential and our capacity to communicate with and understand other people. Postgenderism transcends essentialism and social constructionism...” (13). Intersectional feminism was first discussed by Kimberlé Crenshaw in K. Crenshaw, “Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Anti-Discrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory, and Anti-Racist Politics,” *UCLF* 140 (1989): 139–167. See also Anna Carastathis, “The Concept of Intersectionality in Feminist Theory,” *Philosophy Compass* 9/5 (2014): 304–314.



evidence and to be cognisant of our distance from the world of the text,<sup>41</sup> in this case binary gender is an unmistakable emic focus of the Q sayings themselves.

The frequent repetition of this and similar devices throughout Q, Matthew, and Luke, as well as in one case in Mark, and in John at the narrative level, bears witness to an interest in gender on the part of several independent artefacts from the Jesus movement and early Christianity, and thus, suggests an interest in gendered pairing on the part of Jesus of Nazareth. Thus, gender is an appropriate lens through which to view Q, and, by extension, the teachings of the historical Jesus.

### *The Significance of Q for Women's History*

I have argued herein that Q opens an important window onto an unprecedented and innovative treatment of women within early Jewish and Hellenistic antiquity. Through a unique literary characteristic—referred to here as gender pairs, and elsewhere as gender doublets or *Doppelgleichnisse*<sup>42</sup>—Q presses against the boundaries of first-century women's roles within a patriarchal/kyriarchal framework, providing a very early example of an egalitarian bent within the earliest Jesus movement.<sup>43</sup> Q contains several clear instances where an identical lesson is taught twice in a row, once with a male example and once with a female example. These, I

---

<sup>41</sup> For the “problem of social distance” from the world of the text in question, see further Richard L. Rohrbaugh, “Introduction,” *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation* (Richard Rohrbaugh ed.; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996), 3. Rohrbaugh's example of the prevalence of belief in the “evil eye” serves as an excellent reminder of differences in worldview between ancient text and modern Western reader.

<sup>42</sup> One of the first scholars to notice this phenomenon in the gospels was J. Jeremias, who named it “*Doppelgleichnis*” in *Die Gleichnisse Jesu* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998 [first edition 1947]).

<sup>43</sup> Q scholars are not in an agreement about a date for the translation and compilation of sayings known as Q, but they are unanimous in Q's relative relationship to other early Christian evidence, in that it is among the earliest, if not *the* earliest Jesus-movement data, along with the early letters of Paul. Mack calls Q “the earliest written record we have from the Jesus movement” in *Who Wrote the New Testament*, 47.

propose, along with one occurrence in Mark 2:21–22, are the first known examples of this sort of “equal-opportunity” rhetoric in Greco-Roman antiquity. Other instances in Q of shorter phrases that also use gender-pairing reinforce this tendency to address both genders simultaneously and equally and thereby to confirm and affirm the presence of women in the movement.

On the one hand, this rhetorical device in Q that deliberately addresses male and female audience members<sup>44</sup> with the same content, can be seen as providing evidence for a qualified gender equality in the earliest accessible stratum of Jesus movements. It is thus of great significance for the history of women, and has been rightly flagged as such by scholars eager to affirm women’s important standing in early Christianity. Alicia Batten points out that the Q pairs indicate “a deliberate challenge to societal norms”<sup>45</sup> and Jean-Francois Racine writes that the gendered pairing “is an indication that Q addresses equally men and women.”<sup>46</sup>

On the other hand, upon closer inspection, the gender equality to which Q’s gendered pairs point is circumscribed. Kathleen Corley warns that “such a reconstruction of Jesus’

---

<sup>44</sup> Throughout, when I speak of an “audience,” I am aware of the complexity of what it means to “read” in antiquity. By “audience” I mean “recipients,” without speculating on the specific means of delivery. For information on ways in which a first-century audience may have received such sayings, see A. Millard, “Literacy in the Time of Jesus” *BAR* 29 (2003): 36–45. In this project, I avoid commenting on differing literacy levels, whether auraliterate, oraliterate, oculiterate, scribaliterate, illiterate, etc. For a taxonomy of these and other types of literacy in the ancient world, see L. B. Yaghjian, “Ancient Reading,” *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation* (ed. R. Rohrbach; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996), 208–209. There is also the question of whether one is speaking of the audience as a literary construct implied by a text or as a socio-historical group that formed a text’s actual recipients. Because Q is a collection of sayings material, we must also distinguish between the hearers of Jesus’ of Nazareth’s sayings and the consumers of the written sayings in Q. For this project, I will specify whether the “audience” in question is that of Jesus of Nazareth’s early sayings or that of the specific Greek written collection called Q. While some scholars seem to blend both, broadly speaking, under the umbrella “earliest layer of the Jesus movement,” with the understanding that the members of pre-Gospel Jesus movements who may have heard the parable gender pairs do not span more than one generation, from original hearers to those who joined the movement at the time of Q, not enough can be known about Q’s provenance to blend the two. For this reason, my focus here is on the audience of the original sayings (i.e. the audience of Jesus of Nazareth), to the extent that we have access to them through Q, and on the rhetorical work of the sayings, i.e. the text’s implied recipients. That said, the very presence of the gender pairs does say one thing about that audience: it contained women.

<sup>45</sup> A. Batten, “More Queries for Q: Women and Christian Origins,” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 24/2 (June 1, 1994): 47.

<sup>46</sup> J.-F. Racine and M. Beaumont, “Three Approaches to the Position of Women in the Q Document: Hal Taussig, Luise Schottroff, and Amy-Jill Levine,” in *Women also Journeyed with Him* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2000), 114.

preaching and practice can function as a foundational myth for modern Christian feminism,”<sup>47</sup> a practice which Corley deems inappropriate use of the evidence. William Arnal contends that “the Q couplets do not in and of themselves serve as any convincing indication of a tendency toward gender inclusiveness.”<sup>48</sup> Amy-Jill Levine finds that any efforts to derive a positive feminist reading from Q are “hampered by Q’s androcentric language,”<sup>49</sup> and argues forcefully that Q does not ultimately provide evidence for any kind of gender equality.<sup>50</sup>

It might seem that the two ends of this spectrum are irreconcilably opposed. I propose that this is not the case. Instead, I argue that, while the former sorts of findings are right in that these sayings of Jesus do indicate a teaching and a movement in which women were viewed equally alongside men in terms of being recipients and distributors of the message, the latter types of findings are correct insofar as this was not a teacher or a group which transcended its patriarchal historical context or had the overturning of gendered norms as an overt goal. The paired sayings contained in Q did challenge the status quo for women, but the particular challenge was in their seemingly deliberate equal valuing of wo/men at an intellectual, spiritual, and/or religious level. This sometimes required wo/men to break out of social expectations (such as, e.g. dividing household members from one another as in Q 12:53), but not always, not all expectations, and not programmatically.

---

<sup>47</sup> K. Corley, *Women and the Historical Jesus: Feminist Myths of Christian Origins* (Santa Rosa: Polebridge, 2002), 1. The premise of this work is that the gender situation evidenced by the pairs was not egalitarian from a gender standpoint, but that any freedom for women in the movement was instead a result of a generalised emancipation that had occurred for women in many Greco-Roman and/or Jewish religious and political communities during the Late Republic; the book argues that Jesus indeed conducted a programme of social critique, but for class, not gender, and that feminist readings of Jesus as gender-egalitarian are idealistic and exaggerated.

<sup>48</sup> W. E. Arnal, “Gendered Couplets in Q and Legal Formulations: From Rhetoric to Social History,” *JBL* 116/1 (1997): 92.

<sup>49</sup> A.-J. Levine, “Women in the Q Communit(ies) and Traditions,” *Women and Christian Origins* (ed. R. S. Kraemer and M. R. D’Angelo; New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 150.

<sup>50</sup> Levine, “Yeast of Eden,” throughout.

The characters in the pairs and the wo/men listening to the teachings are not expected to become indistinguishable socially; women more or less remain spinners of cloth and housekeepers, for instance, and men more or less remain farmers and shepherds, not because these gendered occupations are being depicted as divinely ordained or as having any deep theological import in the text, but because overturning gendered occupations is simply not one of Q's implicit concerns. Yet women in Q are most definitely expected to be: equally capable of understanding, internalising, and implementing Jesus' teachings; equally worthy recipients of the teachings; and equally important promulgators of the teachings. Thus, by intellectual/spiritual/religious equality, I mean that the audience of Q's parabolic messages are clearly understood as having an identical capacity, regardless of gender, for receiving and applying Jesus' lessons, as well as an identical potential value as proponents of the lessons to others.

My view that the Q pairs offer an equality that is specifically circumscribed is compatible with scholarship on both sides of the debate. On the one hand, my view of circumscribed equality is compatible with the existing view that any equality within the gender pairs is tempered by factors such as Q's overall androcentric language and outlook,<sup>51</sup> and compatible with the related view that using Q as evidence to argue that Jesus himself programmatically sought to destroy patriarchal gender limitations stretches the evidence too far.<sup>52</sup> I agree with Kathleen Corley's caution that "the notion that Jesus established an anti-patriarchal movement or

---

<sup>51</sup> As Schottroff states, "the Christian Testament as a whole, and the Sayings Source in particular, speak in androcentric language and presuppose a patriarchal system of relationships." "The Sayings Source Q," 510.

<sup>52</sup> See Levine ("Yeast of Eden"), Elliott ("Jesus was not an Egalitarian"), and others who heavily critique the readiness to reconstruct an early "discipleship of equals" that has been embraced by some feminist Christian scholarship. I address this in my literature review in Chapter 2.

a ‘discipleship of equals’ is a myth”<sup>53</sup> and I commend her for having disputed the notion that “patriarchal Judaism” is an apt foil against which to set up Christianity as the alleged emancipator of women.<sup>54</sup> As Corley says,

The fact that women played a role in Jesus’ movement [...] means that we can place Jesus’ movement and the early Christianities solidly within Jewish Palestinian and larger Greco-Roman environments, both of which were far more open to women’s involvement in religion, society, and politics than has previously been assumed.<sup>55</sup>

On the other hand, my view of circumscribed equality is also compatible with more positive views of women in Q. Given the evidence of the gender pairs in Q as analysed in this project in their Hellenistic and early Jewish literary contexts, one cannot altogether reject the notion that Q, in its gender pairs, is working deliberately to level the gender playing field in one specific regard, although other scholars, such as Arnal, Corley, and Levine, may not see the evidence in this way.<sup>56</sup> As I will show in Chapter two, explaining away the presence of gender as scribal wordplay (Arnal)<sup>57</sup> or transferring all credit for gender equality in Q to the wider Hellenistic world while only crediting Jesus for an interest in class equality (Corley),<sup>58</sup> does not do justice to the evidence. Further, while Levine’s extremely negative evaluation of what the

---

<sup>53</sup> Corley, *Women and the Historical Jesus*, 1. The term “Discipleship of Equals” was coined by E. Schüssler Fiorenza to describe the ideal community of the historical Jesus. The first mention of it known to me is in her monograph, *In Memory of Her* (New York: Crossroad, 1983) and she refers to it frequently throughout her written and performed work. A thorough analysis of the ways in which the phrase is used by Schüssler Fiorenza has been published by Margaret M. Beirne, in *Women and Men in the Fourth Gospel: A Genuine Discipleship of Equals* (London: Sheffield Academic, 2003), 28–32. Critiques of this gender-egalitarian picture of earliest Christianity as revisionist will be discussed in Chapter 2.

<sup>54</sup> Corley, *Women and the Historical Jesus*, 6.

<sup>55</sup> Corley, *Women and the Historical Jesus*, 6.

<sup>56</sup> See Arnal, “Gendered Couplets in Q”; Batten, “More Queries for Q”; K. E. Corley, “*Private Women, Public Meals: Social Conflict in the Synoptic Tradition* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993); Levine, “Yeast of Eden”; and “Who’s Catering the Q Affair? Feminist Observations on Q Paraenesis,” *Semeia* 50 (1990): 145–61.

<sup>57</sup> Arnal, “Gendered Couplets in Q.”

<sup>58</sup> “An analysis of Jesus’ teaching suggests that while Jesus censured the class and status distinctions of his culture, that critique did not extend to unequal gender distinctions.” Corley, *Women and the Historical Jesus*, 1.

pairs mean for women<sup>59</sup> is part of a crucial project to highlight anti-Judaism<sup>60</sup> in the Christian Testament<sup>61</sup> and redeem Second Temple Judaism from charges of patriarchy, she has thrown out what is unique about the gender pairs with the proverbial bathwater in service to that task.

I argue that Jesus in Q is indeed advocating a complete spiritual/intellectual/religious equality of men and women, and not, *contra* Corley and Batten, only following along in the wake of a broader Hellenistic women's movement. That said, this advocacy for the spiritual, intellectual, and religious equality of wo/men is by no means an advocacy for gender equality in the modern sense. For instance, the stereotypical and bifurcated gender roles used and reinforced in the Q pairs indicate that the sayings do not advocate for identical social roles for men and women. This is not to say that Q is "against" more widespread gender equality. Indeed, sometimes Q's insistence on the intellectual/spiritual/religious equality of wo/men may mean the transgression and transcendence of social expectations (e.g. Q 12:51–53), but these transgressions are a side effect of the message, rather than its project.

## *Chapter Outline*

Chapter 1, "Background to Q and the Q People," provides an overview of the Q hypothesis, a general introduction to key Q issues, and a discussion of the significance of Q beyond the Synoptic Problem, as an addition to our knowledge of the early Galilean Jesus movement. The chapter goes on to amalgamate the diverse secondary literature on community in

---

<sup>59</sup> Levine, "Yeast of Eden," 302–331, esp. 320–323.

<sup>60</sup> See A. Brenner, "Introduction," *Feminist Companion to the Hebrew Bible in the New Testament* (ed. A. Brenner; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996), 15.

<sup>61</sup> I follow E. Schüssler Fiorenza and others who refer to the New Testament collection as the "Christian Testament" in an attempt at less value-laden terminology. (See Schüssler Fiorenza, *Rhetoric and Ethic*, ix.)

and around Q to provide a composite background of various current theories around Q people. This composite picture discusses early Jews who are interested in the sayings of Jesus over the biography of Jesus, with a particular habit of referring to the *basileia* of God. Simultaneously sapiential and apocalyptic, this posited Jewish community may or may not make use of itinerant messengers, with a message that is deliberately subversive of the dominant cultures of Rome and Jerusalem. It is determined that there is not enough consensus on “The Q People” for this dissertation to speak of them with confidence as an audience, and therefore we will instead have in mind the recipients of Jesus’ oral sayings and/or the implied audience of the text, rather than any potential community around the translated Greek written text(s) known as Q. The chapter concludes by narrowing its focus to the *women* addressed by the text, highlighting Q’s special importance for understanding women’s role in the earliest Jesus movements, most strikingly present in the rhetorical strategy of gendered pairings<sup>62</sup> which in some sense place women on an equal religious and intellectual playing field with men. The reconstructed Q document thus provides a vital lens through which to examine the treatment of women in a group of Jesus people much closer to Jesus’ Galilean Judaism than to the largely Gentile and urban movement Christianity had become in a matter of less than a century.

In Chapter 2, “Gendered Pairs in Q: Review of Literature,” I begin by making a distinction between the scholarship on the gendered pairs and the scholarship on the pairs in the Lukan context in which they were first “discovered.” Study of the Lukan pairs is generally impervious to considerations of Q; yet examining the pairs in their Q context instead offers a

---

<sup>62</sup> It should be mentioned that there are other elements of Q besides the gender pairs which are also highly pertinent to the study of women, including its use of Sophia language, which are not explored in this dissertation. Melanie Johnson-Debaufre has produced a masterful monograph on the feminist ramifications of Q’s eschatology and its use of Sophia imagery. See M. Johnson-Debaufre, *Jesus Among her Children: Q, Eschatology, and the Construction of Christian Origins* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005).

unique perspective and provides a stark literary contrast to the highly narrative context of the Gospels. The secondary literature on the gendered pairs as they appear in Q is then summarised; the chapter comprises all feminist discussion on the pairs to date, as the examination of these pairs in their Q context is a relatively recent and undeveloped field of research.<sup>63</sup> I arrange the scholarship on the Q gender pairs into two main tendencies rather than reviewing the literature chronologically. The themes around which I have grouped the secondary literature are: the widely differing analyses of the import of the pairs for women; the relative comfort or caution with which authors apply the concept of (gender-)egalitarianism to ancient literature; and the way in which feminist analyses of Jesus either show or do not show sensitivity to anti-Judaism and supersessionism. The chapter concludes with my own evaluation of this secondary literature: I share the caution of those who are wary of finding “equality” too easily in antiquity, and I heed the sharp warnings against anti-Jewish readings. At the same time, I also share the conviction of those who insist that something of import for women is indeed happening in Q’s rhetoric. The gendered pairs do push against the boundaries of the status quo for women in unique and important ways while, in other ways, simultaneously reinforcing social gender roles. This chapter thus establishes the importance of Q as a significant locus of evidence for scholarly understandings of women in the early Jesus movement, in a way the Gospels alone cannot, as well as demonstrating through current debate that the interpretation of this important evidence is as yet unresolved, and that the specific nuances I have described in the pairs may provide a useful way through the dilemma.

---

<sup>63</sup> Scholars working specifically on this issue include, among others: Arnal, “Gendered Couplets in Q”; Batten, “More Queries for Q”; Corley, “*Private Women, Public Meals*”; and Levine, “Yeast of Eden” and “Who’s Catering the Q Affair.”



In Chapter 3, “Gendered Pairs in Q: Taxonomy and Individual Analysis,” I begin with my description and definition of the two literary devices in Q that form the subject of this research: the “full pairs” and the “shorter pairs,” which consist of an equal juxtaposition of masculine and feminine concepts or characters within parables or short sayings. This chapter sets out a full taxonomy and description of the primary texts, along with analysis that shows how both sides of the debate can be reconciled with the introduction of greater precision around which type/s of equality can be inferred from the texts and which cannot. Rather than a social equality, the sayings imply an equality that has to do with an individual’s inner intellectual and spiritual life and outward religious life. Specifically, the paired sayings are implying that men and women are equally worthy of hearing/spreading Jesus’ message, and equally capable of contributing to the religious community. In other words, they are equally capable on an intellectual and spiritual level to grasp what is important, and equally valuable on a religious level for contributing to the spread of that message. To imply that men and women are equal, or even identical, at the level of their intellectual and spiritual capacity, or even to imply that men and women are both called to the role of itinerant prophecy for the *basileia*, does not also entail the implication that men and women should otherwise break out of all gendered social roles—nor does it entail an “egalitarian” programme.<sup>64</sup> This observation resolves a tension among Q pairs scholars, some of whom insist that the pairs point to a more or less “feminist” Jesus, while others caution that any utopic “Discipleship of Equals” in the earliest Jesus movement is too good to be true. In effect, both are right. Being able to describe more precisely where the pairs imply, condone, or promote equality, as well as what types of equality are implied, along with

---

<sup>64</sup> As stated before, for the purposes of this project, I employ the term “egalitarian” to what happens in Q in a limited and literary rather than an ideological sense, i.e. as a useful shortcut for describing the presence of “levelling” which brings members of separate social categories closer together in some way into a new shared category that is less hierarchical. Wherever the word and its derivatives are used throughout, this is the intended definition.

where and what type of equality the pairs do not promote, will surely help to clarify this issue. The concept of embedding gendered parallels within parable pairs, addressing both men and women with an identical intellectual message, does demonstrate to both male and female audience members their intrinsic value to the movement, but does not programmatically tackle patriarchy itself or throw off an androcentric worldview. The pairs indicate a real tendency in Q, not only toward gender inclusivity, but also toward gender equality; however, that equality is very carefully limited and defined as the evidence itself warrants.

Chapter 4, “Other Ancient Examples of Gendered Pairs: Where They Are Not and Where They Are,” reports both the negative results of my search for literary precedent for this rhetorical device in Hellenistic and Jewish antiquity, as well as the positive results of those places in other first-century literature from the Jesus movement and early Christianity—that is, in Mark and in John—where the rhetorical device of gendered pairing occurs or is at least echoed. In this chapter, I argue that there are no cases outside Q in the early Jewish and Hellenistic literature previous where parable pairs expressly crafted with human gender balance for the purpose of equity occur; there are, however, cases in the early Christian literature after Q. What these later cases have in common with Q is that they either show discomfort with the gender pairing tendency and work to mute its gender-levelling rhetoric (Luke/Acts), and/or they function as independent attestations to this—or a similar—literary pairing device, and to early Jesus material (John/Mark). Together, these data work to reinforce the argument that the gender pairs are innovations of the historical Jesus.

In the concluding chapter, I reiterate that which has been foreshadowed in this introductory chapter, namely, the following:

Using a careful reading of the text in tandem with other feminist scholarship on the pairs, I have made several clarifications which offer a path through the sharply divided scholarship on women in Q, some of which champions Q's Jesus as promulgating a "discipleship of equals" and offering a proto-feminism over and against what is viewed as a hopelessly patriarchal first-century Judaism, while others strongly critique such rosy readings and point to Q's androcentric language and overall male-centred worldview as evidence that the instances in Q where Jesus extends agency and value to women are nothing that had not already been extended to women in the general *Zeitgeist* of the Late Republic. My findings reveal that, although Q's encouragement of women's agency is indeed in keeping with a relaxation of restrictions on women that had blossomed for a time in the Late Republic, the gender pairs also go beyond the status quo and represent a literary innovation that indicates a notable concern with women's agency and value—at least on a religio-intellectual playing field—in the earliest movement around Jesus in a way that is unique. Through an investigation of other Greco-Roman literature before and after the composition of Q, this innovation can be linked as closely to the historical Jesus as is possible given the limited nature of our sources. This innovation is not part of a programmatic gender-egalitarianism or an organised anti-patriarchy on the part of Jesus or his early followers; Q's comfortable and frequent use of androcentric language and its overall retention of stereotypical gender roles mitigate such a programme. That said, the importance of the gender pairs in Q for Historical Jesus Research and for an understanding of women's role in the early Jesus movement is worthy of notice.

## Chapter 1: Background to Q and the Q People

At the heart of this project are the primary texts in Q—the gender pairs—and some of the interactions within, and ramifications of, the feminist scholarship on them. My subsequent chapters consist of a detailed analysis of these primary texts and of the divided scholarship on them, as well as working toward a proposed resolution to the debate. This chapter, however, provides a more general introduction to key Q issues, including a composite sketch of potential “Q People”—early consumers of the sayings, as background for readers not familiar with Q. This background is not exhaustive, but it serves to highlight basic elements of Q’s text and context that form the backdrop to any discussion of the women and men around Q. This project has relied substantially on the Critical Edition of Q<sup>65</sup> unless otherwise noted, which is quite standard procedure for Q scholarship today. On the other hand, scholarship on Q’s provenance and on any community around the text is considerably tendentious. It should thus be noted that my analysis of the pairs remains largely a literary one that does not hinge on the location of Q within a certain community.

### *A Brief Background to Q*<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> J. Robinson, P. Hoffman, and J. Kloppenborg, eds., *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas, with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas* (Hermeneia Supplements; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000).

<sup>66</sup> A tangential note on the name “Q” itself: Virtually every work on Q today will explain that the nickname “Q” originated as a short form of the German *Quelle*, meaning “source.” See the lengthy note on this in J. Robinson’s introduction to *The Sayings Gospel Q in Greek and English with Parallels from the Gospels of Mark and Thomas* (Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 23, n.30. However, a fascinating if dubious anecdote challenges this universally accepted

Q<sup>67</sup> is the hypothetical<sup>68</sup> sayings source behind the Gospels of Luke and Matthew. No longer extant, it was first posited as a solution to the problem of the many identical sayings of Jesus in the Gospels of Luke and Matthew that seemed to have been taken from a shared source other than Mark, as the sayings often shared a strong verbal agreement despite Luke and Matthew's differing writing styles and aims. Furthermore, they largely appeared in the same order in both gospels,<sup>69</sup> even when placed into different narrative surroundings. As the sayings did not derive from Mark, they were therefore posited as a collection of their own.<sup>70</sup> Q thus

---

etymology. According to Armitage Robinson, the self-proclaimed first scholar to use the nickname "Q," the "*Quelle*" explanation was invented *after* his own naming convention had already caught on, but his original reason for choosing the designation "Q," was that he simply wanted a short way of saying "that which came after P." (P was his nickname for the Gospel of Mark or "Peter's gospel.") Lightfoot relates the anecdote: "It seems now to be assumed that the symbol Q originated in Germany, as being the first letter of the German *Quelle*, source. Dr. Armitage Robinson, however, in conversation with the present writer maintained in all seriousness that he himself was the first to use the symbol, and for an entirely different reason. In lecturing at Cambridge on the sources of the Gospels, in the 'nineties of the last century, he was in the habit, he said, of alluding to St Mark's gospel as P (reminiscences of St Peter), and so the presumed sayings-document as Q, simply because Q was the next letter after P in the alphabet. His contention, therefore, was that some of his hearers carried his method across the North Sea, and that German scholars, having adopted the symbol Q from him, soon found an explanation for it, which to them no doubt seemed both more satisfactory and more rational. Dr Robinson emphasized that no designation of the sayings-document by the symbol Q appeared in German writings until after the period of his lectures at Cambridge, and that the now common explanation of the symbol would be found to be still later." R. H. Lightfoot, *History and Interpretation in the Gospels* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935), 27–28, n. 1.

<sup>67</sup> For a brief introduction to Q, see J. S. Kloppenborg, *Q: The Earliest Gospel: An Introduction to the Original Stories and Sayings of Jesus* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008). For a more in-depth introduction, including a thorough *status quaestionis* and history of scholarship, see Kloppenborg's *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007). For a critical history of Q research and critical text, with translation into English, German, and French, see the introductory matter in: Robinson, et al., *The Critical Edition of Q*

<sup>68</sup> Despite having reached widespread acceptance, Q remains a hypothesis. For the main formulation of a case against Q, see the work by that title: M. Goodacre, *The Case Against Q* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002). Goodacre has been refuted point by point by a number of scholars, including J. Kloppenborg (e.g. "On Dispensing with Q: Goodacre on the Relation of Luke to Matthew" *NTS* 49 [2003]: 210–236).

<sup>69</sup> See P. Vassiliadis, "Original Order of Q: Some Residual Cases," *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus—the Sayings of Jesus* (ed. J. Delobel; BETL 59; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982), 379–387.

<sup>70</sup> After Mark's priority had been established, the notion of Q was born quite naturally, as the simplest way of explaining the roughly 230 verses' worth of material—mostly sayings—shared nearly verbatim by Matthew and Luke, yet seemingly unknown to (or uninteresting to) Mark. These non-Markan sayings were attributed to a hypothetical early sayings collection in Greek. It was surmised that "Matthew and Luke used the same two sources, Mark and a no-longer extant collection of sayings" (Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q in Greek and English*, 11). This is known as the Two-Source hypothesis or the Two-Document hypothesis, and was proposed by Christian Weiss in 1838 and, in a cruder form, by Johan Eichhorn in 1794. See C. R. Holladay, *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2005), 55 n.28 for a brief overview of Weiss and Eichhorn's contributions to the Q hypothesis.

answered, to the satisfaction of many, the important question of the literary relationships among the Synoptic Gospels.

It was before their incorporation into Matthew and Luke, that Q's sayings had been set down in writing in Greek.<sup>71</sup> While the setting of the sayings is clearly Galilee, the provenance of the Greek document is difficult to pinpoint. A number of scholars nevertheless posit a Galilean provenance.<sup>72</sup> Any dating of Q before the composition of Matthew and Luke (80s and 90s) is technically possible, and some imagine it as early as the 30s or 40s, those who specialise in Q tend to date it in the 50s or 60s.<sup>73</sup>

## Significance beyond the Synoptic Problem

For decades after the development of the Q hypothesis, Q's sole function remained steadfastly as a variable in the Synoptic equation.<sup>74</sup> Eventually, though, Q became divorced from

---

<sup>71</sup> See, e.g., Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, 41–88. As J.-P. Michaud puts it, “Les accords entre Mt et Lc, qui vont parfois jusqu’au mot à mot dans leurs textes grecs ... semblent exiger un document écrit.” J.-P. Michaud, “Quelle(s) communauté(s) derrière la Source Q?” *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001), 577–578. Particularly convincing is J. Robinson, “A Written Greek Sayings Cluster Older than Q: A Vestige” *HTR* 92 (1999): 61–77, in which a laser-illuminated palimpsest of Sinaiticus reveals a Greek-language typo that originated at the level of Q.

<sup>72</sup> For a good discussion, see J. Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus: A Re-examination of the Evidence* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000), 170–196. For a long list of scholars locating Q in the Galilee, from von Harnack to the present, see S. J. Joseph, *Jesus, Q, and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Judaic Approach to Q* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 75, n.238.

<sup>73</sup> Kloppenborg writes that Q was “composed at roughly the same time as the activities of Paul [...] during the 50s and 60s of the Common Era.” J. S. Kloppenborg, “Discursive Practices in the Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus,” in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001), 150–151. For a succinct discussion of a range of dates, see J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered: Christianity in the Making, Volume I* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 159.

<sup>74</sup> Kloppenborg points out that, for most of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, “Q functioned as a kind of algebraic unknown that helped to solve other problems.” *Q: The Earliest Gospel*, vii–viii. According to B. Mack, in the 1920s, “Q was still thought of mainly as part of the solution to the synoptic problem [...] it was defined solely as a source document for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, not as a text with its own integrity” (*The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins* [San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1993], 21). Goodacre observes that Q has recently “emerged from the texts of Matthew and Luke, in which it used to be embedded, and onto a stage of its own, no longer simply an aspect of the solution to the Synoptic Problem, but now with a distinctive profile and place in early Christianity” (*The Case Against Q*, 3). While Goodacre is famously appalled by this shift, it has otherwise largely taken hold.

the singular purpose of shedding light on the construction of Matthew and Luke and was approached as a document in its own right for its contents and its context. In other words, Q became a text. James Robinson writes: “Now Q need no longer remain purely hypothetical, a mere postulate lurking unattainably behind Matthew and Luke. The result in more recent times has been a multiplication of reconstructions of the Greek text of Q, in whole or in part.”<sup>75</sup> It has taken more than a century since the rise of Markan priority and the two-source hypothesis for Q to reach its current status—namely, published in critical edition<sup>76</sup> and approached as a text,<sup>77</sup> although most scholars remain aware that such reconstructions, even the cautious critical edition, are hypothetical.

The study of Q as a text raises questions about potential communities responsible for and interested in the material in Q, and also, significantly for this project, questions about the place of women in such communities. John Kloppenborg observes that Q is now of interest “not merely because it offers a solution to the source-critical problems of other (late) documents (Matthew and Luke), but because it is of intrinsic interest as one of the earliest expressions—perhaps the earliest expression—of Christianity in Palestine.”<sup>78</sup> However, it is my view that there is not enough data to reconstruct such a community—if indeed “Q community” can even be said

---

<sup>75</sup>Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q in Greek and English*, 12. These reconstructions use not only the Synoptics, but also derive support from the epistle of James, and of the gospels of *Thomas* and *Peter*. See Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 2. For a succinct explanation of the way the book of James can function as a confirmation of the Two-Source Hypothesis and assist in the reconstruction of authentic sayings tradition, see Meier, *A Marginal Jew, Volume 4*, 200–202. For a look at the importance of Thomas in the search for authentic sayings of Jesus, see J.-M. Sevrin, “Thomas, Q et le Jesus de l’histoire,” *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001), 461–478. For a good recent discussion of the issues in reconstructing Thomas, see A. D. De Conick, *Recovering the Original Gospel of Thomas: A History of the Gospel and Its Growth* (London: T&T Clark, 2006).

<sup>76</sup> Robinson, Hoffman, and Kloppenborg, eds., *The Critical Edition of Q*.

<sup>77</sup> The Society of Biblical Literature had a Q Seminar from 1985 to 1989, which was established as a permanent section in 1990. A look at the subjects of the papers over the years shows a shift from Q as a text-critical tool to Q as a text in its own right and a source of evidence for the reconstruction of a variety of early Judaism and of Christian origins.

<sup>78</sup> J. Kloppenborg, “Introduction,” *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel* (ed. J. Kloppenborg; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 1–2.

to have existed—with any confidence. That said, for the purposes of sketching the types of reconstructions that are currently being posited, the following section, which is a rough composite of the types of situations posited around Q, will serve as background to this project. This dissertation, though, maintains a distinction between the people toward whom the gender pairs were first directed and the people by/for whom they were collected in Greek translation. In order to analyse the pairs from a literary perspective, it is not necessary to answer questions about the composition of Q, although it is a fascinating body of scholarship that cannot reach consensus but is rather a fertile field of speculation and creativity.

### “Q People”

While the Q hypothesis has more or less consolidated into consensus, the varied scholarly imaginings of those who first translated, compiled, and listened to Q have not. Carl Holladay reminds us that the construction of a profile of a Q community is rather controversial.<sup>79</sup> Nonetheless, because Q is the earliest available evidence for attempts to collect Jesus’ teachings, the prospect of piecing together, albeit with caution, reconstructions of its producers and/or consumers is attractive. Burton Mack is an example of a scholar attracted to this prospect. In his view, “Q is the best record we have for the first forty years of the Jesus movements.”<sup>80</sup> In Mack’s words:

[Q] documents the history of a single group of Jesus people for a period of about fifty years, from the time of Jesus in the 20s until after the Roman-Jewish war in the 70s. [...] It has enabled us to reconsider and revise the traditional picture of early Christian history by filling in the time from Jesus until just after the destruction of Jerusalem when the first

---

<sup>79</sup>Holladay, *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament*, 50.

<sup>80</sup> Mack, *The Lost Gospel*, 245.



narrative gospel, the Gospel of Mark, was written.<sup>81</sup>

Claims that Q “documents the history of a single group,” and that this group stretches continuously over five decades, surely over-value Q while undervaluing other historical evidence for early Jesus movements, such as Paul’s letter to the Galatians. On the other hand, dismissing Q entirely is also perilously neglectful. Perhaps Richard Horsley describes Q’s importance more appropriately:

[S]ince Q, as the source of Jesus’ sayings for Matthew and Luke, apparently originated before the great Jewish Revolt of 66–70 C.E., which supposedly precipitated the separation of Jesus’ followers from nascent ‘Judaism,’ it brings the modern historian and believer a giant step closer to the circumstances of Jesus’ ministry and the early stages of the movement in which the Jesus traditions took form.<sup>82</sup>

Q is undoubtedly an important clue for understanding early Jesus movements, but there has been considerably diverse speculation about what kind of community evidence, if any, can be salvaged from one text, itself a tentative reconstruction. Despite Q’s tentative nature, Kloppenborg has been so bold as to subdivide Q into three literary “strata” and posit different social situations behind each stratum of development.<sup>83</sup> However, attempting to identify specific communities with different recensions of Q material when not even one recension is extant is difficult, even problematic.<sup>84</sup> This project, with its focus on an analysis of the gender pairs, does not call for tracing a development over specific stages in any given hypothetical community of Q People. It does not, for that matter, call for any guesses about provenance at all. For interest’s

---

<sup>81</sup> Mack, *Who Wrote the New Testament*, 47.

<sup>82</sup> Richard Horsley, with Jonathan A. Draper *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999), 150.

<sup>83</sup> The idea of discerning a literary development within Q was first discussed by Schultz in the mid-1960s; see S. Schultz, *Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1964). John Kloppenborg went on to develop this hypothesis, resulting in a quite widely-used three-tier stratification of the Q Document; see, *inter alia*, Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q and Excavating Q*. See the section entitled “Both Sapiential and Apocalyptic” below for a fuller description of the community aspects reflected in Kloppenborg’s stratification.

<sup>84</sup> For a critique of stratification, see, e.g., Holladay, *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament*, 51.

sake, however, this chapter will highlight a general picture of certain broad commonalities that tend to emerge across the scholarly reconstructions of Q People. What follows is a composite of popular hypotheses around the consumers and producers surrounding this early sayings material in Greek. These pictures of Q community, to which I do not necessarily ascribe, but which I maintain are important to keep in mind as part of the fabric of Q scholarship, include the following elements: a) a Galilean provenance; b) an interest in sayings coupled with a lack of apparent interest in a biography or christology of Jesus; c) an interest in the concept of the *basileia* of God; d) an interest in both sapiential witticisms and apocalyptic warnings of judgement; e) the possible presence of itinerant prophecy; f) a rural peasant demographic that is Jewish, as opposed to the more urban Gentile demographics represented in the Christian Testament; and g) a subversive or countercultural tendency.

## Galilean Provenance

There is among some Q scholarship a tendency to posit that it is not only Jesus and his earliest movement that derived from Galilee, but that the written Greek document of Q itself may also be accorded a Galilean provenance.<sup>85</sup> Galilee is the backdrop against which the parables in Q make the most sense,<sup>86</sup> and the backdrop against which many Q scholars picture the creators

---

<sup>85</sup> Richard Horsley, for instance, places “the Jesus movement that produced Q” in Galilee. See Horsley, *Whoever Hears You Hears Me*, 102. See Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus*, 170–196 for a “social mapping” of Q as a Galilean scribal document which originated in one of the small “cities” in the Galilee. Most recently, G. B. Bazzana’s *Kingdom of Bureaucracy: The Political Theology of Village Scribes in the Sayings Gospel Q* (Leuven: Peeters, 2015) analyses Q’s terminology and ideology in order to firmly peg Q’s authors as Galileans who knew Greek due to involvement with public administration.

<sup>86</sup> Based on literary and archaeological evidence on Galilee in the first centuries before and after the Common Era, Reed uses Q’s own internal evidence to conclude that “[Q’s] place names, spatial imagery, and themes fit the social and cultural setting of Galilee quite well.” Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus*, 171.

and users of the Q material.<sup>87</sup> Among the realities implied by a Galilean *setting* is that the community that Jesus addresses is neither urban nor wealthy, but rather agrarian and economically disadvantaged; hypotheses of a Galilean *provenance* tend to suggest the same about those concerned with compiling Q.<sup>88</sup> The Galilean populace in Jesus' day were tenant farmers indebted to a handful of absentee landlords in whose ownership the vast majority of the wealth and resources were concentrated.<sup>89</sup> In other words, it was a peasant<sup>90</sup> community, familiar with social inequity. Q's rural imagery fits with this setting—the sayings mention fruit trees (Q 6:43–44), harvest (Q 10:2), sheep (Q 10:3), sowing and reaping (Q 12:24), seeds (Q 17:6), and so on. Further, the geographic locations that are specifically mentioned are Galilean; the “woes”

---

<sup>87</sup> For more on a Galilean setting for Q and Jesus' early movement, see, *inter alia*: W. Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes: Galilean Conflicts and the Setting of Q* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001); M. A. Chancey, *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee* (SNTSMS 118; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); J. D. Crossan, *The Essential Jesus: Original Sayings and Earliest Images* (San Francisco: Harper, 1998); J. D. Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991); S. Freyne, *Jesus, A Jewish Galilean: A New Reading of the Jesus Story* (London: T&T Clark, 2004); S. Guijarro, “Domestic Space, Family Relationships, and the Social Location of the Q People” *JSNT* 27.1 (2004): 69–81; K. C. Hanson, “The Galilean Fishing Economy and the Jesus Tradition,” *BTB* 27 (1997): 99–111; J. S. Kloppenborg, ed., *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1995); Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*; J. S. Kloppenborg, “The Lost Gospel of Q: The Earliest Record of Jesus' Galilean Followers” (Annual Peter Craigie Memorial Lecture; University of Calgary, 2001); J. S. Kloppenborg, “The Sayings Gospel Q: Recent Opinion on the People Behind the Document,” *CurBS* 1 (1993): 9–34; M. Moreland, “Q and the Economics of Early Roman Galilee,” *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (ed. A. Lindemann; BETL 153; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001), 561–575; Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus*; L. E. Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts: Jesus' First Followers According to Q* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1994). For an alternative view, namely, that a Galilean setting does not at all prove a Galilean provenance, see Joseph, *Jesus, Q, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, esp. 33–93.

<sup>88</sup> D. E. Oakman, “The Ancient Economy,” *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation* (ed. Richard Rohrbaugh; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996), 127. Duling writes that “Galilee was a rural farming region” and that the Q sayings “imply poverty” (D. C. Duling, “Millennialism,” in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation* (ed. Richard Rohrbaugh; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996), 196). For a succinct description of the shifting sands of debate over how “urbanised” and how “Hellenised” Galilee was, see R. Rohrbaugh, “The Preindustrial City,” *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation* (ed. R. Rohrbaugh; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996), 117.

<sup>89</sup> Rohrbaugh, “Introduction,” 6. Rohrbaugh here refers to the situation in first-century Galilee as “systematic exploitation.” See further D. E. Oakman, “Jesus and Agrarian Palestine: The Factor of Debt,” *The Social World of the New Testament: Insights and Models* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2008), 63–84.

<sup>90</sup> See R. Redfield, *Peasant Society and Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956) for his early and seminal work on peasantry. For a strong argument for Jesus of Nazareth as peasant artisan, see D. E. Oakman, “Was Jesus a Peasant? Implications for Reading the Jesus Tradition,” *The Social World of the New Testament: Insights and Methods* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2008), 123–140.

against local towns include Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernaum (Q 10:13–15). However, it is important to distinguish between the audience of Jesus of Nazareth’s teaching career and the audience of those sayings as collected in Greek translation, with the presumable aim of reaching a different audience. Alternative provenances place Q in as disparate settings as Qumran<sup>91</sup> and Jerusalem.<sup>92</sup>

## Sayings, Rather than Biography or Christology

Q’s clear interest in Jesus is as teacher or sage—in what he *said*. It is primarily a collection of *teachings*—not of biographical details, or stories of wonderworking and healing.<sup>93</sup> Perhaps most notable is Q’s apparent lack of interest in Jesus’ suffering, death, and resurrection; it has often been noted that this seems to stand in sharp contrast to the interest in Jesus’ death and resurrection to which other texts of the Christian Testament and most apocrypha<sup>94</sup> bear witness. For Koester, this marks a divide between the Galilean Jesus movement and the other ancient Jesus movements:

Very early, different developments are evident in the way in which various circles of Jesus’ followers expressed their relationship to the memory of Jesus of Nazareth. The circles that apparently gathered in Galilee made no recourse to Jesus’ suffering and death. The community that preserved the earliest collection of sayings of Jesus, which eventually resulted in the composition of

---

<sup>91</sup> For this, see Joseph, *Jesus, Q, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

<sup>92</sup> The notion that Q was a Jerusalem document emerged in the 1920s, with H. T. Fowler, “Paul, Q, and the Jerusalem Church,” *JBL* 43 (1924): 9–14. For a history of the scholarship that locates Q in Jerusalem as opposed to Galilee, with brief synopses of arguments for and against, see J. S. Kloppenborg, “Q, Bethsaida, Khorazin, and Capernaum,” in *Q in Context II: Social Setting and Archaeological Background of the Sayings* (Markus Tiwald, ed.; Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2015), 63, n.5.

<sup>93</sup> In his enchanting monograph on the oral and textual development of the Gospels, L. Michael White explains, “the bulk of the Q material is [...] sayings of Jesus with little or no connective narrative. [...] What narrative does appear in the Q material usually functions to ground the teaching in a putative life situation that helps to clarify the point of the saying.” L. M. White, *Scripting Jesus: The Gospels in Re-Write* (New York: HarperOne, 2010), 189.

<sup>94</sup> The *Gospel of Thomas*, itself a collection of sayings, is the notable exception that proves the rule.

the Synoptic Sayings Gospel [...] did not value the recollection of Jesus' suffering and death but [...] emphasized the presence of the saving message of Jesus in his words as they were remembered.<sup>95</sup>

This is not to say that Q is not interested in any other aspect of Jesus, as R. A. Piper clearly demonstrates in his work on allusions to miracles in Q,<sup>96</sup> but simply to say that, in Piper's words, "Q represents the *Gattung* of sayings, more than deeds."<sup>97</sup> As Kloppenborg notes, in the two miracles<sup>98</sup> that do appear in Q, "in neither case does Q's interest lie in the miraculous as a *demonstration* of Jesus' identity. Rather, Q is interested in the *speech* or *teaching* that Jesus' miracles occasion."<sup>99</sup> What this means for the present study is that the gender pairs—and their repercussions for women audience members—form part of what is most important to the compilers of Q; they are *sayings*, at the Q collection's heart, not its periphery.

## **An interest in the *Basileia* of God**

The *basileia* is a concept that occurs repeatedly throughout the sayings material. Sanders describes this theme—which he refers to as the "Kingdom of God"—as having had two compatible meanings that "would have been more or less self-evident given standard Jewish views"<sup>100</sup> in Jesus' day:

---

<sup>95</sup> H. Koester, *History and Literature of Early Christianity, Volume 2* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), 96.

<sup>96</sup> See R. A. Piper, "Jesus and the Conflict of Powers in Q: Two Q Miracle Stories," *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001), 317–350.

<sup>97</sup> Piper, "Jesus and the Conflict of Powers in Q," 319.

<sup>98</sup> Q 7:1–10 relates the healing of the centurion's servant and Q 11:14 relates an exorcism.

<sup>99</sup> Kloppenborg, *Q: The Earliest Gospel*, 70. (Emphasis his.)

<sup>100</sup> E. P. Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus* (London: Penguin, 1993), 169.

One is that God reigns in heaven; the ‘kingdom of God’ or ‘kingdom of heaven’ exists eternally there. God occasionally acts in history, but he completely and consistently governs only heaven. The second is that in the future, God will rule the earth. He has chosen to allow human history to run on with relatively little interference, but someday he will bring normal history to an end and govern the world perfectly. Briefly put: the kingdom of God always exists *there*; in the future it will exist *here*.<sup>101</sup>

However, the teachings of Jesus build another layer of interpretation onto these two existing meanings; Sanders notes that, in the sayings material, “the kingdom is a special realm on earth, one that consists of people who are dedicated to living according to God’s will and that exists both in and side by side with normal human society. [...] ‘the kingdom is like leaven, which cannot be seen but which leavens the whole loaf.’”<sup>102</sup>

I do not inquire herein as to the origins of the concept of the *basileia* of God in Q, but merely point out that the *basileia* is unquestionably central in the sayings material, and that Sanders’ observation of its tangible earthly presence in the sayings is accurate. Those who take part in this divine *basileia* are said to be “more” than John the Baptist: “There has not arisen among women’s offspring anyone who surpasses John. Yet the least significant in God’s *basileia* is more than he” (Q 7:28). John is seen as a turning point in the *basileia*: “the law and the prophets were until John. From then on, the *basileia* of God is violated and the violent plunder it” (Q 16:16). The location of the *basileia* is mysterious and inward: “on being asked when the *basileia* of God is coming, he answered them and said: the *basileia* of God is not coming visibly. Nor will one say, ‘Look, here!’ or ‘There!’ For, look, the *basileia* of God is within you” (Q 17:20–21). Whatever or whenever the *basileia* is, instructions to what may or may not be itinerant messengers certainly feature it as a prominent part of their message: “whatever town

---

<sup>101</sup> Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus*, 169.

<sup>102</sup> Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus*, 174, citing Matt 13:33 // Luke 13:30f.

you enter and they take you in, eat what is set before you, and cure the sick there, and say to them, the *basileia* of God has reached unto you” (Q 10:8–9). Not everyone is amenable to this message, however: “Woe to you, exegetes of the Law, for you shut the *basileia* of God from people” (Q 11:52). The *basileia* is promoted as the listener’s first priority, after which other things fall into place: “do not be anxious, saying, ‘What are we to eat?’ or ‘What are we to drink?’ or ‘What are we to wear?’ For all these the Gentiles seek; for your Father knows that you need them all. But seek his *basileia*, and all these shall be granted to you” (Q 12:29–31). The *basileia* is the subject of Q parables, including some of the gendered parable pairs under investigation in this project: “What is the *basileia* of God like, and with what am I to compare it? It is like a seed of mustard, which a man took and threw into his garden, and it grew and developed into a tree, and the birds of the sky nested in its branches. And again, with what am I to compare the *basileia* of God? It is like yeast, which a woman took and hid in three measures of flour until it was fully fermented” (Q 13:18–21). It is clear from this non-exhaustive list of sayings that the *basileia* is a repeated trope in Q. This is useful for contextualising the role of women in Q, as it will become clear in the coming chapters that Q takes care to include both women and men equally in its vision of *basileia* membership, and to hold both women and men equally accountable when they behave counter to a *basileia* lifestyle.

## **Both Sapiential and Apocalyptic**

In terms of the genres of Q sayings, Q contains both lighthearted wisdom sayings (“The way you want people to treat you, that is how you treat them.” Q 6:31) and more dour sayings of judgement (“The axe already lies at the root of the trees. So every tree not bearing healthy fruit is

to be chopped down and thrown on the fire.” Q 3:9). A perceived contrast between these modes of discourse has led to wide agreement that there are elements of both wisdom and apocalyptic literature in the *logia* material. For some—Kloppenborg in particular—this has brought about a hypothesis that these two elements give us a glimpse into at least two different stages in community development, each literary genre arising from differing circumstances.<sup>103</sup>

Kloppenborg, followed by Mack and others, imagines two or three distinct stages of community development, positing that the sapiential material is from an early “honeymoon” phase, directed more toward the group’s own members, whereas the apocalyptic material came on the scene later as the group experienced rejection and persecution, and is directed more to outsiders. These situations correspond to Kloppenborg’s projected literary strata “Q1” and “Q2.” I do not have confidence that success is possible with such a conjectural enterprise, nor do I think that the presence of both lighthearted and foreboding material necessitates separate temporal stages. However, the community situations which Kloppenborg posits behind each so-called stratum are nonetheless useful to bear in mind as background for a study of the sayings, even though we are not obligated to follow Kloppenborg to his conclusion that the situations occurred in distinct linear sequence.

Building on Kloppenborg’s Q1 group of sayings—the wisdom material—scholars such as Mack imagine a movement of small house groups that share sapiential instruction about the new lifestyle embraced by the group.<sup>104</sup> This collection of sayings is characteristically more

---

<sup>103</sup> This was first discussed in Schultz, *Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*. Kloppenborg went on to develop this work, resulting in a widely-referenced three-stage stratification of the Q Document. See Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*.

<sup>104</sup> B. Mack, “The Kingdom that Didn’t Come: A Social History of the Q Tradents,” *SBL Seminar Papers* 27 (Missoula: Scholars, 1988), 608–635.



lighthearted and witty.<sup>105</sup> In addition to the sapiential sayings are a second sort of sayings, which focus on impending judgement and punishment. Kloppenborg and those who follow his stratification of Q assume that only a situation of persecution could give rise to what looks like anger at injustice and desire for divine revenge.<sup>106</sup> In my view, however, sayings of wisdom and sayings of judgement require no sequential stratification. They are sayings that could have come from the same teacher concurrently and/or been carried on by the early Jesus movement concurrently. If the wisdom is indeed directed to insiders and the judgement to outsiders, there is no particular reason why these audiences could not both be addressed by the same teacher and subsequently collected in the same text, without requiring different stages of development.

Fortunately, this project does not require a decision about whether the different genres in Q arose at different times; rather, communities around the sayings may have involved a combination of house groups and itinerants<sup>107</sup> who held at least some interest in sapiential material and who probably also experienced varying degrees of rejection—or perceived rejection—as they shared their *basileia* message.<sup>108</sup> What is of note for this project is that the Q gender pairs are included in both “strata” of Q—in both the so-called sapiential layer and the apocalyptic layer. At every level of the sayings gospel, there is evidence for the inclusion of women as fully equal recipients and proponents of wisdom, but also as fully equal subjects of judgement.

---

<sup>105</sup> Mack, “The Kingdom that Didn’t Come,” 608–635.

<sup>106</sup> Mack, “The Kingdom that Didn’t Come,” 608–635. Duling notes (without necessarily acquiescing to the notion of literary strata) that Q’s apocalyptic sayings do imply “a reaction to stressful cultural conditions” and suggest “increasing opposition from outsiders,” using Q’s condemnation of “this generation” as a key example of this. Duling, “Millennialism,” 197.

<sup>107</sup> See the next section, “Itinerant,” for a discussion of this element of Q community.

<sup>108</sup> To agree with Duling that “the Q material [...] implies a community already under some stress” (Duling, “Millennialism,” 196) does not necessitate speculation about various “stages.” I prefer Duling’s description of “stress” and deliberately chose the word “rejection” rather than “persecution” because positing a persecution at this early date is problematic and uncalled for by the evidence. Rejection can mean something as mild as experiencing disappointment that more people are not excited by the *basileia* message.

## Itinerant

Many scholars, Gerd Theissen foremost among them,<sup>109</sup> incorporate Q into a vision of community that involves two main sorts of members: the itinerant purveyors of the message of God's *basileia* and the sedentary "hosts" (and recipients of the message) who sheltered and fed the wanderers along their way.<sup>110</sup> Verses like the following give rise to this picture: "Whoever takes you in takes me in, and, whoever takes me in takes in the one who sent me." (Q 10:16) and:

Into whatever house you enter, first say, Peace to this house! And if a son of peace be there, let your peace come upon him; but if not, let your peace return upon you. And at that house, remain, eating and drinking whatever they provide, for the worker is worthy of one's reward. Do not move around from house to house. And whatever town you enter and they take you in, eat what is set before you. And cure the sick there, and say to them, the kingdom of God has reached unto you. But into whatever town you enter and they do not take you in, on going out from that town, shake off the dust from your feet. I tell you: For Sodom it shall be more bearable on that day than for that town. (Q 10:5-12)

As the next chapter will reveal, several feminist scholars believe it likely that women were counted amongst itinerant prophets in the Q community or, barring that, in an earlier Jesus community. However, the itinerancy model is not the only hypothesis.<sup>111</sup>

William Arnal has argued strongly against the itinerancy thesis, and in favour of a

---

<sup>109</sup> See G. Theissen, a main proponent of the itinerant hypothesis, *Social Reality and the Early Christians* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 33–59. For a strong argument against itinerancy in the early Jesus movement and Q, see Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*.

<sup>110</sup> G. Theissen, *Le christianisme de Jésus: ses origines sociales en Palestine* (Paris: Relais Desclée 6, 1978).

<sup>111</sup> For an argument against, see Levine, "Who's Catering the Q Affair." For an argument in favour, see L. Schottroff, "Itinerant Prophetesses: A Feminist Analysis of the Sayings Source Q," *Current Studies on Q* (ed. R. A. Piper; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 347–360. The main argument in favour is from Theissen, since the 70s; See Theissen, *Le christianisme de Jésus*,

scribal setting for Q.<sup>112</sup> This question of whether women might have been present amongst itinerant prophets is a relevant one; for instance, when Luise Schottroff<sup>113</sup> uses the Q gender pairs to argue for gender equality in this movement, the notion of female itinerants figures prominently. However, it is not a question answered in this thesis, as my arguments for the presence of a specific gender equality that levels the playing field spiritually but not socially for women do not hinge on the presence or absence of itinerancy, whether at the level of Q or at the level of earlier Jesus people.

## **Jewish Rather than Gentile**

Q is a Jewish text. It is obvious throughout the Q sayings that the community in question is familiar with Jewish literature and is wrestling with Jewish concerns; the sayings refer frequently to characters and traditions from Israel's past and to issues in first-century Judaism.<sup>114</sup> Q warns its detractors not to think that having Abraham as their forefather is enough to protect them from judgement (Q 3:8). When Q's Satan quotes scripture, it is the Psalms (Q 4:10–11). In Q, the faith of a Roman centurion is used as a foil with which to chastise "Israel" (Q 7:9). Q's Jesus is depicted as fulfilling events prophesied in Isaiah (Q 7:22). Q chides disobedient towns by declaring them to be worse off than their Gentile counterparts in writings from Israel's past: Sodom, Tyre, and Sidon (Q 10:12–14). Q's listeners are told not to give in to worries and anxieties over material goods, because this is something Gentiles do (Q 12:29–30). Many characters from what would become the Hebrew Bible are invoked, such as Jonah (Q 11:29–30),

---

<sup>112</sup> See Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, esp. 91–95.

<sup>113</sup> See Schottroff, "Itinerant Prophetesses."

<sup>114</sup> See Horsley, *Whoever Hears You Hears Me*, 94–97 for a convincing and nuanced discussion of numerous Israelite traditions in Q.

Solomon (Q 11:31–32), Abel and Zechariah (Q 11:51), Noah (Q 17:26–27), and the Twelve Tribes of Israel (Q 22:30). Concepts important across various forms of Judaism are featured in Q as well, such as Torah observance (Q 16:17, Q 11:52), the Jerusalem temple (Q 13:34–35), synagogues (Q 12:11), Pharisaism (Q 11:42), and more.<sup>115</sup>

While Galilee had a tumultuous past and was often caught in the crossfire of wars both literal and cultural,<sup>116</sup> resulting in its diverse and complex makeup, the Jesus community seen in Q indicates that Torah-based Judaism was present and thriving in the Galilee of our time period. Many scholars consider first-century Galilee a Jewish region. Dennis Duling writes that first-century Galilee’s population “appears to have been mostly Jewish.”<sup>117</sup> The older notion that Galilee was known as “Galilee of the Gentiles” has been thoroughly dismantled using both archaeological and literary evidence.<sup>118</sup> Mark Chancey concludes that “Gentiles were a small portion of the population” and that “the evidence, both literary and archaeological, corroborates the Gospels’ depictions of Jesus as a Jew preaching to and working primarily among other Jews.”<sup>119</sup>

Kloppenborg calls Q “our rural, Galilean Jewish Gospel.”<sup>120</sup> Deriving from Galilee, Q is thus seen as evidence for a more Jewish form of the Jesus movement as compared with the more

---

<sup>115</sup> For an influential set of criteria for deciphering whether something in antiquity is Jewish, see James Davila’s *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other* (JSJSupp 105; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

<sup>116</sup> Jewish Galilee had been “continually subject to outside colonial powers” (such as Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, and Romans). Duling, “Millennialism,” 196.

<sup>117</sup> Duling, “Millennialism,” 196.

<sup>118</sup> For a book-length argument, based on exhaustive use of both archaeological and literary evidence, that the population of first-century Galilee was an overwhelming Jewish majority, see Chancey, *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee*. See in particular pages 167–182 for a dismantling of the notion that Galilee was known as “Galilee of the Gentiles” as a scholarly myth.

<sup>119</sup> Chancey, *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee*, 181.

<sup>120</sup> Kloppenborg, *Q: The Earliest Gospel*, 69.

Gentile versions of Christianity in our other sources.<sup>121</sup> The Jewishness of Q is important not only for building a clearer picture of the audience for Jesus' sayings (and possibly for Q), and for the women in those audiences, but it also helps to counteract the supersessionist claims that Christianity provided a so-called feminist haven over and against misogynistic Judaism.<sup>122</sup>

## Subversive or Countercultural

The final element common to reconstructions of Q People is the view that they were a subversive group who pushed against the boundaries of their social constructs. Almost all scholars who posit community around Q (and/or around Jesus) describe it as somehow “countercultural.”<sup>123</sup> In other words, the community in which the sayings emerged may have seen itself located at the margins of society on a number of levels, such as economic, politico-religious, ethnic, and social.<sup>124</sup> Perhaps in response to this sense of marginalisation, there is woven throughout the Q sayings a system of alternative norms—what E. P. Sanders refers to as a “reversal of values.”<sup>125</sup> Levine describes the Q material as providing “a counter to reigning

---

<sup>121</sup> “Q, since it is almost certainly from Jewish Palestine, gives us a glimpse of a Gospel formulated by Jesus’ Galilean followers, quite different in complexion from the diasporic and Gentile Christianities we know from other sources.” Kloppenborg, *Q: The Earliest Gospel*, ix.

<sup>122</sup> See Chapter 2 for a discussion of supersessionism in feminist early Christian scholarship. As a typical example of this type of analysis, I offer Aida Besançon Spencer’s “Jesus’ Treatment of Women in the Gospels,” which, in its race to highlight moments in the Gospels when women are valued alongside men, dismisses in a single paragraph both “Roman Law” and “first-century Jewish thinkers” as misogynistic across the board, in contrast to a Jesus who, according to Spencer, values faith above gender. A. Besançon Spencer, “Jesus’ Treatment of Women in the Gospels,” *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without Hierarchy* (ed. Ronald W. Pierce and Rebecca Merrill Groothuis; Leicester: Apollos, 2005), 126–141, here 139–140.

<sup>123</sup> Racine and Beaumont, “Three Approaches,” 101.

<sup>124</sup> Duling calls Galilean political, economic, and social conditions “stressful” and outlines the demographics thus: “The vast majority of Galileans were mainly peasants (freeholders or tenant farmers) but the masses also included artisans, slaves, freedmen and freedwomen, and people so marginal that they were expendable.” Duling, “Millennialism,” 196.

<sup>125</sup> See Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus*, 196–204.

cultural values.”<sup>126</sup> This counter-cultural bent can be seen in the frequently used trope of reversals of values, such as in sayings like, “the last will be first and the first last” (Q 13:30) and “everyone humbling themselves will be exalted, and everyone exalting themselves will be humbled” (Q 14:11). It can also be seen in the listing of normally negative things as positives, such as when poverty, hunger, mourning, and persecution are listed among blessings in Q 6:20–22. Thus, the Q sayings participate in their culture subversively by offering a programmatic reversal of oppressive norms.<sup>127</sup>

Perhaps it is not surprising for countercultural elements to emerge from the disenfranchised Galileans, who did not enjoy elite status and were perceived as a marginalised group by others.<sup>128</sup> In Jesus’ day, there is considerable evidence that Galileans were seen as lesser from both a socio-economic standpoint, and also an ethnic and religious one; Galilean Judaism was mocked by non-Galileans,<sup>129</sup> and Galilean peasants/artisans were economically disadvantaged<sup>130</sup> in a cycle of “systematic exploitation.”<sup>131</sup> If Galilee is typical of other agrarian societies, then about 90 percent of the populace worked toward supporting an elite ten percent.<sup>132</sup> The Galileans to whom Jesus spoke, and from whose ranks Jesus came, were marginalised socially,

---

<sup>126</sup> Levine, “Women in the Q Communit(ies),” 154.

<sup>127</sup> On Jesus’ program as norm reversal, see, *inter alia*, D. Kraybill, *The Upside-Down Kingdom* (4<sup>th</sup> Revised Edition; Harrisonburg: Herald, 2011); and J. H. Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994).

<sup>128</sup> See, for instance a number of negative references to Galilee in antiquity, such as R. J. Hoffmann’s translation of Julian’s 4<sup>th</sup>-century work *Against the Galileans* (Amherst: Prometheus Books, 2004).

<sup>129</sup> On being Galilean as a reason for Jesus’ non-acceptance in Jerusalem, and on Galileans as outsiders, see G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew: A Historian’s Reading of the Gospels* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1981), 43–44.

<sup>130</sup> “In peasant or agrarian societies, social stratification, best defined as social categorization measured by differences in social wealth and power, is pronounced.” Oakman, “The Ancient Economy,” 132.

<sup>131</sup> Rohrbach, “Introduction,” 6.

<sup>132</sup> Oakman, “The Ancient Economy,” 133. See further D. Oakman, *Jesus and the Economic Questions of His Day* (Lewiston: Mellen, 1986) and H. Moxnes, *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke’s Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988).

economically, and religiously.<sup>133</sup> This may explain why it can be said that Q's sapiential sayings "are non-conventional wisdom and point to social dislocation."<sup>134</sup> Some scholars assert that when Q material was incorporated into the Christian Testament, it was balanced and tamed in order to appear less subversive.<sup>135</sup> This tendency would make sense particularly in a post-70 context.

## Q People and Women: General Background

The incorporation of the Q document into two main Christian gospels firmly indicates its foundational position in the early Jesus movement; it was material that two of the canonical gospel writers deemed worthy of working into their *oeuvres*. It is thus advisable to take Q's significant contribution to our picture of first-century Judaism and Christian origins—and our picture of women in this history—seriously. As is made clear in the following chapters, the Q sayings have what might in some ways be described as an anomalously positive<sup>136</sup> attitude toward the women in their audience. Q's attitudes toward female membership in the early Jesus movement are most strikingly present in the gendered pairings—a rhetorical strategy that places women on an equal intellectual and religious playing field with men. This innovation was at the very least present among those—women and men—who were interested in using and perpetuating Jesus' sayings after his death, and, as I will argue, is likely to have originated within the very movement surrounding Jesus of Nazareth. The reconstructed Q document thus provides

---

<sup>133</sup> This marginalisation was not only with regards to external groups, but also with regards to the upper classes within Judaism. As Schottroff writes, "the Jewish upper classes' participation in the interests of the Pax Romana" contributed to "internal conflicts within Judaism." Schottroff, "The Sayings Source Q," 510.

<sup>134</sup> Duling, "Millennialism," 197.

<sup>135</sup> See, e.g. Duling, "Millennialism," 198.

<sup>136</sup> See Racine and Beaumont, "Three Approaches," 101.

a vital lens through which to examine the treatment of women in a group of Jesus people much closer to Jesus' Galilean Judaism than to the largely Gentile movement Christianity became in a matter of less than a century.

This chapter has described this Galilean Judaism as seen by recent scholarship, and thus forms the backdrop against which to imagine the pairs. While the pairs are herein approached as rhetorical devices within a text, they are simultaneously approached as evidence for the situation of some real first-century women. The categories in the present chapter help to put a human face on the men and women who heard and perpetuated the gender pairs. Throughout this project, our imagined recipients of these gendered parallel sayings will be considered in light of the above scholarship on first-century Galilean Judaism, a peasant Judaism which shares an interest in Jesus' as sage, shows a lack of interest in auspicious birth narratives or resurrection theology, is enthusiastic about living God's *basileia* here on earth, demonstrates familiarity with both sapiential and apocalyptic modes of communication, may or may not support itinerant prophets as a way of spreading its message, and participates in its surrounding culture in subversive ways.



## Chapter 2: Gendered Pairs in Q: Review of Literature

### *Introduction*

In this chapter, I begin by making a distinction between the scholarship on the gendered pairs in Q and the scholarship on the pairs in the Lukan context in which they were first “discovered.” Study of the Lukan pairs is generally impervious to considerations of Q; examining the pairs in their Q context instead offers a unique rural Jewish perspective and provides a stark literary contrast to the narrative context of the Gospels. The secondary literature on the gendered pairs as they appear in Q is then summarised; the chapter comprises all relevant discussion to date, as the examination of these pairs in their Q context is a relatively recent and undeveloped field of research. In terms of structure, I have arranged the scholarship on the Q gender pairs into two “camps” rather than reviewing the literature chronologically. The definitions of these two camps are outlined within the literature review proper. The debate centres on widely differing analyses of the import of the pairs for women, as well as around the relative comfort or caution with which authors apply the concepts of egalitarianism and feminism to ancient literature. The chapter concludes with my evaluation of this secondary literature. This chapter thus establishes the importance of Q as a significant locus of evidence for scholarly understandings of women in the early Jesus movement, in a way the Gospels alone cannot, as well as demonstrating through current debate that the interpretation of this important evidence is as yet unresolved.

## *The Pairs in Gospel Context: The Lukan Gender Pairs as Gateway*

The first work on gendered pairs in the teachings of Jesus was not in the context of Q at all. It occurred in scholarship on the Gospel of Luke,<sup>137</sup> among the most notable contributions on the so-called Lukan pairs being Turid Seim's 1994 monograph, *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke/Acts*.<sup>138</sup> As Seim points out, scholars often note that the Gospel of Luke has a habit of "pairing" men and women, and then go on to discuss what this means for Luke's view of women. Yet scholars who examine women in Luke typically do not incorporate Q into their work at all.<sup>139</sup> Those few who do show an awareness of Q do not attribute all the Lukan gender pairs to material that is commonly thought to derive from Q, but rather attribute those pairs not occurring in Matthew to special Lukan Jesus material, generally assuming that these pairs are original Lukan creations.<sup>140</sup>

The project at hand is not precisely a text-critical one that seeks to determine the boundaries of Q;<sup>141</sup> whether some of the so-called Lukan gender pairs also belong among the Q

---

<sup>137</sup> For instance, the allegedly Lukan tendency of pairing the genders at the narrative level and at the sayings level was addressed by H. Flender in *Heil und Geschichte in der Theologie des Lukas* (Munich: Kaiser, 1965) and in an article on the subject by J. Klopas, "Jesus and Women: Luke's Gospel" in *Theology Today* 43/2 (1986): 192–202.

<sup>138</sup> T. Seim, *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke & Acts* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), first published in 1994 in the *Studies of the Old Testament and its World* series. Seim's "double message" consists of her thesis that the Gospel of Luke contains mixed messages for women and "cannot be reduced either to a feminist treasure chamber or a chamber of horrors for women's theology" (249). While she finds that the gender pairs in Luke indicate that there were plenty of women in the audience and active in the movement, she notes at the same time a discomfort and ambivalence toward them on the part of Luke and other characters in the gospel, and even a crafted curtailment of women's roles in the broader scheme of Luke/Acts.

<sup>139</sup> E.g. Flender, *Heil und Geschichte in der Theologie des Lukas*; Klopas, "Jesus and Women: Luke's Gospel"; and Seim, *Double Message*.

<sup>140</sup> The *Women's Bible Commentary* serves as a characteristic example of this scholarly assumption: "The (Lukan) technique called 'pairing' is very noticeable. One version of a story or teaching refers to a man and the other to a woman, reinforcing the message and encouraging women as well as men to identify with the characters. This pairing occurs most often in the discourse of Jesus—for example, the man who plants the mustard seed and the woman who takes the leaven [...] Some healings form pairs: the widow's only son and Jairus's only daughter (7:12; 8:42)." J. Schaberg, "Luke," *The Women's Bible Commentary: Expanded Edition with Apocrypha* (ed. C. Newsom and S. H. Ringe; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998), 366.

<sup>141</sup> For a history of the reconstruction of Q in the form of the International Q Project and the Hermeneia critical edition, including an outline of the key issues, see F. Neirynck, "The Reconstruction of Q and IQP / CritEd

sayings is, for me, still an open question. Thus, the ramifications of whether, how, and why Luke carries on an existing tradition of gender pairing are herein left aside. That said, while the starting point for the current project is the edition of Q as it currently stands published, specific exceptions are permitted where strong arguments are made within the secondary literature for so-called special Lukan material deriving instead from Q. In other words, I am open to the inclusion in Q of gender pairs for which one half have only come down to us in Luke's gospel, and thus do not appear in the current cautious critical edition, when such inclusions are supported by existing scholarship. I include such "Lukan" pairs because I think, as Seim in her "Double Message" suspects, that the question of whether or not gendered pairs were created by Luke—and if so how "Luke's" special pairs do or do not differ from the pairs original to Jesus—is an important one. Future text-critical work on Luke and Q must incorporate the scholarship on gender pairs in Jesus' sayings material outside the current critical edition of Q in order to improve our chances of better understanding the realities of first-century women in the Jesus movement.

### *Divorcing Q's Women from Gospel Women*

The difference between a gendered parallel saying attested only in Luke (and thus technically of potential Lukan origin) and a gendered parallel saying attested in both Matthew and Luke (and thus Q) is, I argue, highly important to the study of women in these early communities. In looking to Q for information about women in Jesus' early movement, I thus

---

Parallels," in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (ed. A. Lindemann; Leuven, Leuven University Press, 2001), 53–148. For a fine introduction to the discipline of text criticism as it relates to the Christian Testament, see D. C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

examine Jesus' sayings material in a literary context closer to its original format.<sup>142</sup> As the following chapters will demonstrate, stripping the sayings away from their embellished and framed placement in the narrative gospels is a conceptually different project than examining them at the source in the saying list. For instance, while this project reveals the paired sayings material in Q to be of remarkable import for its reflection and design of an equality for women in the early Jesus movement, the material on women in Luke does not share identical tendencies with that of Q. While Luke had previously been viewed similarly as a promoter of women's equality in the movement, it is now being re-examined as quite the contrary; Jane Schaberg and Sharon Ringe write:

Because [The Gospel of Luke] contains a great deal of material about women that is found nowhere else in the Gospels, many readers insist that the author is enhancing or promoting the status of women. Luke is said to be a special "friend" of women, portraying them in an extremely progressive and almost modern fashion, giving them a new identity and a new social status. [...] Even as this Gospel highlights women as included among the followers of Jesus, subjects of his teaching, and objects of his healing, it deftly portrays them as models of subordinate service, excluded from the power centre of the movement and from significant responsibilities. Claiming the authority of Jesus, this portrayal is an attempt to legitimate male dominance in the Christianity of the author's time. It was successful.<sup>143</sup>

This observation about the Lukan incorporation of earlier material serves to indicate that the Matthean and Lukan literary projects, with their own tendencies, aims, urban milieux, and community concerns, provide examples of a context in which Jesus' sayings material *was used*. Q, on the other hand, is seen by some as an example of a context in which Jesus' sayings material *emerged*; or, if that is too optimistic a readings, then at the very least, Q provides yet

---

<sup>142</sup> See J. S. Kloppenborg and L. E. Vaage, "The Sayings Gospel Q and Method in the Study of Christian Origins" in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus (Semeia 55; Atlanta: Scholars, 1991)*, 1–4.

<sup>143</sup> J. Schaberg and S. Ringe, "Gospel of Luke," *Women's Bible Commentary: Twentieth-Anniversary Edition Revised and Updated* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012), 493. See further: V. Koperski, "Is 'Luke' a Feminist or Not? Female-Male Parallels in Luke-Acts," *Luke and his Readers: Festschrift A. Denaux* (BETL 132; ed. R. Bieringer, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden; Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 25–48.

another context in addition to the Gospels in which to understand how the Jesus movement used his sayings, and an earlier one at that. This is why an attempt to understand women in the early Jesus movement is incomplete without an examination of these parables and sayings outside the Matthean and Lukan *oeuvres*.

In this regard, this project joins an emerging trend toward an approach to the study of Christian origins that seeks to remove the additional layers of interpretation constituted by the surrounding Lukan and Matthean context, and instead approaches sayings material such as the gendered pairs from the standpoint of its context in Q. Luise Schottroff,<sup>144</sup> Denis Fricker,<sup>145</sup> Jean-Francois Racine,<sup>146</sup> Alicia Batten,<sup>147</sup> Kathleen Corley,<sup>148</sup> Amy-Jill Levine,<sup>149</sup> and William Arnal<sup>150</sup> are referred to in the above order in the literature review below; each of these scholars has made use of the fact that the pairs originate in a stratum of the Jesus-movement literature that predates the canonical Gospels in order to piece together new evidence for community around Jesus. While their methods and starting points may overlap a great deal, their conclusions about women and Q differ sharply, with the result that I have organised them into groups I call “Camp 1” and “Camp 2,” with a moderate camp called “Camp 1.5.” As we will see below, the scholars in Camp 1, such as Schottroff, Fricker, and Racine, use Q’s gendered pairs to reconstruct a highly positive socio-historical picture of women in the early Jesus movement, which they attribute to the historical Jesus and/or to a Q community. Batten and Corley, in Camp 1.5, also

---

<sup>144</sup> See Schottroff’s “Itinerant Prophetesses”; “The Sayings Source Q”; and *Lydia’s Impatient Sisters: A Feminist Social History of Early Christianity* (London: SCM, 1995).

<sup>145</sup> See D. Fricker, *Quand Jésus Parle au Masculin-Féminin: Étude Contextuelle et Exégétique d’une Forme Littéraire Originale* (ÉBib Nouvelle Série 53; Paris: Gabalda, 2004) and “La femme, la famille, et la communauté dans la source des *logia*,” *RevScRel* 79/1 (2005): 97–116.

<sup>146</sup> See Racine and Beaumont, “Three Approaches.”

<sup>147</sup> See Batten, “More Queries for Q.”

<sup>148</sup> See Corley, *Private Women, Public Meals and Women and the Historical Jesus*.

<sup>149</sup> See Levine, “Yeast of Eden,” 302–331 and “Women in the Q Communit(ies) and Traditions,” 150–170.

<sup>150</sup> See Arnal, “Gendered Couplets in Q,” 75–94.

find that the pairs work as evidence for a positive socio-historical situation for women, but they attribute this situation exclusively to a wider movement across the late Greek republic and at the turn of the Roman Empire, rather than to the Jesus movement. Other scholars, such as Levine and Arnal in what I call Camp 2, do not interpret the gendered pairs as proof of any socio-historically equal treatment of women and men.

Despite their varied conclusions, the above scholars all accept that studying the gender-focused parables and sayings *as they occur in Q*, and not just through their Christian canonical context in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, is a necessary step toward a more precise understanding of the material. Examining the sayings attributed to Jesus in a Lukan or Matthean context, while important for an analysis of how Luke and Matthew use sayings material, is not at all the same as analysing the material on its own, in an earlier form, removed from the narratives, miracles, tendencies, and theologies that form those larger texts—even though the text of Q as we know it has been reconstructed using those very works.

Genre is a factor in the interpretation of a text. The narrative literary genre established by early followers of Jesus that we now call “gospel” had not yet been developed when the Q sayings came into being.<sup>151</sup> Q may be an εὐαγγέλιον in the broadest sense of a “good

---

<sup>151</sup> Q has been dated anywhere from the 30s to the 70s, with the majority opinion falling in the 60s. (See E. Boring, *Introduction to the New Testament* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012], excursus 3.5, “The Sayings Source Q”). However, the earliest of the less sayings-based, more biographical works about Jesus that came to be known as “Gospels” seem to have been set in writing beginning no earlier than 70. (See Boring, *Introduction to the New Testament*, section 21.4, “Interpreting Mark: Date, Occasion.”) The first known use of the term “gospel” (*euangelion*) to refer not only to the general “good news” about Jesus, but also to a literary genre is by Justin in his *First Apology* (dated c. 155 C.E.) See L. Wills, *Quest of the Historical Gospel: Mark, John, and the Origins of the Gospel Genre* (London: Routledge, 1997) for an excellent discussion of the origins of the Gospel genre, which includes frequent references to the history of scholarship, and which incorporates fruitful comparisons with Greek Hero Cult. For an argument for the complex and multivalent use of the term εὐαγγέλιον from very early in the Jesus movement, see S. Guijarro, “La Coexistence de différents sens du terme *euaggelion* aux origines du christianisme,” *RTL* 45 (2014): 481–501.

message,”<sup>152</sup> but as a sayings collection, it differs markedly in interest and style from the narrative gospels. The closest that Q, as a collection of *logia*, might come generically to the narrative gospels is as a “Sayings Gospel,” which is indeed how some scholars have chosen to label it.<sup>153</sup> The legitimacy of conceptualising a Sayings Gospel as genre was greatly strengthened with the discovery of the sayings-based *Gospel of Thomas*.<sup>154</sup>

Despite the distinct difference in function and style between the Q *logia* and the more biographically-driven gospels<sup>155</sup> into which those *logia* became embedded, few scholars before those selected in the present review of literature have looked to Q as a separate pool of evidence

---

<sup>152</sup> See Kloppenborg, *Q: The Earliest Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox), 60–61 for a discussion of the ways in which Q can be considered an εὐαγγέλιον in the sense that Paul had a gospel and *Thomas* called itself a gospel, but not in the sense of the biographical literary genre innovated by “Mark.”

<sup>153</sup> See, for instance, Kloppenborg, “Discursive Practices in the Sayings Gospel Q,” 149–190 and *Excavating Q*. See also J. Robinson’s *The Sayings of Jesus: The Sayings Gospel Q in English* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002).

<sup>154</sup> Robinson freely links Q and *Thomas* under the shared category of “sayings gospel”: “The canonical Gospels are all Narrative Gospels, whereas Q, in this respect more like *The Gospel of Thomas*, is largely a Sayings Gospel.” Robinson, “The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus,” 28. Aside from the temptation narrative in Q 4:1–13, Q holds no strong narrative framework, other than a briefest setting of the stage here and there, in terms of location or character introductions. It is therefore the genre “logia” into which Q is understandably most commonly classified. “The sayings of the Q source show generic features of the collections of sayings of the Greek and Roman world.” (J. T. Barrera, *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible: An Introduction to the History of the Bible* [transl. W. G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1998], 34.) We see such “sayings lists” in a few other places in early Jewish/Christian antiquity, such as in the collection of parables in Mark 4, as well as in the *Gospel of Thomas*. In fact, the discovery of *Thomas* was a key turning point in the willingness of many scholars to consider “sayings gospel” as a genre at all. “The existence of Q was once challenged by some scholars on the grounds that a sayings gospel was not really a gospel. The challengers argued that there were no ancient parallels to a gospel containing only sayings and parables and lacking stories about Jesus, especially the story about his trial and death. The discovery of the *Gospel of Thomas* changed all that. *Thomas*, too, is a sayings gospel that contains no account of Jesus’ exorcisms, healings, trial, or death.” R. W. Funk, R. W. Hoover, and the Jesus Seminar, *The Five Gospels: What Did Jesus Really Say? The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus* (New York: HarperOne, 1997), 12. See further, Kloppenborg, *Q: The Earliest Gospel*, 73 for a brief summary of the ramifications of the discovery of *Thomas* for scholarly attitudes and nomenclature for Q. For a good book-length argument for *Thomas* as an independent witness to original Jesus traditions, see S. J. Patterson, *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus* (Sonoma: Polebridge, 1993). For the notion that *Thomas* contains elements that have been handed down orally from a very early point in the Jesus movement, which can thus help in the reconstruction of original Jesus sayings, see, *inter alia*, L. M. McDonald, *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon: Revised and Expanded Edition* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995), 139, esp. n5.

<sup>155</sup> I here call the Gospels “biographically-driven” rather than straight “biographies” quite deliberately. I am aware that generic issues prevent the Gospels from fitting easily into existing Greco-Roman “Lives” (βίοι). At the same time, in comparison to Q, the most obvious difference between the Gospels and Q is the presence or lack of focus on biographical moments in Jesus’ life, such as passion narratives, birth narratives, career description, encounters with others, and actions (such as accounts of healings and miracles). See R. A. Burridge, *Four Gospels, One Jesus?* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 6–7 for a very brief summary of how viewing the Gospels as biography has come in and out of vogue, and is now in favour once again, with limitations.

for women in the Jesus movement, although many monographs have addressed the role of women in Matthew and Luke.<sup>156</sup> Conceptualising the Q material as distinct from Matthean and Lukan contexts, and the Q gender pairs as distinct from the “Lukan” pairs, is worthwhile as it opens a window onto an early Galilean Jewish Jesus movement<sup>157</sup> that is largely missing from the increasingly Gentile Jesus movements attested in Christian Testament documents such as Luke/Acts<sup>158</sup> and the letters of Paul.<sup>159</sup> This is not surprising, since Q represents not only a different genre from narrative gospels, as mentioned above, but also a rather different social and geographical location, as the previous chapter has indicated. Examining the gendered pairs in their Q setting guides us to women in a Jesus movement that is poorly attested in the largely Gentile-oriented literature preserved in the Christian Testament.

Further, not only does Jesus’ sayings material shift along the spectrum between Jewish and Gentile at the hands of the gospel writers,<sup>160</sup> it also moves from rural toward urban. Leslie

---

<sup>156</sup> E.g., in the last two decades alone, the following studies are among many which purport to follow “women in the gospels” yet do not differentiate between women in the Synoptic Gospels and women in the Sayings Gospel: R. Bauckham, *Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002); S. J. Binz, *Women and the Gospels: Friends and Disciples of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011); E. V. Dowling, *Taking Away the Pound: Women, Theology, and the Parable of the Pounds in the Gospel of Luke* (London: T&T Clark, 2007); F. Gench, *Back to the Well: Women’s Encounters with Jesus in the Gospels* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004); A.-J. Levine, ed., *A Feminist Companion to Luke* (London: Sheffield Academic, 2002); A.-J. Levine, ed., *A Feminist Companion to Matthew* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001); B. E. Reid, *Choosing the Better Part? Women in the Gospel of Luke* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996); F. Scott Spencer, *Salty Wives, Spirited Mothers, and Savvy Widows: Capable Women of Purpose and Persistence in Luke’s Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012); and B. B. Thurston, *Women in the New Testament: Questions and Commentary* (New York: Crossroad, 1998). One notable exception to this trend is the volume *Women and Christian Origins*, edited by R. S. Kraemer and M. R. D’Angelo, in which one chapter is devoted to “Representations of Women in the Gospel of Matthew and Luke/Acts” and a separate chapter treats “Women in the Q Communit(ies) and Traditions” (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

<sup>157</sup> Indeed, many scholars such as L. M. McDonald date Q “well before” a Pauline corpus of writings. See McDonald, *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*, 253 n9.

<sup>158</sup> Robinson points out that, “the Q People, that is to say, the few who still identified themselves with Jesus in Galilee, have largely been lost from sight, as has always been the case since Luke almost completely bypassed Galilee in Acts.” Robinson, “The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus,” 27–28.

<sup>159</sup> On the juxtaposition of the earliest Jesus movement as Jewish and the Christianity represented in the canon Christian Testament as Gentile, see, *inter alia*, Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, esp. 42–57.

<sup>160</sup> “The hypothesis of a Jewish Q is firmly supported by recent scholarship,” writes S. J. Joseph in *Jesus, Q, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 47. By the time of Luke/Acts, however, the material has been incorporated into an urban document whose “implied author claims to be an authentic part of the heterogeneous population of the Roman



Houlden writes that the Gospels filter the sayings “from an originally uneducated Galilean and rural setting to more sophisticated urban settings.”<sup>161</sup> Rohrbaugh, too, affirms that “whatever the provenance of Jesus and his earliest followers, the principle writers (and presumably readers as well) of the New Testament were urban persons. [...] The Christian movement shifted (almost exclusively) to this urban environment.”<sup>162</sup> In addition to these shifts from rural to urban and Jewish to Gentile, the “developing conditions and attitudes in the church” constitute an additional “distorting factor.”<sup>163</sup>

In short, if historical accident had left us with only Matthew or only Luke, there would be no reconstructing an earlier layer of sayings material and the place of women in a distinct stage of the Jesus movement would be lost. The fact that both gospels are available to us with clearly separate tendencies and yet verbatim sayings that are often in the same order, allows us to extricate the sayings from their duties in the service of these narrative gospels. In the constant search for what Mack describes as “the movements that regarded Jesus as their founder-teacher,”<sup>164</sup> he advocates that “the picture of Jesus portrayed in the New Testament Gospels be set aside. That portrayal did not occur until Mark wrote his story of Jesus after the Roman-Jewish war.”<sup>165</sup> While “setting aside” the Jesus of the Gospels seems extreme, the exercise of temporarily setting aside preconceptions based on those admittedly later snapshots in the development of Jesus traditions in order to focus on a snapshot of the sayings material in earlier form is indeed useful. The following section of this chapter will outline the findings of those

---

Empire.” V. K. Robbins, “The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts,” *The Social World of Luke-Acts* (ed. J. H. Neyrey. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 332.

<sup>161</sup> L. Houlden, “Introduction to the New Testament,” *Oxford Bible Commentary* (ed. John Barton and John Muddiman; New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 840.

<sup>162</sup> Rohrbaugh, “The Preindustrial City,” 107.

<sup>163</sup> Houlden, “Introduction to the New Testament,” 840.

<sup>164</sup> Mack, *Who Wrote the New Testament*, 47.

<sup>165</sup> Mack, *Who Wrote the New Testament*, 47.

scholars who are doing the work of laying aside the search for women vis-à-vis the Jesus of the Gospels in order to uncover the story of women and the Jesus of the Q sayings.<sup>166</sup> As Amy-Jill Levine reminds us, the parables of Jesus have been reinterpreted and changed, “starting with the Gospel writers themselves,”<sup>167</sup> whereas Q may, as Mack puts it, “put us in touch with the first followers of Jesus.”<sup>168</sup> Thus, the more we can extricate Q material from Lukan and Matthean literary aims, the better we can understand how these sayings may have worked for wo/men in their original audience.

### *The Pairs in Pre-Gospel Context: Review of Secondary Literature on the Q Gender Pairs*

There is not a vast body of work to be tackled to ascertain the state of the question on women in the Q pairs. Only one full-length monograph discusses the gender pairs and the role of women in Q outside of their gospel context.<sup>169</sup> When seen all together, what emerges is that virtually all of the work to date on women and the Q pairs can be divided into camps; indeed, some authors situate themselves as such explicitly. One side of the debate counts Q’s gender pairs as strong

---

<sup>166</sup> It should be noted that by wishing to remove the sayings material from its gospel dressings and studying it in the Q collection I do not imply that I can study it “raw.” As Robinson notes, Q, “as a text [...] would inevitably have its own way of shaping the material it took over from the tradition.” Robinson, “The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus,” 27. Likewise, Kloppenborg states that “Q, no less than Mark, has a definite editorial perspective [...] and that its selection and arrangement likely reflects the situation of its framers (in the late 50s or 60s or even 70s) rather than Jesus in the 30s.” Kloppenborg, “Discursive Practices in the Sayings Gospel Q,” 163.

<sup>167</sup> A.-J. Levine, *Short Stories by Jesus: The Enigmatic Parables of a Controversial Rabbi* (New York: HarperCollins, 2014), 3. Cf. L. Houlden’s comment that “Jesus is never encountered ‘neat’ in the New Testament” but is instead subject to “all the inevitable distortion that goes with subjectivity.” Houlden, “Introduction to the New Testament,” 840.

<sup>168</sup> Mack, *Who Wrote the New Testament*, 47.

<sup>169</sup> This French-language work is Fricker’s *Quand Jésus Parle au Masculin-Féminin*. Fricker has a thorough *état de la question* (pp. 21–47) as well as an excellent multilingual bibliography (pp. 391–413). Any citations of Fricker in English herein are my own translations from his original French. In addition to Fricker’s book-length work, there is also M. Johnson-Debaufre’s, *Jesus Among Her Children: Q, Eschatology, and the Construction of Christian Origins* (HTS 55; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005). Debaufre, however, does not specifically direct her focus to the pairs, but rather to women in Q in relation to Christian origins in general, with a focus on Woman Wisdom.

evidence for gender “egalitarianism” within the early Jesus movement. The other side critiques such readings as overly generous, and instead interprets the pairs in one of two alternative ways: (a) that the pairs *do* indicate a kind of gender equality, but insists that no credit for this can be awarded to Jesus or the early Jesus movement, but should rather be attributed to the general changes that had been occurring in the society of the day; or (b), diverging even further from Camp 1, that any findings of gender equality in Q are erroneous—and at times supersessionistic—wishful thinking, and that Q is as androcentric a document as any other of its time. My own text-first approach, articulated in the chapters following this discussion, resolves the tension between the camps by describing greater precision in the rhetorical work of the pairs.

## Perspective 1: Q’s Gender Pairs as Evidence for Gender Equality in the Early Jesus Movement

### Luise Schottroff

The first attention paid to the pairs in the context of gender in Q was by Luise Schottroff. Throughout the 1990s, Schottroff’s work approached the question of women in community around Q using a hermeneutic of feminist liberation theology.<sup>170</sup> Schottroff argues repeatedly, and with rigorous engagement with the primary text and context, that the Q sayings that reference women, and the Q gender pairs in particular, demonstrate the deliberate inclusion of women on equal footing with men in both the rhetoric of the text and the Jesus movement on the

---

<sup>170</sup> Luise Schottroff’s first work on women in Q (“Itinerant Prophetesses: A Feminist Analysis of the Sayings Source Q”) arose as part of the SBL Q seminar. It was translated by J. Reed of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity at Claremont and published as one of their Occasional Papers (21) in 1991. The work was republished with the same title in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q* (ed. R. A. Piper; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 347–360. In 1994, Schottroff also contributed “The Sayings Source Q,” also from the perspective of feminist liberation theology, along with *Lydia’s Impatient Sisters*.

ground. She argues, following Theissen, that itinerant prophets form an integral part of this early movement,<sup>171</sup> and, that Q strongly indicates that both women and men could play this role. She concludes, further, that this practice represents a major and deliberate challenge to patriarchal norms.<sup>172</sup> She does note that there are, nevertheless, places throughout Q where a generally androcentric outlook prevails: “the Christian Testament as a whole, and the Sayings Source in particular, speak in androcentric language and presuppose a patriarchal system of relationships.”<sup>173</sup> However, Schottroff views this androcentrism as something that could hardly be avoided, given the ancient context, and which can be hermeneutically stripped away to uncover not only a flourishing of women in the movement, but even a “preferential option for women.”<sup>174</sup> These findings are not surprising, given that Schottroff’s explicit method as a feminist liberation theologian includes seeking just such points of women’s agency in the text.<sup>175</sup> This hermeneutical uncovering of challenges to patriarchy,<sup>176</sup> even within parts of Q that are couched in androcentric language and ideas, raises objections from Schottroff’s critics as overly

---

<sup>171</sup> See Schottroff, *Itinerant Prophetesses*, throughout. While Theissen formulates a picture of early Jesus communities relying on both itinerant prophets and stationary hosts in *Le christianisme de Jésus*, attention is not paid to gender as it is in Schottroff. For additional arguments for the inclusion of women followers of Jesus among itinerant prophets, see J. D. Crossan, “Itinerants and Householders in the Earliest Kingdom Movement,” *Reimagining Christian Origins* (ed. E. Castelli and H. Taussig; Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1996), 113–129.

<sup>172</sup> See Schottroff, “The Sayings Source Q,” throughout.

<sup>173</sup> Schottroff, “The Sayings Source Q,” 509.

<sup>174</sup> “Despite its intensely androcentric language and its patriarchal horizon of imagination, this sayings tradition encourages us to develop visions of a better world, a world that, through a preferential option for women who are tormented by poverty, sexual exploitation, and ignorance, we can begin to envision and to achieve.” Schottroff, “The Sayings Source Q,” 531.

<sup>175</sup> When discussing her method, Schottroff is candid about the questions asked of the text: “An analysis of patriarchy in the Christian Testament implies a critical examination of patriarchal structures at several levels: (1) Where in the Christian Testament texts do we find patriarchal power structures uncritically maintained? (2) Where in the Christian Testament are there initiatives toward a critique of patriarchy? (3) Where, even in androcentric texts, is it possible to bring to light the history of women that has been rendered invisible? (4) Where does the Christian Testament contain options from which a feminist theology of liberation can draw inspiration?” Schottroff, “The Sayings Source Q,” 509.

<sup>176</sup> See, e.g., Schottroff, *Itinerant Prophetesses*, 9–10.

optimistic.<sup>177</sup> The consequence of Schottroff's work with women in Q is that the medium (the gender pairs), the message (an egalitarian *basileia*), and the method (itinerant prophets and prophetesses) point to a community and a leader that, although mired in an androcentric context, still managed to deeply challenge certain patriarchal norms around the value of both women and men to this movement and to its God.

## Denis Fricker

Denis Fricker's 2004 dissertation *Quand Jésus parle au masculin-féminin*<sup>178</sup> was the first book-length work undertaken specifically to shine a bright and substantial spotlight on the gender pairs as they appear in Q. Examining the pairs from various standpoints in turn, ranging from sociological to theological to historical-critical to rhetorical, Fricker's work clearly aims to be exhaustive and precise. Like Schottroff, Fricker also admits an overtly feminist and theological goal, relevant to practitioners of Christianity today, and, like Schottroff, Fricker is also historically rigorous, and explicit about his methods. He offers a multilingual literature review, and incorporates all existing work to date into his project, which essentially reaches the twofold conclusion that: 1) the Q parable pairs unequivocally represent a deliberate program of equality between men and women, and 2) that they can be linked directly to the historical Jesus.

## Jean-Francois Racine

---

<sup>177</sup> Examples of such critiques are outlined in the "Camp 2" section below. Approaching a text with Schottroff's feminist hermeneutic of liberation does predict that the outcome is more likely to be a favourable one for women. That said, Schottroff's analysis is nonetheless meticulous, as she is explicit about her method, and she thoroughly combs the text of Q for both its androcentric and its "liberating" aspects.

<sup>178</sup> Fricker, *Quand Jésus parle au masculin-féminin*.

In keeping with Fricker and Schottroff, Jean-Francois Racine also concludes that the gender pairs in Q form admissible evidence not only that women were present in Q's audience, but also that treating wo/men as equals was definitely among the rhetorical aims of such sayings. Racine addresses the gender pairs in the context of his article which aims to provide a synthesis of various scholarship on women in Q.<sup>179</sup> In reference to the pairs, he states: "this type of juxtaposition is an indication that Q addresses equally men and women."<sup>180</sup>

Racine concludes that there was "an egalitarian social ethos at work in Q,"<sup>181</sup> which clearly extends to gender. He contends that, in light of three things—Bernadette Brooten's scholarship on women leaders in early synagogues;<sup>182</sup> Kathleen Corley's juxtaposition of Q material against the backdrop of a burgeoning freedom for women in the late republic which Augustus worked hard to curtail; and Paul's frequent references to women in places of leadership and influence—"the hypothesis that Q is addressed as much to women as to men, and that women take part along with men in the task of spreading the Jesus movement becomes much more credible as still another sign of a widespread movement."<sup>183</sup> Racine is thus also positioned in what I have called "camp 1," as another scholar who sees the gender pairs as evidence for a deliberate move toward gender equality on the part of Q and/or Jesus.

### Perspective 1.5: Gender Pairs are Only Evidence of Equality in Keeping With Late Republic Equality

---

<sup>179</sup> Racine and Beaumont, "Three Approaches."

<sup>180</sup> Racine and Beaumont, "Three Approaches," 114.

<sup>181</sup> Racine and Beaumont, "Three Approaches," 114.

<sup>182</sup> Bernadette Brooten, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues* (Chico: Scholars, 1982).

<sup>183</sup> Racine and Beaumont, "Three Approaches," 116.

## Alicia Batten

In 1994, Alicia Batten published her article in the *Biblical Theology Bulletin* focusing on women in Q, and in particular on five gender pairs.<sup>184</sup> In this work, Batten takes a slightly different approach from other scholars; she addresses the implications of Q's challenges to familial and gender structures, for women. In some aspects, Batten is in direct agreement with Schottroff in the latter's assessment that, despite working within typical androcentric frameworks, Q's rhetoric constitutes "a deliberate challenge to societal norms."<sup>185</sup> Batten's reasons for this conclusion may not be the same as other scholars, but she aligns with "Camp 1" in her acceptance of the pairs as clear evidence that wo/men were, at least in some ways, on equal footing in the Jesus movement around Q. For instance, rather than locating Q's challenge to gender norms largely in the presence of women as itinerant prophets in the Q community, as Schottroff does, Batten instead locates Q's inclusivity more squarely within the pairs themselves; she detects a deliberate social and literary strategy implied by Q's repeated offering of paired masculine and feminine examples.<sup>186</sup> Batten uses the pairs to argue that there were women in the Q audience (whether as itinerant prophets or supportive hosts or both), that these women were included deliberately by Q's rhetoric, and that, furthermore, the Q community was generally "a group of people who offered a more inclusive environment for women"<sup>187</sup> in both the public and the private realm.<sup>188</sup>

However, although Batten sides with Camp 1 in her view that the gender pairs provide strong evidence for men's and women's relative equality in the early Jesus movement around Q,

---

<sup>184</sup> Batten, "More Queries for Q," 44–51.

<sup>185</sup> Batten, "More Queries for Q," 47.

<sup>186</sup> Batten, "More Queries for Q," 47.

<sup>187</sup> Batten, "More Queries for Q," 49.

<sup>188</sup> Batten, "More Queries for Q," 44.

she diverges significantly from others in that camp in that she does not view this equality as originating with Jesus or within the Q community. She instead situates this Q group within its broader socio-historical context in such a way as to suggest that the increased agency offered to women in Q is quite in line with the general situation for women in the late Hellenistic period and at the crossroads of Roman Empire.<sup>189</sup> While women in Mediterranean antiquity had generally existed within a circle of power that was restricted to the domestic as opposed to the public realm, women in the Late Republic temporarily enjoyed a shift from this exclusively private power toward some patches of public power as well. In other words, Batten does not describe Q's challenge to social hierarchies as an exclusively Christian or Jesus-movement innovation that broke sharply away from Jewish or Hellenistic patriarchy, but instead sees Q's treatment of women as participating in a *status quo*, alongside Judaism and Hellenism, in "a wider phenomenon throughout the Hellenistic world" wherein women were already partaking in new opportunities of public participation.<sup>190</sup> She writes: "earliest Christianity, often characterized as an inclusive haven for women fleeing from patriarchal Judaism or Graeco-Roman religions, was not unique,"<sup>191</sup> and, further, that:

neither Judaism nor Hellenism needs to be denigrated in order to appreciate the inclusivity discernible in Q [...]. It was not necessarily a Christian ideology that promoted such openness, but a wider phenomenon throughout the Hellenistic world, which for some time offered more opportunities for women to participate publicly, as the examples of women benefactors, synagogue leaders, and philosophers solidly illustrate.<sup>192</sup>

---

<sup>189</sup> After examining a list of textual and material evidence, both her own and from secondary literature, Batten concludes: "(A)s the examples have shown, women were increasingly gaining public status throughout the Mediterranean during the Late Republic. Both Jewish and Graeco-Roman women engaged in public activities involving religion, politics, and philosophy." Batten, "More Queries for Q," 46–47.

<sup>190</sup> Batten, "More Queries for Q," 49.

<sup>191</sup> Batten, "More Queries for Q," 47.

<sup>192</sup> Batten, "More Queries for Q," 49. On this she sides with Corley, *Private Women, Public Meals* (see below).



Batten considers Augustan marriage reform a relevant context in which to examine Q, pointing to Augustus' focus on women's propriety as an indicator that women in the Late Republic had been enjoying their new opportunities on a scale that was wide enough to threaten the social and political structures and cause a backlash: "Augustus' laws on marriage are a significant indication that women were becoming too free."<sup>193</sup> In her conclusion, Batten alludes to the fact that this rise in women's circle of agency occurred for a limited time only, and pinpoints Augustus' frequent measures to control women's behaviour<sup>194</sup> as the dawn of an era which sought—successfully—to regain tighter control over women's freedoms. She concludes:

as is commonly known, Christianity later became a patriarchal religion despite these exciting beginnings. Hence, continuing to study its development in light of larger forces will perhaps better enable us to understand why Christianity appears so quickly to have forgotten some of its own origins.<sup>195</sup>

According to Batten, these "exciting beginnings" cannot be attributed to Jesus/Christianity in the first place; Q's gender-levelling tendencies are rather the result of a general movement. For this reason, I have positioned Batten in Camp 1.5, between Camp 1 who credit Jesus of Nazareth for the gender pairs, which are evaluated as unequivocally positive, and Camp 2 who do not evaluate the gender pairs as necessarily positive for women at all. Batten grants the pairs their due as gender-levelling literature, while looking beyond Jesus to the Hellenistic social world as the correct context from which the pairs could have sprung. I agree with Batten's approach and findings; she has successfully located the pairs in a wider context, resulting in an important corrective to supersessionistic analyses, while at the same time recognising their rhetorical work as significant for our understanding of the role of women in the Jesus movement.

---

<sup>193</sup> Batten, "More Queries for Q," 49.

<sup>194</sup> See L. F. Raditsa, "Augustus' Legislation Concerning Marriage, Procreation, Love Affairs and Adultery," *ANRW* 2/13 (1980): 278–339.

<sup>195</sup> Batten, "More Queries for Q," 49.

## Kathleen Corley

Kathleen Corley is a member of the Jesus Seminar who specialises in historical Jesus research with a particular view to the status of women.<sup>196</sup> Meal praxis is central to her analyses of the place of women around Jesus of Nazareth and in the early movements that followed his death. Corley, like Batten, notices practices mentioned in Jesus material that hint at a newly public place for women, and concludes that the women who enjoyed a more public presence in the Jesus movement “were participants in a larger process of innovation which incorporated the inclusion of women in various social and religious contexts.”<sup>197</sup> Like Batten, Corley is of the opinion that while the Q material does indicate an emancipation of women, this is by no means indicative of an innovation on the part of Jesus or early Christianity, but is rather indicative of a “larger process” across Mediterranean antiquity. I concur with Corley’s findings; thus it is Camp 1.5 in which my own analysis of the Q pairs is best situated.

## Perspective 2: Gender Pairs not Evidence of Equality at All

The scholars I have grouped in Camp 2 diverge from both Camp 1 and Camp 1.5 in that they do not find Q to contain evidence for equality between men and women. They interpret the pairs in other ways, none of which brings them to the conclusion that gender equality is a force at play in Q.

---

<sup>196</sup> Corley’s key works that touch on women and the Q document are: *Private Women, Public Meals* and *Women and the Historical Jesus*.

<sup>197</sup> Corley, *Women and the Historical Jesus*, acknowledgements, n.p.

## Amy-Jill Levine

In Amy-Jill Levine's 1990 article, "Who's Catering the Q Affair? Feminist Observations on Q Paraenesis,"<sup>198</sup> she assumes both the existence of "Q people" and the existence of Kloppenborg's two strata in Q, taking the proposed strata as a reflection of two different stages in the social status of the "Q People." Like Schottroff, she views the earlier stage as characterised by mendicant missionaries. However, following Theissen on a point where Schottroff differs, she views these wandering prophets as male. Since these male mendicants are liminal members of society, the role of the female members of the group is to offer much-needed support (such as food, lodging, and finances). She views the "later" stratum (Q2) as reflective of a time after which these missionaries had met, on the one hand, with a measure of success (and therefore a more solid social network was in place) and, on the other hand, with rising opposition from mainstream views (occasioning this layer of Q's more vitriolic rhetoric). In this later stage, the importance of the women's supportive network is, for Levine, more substantial. In Levine's own words, this form-critical analysis thus offers "both confirmation of and qualifications to the popular hypothesis that Q represents a discipleship of equals."<sup>199</sup>

However, in her subsequent article for the *Feminist Companion to the Hebrew Bible in the New Testament*, Levine offers a much more negative interpretation of the gender pairs in Q, in terms of their connection to any sort of equality for first-century women.<sup>200</sup> She sounds an alarm about the fact that much of the scholarship on women in early Christianity has set up a dichotomy of "women in early Judaism" versus "women in early Christianity," wherein both are extreme caricatures, the former depicted as hopelessly patriarchal and restrictive for women, and

---

<sup>198</sup> Levine, "Who's Catering the Q Affair."

<sup>199</sup> Levine, "Who's Catering the Q Affair," 146.

<sup>200</sup> Levine, "Yeast of Eden," 302–331.

the latter depicted as unflaggingly emancipatory.<sup>201</sup> “The prevailing hypothesis is that Judaism, however and if ever defined, regarded women as weak-willed, wanton, and, in general, worthless.”<sup>202</sup> As Judith Plaskow has said, “it seems as if the feminist struggle with patriarchal christologies leads back into the trap of anti-Judaism.”<sup>203</sup> Levine laments this trend in Christian scholarship on Jesus and women as an “orientalising of the Jews” which “serves to distinguish them culturally and ethically from Jesus and his followers.”<sup>204</sup> In this article, Levine deems the Q pairs to be insufficient as evidence of any real difference for women, especially given the androcentrism and patriarchy throughout early Christianity, including throughout the text of Q itself, and suggests that analyses which latch onto the pairs as proof of gender egalitarianism stem from bias.<sup>205</sup> In a more recent article, she encapsulates this issue with typical pith: “negatively categorizing early Judaism as misogynistic and positively categorizing Jesus as proactive on women’s rights is both bad history and bad theology.”<sup>206</sup> She portrays the Q community as one in which the participation of women is not remarkable:

Jesus gathered a small but loyal following of fellow Jews who sought to incarnate the *basileia*, the kingdom of heaven, on earth. They preached a joyous attitude toward life, community support and solidarity, and a view of others based on actions, not on pronouncements, birth, or wealth. With this message and this

---

<sup>201</sup> Levine, “Yeast of Eden,” 307.

<sup>202</sup> Levine, “Yeast of Eden,” 303.

<sup>203</sup> J. Plaskow, “Feminist Anti-Judaism and the Christian God,” *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 7/2 (1991): 106. See also Plaskow’s “Anti-Judaism in Christian Feminist Interpretation,” *Searching the Scriptures: A Feminist Introduction* (ed. E. Schüssler Fiorenza; New York: Crossroad, 1993), 7–29.

<sup>204</sup> Levine, “Second-Temple Judaism, Jesus, and Women,” 303. I agree wholeheartedly with Levine’s critique of early feminist scholarship on women in Christianity as highly problematic with regards to its oversimplification of Judaism in its rush to uncover gender equality at the roots of the Christian tradition. Schüssler Fiorenza’s aforementioned 1995 work *Jesus: Miriam’s Child, Sophia’s Prophet* is a refreshing corrective, as it addresses Christian anti-Judaism around Jesus and women directly.

<sup>205</sup> See also Levine’s 2002 article, “Matthew, Mark, and Luke: Good News or Bad?” in *Jesus, Judaism, and Christian Anti-Judaism* (ed. P. Fredriksen and A. Reinhartz; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 77–98, which argues broadly that both modern interpretive biases and incomplete/conflicting ancient evidence work to complicate the issue of anti-Judaism in early Christian texts, although the article does not reflect on Q *per se*.

<sup>206</sup> A.-J. Levine, “The Word Becomes Flesh: Jesus, Gender, and Sexuality,” *The Historical Jesus in Recent Research* (ed. J. D. G. Dunn and S. McKnight; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 516.

lifestyle, women took their place among Jesus' followers. His association with women, in and of itself, is unremarkable.<sup>207</sup>

Levine's work, like Batten's and Corley's, represents a welcome change in the direction of the conversation about women in the Jesus movement, correcting a dismissive lack of attention to early Judaism and a tendency to anti-Jewish conclusions. My work on the Q pairs hears Levine's important caveats against supersessionist readings, while attempting to overturn her ruling about the lack of significance of the Q pairs in terms of what they can tell us about any deliberate inclusion of women on the part of Q.

## **William Arnal**

In 1997, William Arnal published an article with a unique thesis on the gendered pairs within Q, namely, "that the phenomenon is more indicative of a penchant for legal and regulatory formulations than it is of an interest in a deliberate critique of patriarchy."<sup>208</sup> According to Arnal, although all work on the pairs to that point had agreed that they indicate positivity toward women to some degree, "the Q couplets do not in and of themselves serve as any convincing indication of a tendency toward gender inclusiveness."<sup>209</sup> He defines the pairs as "repetitious examples, statements, or arguments, paired by gender: one male, one female"<sup>210</sup> but concludes that Q, overall, has a "blatantly androcentric character."<sup>211</sup> The only gender equality for which Arnal will admit the pairs as evidence is that "the Q program is launched with examples drawn from the world of both male and female experience, and that judgment is

---

<sup>207</sup> Levine, "The Word Becomes Flesh," 523.

<sup>208</sup> Arnal, "Gendered Couplets in Q," 77.

<sup>209</sup> Arnal, "Gendered Couplets in Q," 92.

<sup>210</sup> Arnal, "Gendered Couplets in Q," 77.

<sup>211</sup> Arnal, "Gendered Couplets in Q," 92.

proffered to both the men and the women of impenitent Israel.”<sup>212</sup> His analysis thus joins Levine’s against the grain of those analyses outlined above in Camp 1 and Camp 1.5, which cite the gender pairs as a clear sign of Q’s deliberate inclusion of women.

### *Evaluation and Conclusions*

The above collection of scholars all represent a shift in the discussion of the gendered pairs in the sayings of Jesus away from their context in the narrative gospels and into their earlier context within the Q source. The thread of disagreement that runs throughout the above collection of work, and the topic around which this work has been divided into camps, has to do with the juxtaposition of interpretations of the Q pairs as revealing either a somewhat gender-egalitarian tendency in the Q texts and communities, or else reaffirming a somewhat patriarchal/kyriarchal/androcentric status quo. The crux of the disagreement revolves around the application of such categories as egalitarianism and feminism to texts from antiquity, namely, over whether it is ever appropriate to regard anything in antiquity as either egalitarian or feminist at all. Even among those for whom definitions of feminism and egalitarianism can be sufficiently qualified to avoid anachronism, there is disagreement and discrepancy around how such concepts can and cannot be identified within an ancient text.

Kathleen Corley<sup>213</sup> and John Elliott<sup>214</sup> are two scholars who have taken issue with the use of early Jesus material as evidence for gender equality and/or egalitarian social values. Corley

---

<sup>212</sup> Arnal, “Gendered Couplets in Q,” 93.

<sup>213</sup> Corley, *Women and the Historical Jesus*.

<sup>214</sup> See Elliott, “Jesus was not an Egalitarian,” 75–91 for a critique of scholars who, in Elliott’s view, paint too rosy a picture of early Christianity at the expense of historicity. Elliott calls, rightly, for a definition of “egalitarian” by any who choose to use the term (76).

views such conclusions as Christian feminist mythmaking, while Elliott views the category of egalitarianism as an historical anachronism. Mary Ann Beavis directly responded in a 2007 article to those who had dismissed and criticised the use of egalitarianism as a concept for the early Jesus movement; this work was comprised of particularly direct responses to Kathleen Corley and John Elliott. Beavis comes to the defense of that very “widely held hypothesis” which Corley and Elliott had attempted to challenge, namely, the notion that Jesus and his *basileia* movement had been “egalitarian,” but that by the time of Paul, the church had already begun reverting to “the non-egalitarian norms of the ancient Mediterranean world.”<sup>215</sup> What Corley had labelled “Feminist Myths of Christian Origins” and Elliott had declared to be anachronistic, Beavis works hard to redeem. She does so by exposing critiques like Corley’s and Elliott’s as having set up feminist reconstructions of Christian origins in such a biased and selective way as to make them easy to refute.<sup>216</sup> Beavis argues that both gender equality and egalitarianism in general—defined appropriately in context—are clearly present in the earliest *basileia* movement.<sup>217</sup>

My dissertation offers a helpful clarification to this discussion: I concur with Beavis in her view that even feminist readings which explicitly set out to uncover positive moments for women in the text can make contributions to historical questions as well, and cannot be wholly thrown out because of their stated (or even unstated) biases. Beavis is correct that these readings have in many cases been described by critics in overly simplistic terms, or dismissed wholesale although they vary substantially in nuance and rigour. Schüssler Fiorenza, for instance, while among the loudest and most prolific voices for an egalitarian and woman-positive Jesus of

---

<sup>215</sup> M. A. Beavis, “Christian Origins, Egalitarianism, and Utopia,” *JFSR* 23/2 (Fall 2007): 27.

<sup>216</sup> Beavis, “Christian Origins,” 27.

<sup>217</sup> Beavis, “Christian Origins,” 27.

Nazareth,<sup>218</sup> is at the same time one of the most frequent admonishers of anti-Judaism and supersessionism in Christian feminist scholarship.<sup>219</sup> Schottroff, too, guards mindfully against anti-Jewish reconstructions in her work on women in Q.<sup>220</sup>

On the other hand, I also agree with Corley and Elliott in their view that the picture of women that we find in the Jesus material is not a clear, uncomplicated one. While Corley and Elliott are uncomfortable with conclusions such as “Q is feminist” or “Jesus was egalitarian,” this project responds to their calls for caution by instead concluding that Q treats women equally *in this specific way and not these other ways*.

I agree with critics like Elliott who complain that allowing current questions to shape our investigations of ancient data is in some ways not a best practice for historians of antiquity; I similarly concur that heading into an investigation of what evidence we have for women in the Jesus movement with our desired conclusions already in hand does a disservice to the stories of women in antiquity even as it aims to uplift contemporary women, and teaches us more about modern questions than it does about first-century Judaism. Levine, Arnal, Corley, Batten, and Schottroff are right to note that androcentric language and a patriarchal/kyriarchal worldview mitigate reading Q with rose-coloured glasses in terms of the role of women in the earliest Jesus movement versus the role of women in general at the time. However, while these cautions are an important starting point for such investigation, they are not its ending point. The presence of androcentric language is unremarkable in antiquity; it does not negate the fact that a literary

---

<sup>218</sup> See, e.g., E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *Discipleship of Equals: A Critical Feminist Ekklesiology of Liberation* (New York: Crossroad, 1993).

<sup>219</sup> See, e.g., E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *Jesus and the Politics of Interpretation* (New York: Continuum, 2000), 128.

<sup>220</sup> E.g.: “The Jewish upper classes’ participation in the interests of the Pax Romana led also to internal conflicts within Judaism, whose textual expression became, in the later history of Christian interpretation, an instrument of anti-Judaism. As a result, a social-historical contextualization of the texts is also fundamental for the issue of anti-Judaism.” Schottroff, “The Sayings Source Q,” 510.



pattern exists within Q that is unprecedented in antique literature, and that unmistakably highlights gender in a way that does not seem to have at its base the purpose of disparaging women, but rather seems to stem from an impulse toward women's inclusion. The fact that scholars on one end of the spectrum are correct to point out that what is happening in the pairs cannot be equated to modern egalitarianism or modern feminism, and correct that we ought to be on the lookout for anti-Jewish and anachronistic interpretation, should not be allowed to overshadow the important work of scholars at the other end of the spectrum who highlight a literary anomaly that is of unique importance for the study of women in the Galilean Jesus movement.

Alicia Batten and Kathleen Corley do see gender equality evidenced in the Q pairs, albeit credited not to the Jesus movement but rather to the *Zeitgeist*, and thus fall toward the centre of this spectrum. It seems to me that in their important work toward situating the Q pairs more carefully in their wider Mediterranean context, and, in so doing, counteracting claims of Christian superiority that can smack of supersessionism, Batten and Corley may have downplayed the remarkable innovation that the gender pairs do present. While the time may indeed have been right to allow for Q's extension of various opportunities to women and its encouragement to community members to challenge traditional familial roles, as Batten and Corley have demonstrated, the particular way in which Q does this is, at a literary level, completely unprecedented; as I will show in chapter 4, the use of the particular rhetorical strategy of the pairs, and the implications of that strategy for its recipients, is undocumented in earlier Hellenistic and Second-Temple texts. The fruits of women's opportunity may indeed have ripened in the Late Republic, but the Q material is unique evidence that they were actually plucked and enjoyed.

The success of this research project lies in its amalgamation of the best research from various feminist perspectives on the Q pairs. This project shares the scepticism of some researchers around how far towards “equality” the Q pairs can be stretched, and heeds the sharp warnings of against anti-Jewish readings. It also shares the conviction of feminist scholars who note that something of import for women is indeed happening in Q’s rhetoric. The following chapters will demonstrate, through a close reading that is sensitive to both text and context, that the gendered pairs push against the boundaries of the status quo for women in unique and important ways while, in other ways, simultaneously reinforcing social gender roles.

## Chapter 3 Gendered Pairs in Q: Taxonomy and Individual Analysis

### *Definitions*

The literary devices in Q upon which this project is based consist of an equal juxtaposition of masculine and feminine concepts or characters within parables<sup>221</sup> or short sayings. The scholars mentioned in the review found in the previous chapter have all worked in some capacity on Q's tendency to position male and female genders side by side in these parables or sayings. According to Schottroff, Fricker, Racine, Batten, and Corley, this juxtaposition functions to plant and/or to mirror a notion of parity among recipients of Jesus' sayings material. This question of whether the presence in Jesus' *logia* of these deliberate adjacent references to the masculine and the feminine is as a *result* of women already existing in the movement, or is as a *catalyst* or invitation to women to join the movement is an important one, which may not be answerable, but it should nonetheless be addressed in future in Q scholarship. According to Levine and Arnal, however, the existence in the text of these pairings of masculine and feminine cannot conclusively translate to any type of parity in the community.

This chapter sets out a taxonomy and description of the primary texts<sup>222</sup> involved in this debate, along with analysis that shows how both sides of the debate can be reconciled with the

---

<sup>221</sup> The classic work of A. Julicher (*Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* [Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck)], 1888), on the parables of Jesus and their literary and cultural heritage, remains in many ways influential to the present day. For a reflection on the ongoing relevance of Julicher's parable classifications, and a report on the state of the investigation in the last century, see M. A. Beavis, "Parable and Fable," *CBQ* 52 (1990): 473–498.

<sup>222</sup> Throughout, quotations from the primary text in Greek are from the *Hermeneia* critical edition of Q. In the instance that a Greek passage does not occur in the critical edition, quotations are from the 28<sup>th</sup> edition of the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece* (NA<sup>28</sup>). Translations into English are those of the critical edition of Q. In the

introduction of greater precision around which type/s of equality can be inferred from the texts and which cannot. In terms of organisation, the texts are divided into two major generic categories, since the gender-pairing tendency in Q is expressed in the text in two ways: in binary sets of parables, and in brief binary phrases. In the first instance—sets of parables—two highly similar parables that teach an identical lesson are reiterated in succession, once using feminine examples and once using masculine examples. In one half of each pair (sometimes the first half and other times the second), the protagonist(s) of the parable is a woman or women, or some task<sup>223</sup> that is related to women’s daily lives. In the other half of each pair, the protagonist(s) of the parable is a man or men, or some task or object that is related to men’s daily lives. In each set of repeated parables, key lines are repeated verbatim in both parables, while other lines or phrases are contrasted. These contrasting words or phrases make up what I call the parallel parable’s “variables” or variations. The main variable in the pairs is always gendered. Given that each half of the pair of parables teaches the same lesson, the gendered portions do not have the effect of setting the genders apart from each other;<sup>224</sup> instead, I argue that the parallel didactic contents of the juxtaposed pairs have the effect of *equating* the genders. The gendered variables stand in the same symbolic location within each teaching pericope.

In addition to these gendered parable sets, a second type of gendered pairing also occurs in Q. In this secondary type of pairing, a brief phrase including both a masculine and a feminine element such as “brothers and sisters” is used, when one element alone (such as “brothers”) would normally suffice. These briefer pairs again signal an attention on the part of the author(s)

---

instance that a Greek passage does not occur in the critical edition, translations are from the Revised Standard Version (RSV). When translations are my own, they are noted as such.

<sup>223</sup> For more on this, see the section entitled “gender implied” below.

<sup>224</sup> A handy example of how a saying that juxtaposes genders might instead set them apart can be found in Ephesians 5:22–25: “Wives, submit to your husbands [...] Husbands, love your wives.”

to the placement of men and women on par in the text in some way and/or to the inclusion of women as intended recipients and/or existing community members.

Throughout this project, I will refer to the former sort of pairing using terms such as “full pairs,” “complete pairs,” “parallel parable pair,” or some similar label. The latter, briefer sort will be referred to as the “shorter pairs.” The terms “gender pairs” or “gendered pairs” can refer to either type of pairing.

## Full Pairs

In the full pairs, the gendered variable can be present both literally and figuratively. In other words, binary gender is sometimes conveyed in the plain sense of the text (i.e. a male protagonist in one and a female protagonist in the other), while, other times, gender is only indirectly implied by the content and context (i.e. a male-associated activity or topic in one parable and a female-associated activity or topic in the other). In some cases, the concept of gender is reinforced in both of these ways in the same pair.

My definition of a full parallel parable pair includes each component from letters a) to e) in the following table. Complete gender pairs:

a) are a set of two parables which
b) occur one after another in the text of Q, and
c) teach the same lesson,
d) in a verbally parallel manner,
e) wherein one parable highlights masculinity and the other femininity, either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. literally (i.e. a male protagonist and a female protagonist), or</li> <li>ii. indirectly (i.e. a male-associated activity or topic and a female-associated activity or topic), or</li> <li>iii. both literally and figuratively (i.e. a male protagonist is also performing a masculine task and a female protagonist is also performing a feminine task).</li> </ul>

By way of illustration, a brief look at the twin Q parables of the lost sheep and the lost coin will serve as an example:

Which man<sup>225</sup> is there among you who has a hundred sheep, on losing one of them, will not leave the ninety-nine in the mountains, and go hunt for the lost one? And if it should happen that he finds it, I say to you that he rejoices over it more than over the ninety-nine that did not go astray.

Or what woman who has ten coins, if she were to lose one coin, would not light a lamp and sweep the house and hunt until she finds? And on finding she calls the friends and neighbours, saying: Rejoice with me, for I found the coin which I had lost. (Q 15:4–5a, 7–9)

In this example, the parable about a man who has a hundred sheep and loses one is coupled with the parable about a woman who has ten coins and loses one. In both cases, what has been lost is diligently sought and is recovered in the end, and rejoicing ensues. These two parables together fill all of the criteria required to form a full parallel pair, gendered in both form and content (i.e. gender is both overt and implied):

- They appear nearby in the sayings material (Q 15:4–5a and 7–9);
- They both teach the same lesson (about valuing what is lost, even if what is lost is but a small portion of the whole);
- They are largely verbally parallel (which man/what woman, who has a hundred sheep/who has ten coins, losing/lose, will not ... hunt/would not ... hunt, he finds it/on finding, rejoicing/rejoice);
- The variable in each parable has to do with gender, both literally, as the first protagonist is a man and the second a woman, and indirectly, as shepherding is a task

---

<sup>225</sup> While Q reads *τίς ἄνθρωπος* and translates it as “which person” in keeping with a standard translation choice toward inclusive language throughout the critical edition, I argue that in cases like paralleled pairs, where *τίς ἄνθρωπος* stands in literary opposition to *τίς γυνή* in the parallel verse, it stands to reason that “man” is the translation that better captures what is happening rhetorically.

undertaken in the typically masculine public realm,<sup>226</sup> while caring for the home is in the typically feminine private or domestic arena.<sup>227</sup>

Thus, the companion parables about the lost sheep and the lost coin form a “full pair” according to my definition.

I have developed a further taxonomy for referring to the various configurations of these full pairs, based on how the text conveys gender. According to my analysis, there are eight full parable pairs in Q. In three cases, the gender is only mentioned overtly, such as in Q 11:31–32, where the protagonist is a foreign woman from Israel’s literary past in one (i.e. “The Queen of the South”), and a group of foreign men from Israel’s literary past in the other (i.e. “Ninevite men”). In two cases, the gender is only indirectly implied by the contents of the parables, such as in Q 12:24 and 27, where sowing crops is juxtaposed with spinning wool in the parable pair of the ravens and the lilies. There, no human protagonists exist; instead the female-associated topic

---

<sup>226</sup> Sheep are “distinctively under male control” in the ancient Mediterranean world. B. J. Malina, “Understanding New Testament Persons,” *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation* (ed. R. Rohrbaugh; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996), 50. See also C. Osiek and D. L. Balch, *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 138. As a rule, men in Greco-Roman antiquity were socialised to perform all outdoor tasks such as shepherding, while women were socialised to remain largely indoors; women were “in the house, weaving, veiled, guarding the stores” whereas men, both upper-class and peasant, were more likely to be “outside, fighting, farming, and winning goods to store.” J. J. Winkler, *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 160.

<sup>227</sup> H. Moxnes, “Honor and Shame,” *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation* (ed. R. Rohrbaugh; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996), 21. Further, as Neyrey puts it: “the ancients construed the world as gender divided: males in the ‘public’ and females in the ‘private’ world.” J. H. Neyrey, “What’s Wrong with this Picture: John 4, Cultural Stereotypes of Women, and Public and Private Space,” *A Feminist Companion to John: Volume 1* (ed. A.-J. Levine; London: Sheffield Academic, 2003), 100. “Some places are distinctively female: for example, the inside of a house.” Malina, “Understanding New Testament Persons,” 50. It should also be noted that, while the ancient Mediterranean world certainly relegated women to the private realm while men functioned primarily in the public realm, there are nuances and exceptions related to class. Amy-Jill Levine writes: “studies of the early Christian household have modified any strict reconstruction of public versus private geographical divisions. It may be more accurate to see public and private space as determined not only by location (e.g. market and home), the male ‘without’ (ἐξω) and the female ‘within’ (ἐν), but also by time. That is, the upper-class house has a public function during the day and a private function at night. In like manner, the assignment of men to the agricultural, commercial, and civic realms and the female to the domestic space of home, well, and oven must be tempered by notions of class. There were women who worked in the market and men who served in the home. The ‘women’s quarters’ were an attribute only of the elite.” A.-J. Levine, “Introduction,” in *A Feminist Companion to John: Volume 1* (ed. A.-J. Levine; London: Sheffield Academic, 2003), 8.

of spinning is juxtaposed with the male-associated activity of farming. In three cases, the gender is both overt and implied, such as in the parables of the lost coin and the lost sheep (Q 15:4–5a, 7–9), where the male protagonist also performs the masculine task of shepherding and the female protagonist also performs the feminine task of housekeeping. I have described these differences among the full parallel parable pairs with the following subcategories: the full pair, gender overt; the full pair, gender implied; and the double full pair, gender overt and implied.

### Shorter Pairs

The other literary device present in Q, which also juxtaposes gender in such a way as to place masculine and feminine on par, may be less complex, but it still bears mentioning. These moments in the sayings material, which I refer to as the “shorter pairs,” are stand-alone phrases that mention male and female counterparts, such as “brothers and sisters” or “fathers and mothers”; these are cases where the masculine alone would normally have sufficed in a patriarchal and male-centred society. In the vast majority of early Jewish and early Christian literature, referring to groups of people in the plural does not require the feminine at all. The masculine plurals of words like “Jews,” “brothers,” “sons of Israel,” or “disciples” generally suffice, and can be interpreted as either including women without having to mention them, or as simply excluding women altogether.<sup>228</sup> The several instances in Q where phrases appear that take care to include both the feminine and the masculine noun serve to reinforce the notion that there

---

<sup>228</sup> See Polaski’s discussion of the meaning of masculine plurals, such as ἀδελφοί (brothers) in the writings of Paul, in S. Polaski, *A Feminist Introduction to Paul* (Danvers: Chalice, 2005), 16–17, for an example of an analysis of whether women are meant to be included. The same questions arise from biblical Hebrew, as if even one male is present in a group, it is the masculine plural form that is used; for a feminist reading of exceptions to this rule in the Hebrew Bible, see A. R. Davis, “The Literary Effect of Gender Discord in the Book of Ruth” *JBL* 132/3 (2013): 495–513.



is an interest in gender behind the sayings material of Jesus, especially when taken together with the presence of the more elaborate juxtapositions of gender seen in the full pairs of parables.

In an effort to be exhaustive, I include in my analysis any potential gendered Q pairs. Potential pairs include those that are not overtly gendered, but for which an argument in favour of gender-parallelism can be made, as well as pairs that may not have ended up in the critical edition of Q because, for instance, they only appear in one of Q's witnesses. Given that the critical edition of Q has been reconstructed with an approach that errs on the side of minimalism, it is entirely possible that gender pairs that occur only in one Gospel could nonetheless originate in Q, just as Markan pericopes that only occur in one Synoptic Gospel originate in Mark. Where other scholars have argued for the inclusion of a gender pair in future critical editions of Q, and I agree with their arguments, I have included such pairs here.

### Taxonomy: Full Pairs

All of the scholars mentioned in the literature review found in the previous chapter have extricated the discussion of the paired gender sayings from their Christian Testament context, and have instead approached the pairs from the standpoint of their context in the Sayings Source. Among these researchers, two in particular have made focused attempts to collect and classify all of the full parable Q pairs, namely, William Arnal in his 1997 article,<sup>229</sup> and Denis Fricker in his 2004 monograph.<sup>230</sup> Arnal and Fricker have laid the groundwork for the following taxonomy. These are arranged according to my own categories (i.e. according to whether the gender in the pair is implied, overt, or both implied and overt).

---

<sup>229</sup> Arnal, "Gendered Couplets in Q," 77–82.

<sup>230</sup> Fricker, *Quand Jésus parle au masculin-féminin*, Chapter 1.

Q 12:24, 27	Ravens, lilies	Full parallel parable pair	gender implied
Q 11:11–12	Bread, fish	Full parallel parable pair	gender implied
Luke 4:25–27	Widows, lepers	Full parallel parable pair	gender overt
Luke 11:5–8/Luke 18:2–5	Persistent friend, persistent widow	Full parallel parable pair	gender overt
Q 11:31–32	Queen of the south, Ninevite men	Full parallel parable pair	gender overt
Q 13:18–21	Mustard seed, yeast	Double-full parallel parable pair	gender both overt and implied
Q 15:4–5a, 7–9	Sheep, coin	Double-full parallel parable pair	gender both overt and implied
Q 17:34–35	Field, mill	Double-full parallel parable pair	gender both overt and implied

### Taxonomy: Shorter Pairs

In addition to the above full parallel parable pairings are the short phrases which include parallel male and female examples. As mentioned above, these brief pairings are not complete didactic pericopes, with one lesson having a male example and the other lesson having a female example; rather they are short phrases that nonetheless make a point of mentioning male and female counterparts. As such, they provide an additional example in Q where the inclusion of a male and a female example is not seemingly integral to the sense of the passage, and yet some sort of care is taken to include both. The following table includes the shorter pairs roughly in the order in which they may have appeared in Q:

Q 7:29–30	Tax collectors and prostitutes
Q 7:32	Fluting and wailing
Q 12:53	Division in the household
Q 14:26	Parents and children

### *Text and Analysis of Each Full Pair*

#### Gender Implied

The two full pairs in this section are the ravens/lilies and the bread/fish. In these pairs, the gendered variables are not indicated literally by the gender of any protagonists, but are rather implied indirectly by the presence of other elements associated with gender, such as tasks normally undertaken primarily by either the men or the women of the day.

#### **Q 12:24, 27 Ravens/Lilies**

Consider the ravens: They neither sow nor reap nor gather into barns, and yet God feeds them. Are you not better than the birds?

Consider<sup>231</sup> the lilies, they neither card<sup>232</sup> nor toil nor spin; yet I tell you: Not even Solomon in all his glory was arrayed like one of these. (Q 12:24, 27)

While these paired parables of the ravens and the lilies appear in Schottroff's list of Q pairs, Arnal does not include them as a gendered pairing. He writes that Schottroff "incorrectly adduces" that this is a pair because Solomon is a man.<sup>233</sup> Arnal is clearly mistaken about which part of the parable constitutes the gendered variable; the gender-variable component of the pair does not include Solomon at all, but instead the tasks of sowing and reaping versus carding and spinning make up the parable's gendered parts. Sowing and reaping are jobs associated with the male gender in Mediterranean antiquity,<sup>234</sup> whereas the association between spinning and the female gender for this period could not be stronger.<sup>235</sup> Solomon, on the other hand, is an

---

<sup>231</sup> I have chosen to begin both sayings with "consider" in English, in the interest of greater parallelism, as I believe this is the translation which makes the most sense. However, the critical edition, which does not seem to have had the gender pairs in mind at all when considering English renderings, translates the first instance as "consider" and the second instance as "observe." Both reconstructions in the critical edition are conjectural; in the first parable, "consider" is reconstructed from [κατανοήσ]ατε and in the second parable, "observe" is reconstructed from κατα[[μύθε]]τε. Since the portions within square brackets signify conjecture, and portions within double square brackets signify extreme conjecture, there is no reason not to reconstruct both parables as beginning with κατανοήσατε—"consider," and thus enjoy parallel beginnings for these parallel lessons.

<sup>232</sup> I have here modified the text from the Q translation in the critical edition, which reads "Observe the lilies, how they grow: They do not work nor do they spin" (which is how the verse also appears in the gospels). As the text-critical note in the critical edition notes, there was already a scribal error here at the level of Q: "The original reading οὐ ξαίνει ("do not card") is, already in Q, corrupted by a scribal error into αὐξάνει." Robinson et al, *Critical Edition*, 344. I have thus translated the verse as it likely originally circulated, since the original version of the saying is in a more parallel form. The scholarship that went into this decision is highly informed by a palimpsest of this text in Codex Sinaiticus, discovered under ultraviolet light, which confirms that the original version of the pair contains superior literary parallelism. In the underlying text—a rendering which is also preserved in saying 36 of the *Gospel of Thomas*—the lilies and the ravens are each connected to a trio of negative verbs, which they do *not* do: ravens neither sow nor reap nor gather into barns, and lilies neither *card* nor toil nor spin (as seen above, the difference in Greek between "they grow," αὐξάνει, and "they do not card," οὐ ξαίνει, is very slight); this was uncovered by T. C. Skeat in 1938, who also confirmed its reinforcement in *Thomas*. See H. J. M. Milne and T. C. Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1938). James Robinson pointed out the importance of this discovery as a proof that Q was a written Greek text. See J. Robinson, "The Nag Hammadi Gospels and the Fourfold Gospel" in *The Earliest Gospels* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 84–85, as well as his earlier "A Written Greek Sayings Cluster older than Q," 61–77 and his "The Pre-Q Text of the (Ravens and) Lilies: Q 12:22–31 and P. Oxy 655 (*Gos. Thom.* 36)," in *Text und Geschichte (MTSR 50; Marburg: Elwert, 1999)*, 143–180.

<sup>233</sup> Arnal, "Gendered Couplets in Q," 78, note 15.

<sup>234</sup> Neyrey, "What's Wrong with this Picture?" 105.

<sup>235</sup> Neyrey, "What's Wrong with this Picture?" 105.

incidental character in a secondary part of the lesson—a descriptive detail rather than a major variable. In other words, this pair is a full parable pair, but with the gender implied rather than overt. The part of the pair that highlights gender is in the gendered division of labour. Both a woman's work of spinning and a man's work of sowing are mentioned in the parallel pair, showing an awareness on the part of the author/editor/speaker of the concerns of both male and female audience members. At the same time, the labour itself, whether women's work or men's work, is not to be credited exclusively as a source of blessing in the *basileia*; instead, the listener is meant to acknowledge that blessing and provision ultimately come from God, as does the meal of the raven and the garments of the lily. In this way, the pair of parables simultaneously and equally lift up women's tasks as equally worthy of mention as men's tasks while also simultaneously and equally pointing beyond the earthly tasks of both women and men, calling both women and men to acknowledge God as provider. The pair of parables works within the parameters of existing first-century gendered occupations and does not seem to suggest a social equality that would see women sowing and men spinning cloth; rather than functioning on a social level, the way in which the pair implies gendered equality is on a spiritual and/or religious level. Both the women who spin and the men who sow are individuals who are beholden to the practice of acknowledging God as provider, and thus both have agency in their own religious lives in the *basileia* community.

### **Q 11:11–12 Bread/Fish**

What person<sup>236</sup> of you, whose son<sup>237</sup> asks him for bread, will give him a stone? Or again when he asks for a fish, will give him a snake? (Q 11:11–12)

I posit that this pair, which occurs in both Matthew (7:9–10) and Luke (11:11–12), with small variations, may constitute another Q pair in which the gender is implied, rather than overt. The repetitive nature of the saying “asks for *x* ... will give him *y* // asks for *c* ... will give him *d*” indicates that parallelism is at play. Because bread-making was a task associated with women,<sup>238</sup> and fishing a task associated with men,<sup>239</sup> a reasonable argument could be made for including this parallel parable pair among the gendered pairs originating in Q. Although this paired saying is very brief, I include it here rather than among the shorter pairs, since it is nonetheless symbolic and didactic, despite its brevity. The two parallel lines, one evoking a first-century man’s task, and one evoking a first-century woman’s task, both ask a rhetorical question in which the elements stand in metaphorically for some aspect of life for members of the *basileia* movement, in addition to their literal meaning. While the reference to gender is subtle—only the parallel terms “bread” and “fish” have any connection to gender roles—the fact that other instances of parallelism in Jesus’ sayings material often refer to gender strengthens the possibility in the case of this Matthean and Lukan paired saying.

---

<sup>236</sup> In this case, I have let ἀνθρώπος stand as “person” as is the custom in the critical edition, since it is not juxtaposed with another character and does not form part of the gender pair in this saying.

<sup>237</sup> I have taken the translation of this whole pericope directly from the Q critical edition, except for changing “child” to “son” here. As the Greek is υἱός, this is really the best choice here. This single point of conflict between my translation and that of the critical edition does not have any bearing on the gendered or paralleled parts of the saying, but it does show that Q’s language is generally, if not always, male-centred, outside of the specific instances of the gendered parallels, which is important for the purposes of this study.

<sup>238</sup> Says Neyrey, “What’s Wrong with this Picture?” 105. Athenaeus of Atteneia writes that a woman can “get good exercise” by “wetting the flour and kneading the dough” (21.6–8).

<sup>239</sup> For example, all named fishers in the canonical Gospels are male. Simon, Andrew, James, and John are fishing when Jesus calls them in Matt 4:18 (cf Mark 1:16), and John 21:1 has Simon, Thomas, Nathanael, and the sons of Zebedee heading out to fish. See Hanson, “The Galilean Fishing Economy and the Jesus Tradition,” 99–111. While it seems that men were universally the fishers in Mediterranean antiquity, women could be involved in the making of fishing nets: see A. Marzano, *Harvesting the Sea: The Exploitation of Marine Resources in the Roman Mediterranean* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 296.

## Gender Overt

The pairs in this second section do not rely on a knowledge of gender-based divisions of labour in first-century Palestine. Instead, their references to gender are more direct. Specifically a female widow is juxtaposed with a specifically male leper, a pestering woman is paired with a pestering man, and a foreign Queen from Israel's literary past is doubled by a group of foreign (male) Ninevites from the book of Jonah.

### **Luke 4:25–27 Many Widows including Zarephath/Many Lepers including Naaman**

But in truth, I tell you, there were many widows [πολλαὶ χήραι] in Israel in the days of Elijah, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, when there came a great famine over all the land; and Elijah was sent to none of them but only to Zarephath, in the land of Sidon, to a woman who was a widow.

And there were many lepers [πολλοὶ λεπροὶ] in Israel in the time of the prophet Elisha; and none of them was cleansed, but only Naaman the Syrian. (Luke 4:25–27 RSV)

This parable pair can be classified as a full parable pair, with overt reference to gender. “Widows (feminine plural *πολλαὶ χήραι*) in Israel” are juxtaposed with “lepers (masculine plural *πολλοὶ λεπροὶ*) in Israel.” Both are traditionally disadvantaged groups in the context of the texts that came to form the Hebrew Bible.<sup>240</sup> In each lesson, only one individual from the greater group is the recipient of prophetic blessing: Elijah is sent to Zarephath, one widow out of many,

---

<sup>240</sup> See R. A. Simkins, “The Widow and Orphan in the Political Economy of Ancient Israel,” *Journal of Religion & Society Supplement* 10 (2014): 20–33 and G. T. Sheppard, “Poor,” in *Mercer Dictionary of the Bible* (ed. W. E. Mills; Macon: Mercer University Press, 1990), 700–701.

in Sidon, to help her during a time of famine, and Elisha is sent to Naaman of Syria, one leper out of many, to cleanse him from his leprosy. The twist in both cases is that the disadvantaged individual who receives divinely-sanctioned assistance is an “outsider” to Israel. The parable thus implies that blessing in the *basileia* is not automatically bestowed on the merit of being an insider, since a Sidonite and a Syrian are the beneficiaries here. More importantly for our purposes, however, the pairing of these parables also implies that both women and men are eligible for this type of help; thus, gender is one criterion that neither guarantees nor abolishes privilege and blessing.

The lesson in this pair is similar to that of the lesson in a pair that will be discussed below—that of the Queen of the South and the Ninevite men (Q 11:31–32), in which having a certain privileged status within the people of Israel does not guarantee blessing; instead, there are other criteria at play by which even Gentiles/outsiders can achieve high status in God’s *basileia*. By using poor Sidonite widows and high-class Syrian lepers, royal Southerners and average Ninevites, Q is showing insider/outsider status, socio-economic status, and gender to be irrelevant as criteria of eligibility for esteem in the *basileia*.

Both halves of this parable pair of the widows and the lepers occur in Luke; neither portion occurs in Matthew. Of course, because of a commitment to caution, the pair does not appear in the critical edition of Q. Although this pair with the widow from Sidon and the leper from Syria are included in Brice Jones’ handy collection of material unique to Luke, Jones is careful to state that his “inclusion of these particular passages is not meant to suggest that some of the material cannot possibly be assigned to Q.”<sup>241</sup> I include it here because its absence from

---

<sup>241</sup> B. Jones, *Matthean and Lukan Special Material: A Brief Introduction with Texts in Greek and English* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2011), 13.



Matthew can by no means indicate conclusively that it was not present in Q, especially given its format. I include pairs of this sort based on the premise that Matthew and Luke used the sayings source in much the same way that they used Mark. If we did not have Mark, and had to reconstruct it from Matthew and Luke alone, we would lose at least 10 percent of Mark; we would lose much more than 10 percent, however, if we only used the bits of Mark that appear in both gospels.<sup>242</sup> It thus stands to reason that if the Matthean and Lukan methods for the incorporation of Q sayings are similar to their methods for incorporating Mark, it becomes more likely that the paired gender parable of the widows and the lepers goes back to Q, although Matthew did not see fit to use this pair.<sup>243</sup> Furthermore, given the fact that in the grand scheme of Luke/Acts, the effect overall is to weaken Q's gender-levelling,<sup>244</sup> it does not seem likely to me that Luke coined original gender pairs. I therefore argue for the likelihood that the widows/lepers pair is from among the original sayings list.

### **Luke 11:5–8/Luke 18:2–5 Persistent Friend/Persistent Widow**

And he said to them [πρὸς αὐτούς], “Which of you who has a friend [φίλον] will go to him at midnight and say to him, ‘Friend, lend me three loaves; for a friend of mine has arrived on a journey, and I have nothing to set before him’; and he will answer from within, ‘Do not bother me; the door is now shut, and my children are with me in bed; I cannot get up and give you anything’? I tell you, though he will not get up and give him anything because he is his friend, yet

---

<sup>242</sup> “(M)ore than 90 percent of Mark was copied by either Matthew or Luke or both.” Kloppenborg, *Q: The Earliest Gospel*, 98.

<sup>243</sup> Perhaps the pair looked too favourably on non-Jews for Matthew's purposes.

<sup>244</sup> This is argued extensively in Schaberg and Ringe, “Gospel of Luke,” 493–511. It is also the most important premise of that seminal work on Lukan gender pairs, Seim's *The Double Message*. B. Reid goes so far as to say that Luke “is intent on restricting [women] to silent, passive, supporting roles.” Reid, *Choosing the Better Part?* 53.

because of his importunity he will rise and give him whatever he needs.” (Luke 11:5–8 RSV)

He said, “In a certain city there was a judge who neither feared God nor regarded man; and there was a widow [χήρα] in that city who kept coming to him and saying, ‘Vindicate me against my adversary.’ For a while he refused; but afterward he said to himself, ‘Though I neither fear God nor regard man, yet because this widow bothers me, I will vindicate her, or she will wear me out by her continual coming.’” (Luke 18:2–5 RSV)

For reasons unknown, Matthew’s Gospel does not contain this set of parables; both are known to us only through Luke. For this reason, they were not included in the critical edition of Q; however, they were nonetheless granted a page therein, since at least one editor suspected they went back to the early sayings tradition.<sup>245</sup>

The two clearly form a full parallel parable pair, gender overt, as they both teach the same lesson and contain a female and a male example. The widow, who is the gender variable in the second parable is specifically feminine (χήρα), whereas the friend, who is the gender variable in the first parable is specifically masculine (φίλον). For the same reasons as were given for the previous Lukan pair—the widows and the lepers (Luke 4:25–27), I include this as a possible Q pair too. Furthermore, if the passages were unique to Luke and he had deliberately crafted such a parallel pair, one would have to explain why they are not recorded together in the Lukan text.

Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza has also highlighted these two texts—the persistent widow and the persistent friend—as a gender pair original to Q/Jesus.<sup>246</sup> Schüssler Fiorenza views the parables proper as original Jesus material, but it is not so with their book-ended lead-up and commentary in Luke’s Gospel. According to her, these bookends are Lukan additions which alter

---

<sup>245</sup> The page for Q 11:5–8 exists in Q, but is virtually blank, save the following brief and rather honest footnote: “Is Luke 11:5–8 in Q?” Robinson et al., *Critical Edition*, 212.

<sup>246</sup> In her keynote address at the Bible and Social Justice Conference at St. Ambrose University, Davenport, Iowa, in 2013.

the meaning significantly and deliberately. In Luke, the parable of the persistent friend is sandwiched between discussions of prayer, forcing the reluctant sleeping character to become a symbol for God. Likewise, she posits, Lukan additions to the parable of the “Persistent Widow” similarly force the uncaring judge into the position of God. She regards Luke 18:6–8 as a Lukan framing and taming of the original parable pair:

And the Lord said, “Hear what the unrighteous judge says. And will not God vindicate his elect, who cry to him day and night? Will he delay long over them? I tell you, he will vindicate them speedily. Nevertheless, when the Son of man comes, will he find faith on earth?” (Luke 18:6–8 RSV)

Schüssler Fiorenza argues that connecting the uncaring friend and unjust judge with God not only depicts God in a surprisingly negative light, but also gives those unsavoury characters all the power in the parables. The message then becomes, in her words, “pray harder, but don’t mess with the system.”<sup>247</sup> However, without this guiding frame, the meaning of these parables in a stripped-down form is no longer necessarily about prayer or persistence at all, but rather about demanding justice, even if it makes one appear disruptive or annoying. Indeed, I argue that the statement by the judge that he “has no fear of God” strongly goes against a reading where the character of the judge could be meant to be seen as a stand-in for God in the original parable, as it is highly unlikely that Jesus or Luke would depict God so negatively and with such convoluted self-reference. Luke’s framing of the parables goes against their internal grain to force a different reading.

Amy-Jill Levine agrees that this widow has been “domesticated” by Luke.<sup>248</sup> Levine demonstrates that the trope of the widow in the Hebrew Bible and other earlier Jewish literature

---

<sup>247</sup> E. Schüssler Fiorenza, keynote address, Bible and Social Justice Conference, St. Ambrose University, Davenport, Iowa. 2013.

<sup>248</sup> See A.-J. Levine, “This Widow Keeps Bothering Me,” in *Finding A Woman’s Place: Essays in Honor of Carolyn Osiek* (ed. D. L. Balch and J. T. Lamoreaux; Eugene: Pickwick, 2011).

often reverses the expected widow's role, instead epitomizing strength and cleverness,<sup>249</sup> whereas the "importuning widow" as portrayed in Luke (as opposed to Q) is "more 'woman on her knees' than 'woman with a fist.' Luke nicely tucks the widow of the parable within other conventional images of poor, dependent, or powerless widows."<sup>250</sup> When we look at the pared-down pair as it may have appeared in Q, the message is different. There, the fact that a male example and a female example are paired in this way indicates emphatically that agents of the *basileia* can come in both male and female packages, and that they can effect positive change.

As in the case of the son asking for bread and fish in Q 11:11–12, there is some grammatical androcentrism at play here, insofar as the listeners in the first parable are assumed to be male, using the masculine third-person plural: "And he said to them [πρὸς αὐτούς]." This, of course, is quite standard for the Greek language (or, for that matter, for many languages both antique and modern), and does not necessarily mean that no women were present. Yet despite its unremarkable nature, this grammatical usage still speaks of an inherent male-centred worldview in the text. This androcentrism at the outset of this parable pair means that even if we agree with Schüssler Fiorenza and Levine that the emphasis on prayer which downplays women's agency in the parable is entirely Lukan, and the emphasis was likely originally on persistence in pursuing justice in the face of an unjust system, the androcentrism throughout Q makes it unlikely that this system of injustice against which *basileia* members are encouraged to fight has to do with patriarchy itself.

While this instance of male-centred language in the pair supports Camp 2, the pair also supports Camps 1 and 1.5 in its insistence on the coupling of both a male and a female

---

<sup>249</sup> Levine, "This Widow," 124.

<sup>250</sup> Levine, "This Widow," 124.

protagonist to teach the same lesson. The widow functions, as with the other gender pairs, in such a way as to imply that women are included as important agents of the *basileia* movement, even as this particular pair excludes them in some of its typically androcentric grammar.

### **Q 11:31–32 The Queen of the South and the Ninevite Men**

The Queen of the South will be raised at the judgement with this generation and condemn it, for she came from the ends of the earth to listen to the wisdom of Solomon, and look, something more than Solomon is here!

Ninevite men [ἄνδρες] will arise at the judgement with this generation and condemn it, for they repented at the announcement of Jonah, and look, something more than Jonah is here! (Q 11:31–32)

This pair, taken directly from the critical edition as-is, is another a full parable pair, gender overt.

The strong parallelism in Q 11:31–32 is visible at a verbal level, in the near-exact repetition of “will be raised/will arise,” “at the judgement with this generation and condemn it, for” and “and look, something more than Solomon/Jonah is here.” The sections that stray from the verbatim repetition are, of course, the male and female counterparts and the briefest of summaries of their earlier narrative contexts, the famous Queen from the books of 1 Kings (10:1–13) and 2 Chronicles (9:1–12), and the Ninevite men from the tale of Jonah (3:5 etc.).

In addition to the careful verbal parallelism is the parallel content of the lessons. The characters in both parables are Gentiles from Israel’s literary past, one a woman and the other a group of men (specifically ἄνδρες). Although these characters are not from among the people of Israel, the parables have them being nonetheless “raised at the judgement with this generation

and [they] condemn it.” They are used in the double parable as a didactic device to shame “this generation” and presumably generate apocalyptic hope/fear, as appropriate. That is to say, even though these figures from texts that would come to form the Hebrew Bible were not the expected heroes in their stories because of their outsider status, they behaved in such a way as to merit praise and to raise their standing. In the case of the Queen of Sheba, she listened to and acted upon the wisdom of Solomon, and in the case of the men of Nineveh, they listened to and acted upon the prophecy of Jonah. In both cases, it is assumed that “this generation,” unlike the male and female examples being held up in the parables, is behaving incorrectly by not listening to the wisdom/prophecy of the day, i.e. “something even bigger than” Solomon and Jonah, namely Jesus. Pairing these two parables, which teach an identical lesson, but which feature the Queen, on the one hand, and the Ninevite men, on the other hand, functions to indicate that no matter one’s connection to the Jewish community and no matter one’s gender, one can achieve high status in the *basileia* movement by following the example of listening and acting upon Jesus’ wisdom.

Gender Both Overt and Implied

**Q 13:18–21 Mustard Seed/Yeast**

What is the *basileia* of God like, and with what am I to compare it? It is like a seed of mustard, which a man<sup>251</sup> took and threw into his garden. And it grew and developed into a tree, and the birds of the sky nested in its branches.

And again: With what am I to compare the *basileia* of God? It is like yeast, which a woman [γυνή] took and hid in three measures of flour until it was fully fermented. (Q 13:18–21)

In these two short lessons on the nature of the *basileia* of God, the parallelism is evident.

In both cases, the teacher presents a simile with which to illustrate God's rule: "It is like *x*, which (someone) took and *y*." In each case, the item of comparison is something that begins tiny—almost imperceptible—and grows into something noticeable, and moreover something ostensibly useful and positive—shelter and food. The tiny mustard seed grows into a large plant, which houses the birds, and the tiny amount of yeast aids in the breadmaking process, causing dough to grow large.

As is characteristic of the gender pairs, one of the variables—that is, the components of the parable that, while they are parallel counterparts, are not verbatim—is gender. The lesson of the yeast features a female participant (γυνή), and the lesson of the mustard seed features a male one. In this case, the characters' genders are also reinforced by their activities: sowing is a task which was traditionally performed by men at the time,<sup>252</sup> while baking was traditionally

---

<sup>251</sup> The critical edition has "person" here, as is its consistent translation custom for the Greek *ἄνθρωπος*. However, as argued above, I would argue that in this context the word is not inclusive but is clearly functioning in opposition to the γυνή in the parallel saying.

<sup>252</sup> As has been addressed above, "males, whose proper gender space is the 'open air,' do tasks appropriate to that space: 'plowing, sowing, planting, and grazing are all such open-air employments.'" Neyrey, "What's Wrong with this Picture?" 105. The only time in Greco-Roman antiquity that one hears of women working in fields is in texts that are describing ways in which the culture of an Other is "barbaric." P. Garnsey, *Food and Society in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 110.

performed by women,<sup>253</sup> making this a double full parable pair, with the gender being both overt and implied.

While all of the gender pairs by their very existence imply a certain inclusivity for women, this one has an added attraction for feminist readings. Even Levine grants that, in Q's depictions of women baking bread or grinding at a flour mill, "women's work is acknowledged."<sup>254</sup> Beyond the mere recognition of tasks normally performed by women, however, is the fact that, in the parables of the yeast and the mustard seed, the concept for which the gendered variables stand in is an unequivocally positive one; the man sowing and the woman baking are clear agents of the *basileia*. As Schüssler Fiorenza has pointed out, the fact that a woman appears as an active participant in the spread and growth of the *basileia* lends itself to a positive interpretation, from a feminist-theological point of view.<sup>255</sup> A similar incidence of the activities of a woman or women being likened to the activities of God occurs in the parable of the lost coin (below).<sup>256</sup> Schottroff, too, points out the positive feminist implications of a task so closely associated with women in the household, and here performed by a woman, being explicitly associated with God's actions.<sup>257</sup> Such an illustration serves to value women as potentially equal spiritual and religious agents of the Jesus movement, as the scholars of Camp 1 would attest, although, since the woman is not sowing and the man is not baking, the genders in the *basileia* are not socially identical.

---

<sup>253</sup> "Females, whose proper gender place is 'covered,' do the basic tasks that support the household [...] cover is needed for the making of corn into bread." Neyrey, "What's Wrong with this Picture?" 105.

<sup>254</sup> Levine, "Women in the Q Communit(ies)," 150.

<sup>255</sup> Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 131.

<sup>256</sup> Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 131.

<sup>257</sup> Luise Schottroff, "Feminist Observations on the Eschatology of the Sayings Source" (paper presented at the 1992 annual meeting of the SBL, San Francisco, November 1992), 6.



## Q 15:4–5a, 7–9 Lost Sheep and Lost Coin

Which man<sup>258</sup> is there among you who has a hundred sheep, on losing one of them, will not leave the ninety-nine in the mountains, and go hunt for the lost one? And if it should happen that he finds it, I say to you that he rejoices over it more than over the ninety-nine that did not go astray.

Or what woman who has ten coins, if she were to lose one coin, would not light a lamp and sweep the house and hunt until she finds? And on finding she calls the friends and neighbours, saying: Rejoice with me, for I found the coin which I had lost. (Q 15:4–5a, 7–9)

Here we have another set of parallel parables. While the parable of the sheep appears in both Luke and Matthew, the coin only appears in Luke. Nonetheless, pairs scholars and other Q scholars agree that it is original to Q and not Luke, and it appears in the critical edition;<sup>259</sup> Arnal concurs that “there are good grounds for regarding it as having been derived from Q and omitted by Matthew”<sup>260</sup> and points out that Luke introduces *both* parables with the singular *την παραβολην ταύτην*, “an indication that he regarded them, and received them, as a single unit.”<sup>261</sup>

In this pair of parables, both characters lose a small portion of their complete wealth: the man has a hundred sheep and loses one, and the woman has ten coins and loses one. In each case, the protagonist considers the small loss to be of great importance, and goes out of his/her way to

---

<sup>258</sup> As mentioned above, this translation is from the critical edition of Q, with the exception of my translation “man.” Q translates *τίς ἄνθρωπος* as “which person” in keeping with the typical translation choice throughout the critical edition, but in cases where *τίς ἄνθρωπος* stands in literary opposition to *τίς γυνή* in a parallel verse, it stands to reason that “man” better captures what is happening rhetorically.

<sup>259</sup> For an outline of some of the scholarship behind this decision, see J. S. Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Concordance, and Critical Notes* (Sonoma: Polebridge, 1988), 176.

<sup>260</sup> Arnal, “Gendered Couplets in Q,” 82.

<sup>261</sup> Arnal, “Gendered Couplets in Q,” 82. See further on that page: “[The Lost Coin’s] strong formal and thematic affinities with the lost sheep parable make it unlikely that the parable could have circulated in Luke’s ‘L’ traditions independently of the lost sheep. The parable must either have been formulated along with the lost sheep or have been modelled after it.”

scour the surroundings until what was lost has been found. In each case, the small percentage that is lost is the focus, rather than the majority which is still safe, evidenced by the great rejoicing over locating the lost portion. As with the above mustard/yeast parable, here too is an additional reinforcing layer of genderedness, beyond the simple juxtaposition of *τὸς ἄνθρωπος* with *τὴν γυναῖκα*, since the man is out with the sheep in the traditionally male<sup>262</sup> arena of the field, and the woman is keeping house, in the traditionally female arena of private life.<sup>263</sup> This is therefore another double full parable pair, with the gender being both overt and implied.

The parables as they have come down to us in this case are not strictly verbally parallel. When the man retrieves the sheep, he “rejoices more over it than the ninety-nine that did not go astray.” For literary balance, we might expect the woman’s found money to result in her “rejoicing more over it than the nine that were not lost” or some such as well. The woman indeed rejoices, but she prefers to do so collectively; the text reports that she “calls the friends and neighbours, saying ‘rejoice with me.’”<sup>264</sup> The fact that this gender pair is not carefully parallel actually militates against Arnal’s argument that the reason these pairs exist has nothing to do with gender and more to do with a connection with Galilean Jewish scribal culture.<sup>265</sup> If the

---

<sup>262</sup> Malina, “Understanding New Testament Persons,” 50. It can be generalised across Greco-Roman antiquity that women did not work in fields. Garnsey, *Food and Society in Classical Antiquity*, 110. The only exception would be in times of dire need in peasant communities when “all hands had to be mobilised” Garnsey, *Food and Society*, 111.

<sup>263</sup> As mentioned above and elsewhere, “women occupied the private or domestic sphere.” Moxnes, “Honor and Shame,” 21. Further, as Neyrey puts it: “the ancients construed the world as gender divided: males in the ‘public’ and females in the ‘private’ world.” Neyrey, “What’s Wrong with this Picture,” 100. While exceptions relating to class were necessary, non-elite rural females were expected to match everything that was expected of elite, urban females, as far as their wealth permitted. Levine, “Introduction,” 8.

<sup>264</sup> It is possible that first-century hearers may have found the slight differences between them amusing. Just as present-day sexist jokes rely on stereotypes such as the “typical chatty woman” which essentialise gender, first-century humour may also have relied on stereotypes. If what has been passed down to us in this particular doublet is indeed a vestige of a first-century sexist joke, then perhaps it can shed light on whether the audience of Q (and/or of the historical Jesus) was a mixed one. This is an otherwise unexplained departure from a set of parallel parables that otherwise follow each other rather closely in terms of language structure which would profit from future investigation.

<sup>265</sup> This is the argument throughout Arnal, “Gendered Couplets in Q” and is a small part of his important monograph *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, esp 168ff. Arnal’s solid argumentation for Galilean scribes behind the Q document do not at all hinge significantly on what I consider to be the sole error in his otherwise top-notch contribution, namely,

author or editor were interested in wordplay around gender rather than actual gender diversity in the audience, then the wordplay should have been more artfully consistent, as I will discuss in greater depth below.

Again, this is a pairing in which the woman and the man both function in the same variable location in the parables, and while not indistinguishable in terms of societal roles (i.e. performing typically gendered social tasks), they are certainly equal variables in the world of the parables in which they stand. In this way, this pair reinforces the notion that the same religious or intellectual lesson can be applied equally to all wo/men, whereas no similar attempt is made toward a levelling of social expectations in terms of gendered tasks.

### **Q 17:34–35 Two Men/Two Women**

I tell you, there will be two men [δύο] in the field; one [εἷς] is taken and one [εἷς] is left.

Two women [δύο] will be grinding at the mill; one [μία] is taken and one [μία] is left. (Q 17:34–35)

This pair is short, but is nonetheless a full parallel parable pair. In fact, it is a double full parable pair, gender both overt and implied. The two men of the first situation are juxtaposed with two women in the second,<sup>266</sup> signifying the overt type of gendering, while the implied gendering is

---

not granting any connection between the women in the gendered pairs and possible women on the ground in the early Jesus movement. Arnal's arguments against any deliberate inclusiveness toward women in Q are discussed and refuted in greater detail in the following chapter.

<sup>266</sup> There is no noun specifying that the “two” in the field are male and the “two” at the mill are female at the outset of each line. The Greek in both cases simply uses δύο. However, in the second part of each line, the reason why these are always translated as “two men” and “two women” in both Q and the gospel passages becomes clear. The “ones” are gendered. Those in the field are the masculine εἷς and those at the mill are the feminine μία.

presented through the sowing which can be connected with “men’s work”<sup>267</sup> and the grinding of grain which can be connected with “women’s work.”<sup>268</sup> In the Lukan version, the two men are in the same bed at night rather than in a field, but they work better as a pair in the Q version, where having the men in the field strengthens the gendered nature of the variables, and is more balanced as each line represented an important social and economic task, whether sowing/harvesting crops, or grinding flour.

In each case, one of the two characters is “taken,” while the other is “left behind,” in the context of presumably apocalyptic future events. This implies that one of the men and one of the women will be rewarded, while the other man and the other women will miss out. Or, conversely, one of the men and one of the women will be punished, while the other man and the other woman will be spared. Either way, the fact that examples of both women and men are depicted as being accountable for their own salvation and their own divine assessment “on that day” works to sustain my argument that the pairs imply an equality between the genders on a spiritual/intellectual/religious level. Even Arnal concludes from this saying that “the people responsible for Q quite self-consciously count women among culpable outsiders and hence imagine the judgement to pertain to them as well as to men. This would in turn be indicative of the presence of women among ‘insiders’ as well.”<sup>269</sup> It is clear from this parable set that women are here depicted as being responsible for their own spiritual lives in the same way as men, since

---

<sup>267</sup>Garnsey, *Food and Society*, 110; Malina, “Understanding New Testament Persons,” 50.

<sup>268</sup> See T. Takaoglu, “Archaeological Evidence for Grain Mills in the Greek and Roman Troad,” *Vom Euphrat bis zum Bosphorus: Kleinasien in der Antike* (Bonn: Dr. Rudolph Habelt, 2008), 673–679, esp. the discussion of the importance of simple domestic hand mills on page 678. Homer also makes reference to a woman grinding flour and twelve maids grinding flour: *Od*, 20, 117–121.

<sup>269</sup> Arnal, “Gendered Couplets in Q,” 85. Even while Arnal admits this, he goes on to note (85) that the social status of these female insiders is not clear. This is because he is attempting to argue that Q does not necessarily have women in the audience, so that he can connect the gender pairs to a scribal context. The two, however, are not mutually exclusive: there is no reason why scribes cannot have been involved in the composition or compilation of Q while also reflecting a group that had women as active participants who were thus addressed deliberately in many of the sayings.

just as men are generally considered accountable for their own actions vis-à-vis salvation in an eschatological context, here women are being held accountable and not merely being dragged along with the nearest male chaperone or patriarch. The two women grinding at the mill are presented alone, without male guidance, and yet one has behaved in such a way as to reap eschatological rewards while the other has merited eschatological punishment.

### *Texts and Analysis of the Shorter Pairs*

In addition to the above companion parable pairs, wherein one features a female example and one features a male example, there exists the second gender-paired literary device in Q, described above. As mentioned before, I have dubbed this second, abbreviated version of gender pairs the “shorter pairs.” Instead of complete parables, the shorter pairs consist of short phrases that, despite their brevity, are nevertheless careful to include one male and one female component. Sons are mentioned alongside daughters, mothers alongside fathers, (male) tax collectors alongside (female) prostitutes, and so on.

#### Q 7:29-30? Tax Collectors and Prostitutes

For John came to you, and the tax collectors [τελῶναι] and [prostitutes?]<sup>270</sup> responded positively, but the religious authorities rejected him.

---

<sup>270</sup> The word in square brackets is my reconstruction, as the critical edition of Q leaves a lacuna in the place of “prostitutes.” The text-critical notes leave the question open as to whether the Lukan or the Matthean version appeared in Q. Robinson et al., *Critical Edition*, 138.

In this saying, the unsavoury group(s) of characters in the first line are contrasted with the supposedly respectable and laudable group in the second line, but the unexpected has occurred yet again. The unsavoury group or groups have responded correctly to John, but the religious leaders (including, specifically, Pharisees in Luke 7:30) responded incorrectly. The theme of a reversal of expectations for outsiders and insiders recurs in this verse. If my tentative reconstruction is correct, then the two unsavoury groups (male tax collectors and female prostitutes) could represent a small gender pair.

However, it is not at all certain that these masculine plural tax collectors were accompanied by masculine plural sinners and/or feminine plural prostitutes in an earlier version of the saying or not, which makes a difference as to whether or not this saying ever took the form of a shorter gender pair. Many reconstructions in English of Q from the members of the International Q Project, including the critical edition, leave the second part of the pair blank; most Q texts merely read “tax collectors and ...” since the reconstruction is not straightforward,<sup>271</sup> implying that they suspect the saying predates Matthew and Luke but are not able to reconcile its substantial variants. Matthew 21:32 has (male) tax collectors (τελῶναι) and (female) prostitutes (πόρναι)<sup>272</sup> but its counterpart in Luke 7:39 has only the tax collectors. Matthew does not have the second part of the saying, where Luke (7:30) chastises the Pharisees (φαρισαῖοι) and lawyers (νομικοί). Instead, Matthew 21:32 chastises the “you” of the implied audience: “you did not believe [John] but the tax collectors and prostitutes did.”

---

<sup>271</sup> See Kloppenborg, *Q: The Earliest Gospel*, 129.

<sup>272</sup> The phrase, with paired gender, occurs twice in Matthew 21:31–32: “Jesus said to them, “Truly I tell you, the tax collectors and the prostitutes are going into the kingdom of God ahead of you. For John came to you in the way of righteousness and you did not believe him, but the tax collectors and the prostitutes believed him; and even after you saw it, you did not change your minds and believe him.” (NRSV)

There is a similar verse in Q which can be reconstructed more confidently because it appears the same in both Matthew (11:19) and Luke (7:34); there, the phrase is “tax collectors and sinners.” It reads: “The son of humanity came, eating and drinking, and you say: Look! A person who is a glutton and drunkard, a chum of tax collectors and sinners!” (Q 7:34). However, this does not help to clarify the situation in our potential short gender pair where there is a stark difference between the Matthean and Lukan versions.

Corley argues that Matthew’s “tax collectors and prostitutes” (Matt 21:32) is the more likely reading, making Q 7:29–30 a gender pair.<sup>273</sup> If this short pair was originally gendered, then Jesus is here associated with two groups of gendered sinners: male tax collectors and female prostitutes. This juxtaposition of two somewhat unsavoury tasks, tax collection performed by men and sex work performed by women (as *πόρναι* is used), does fit well with the tendency to pair gendered tasks elsewhere in Q. In other words, it is reasonably likely that if there is a general tendency within Q toward such gendered pairings, and if, when Matthew and Luke vary, one possible reconstruction is a parallel gendered pair, then, I argue, that reconstruction is to be preferred. Each gospel writer has simply dropped one half of the example and has substituted a group of sinners that fits better with his aims. In the case of Luke, the function of the saying was to chastise Pharisees and lawyers, whereas Matthew was concerned with chastising the chief priests and elders. (Matthew 21:23 situates Jesus’ delivery of this string of parables in the temple.) If this is the case, as I suggest, then it demonstrates that the earlier reading pays attention to the inclusion of female examples whereas the Gospel writers share an interest in using the saying, but do not both share its interest in pairing gender in this case. Even though the

---

<sup>273</sup> See Corley, *Private Women, Public Meals*, 157–58 as well as “Jesus, Egalitarian Meals, and Q” (paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL, San Francisco, November 1992), 1–11.

examples in this pair are negative examples, the inclusion of both genders still indicates a measure of equality, as it gives both men and women an active role in their own salvation –while both can be held responsible for sins or at least for tasks perceived as unsavoury such as tax collection and sex work, both can also be lauded for overcoming negative expectations and acknowledging wisdom when they see it.

### Q 7:31–32 Fluting and Wailing

To what am I to compare this generation and what is it like? It is like children seated in the marketplace who, addressing the others, say: We fluted for you, but you would not dance; we wailed, but you would not cry. (Q 7:31–32)

Although Fricker is of the opinion that this section of Q also follows the pattern of a *paire mixte* (his term for gendered parable pairs),<sup>274</sup> its format is a little different from what I call a full parable pair; rather than two separate parables, this segment could either be considered a single parable which contains a male and a female element within it (i.e. a shorter pair that happens to occur within a didactic pericope), or else two parables that are extremely short. The masculine and feminine elements are not overt, but are rather implied by the juxtaposed gendered concepts “fluting” and “wailing.” Whether one views these verses as a single parable with two parts or as two tiny parables, the passage uses these two adjacent comparisons to describe “this generation.” The tentative allusion to gender would be easy enough to miss. However, the fact that Q is prone to gendered pairs, coupled with the fact that wailing is a

---

<sup>274</sup> Fricker, *Quand Jésus Parle au Masculin-Féminin*.



component of mourning practices assigned to women in Greco-Roman antiquity<sup>275</sup> is enough to suggest that the pairing may have been intentionally gendered. While flute-playing can sometimes be connected with men,<sup>276</sup> the presence of flute-girls (*auletrides*) in Greco-Roman antiquity is well-known as well.<sup>277</sup> Thus, despite Fricker's suggestion, this passage cannot confidently be counted amongst the short Q sayings that pair masculine and feminine examples.

### Q 12:51–53 Division in the Household

Do you think that I have come to hurl peace on earth? I did not come to hurl peace, but a sword? For I have come to divide son against father, and daughter against her mother, and daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. (Q 12:51–53)

In this pericope, we see a list of three pairs. A parent-child bond between two male family members (son and father), a parent-child bond between two female family members (daughter and mother), and an in-law parent-child bond between women (daughter-in-law and mother-in-law). From a strictly literary perspective, the pairs are not a perfectly balanced parallelism. For that to be the case, one more pair would be required—that of son-in-law and father-in-law. Of course, the reason for the lack of this fourth pairing is simple: since these are examples drawn from daily life, the relationship between father-in-law and son-in-law essentially did not exist. A son-in-law and father-in-law pairing could thus not have resonated with the audience and may not even have occurred to the author, due to its meaninglessness in the

---

<sup>275</sup> See D. Good, "Beyond the Canon," *Women's Bible Commentary Twentieth Anniversary Edition: Revised and Updated* (ed. C. A. Newsom, S. H. Ringe, and J. E. Lapsley; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012), 633–639, here 635 for a list of places in the Christian Testament and other early Christian literature where women's oral funerary lament traditions are mentioned. See also T. Gamliel, "Textual Categories and Gender Images in a Women's Wailing Performance," *Social Analysis* 51/3 (2007): 23–54.

<sup>276</sup> See C. A. Evans, *Matthew* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 207. See also Josephus *J.W.* 3.437. Male flute-players also appear often in sacrificial processions on reliefs.

<sup>277</sup> See, e.g. Acts of Thomas 1.5.

context; marriage in a patriarchal society meant that a daughter would leave her father's household to join her husband's household,<sup>278</sup> making relationships between son-and-laws and their father-in-laws much less important/developed/likely than their female counterparts. Mothers-in-law and daughters-in-law, on the other hand, would be thrust into close proximity and would lead highly intertwined lives. Thus, the relationship permutations within this passage only reflect relationships that actually existed in the social world in which the audience lived.

According to Schottroff, the inclusion of these three relationships in a saying which refers to the potentially tumultuous consequences of discipleship to Jesus implies the active membership of both men and women in the movement.<sup>279</sup> In ancient Mediterranean society, where anthropologists speak of people as "embedded" in the family, severed family ties are no small matter.<sup>280</sup> Schottroff argues that the inclusion of all three core family relationships in the lines of division in this verse indicate that the rifts "affect both genders in the same way."<sup>281</sup> But Schottroff goes further than interpreting the saying as evidence for the involvement of women in discipleship and itinerant prophecy. She also takes the saying to indicate a deliberate attempt to overthrow the patriarchal household structure. She juxtaposes this Q saying with a previous saying from early Jewish scriptures that also details the breakdown of the patriarchal family, found in Micah 7:5–6. She concludes that while, in Micah, the destruction of patriarchy is viewed as going against the will of God, this same destruction in Jesus' sayings is viewed as

---

<sup>278</sup> "Both versions of the saying [i.e. in both Matthew and Luke] presuppose a patriarchal household structure in which a daughter, a married son, and his wife live with the parents." Schottroff, "The Sayings Source Q," 511.

<sup>279</sup> Schottroff, "The Sayings Source Q," 511.

<sup>280</sup> "The line between personal identity and family identity [in the ancient Mediterranean world] tended to disappear." Moxnes, "Honor and Shame," 21. For a specific look at kinship in this context, see K. C. Hanson's "Kinship," *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation* (ed. R. Rohrbaugh; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996), 62–79 as well as his "All in the Family: Kinship in Agrarian Roman Palestine," *The Social World of the New Testament* (e. J. H. Neyrey and E. C. Stewart; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2008), 25–46.

<sup>281</sup> Schottroff, "The Sayings Source Q," 511.

ushering in that will, in the form of the *basileia*: “In Mic 7:5–6, the collapse of the patriarchal family expresses the disorder of the whole society, an anarchy raised against good order. In the Sayings Source what we find is a terrible—but by the will of God *necessary*—event.”<sup>282</sup> In other words, Schottroff not only interprets this short gender pair as evidence that the social reality for Jesus’ earliest followers included both male and female leaders, but also as evidence for the programmatic dismantling of patriarchy on the part of Jesus or the first compilers of his sayings material. Schottroff is clearly right that the obvious attention paid to including both genders in this saying does imply female membership in the *basileia* movement—and that such involvement might bring about disruption of familial relationships for women as well as men. However, I believe she goes too far in reading this disruption as somehow necessary to the movement or at the core of the movement’s message. It is possible for a controversial movement to result in the disruption of its members’ patriarchal family structures *without* having as its goal the destruction of patriarchy. It is clear that the saying acknowledges women and men equally, but it is not as clear that the saying declares women’s and men’s complete societal equality.

#### Q 14:26 Parents and Children

The one who does not hate father and mother cannot be my disciple; and the one who does not hate son and daughter cannot be my disciple. (Q: 14:26)

Here is a straightforward and balanced set of pairs: a father and a mother, along with a son and a daughter, with the rest of the sayings verbally identical. The call to place discipleship to Jesus as a priority that surpasses family bonds mentions two hypothetical familial

---

<sup>282</sup> Schottroff, “The Sayings Source Q,” 512.

relationships: that of the parent and that of the child. For each of the two relationships, one male and one female example is given. Each set of people (male and female parents, and male and female children) is called upon to place *basileia* loyalty above even loyalty to family; expectations are the same for both women and men.

It is noteworthy that the passage is quite different in Luke: “If any one comes to me and does not hate his own father and mother *and wife and children* and brothers and sisters, yes, and even his own life, he cannot be my disciple” (Luke 14:26 RSV, emphasis mine). The critical edition of Q excludes the phrase “wife and children” as a Lukan interpolation. Before the publication of the critical edition, scholars of women in the early Jesus movement had already noted that adding “wife and children” to the list of groups to be left behind not only destroys the balanced parallelism of the saying, but also excludes women from itinerancy by implying that those called by Jesus for his movement had wives (i.e. were men).<sup>283</sup> Perhaps this is further evidence of a Lukan tendency to circumscribe the role of women in the early Jesus movement.

### *Chapter Conclusions*

Based on the pair-by-pair analysis above, I argue, along with Schüssler Fiorenza, Schottroff, Corley, and Batten (Camps 1 and 1.5) that there emerges in Q a real tendency, not only toward gender *inclusivity* (i.e. including women as well as men as subjects and implied audience members), which is already rare in antiquity, but also toward gender *equality*. This is not an unqualified equality: as Levine and Arnal (Camp 2) and Schottroff (Camp 1) have pointed

---

<sup>283</sup> See Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 145–46; Schottroff, “Sayings Source Q,” 515. Arnal, in “Gendered Couplets in Q,” 78, n.12, writes: “Note also in support of this conclusion that the ‘children’ referred to in Luke are described with the word τέκνα, which is consistently used in Q as a positive designation for the Q people themselves, whereas here, in contrast, it is used of those left behind.”

out, the androcentrism generally present otherwise in Q mitigates against an idealistic discipleship of complete equals. However, I contend that the unsurprising presence of androcentric language in first-century sayings is not reason enough to dismiss entirely the import of these unusual gendered pairs.<sup>284</sup> I argue that the pairs' significance for women cannot be dismissed; that said, it must certainly be made a great deal more precise. The specific equality depicted in Q's gendered examples, and implied by Q's rhetorical pairs is such that men and women are expected to continue to perform different social roles. While women and men are both important and valued in the countercultural *basileia* of Q, they are not meant to be indistinguishable from one another. Gendered societal roles, such as a gendered division of labour, remain intact,<sup>285</sup> as does the androcentrism typical of first-century Palestinian society. In terms of gender, the Q pairs do nevertheless model non-social—that is, intellectual, spiritual, and religious—equality as a norm.

This religious equality that emerges from the analysis of the sayings of Jesus in Q on their own is not the result that emerges when the sayings of Jesus as found in the Gospels are analysed. The study of the sayings in Q is not the same project as studying the material around women in Luke, for instance. While both seem to have female audience members in mind, the Lukan author seems to be shaping his burgeoning movement in a different direction than that of the Q material.<sup>286</sup> Whereas Luke's plentiful female characters serve as role models for women

---

<sup>284</sup> Arnal tries to argue against a connection between women in the gender pairs and actual women in the audience by saying, "were women sufficiently active to ensure the composition of such couplets, we can hardly account for the preponderance of androcentric language." However, this is hardly an argument; androcentric language can certainly co-exist alongside some elements of gender equality, just as it frequently does to this day. "Gendered Couplets in Q," 86.

<sup>285</sup> This is no surprise for first century Mediterranean society: "Societies with kinship as the focal point invariably have a moral division of labour based on gender." Malina, "Understanding New Testament Persons," 50.

<sup>286</sup> "The author of Luke is interested in the education of women in the basics of the Christian faith and in the education of outsiders about Christian women. The Gospel attempts to meet various needs such as [...] controlling women who practice or aspire to practice a prophetic ministry in the church. One of the strategies of this Gospel is

who, albeit valued, are decidedly subordinate, the female role models in Q's gender pairs are not subordinated to men.

That said, identifying gender-levelling in the Q sayings is not the same as arguing that "Jesus was an egalitarian" nor that his movement was an egalitarian movement. J. H. Elliott has already iterated clearly why such claims are highly problematic.<sup>287</sup> Elliott calls for "historical honesty" over revisionist wishful thinking, and I agree with this methodological caution. The gender pairs are clearly not suggesting that women and men should be indistinguishable in a social setting, nor advocating that they switch social gender roles. Nor are the pairs overtly addressing or even acknowledging a situation that is now described as patriarchy or androcentrism. That is, it is not within the rhetorical aims of the sayings, of Q as a whole, or of the historical Jesus to encourage women to burn their aprons and become shepherds and men to get in touch with their housekeeping side and learn to spin cloth. Rather than social equality, the sayings imply an equality that has to do with an individual's inner intellectual and spiritual life and outward religious life. Specifically, the paired sayings are implying that men and women are equally worthy of hearing Jesus' message, equally eligible to participate in the *basileia*, and that their contributions to that religious community are equally important. In other words, women and men are depicted as equally able on an intellectual and spiritual level to grasp what is important, and equally valuable on a religious level for contributing to the enactment of that lifestyle and the spread of that message. To imply that men and women are equal, or even identical, at the

---

to provide female readers with female characters as role models: prayerful, quiet, grateful women, supportive of male leadership, forgoing the prophetic ministry." Schaberg and Ringe, "Gospel of Luke," 493.

<sup>287</sup> In his sharp response to Schüssler Fiorenza, John Dominic Crossan, and others who reconstruct the earliest Jesus movements as a "discipleship of equals," Elliott concludes, "An anachronistic imputation of modern notions to the biblical authors should be challenged and resisted in the name of historical honesty wherever and however it occurs. To be sure, let us expend every ounce of energy it takes to reform the ills of society and church. But let us do so with historical honesty, respecting the past as past and not trying to recreate it with modern constructs or re-write it with new ideological pens." Elliott, "Jesus Was Not an Egalitarian," 90.

level of their intellectual and spiritual capacity—or even to imply that men and women are both called to the role of itinerant prophecy for the *basileia*, and both called to break away from familial duties if these impede the work of the *basileia*—does not also entail the implication that men and women should otherwise break out of all gendered social roles, nor does it entail an “egalitarian” programme.<sup>288</sup>

This observation resolves the tension between the “divided” Q-pairs scholars, half of whom insist that the pairs point to a more or less “feminist” Jesus, while the other half caution that any utopic “Discipleship of Equals” in the earliest Jesus movement is too good to be true. In effect, both are right. What I have done is to describe more precisely where the pairs imply, condone, or promote equality, as well as what types of equality are implied, along with where and what type of equality the pairs do not promote, which will surely help to clarify this debate.

In my argument, the limited and specific equality between the genders which can repeatedly be found in the paired sayings serves to level the “inner” (spiritual/intellectual/religious) playing field for first-century wo/men in the Jesus movement, but leaves the “external” (social) playing field intact, or close to intact. Addressing both male and female audience members with an identical intellectual message through the use of these parallel gender pairs may indeed demonstrate to both male and female audience members their intrinsic value to the movement, but it does not necessarily tackle patriarchy programmatically or imply an attempt to throw off an androcentric worldview; it simply demonstrates the inclusion of women as equal recipients of Q’s religious and spiritual message and not automatically as equals in other respects.

---

<sup>288</sup> As stated before, for the purposes of this project, I employ the term “egalitarian” to what happens in Q in a limited not an ideological sense, i.e. as a useful shortcut for describing any process of deliberate “levelling” which brings members of separate social categories closer together in some way into a new shared category that is less hierarchical. Wherever the word and its derivatives are used throughout, this is the intended definition.

Furthermore, Corley, Batten, and Levine all correctly point out that Q's gender-levelling enterprise, such as it is, did not arise out of thin air in an otherwise abysmally patriarchal Jewish setting; on the contrary, this limited gender-levelling is only made possible by a relaxing of societal restrictions upon women that was happening all over the late republic throughout diverse pockets within Judaism and Hellenism.<sup>289</sup> Having said this, that precise literary formulation seen in the Q sayings, although a manifestation of this general relaxing of restrictions for women, is nevertheless truly innovative, as the next chapter will demonstrate, and thus its gender-levelling rhetorical implications, albeit limited, must not be dismissed. This distinction is my contribution to the discussion of the pairs, and it helps to make sense of the polarised voices in the current conversation. The following chapter examines possible precedents for gendered parable pairs in previous Greco-Roman literature and illustrates their literary uniqueness in Hellenistic/Jewish antiquity.

---

<sup>289</sup> For an excellent synthesis of the complex, overlapping, and reciprocal interaction between Judaism and Hellenism in the spirit of Hengel, as it pertains to women and sexuality in Judaism in the Greco-Roman period, see the concluding chapter of W. Loader, ed. *The Pseudepigrapha on Sexuality: Attitudes toward Sexuality in Apocalypses, Testaments, Legends, Wisdom, and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 490–513.



## Chapter 4: Other Ancient Examples of Gendered Pairs: Where They Are Not and Where They Are

The previous chapter described and analysed each gender pair in Q, charting a middle course between two sides of a debate—between those scholars who would use the Q pairs as evidence of widespread gender equality in the early Jesus movement and those scholars who do not see the pairs as evidence for egalitarianism at all. The current chapter addresses the special concerns of Camp 1.5. The Q scholars of this minimalist camp, namely Alicia Batten and Kathleen Corley, allow that the gender pairs do indicate a measure of gender equality, but credit this enhanced possibility for women's agency in the Jesus movement to the wider social situation of the Late Republic, rather than to Jesus of Nazareth or the sayings material.

By demonstrating in this chapter that the gender pairs of Q are unprecedented in ancient Mediterranean literature, I offer an important corrective to the work of Batten and Corley; while they are quite right to highlight the indispensable role of the *Zeitgeist* in providing the framework for women's participation and value in movements like the *basileia* group around Jesus, and while they are right to thus combat supersessionistic readings, I maintain that it is also important to acknowledge the unique rhetorical way in which the pairs accomplish this valuing and participation of women. I illustrate this uniqueness in the present chapter through a comparative examination of Q's pairs vis-à-vis their previous literary contexts: the texts which came to be known as the Hebrew Bible and other Jewish and/or Greco-Roman literature, particularly those pieces of literature that have been specifically suggested as literary ancestors to the gender pairs.

I also examine the pairs in relation to the first-century Christian texts in which they can be said to have an afterlife. These contemporaneous comparisons also serve to underscore the uniqueness of the gendered parallel pairs. With the help of some of the criteria for authenticity in historical Jesus research, I work to establish them as original to Jesus of Nazareth, and as such, as important evidence for the earliest Jesus movement's approaches to gender.

### *Summary of Chapters 2 and 3*

As demonstrated in chapters 2 and 3, Q contains several verbally parallel parable duos which appear alongside one another, and which highlight first one gender and then another. Additionally, Q has various instances of shorter phrases that also contain gendered pairs. While one or two cases of attention to gender might be seen as coincidence, several repeated occurrences throughout Q strengthen the likelihood that they flag gender as a focus in the text; the full parallel parable pairs work in conjunction with shorter paired phrases to indicate that there is a crafted emphasis on male-female pairing in the sayings of Jesus. Specifically, there exists throughout Q a tendency, not only toward general gender *inclusivity*, that is including women as subjects and implied audience members,<sup>290</sup> but also toward a particular gender *equality*, that is, modelling intellectual/spiritual/religious—although not social—equality as a norm. Up until this point, this project's findings have confirmed an ongoing consideration for women in the text of Q, most commonly in the form of a specific rhetorical attempt (gendered pairings) to recognise and validate female audience members. As mentioned above, those

---

<sup>290</sup> I here remind the reader of the discussions of women as implied audience members in Q at the outset of Chapter 3, particularly in the notes to the first paragraphs, as well as throughout that analysis of the pairs and in its concluding section.

scholars who argue that this tendency toward gendered pairing within Q points to social “egalitarianism” or “a Discipleship of Equals”<sup>291</sup> in the early Jesus movement have sometimes erroneously used “patriarchal Judaism” as a foil against which to measure the relative freedom offered to women by the early movements around Jesus of Nazareth,<sup>292</sup> and have been rightly called to task<sup>293</sup> for what such a juxtaposition reveals about the persistence of anti-Judaism in Christian feminist scholarship. This critique is especially apt given the widespread relaxation of many strict societal expectations upon women which occurred throughout diverse Hellenistic and Jewish groups during the Late Republic, as Corley and Batten have pointed out. This relaxation helped make women’s involvement in public movements such as the Jesus movement possible, but also gave rise to redoubled restrictions on women’s behaviour, such as the Augustan marital reforms.<sup>294</sup>

Both sides of this debate have made astute observations, but my text-first approach yields a unique precision that better articulates in which ways the pairs can claim to be egalitarian or gender-levelling and in which ways they cannot, as well as to clarify appropriate backdrops against which to view them. It is the task of this chapter to highlight the literary uniqueness of the pairs, thus salvaging the proverbial baby from the bathwater. That is, this chapter highlights what is exceptional about the pairs’ gender-levelling work in the early Jesus movement, without denigrating other varieties of Judaism, and while recognising that this gender equality did not arise in a vacuum. As evidenced by systematic attempts at curtailing women’s freedoms, such as

---

<sup>291</sup> See, e.g., Schüssler Fiorenza’s “Jesus of Nazareth in Historical Research,” 29–48.

<sup>292</sup> This problem is addressed in Batten, “More Queries for Q,” 47–49.

<sup>293</sup> By, *inter alia*, Batten, “More Queries for Q,” 47–49 and Corley, *Women and the Historical Jesus*, 1–6.

<sup>294</sup> For instance, Augustan-era laws like the *Lex Iulia de maritantiis ordinibus* in 18 B.C.E. and *Lex Papia Poppaea nuptialis* in 9 B.C.E. made marriage non-optional precisely to limit women’s growing emancipation as a result of their participation in banquets. Corley, *Private Women, Public Meals*, 53–65.

those of Augustus,<sup>295</sup> Hellenistic women, including Jewish women, were indeed enjoying unprecedented social mobility.<sup>296</sup>

That said, the particular literary structure of the parallel parable gender pairs is not extant prior to Q in earlier Jewish or Hellenistic literature. In other words, contra Arnal, who locates the work of the pairs in repetitive scribal tendencies unrelated to social gender,<sup>297</sup> and contra Corley<sup>298</sup> and Batten,<sup>299</sup> who locate the gender equality of the pairs in the aftermath of Hellenistic Republican culture, and contra Fricker, who locates the rhetorical ancestry of the pairs in the Hebrew poetic tradition,<sup>300</sup> I demonstrate that the rhetorical work of these sayings vis-à-vis gender is a literary innovation, which acknowledges female audience members in an unprecedented way. While the time was ripe for women's welcome engagement in some intellectual and spiritual/religious movements in a relatively new way at the close of the Republic and the dawn of the Roman Empire, the pairs nevertheless participate in this possibility in a way that was theretofore demonstrably unparalleled.

If, as I will show, gendered parable pairing represents an innovation, this represents an important piece of evidence in the study of first-century Galilean Judaism and Christian origins. If this unique literary signal for an equal valuing of women and men on an intellectual and religious level does not occur prior to Q, which I will demonstrate that it does not, then it is

---

<sup>295</sup> In order to encourage relationships deemed "appropriate," Augustus introduced financial "baby bonus" laws, which only applied to "approved" marriages (e.g. marriages between individuals of "appropriately matched" class), not only rendering the children of non-approved marriages illegitimate, but even making their parents liable for penalties for being "unmarried" and "childless." Raditsa, *Augustus' Legislation Concerning Marriage*, 281. For more on Augustus' "moral renewal" programme, see R. Horsley, "The Gospel of Imperial Salvation: Introduction," *Paul and Empire*, (ed. R. Horsley; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1997), 10–24, esp. 15.

<sup>296</sup> For examples of flexibility for women in the Late Greek Republic juxtaposed with attempts to curtail them, see L. E. Mitchell, "Codes of Law and Laws: Ancient Greek and Roman Law," *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Women in World History* (ed. B. G. Smith; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 422–426, esp. 425.

<sup>297</sup> Arnal, "Gendered Couplets in Q."

<sup>298</sup> Corley, *Women and the Historical Jesus*.

<sup>299</sup> Batten, "More Queries for Q."

<sup>300</sup> Fricker, *Quand Jésus Parle au Masculin-Féminin*, Chapters 3 and 4. See esp. p. 120ff for Hebraic parallelism.

highly plausible that it is a literary form which originated with Q and/or with Jesus of Nazareth, the ostensible speaker of the sayings. This is not to say that the Jesus movement can be credited with innovating female public participation or social agency in general, or with pioneering group membership that is open to females as well as males, especially not over and against a (non-existent) hopelessly patriarchal Judaism. Rather, it is to say that this particular literary device of gendered pairing that levels the value of male and female recipients in a specifically intellectual/religious/spiritual way, while not a general social way, must be credited as original to the early Jesus movement at the pre-Gospel stage, and can take its place *among other* varying forms of innovative gender-levelling taking place across the Mediterranean world at the time.

Although others have suggested possible literary ancestors for the gender pairs of Jesus' sayings material (see below), I demonstrate with certainty that no evidence of this precise rhetorical tool is extant before Q.<sup>301</sup> I argue that no literary precursor to the Q gender parallels can be identified; no text from antiquity prior to Q performs the precise device found in Q. The scholars who have attempted to draw connections with different texts as possible precursors to the gender pairs of Q are outlined below; their conclusions remain useful as comparisons, yet decidedly unconvincing as direct ancestors. Examining those texts which, according to these scholars, have come the closest to the parallel gendered parables only serves to highlight, through their generic and thematic distance from the pairs, the uniqueness of the gendered parable pairs in Q.

---

<sup>301</sup> My extensive search through the Hellenistic and Jewish literature preceding Q confirms that this type of gendered pair is unprecedented. After careful review of the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Hebrew Bible, and various works of didactic or sayings literature in Greek that could possibly form a background to Q, including Greek works and bodies of works ranging from the fables of Aesop, to the Homeric corpus, to the poets contemporaneous with Q, to the range of other Greek-language works that are searchable using the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, I cannot report having found anything resembling the literary genre of a parallel parable pair which uses gender as its variable.

### *No Direct Literary Ancestry for the Q pairs: Close Calls*

This section will examine the textual background in which one might reasonably expect to find literary ancestors for the Q pairs: Jewish scriptures that pre-date Q and other such Hellenistic literature. The former context, the bodies of pre-Christian Jewish books, some of which came to be collected in the Hebrew Bible and others of which are collected in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Septuagint, Dead Sea Scrolls, and beyond, includes many texts with which Jesus and his early followers were attestably familiar. The latter context is the pre-Christian Hellenistic literature outside of Judaism (such as the fables of Aesop, the works of philosophers, novels, plays, and more). While no direct precedent for gender pairs can be found in these bodies of work, this chapter outlines those “close calls” which have been or could be suggested as ancestors.

Finally, another literary context in which to seek shared literary relationships with, although not ancestors for, the pairs is in first-century Christian literature. While contemporaneous literature cannot provide literary precedent, such works can nonetheless conceivably be viewed as sharing a common literary ancestry with Q or as at least belonging to a shared cultural repertoire. Roughly contemporaneous documents can thus be related as “siblings” or as having drunk from the same well of inspiration. It is from an analysis of these contemporaneous and later early Christian texts that I form arguments that increase the likelihood that Jesus of Nazareth was the innovator of Q’s gender pairs. Criteria of authenticity for historical Jesus research, such as the criteria of embarrassment, of dissimilarity, and of multiple attestation, are applied to first-century gender pairs outside Q in the final segment of this chapter.

## Close Calls in the Tanakh and Apocrypha

The context that may seem the most obvious in which to search for literary precedent for the gendered pairs of Q is in prior Jewish literature, including those books which were later collected in the Apocrypha and Hebrew Bible and canonised as Jewish and Christian scripture.<sup>302</sup> This is an obvious context in which to search, since it is beyond doubt that Jesus and his earliest Jewish followers knew, or knew of, many of these texts.<sup>303</sup>

Indeed, two key features of the pairs are also recurring features in many of the texts of the Tanakh and Apocrypha, namely, the genre of small teaching stories such as parables, and the device of parallelism. Just as in the gender pairs of Q, these two features (parable and parallelism), both common in early Jewish literature in Hebrew, do sometimes occur together in the Hebrew poetic tradition.<sup>304</sup> However, unlike in the gender pairs of Q, parable and parallelism are never employed deliberately as a unit in order to address both masculine and feminine topics and audience members simultaneously and equally.

---

<sup>302</sup> See S. Z. Leiman, *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture* (Hamden: Archon, 1976) for a history of the collection process of the Tanakh, and McDonald, *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*, for a history of the same for the Christian Testament, “Old” Testament/LXX, and Apocrypha/Deuterocanon. See also Barrera, *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible*.

<sup>303</sup> On the presence of earlier Jewish literature in the Gospels and the sayings of Jesus, see W. Adler, “The Pseudepigrapha in the Early Church,” *The Canon Debate* (ed. L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 211–228; J. R. Edwards, *The Hebrew Gospel and the Development of Synoptic Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009); D. J. Harrington, “The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Early Church and Today,” *The Canon Debate* (ed. L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 196–210; M. Hengel, *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture* (London: T&T Clark, 2002); and S. Moyise, *Jesus and Scripture: Studying the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011). See also Gerbern Oegema, “Non-Canonical Writings and Biblical Theology,” *The Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity, and Other Greco-Roman Religions in Antiquity* (Studien zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, Bd 2; ed. I. Henderson and G. Oegema; Gutersloh: Gutersloher Verlagshaus, 2006), 491–512.

<sup>304</sup> The definition of *mashal* (משל) (the closest Hebrew approximation of the English “parable”) in the BDB connects parable with parallelism in its main definition: a “proverb, parable (of sentences constructed in parallelism).”

## ***Parables and Parallelism in the Tanakh and Apocrypha***

Parables similar to the short fictional teaching stories used in the full Q pairs can certainly be found in a variety of places within the Hebrew Bible.<sup>305</sup> For instance, in Judges 9:8–15, Jotham recounts the parable of the trees, wherein the most noble and deserving trees decline ruling over the other trees, but the low-class bramble jumps at the chance to rule—and rule violently. In 2 Sam 12:1–7, the prophet Nathan bravely regales David with the condemnatory parable of the ewe lamb. This didactic form was common in Hebrew writings and would have been known by those who were familiar with such texts, including Jesus,<sup>306</sup> and is, of a certainty, a favoured rhetorical method of Jesus in his sayings material.

The other element of the Q pairs that is also found within the Tanakh and Apocrypha—and sometimes within the parables of the Tanakh and Apocrypha—is parallelism.<sup>307</sup> Parallelism, simply defined as “the repetition of an idea in slightly different terms,”<sup>308</sup> is well known as the distinguishing literary marker most characteristic of Hebrew poetry.<sup>309</sup> The parallelism at work in the diverse texts of the Hebrew Bible has been divided into a variety of types.<sup>310</sup> The most

---

<sup>305</sup> See the section entitled “The Parables in Israel’s Scriptures” in Levine, *Short Stories by Jesus*, 4–6. *Mashal* (משל) is considered the closest Hebrew counterpart to the English “parable” and Greek *parabole*, παραβολή, ἥς, ἡ.

<sup>306</sup> See Levine, *Short Stories by Jesus*, 4.

<sup>307</sup> For a concise overview of the use of parallelism as a poetic device in Hebrew, see J. C. Dancy, *The Divine Drama: The Old Testament as Literature* (Cambridge: Lutterworth, 2001), 21–24.

<sup>308</sup> S. L. Gravett, “Literature, Old Testament As,” *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible* (ed. D. N. Freedman; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 813.

<sup>309</sup> Robert Lowth’s still oft-cited work of more than two centuries ago, *De sacra poesi Hebraeorum praelectiones academicae* (*Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*) (Oxford: Clarendon, 1753), remains surprisingly influential on the subject of Hebrew poetry, and it is in Lowth’s commentary on Isaiah that he declares parallelism to be its defining characteristic: R. Lowth, *Isaiah: A New Translation, with a Preliminary Dissertation and Notes, Critical, Philological, and Explanatory* (Boston: Pierce, 1834). For a recent overview of the discussion, see F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp, “Poetry, Hebrew,” *The New Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible* 4 (ed. K. D. Sakenfeld; Nashville: Abingdon, 2009), 550–558. For a good general introduction to the field, see D. L. Petersen and K. H. Richards, *Interpreting Hebrew Poetry* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992).

<sup>310</sup> See M. A. Powell, ed. *Harper Collins Bible Dictionary: Revised and Updated* (New York: HarperCollins, 2011), 718 and J. M. LeMon and B. A. Strawn, “Parallelism,” *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Wisdom, Poetry, and Writings* (ed. T. Longman III and P. Enns; Downer’s Grove: InterVarsity, 2008), 502–515 for taxonomies of the numerous categories of poetic parallelism in Hebrew.



basic and overarching categories of parallelism relevant to our purposes are two of the first three described by Lowth in 1834, still in use today: synonymous and antithetic.<sup>311</sup> Lowth also spoke of “parallel lines” and “parallel terms,” the former referring to an entire structural half of the pair of texts in question, and the latter referring to the individual paralleled terms within those lines<sup>312</sup> (something akin to what I refer to as the “variables”). This nomenclature remains useful. To illustrate, Prov 1:20 reads, “Wisdom cries out in the street; she raises her voice in the public squares.” In this case, “Wisdom cries out in the street” and “she raises her voice in the public squares” are what Lowth calls the “parallel lines.” “Cries out” and “raises her voice” are “parallel terms,” as are “the street” and “the public squares.” This is an example of *synonymous* parallelism, which uses the second line to reinforce or expand upon the ideas in the first line.<sup>313</sup>

To further demonstrate synonymous parallels, consider Isa 60:2, which says that “darkness will cover the earth; thick darkness [will cover] the peoples.” Sandra Gravett explains that the second half of synonymous cases like this serve in the text both as emphasis as well as for poetic/aesthetic purposes: “‘Darkness’ and ‘thick darkness,’ while different Hebrew words, convey the same idea, as do ‘earth’ and ‘peoples’; the ideas articulated thus receive emphasis through reinforcement of the image.”<sup>314</sup> Similarly, Amos 5:24 reads “But let justice roll down like waters, and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream.” Here, the concept of justice is reinforced by the concept of righteousness, which stands in the same position in the second phrase. Likewise, the waters in the first phrase are echoed by the ever-flowing stream of the

---

<sup>311</sup> See Lowth, *Isaiah*. Lowth’s third category was “synthetic parallelism” but he admitted it was problematic and it has not proven convincing to scholars over the course of time; see W. C. Kaiser, Jr. and M. Silva, *Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics: The Search for Meaning* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 90.

<sup>312</sup> Lowth, *Isaiah*, ix.

<sup>313</sup> K. Dell, “Proverbs,” *The New Oxford Annotated Bible, New Revised Standard Version with Apocrypha* (fully revised fourth edition; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 896.

<sup>314</sup> Gravett, “Literature, Old Testament As,” 813.

second. Both of the lines in the parallel convey approximately the same message, through repetition of synonyms or near-synonyms. Sirach frequently does the same; 14:20 reads, “blessed is the man who meditates on wisdom, and who reasons intelligently” and 14:26 continues, “he will place his children under (Wisdom’s) shelter, and will camp under (Wisdom’s) boughs.”

By contrast, *Antithetical* parallelism is where the two lines, although similar in structure, show contrasting or opposing ideas.<sup>315</sup> Much like synonymous parallelism, antithetical parallelism also reinforces the same idea in the second line. However, it does so by using an inverted negation of the first line, rather than a repeated echo of it. Antithetical parallelism is frequent throughout Proverbs<sup>316</sup> (e.g. Prov 12:1, “Whoever loves discipline loves knowledge, but those who hate to be rebuked are stupid” and Prov 10:2, “Treasures gained by wickedness do not profit, but righteousness delivers from death”). It can also be found in Sirach (e.g. Sirach 21:22, “The foot of a fool rushes into a house, but an experienced person waits respectfully outside” and Sirach 21:26, “The mind of fools is in their mouth, but the mouth of wise men is in their mind.”) Like synonymous parallels, antithetical parallels also ultimately convey the same message, but do so by reiterating the concept using two opposite ways of saying the same thing, rather than using synonyms or closely-related concepts.

Antithetical and synonymous parallelism are the two most frequent types of parallelism in Hebrew poetry.<sup>317</sup> It will be obvious to the reader that if the full Q pairs had to be classified into one or the other category, they would be the synonymous type. It is this similarity in form between the Q gender pairs and the synonymous parallels of Hebrew poetry that brings Denis Fricker to the conclusion that the Q gender pairs owe their formal ancestry (although not the

---

<sup>315</sup> J. L. Resseguie, “Literature, New Testament As,” *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible* (ed. D. N. Freedman; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 815.

<sup>316</sup> Gravett, “Literature, Old Testament As,” 813.

<sup>317</sup> Dell, “Proverbs,” 896.

ancestry of their content and argumentation) to the Hebrew poetic tradition.<sup>318</sup> I concur with Fricker that the literary device is similar at a formal level, and also agree that the content of the parables in Q, that is their didactic aims, are quite different from their parabolic Hebrew ancestors. However, I differentiate even more forcefully than Fricker between the rhetorical aims of Hebrew poetry versus the gender pairs. Although synonymous parallelism is abundant throughout the Hebrew scriptures as well as throughout Q, at no point prior to Q do *two parallel parables (mishals) or sayings* occur *one after another* in the Hebrew Bible or apocrypha/Pseudepigrapha, and certainly not where an identical lesson is clearly geared toward both male and female audience members, or in which a male example and a female example are used in synonymous fashion to convey an identical teaching. In other words, the gender pairs of Q reflect a Hebrew tradition of parallelism and a separate Hebrew tradition of parabolic teaching, but they push these traditions further into a pioneering doubled usage which makes use of gender as a linking factor between two parables that teach the same lesson.

### ***Grammatical Gender and Parallelism in Hebrew Poetry***

At first glance, one might suppose that a “close call” in terms of finding a would-be precedent for Q’s gendered pairing could be based in *grammatical* gender in the Hebrew poetic tradition. The alleged use of grammatical gender as a component in synonymous Hebrew parallelism might be posited as an ancestor for gender-based parallelism in Q<sup>319</sup> because, at times, the two parallel terms in parallel lines of Hebrew poetry alternate between masculine and

---

<sup>318</sup> Fricker, *Quand Jésus Parle au Masculin-Féminin*, 236.

<sup>319</sup> See, e.g. Adele Berlin, “Grammatical Aspects of Biblical Parallelism,” *HUCA* 50 (1979): 17–43, for an argument that ancient Hebrew makes use of components of grammar as a part of its poetic parallelism, including grammatical gender.

feminine grammatical gender. In Ps 85:11, for instance, the two parallel nouns in the first part are grammatically feminine, while the two in the second half are grammatically masculine.<sup>320</sup> Sometimes referred to as “gender-matched parallelism,”<sup>321</sup> this posited Hebrew poetic device, which is said to rely on grammatical gender as one of the elements in parallel, is problematic; it is well-known in the field of linguistics that grammatical gender does not extrapolate to natural gender in this way.<sup>322</sup> While gender may sometimes correlate in nouns like “lion” and “lioness” that refer to beings with gender (and sometimes not), grammatical gender certainly does not correlate to human gender in nouns like “table,” “song,” “pride,” and “ocean,” which are far more likely to form parallel elements in Hebrew poetry. It is therefore not advisable to assume correlation between grammatical gender and social gender.<sup>323</sup> Furthermore, there is no way of determining that the cases where parallel terms in Hebrew happen to use a masculine noun and then a feminine noun are deliberate. Chances are naturally statistically high that the terms in one line of the parallel would be grammatically masculine, and grammatically feminine in the other line, in a significant percentage of the cases, as Hebrew only has the two options for grammatical gender.<sup>324</sup> Also, even it were a good idea to equate grammatical gender with human gender in analysis, which it is not, and even if we assumed that the psalmists juxtaposed male with female grammatical gender deliberately some of the time, which we cannot, there would still not be a

---

<sup>320</sup> LeMon and Strawn, “Parallelism,” 511.

<sup>321</sup> See W. G. E. Watson, “Gender-Matched Synonymous Parallelism in the Old Testament” *JBL* 99/3 (1980): 321–341.

<sup>322</sup> On the instability of correspondence between grammatical gender and so-called natural gender, see J. M. Anderson, *Morphology, Paradigms, and Periphrases* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 269ff; D. E. Baron, *Grammar and Gender* (New Haven: Yale, 1986); and H. Motschenbacher, *Language, Gender, and Sexual Identity: Poststructuralist Perspectives* (SLS 29; Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2010), 63ff. For a feminist argument that grammatical gender may nonetheless have an effect upon modern interpretation, see A. Alvanoudi, *Grammatical Gender in Interaction: Cultural and Cognitive Aspects* (BSLC 9; Leiden: Brill, 2014).

<sup>323</sup> See Kaiser and Silva, *Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics*, 52, for a specific caution against extrapolating messages about social gender from grammatical gender in the Hebrew Bible.

<sup>324</sup> Hebrew has no grammatical neuter.

clear ancestral literary path between Hebrew poetry and the specific equality-building rhetorical enterprise undertaken in the parable pairs of Q. Natural (as opposed to grammatical) gender as a topic is rare enough in antiquity, let alone the strategy of gender-levelling that is at play in the Q pairs. In other words, even if Q were drawing on the parallelism tradition of the Psalms, Sirach, and other Hebrew poetic texts, I put it that Q still innovates in that its unique use of this common literary device focuses on human gender in human social community; even if the grammatical parallels in Hebrew poetry were a precursor to parallelism in any later Jewish and Christian texts, which may be broadly the case, Q addresses gender at a different level entirely, and with strong evidence of deliberation.

No text from the Hebrew poetic tradition provides an adequate explanation for the gendered parallel parable pairs of Q since no text of that type deals with social/historical gender in intentional parallel. Although there is precedent within Jewish scriptures for the use of parables and for literary parallelism, it is clear that the precise literary device found within Q—that is, the *gendered* parallel parable pair for inclusive purposes—cannot be said to find its precedent there.

## Close Calls in the Pseudepigrapha

Another early Jewish collection in which I searched for precedent for the gender doublets is the Pseudepigrapha. While the books known by scholars under the name Pseudepigrapha were not an ancient collection, and are rather a modern academic construct,<sup>325</sup> there is no question that many of the books within this category were known by Christian Testament authors as well as by

---

<sup>325</sup> See S. Sheinfeld, “The Pseudepigrapha in Current Research,” *Religion Compass* (2013): 1–8.

Jesus.<sup>326</sup> While many of the texts of the Pseudepigrapha<sup>327</sup> employ parallelism,<sup>328</sup> neither natural gender nor a rhetorical attempt to be inclusive to female audience members using paired parables feature in any of the Pseudepigrapha's parallels, synonymous or otherwise, but one, according to my findings: *Joseph and Aseneth*, and there in but a single passage.

### ***Joseph and Aseneth***

A short gendered pairing of a sort can be found in *Joseph and Aseneth* 8:5–7, where Joseph recites an injunction that applies to “a man who worships God,” and then adds the same injunction for “a woman who worships God”:

It is not right for a man who worships God, who with his mouth blesses the living God, and eats the blessed bread of life, and drinks the blessed cup of immortality, and is anointed with the blessed unction of incorruption, to kiss a strange woman, who with her mouth blesses dead and dumb idols, and eats of their table the bread of anguish, and drinks of their libations the cup of treachery, and is anointed with the unction of destruction. A man who worships God will kiss his mother and his sister that is of his own tribe and kin, and the wife that shares his couch, who with their mouths bless the living God. So too it is not right for a woman who worships God to kiss a strange man, because this is an abomination in God's eyes (*Joseph and Aseneth* 8: 5–7).

---

<sup>326</sup> See G. S. Oegema and J. H. Charlesworth, eds., *The Pseudepigrapha and Christian Origins: Essays from the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas* (New York: T&T Clark, 2008); McDonald, *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*; and J. H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); as well as Davila, *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha*.

<sup>327</sup> Any Pseudepigrapha mentioned or cited herein are from Charlesworth's two-volume collection, hereafter *OTP*. J. H. Charlesworth, ed. *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 Volumes; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983)

<sup>328</sup> There is typical biblical parallelism in the poetic sections of *Ahiqar*, *Apocalypse of Abraham*, *Apocalypse of Elijah*, *Enoch*, *3 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *Testament of Moses*, and more, and other books contain vestiges of parallelism from suspected Hebrew originals, such as *Life of Adam and Eve* (See Charlesworth, *OTP*, 251). Indeed, the presence of parallelism is often used to help determine whether a pseudepigraphon of uncertain provenance was originally composed in Hebrew, such as in the case of *Questions of Ezra*. See M. E. Stone, “Questions of Ezra,” *OTP* 1 (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 591–600.

In this context, where the character of Joseph is presented with the opportunity to kiss the beautiful Aseneth, it makes sense for him to recite a reason why male followers of Joseph's god must not embrace female non-followers. However, Joseph repeats and rephrases a (sharply abbreviated) version of the scenario for a hypothetical female follower, extrapolating that female followers of Joseph's god (although there are none in the text at this point) also must avoid embracing male non-followers. This is certainly a kind of gender pair, as found in Q. The passage uses a measure of parallelism to address both potential male audience members and potential female audience members with the same lesson: do not choose a partner who does not worship our god. Obviously, the literary situation is quite different from that of Q in terms of genre; rather than parable pairs in a sayings list, the passage in *Joseph and Aseneth* is not parabolic, but woven into the narrative of a novel.<sup>329</sup> The way in which this passage functions as an injunction, although it is well-integrated in the plot, is certainly closer to that of "legal variations on a theme," as suggested by Arnal for the Q pairs, since the *Joseph and Aseneth* passage proclaims the (il)legality of a certain action by men, and reiterates the (il)legality of the same action by women, although here it takes place not in a legal document, but in a historicised narrative that addresses a legal question of everyday relevance—intermarriage with outsiders and the status of proselytes.<sup>330</sup> This proclamation against marrying foreigners and anxiety around their relationship to the community is a recurring theme in the texts that came to be collected as the Hebrew Bible, and in *Joseph and Aseneth* as well. One of the text's very *raison d'être* may have been to explain how the Egyptian character of Aseneth came to be a suitable bride for the patriarch Joseph in the book of Genesis (41:45), given the Hebrew Bible's general attitude

---

<sup>329</sup> On the genre of *Joseph and Aseneth*, which he loosely defines as a "romance," see C. Burchard, "Joseph and Aseneth," *OTP* 2 (ed. Charlesworth; Garden City: Doubleday, 1985), 186.

<sup>330</sup> See H. C. Kee, "The Socio-Cultural Setting of Joseph and Aseneth," *NTS* 29 (1983): 394–413 and "The Socio-Religious Setting and Aims of *Joseph and Aseneth*" (*SBLSP* 1976; Missoula: Scholars, 1976), 183–192.

against intermarriage.<sup>331</sup> For this reason, it would be impossible to argue with much conviction that this one exception found within all the texts of the Hebrew Bible and Apocrypha/Pseudepigrapha might be considered a direct literary precedent to the gendered pairs of Q; rather, it fits nicely within the aims of the novel, which explains how a patriarch from Israel's past came to marry a foreigner (by depicting the foreigner first having a divine experience which marks her as an insider).<sup>332</sup> In this case, the point of the passage in *Joseph and Aseneth* is not, as is the point in the Q pairs, to address and possibly level gender, but rather to make sure that the community's marital norms are also kept by women.<sup>333</sup> These things, in addition to the fact that the work may not predate Q,<sup>334</sup> work against any possibility that this one gendered parallel passage in the Pseudepigrapha can be seen as a precursor to the Q gender pairs. This single injunction against kissing an outsider, given to both men and women, might call to mind a short Q gender pair, and might imply that both men and women must follow this rule, but given its inconclusive date and its singularity it cannot be counted as precedent for Q in any meaningful way.

### Close Calls in Other Hellenistic literature

A detailed search through other Hellenistic literature in the centuries leading up to the common era, focusing mainly on didactic genres, such as fables, as the realms most likely to be fruitful for comparison with Q's parallel parable pairs, also reveals that no earlier Greek text can

---

<sup>331</sup> E.g. Genesis 24:3–4, Ezra 10:10, Malachi 2:11, etc.

<sup>332</sup> See *Joseph and Aseneth*, chapters 14 through 17.

<sup>333</sup> Or perhaps, in a patriarchal context ... especially kept by women.

<sup>334</sup> See Davila, *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha*, 190ff for an even-handed discussion of *Joseph and Aseneth*'s dating and provenance; the work has been dated anywhere between the 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C.E. and the 2<sup>nd</sup> century C.E. Above all, it should be noted that *Joseph and Aseneth* cannot with certainty be said to pre-date Q.



be said to clearly address a mixed audience of men and women while offering them repeated parables which provided an identical lesson with an example of each gender.

## Parables and Fables in other Hellenistic Writings

Scholar Klyne Snodgrass has written a sourcebook for the Hellenistic background to Jesus' parables.<sup>335</sup> Unlike many scholars, Snodgrass commendably searches for parallels to the parables of Jesus not only throughout early Jewish books, but also throughout wider Hellenistic writings, and also compiles handy appendices for everywhere the Greek word *parabole* and the Hebrew word *mishal* occur, throughout the Tanakh, LXX, other early Jewish literature, and beyond. Within this sourcebook, which extends as far back as the fables of Aesop, Snodgrass has not reported a literary structure comparable to that of the gender pairs of Q.<sup>336</sup>

Insofar as fables are fictional stories which display a truth,<sup>337</sup> they are similar to the parables in the full gender pairs of Q. In some ways, however, the very format of fables precludes their ancestry to doubled parables in the Jesus material. Aesop and Stesichorus, among the most famous fabulists before the Common Era, were still in circulation in the first century,<sup>338</sup> and could thus seem like an appropriate place to search for gender-paralleled tales. However, the manner in which they are collected and circulated precludes this possibility, as each fable is a separate entity; they are not paired. Furthermore, none are doubled and parallel, let alone doubled and paralleled with gender as the main variable. Thus, although fables might be one of

---

<sup>335</sup> K. Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008).

<sup>336</sup> In an email to me in 2012, Snodgrass confirmed that at no point during the research for his book did he come across a gender-based pairing of parables in Hebrew or Greek that might constitute a literary ancestor for the Q pairs.

<sup>337</sup> This is the definition of a fable given in Aelius Theon's *Progymnasmata* 3 in the first century.

<sup>338</sup> For instance, Aesop's stories merit a mention in the work of the 1<sup>st</sup>-century philosopher Apollonius of Tyana.

the generic antecedents for the parables in general, they do not provide a precursor to the device that is found in the gendered parallel parable pairs of Q.

### Close Calls in Rabbinic Literature: Arnal's Scribal Wordplay

William Arnal has argued for the location of the gender pairs as they appear in Greek translation in Q within the patterned legal repetitions of early rabbinic scribes.<sup>339</sup> Although the texts Arnal uses as evidence for this are generally later than Q,<sup>340</sup> he sees the common legislative scribal culture from which both emerged as a possible explanation for the presence of gender juxtaposition in the Q pairs, and likens them to civic codes and contracts, such as marriage and divorce documents.<sup>341</sup> Arnal points to wordplay elsewhere in Q<sup>342</sup> as a clue that the parable pairs do not have to do with gender, but rather have to do with a proclivity towards repetition and variations on a theme. He asserts that “the Q couplets do not in and of themselves serve as any convincing indication of a tendency toward gender inclusiveness.”<sup>343</sup> In other words, Arnal argues that the author(s)/translator(s) of Q, which he describes as a scribe or scribes, had no intention of commenting on gender or reaching out to female audience members, but rather that these scribes simply had a tradition of employing parallelism and enjoying wordplay: “a specific identification of Q's tradents with legal administration, presumably at the village level, serves

---

<sup>339</sup> Arnal does this in both “Gendered Couplets in Q” and in his monograph *Jesus and the Village Scribes*.

<sup>340</sup> E.g. the Mishnah, redacted around 200 C.E. (see Arnal, “Gendered Couplets in Q,” 87, n.58).

<sup>341</sup> Arnal, “Gendered Couplets in Q,” 88–89.

<sup>342</sup> Such as Q 9:58: “Foxes have holes, and birds of the sky have nests; but the son of humanity does not have anywhere he can lay his head,” and Q 10:13–15: “Woe to you, Chorazin! Woe to you, Bethsaida! For if the wonders performed in you had taken place in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago, in sackcloth and ashes. Yet for Tyre and Sidon it shall be more bearable at the judgement than for you. And you, Capernaum, up to heaven will you be exalted? Into Hades shall you come down!” However, these examples of wordplay are not particularly frequent in or characteristic of Q.

<sup>343</sup> Arnal, “Gendered Couplets in Q,” 92.

only to reinforce the impression already gained that these couplets are in fact patterned after legal or quasi-legal formulas.”<sup>344</sup>

Arnal’s thesis, however, is flawed in one respect. He argues that the parallel parables in Q have nothing to do with gender and are rather all about wordplay, on the basis that Q can be connected with scribal culture. Arnal’s hypothesis that Q’s sayings were curated in a scribal context is practically undeniable and makes more sense than any other current theory. His problematic arguments that the Q gender pairs do not have to do with gender<sup>345</sup> are not integral to his otherwise impeccable work on Galilean scribal culture. That is, his fruitful connection of Q with scribal culture is by no means mutually exclusive to the presence of attention to gender. From an argument that other wordplay exists in Q, it does not logically follow that the gendered pairs are therefore meaningful *only* as wordplay, and not relevant to a discussion of social/historical gender. In a text-forward analysis, when we encounter close verbal parallels in Q where the only variable in the otherwise parallel parable is gender, gender is what should rise to the fore as the key to narrative analysis of those pairs.

My argument that gender is a key element in Q’s parallel parables is strengthened by the fact that the parallelism in Q is somewhat uneven and verbally imperfect—literary parallelism alone cannot possibly be at the forefront of the significance of these passages. Many of the Q gender pairs, while they parallel one another in a general way and in the theme and content, do not show any evidence of being rigidly verbally parallel, nor do they address content that is particularly legal. The parables of the lost sheep and the lost coin (Q 15:4–5a, 7–9), for instance, with the shepherd rejoicing on his own and the woman calling her neighbours to rejoice as a

---

<sup>344</sup> Arnal, “Gendered Couplets in Q,” 91.

<sup>345</sup> Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 168–170.

group, serve to highlight the fact that the pairs are clearly not *pedantically* parallel as one might expect if legal or artistic permutations were the concern. Indeed most of the parallel gender pairs are *imperfectly* parallel at the verbal level, and show stronger parallelism at the level of *content*. While these pairs might be symmetrical in terms of their lesson and their juxtaposition of gender, if the whole point were legislative permutations of a theme, then it is likely that this feature would be more obvious in the text of Q, and occur with more frequency and consistency throughout the text. Likewise, Arnal's claim that Q tends towards parallelism in general would be stronger if Q exhibited more verbal play, but as this feature is infrequent, it is more likely that gender is a driving force in the parallelism of these parable pairs. If the gender pairs could be explained away by a tendency toward parallelism in general, as Arnal claims, then one would expect to see far more verbal play throughout Q, and to see repeated parable pairs that do not relate to gender.

To restate my critique of Arnal's position, it can by all means be argued as he does that Q's curators were scribes, but it does not follow that the presence of scribes precludes attention to gender, particularly when these pairs so often revolve around gender and consistently offer one masculine and one feminine example. Arnal claims that Q's general androcentrism indicates that "these administrators were exclusively male" and that "the Q traditions and the various layers were composed by, transmitted by, and preserved by men."<sup>346</sup> Both of these things may well be true and still not be cause for dismissal of the rhetorical work of the pairs; Arnal's reasoning does not take into account the distinct possibility that a rhetorical valuing of women audience members may coexist simultaneously with male-dominated scribal culture, androcentric language, and a patriarchal/kyriarchal outlook. There are thus significant problems with Arnal's

---

<sup>346</sup> Arnal, "Gendered Couplets in Q," 92.

attempt to move the pairs into a discussion of scribal culture at the expense of a discussion of gender. This is a discussion which must by no means take on an either/or character.

### Summary of Close Calls: Gender Pairs as Innovation

The above “close calls” are really not so close after all. These literary comparisons, whether the poetic synonymous parallelism in Hebrew literature, the double injunction in the pseudepigraphon *Joseph and Aseneth*, or the wordplay of first-century scribes, do not provide convincing origins for Q’s gendered pairing. It is clear from the infrequency of Q’s wordplay outside the gendered pairs that Q is not a document that one might categorise as particularly focused on wordplay. It is clear that synonymous parallelism in Hebrew poetry, even when its variables may sometimes seem to correlate with grammatical gender, does not approach the rhetorical project at work in the Q pairs with natural gender. It is clear that the presence of a command for both men and women in the romance novel *Joseph and Aseneth*, even if the work could be conclusively dated as prior to Q, does not serve as an obvious inspiration for the gender-levelling function of the gendered pairings in Q. Therefore, when we do encounter close verbal parallels in Q, and the only variable in the otherwise parallel parable is gender, a text-first approach dictates that *gender is what should rise to the fore as the key to narrative analysis*—all the more so because parallelism is not a particularly notable feature of Q in passages when gender is not at the fore.

In light of the results of this search for precedents and close calls throughout the Hebrew Bible and Hellenistic/Jewish writings prior to Q, it becomes quite clear that Q’s gendered parallels can be described as an innovation. The same device—that is, synonymous parallelism in twin-lessoned parables, having natural gender and gendered societal roles as parallel terms—

does not appear anywhere in previous early Jewish or Hellenistic writings. This research has important ramifications not only for the origins of the pairs themselves, but also for research on the historical Jesus and his earliest followers.

### *Gender Pairs in Contemporaneous and Later Texts*

The final context in which literary connections may be discerned for the gender pairs is in literature contemporaneous with Q, extending through the first century. While such literature may not be considered as a precedent to the gendered pairs, it can certainly be counted towards evidence of shared traditions, which could in turn suggest that both the Q pairs and the other 1<sup>st</sup>-century texts in which they appear may have drawn upon earlier shared sources. The presence of gendered pairs in other documents similar in date to Q, along with their afterlife in documents immediately following Q, may indicate that all of the documents share a common historical source, which, as I argue at the close of this chapter, is likely to have been Jesus of Nazareth.

### **The Afterlife of the Q Gender Pairs**

The Q-style gender parallel parable pairs are unprecedented in any extant Hellenistic or early Jewish text before Q. By contrast, the device most certainly exists in the early Christian literature that came *after* the sayings material. Despite their lack of discernible literary ancestors

in early Jewish or Hellenistic writings, vestiges of something very like Q's gendered pairs do occur in early Christian literature in the decades contemporaneous with and following Q, namely, in the Gospels of Mark and John, and, of course, in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke from which Q was reconstructed.

While the gender pairs in Matthew and Luke are direct literary descendants of Q, the places in the Gospels of John and Mark where vestiges of gender pairs occur provide independent witnesses of the tendency toward gender pairing that has been identified in the Q sayings.<sup>347</sup>

## **Luke/Acts and Gender Pairs**

As mentioned in earlier chapters, the most obvious place where gender parallels exist outside the Q document is in the Gospels of Luke and Matthew, from which Q was reconstructed. Matthew has generally been viewed as less interested in the gendered pairs than Luke, as Matthew tends to drop one of each pair, where Luke will retain duplicate parables. Kloppenborg and Derrenbacker's interpretation of Luke's use of Q's gender pairs over and against Matthew's usage is highly typical: "On the Two Document hypothesis, Luke saw gender pairing in Q [...] and developed this. Matthew, by contrast, did nothing to enhance gender

---

<sup>347</sup> As is customary, I treat Mark, Q, and John as independent textual traditions. See Holladay, *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament*, for succinct overviews of the literary independence of Mark, Matthew/Luke/Q (p. 133), and John (pp. 198–199). For a remarkable old relic arguing for Mark's use of Q, see B. H. Streeter's "St. Mark's Knowledge and Use of Q," *Studies in the Synoptic Problem* (ed. W. Sanday; Oxford: Clarendon, 1911), 165–183.

pairing and in fact omitted the parable of the drachma.”<sup>348</sup> However, as was noted in chapters 2 and 3 and earlier in this chapter, feminist close readings of the treatment of the Q pairs by Luke reveal that Matthew is not the only Synoptic author who shows ambivalence or discomfort, or at best disinterest, toward them. Turid Seim’s analysis of Luke as presenting a “double message” around women indicates that the Gospel of Luke also sends mixed signals for women. While Seim finds that the gender pairs and other elements in Luke do indicate that there were plenty of women in the audience and active in the movement, she notes at the same time that these women elicit tension on the part of Luke and other characters in the gospel, and argues that there is ultimately a crafted curtailing of women’s roles in the broader scheme of Luke/Acts.<sup>349</sup> Schaberg and Ringe concur with Seim; they find that Luke’s Gospel shows an interest in “controlling women who practice or aspire to practice a prophetic ministry in the church”<sup>350</sup> and they describe Lukan female role models as “prayerful, quiet, grateful women, supportive of male leadership, forgoing the prophetic ministry.”<sup>351</sup> Reid’s study of women in Luke similarly finds Luke to be “intent on restricting [women] to silent, passive, supporting roles.”<sup>352</sup> When Schüssler Fiorenza compares women in Q material to their placement and treatment in Luke, she too argues for a strong tendency to tame and re-frame any gender-levelling work being wrought by Q; she also declares that the so-called Lukan tendency to compose gender pairs is largely a matter of Luke using existing pairs that were original to Q but were simply omitted by Matthew.<sup>353</sup> There is thus strong agreement among virtually all recent feminist readings of Luke

---

<sup>348</sup> R. A. Derrenbacker, Jr. and J. S. Kloppenborg, “Self-Contradiction in the IQP? A Reply to Michael Goulder,” *JBL* 120/1 (Spring 2001): 72.

<sup>349</sup> Seim, *The Double Message* (i.e. that the Gospel of Luke contains mixed messages for women).

<sup>350</sup> Schaberg and Ringe, “Gospel of Luke,” 493.

<sup>351</sup> Schaberg and Ringe, “Gospel of Luke,” 493.

<sup>352</sup> Reid, *Choosing the Better Part?*, 53.

<sup>353</sup> See, *inter alia*, Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, esp. 145–46.



which take Q into account: Luke's tendencies differ significantly from those of Q when it comes to the role of women. Despite Matthean and Lukan discomfort with gender pairs, the need was felt to incorporate those even when their tendencies conflicted with those of the Gospel authors. The treatment of the Q pairs by Luke and Matthew reveal that the pairs were altered at a very early stage in their reception history.

## John's Gospel and Gender Pairs

Scholars have long noted that the presence of a narrative balance between female characters and male characters in the Gospel of John.<sup>354</sup> Nicodemus is set in contrast to the Samaritan Woman, Martha is contrasted with Peter, Mary of Bethany is juxtaposed with Judas, and the list goes on. Most of these scholars agree that there are six pairs of characters that deliberately highlight and balance gender in John:

Jesus' mother and the royal official	John 2:1–11 and John 4:46–64
Nicodemus and the Samaritan	John 3:1–12 and John 4:4–42
The blind man and Martha	John 9:1–41 and John 11:1–54
Mary of Bethany and Judas	John 12:1–8

---

<sup>354</sup> For a brief bibliography of those who have worked on this from the 70s to the present, see Conway, "Gender Matters in John," 78 n3.

Jesus' mother and the beloved disciple	John 19:25–27
Mary of Magdala and Thomas	John 20:11–18 and John 20:24–29

These six Johannine pairs are not short, verbal parallels like those in Q; rather, they involve the juxtaposition of a male example and a female example on a much broader scale within the gospel, at the level of plot. Nevertheless, they attest to the presence of a juxtaposition of male and female genders of which the author/editor was undoubtedly cognisant. In my view, this aspect of John's Gospel is an independent continuation of the same pairs tradition that stands behind Q, albeit at a broader narrative level, rather than in fictional protagonists of short parables.

Colleen Conway has done extensive work on the pairing of men and women in the plot of the fourth gospel<sup>355</sup> and agrees with previous scholars that there is indeed a “consciousness of gender identity” in the gospel.<sup>356</sup> Conway is consciously going against previous scholarship on Johannine women when she concludes that, although the gospel is indeed conscious of gender and does offer an array of female participants, the message is not one of “a genuine discipleship of equals” about which feminist theologians should necessarily rejoice unequivocally, as suggested by Beirne. She writes: “in the Gospel of John, women appear free from traditional gender categories in the social realm, but the customary relationship between male and female is reinscribed in the spiritual realm.”<sup>357</sup> Conway concludes that, while there is no question that

---

<sup>355</sup> See her *Men and Women in the Fourth Gospel: Gender and Johannine Characterization* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1999) and “Gender Matters,” 79–103.

<sup>356</sup> Conway, “Gender Matters,” 80.

<sup>357</sup> Conway, “Gender Matters,” 102.

gender is actively employed in the construction of meaning in the Johannine narrative, that meaning is ambiguous and multifaceted.<sup>358</sup>

Conway's ambivalent reading stands in contrast to that of another scholar who has also demonstrated the existence of gendered parallels at the level of narrative in John: Margaret Beirne.<sup>359</sup> Beirne, who also describes this literary element as "gendered pairs," identifies the same six deliberate male/female pairings in John about which Conway and others write. Beirne, however, considers these six Johannine gendered pairs to be John's continuation of the earlier gender pairing that she perceives as a Lukan convention (as is common among Lukan scholars who do not give much thought to Q). Unlike Conway, Beirne interprets this Johannine attempt to balance both genders in the narrative as a way of modelling a "discipleship of equals," as the title of her work indicates with no uncertainty: *Women and Men in the Fourth Gospel: A Genuine Discipleship of Equals*. Additionally, Beirne highlights this as a significant part of the Johannine author's project:

The six nominated 'gender pairs' of the fourth gospel are located in literary arrangements suggestive of a balancing of gender and are contextualised with the Johannine Jesus encompassing the major dimensions of the Gospel's theological purpose.<sup>360</sup>

While the conclusions of Beirne and Conway differ markedly in terms of their ramifications for women both ancient and modern, they agree completely in one respect: the fourth gospel contains a crafted pairing of masculine and feminine at the literary level, which was deliberate on the part of the author for the purposes of acknowledging female audience

---

<sup>358</sup> Conway, "Gender Matters," 103.

<sup>359</sup> Beirne, *Women and Men in the Fourth Gospel*.

<sup>360</sup> Beirne, *Women and Men in the Fourth Gospel*, 41.

members. This latter point will become significant for my argument regarding the origins of Q's gender pairs, which I discuss in the conclusion to this chapter.

## Mark's Gospel and Gender Pairs

In addition to the case of Johannine gendered pairing, there is also an instance of a Markan gendered parallel parable pair (Mark 2:21–22 and parallels)—the parables of the Patch and the Wine.<sup>361</sup> This pair, which made its way into Luke and Matthew via Mark rather than Q,<sup>362</sup> juxtaposes a patch of unshrunk cloth in the first part with new wine in the second. Its possible connection to gender was first noted by Denis Fricker in the context of his discussion of gendered pairing in Q.<sup>363</sup> The verses in question read:

No one sews a piece of unshrunk cloth on an old cloak; otherwise, the patch pulls away from it, the new from the old, and a worse tear is made. And no one puts new wine into old wineskins; otherwise, the wine will burst the skins, and the wine is lost, and so are the skins (Mark 2:21–22).

In the first two parallel lines, a patch that has not been prepared by shrinking will result in the loss of both patch and cloak; in the second parallel lines, wine that is put into old wineskins at too early a stage in its process will result in the loss of both wine and skins.<sup>364</sup> At first glance, while this is clearly a doubled parable, the twin lessons do not seem to refer to gender at all. Recall, however, that one version of the gender pairs in Q avoids mentioning human gender directly, but rather implies it by using day-to-day tasks associated with either men or women.

---

<sup>361</sup> This name, which has not caught on, was suggested by Alistair Kee in a 1970 article, “so there is no value judgement on the various elements”; Kee was deliberately going against all previous nomenclature in a noble effort to break free of a dominant supersessionist reading. A. Kee, “The Old Coat and the New Wine: A Parable of Repentance,” in *NovT* 12/1 (January 1970): 18.

<sup>362</sup> It is also found in Matthew 9:14–17 and Luke 5:33–39, and appears in saying 47 of the *Gospel of Thomas*. It is not included in the critical edition of Q.

<sup>363</sup> Fricker, *Quand Jésus parle au Masculin-Féminin*, Chapter 7.

<sup>364</sup> Kee, “The Old Coat and the New Wine,” 20–21.

With this type of gender pair in mind, the similarity between the Q pairs and this Markan parallel is obvious; Mark 2:21–22 is a gendered pair, as sewing can be connected with the female realm<sup>365</sup> and wine-making with the male realm.<sup>366</sup> It would seem that the Gospel of Mark contains a gender pair much like those seen in Q.

If Mark 2:21–22 indeed constitutes a gendered parallel pair, then the fact that such a pair exists within the a text which approximately contemporaneous with yet independent text of Q, begins to build a case that these pairs are an innovation which must go back to a figure or group preceding both Mark and Q—namely, Jesus of Nazareth. The appearance of various types of gendered pairing in three independent texts—John, Mark, and the Luke/Matthew/Q sayings material strongly suggests that the pairs originated with a stratum of the Jesus movement prior to their two earliest pieces of literary evidence, Mark and Q, and thus with the historical Jesus. This final section will examine the afterlives of the pairs in light of some of the criteria for authenticity for historical Jesus research.

### *Conclusion: Gender Pairing and the Historical Jesus*

As I have shown earlier in this chapter, there are no cases outside Q in the early Jewish and Hellenistic literature previous where literary pairs expressly crafted with human gender balance

---

<sup>365</sup> “The control of the shuttles and all kinds of wool-work” is said to be relegated completely to women in Plato, *Laws* 805d–806a. Xenophon sees a knowledge of spinning and “making a cloak” to be the absolute basic minimum training that a wife should come equipped with *Oikonomikos* 7.5–6.

<sup>366</sup> Viticulture is so important in the ancient Mediterranean that it is said to make up a third of the “Mediterranean Triad” of wheat, olive oil, and wine. See C. Renfrew, *The Emergence of Civilisation: The Cyclades and the Aegean in The Third Millennium BC* (Oxford: Oxbow, 1972), 280. Although several elite Roman feminine names have been found reported as managers and owners of viticultural enterprises (Suzanne Dixon, *Reading Roman Women* [London: Duckworth, 2001], 97), it is almost certain that the “grittiest work of the vintage” was done by (male) contract labour. D. L. Thurmond, *A Handbook of Food Processing in Classical Rome: For Her Bounty no Winter* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 111.

occur. There are, however, cases in the early Christian literature after Q. What these later cases have in common with Q is that they show either discomfort with the gender pairing tendency and work to mute its gender-levelling rhetoric (Luke/Acts), and/or they function as independent attestations to this literary pairing device, and to early Jesus material (John/Mark). Together, these data work to reinforce the argument that the gender pairs are innovations of the historical Jesus.

## Multiple Attestation

The appearances of gender pairs (of various sorts) in Mark and John in addition to Q represent three separate literary traditions: the Q/Matthew/Luke complex, the one small instance in Gospel of Mark, and at the narrative level in the Gospel of John.<sup>367</sup> These appearances strengthen the argument that the pairs originated with Jesus of Nazareth, according to the criterion of multiple attestation. This criterion for historical Jesus research has recently been succinctly defined by John P. Meier as follows: “The criterion of *multiple attestation* focuses on sayings or deeds of Jesus witnessed (i) in more than one independent literary source (e.g., Mark, Q, Paul, or John) and/or (ii) in more than one literary form or genre.”<sup>368</sup> While the practice of relying on criteria of authenticity has waned in some circles, and important work is being done on the role not only of texts but of orality and memory in developing traditions,<sup>369</sup> it is still of note that a rhetorical technique which I have shown to have originated with Jesus seems to have

---

<sup>367</sup> For an intriguing argument that John and Mark, although independent from one another, had access to an earlier shared gospel tradition relating to the genre of aretalogical biography, see Wills, *The Quest for the Historical Gospel*.

<sup>368</sup> Meier, *A Marginal Jew, Volume 4*, 15.

<sup>369</sup> See, e.g., R. Horsley with J.A. Draper, *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q*. See also Rafael Rodriguez, *Structuring Early Christian Memory* (LNTS 407; London: T&T Clark, 2010).

echoes of various sorts in many of the first-century texts that are used most often by scholars to investigate the historical Jesus.

Given the Johannine use of narrative gender pairing, John's Gospel constitutes an early Christian text without direct literary dependence on Q<sup>370</sup> which displays a clear interest in presenting a text that balances genders at the literary level. While Conway interprets this balance in a more negative light, and Beirne in a more positive one, both clearly identify a strong tendency in John's narrative to use parallel male and female characters. What is important for the purposes of this section is that an early Christian witness independent from Q is carrying on the tradition of gendered pairing, although at a broader narrative level. Therefore, John serves as an independent witness to an attention to a qualified gender equality that, while it does not serve as an indicator of what was going on within Q and around the creation of Q, does connect disparate early Jesus movements together by the cord of deliberately gender-balanced language and (at least according to Beirne) an interest in women's intellectual and religious agency. The presence of this tendency in both Johannine circles and in pre-synoptic Q circles strengthens the likelihood that their shared ancestor, Jesus of Nazareth,<sup>371</sup> had a penchant for gendered pairing. Add to this the gendered pair in Mark 2:21–22, and the likelihood increases all the more.

According to long-established methods of basic Historical Jesus Research, such a situation (i.e. of multiple attestation, especially from different genres) indicates that the trend predates the

---

<sup>370</sup> For full and convincing arguments for the literary independence of John from the Synoptic Gospels, see R. E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (2 vols: New York: Doubleday, 1994); Meier, *A Marginal Jew*, volumes 1 through 4, *passim*; and D. M. Smith, *John among the Gospels* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2001), esp. 195–241.

<sup>371</sup> For an example of the recently renewed appreciation for the Gospel of John as a source for historical Jesus research and not only a source for early Christianity, see R. Horsley and T. Thatcher, *John, Jesus, and the Renewal of Israel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013). The establishment of a "John, Jesus, and History" group of the Society of Biblical Literature has resulted in the following two volumes so far: P. N. Anderson, F. Just, and T. Thatcher, eds., *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 1: Critical Appraisals of Critical Views* (Atlanta: SBL, 2007) and *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 2: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel* (Atlanta: SBL, 2009).

earliest of the traditions; that is, gender pairs predate Q and Mark. In other words, since: (1) Q and Mark are among some of the earliest Christian documents; and (2) they share an element that is unique to them; and (3) this element is echoed in a later but literarily independent early Christian source (John), and kept by Luke and Matthew although they were compelled to modify it; then (4) it is highly plausible that this shared element, which does not have any identifiable roots in either early Jewish or Hellenistic literature, can be traced to the historical Jesus. Indeed, such assumptions are standard practice in Historical Jesus Research.<sup>372</sup>

Therefore, this concept of embedding parallel gender pairs within narrative, addressing both male and female audience members with an identical intellectual message, and thus demonstrating to both male and female audience members their intrinsic value to the movement, can be traced back to Jesus of Nazareth using that most basic of precepts of Historical Jesus Research: multiple attestation. Gendered pairs occur within the Q/Luke/Matthew complex, within Mark 2:21–22, and within John’s Gospel; there are three separate witnesses from the first-century Jesus movement that point to the didactic use of parallel gender pairs. This indicates that the notion originated at some point prior to the earliest witness, which is Q. Obviously, not much, if any, data for the early Jesus movement can be said to predate Q; to state things in the most cautious way possible, Q is connected with some of Jesus’ earliest followers, if not directly with Jesus.

## Embarrassment

---

<sup>372</sup> See S. Porter, *The Criteria for Authenticity in Historical Jesus Research: Previous Discussion and New Proposals* (JSNTSup 191; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000) for a thorough discussion of the current state of criteria for historical Jesus research as well as a history of past issues in the development of the criteria.



The criterion of embarrassment<sup>373</sup> strengthens the connection of the pairs with Jesus, given the ways in which Luke/Acts and Matthew have been demonstrated to frame, avoid, or modify the raw form of the gender pairs with ambivalence and discomfort. They take the parables over, but in dropping one half of a pair or in inserting them in a narrative frame that shifts their focus or meaning, they draw attention away from the gender-levelling function of the rhetorical units at their Q stage. This chapter's earlier examination of the pairs as used by Luke and Matthew, when compared with the pairs on their own in Q, reinforces the likelihood of their authenticity as Jesus-sayings, since they meet the criterion of embarrassment, considering the discomfort with which they are sometimes incorporated into the works of Matthew and Luke. This may mean that the gender pairs had already been established as authentic and useful in the communities, prior to Matthew and Luke's Gospels, strongly indicating their use by Jesus of Nazareth.

## Dissimilarity

In addition to the confirmations of authenticity due to multiple attestation and due to embarrassment, it has also been established herein that the gender pairs in Q represent an unprecedented innovation in Greco-Roman Jewish antiquity. The innovative nature of the pairs brings another criterion of authenticity into play: the criterion of dissimilarity. As is

---

<sup>373</sup> The criterion of embarrassment was added to the arsenal of Historical Jesus researchers in the 1950s, and states that an author is not likely to include material that makes his or her own ideology or group look bad in the eyes of the reader, and thus, if early Christian authors included Jesus material that was "embarrassing" to them—such as the ignominious manner in which their leader suffered death, then such material is flagged as potentially more likely to be authentic. See Porter, *The Criteria for Authenticity for Historical Jesus Research*.

demonstrated in the earlier part of this chapter, the gendered pairs lack any literary ancestors in the Hellenistic world and the Second-Temple Period.

According to this criterion, also sometimes referred to as the “criterion of discontinuity,” the “material which can be shown to be dissimilar to characteristic emphases both of ancient Judaism and of the early Church”<sup>374</sup> is flagged as potentially more likely to be authentic.<sup>375</sup> In other words, if something placed in the mouth of Jesus cannot be traced to previous expressions of Judaism, nor to agendas of the later Christian Church, then the possibility that they are indeed authentic individual teachings of the teacher himself is heightened. Given the gender parallel pairs’ absence from previous literature, which contributes to the argument that they are an innovation, and given the ways in which the pairs are altered in literature after Q, I argue the criterion of dissimilarity applies to the gender pairs in Q’s Jesus sayings material too. A lack of literary precedent prior to Q, along with the preponderance of modifications made to the gender pairs in early Christian traditions (e.g. in Matthew and in Luke/Acts), work together to distinguish the Q pair from other literary examples of Judaism and Christianity both before and after, and thus to establish Jesus or his earliest stratum of followers as their place of origin.

## Conclusion

---

<sup>374</sup> N. Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1967), 39. John Meier, who uses the term “Discontinuity,” writes that this criterion “focuses on words or deeds of Jesus that cannot be derived either from the Judaism(s) of Jesus’ time or from the early church.” Meier, *A Marginal Jew, Volume 4*, 15.

<sup>375</sup> While this criterion has rightly been criticised (see G. S. Oegema, *Apocalyptic Interpretation of the Bible* [New York: T&T Clark, 2012], esp. pp. 78–79) because its unbalanced use could lead to a reconstruction of the historical Jesus that is unrealistically dissimilar to the varieties of Judaism in and around the first century, I do advocate its use in conjunction with various other criteria (such as the criterion of embarrassment, of similarity, and of multiple attestation), which work together to avoid the recreation of an overly anomalous Jesus.

The gendered parable pairs of Q seem to have been an innovation of the earliest Jesus movement. Perhaps Jesus of Nazareth coined the convention himself. Such pairs do not occur before him, yet they do occur in multiple sources immediately after him that are connected to him. They have been modified by some of these sources in a way that reflects embarrassment or discomfort.

The consequences of this more solid connection between Jesus and the gender pairs *as they appear in Q* make the findings of this thesis all the more poignant and relevant. The “Discipleship of Equals” model need not be completely discarded along with all of the eminently discardable elements of Christian feminist scholarship which sacrifice historical caution and malign early Judaism in their clamour to redeem Christian origins from androcentrism and kyriarchy.<sup>376</sup> That said, it must be modified: the gender pairings in Q, bolstered by gendered pairing in Mark and John, indicate that there was innovation within Galilean Judaism toward a precisely limited gender equality, that is, a discipleship of intellectual, spiritual, and religious—but not social—equals. This circumscribed gender levelling was made possible by the surrounding context of expanded options for women’s group membership already occurring in the Late Republic, and did not arise as a feminist Christian phoenix out of the ashes of so-called hopelessly patriarchal Judaism. It was quickly met with some resistance and modification, even as it was incorporated into developing Christian traditions.

The relative importance of this interest in the equal religious treatment of wo/men in the sayings of Jesus of Nazareth, when placed in juxtaposition with women’s lessened importance and/or the tension Q’s interest in women causes in other early Christian texts, and with the Q

---

<sup>376</sup> See the discussion of A.-J. Levine and bathwater in the section entitled “The Significance of Q for Women’s History” of my Introduction.

innovation's systematic rejection in Christian texts of the mid-second century and beyond,<sup>377</sup> highlights the rapid demise of gender pairs following the loss of their main innovator. In fact, the search for a foil against which to sharply contrast this gender-levelling in the early Jesus movements would do better to focus on its reception and eventual near-obliteration by early Christianity than on the Hellenistic and Jewish contexts from which it emerged. These should be the next steps for pairs scholars, as the next and final chapter will suggest.

---

<sup>377</sup> The systematic misogyny of the Church Fathers and the programmatic diminishment of the role of women in early Christianity will be covered in the next and final chapter.

## Conclusion

Those who work on Q have generally agreed that it should play a key role in our understanding of Christian origins.<sup>378</sup> The present project shows that there is one particular element in Q—its innovative technique of pairing gendered parallel parables—that should play a role in our understanding of where women fit into those origins. While we have been making use of Q for the former task for a century, it is high time we shift our focus to the latter task. As Turid Seim asserts in her seminal work on the gender pairs in Luke: “In order to combat the massive process that has rendered women invisible, it is an essential task to make them visible again in text and history.”<sup>379</sup> So often, however, we lack the necessary information to uncover ancient women; ancient data that could make women visible have been preserved only through thickly androcentric perspectives, or have simply not been preserved at all. With Q, though, the evidence has been there before our eyes for a hundred years; it has been our inattention to feminist questions that have obscured what these data can tell us about early Jewish women in first-century Galilee and beyond. William Arnal has noted that there are *two* systemic means by which the history of women in antiquity has been obscured: “Women have been systematically effaced from the historical record by androcentric source materials, and by androcentric historical readings of those sources.”<sup>380</sup> There is nothing that we as historians can do to change the fact that our source materials are male-centred. What is lost is lost forever. That said, there *is*

---

<sup>378</sup> Kloppenborg states that Q has come to “make a real difference in how Christian origins are imagined.” *Q: The Earliest Gospel*, vii.

<sup>379</sup> Seim, *The Double Message*, 8.

<sup>380</sup> Arnal, “Gendered Couplets in Q,” 75.

a great deal we can do about our own androcentric readings of the material that is extant. Male-centred readings have hitherto failed to employ Q to its fullest extent in terms of understanding gender in the early Jesus movement.

Perhaps in a majority of cases, shining the light of woman-centred approaches onto ancient androcentric data only serves to reinforce the paucity of information about ancient women, and to elucidate in greater detail the well-known patriarchal and kyriocentric systems of oppression and inequality. In the case of Q, however, as my research shows, women-centred approaches can instead uncover areas where it has been modern oversights and assumptions, rather than the evidence itself, that have served to obscure wo/men's past.<sup>381</sup> Not only androcentric data, but also modern androcentric scholarly interests, have blurred our vision of women's role in Jesus' sayings material.

Androcentric interpretive strategies and concerns have resulted in a lack of attention, for the better part of a century, to Q's important information about first-century women and their place in the earliest stratum of Jesus material. My choice to highlight gender as an interpretive lens for Q is guided not only by modern questions, but also by the ancient data; binary gender is an unmistakable focus of the Q pairs. While it is best practice to be vigilant about bringing questions about gender to antique evidence in an anachronistic way, as some early feminist readings may have done in overhasty enthusiasm, Q is unquestionably a text that presents—as

---

<sup>381</sup> The example *par excellence* of the extent to which androcentric readings and readers can completely misinterpret plain and plentiful data is Bernadette Brooten's work on female leaders in ancient synagogues (Brooten, *Women Leaden in the Ancient Synagogue*). Arnal uses Brooten to illustrate how androcentric interpretation can stand in blatant contradiction to ancient data: "A case in point is Bernadette Brooten's persuasive argument that the ancient Jewish synagogue (although far from promoting the equality of men and women) was not devoid of important female members and participants. Most traditional scholarship, however, has argued the general exclusion of women from the synagogue and, indeed, from any important role in Hellenistic and Roman Judaism. [...] The evidence for women taking on significant roles in early Judaism has either been ignored or dismissed by (mostly male) scholars." Arnal, "Gendered Couplets in Q," 75, n.1.

part of both its form and its content—an interest in gender in its own right. Q clearly works to create and/or mirror a parity of sorts between men and women. A series of verbally parallel parable pairs where the one variable is a gendered male/female binary flags to the reader that gender is not only present in the text, but is somehow one of its foci. Furthermore, the repetition of this and similar devices throughout Q, Matthew, Luke, Mark to a lesser degree, and John to a large degree, bears witness to an interest in gender on the part of several independent artefacts from the earliest stratum of the Jesus movement. There is thus solid footing from which to explore an interest in gender on the part of Jesus of Nazareth.

Only when the sayings of Jesus are studied with the question of women at the forefront is their own deliberate and repeated attention to gender revealed. When the gendered pairs are taken in their broader literary context, the level to which they are an innovation in antiquity is revealed as well. The task of not merely passing judgement upon this specific attention to gender in Q, nor of extrapolating too boldly or wishfully from it, but rather of describing it in detail,<sup>382</sup> works toward discerning the role of women in and around Q, and even toward understanding the teachings of the historical Jesus toward women.

For this reason, this project is significant whether one goes so far as to stratify Q in the footsteps of Kloppenborg, or doubts its very existence in the footsteps of Goodacre. As Schottroff writes of her work on women in the Q pairs, “the results should be equally useful for those who presume a distinction between Q1 and Q2 and for those who doubt the very existence of Q. They all may read the following discussion as a description of some central elements of the

---

<sup>382</sup> In the words of Tal Ilan: “The terms ‘improvement’ and ‘deterioration’ are not relevant to the question of women’s status and condition [...] the role of the historian is to *describe* changes and developments without making value judgements.” *Jewish Women in Greco-Roman Palestine: An Inquiry into Image and Status* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 6. Further, according to Broton, “how could one evaluate the complex historical phenomena of Jewish women’s lives with the categories ‘positive,’ ‘ambivalent,’ and ‘negative’? Even as categories for describing attitudes, this is not adequate.” “Early Christian Women and their Cultural Context,” 75–76.

Jesus movement or of the message of Jesus.”<sup>383</sup> The present project is the first book-length work in English to treat the parallel parable pairs of Q with a view to the ways in which these pairs not only uncover some realities of women in the earliest Jesus movements, but also something of Jesus of Nazareth’s attitude toward them. Its findings concur with those of the French monograph to examine the pairs for this purpose, wherein Denis Fricker concludes that a pairing of female figures with male figures is a process undertaken by Jesus himself<sup>384</sup> and that the pairs “seem to have been an original and remarkable mode of expression in the discourse of the historical Jesus.”<sup>385</sup> However, my findings diverge from Fricker’s where he finds the pairs “firmly rooted in Semitic poetry” and “their argumentation ... in Hellenistic rhetoric.”<sup>386</sup> I assert instead that the pairs achieve clear rhetorical uniqueness.

This project sides with Arnal, Levine, and Schottroff that the textual milieu in which the pairs are transmitted to us (i.e. the sayings source Q) is indeed androcentric, and with Batten, Corley, and Levine that there was, in the Late Republic, a relaxing of restrictions for some women that did not originate with Christianity over and against Judaism and Hellenism. However, *contra* Arnal and Levine, along with Schottroff and Schüssler Fiorenza, I read Q against the androcentric grain and argue that the gender pairs are indeed solid evidence that women and men were qualified equals in the oldest stratum of the Jesus movements in a limited but unique way.

My distinct contributions to the discussion are twofold:

---

<sup>383</sup> L. Schottroff, “The Sayings Source Q,” 511.

<sup>384</sup> Fricker, *Quand Jésus Parle au Masculin-Féminin*, 377.

<sup>385</sup> Fricker, *Quand Jésus Parle au Masculin-Féminin*, 380. Translation mine.

<sup>386</sup> Fricker, *Quand Jésus Parle au Masculin-Féminin*, 79. Translation mine.



First, I have described *in which ways* the pairs reveal men and women to be equal, and in which ways they reinforce gender inequalities. Namely, the gender pairs view men and women as identical in a realm I have described using the cluster of terms “spiritual,” “religious,” and “intellectual,” while retaining gendered roles that are more or less status quo in a realm we might call “social.” Even socially gendered roles, though, are disrupted to some degree in Q when we take into account those reconstructions of the Q people which reveal itinerant prophecy as a possibility for both male and female community members, and the encouragement of a breakdown of patriarchal familial boundaries when these boundaries clash with the group’s *basileia* message. This parsing of when and in what ways women and men are equal in Q—and when and in what ways they are not—is a way through the controversy found in the initial scholarship on women and the pairs. Rather than a question of *whether or not* Q challenges the patriarchy/kyriarchy of the day, it is a question of determining *in which ways* Q presents challenges to patriarchy, and in which ways it does not.

Secondly, I have corroborated Fricker’s findings that the pairs are an innovation, and one at the earliest stratum of the Jesus movement. I have done so without resorting to anti-Jewish readings that pit the Jesus movement against earlier and adjacent forms of early Judaism in a false dichotomy. Rather, I have worked with Batten and Corley to incorporate current research on the broader status of women from the fall of the Greek Republic to the rise of the Roman Empire, placing the women of the Jesus movement in context with women in other movements, acknowledging continuities as well as highlighting the literary uniqueness of the pairs.

What the parable pairs of Q, in comparative literary context, can tell us about women in the earliest communities around Jesus shows that we are far from finished making adequate use of the data available to us. If Q is, in James Robinson’s provocative words, “The Gospel of

Jesus,”<sup>387</sup> then it is Jesus’ gospel, rather than the canonical Gospels, in which we find showcased one of the most remarkable treatments of women as spiritually and intellectually equal to men in all of Greco-Romany antiquity. At the same time, careful analysis of the text also reveals that the “Gospel of Jesus” cannot, for a historian, be used as evidence for egalitarianism or feminism by modern definition. Whether it can do so for a theologian is, of course, another matter.

### *Future Directions*

The unique brand of intellectual/spiritual/religious equality conferred upon the women in Jesus of Nazareth’s movement through the gendered pairs did not survive long in the decades after his crucifixion.<sup>388</sup> Counter-trends which actively sought to dictate what women should and should not do in the Jesus movement began as early as the Pauline epistles<sup>389</sup> and the Gospel of Luke.<sup>390</sup> By the time of the early Church Fathers, some of these counter-trends had developed in directions that denigrated womanhood quite drastically, in contrast with the rhetorical work of the gender pairs.<sup>391</sup> While the patristic period cannot be painted with a too-generalised brush,<sup>392</sup> women as a group are often criticised by patristic authors as useless except for procreative

---

<sup>387</sup> See J. Robinson, *The Gospel of Jesus: In Search of the Original Good News* (New York: HarperCollins, 2005).

<sup>388</sup> See H. Kung’s *Women in Christianity* (London: Continuum, 2001), one of the many monographs in which it is argued that, while active roles—including leadership roles—for women seemed to pose no problem for Jesus and the earliest Christians, they were viewed as increasingly problematic as Christianity developed.

<sup>389</sup> See H. C. Kee, who notes a shift away from gender-levelling ethics in the historical Jesus towards a more ambivalent role for women in the authentic letters of Paul, to a definitively confining and submissive role for women by the time of the disputed Paulines in “The Changing Role of Women in the Early Christian World,” *Theology Today* 49/2 (July 1992): 225–238, esp 231–232.

<sup>390</sup> As is argued with concision and clarity in Schaberg and Ringe, “Gospel of Luke.”

<sup>391</sup> See Beverley Clack, ed., *Misogyny in the Western Philosophical Tradition: A Reader* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 49–94.

<sup>392</sup> For her seminal works on the Patristic period which push past the misogyny to uncover evidence for more complex women’s roles, see Elizabeth Clark’s important volumes, *Jerome, Chrysostom, and Friends: Essays and Translations* (New York: Mellen, 1979) and *Ascetic Piety and Women’s Faith: Essays on Late Ancient Christianity* (Lewiston: Mellen, 1986).

purposes<sup>393</sup> (which are nonetheless viewed as disgusting),<sup>394</sup> are encouraged to somehow shed their womanhood,<sup>395</sup> and are even blamed as a group for Jesus' death.<sup>396</sup> This loss of something seemingly special to the earliest followers of Jesus raises the question: what happened? Alicia Batten frames the issue in her article on the gender pairs:

as is commonly known, Christianity later became a patriarchal religion despite these exciting beginnings. Hence, continuing to study its development in light of larger forces will perhaps better enable us to understand why Christianity appears so quickly to have forgotten some of its own origins.<sup>397</sup>

Among the “larger forces” Batten flags as important for inclusion in future study if we wish to understand what happened to destroy “these exciting beginnings,” is the Augustan marital and moral reform programme.<sup>398</sup> I agree; the success of the Augustan reforms would be a fruitful context in which to investigate why the limited freedoms enjoyed by the women in and around Q do not seem to have continued. This move in early Christianity toward more typical gender relations does correspond roughly to the increase in Gentile membership in the movement—a demographic which eventually came to dominate the Church. Perhaps it could be investigated

---

<sup>393</sup> “I don't see what sort of help woman was created to provide man with, if one excludes the purpose of procreation. If woman was not given to man for help in bearing children, for what help could she be? To till the earth together? If help were needed for that, man would have been a better help for man. The same goes for comfort in solitude. How much more pleasure is it for life and conversation when two friends live together than when a man and a woman cohabitate?” Augustine, *De genesi ad litteram*, 9, 5–9.

<sup>394</sup> “I consider that nothing so casts down the manly mind from its heights as the fondling of women, and those bodily contacts which belong to the married state.” Augustine, *Soliloq.* 1.10. “The whole of her bodily beauty is nothing less than phlegm, blood, bile, rheum, and the fluid of digested food. [...] If you consider what is stored up behind those lovely eyes, the angle of the nose, the mouth and cheeks you will agree that the well-proportioned body is merely a whitened sepulchre, total inner filth.” Chrysostom, *Exhortation to the Fallen Theodore*, 14.

<sup>395</sup> “As long as a woman is for birth and children she is different from man as body is from soul. But when she wishes to serve Christ more than the world, then she will cease to be a woman, and will be called man.” Jerome, *Commentary on Ephesians*, 3.5.

<sup>396</sup> E.g. “The curse God pronounced on your sex still weighs on the world. [...] You are the devil's gateway. [...] You are the first that deserted the divine laws. All too easily you destroyed the image of God, Adam. Because you deserved death, it was the son of God who had to die.” Tertullian, *On the Apparel of Women* 1.1.

<sup>397</sup> Batten, “More Queries for Q,” 49.

<sup>398</sup> “Augustus' laws on marriage are a significant indication that women were becoming too free.” Batten, “More Queries for Q,” 49.

whether urban Gentiles were more firmly entrenched in upper-class Roman gender norms than were the rural Jewish peasants at the movement's origins. Perhaps it is possible that the shifts within the Jesus movement from gender-equality to gender-hierarchy were not coincidental, but rather were linked to the shift from majority Jewish to majority Gentile membership, and thus more exposed to the lasting influence of the highly successful moral reforms of Augustus, whose programmatic policies and portrayals of the proper place of women were embraced and enlarged throughout the Roman Empire long after his death<sup>399</sup>—including by the ultimately influential Paul of Tarsus. While it is not within the scope of this project—nor perhaps within the scope of the possible—to explain the demise of the gendered innovations that are revealed in the Q gender pairs, future scholarship might do well to take Augustan moral and marital reforms, and their success upon the Gentile population that eventually overtook Christianity, as a possible starting point.

Additionally, this project brings into focus the need for text-critical attention to be paid to the gender pairs when the next critical edition of Q is being prepared. Recent feminist researchers on the Lukan use of the pairs (at least those who take Q into account as a text) are a sharp indicator that the pairs that have often been classified as original to Luke; this is because of a perceived tendency that Luke is more inclusive of women. Given, the present study, the “Lukan pairs” now seem far more likely to have originated in Q too, despite their absence from Matthew.

---

<sup>399</sup> M. Beard, J. North, and S. Price cover the Augustan reforms and their aftermath in *Religions of Rome, Volume 1: A History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 186–210, and J. M. G. Barclay deals with Jewish interactions with and responses to the reforms in *Negotiating Diaspora: Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire* (London: T&T Clark, 2004). See also, on the widespread and long-lasting influence of Augustus via “social media,” Paul Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (transl. Alan Shapiro; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1988).

Furthermore, it is worth investigating why the gender pairs appear in more than one of Kloppenborg's proposed strata.<sup>400</sup> If Q can be divided into two main formational periods, and gender pairs occur in *both* of them, then this makes them—and their repercussions for women—all the more central to those early Jesus communities. Conversely, perhaps the presence of the pairs across both strata mitigates the likelihood of stratification.<sup>401</sup>

These two questions, of why the gender pairs were weakened as Christianity solidified, and what the gender pairs can teach us text-critically about Q, will continue to keep Q and its gendered pairs at the fore as an important source of data for the development of the varieties of early Judaism and the development of Christian origins.

---

<sup>400</sup> See Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*.

<sup>401</sup> I explore this question in an article that is in preparation.

## Sources Cited

- Achtemeier, Elizabeth. "The Impossible Possibility: Evaluating the Feminist Approach to Bible and Theology." *Interpretation* 42 (1988): 45–57.
- Adler, William. "The Pseudepigrapha in the Early Church." Pages 211–228 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002.
- Alvanoudi, Angeliki. *Grammatical Gender in Interaction: Cultural and Cognitive Aspects*. Brill's Studies in Language, Cognition, and Culture 9. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Anderson, John M. *Morphology, Paradigms, and Periphrases*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Anderson, Paul N., Felix Just, and Tom Thatcher, eds. *John, Jesus, and History Volume 1: Critical Appraisals of Critical Views*. Atlanta: SBL, 2007.
- Anderson, Paul N., Felix Just, and Tom Thatcher, eds. *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 2: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel*. Atlanta: SBL, 2009.
- Arnal, William E. "Gendered Couplets in Q and Legal Formulations: From Rhetoric to Social History," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116/1 (1997): 75–94.
- Arnal, William E. *Jesus and the Village Scribes: Galilean Conflicts and the Setting of Q*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
- Barclay, John M. G. *Negotiating Diaspora: Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Baron, Dennis E. *Grammar and Gender*. New Haven: Yale, 1986.
- Barrera, Julio Treballe. *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible: An Introduction to the History of the Bible*. Translated from the Spanish by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Batten, Alicia. "More Queries for Q: Women and Christian Origins." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 24/2 (June 1, 1994): 44–51.
- Bauckham, Richard. *Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Bazzana, G. B. *Kingdom of Bureaucracy: The Political Theology of Village Scribes in the Sayings Gospel Q*. Leuven: Peeters, 2015.
- Beard, Mary, John North, and Simon Price. *Religions of Rome, Volume 1: A History*. York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Beavis, Mary Ann. "Christian Origins, Egalitarianism, and Utopia." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 23/2 (Fall 2007): 27–49.

- Beavis, Mary Ann. "Parable and Fable," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 52 (1990): 473–498.
- Beirne, Margaret M. *Women and Men in the Fourth Gospel: A Genuine Discipleship of Equals*. London: Sheffield Academic, 2003.
- Berlin, Adele. "Grammatical Aspects of Biblical Parallelism." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 50 (1979): 17–43.
- Besançon Spencer, Aida. "Jesus' Treatment of Women in the Gospels." Pages 126–141 in *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without Hierarchy*. Edited by Ronald W. Pierce and Rebecca Merrill Groothuis. Leicester: Apollos, 2005.
- Binz, Stephen J. *Women and the Gospels: Friends and Disciples of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011.
- Boring, Eugene. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012.
- Boyarín, Daniel. *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.
- Brenner, Athalya. "Introduction." Pages 15–30 in *Feminist Companion to the Hebrew Bible in the New Testament*. Edited by Athalya Brenner. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.
- Brocke, Edna. "Do the Origins Already Contain the Malady?" Pages 349–354 in *A Feminist Companion to the Hebrew Bible in the New Testament*. Edited by Athalya Brenner. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.
- Brooten, Bernadette. "Early Christian Women and their Cultural Context: Issues of Method in Historical Reconstruction." Pages 65–91 in *Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship*. Edited by Adela Yarbro Collins. Chico: Scholars, 1985.
- Brooten, Bernadette. *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues*. Chico: Scholars, 1982.
- Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1907.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Death of the Messiah*. 2 volumes. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- Burchard, Christoph. "Joseph and Aseneth." Pages 177–248 in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 2*. Edited by James Charlesworth. Garden City: Doubleday, 1985.
- Burridge, Richard A. *Four Gospels, One Jesus?* 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Camp, Claudia. *Wisdom and the Feminine in the Book of Proverbs*. Decatur: Almond, 1985.
- Carastathis, Anna. "The Concept of Intersectionality in Feminist Theory." *Philosophy Compass* 9/5 (2014): 304–314.
- Chancey, Mark A. *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 118. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Charlesworth, James H. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 Volumes. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983–1985.

- Chesnutt, Randall. "Revelatory Experiences Attributed to Biblical Women." Pages 107–126 in *Women Like This: New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by Amy-Jill Levine. Atlanta: Scholars, 1991.
- Clack, Beverley, ed. *Misogyny in the Western Philosophical Tradition: A Reader*. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Clark, Elizabeth. *Ascetic Piety and Women's Faith: Essays on Late Ancient Christianity*. Lewiston: Mellen, 1986.
- Clark, Elizabeth. *Jerome, Chrysostom, and Friends: Essays and Translations*. New York: Mellen, 1979.
- Collins, John J. *The Bible After Babel: Historical Criticism in a Postmodern Age*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Conway, Colleen. "Gender Matters in John." Pages 79–103 in *A Feminist Companion to John: Volume II*. Edited by Amy-Jill Levine. Cleveland: Pilgrim, 2003.
- Conway, Colleen. *Men and Women in the Fourth Gospel: Gender and Johannine Characterization*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1999.
- Corley, Kathleen E. *Private Women, Public Meals: Social Conflict in the Synoptic Tradition*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993.
- Corley, Kathleen. "Jesus, Egalitarian Meals, and Q." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL. San Francisco, November 1992.
- Corley, Kathleen. *Women and the Historical Jesus: Feminist Myths of Christian Origins*. Santa Rosa: Polebridge, 2002.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Anti-Discrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory, and Anti-Racist Politics." *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 140 (1989): 139–167.
- Crossan, John Dominic. "Itinerants and Householders in the Earliest Kingdom Movement." Pages 113–129 in *Reimagining Christian Origins*. Edited by Elizabeth Castelli and Hal Taussig. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1996.
- Crossan, John Dominic. *The Essential Jesus: Original Sayings and Earliest Images*. San Francisco: Harper, 1998.
- Crossan, John Dominic. *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
- Dancy, John C. *The Divine Drama: The Old Testament as Literature*. Cambridge: Lutterworth, 2001.
- Davila, James. *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 105. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Davis, Andrew R. "The Literary Effect of Gender Discord in the Book of Ruth" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 132/3 (2013): 495–513.



- De Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex*. New York: Vintage, 1973.
- De Conick, April D. *Recovering the Original Gospel of Thomas: A History of the Gospel and Its Growth*. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Dell, Katharine. "Proverbs." Pages 895–896 in *The New Oxford Annotated Bible, New Revised Standard Version with Apocrypha*. Fully revised fourth edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Derrenbacker, Robert A. Jr. and John S. Kloppenborg. "Self-Contradiction in the IQP? A Reply to Michael Goulder." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 120/1 (Spring 2001): 57–76.
- Dobbs-Allsopp, Frederick William. "Poetry, Hebrew." Pages 550–558 in *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 4. Edited by Katharine Doob Sakenfeld. Nashville: Abingdon, 2009.
- Dowling, Elizabeth V. *Taking Away the Pound: Women, Theology, and the Parable of the Pounds in the Gospel of Luke*. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Duby, Georges and Michelle Perrot, series eds. *A History of Women in the West*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994–1996.
- Duling, Dennis C. "'Egalitarian' Ideology, Leadership, and Factional Conflict within the Matthean Group." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 27 (1997): 124–137.
- Duling, Dennis C. "Millennialism" Pages 183–205 in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*. Edited by Richard Rohrbaugh. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Jesus Remembered: Christianity in the Making, Volume 1*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Dvorsky, George and James Hughes. "Postgenderism: Beyond the Gender Binary." *Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies White Papers* (March 2008): 1–18.
- Edwards, James R. *The Hebrew Gospel and the Development of Synoptic Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Elliott, John H. "Jesus was not an Egalitarian: A Critique of an Anachronistic and Idealist Theory." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 32 (2002): 75–91.
- Evans, Craig A. *Matthew*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Fowler, H. T. "Paul, Q, and the Jerusalem Church." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 43 (1924): 9–14.
- Flender, Helmut. *Heil und Geschichte in der Theologie des Lukas*. Munich: Kaiser, 1965.
- Freyne, Sean. *Jesus, A Jewish Galilean: A New Reading of the Jesus Story*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Fricker, Denis. "La femme, la famille, et la communauté dans la source des logia." *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 79/1 (2005): 97–116.
- Fricker, Denis. *Quand Jésus Parle au Masculin-Féminin: Étude Contextuelle et Exégétique d'une Forme Littéraire Originale. Études Bibliques Nouvelle Série* 53. Paris: Gabalda, 2004.

- Funk, Robert W., Roy W. Hoover, and the Jesus Seminar. *The Five Gospels: What Did Jesus Really Say? The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus*. New York: HarperOne, 1997.
- Gamliel, Tova. "Textual Categories and Gender Images in a Women's Wailing Performance." *Social Analysis* 51/3 (2007): 23–54.
- Garnsey, Peter. *Food and Society in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Gench, Frances Taylor. *Back to the Well: Women's Encounters with Jesus in the Gospels*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004.
- Good, Deirdre. "Beyond the Canon." Pages 633–639 in *Women's Bible Commentary Twentieth Anniversary Edition: Revised and Updated*. Edited by Carol A. Newsom, Sharon H. Ringe, and Jacqueline E. Lapsley. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012.
- Goodacre, Mark. *The Case Against Q*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002.
- Goodacre, Mark. "Criticising the Criterion of Multiple Attestation: The Historical Jesus and the Question of Sources." Pages 152–172 in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*. Edited by Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne. New York: T&T Clark, 2012.
- Gravett, Sandra L. "Literature, Old Testament As." Pages 812–814 in *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Guijarro, Santiago. "Domestic Space, Family Relationships, and the Social Location of the Q People" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 27.1 (2004): 69–81.
- Guijarro, Santiago. "La Coexistence de différents sens du terme *euaggelion* aux origines du christianisme." *Revue théologique de Louvain* 45 (2014): 481–501.
- Hanson, Kenneth C. "All in the Family: Kinship in Agrarian Roman Palestine." Pages 25–46 in *The Social World of the New Testament*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey and E. C. Stewart. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2008.
- Hanson, Kenneth C. "Kinship." Pages 62–79 in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*. Edited by Richard Rohrbaugh. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Hanson, Kenneth C. "The Galilean Fishing Economy and the Jesus Tradition." *Biblical Theology Bulletin: Journal of Bible and Culture* 27 (1997): 99–111.
- Harrington, Daniel J. "The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Early Church and Today." Pages 196–210 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002.
- Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. 1<sup>st</sup> English edition. 2 volumes. London: SCM, 1974.
- Hengel, Martin. *Judentum und Hellenismus : Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2 Jh.s v.Chr.* Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1973.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture*. London: T&T Clark, 2002.

- Hoffmann, R. Joseph, ed. *Julian's Against the Galileans*. Translated by R. Joseph Hoffmann. Amherst: Prometheus Books, 2004.
- Holladay, Carl R. *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2005.
- Horsley, Richard and Tom Thatcher. *John, Jesus, and the Renewal of Israel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.
- Horsley, Richard. "The Gospel of Imperial Salvation: Introduction." Pages 10–24 in *Paul and Empire*. Edited by Richard Horsley. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1997.
- Horsley, Richard with Jonathan A. Draper. *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999.
- Houlden, Leslie. "Introduction to the New Testament." Pages 830–43 *Oxford Bible Commentary*. Edited by John Barton and John Muddiman. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Ilan, Tal. *Jewish Women in Greco-Roman Palestine: An Inquiry into Image and Status*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *Die Gleichnisse Jesu*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- Johnson-Debaufre, Melanie. *Jesus Among Her Children: Q, Eschatology, and the Construction of Christian Origins*. Harvard Theological Studies 55. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Jones, Brice. *Matthean and Lukan Special Material: A Brief Introduction with Texts in Greek and English*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2011.
- Joseph, Simon J. *Jesus, Q, and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Judaic Approach to Q*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Julicher, Adolf. *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*. Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1888.
- Kaiser, Walter C. Jr. and Moises Silva. *Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics: The Search for Meaning*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.
- Kee, Alistair. "The Old Coat and the New Wine: A Parable of Repentance." *Novum Testamentum* 12/1 (January 1970): 13–21.
- Kee, Howard Clark. "The Changing Role of Women in the Early Christian World." *Theology Today* 49/2 (July 1992): 225–238.
- Kee, Howard Clark. "The Socio-Cultural Setting of Joseph and Aseneth." *New Testament Studies* 29 (1983): 394–413.
- Kee, Howard Clark. "The Socio-Religious Setting and Aims of *Joseph and Aseneth*." Pages 183–192 in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 1976. Missoula: Scholars, 1976.
- Keith, Chris and Anthony Le Donne, editors. *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*. New York: T&T Clark, 2012.
- Kloppas, Jane. "Jesus and Women: Luke's Gospel." *Theology Today* 43/2 (1986): 192–202.
- Kloppenborg, John S., ed. *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1995.

- Kloppenborg, John S. "Discursive Practices in the Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus." Pages 149–190 in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001.
- Kloppenborg, John S. *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
- Kloppenborg, John S. *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Kloppenborg, John S. "Introduction." Pages 1–22 in *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
- Kloppenborg, John S. "The Lost Gospel of Q: The Earliest Record of Jesus' Galilean Followers." Annual Peter Craigie Memorial Lecture; University of Calgary, 2001
- Kloppenborg, John S. "On Dispensing with Q: Goodacre on the Relation of Luke to Matthew." *New Testament Studies* 49 (2003): 210–236.
- .
- Kloppenborg, John S. "Q, Bethsaida, Khorazin, and Capernaum." Pages 61–90 in *Q in Context II: Social Setting and Archaeological Background of the Sayings*. Edited by Markus Tiwald. Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2015.
- Kloppenborg, John S. *Q: The Earliest Gospel: An Introduction to the Original Stories and Sayings of Jesus*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008.
- Kloppenborg, John S. *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Concordance, and Critical Notes*. Sonoma: Polebridge, 1988.
- Kloppenborg, John S. "The Sayings Gospel Q: Recent Opinion on the People Behind the Document," *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 1 (1993): 9–34.
- Kloppenborg, John S. and Leif E. Vaage, "The Sayings Gospel Q and Method in the Study of Christian Origins." Pages 1–4 in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus. Semeia* 55. Atlanta: Scholars, 1991.
- Koester, Helmut. *History and Literature of Early Christianity, Volume 2*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000.
- Koperski, Veronica. "Is 'Luke' a Feminist or Not? Female-Male Parallels in Luke-Acts." Pages 25–48 in *Luke and his Readers: Festschrift A. Denaux*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 182. Edited by Reimund Bieringer, Gilbert Van Belle, and Jozef Verheyden. Leuven: Peeters, 2005.
- Kraemer, Ross Shepard and Mary Rose d'Angelo, eds. *Women and Christian Origins*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Kraybill, Donald. *The Upside-Down Kingdom*. 4<sup>th</sup> revised edition. Harrisonburg: Herald, 2011.
- Kung, Hans. *Women in Christianity*. London: Continuum, 2001.
- Leiman, Sid Z. *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture*. Hamden: Archon, 1976.

- LeMon, Joel M. and Brent A. Strawn, "Parallelism." Pages 502–515 in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Wisdom, Poetry, and Writings*. Edited by Tremper Longman III and Peter Enns. Downer's Grove: InterVarsity, 2008.
- Levine, Amy-Jill, ed. *A Feminist Companion to Luke*. London: Sheffield Academic, 2002.
- Levine, Amy-Jill, ed. *A Feminist Companion to Matthew*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- Levine, Amy-Jill, ed. *Women Like This: New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1991.
- Levine, Amy-Jill. "Introduction." Pages 1–14 in *A Feminist Companion to John: Volume 1*. Edited by Amy-Jill Levine. London: Sheffield Academic, 2003.
- Levine, Amy-Jill. "Matthew, Mark, and Luke: Good News or Bad?" Pages 77–98 in *Jesus, Judaism, and Christian Anti-Judaism*. Edited by Paula Fredriksen and Adele Reinhartz. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
- Levine, Amy-Jill. "Second Temple Judaism, Jesus, and Women: Yeast of Eden." Pages 302–331 in *A Feminist Companion to the Hebrew Bible in the New Testament*. Edited by Athalya Brenner. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.
- Levine, Amy-Jill. "The Word Becomes Flesh: Jesus, Gender, and Sexuality." Pages 509–523 in *The Historical Jesus in Recent Research*. Edited by James D. G. Dunn and Scot McKnight. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- Levine, Amy-Jill. "This Widow Keeps Bothering Me." Pages 124–150 in *Finding A Woman's Place: Essays in Honor of Carolyn Osiek*. Edited by David L. Balch and Jason T. Lamoreaux. Eugene: Pickwick, 2011.
- Levine, Amy-Jill. "Who's Catering the Q Affair? Feminist Observations on Q Paraenesis." *Semeia* 50 (1990): 145–61.
- Levine, Amy-Jill. "Women in the Q Communit(ies) and Traditions." Pages 150–170 in *Women and Christian Origins*. Edited by Ross Shepard Kraemer and Mary Rose D'Angelo. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Levine, Amy-Jill. *Short Stories by Jesus: The Enigmatic Parables of a Controversial Rabbi*. New York: HarperCollins, 2014.
- Lieu, Judith. "'Impregnable Ramparts and Walls of Iron': Boundary and Identity in Early 'Judaism' and 'Christianity'" *New Testament Studies* 48 (2002): 297–313.
- Lightfoot, Robert Henry. *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.
- Loader, William, ed. *The Pseudepigrapha on Sexuality: Attitudes toward Sexuality in Apocalypses, Testaments, Legends, Wisdom, and Related Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Loades, Ann. "Feminist Interpretation." Pages 81–94 in *The Cambridge Companion to Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by John Barton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Lowth, Robert. *De sacra poesi Hebraeorum praelectiones academicae (Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews)*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1753.

- Lowth, Robert. *Isaiah: A New Translation, with a Preliminary Dissertation and Notes, Critical, Philological, and Explanatory*. Boston: Pierce, 1834.
- Mack, Burton. "The Kingdom that Didn't Come: A Social History of the Q Tradents." Pages 608–635 in *SBL Seminar Papers* 27. Missoula: Scholars, 1988.
- Mack, Burton. *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1993.
- Mack, Burton. *Who Wrote the New Testament: The Making of the Christian Myth*. New York: HarperCollins, 1995.
- Malina, Bruce J. "Understanding New Testament Persons." Pages 41–61 in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*. Edited by Richard Rohrbaugh. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Martin, Dale B. *Sex and The Single Savior: Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006.
- Marzano, Annalisa. *Harvesting the Sea: The Exploitation of Marine Resources in the Roman Mediterranean*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Mason, Steve. "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 38 (2007): 457–512.
- McDonald, Lee Martin. *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon: Revised and Expanded Edition*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995.
- Meier, John P. *A Marginal Jew*. 5 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991–2015.
- Meyers, Carol, ed. *Women in Scripture: A Dictionary of Named and Unnamed Women in the Hebrew Bible, the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books, and the New Testament*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2000.
- Michaud, Jean-Paul. "Quelle(s) communautaire(s) derrière la Source Q?" Pages 577–606 in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001.
- Millard, Alan. "Literacy in the Time of Jesus." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 29 (2003): 36–45.
- Milne, Herbert John Mansfield and Theodore Cressy Skeat. *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus*. London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1938.
- Mitchell, Linda E. "Codes of Law and Laws: Ancient Greek and Roman Law." Pages 422–426 in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Women in World History*. Edited by Bonnie G. Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Moreland, Milton C. "Q and the Economics of Early Roman Galilee." Pages 561–575 in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. Edited by Andreas Lindemann. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 153. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001.
- Motschenbacher, Heiko. *Language, Gender, and Sexual Identity: Poststructuralist Perspectives*. *Studies in Language and Society* 29. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2010.
- Moxnes, Halvor. "Honor and Shame." Pages 19–40 in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*. Edited by Richard Rohrbaugh. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.

- Moxnes, Halvor. *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- Moyise, Steve. *Jesus and Scripture: Studying the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Murphy, Cullen. *The Word According to Eve*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1998.
- Neirynck, Frans. "The Reconstruction of Q and IQP / CritEd Parallels." Pages 53–148 in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. Edited by Andreas Lindemann. Leuven, Leuven University Press, 2001.
- Neyrey, Jerome. "What's Wrong with this Picture: John 4, Cultural Stereotypes of Women, and Public and Private Space." Pages 98–125 in *A Feminist Companion to John: Volume 1*. Edited by Amy-Jill Levine; London: Sheffield Academic, 2003.
- Oakman, Douglas E. "Jesus and Agrarian Palestine: The Factor of Debt." Pages 63–84 in *The Social World of the New Testament: Insights and Models*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2008.
- Oakman, Douglas E. "The Ancient Economy." Pages 126–143 in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*. Edited by Richard Rohrbaugh. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Oakman, Douglas E. "Was Jesus a Peasant? Implications for Reading the Jesus Tradition." Pages 123–140 in *The Social World of the New Testament: Insights and Methods*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2008.
- Oakman, Douglas E. *Jesus and the Economic Questions of His Day*. Lewiston: Mellen, 1986.
- O'Brien, Julia M., Editor. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible and Gender, Volume 1 ASI-MUJ*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Oegema, Gerbern S. "Non-Canonical Writings and Biblical Theology." Pages 491–512 in *The Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity, and Other Greco-Roman Religions in Antiquity*. Studien zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, Bd 2. Edited by Ian Henderson and Gerbern Oegema. Gutersloh: Gutersloher Verlagshaus, 2006.
- Oegema, Gerbern S. and Ian Henderson, eds. *The Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity, and Other Greco-Roman Religions in Antiquity*. Studien zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, Bd 2. Gutersloh: Gutersloher Verlagshaus, 2006.
- Oegema, Gerbern S. and James H. Charlesworth, eds. *The Pseudepigrapha and Christian Origins: Essays from the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas*. New York: T&T Clark, 2008.
- Oegema, Gerbern S. *Apocalyptic Interpretation of the Bible*. New York: T&T Clark, 2012.
- Ogden Bellis, Alice. *Helpmates, Harlots, and Heroes: Women's Stories in the Hebrew Bible*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007.
- Osiek, Carolyn and David L. Balch. *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.
- Oxford University Press. *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

- Parker, David C. *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Patterson, Stephen J. *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*. Sonoma: Polebridge, 1993.
- Perrin, Norman. *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*. London: SCM, 1967.
- Petersen, David L. and Kent Harold Richards. *Interpreting Hebrew Poetry*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Pilch, John J. "Are there Jews and Christians in the Bible?" *Harvard Theological Studies* 53/1 (1997): 119–125.
- Piper, Ronald A. "Jesus and the Conflict of Powers in Q: Two Q Miracle Stories." Pages 317–350 in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001.
- Plaskow, Judith. "Anti-Judaism in Christian Feminist Interpretation." Pages 7–29 in *Searching the Scriptures: A Feminist Introduction*. Edited by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza. New York: Crossroad, 1993.
- Plaskow, Judith. "Feminist Anti-Judaism and the Christian God." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 7/2 (1991): 99–108.
- Polaski, Sandra. *A Feminist Introduction to Paul*. Danvers: Chalice, 2005.
- Porter, Stanley E. *The Criteria for Authenticity in Historical Jesus Research: Previous Discussion and New Proposals*. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 191. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.
- Powell, Mark Allen, ed. *Harper Collins Bible Dictionary: Revised and Updated*. New York: HarperCollins, 2011.
- Racine, Jean-François and Madeleine Beaumont. "Three Approaches to the Position of Women in the Q Document: Hal Taussig, Luise Schottroff, and Amy-Jill Levine." Pages 99–116 in *Women also journeyed with Him: Feminist Perspectives on the Bible*. Edited by Gerald Caron. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2000.
- Raditsa, Leo Ferrero. "Augustus' Legislation Concerning Marriage, Procreation, Love Affairs and Adultery." Pages 278–339 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* 2/13. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1980.
- Redfield, Robert. *Peasant Society and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.
- Reed, Jonathan. *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus: A Re-examination of the Evidence*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000.
- Reid, Barbara E. *Choosing the Better Part? Women in the Gospel of Luke*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996.
- Reinhartz, Adele. "A Fork in the Road or a Multi-Lane Highway? New Perspectives on 'The Parting of the Ways' Between Judaism and Christianity." Pages 278–293 in *The Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity and Other Greco-Roman Religions in Antiquity*.



- Studien zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, Bd 2. Gerbern Oegema and Ian Henderson, eds. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2005.
- Reinhartz, Adele. "The Vanishing Jews of Antiquity." *Marginalia Review of Books*, 24. June 2014. No pages. Cited July 15, 2015. Online: <http://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/vanishing-jews-antiquity-adele-reinhartz>.
- Renfrew, Colin. *The Emergence of Civilisation: The Cyclades and the Aegean in The Third Millennium BC*. Oxford: Oxbow, 1972.
- Resseguie, James L. "Literature, New Testament As." Pages 815–817 in *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Robbins, Vernon K. "The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts." Pages 305–332 in *The Social World of Luke-Acts*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Robinson, James, Paul Hoffman, and John Kloppenborg, eds. *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas, with English, German, and French translations of Q and Thomas*. Hermeneia Supplements. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
- Robinson, James. "A Written Greek Sayings Cluster Older than Q: A Vestige." *Harvard Theological Review* 92 (1999): 61–77.
- Robinson, James. "The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus." Pages 27–52 in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. Edited by A. Lindemann. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001.
- Robinson, James. "The Nag Hammadi Gospels and the Fourfold Gospel." Pages 69–87 in *The Earliest Gospels*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Robinson, James. "The Pre-Q Text of the (Ravens and) Lilies: Q 12:22–31 and P. Oxy 655 (Gos. Thom. 36)." Pages 143–180 in *Text und Geschichte (Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 50. Marburg: Elwert, 1999.
- Robinson, James. *The Gospel of Jesus: In Search of the Original Good News*. New York: HarperCollins, 2005.
- Robinson, James. *The Sayings Gospel Q in Greek and English with Parallels from the Gospels of Mark and Thomas*. Leuven: Peeters, 2001.
- Robinson, James. *The Sayings of Jesus: The Sayings Gospel Q in English*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.
- Rodriguez, Rafael. *Structuring Early Christian Memory*. Library of New Testament Studies 407. London: T&T Clark, 2010.
- Rohrbaugh, Richard L. "Introduction." Pages 1–15 in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*. Edited by Richard Rohrbaugh. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Rohrbaugh, Richard. "The Preindustrial City." Pages 107–125 in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*. Edited Richard Rohrbaugh. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.

- Rohrbaugh, Richard. "The Preindustrial City." Pages 107–125 in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*. Edited by Richard Rohrbaugh. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Sanders, Ed Parish. *The Historical Figure of Jesus*. London: Penguin, 1993.
- Schaberg, Jane and Sharon Ringe. "Gospel of Luke." Pages 493–511 in *Women's Bible Commentary: Twentieth-Anniversary Edition Revised and Updated*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012.
- Schaberg, Jane. "Luke." Pages 363–380 in *The Women's Bible Commentary: Expanded Edition with Apocrypha*. Edited by Carol Newsom and Sharon H. Ringe. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998.
- Schottroff, Luise. "Feminist Observations on the Eschatology of the Sayings Source." Paper presented at the 1992 annual meeting of the SBL. San Francisco, November 1992.
- Schottroff, Luise. "Itinerant Prophetesses: A Feminist Analysis of the Sayings Source Q." Pages 347–360 in *Current Studies on Q*. Edited by Ronald A. Piper. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Schottroff, Luise. "The Sayings Source Q." Pages 510–534 in *Searching the Scriptures 2: A Feminist Commentary*. Edited by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza. New York: Crossroad, 1994.
- Schottroff, Luise. *Lydia's Impatient Sisters: A Feminist Social History of Early Christianity*. London: SCM, 1995.
- Schultz, Siegfried. *Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1964.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. *Bread Not Stone*. Boston: Beacon, 1995.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. *But She Said: Feminist Practices of Biblical Interpretation*. Boston: Beacon, 1992.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. "Critical Feminist Studies in Religion." *Critical Research on Religion* 1/43 (2013): 43–50.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. *Discipleship of Equals: A Critical Feminist Ekklesiology of Liberation*. New York: Crossroad, 1993.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. "Feminist/Women Priests – An Oxymoron?" *New Women/New Church*, (Fall 1995): 10–18.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. *In Memory of Her*. New York: Crossroad, 1983.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. "Jesus of Nazareth in Historical Research." Pages 29–48 in *Thinking of Christ: Proclamation, Explanation, Meaning*. Edited by Tatha Wiley. New York: Continuum, 2003.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. *Jesus and the Politics of Interpretation*. New York: Continuum, 2000.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. *Jesus: Miriam's Child, Sophia's Prophet: Critical Issues in Feminist Christology*. New York: Continuum, 1995.

- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. "Remembering the Past in Creating the Future: Historical-Critical Scholarship and Feminist Biblical Interpretation." Pages 43–64 in *Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship*. Edited by Adele Yarbro Collins. Chico: Scholars, 1985.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. *Rhetoric and Ethic: The Politics of Biblical Studies*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. *Wisdom Ways: Introducing Feminist Biblical Interpretation*. Maryknoll: Orbis, 2001.
- Seim, Turid. *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke & Acts*. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Sevrin, J.-M. "Thomas, Q et le Jesus de l'histoire," pages 461–478 in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. Edited by A. Lindemann. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001.
- Sheinfeld, Shayna. "The Pseudepigrapha in Current Research." *Religion Compass* (2013): 1–8.
- Sheppard, Gerald T. "Poor." Pages 700–701 in *Mercer Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by Watson E. Mills. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1990.
- Siegele-Wenschkewitz, Leonore. "In the Dangerous Currents of Old Prejudices: How Predominant Thoughts have Disastrous Effects and What could be Done to Counter Them." Pages 342–348 in *A Feminist Companion to the Hebrew Bible in the New Testament*. Edited by Athalya Brenner. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.
- Simkins, Ronald A. "The Widow and Orphan in the Political Economy of Ancient Israel." Pages 20–33 in *Journal of Religion & Society Supplement* 10 (2014).
- Smith, Dwight Moody. *John among the Gospels*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2001.
- Snodgrass, Klyne. *Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Soulen, Richard N. and R. Kendall Soulen. "Historical Critical Method." Pages 88–89 in *Handbook of Biblical Criticism, Fourth Edition*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011.
- Spencer, Franklin Scott. *Salty Wives, Spirited Mothers, and Savvy Widows: Capable Women of Purpose and Persistence in Luke's Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.
- Stone, Michael E. "Questions of Ezra." Pages 591–600 in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume I*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983.
- Streeter, Burnett Hillman. "St. Mark's Knowledge and Use of Q." Pages 165–183 in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*. Edited by William Sanday. Oxford: Clarendon, 1911.
- Takaoglu, Turan. "Archaeological Evidence for Grain Mills in the Greek and Roman Troad." Pages 673–679 in *Vom Euphrat bis zum Bosporus: Kleinasien in der Antike*. Bonn: Dr. Rudolph Habelt, 2008.
- Theissen, Gerd and Annette Merz. *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998.

- Theissen, Gerd. *Le christianisme de Jésus: ses origines sociales en Palestine*. Paris: Relais Desclée 6, 1978.
- Theissen, Gerd. *Social Reality and the Early Christians*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Thurmond, David L. *A Handbook of Food Processing in Classical Rome: For Her Bounty no Winter*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Thurston, Bonnie Bowman. *Women in the New Testament: Questions and Commentary*. New York: Crossroad, 1998.
- Markus Tiwald, editor. *Q in Context II: Social Setting and the Archaeological Background of the Sayings*. Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2015.
- Vaage, Lief. *Galilean Upstarts: Jesus' First Followers According to Q*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1994.
- Vassiliadis, Petros. "Original Order of Q: Some Residual Cases." Pages 379–387 in *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus—the Sayings of Jesus*. Edited by Joel Delobel. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 59. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982.
- Vermes, Geza. *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1981.
- Watson, Wilfred G. E. "Gender-Matched Synonymous Parallelism in the Old Testament" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99/3 (1980): 321–341.
- White, L. Michael. *Scripting Jesus: The Gospels in Re-Write*. New York: HarperOne, 2010.
- White, Sidnie Ann. "Women: Second Temple Period." Pages 330–334 in *The Oxford Guide to People and Places of the Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Wills, Lawrence. *Quest of the Historical Gospel: Mark, John, and the Origins of the Gospel Genre*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Winkler, John J. *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Yaghjian, Lucretia B. "Ancient Reading," *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*. Edited by Richard Rohrbaugh. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996), 206–230.
- Yarbro Collins, Adela, ed. *Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship*. Chico: Scholars, 1985.
- Yoder, John Howard. *The Politics of Jesus*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.