Jesus and Other Men

Biblical Interpretation Series

VOLUME 159

Jesus and Other Men

Ideal Masculinities in the Synoptic Gospels

By

Susanna Asikainen

BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Asikainen, Susanna, author.
Title: Jesus and other men : ideal masculinities in the Synoptic Gospels / by Susanna Asikainen.
Description: Boston : Brill, 2018. | Series: Biblical interpretation series, ISSN 0928-0731 ; volume 159 | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2017053617 (print) | LCCN 2017054606 (ebook) | ISBN 9789004361096 (E-book) | ISBN 9789004360983 (hardback : alk. paper)
Subjects: LCSH: Bible. Gospels—Criticism, interpretation, etc. | Masculinity—Biblical teaching. | Masculinity in the Bible. | Men (Christian theology)—Biblical teaching.
Classification: LCC BS2555.6.M39 (ebook) | LCC BS2555.6.M39 A85 2018 (print) | DDC 226/.08155332—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2017053617

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0928-0731
ISBN 978-90-04-36098-3 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-36109-6 (e-book)

Contents

Acknowledgements

This book started out as a doctoral dissertation at the University of Helsinki. It is with great pleasure that I thank the people whose friendship, support, and wisdom contributed to the work. First and foremost I want to thank my supervisors, Prof. Antti Marjanen and Doc. Risto Uro. They have offered me support and encouragement while at the same time challenging me to sharpen my argumentation.

I am very grateful to the pre-examiners of my dissertation, Prof. Jennifer Glancy and Dr. Petri Merenlahti, for their insightful feedback and comments. Prof. Glancy was also my opponent in the public examination of my thesis. Her incisive comments and the thought-provoking conversation we had helped me to clarify my argumentation.

I had the privilege of being part of the research project "Gender, Social Roles, and Occupations in Early Christianity." I want to thank Doc. Niko Huttunen, Dr. Kaisa-Maria Pihlava, and Kirsi Siitonen, who offered numerous helpful comments to my work along the way. I am also grateful to the international partners of the research project, Professors John S. Kloppenborg, Halvor Moxnes, and Carolyn Osiek, who offered valuable comments to my work.

The Department of Biblical Studies in the University of Helsinki has been a wonderful place for research. I have had the pleasure of working with a number of intelligent and inspiring people. Thank you all!

During the years I worked on my dissertation, I received funding from the Research Foundation of the University of Helsinki, the Finnish Graduate School of Theology, the Emil Aaltonen Foundation, and the Finnish Cultural Foundation.

Dr. Albion M. Butters revised my English. Needless to say, all remaining mistakes are due to my own negligence.

Finally, I want to thank my family; my parents Tuula and Hannu Asikainen, my sister-in-law Anniina Asikainen, and my brother Tomi Asikainen, who shares my interest in Classical texts and has always been interested in reading and commenting on my work.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

In her song *Muhammad My Friend*, singer-songwriter Tori Amos toys with the idea that the child whose birth in Bethlehem is described in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke was in fact a girl. The gender of the child is not the only difference between the Jesus of the Gospels and the messiah envisioned by Tori Amos. Whereas the Jesus of the Gospels is crucified naked, alone, and abandoned by his followers, Tori Amos' crucified messiah wears Shiseido luxury-brand lipstick while her friends have gathered by her side to drink tea.[1]

Tori Amos' vision of a girl messiah certainly goes against the grain of the Christian tradition. After all, Luke mentions that the baby Jesus was circumcised. That Jesus was a man has been taken for granted in much of the study. But what kind of a man was Jesus? What did it mean to be a man in the ancient Greco-Roman world? In this study, I seek to answer these questions by examining the ideal masculinities in the Synoptic Gospels.

Interest in the study of masculinities in the Bible emerged in the mid-1990s and has since grown slowly but steadily.[2] Nevertheless, studies on the masculinity of Jesus or masculinities in the Synoptic Gospels are still few and far between.[3] There remains a need for further study on the masculinity of Jesus

1 Tori Amos, "Muhammad My Friend." *Boys for Pele*. Atlantic Records, 1996.

2 The first studies of masculinity in the Bible were published around the mid-1990s. See, e.g., Eilberg-Schwartz 1994; Moore 1996; 2001; Moxnes 2003. One of the most prolific writers on biblical masculinities has been David J. A. Clines; see Clines 1995; 1998; 2002; 2003; 2007; 2010. For other studies on biblical and early Christian masculinities, see, e.g., Aasgaard 2009a; Burrus 2000; Cobb 2008; Creangă (ed.) 2010; Creangă & Smit (eds.) 2014; Kahl 2000; Kuefler 2001; Larson 2004; Mayordomo Marín 2006; Smit 2006; Tinklenberg deVega 2006; Young 1994; Zsolnay (ed.) 2017.

3 In his article "Ecce Vir, or: Gendering the Son of Man," David Clines (1998) studies the composite portrait of Jesus of the four canonical Gospels, not the Jesus of any individual Gospel. As such, Clines' study does not pay attention to the differences between the Gospels. *New Testament Masculinities*, edited by Stephen D. Moore and Janice Capel Anderson (2003), has several articles that concentrate on masculinities in different Gospels. All of the articles concentrate on slightly different points of view and different themes, which makes comparing the Gospels difficult. When studying the masculinity of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke, Brittany Wilson's *Unmanly Men: Refigurations of Masculinity in Luke-Acts* (2015) focuses only on the passion narrative. Wilson's book also contains relatively little comparison between the Synoptic Gospels. In her monograph *Behold the Man: Jesus and Greco-Roman Masculinity* (2008), Colleen Conway studies the four canonical Gospels, concentrating on the connection

and ideal masculinities in the Synoptic Gospels. In particular, what we do not yet have is a study that concentrates on both the masculinities of Jesus and the other men in the Synoptic Gospels and compares the masculinity ideals of the Synoptic Gospels. How do the Synoptic Gospels address the same themes and issues concerning masculinity? What are the differences and similarities between the Synoptic Gospels? What are the characteristic features of their respective masculinity ideals?

In this study, I focus especially on the masculinity of Jesus, but I also examine the portrayal of the other male characters, as well as female characters, in the Synoptic Gospels. It is important to study both male and female characters, since masculinity is defined both in relation to femininities and in relation to other masculinities. I do not study the masculinity of the historical Jesus, but concentrate instead on how the Synoptic Gospels portray Jesus and the other characters. According to the two-source theory, Matthew and Luke have used Mark as their source. Do the changes that Matthew and Luke make to Mark's text also reflect a different ideal of masculinity?

There are several definitions of masculinity. In this study, I define masculinity as gender ideology. In other words, masculinity means the ideal a man is supposed to fulfill. The ideal masculinities of the Synoptic Gospels are shown most clearly in the character of Jesus. In the ancient Greco-Roman world, ideal characteristics were masculine; thus, ideal human behavior was generally also masculine to some extent. From the point of view of the early Christians, Jesus was an ideal character, and one may suppose that the Synoptic Gospels sought to portray Jesus as ideally masculine. Therefore, I do not analyze whether the Synoptic Gospels portray Jesus as masculine. Rather, I study what kind of masculinity the Synoptic Gospels present as the ideal. In addition to Jesus' masculinity, I also examine the way in which presentations of other (male) characters reflect the ideal masculinities of the Synoptic Gospels. In order to analyze these ideal masculinities, I compare the Synoptic Gospels with other ancient Greco-Roman texts. What were the ideal masculinities of the Synoptic Gospels and how did they relate to other ideals of masculinity that existed in the ancient Greco-Roman world? As a result of the analysis, I suggest that the Gospel of Luke is the closest to the ancient Greco-Roman ideal of self-controlled masculinity. The Gospel of Mark, on the other hand, portrays both Jesus and the disciples as examples of voluntarily marginalized masculinity. Matthew enhances the depiction of Jesus by moving it closer to the ancient

---

between masculinity and Christology. For each Gospel, Conway chooses themes that shed light on the Christology of that particular Gospel. Again, this makes it difficult to see whether these themes are treated differently in the Gospels.

Greco-Roman ideal of self-controlled masculinity, but at the same time he maintains that the disciples should voluntarily accept the marginalized position of the early Christians.

In a study like this, there is a danger of seeing everything through gender-tinted glasses. Just because Jesus was a man does not mean that everything he did was necessarily gendered. It is important to emphasize that I do not believe that the Gospel writers intended to tell their narratives with a concern for (Jesus') masculinity in mind at all times. On the contrary, gender ideology is not the explicit concern of the writers of the Synoptic Gospels. The Synoptic Gospels do not, for instance, explicitly call Jesus masculine or his opponents unmasculine. Still, we can study the Synoptic Gospels from the point of view of masculinity. Terms such as masculine, feminine, effeminate, manly, or unmanly need not be present in the text in order for the texts to be studied from a gender perspective.[4] Even without the presence of such terms, knowledge of the ancient ideals of masculinity may illuminate the text.[5] For example, the changes that Matthew and Luke made to Mark's text may have shaped the portrayal of the ideal masculinity of the Gospels, even if the effect of these changes on the ideal masculinity was not intentional.

Of Masculinities and Men

In order to study masculinity in the Synoptic Gospels, we must begin by defining the term 'masculinity.' What are we talking about when we talk about masculinity? It has become popular since the 1970s to differentiate between biological

4 See Mari Matsuda's (1990–1991, 1188–1190) method of "asking the other question": "When I see something that looks racist, I ask, 'Where is the patriarchy in this?' When I see something that looks sexist, I ask, 'Where is the heterosexism in this?' When I see something that looks homophobic, I ask, 'Where are the class interests in this?'" Thus, even if gender or masculinity is not the explicit topic in the narrative, one can "ask the other question" of where gender or masculinity can be found in the text.

5 See Parsons (2006, 67), who studies physiognomy in Luke-Acts and notes: "As we search for evidence of ancient physiognomy in the Lukan writings, we will do well to make a crucial distinction between topics on which Luke *touches* and subjects about which Luke *teaches*. That is to say, in certain passages of Luke and Acts, knowledge of ancient physiognomic convention will shed additional light on the text. But that does not mean that these conventions represent what Luke thinks about the subject." Emphasis original. In the same way, knowledge of the ancient ideals of masculinity sheds additional light on the Synoptic Gospels even if masculinity was not the explicit concern of the writers.

sex ('male,' 'female') and socially constructed gender ('man,' 'woman').[6] In recent years, it has become increasingly common to perceive that biological sex is as much of a social construct as gender.[7] Nevertheless, I still find the distinction between sex and gender useful.[8] People who are biologically male are not necessarily considered manly or masculine. Instead, some males are labeled as effeminate. In everyday language, the terms 'masculinity' and 'femininity' are not used to describe the sex difference between males and females, but to express the ways in which men differ among themselves and women differ among themselves.[9] Because masculinity is not a quality that all males have, I differentiate between maleness and masculinity.[10] Maleness is the result of the biological make-up of males (e.g., chromosomes and hormones). Maleness is biological, whereas masculinity belongs to the realm of gender.[11] As will be shown in Chapter 2, masculinity was not considered an inherent quality of all males in the ancient Greco-Roman world either.

In masculinity studies, masculinity is usually defined either as an identity or as an ideology.[12] Since the object of my study is not how the historical Jesus identified himself as masculine but rather the text of the Synoptic Gospels and the ideals presented there, in this study masculinity refers to gender ideology. In other words, masculinity means the ideal that a group has: what the ideal

---

6 E.g., Rubin 1975, 179: "Gender is a socially imposed division of the sexes. It is a product of the social relations of sexuality." These social relations "transform males and females into 'men' and 'women.'"

7 Kessler & McKenna's influential book *Gender: An Ethnomethodological Approach* (1978) can be seen as the originator of this development. See also Fausto-Sterling 1993; 2000; Herdt 1994, 78.

8 See Bjelland Kartzow (2010, 383–385), who suggests that in antiquity slaves and free persons had their biological sex in common, but belonged to different gender systems.

9 Connell 2005, 69. It is also possible for a woman to be considered masculine. On female masculinity, see Halberstam 1998.

10 Flanigan-Saint-Aubin (1994, 255 n. 3) makes a similar distinction between the "sense of maleness," which is biological and a result of hormonal forces, and "masculinity or masculine identity" (manliness), which is a social process and result of the attitudes and actions of the culture.

11 Whitehead and Barrett (2001, 16), for example, note that "although no human behaviour is totally uninfluenced by biology, masculinity reflects social and cultural expectations of male behaviour rather than biology." The relationship between biological sex and socially constructed gender is complex, and an in-depth scientific analysis of the matter goes beyond the scope of my study.

12 E.g., Hearn & Collinson 1994, 104.

man is like, or how a man should behave.[13] It must be stressed that gender ideology does not necessarily reflect the reality of men. All men do not fulfill the ideal and are not considered masculine. For a man to be considered masculine, his masculinity must be approved by other men. This means that men often have to negotiate their masculinity with other men. Another important thing to note is that the ideals of how a man is supposed to behave are not universal, but differ from society to society.[14] Every culture also has several different ideologies of masculinity instead of one dominant masculinity ideology.[15] Gender ideologies, like all ideologies, are not normative: not all people share them. This means that it is possible for each group of people to have their own gender ideology or ideal masculinity. As we will see in Chapter 2, this was also the case in antiquity. There were several competing ideals of masculinity in the ancient Greco-Roman world.

Recent studies on masculinity have acknowledged the multiplicity of masculinities. Thus, it has become common to speak of "masculinities" in the plural. These different masculinities are not equal, but form a network of power relations. Therefore, I take as a starting point Raewyn Connell's differentiation between hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinities.[16]

---

13 I define 'ideology' as a set of ideals and values that a group has. My definition of masculinity is thus close to that of Craig Williams (1999, 4): "*Masculinity* refers to a complex of values and ideals that can more profitably be understood as a cultural tradition than as a biological given: the concept refers to what it is to be fully gendered as 'a man' as opposed to merely having the physical features held to signify 'a male.'" Cf. *Oxford English Dictionary*, which gives as one of the definitions for ideology "a set of beliefs governing conduct." For definitions of ideology, see Eagleton 1991, 1–6.

14 Ethnographic studies of primitive societies have shown that the ideals of masculinity differ considerably from one society to the next, from the aggressive Mundurucú in Brazil and Amhara in Africa to the non-violent and gentle Machiguenga in Peru and Tahitians. Coltrane 1992, 87–89. See also Gilmore 1990.

15 In their study on class relations, Abercrombie and Turner argue that there is no one dominant ideology that is then adopted by the subordinate classes. On the contrary, the subordinate classes rarely share the ideology of the dominant class. This was especially the case earlier in history, when there was no mass media to help distribute the ideology of the dominant group. Abercrombie and Turner argue that the ideology of the dominant class has historically had more significance for the internal cohesion of the dominant class itself. Abercrombie & Turner 1978, 149–163.

16 This division is originally found in Tim Carrigan, R. W. Connell, and John Lee's article "Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity." Carrigan, Connell & Lee 1985. The concepts of hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinities have been expanded in Connell's later studies. Connell 1987, 183–186; 2005, 76–81; 1991; see also Connell 1993; 1995; 1997; 1998; 2000; 2002.

Hegemonic masculinity is the masculinity of the hegemonic or dominant group. Connell maintains that gender is always a relational concept and thus hegemonic masculinity is also constructed in relation to femininities and other masculinities.[17] According to Connell, hegemony means "a social ascendancy achieved in a play of social forces that extends beyond contests of brute power into the organization of private life and cultural process."[18] Moreover, hegemony does not mean total cultural dominance—there are also other masculinities.

It is important to note that hegemonic masculinity is not a fixed character type. There is no set of characteristics which is always and everywhere in the hegemonic position. Instead, hegemonic masculinity is the masculinity that occupies the dominant position in a certain configuration of gender relations. Connell emphasizes that hegemony is a currently accepted strategy, which means that its position is always contestable. Hegemony, then, can be disrupted or can disrupt itself. Thus, in certain situations new groups may challenge the old hegemony and construct a new hegemony. This means that historical change of masculinities is possible. Connell notes that in modern Western society, masculinity is heterosexual, aggressive, competitive, and homosocial. It emphasizes hierarchy and the capacity to dominate.[19] What was the ancient Greco-Roman hegemonic masculinity like? The majority of ancient Greco-Roman texts were most likely written by members of the elite. They thus formed the source for hegemonic masculinity in the ancient Greco-Roman world. In Chapter 2, I examine in more detail the hegemonic masculinity of the ancient Greco-Roman world.

Hegemonic masculinity is more of an ideal, since most men cannot actually meet its standards. Nonetheless, hegemonic masculinity gives a position of power to men, meaning that the majority of men have certain advantages over women and children. This also means that since most men benefit from hegemonic masculinity, they do not oppose it. Connell calls this *complicit masculinity*.[20] It could be characterized as a tacit agreement with the hegemony. Connell suspects that in the contemporary world, men who are

17 Connell 2005, 44.

18 Connell 1987, 184.

19 Connell 1997, 8. For example, the hegemonic masculinity of the late 20th-century USA could be expressed in the words of Erving Goffman: "In an important sense there is only one complete unblushing male in America: a young, married, white, urban, northern, heterosexual, Protestant father of college education, fully employed, of good complexion, weight, height, and a recent record in sports." Quoted by Pleck 1995, 13.

20 Connell 2005, 79.

complicit with hegemonic masculinity form the largest group of men,[21] but we cannot presume that this is the case in every culture.

Since hegemonic masculinity is constructed in relation to other masculinities, there are also relations of dominance and subordination between groups of men. *Subordinated masculinities* are associated with femininity. Femininity is defined by the hegemonic masculinity as whatever masculinity is not, and therefore the subordinated masculinities are portrayed as stereotypically effeminate. For example, since contemporary hegemonic masculinity emphasizes heterosexuality, the most common form of contemporary subordinated masculinity is homosexual masculinity.[22] There are also other types of subordinated masculinities. Connell points out that some heterosexual men are "expelled from the circle of legitimacy" because they do not fulfill the requirements of the hegemonic masculinity in certain ways. These men are also feminized by the hegemonic masculinity and called, for example, wimps or sissies.[23] Connell also emphasizes that these other masculinities are not necessarily clearly defined. On the contrary, they might even be denied recognition as alternative masculinities.[24] In the ancient Greco-Roman world, effeminate men were called κίναιδοι or *cinaedi*. Eunuchs were another group of men considered to be effeminate in antiquity. Unlike in the contemporary world, however, sexual behavior was only one facet that led to men being labeled as effeminate. As we will see in more detail in Chapter 2, in the ancient Greco-Roman world effeminacy was caused by a lack of self-control.

Hegemony, complicity, and subordination are relations internal to the gender order. However, gender is not independent of other social structures like class, race, or ethnicity (or religion, which Connell does not mention). Gender intersects these other structures, creating further relationships between masculinities.[25] Connell calls masculinities that intersect with other structures *marginalized masculinities*. If the contemporary hegemonic masculinity is embodied by a white, middle-class man, then a black, middle-class man is marginalized because he is black, whereas a poor, black man is doubly marginalized because he is poor and black. Marginal religious groups like Jews in diaspora or the early Christians would also have had a marginal masculinity. According

21 Connell 1997, 8.

22 This does not mean that homosexuality is always necessarily subordinated in every culture. For example, same-sex sexual behavior is ritualized in some cultures.

23 Connell 2005, 79.

24 Connell 1987, 186.

25 On intersectionality, see, e.g., Matsuda 1990–1991; Nash 2008; Davis 2008; Bjelland Kartzow 2010.

to Connell, some aspects of marginalized masculinities may be *authorized* by the hegemonic masculinity. For instance, a black athlete may be seen as an exemplar of hegemonic masculinity. However, this does not grant authority to other black men.[26] In the ancient Greco-Roman world, gladiators can be seen as an example of a marginalized masculinity authorized by the hegemony.[27]

In sum, one of the most important features of a hegemonic masculinity is the power to state who is and who is not really masculine or to ignore certain masculinities. Subordinated masculinities are the necessary "other" against which the hegemonic masculinity mirrors itself. They are labeled as effeminate. Marginalized masculinities, on the other hand, are not necessarily feminized but pushed out, ignored, or denied existence. They can nevertheless be considered examples of masculinity; in other words, their masculinity can be "authorized" in some ways.

A Reassessment of Connell's Theory

The strength of Connell's theory is that it acknowledges the diversity of masculinities and the intersectionality between gender and other social structures. It also takes into account the possibility of historical change: if the current hegemonic masculinity does not answer the demands of the situation, another ideal of masculinity may take its place and become hegemonic instead.[28] Because of this, Connell's categorization is widely used in masculinity studies. Nevertheless, it has also been evaluated critically.[29]

Some of the criticism stems from the subsequent usage of the term "hegemonic masculinity." Connell emphasizes the relational nature of gender. Hegemonic masculinity exists only in relation to other masculinities. However, scholars have often used the concept of hegemonic masculinity attributionally as a list of qualities or traits. This makes hegemonic masculinity a static and fixed structure. It also loses sight of the competition and contest between different masculinities. Connell maintains that gender is a set of power relations, but critics note that in subsequent studies scholars have used power as

26 Connell 2005, 81.

27 See further in Chapter 2.

28 See also Wetherell & Edley 1999, 336.

29 Connell answers the criticisms against his theory in Connell & Messerschmidt 2005.

an attribute of hegemonic masculinity rather than as a social relationship between individuals.[30]

Despite these criticisms, I still maintain that Connell's theory offers the best starting point for the study of masculinities. The critics do not question the existence of hegemonic and non-hegemonic forms of masculinity, but suggest that Connell's formulation of hegemonic masculinity should be further developed.[31] Connell emphasizes that the relationships between hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinities provide a sparse framework.[32] I suggest that Connell's framework can be developed to better illustrate the complex relationships between different masculinities.

Margaret Wetherell and Nigel Edley maintain that Connell's framework is too simplistic to accurately portray the complexity of the real world. They question, for example, whether there is only one hegemonic masculinity at any given time, and they call for a more complex account of hegemonic masculinity than the current one.[33] Following Wetherell and Edley, I do not think that there is necessarily just one hegemonic masculinity. On the contrary, there may be several masculinities competing for the hegemonic position. For example, in the ancient Greco-Roman world there were several ideals of how a man was supposed to behave. As we will see in Chapter 2, some writers emphasized the importance of control over others, while others maintained that a man should first and foremost control himself. Both of these masculinity ideals could be seen as competing for the hegemonic position. It is important to note that

30 Hearn 2004, 58; Jefferson 2002, 70–71; Lusher 2008, 42; Martin 1998, 473; Whitehead 2002, 93–94. See also Demetriou 2001. According to Petersen (2003), in later studies that apply Connell's theory the connection between masculinities and power has disappeared, and the term "masculinities" is used simply to depict the diversity or plurality of masculinity. Connell (2000) accepts this criticism but argues that "the broader critique of masculinity research for assuming fixed identities, or stability in masculinity, is not accurate. Research on the social construction of masculinities has placed a good deal of emphasis on the uncertainties, difficulties, and contradictions of the process."

31 Lusher (2008, 40) also notes that the critiques of Connell do not undermine the plurality and hierarchy of masculinities, but rather "seek to elaborate and expand the details."

32 Connell 2005, 81. The terms are also "not fixed character types but configurations of practice generated in particular situations in a changing structure of relationships." Connell's notion of masculinity as "a configuration of practice" places the emphasis on actual behavior. Masculinities come into existence as people act; they do not exist prior to social behavior as identities or personalities. Connell 1995, 46; 2000. Connell's "configuration of practice" is slightly different than Butler's theory of gender as performance. See Butler 1990; 1993; see also West & Zimmerman 1987. Connell explains the distinction in Ouzgane & Coleman 1998.

33 Wetherell & Edley 1999, 337, 351–352. See also Jefferson 2002, 71.

masculinities are not lists of traits or attributes. The masculinities competing for the hegemonic position can have completely different ideals.

Connell calls masculinities that intersect with other structures marginalized masculinities. Connell mentions class, race, and ethnicity as examples of these intersections. However, there is no reason why sexuality, body type, or temperament could not be counted among these intersections. This means that the two groups Connell mentions as examples of modern subordinated masculinities—gays and "sissies" (feminine-looking men or men with gentler temperament)—could also be categorized as marginalized masculinities.

Rather than differentiating between marginalized and subordinated masculinities, it might thus be better to see subordinated masculinities as part of marginalized masculinities. The majority of marginalized masculinities remain pushed out, ignored, or denied existence—and, as such, they are culturally invisible. However, not all marginalized masculinities have the same status. Marginalized masculinities can also be given positive evaluation by the hegemony. In other words, they can be authorized by the hegemony and gain cultural visibility. Marginalized masculinity may also gain negative evaluation by the hegemonic masculinity. They may be labeled effeminate and thus (in Connell's terms) become subordinated by the hegemony. Subordinated masculinity is culturally visible as the "other," an example of what the hegemonically masculine man should not be like.

Stereotyping a masculinity as effeminate can be used as a way of marginalizing a masculinity. For example, Jewish men in diaspora have historically been both marginalized and feminized.[34] Labeling a group of people as effeminate can happen also between groups competing for the hegemonic position. In the ancient Greco-Roman world, writers called tyrants effeminate, which was an effective strategy for denying the legitimacy of their power and marginalizing them as not real men.

On the other hand, some type of masculinity within non-hegemonic masculinities can be in a more dominant position in relation to others, despite not being in the hegemonic position in the culture overall. For example, in the Greco-Roman world eunuchs were generally considered effeminate. Thus, their masculinity was subordinated. Nevertheless, not all eunuchs had the same social status. Some eunuchs gained political power, which made them more "authorized" than other eunuchs. For instance, the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8:26–40 appears to be more authorized than the self-castrated eunuchs of Matthew 19:12. In a similar manner, slaves were marginalized but the

34 See, e.g., Kimmel 1988, 153–154; Boyarin 1997; Brod 1994, 92. Kimmel (1988, 153) notes that the "Middle-Eastern machismo" is very different from Jewish culture in the diaspora.

masculinity of gladiators (most of whom were slaves) could be seen as authorized by the hegemony.[35]

It is important to emphasize that authorization and subordination are both strategies used by hegemonic masculinities, which authorize and subordinate other masculinities. The amount of marginalization, as well as the amount of authorization and subordination, varies. In addition, different hegemonic masculinities may evaluate different marginalized masculinities in various ways.

The majority of masculinity studies, both outside of and in the field of biblical studies, have taken as their starting point the privileged position of hegemonic masculinities. Non-hegemonic masculinities are not studied as much and their relation to hegemonic masculinities remains undertheorized.[36] As mentioned above, Connell acknowledges that some aspects of marginalized masculinities may be authorized by the hegemonic masculinity. Nevertheless, Connell studies masculinities mostly from the point of view of the hegemonic masculinity. For this reason, Connell's framework has also been criticized for lacking in-depth theorization of subordinated and marginalized masculinities. For instance, Tim Edwards notes that although Connell mentions race as an important aspect of marginalized masculinity, race *per se* gets either no or only cursory attention.[37]

In her monograph *Behold the Man: Jesus and Greco-Roman Masculinity*, Colleen Conway takes as the starting point of her study the hegemonic masculinity of the ancient Greco-Roman world. Conway examines how New Testament texts relate to the hegemonic masculinity of the Greco-Roman world. The hegemonic ideology was held by the elite, but according to Conway it was also supported by the lower classes, including Christians.[38] However,

35 See more on this in Chapter 2.

36 This is also noted by Beasley 2005, 196, 213–216. However, although marginalized masculinities remain undertheorized, this does not mean that marginalized masculinities have not been studied at all. There are studies on contemporary marginalized masculinities of, for example, Jewish, African-American, and Mexican immigrant men. See, e.g., Abreu et al. 2000; Baca Zinn 1989; Bell 1995; Bucholtz 1999; Espiritu 2007; Franklin 1987; Harper 2007; Hondagneu-Sotelo 1992; Hondagneu-Sotelo & Messner 1994; hooks 1995; 2004; Hunter & Davis 1992; Lazur & Majors 1995; Majors 1989; 2001; Rogers 2008; Staples 1989.

37 Edwards 2006, 75. Chaney (2009) criticizes Connell for ignoring race and ethnicity, but her criticism is misdirected since she does not seem to be aware of Connell's concept of marginal masculinities.

38 Conway 2008, 10.

one can question whether most men in the ancient Greco-Roman world were indeed complicit with the hegemonic masculinity.[39]

Conway notes that there were several opinions about what was masculine in the ancient Greco-Roman world. For example, she argues that there were different attitudes toward anger, which were in tension with each other. Conway maintains that all of these different attitudes were part of the hegemonic masculinity and that the hegemonic masculinity was internally contradictory.[40] One might wonder, however, if the hegemonic masculinity was so multiform and contradictory, can it really be called one ideal?[41] Although it is possible for a person to hold contradictory ideals, this does not make the ideal itself contradictory. If all of the ideals present in ancient Greco-Roman texts are seen as part of the same hegemonic ideal, it is possible to label almost any behavior as hegemonically masculine, to the point that the term loses its meaning. As argued above, it is better to see these different ideals as part of several masculinities that were competing for the hegemonic position.

The hegemonic ideals reflect the ideology of only a minority. According to Connell, even though only a minority of men can truly embody hegemonic masculinity, the majority of men are complicit with this hegemonic ideal.[42] However, this might not have been the case in antiquity, where there were no mass media to help spread the gender ideologies of the elite. It is impossible to know how widely the concerns of the elite writers were shared by the members of the lower classes.[43] Furthermore, even if non-elite people were aware of the hegemonic ideals, it does not mean that they shared these ideals.[44]

In the first century CE, Christianity was not in a hegemonic or culturally dominant position, so it could not represent the hegemonic masculinity in the Greco-Roman world. On the contrary, early Christianity was a marginalized group. Marginalization does not necessarily mean active persecution here; it could simply be that the dominant groups were ignoring or not even aware of the existence of the early Christians. The fact that there are so few mentions of Christians in the Greco-Roman literature of the first and second centuries CE

39 See Gleason (2003, 325–327), who remarks that scholars should consider whether the ideal masculinity of the elite really represented the ideals of ordinary people.

40 Conway 2008, 25–29. See more on emotions and masculinity in Chapter 6.

41 A similar question is raised by Sipilä (1994, 28) regarding the concept of hegemonic masculinity in general.

42 Connell 2005, 79.

43 Kuefler 2001, 8.

44 Thatcher (2009, 34) notes that the "powerful people are never fully able to impose their version of reality on subordinate classes." See also Scott 1990; Abercrombie & Turner 1978.

attests to the marginality of early Christianity.[45] Early Christian men were not labeled as effeminate in the ancient Greco-Roman texts, so their masculinity was not subordinated. The cultural invisibility of the early Christians of the first century CE made their masculinity marginalized.[46]

Theorizing Marginalized Masculinities

Changing the focus from hegemonic to marginalized masculinities can offer a corrective to the overemphasis of hegemonic masculinities.[47] Marginalized masculinities are defined from the point of view of the hegemonic masculinities. This tells us nothing about how the marginalized masculinities view the hegemonic masculinity or whether they accept the evaluation of the hegemonic group. Neither does it tell us anything about what strategies marginalized masculinities employ in relation to hegemonic masculinities. I propose that this is where complicit masculinity comes into the picture.

---

45 The first mentions of Christians by non-Christian writers are from the second century. Of these, Tacitus (*Ann.* 15.44), Suetonius (*Nero* 16), and Pliny the Younger (*Ep.* 10.96) portray early Christianity negatively, whereas Epictetus (*Diatr.* 2.9.19–21, 4.7.6), Marcus Aurelius (*Med.* 11.3), and Lucian (*Peregr.* 11–13; *Alex.* 25, 38) are more neutral. See Huttunen 2013. The rarity of the mentions of Christians in the ancient Greco-Roman texts of the first century CE attests to the cultural invisibility of early Christianity. In addition, in the first century CE, Christianity was a minority group. Stark (1997, 4–7) calculates that there were approximately 7,530 Christians in the year 100 CE (0.0126% of the population of the entire Roman Empire). Even if this number is on the low side, it shows that in the first century, early Christianity was small. The majority of early Christians were not members of the elite. For the social status of the early Christians of the first century, see Stegemann & Stegemann 1999, 227–232, 288–316.

46 Christianity only gained the hegemonic position after the Constantinian shift. Mathew Kuefler (2001) has studied how the Christian masculinity gained the status of hegemonic masculinity from the third to fifth centuries CE. Kuefler argues that the previous hegemonic masculinity, which emphasized the political and military power of the Roman men, could not respond to the needs of the elite. The imperial succession excluded Roman men from the position of political power while at the same time the military power of Rome was declining. According to Kuefler, the ideal masculinity of Christianity offered a better answer to the changing situation than the traditional ideals of masculinity. Kuefler suggests that the ideology of Christian masculinity was one possible reason why Roman men converted to Christianity.

47 Hondagneu-Sotelo and Messner (1994, 214) have argued that the standpoint of the oppressed groups should be taken as the point of departure in masculinity studies.

Connell talks about complicit masculinity in the singular, but it is also possible for several masculinities to be complicit in different ways, with some perhaps being more complicit and others less complicit. I suggest that it might be better to see complicit masculinity not as a type of masculinity, but rather to understand complicity as one of the strategies that a masculinity can adopt in relation to hegemonic masculinities.[48] In other words, complicity means closeness to the hegemonic masculinities. Different marginalized masculinities can be complicit with the hegemonic masculinities to varying degrees. Marginalized masculinities can still be complicit with the hegemony—in other words, they can be in agreement with some of its ideals.[49] The closer the masculinity is to the hegemonic masculinities and the more ideals a marginalized masculinity shares with a hegemonic masculinity, the more complicit that masculinity is. Authorization of a marginalized masculinity can be seen as complicity accepted by the hegemony, but complicity may also not be accepted by the hegemonic masculinities.

Being complicit with the hegemonic masculinities (or just one hegemonic masculinity or some aspects of that hegemonic masculinity) is not the only strategy a marginalized masculinity can adopt. Marginalized masculinities may also be non-complicit and in opposition to the hegemonic masculinities, or they may accept their marginalized status voluntarily. For example, contemporary marginalized masculinities seem to have different strategies for negotiating relationships with hegemony. Some of these strategies may be more complicit, whereas others are in opposition to hegemony. For instance, hypermasculinity is a common strategy among African-American and Latino cultures.[50] Hypermasculinity can be defined as an overemphasis of the aspects of power and control that are important for the contemporary hegemonic masculinity. Maxine Baca Zinn suggests that hypermasculinity is an attempt to

48 See Wetherell and Edley (1999, 340–352), who maintain that complicity and resistance should be used as labels for discursive strategies rather than for types of men. Wetherell and Edley note that there are several ways in which men relate to hegemonic masculinity, ranging from resistance to complicity. They conclude their study by suggesting that there are three positions: 1) the heroic position exemplifies Connell's complicit masculinity; 2) the "ordinary" position sees self as moderate or average and the heroic masculinity as over the top or extreme; and 3) the rebelling position sees self as unconventional and resistant to the hegemonic masculinity. The relationship between these resistant and complicit practices is not a simple dichotomy. Rather, the production of gendered self is a complex process. It is possible for complicity and resistance to be mixed together.

49 Connell (1991) mentions in passing that it is possible for marginalized men to be complicit with hegemonic masculinity, but Connell does not theorize about this further.

50 See, e.g., Lazur & Majors 1995; Majors 1989.

gain control in a situation where the men of marginalized groups do not have access to socially valued roles.[51] Harry Brod maintains that two strategies can be found in modern Jewish masculinities, namely, conforming to dominant norms and cross-gender alliances.[52]

Within cross-cultural studies, it has been suggested that acculturating, non-dominant groups have several ways of relating to the dominant culture.[53] For example, J. W. Berry has studied the different ways that acculturating groups can relate to the dominant culture.[54] First, Berry asks whether it is a value for the acculturating group to maintain the cultural identity and characteristics of one's own group. Needless to say, in the early Christian texts maintaining cultural identity as a Christian is a value. The New Testament texts are more interested in the question of how Christians are supposed to relate to the surrounding Greco-Roman society.[55] The second question Berry asks is whether it is a value to maintain relationships and participate with other groups. If a person wants to maintain relationships with other groups, Berry calls the chosen strategy *integration*. If the person wants to maintain their cultural identity but avoids interaction with other groups, Berry calls it *separation*.[56]

This is a modern theory and one should be cautious in applying it to antiquity. However, Berry's categorization is helpful in showing that marginal groups can have different attitudes of acceptance and resistance toward the dominant culture. Berry's theory illustrates that marginal groups may approve certain facets of the dominant culture. This is similar to Connell's concept of complicity. Thus, some of the early Christian masculinities might have been complicit

51 Baca Zinn 1989, 94. See also Torres 2007, 34.

52 Brod 1994, 92. On Jewish masculinities, see also Breitman 1988; Kimmel 1988; Leifkovitz 1988.

53 Antonovsky 1956, 57; Berry 1990, 206. For example, when studying second-generation Jewish immigrant men in the USA, Antonovsky finds six different responses to a marginal situation: 1) active Jewish orientation; 2) passive Jewish orientation; 3) ambivalent orientation: marginal and conflicted; 4) dual orientation: integration into society; 5) passive general orientation: indifferent; and 6) active general orientation: assimilation without hiding or denying Jewishness. Antonovsky 1956, 60–61.

54 Berry 1990; 1997.

55 The most negative New Testament text toward Rome is the Book of Revelation, of course. On the opposite end is Luke, whose pro-Roman tendencies are well noted; see, e.g., Matthews 2010, 37–40. On the New Testament writers' different attitudes to Rome, ranging from positive to negative, see Carter 2006, 16–24.

56 Berry 1990, 216–217.

with hegemonic masculinities.[57] Another way to put this is to say that the marginality of early Christians may have been either voluntary or involuntary. I use the term "involuntary marginality" to refer to those who do not want to be marginal—that is, those that want to share the values and ideals of the hegemonic group and are "complicit" with it. Voluntary marginality, on the other hand, refers to those who accept and embrace their marginality.[58] Furthermore, it is important to note that Berry's categorization is relatively simplistic. Instead of simple acceptance or resistance, it might be of value for a non-dominant group to have a relationship with the dominant culture in regard to some issues or to a certain extent. Acceptance and resistance form a continuum rather than a dichotomy. It is also possible that complicity and resistance are mixed together. Even though a marginal group may seem to be complicit with the hegemonic ideology, it might actually subvert it.

There could have been several early Christian masculinities, not just one. These early Christian masculinities could have had diverse strategies and ways of relating to the hegemonic masculinities of the ancient Greco-Roman world. In previous studies, it has been suggested that Luke had apologetic and pro-Roman tendencies, whereas Mark and Matthew shared more marginal ideals.[59] Dennis Duling, for example, argues that Matthew advocates ideological marginality (that is, voluntarily accepting marginalization).[60] Are these themes also evident in the Synoptic Gospels' portrayals of ideal masculinities? In this study, I examine how the Synoptic Gospels relate to the hegemonic masculinities of the ancient Greco-Roman world. How can the complex relationships between hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinities be seen in the ancient Greco-Roman world? What kinds of relationships did the marginalized early

57 I propose that writings with an apologetic purpose are more likely to be complicit with hegemonic masculinities, since they intend to show that Christianity is not a threat to the dominant Roman order.

58 The terms "involuntary marginality" and "voluntary marginality" have also been used by Duling. For Duling, however, involuntary marginality is less about unwillingness and more about the inability to participate. Duling (2002, 521; 1993, 645, 648) maintains that involuntary marginality means that because of their sex, race, or ethnicity, people are "denied the opportunity to participate in roles expected of them." Voluntary marginality (Duling 2002, 521; 1993, 648), on the other hand, means that people consciously choose not to "live according to commonly accepted norms." Accordingly, in a later article, Duling (2002, 546–549) uses the term "structural marginality" instead of involuntary marginality and "ideological marginality" instead of voluntary marginality.

59 For Luke, see, e.g., Matthews 2010, 37–40; D'Angelo 2003b. For Mark and Matthew, see, e.g., Carter 1994; 2000; Barton 1994.

60 Duling 1993.

Christian masculinities of the Synoptic Gospels have with the hegemonic masculinities of the wider Greco-Roman world?

Outline of the Study

Now it is time to go into more detail on the outline of the present study. Before moving on to study the Synoptic Gospels, we need to ascertain what the ideal hegemonic masculinities were like in the ancient Greco-Roman world. This enables comparison between the ancient Greco-Roman ideals and the ideals presented in the Synoptic Gospels. Chapter 2 examines masculinities in the Greco-Roman world and provides a background for the study of the ideal masculinities in the Synoptic Gospels. I employ a wide variety of sources in order to introduce the ideals of masculinity that existed in the ancient Greco-Roman world. As a result, it will be shown that there were several ideals of masculinity, even among the elite. Which one of these was the hegemonic masculinity? This problem can be solved by supposing that there were several ideal masculinities competing for the hegemonic position.

In the later chapters, the Synoptic Gospels are compared with these ideals. What are the ideal masculinities of the Synoptic Gospels? What kind of masculinity does their Jesus have? Which ideals do the Synoptic Gospels share with the masculinities that were competing for the hegemonic position and which are in opposition to hegemonic masculinities? Would ancient Greco-Roman readers have considered Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels to be masculine?

I organize my study around themes, instead of analyzing each Synoptic Gospel individually. This makes it easier to compare the Synoptic Gospels with each other. A possible limitation is that the overall picture of the ideal masculinity in each individual Gospel becomes more difficult to delineate. I attempt to correct for this downside in the Conclusions section of the chapter.

The themes that I concentrate on can be categorized into two groups: Jesus' relationships with other people and Jesus in relation to the ideal of self-control. Jesus' relationships with other people are studied in Chapters 3–5. As noted above, gender is a relational concept. Masculinities are defined in relation to femininities and other masculinities. The men that Jesus interacts with form two groups. I investigate the first group of men, those who are antagonistic to Jesus, in Chapter 3. The second group of men, those who are positive toward Jesus, is examined in Chapter 4. In Chapter 4, I also concentrate on Jesus' teaching on ideal discipleship. Marginal groups such as slaves, children, and eunuchs are also studied in this chapter. The women that Jesus meets do not form a homogenous group, but as there are fewer female characters in the

Synoptic Gospels, the relationship between Jesus and women is studied only in one chapter, Chapter 5. The next two chapters, Chapters 6 and 7, concentrate on self-control in connection with emotions and suffering. Self-control, as we see in Chapter 2, was an important facet of masculinity in the Greco-Roman world. Nevertheless, different views on emotions and suffering are found in the ancient Greco-Roman texts. Chapter 6 concentrates on the Synoptic Gospels' portrayals of emotions, especially the emotions of Jesus. Chapter 7 examines Jesus' teaching on suffering, as well as the passion narratives. Finally, Chapter 8 summarizes the conclusions of this study.

CHAPTER 2

Masculinities in the Ancient Greco-Roman World

Introduction

In this chapter, I study the masculinities of the ancient Greco-Roman world. My aim is not to provide a comprehensive analysis, but to offer guidelines that will help to compare the ideal masculinities in the Synoptic Gospels with the ideals existing in the ancient Greco-Roman world. In the previous chapter, I suggested that there may be several ideals competing for the hegemonic position in any given culture. What were the hegemonic masculinities like in the ancient Greco-Roman world?

This chapter employs a diachronic approach. I use a wide range of sources, ranging over several centuries,[1] to show the prevalence of some ideals and change in others, as well as the enduring competition between different ideals. Nevertheless, most of the information comes from writings by the elite, especially philosophical texts. We cannot be sure if the masculinities presented in these writings *were* the hegemonic masculinities. For example, the philosophical ideals were not necessarily hegemonic or widespread. Philosophers in general were not the normative voice of the culture.[2] In any case, I suggest that the ideals presented in this chapter were at least competing for the hegemonic position. The philosophical texts also offer the most material on the ethics and ideals of the ancient Greco-Roman people. One of the philosophical schools to which I often refer in this chapter is the Stoic school, which was the dominant philosophical movement of the first two centuries CE.[3] It was thus contemporary with the writing of the Synoptic Gospels.

My main thesis in this chapter is that there were at least two competing ideals of masculinity in the ancient Greco-Roman world, one emphasizing

1 Most of these sources are philosophical treatises, although I do refer to drama and poetry, for example. The reason is that philosophical writings explicitly discuss what masculinity is and how ideal men are supposed to behave. In terms of genre, narrative texts such as ancient novels are closer to the Synoptic Gospels, but they are also too similar in a way, since neither explicitly discusses masculinity. Comparing ancient novels with the Synoptic Gospels would require the external perspective provided by the Greco-Roman philosophical writings.

2 See, e.g., Plato, *Resp.* 489a, where Socrates mentions the marginalization of the philosophers in Athens. See also Winkler 1990, 172; Hobbs 2000, 202; Langlands 2006, 13.

3 Russell 2001, 63; George 2009, 81.

control over others and the other emphasizing self-control. I will also argue that being born a man was not enough to make a man masculine in the ancient Greco-Roman world. It was possible for a man to be labeled effeminate, and I will examine the reasons that made a man effeminate. To end the chapter, I will briefly study early Jewish masculinities as examples of marginalized masculinities. This analysis further complicates the picture of the ideal masculinities in the ancient Greco-Roman world.

Biological Sex in the Ancient Greco-Roman World

In Chapter 1, it was noted that being born male is not enough to make one masculine. Was this also the case in the ancient Greco-Roman world? The ancient Greco-Roman understanding of biological sex was vastly different from the modern one. In the Greco-Roman medical and philosophical texts, the female and male reproductive organs were thought to be essentially the same. Males and females had the same sexual organs, but they were in different places. The male body was seen as the normative, standard, and perfect human body. The female body was thought to lack the vital heat that made the male body perfect. This is why the female reproductive organs were an inverted—and hence, imperfect—version of the normative male genitals.[4] This view was held, for example, by Galen and Soranus of Ephesus.[5] Galen argues:

> All the parts, then, that men have, woman have too, the difference between them lying in only one thing, which must be kept in mind throughout the discussion, namely, that in women the parts are within [the body], whereas in men they are outside, in the region called the perineum.[6]

Thomas Laqueur calls this the one-sex model. He points out that there were not two distinct sexes that were considered the opposite of each other, but

4 Laqueur 1990, 4–6.

5 Soranus, *Gynecology* 1.9; 1.16; 1.33. Laqueur 1990, 10, 26, 62. Aristotle argues that the womb is peculiar to the female and the penis is distinctive of the male. Aristotle, *Hist. an.* 493a25–27. Nevertheless, in *Hist. an.* 493b, Aristotle says: "The privy part of the female is opposite in structure to that of the male: the part below the pubes is receding, and does not protrude as in the male." Transl. A. L. Peck. Aristotle also uses the same word, αἰδοῖον, to describe the male and female genitalia.

6 Galen, *On the Usefulness of the Parts of the Body* 14.6–7, in Lefkowitz & Fant (ed.) 2005, 243–246. Transl. M. T. May.

rather "delicate, difficult-to-read shadings of one sex."[7] Females and males were not considered opposite sexes, but more perfect or less perfect versions of the male body. Sex, in other words, was considered a sliding scale or a continuum with the perfect male on one end and the imperfect female on the other. Males were the fetuses who had reached their full potential.[8] It was believed that the sex of the fetus was determined either by its place in the uterus, by the temperature of the womb, or by the strength of the seed.[9] Since sex was determined by such vague and indefinite factors, biological sex was problematic: there was always the danger of a confusion of sexes. What made the sex even more problematic was its instability. Even after birth, the sex was not immutable. Reports of sex changes are common in ancient Greco-Roman literature.[10] Pliny the Elder, after talking about hermaphrodites,[11] discusses women who have changed into men. He even mentions himself seeing a person whose sex had changed.

> Women changing into men is no fantasy. We find in the Annals that during the consulship of P. Licinius Crassus and C. Cassius Longinus a girl living with her parents in Casinum changed into a boy and was transported to a barren island at the command of the soothsayers. Licinius Mucianus has recorded that he actually saw at Argos a man called Arescon who had been given the name Arescusa at birth and had even married a husband, but then grew a beard, developed male attributes, and took a wife. He also records seeing a boy at Smyrna who had experienced the same sex change. I myself saw in Africa one L. Consitius, a citizen of Thysdrus who

7 Laqueur 1990, 52.

8 Brown 1988, 9–10.

9 For example, Parmenides argued that females develop on the left side of the womb and males on the right. Empedocles maintained that males need a hot womb to develop, while a cold womb produces females. In Hippocratic writings, it is argued that the strength and quantity of sperm determines the sex. If both partners produce strong sperm, a male is born, but weak sperm results in a female. If one partner produces strong and the other weak sperm, the sex of the fetus is determined by the quantity of the sperm. See Laqueur 1990, 39; Allen 1985, 25–35.

10 For examples, see Ovid, *Metam.* 3.316–338 (Tiresias); 4.279–280 (Sithon); 4.285–388 (Hermaphroditus); 8.843–878 (Mestra); 9.666–797 (Iphis); 12.169–209 (Cainis). See also Brisson 2002, 35–44.

11 Pliny the Elder, *Nat.* 7.3.34: "People are also born participating in both sexes at once. We call them hermaphrodites, and, though they were once called *androgyni* and regarded as portents, they are now regarded as pets." Transl. Beagon 2005, 66.

> had turned into a man on his wedding day [and who was still alive at the time of writing].[12]

The sex changes mentioned by ancient writers are usually from female to male. Since the female reproductive organs were believed to be an inverted version of male genitals, they could protrude from the body if the body became more male-like; in other words, if body heat increased. The female sex was also seen as less stable. Since nature tended toward more perfect—that is, male—the sex changes were female to male.[13] The change needed not be as drastic as an actual sex change. There were stories of men who had become physically effeminate. A man could also lose his heat, making him more effeminate.[14] A Hippocratian treatise claims that Scythian men's inactive lifestyles made them more like women.[15] Thus, there could be masculine women and effeminate men. In order to be masculine, a man had to actively strive to extirpate traces of softness.[16]

As we have seen, it was possible to be somewhere in between the male and female poles of the sex continuum and to change one's sex. Considering the fluidity of biological sex, it was no wonder that masculinity could be called into question as well. Being born with male genitalia was not enough to prove that one was masculine. Still other aspects of the body could betray a lack of masculinity. Signs of the body were deciphered with the help of physiognomy.[17] Physiognomists believed that physical characteristics could be used as signs of behavioral characteristics and vice versa.[18] For example, Pseudo-Aristotle claims that males are braver and more honest, whereas females have a more evil disposition and are less courageous and honest.[19] Bodily signs were used

---

12 Pliny the Elder, *Nat.* 7.4.36. Transl. Beagon 2005, 66–67.

13 Beagon 2005, 173, 176.

14 Brown 1988, 10–11.

15 Hippocrates, *Aër.* 20–22. See also Allen 1985, 48; Dean-Jones 2003, 191.

16 Brown 1988, 11; Laqueur 1990, 7, 52.

17 Gleason 1995; Parsons 2006. The ancient sources include, for example, pseudo-Aristotle, *Physiogn.*; Polemo, *Physiognomonica*; Adamantius, *De Physiognomica*; Hippocrates, *Epid.* 2.6.1; 2.5.1; 2.5.16; 2.6.14, 19; 6.4.19; *Aër.* 24.1–40. Aristotle, *Part. an.* 648a; *Hist. an.* 491b; Iamblichus, *Vit. Pyth.* 17.71; Aulus Gellius, *Noct. att.* 1.9. On the other hand, some ancient writers expressed doubt about the possibility that one's character could be known from one's body. See, e.g., Pliny the Elder, *Nat.* 11.273–74; Euripides, *Med.* 516–519; Plutarch, *Cato the Elder* 7.2. See also Parsons 2006, 34–36.

18 Gleason 1995, 29, 58.

19 Pseudo-Aristotle, *Physiogn.* 809a–810a. See also Pseudo-Aristotle, *Physiogn.* 814a: "The male sex has been shown to be juster, braver, and speaking generally, superior to the female." Transl. W. S. Hett.

not only to differentiate between men and women, but also (and more importantly) between manly "real men" and effeminate men, the *cinaedi*.[20]

Ancient Greco-Roman Gender Stereotypes

Since a man was the standard, virtues were considered masculine characteristics. Mathew Kuefler notes that "it is impossible to separate Roman definitions of masculinity from more general notions of ideal human behavior."[21] Men and women were stereotypically portrayed in ancient Greco-Roman literature as being at the opposite ends of the gender hierarchy, with men epitomizing the virtues and women the vices. Men were depicted as strong, brave, magnanimous, and rational. They could control themselves. Women, on the other hand, were depicted as weak, vindictive, irrational, and self-indulgent.[22] Women lacked courage.[23] They were credulous and superstitious.[24] Arrogance, deception, ambition, and lust for power were also especially feminine vices.[25] All of these vices resulted from women's lack of masculine reason and self-control. The women's lack of control was based on biology. According to the Hippocratic theory, women had a moister constitution. As emotions were

20 Gleason (1990, 412) notes that physiognomy "purported to characterize the gulf between men and women, but actually served to divide the male sex to legitimate and illegitimate members." For example, Pseudo-Aristotle, *Physiogn.* 807a–808a presents the differences in the bodies of a masculine man and an effeminate man: "The characteristics of the brave man are stiff hair, an erect carriage of body, bones, sides and extremities of the body strong and large, broad and flat belly; shoulder-blades broad and far apart, neither very tightly knit nor altogether slack: a strong neck but not very fleshy; a chest fleshy and broad, thigh flat, calves of the legs broad below; a bright eye, neither too wide opened nor half closed; the skin on the body is inclined to be dry; the forehead sharp, straight, not large, and lean, neither very smooth nor very wrinkled. [...] The morbid character (κίναιδος) is shown by being weak-eyed and knock-kneed; his head is inclined to the right; and he carries his hands palm upward and slack, and he has two gaits—he either waggles his hips or holds them stiffly; he casts his eyes around him like Dionysius the sophist." Transl. W. S. Hett.

21 Kuefler 2001, 19.

22 Just 1989, 153–154. For instance, in the poem of Semonides of Amorgos, a wide range of negative qualities of women are mentioned: women are dirty, nosy, inconstant, thievish, vain, extravagant, greedy, lazy, and sexually insatiable. See also Plato, *Leg.* 781a.

23 E.g., Sophocles, *Trach*. 898–899; Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.33.

24 E.g., Plutarch, *Advice to the Bride and Groom* 19; Tacitus, *Ann.* 14.4.

25 For feminine schemes, see, e.g., Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.3–6; 11.3; 12.57–68; Livy 1.41; 1.48. For lust for power and ambition, see, e.g., Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.33; 12.7. Rutland 1978, 15–29; Smethurst 1950, 81–82.

considered to be moist, women were more susceptible to those.[26] In addition, women were believed to desire and enjoy sexual intercourse more than men.[27] Women also lacked self-control in relation to food and wine. They were gluttonous and inebriate.[28] Their lack of control was shown in avarice and desire for luxury as well.[29] The hierarchy between men and women was thus explained as based upon nature.[30] Biologically, males were perfect; therefore, men should be perfect (that is, masculine) in other ways as well. However, as we will see, this was not always the case.

It is essential to note that these stereotypical masculine and feminine characteristics did not necessarily correspond to anatomical sex.[31] Stereotypes only show how men and women were expected to behave, not how they actually behaved. Not all women behaved as was stereotypically expected of them. The ancient Greco-Roman writers themselves acknowledged that there were ideal women who could occasionally exemplify "masculine" virtues.[32] For instance, *Laudatio Turiae* and Plutarch mention ideal women who display masculine qualities. Nevertheless, these women offered no challenge to men and thus did not threaten their masculinity. The masculine behavior of a woman became transgressive when it exceeded the role of the ideal woman and threatened her husband.[33] In sum, the vices were stereotypically feminine aspects, but this did not mean that vices were necessarily aspects of all women. It was possible for a woman to have masculine qualities. In the same way, it was possible to label some men as effeminate if they did not adhere to the masculine ideal.

There were several opinions in the philosophical literature concerning the virtuous woman. Greco-Roman philosophers disagreed over whether the virtues of men and women were the same or different. Several philosophers argued that the virtues of men and women are different. The man's virtue is to

---

26 Especially in Stoic philosophy, emotions were considered to be irrational and thus a sign of a lack of self-control. More on women and emotions is found in Chapter 6.

27 E.g., Aristophanes, *Eccl.*, *passim*; *Lys.*, *passim*; Aristotle, *Probl.* 879a33–34; *Pol.* 1335a; Plutarch, *The Eating of Flesh* 997B. See also Carson 1999, 81; Nortwick 2008, 51; Dover 1974, 101.

28 E.g., Aristophanes, *Thesm.* 630–632, 730–738; *Eccl.* 130–145; Hesiod, *Works and Days* 703; Phaedrus 3.1. Cf. also Xenophon, *Oec.* 7.6, where Ischomachus commends his wife for having learned how to control her appetite. Just 1989, 153–166, 186; Lieu 2004, 184.

29 E.g., Livy 34.4.15–16; Sallust, *Bell. Cat.* 11; Plutarch, *Advice to the Bride and Groom* 12, 26, 48.

30 Brown 1988, 9.

31 Gleason 1995, 58.

32 See more on the ideal women in Chapter 5.

33 See, e.g., Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*; Juvenal, *Sat.* 6.

rule and the woman's virtue is to obey.[34] In Plato's *Meno*, this idea is presented by the titular character. Even though Socrates disagrees with this opinion and argues that the virtues are the same for men and women, Meriel Jones notes that "Meno is more likely to be representative of the popular view."[35] Aristotle also argued that "good men and good women are not good in the same way."[36] In this view, which emphasized the difference of the virtues of men and women, a masculine woman presented a greater threat to the masculinity of men. Plato and the Stoics, on the other hand, argued that men and women had the same virtues: wisdom (φρόνησις), courage (ἀνδρεία), justice (δικαιοσύνη), and temperance (σωφροσύνη).[37] The virtues were still conceptualized as masculine. According to the Stoics, therefore, the virtuous woman was to some extent masculine. These two ideals, which continued to co-exist throughout antiquity, affected the ideal masculinity as well. Before moving on to the ideal qualities and virtues of men, we need to investigate who could be hegemonically masculine men. Not all men had the opportunity to be hegemonically masculine.

Who is a Real, Hegemonically Masculine Man?

The ancient Greeks and Romans did not consider masculinity to be a permanent state that one could achieve irrefutably, but something that was always under construction and open to the scrutiny of other men. According to Maud Gleason, masculinity was an achieved state, independent of anatomical sex.[38] Other men could grant or deny the masculinity of a man. Evaluating the masculinity of other men was common in the ancient Greco-Roman world and invectives were readily used against deviants.[39] Thus, masculinity was not an inherent part of every man. There were biological men who were not considered "real" men.

---

34 Plato, *Meno* 71e.

35 Jones 2012, 106.

36 Aristotle, *Pol.* 1260a20. Transl. H. Rackham. See also *Pol.* 1277b20–23; *Rhet.* 1361a; 1367a20. This view of different virtues was supported also by Pythagoras, Democritus, Protagoras, and Gorgias; see Allen 1985, 22–43. See also Seneca, *Const.* 1.

37 Plato, *Meno* 71e–73c; *Resp.* 451d–452a, 455d–e; Antisthenes according to Diogenes Laertius 6.12; Musonius Rufus, *That Women Too Should Study Philosophy*. On the four cardinal virtues, see Plato, *Resp.* 435b; Cicero, *Inv.* 2.53.

38 Gleason 1995, xxii, 59, 96, 159; quotation from p. 59.

39 Gleason 1995, 27.

The ancient Greco-Roman gender system formed a hierarchical scale.[40] Peter-Ben Smit notes that the hierarchy of masculinity was not so much a gender hierarchy as a hierarchy of degrees of humanity.[41] The hierarchy also took on cosmic proportions, since masculinity was considered more divine.[42] At the top of the hierarchy were the exemplars of hegemonic masculinity: free, elite, adult male citizens. Below them were others, who could be categorized under the common term "unmen." These included not only women, but also boys, slaves, effeminate males, eunuchs, and "barbarians."[43] Discussed above was the women's lower position in the hierarchy, and above we have also seen how ethnicity affects masculinity: Scythian men were considered effeminate. The Greeks considered non-Greeks to be effeminate, but they themselves were regarded as effeminate by the Romans. Cicero, for instance, constructs Roman men as morally superior to and more masculine than the Greeks.[44] Lower-class men and slaves were also disqualified from being fully masculine.[45] Masculinity was connected not only with status, but also age. Both young boys and older men were generally thought to be lacking in proper masculinity. Real men were men in their prime.[46] One's place in the hierarchy was not stable, but could change. Boys and adolescent males moved up the ladder as they matured. Free, adult, elite men, on the other hand, could fall down the hierarchy and become effeminate if they did not fulfill the ideals of masculinity.

This gender hierarchy is also evident in the terms used. In Latin, there are two words for 'man,' *homo* and *vir*. *Homo* and *mulier* were the generic terms for 'man' and 'woman,' and these were used of the lower classes, including slaves and freedmen or freedwomen. *Vir* and *femina*, on the other hand, were used of the upper classes.[47] The Latin *vir* was a real, manly man.[48] The same was

40 Anderson & Moore 2003, 68; see Mattila 1996.

41 Smit 2006, 31.6.

42 See, e.g., Aristotle, *Gen. an.* 732a7–9; Philo, *Flight* 51.

43 Moore 2001, 135–136; Anderson & Moore 2003, 69.

44 Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.1.2; *Rep.* 5. See also Edwards 1993, 20, 95; Frilingos 2003, 307.

45 Kuefler 2001, 8; Glancy 2002, 24–25. One must note, however, that anatomy was not the only signifying element: elite women were higher on the hierarchy than male slaves or lower-class men. This perspective of intersectionality complicates the picture.

46 Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1390b. See also Horace, *Ars* 35–37. On "masculinity of youth" and "masculinity of matrimony" in New Comedy, see Pierce 1998.

47 Santoro L'Hoir 1992, 1–2. Santoro L'Hoir (1992, 2) notes: "while every man, by definition, is a *homo*, and every woman, a *mulier*, not every man or woman is a *vir* or a *femina*, respectively." This usage can be seen in Cicero and Livy; see Santoro L'Hoir 1992.

48 Gunderson 2000, 7; Alston 1998, 206. Santoro L'Hoir (1992, 2) notes that *vir* and *femina* came to be identified with the virtues of Rome. In contrast, *homo* and *mulier* came to represent foreign vices.

true in Greek. While ἄνθρωπος denoted the general man, ἀνήρ was used for the "real" man.[49] The "real" men were those who fulfilled the ideals of hegemonic masculinity.

What, then, were the real men like? According to Craig Williams, control and dominion were the prime directives of Roman masculinity. A man had to constantly defend his masculinity by controlling not only those under his jurisdiction, but also himself and his desires and emotions. Control was connected with power (*potestas*), meaning both power over others and independence of the power of others.[50] The unmanly status of groups lower in the gender hierarchy mentioned above was a result of their inability to control others or even themselves. Men who were adults, free, and members of the elite were considered the most able to control themselves and, accordingly, also others.[51] Nevertheless, elite men were not secure in their masculinity either. As we have seen, it was a common belief that a man could control himself much better than a woman, so inability to exercise control made a man effeminate. Effeminate men constituted a negative paradigm to the masculine ideal: they were what real men were not, and real men were what effeminate men were not.[52]

In the first century CE, following the influence of Stoic teaching, the emphasis shifted increasingly from control of others to self-control.[53] The philosophers argued that control over oneself was the basis for the control of other people.[54] Self-control demonstrated that a man was worthy to govern others.[55] Control of others and self-control can be thus seen in a causal way. Self-control is a prerequisite for control of others. Liew argues, however, that the relationship between these competing ideologies is less straightforward. The competing ideologies simply coexisted, and they could become mixed together.[56] It is important to note that there was no one single hegemonic masculinity, but several ideals of masculinity competing for the hegemonic position.[57] Different

49 Schmidt 1967–1969, 385–387; Oepke 1964a, 360–363; Santoro L'Hoir 1992, 27. The words for sexual differentiation in Greek were ἄρσην and θῆλυς. The gender-specific word for woman was γυνή; see Schmidt 1967–1969, 401–404; Oepke 1964b, 776.

50 The importance of control is also evident in the use of such terms as *imperium*, *auctoritas*, and ἐξουσία. It was argued that a true man was never servile. See, e.g., Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 6.35.2. Alston 1998, 206–207; Smit 2006, 31.6; Williams 1999, 133, 138.

51 Nortwick 2008, 25.

52 Williams 1999, 126–127, 141.

53 Anderson & Moore 2003, 69.

54 E.g., Plato, *Gorg.* 491d–e; Plutarch, *Sayings of Spartans* 233D.

55 See, e.g., Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 1.13; Xenophon, *Ages.* 6; Plato, *Symp.* 217a–219e.

56 Liew 2003, 109.

57 See Chapter 1.

ideals competing for the hegemonic position can be seen, for example, in discussions about whether control of others or self-control is more important in terms of self-defense and sexual behavior.

The discussion of whether a man should retaliate against wrongs he has suffered or whether he should be self-controlled and seek compensation in court demonstrates the existence of competing, co-existing ideals of masculinity. This discussion will be important later when I study Jesus' behavior in the passion narratives.[58] The idea that the real man was able to revenge wrongs was common. According to Aristotle, it is disgraceful not to be able to defend oneself.[59] In Plato's *Gorgias*, Callicles argues that "endurance of wrong done is not a man's part at all, but a poor slave's."[60] According to this view, a real man does not submit to wrongs, but is able to defend himself and his own. Socrates, on the contrary, argues that doing wrong is worse than suffering it.[61] Angela Hobbs notes that Plato presents two alternative concepts of masculinity, the Achillean version of masculinity as violence and control and Socrates' version of masculinity as self-control and endurance. Plato problematizes the heroic masculinity of Achilles and advocates self-control as the ideal masculinity: real men must control themselves.[62] In Stoic writings as well, the ideal of self-control was seen as more important than avenging wrongs.[63] In sum, there seems to have been at least two competing ideals. It is possible that the ideal of masculinity as control over others, which Callicles and Aristotle favored, was the more common and widespread ideal. Socrates, Plato, and the Stoics favored the ideal of self-controlled masculinity, which may have been the ideal for only a minority of men.

The orators used both of these ideals for their own ends.[64] For example, Demosthenes argues in *Against Meidias* that when he did not retaliate after

58 See more in Chapter 7.

59 Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1355a–b. See also Aristophanes, *Vesp*. 1297–1298.

60 Plato, *Gorg.* 483a–b. Transl. W. R. M. Lamb. Hobbs 2000, 138–140.

61 Plato, *Gorg.* 474b. See also Plato, *Gorg.* 522e: "No man fears the mere act of dying, except he be utterly irrational and unmanly (ἄνανδρος); doing wrong is what one fears." Transl. W. R. M. Lamb. See also Plato, *Crito* 49a–b.

62 Hobbs 2000.

63 For example, Cicero argues in *Tusc*. 2.14–15 that disgrace is a greater evil than pain. He calls the view of Aristippus the Socratic and Epicurus, who maintained that pain was the chief evil, a "backboneless, effeminate view" (*enervatam muliebremque sententiam*). Transl. J. E. King.

64 Roismann 2002, 129.

an assault, he had behaved with self-restraint (σωφρόνως).[65] Demosthenes maintains that a man should not resort to self-defense, but he should instead seek redress from the law.[66] Based on this, Gabriel Herman argues that "the Athenian code prescribed that *upon being provoked, offended, or injured a citizen should not retaliate, but should exercise self-restraint, avoid violence, reconsider, or renegotiate the case; in brief, compromise*."[67] In another speech, however, Demosthenes presents an opposite ideal and implies that a man who did not hit back resembled a slave.[68] David Cohen sees this speech as more representative of Demosthenes' thinking. According to Cohen, the court did not serve to terminate conflicts; on the contrary, Demosthenes' speech was a sign of the agonistic nature of the Athenian society.[69] However, instead of emphasizing the importance of either ideal, I suggest that these two ideals, the ideal of non-retaliatory response and the ideal of defending oneself, simply coexisted.[70] Thus, there appears to have been two ideals competing for the hegemonic position. Demosthenes used both for his own ends, depending on his needs. He did not attempt to resolve the conflict between these different ideals.

Ideal Characteristics of Masculine Men

As mentioned above, virtues in general were considered masculine. This did not mean that women could not be virtuous; women were only expected to behave in a stereotypically "feminine" way. Virtuous behavior was discussed in philosophical writings. Plato mentions wisdom (φρόνησις), temperance (σωφροσύνη), courage (ἀνδρεία), and justice (δικαιοσύνη) as the components of virtue.[71] Aristotle adds magnanimity (μεγαλοψυχία), magnificence (μεγαλοπρέπεια), liberality (ἐλευθεριότης), and gentleness (πραότης).[72] The ideal man in the ancient Greco-Roman world was on one hand a good leader:

65 Demosthenes, *Against Meidias* 21.74. See also Demosthenes, *Against Conon* 54.13; Lysias, *For the Soldier* 9.4–5.

66 Herman 1996, 14–15, 21–22.

67 Herman 1994, 107 (emphasis original); Herman 1993, 418.

68 Demosthenes, *Against Timocrates* 24.167. Cf. Demosthenes, *Against Meidias* 21.180. In *Against Meidias* 21.72, Demosthenes notes that it is understandable if one wants to defend himself. See also Lysias, *Against Simon*.

69 Cohen 1995.

70 See also Roismann 2002, 136–137; Dover 1974, 3.

71 Plato, *Prot.* 349b. See also Cicero, *Tusc.* 3.36–37.

72 Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1366b.

loyal, just, helpful to his community, and courageous in war. He was also self-controlled in his use of power and not overly ambitious or power-hungry. On the other hand, in his private life the ideal man fulfilled his familial duties as a good son and leader of the household, and he was self-controlled and guided by reason. *Pietas* or εὐσέβεια, which meant both piety toward the gods and obedience toward parents, was also an ideal quality for a man.[73]

The quintessential masculine virtue was ἀνδρεία or *virtus*. Both the Greek word ἀνδρεία and the Latin word *virtus* derive from the gender-specific term for 'man' (ἀνήρ and *vir*, respectively), and they can thus be translated as "manliness" or "manly behavior." Both words characterize the ideal behavior of a man.[74] Cicero, for example, argues that men should be virtuous, since "it is from the word for 'man' (*vir*) that the word virtue (*virtus*) is derived."[75] Since etymologically ἀνδρεία and *virtus* meant 'manliness,' attributing the quality to a woman was automatically paradoxical.[76] For example, Herodotus expresses wonder when Artemisia, the queen of Halicarnassus, displays ἀνδρεία.[77] Seneca presents women's vices (*muliebria vitia*) as antithetical to *virtus*, but he also argues that being a woman is no excuse for lacking *virtus*.[78] Musonius Rufus maintains as well that a woman should have ἀνδρεία.[79] For the Stoic philosophers, male sex was not the prerequisite for ἀνδρεία or *virtus*. Still, it was considered unusual for a woman to display ἀνδρεία.

The term ἀνδρεία was used in martial contexts and is usually translated as 'courage.' The Latin *virtus*, on the other hand, had wider connotations than ἀνδρεία. The word was used to translate both ἀνδρεία and ἀρετή. Initially, *virtus* meant courage demonstrated in war, but over time the concept was

---

73 Roisman 2005, 7; Smethurst 1950, 86; D'Angelo 2007, 66–71.

74 McDonnell 2006, 2. According to McDonnell, the Roman ideal of *virtus* originally meant courage in battle. Influenced by Hellenism and the Greek ideal of ἀρετή, the ideal of masculinity changed and *virtus* began to have a more ethical meaning. McDonnell 2006, 9, 105, 112. *Virtus* was also "a quintessentially public value that was displayed, tested, won, or lost in the delimited context of service to the Republic." McDonnell 2006, xiii.

75 Cicero, *Tusc.* 2.43. Transl. J. E. King.

76 Just 1989, 157.

77 Herodotus, *Hist.* 7.99.1. See also Harrell 2002, 77.

78 Seneca, *Helv.* 16.2–5. Williams 1999, 133.

79 Musonius Rufus, *Whether Daughters and Sons Should Receive the Same Education*: "Someone may perhaps say that manliness (ἀνδρεία) is a quality only of men. Not so! For a woman too must be manly and the best women at least must have no strain of cowardice, so that she is bowed down neither by labour nor by fear. If this is not so, how will a woman be chaste, if someone by causing her fear or imposing labour could force her to suffer some outrage." Transl. Cora E. Lutz. See also Goldhill 1995, 137; Nussbaum 2002, 287.

intellectualized and came to mean resisting (moral) evil.[80] There was thus a connection between morality and masculinity. The traditional definition of ἀνδρεία as martial courage and steadfastness in battle can be seen in Plato's dialogue *Laches*, where the initial definition of ἀνδρεῖος is "anyone who is willing to stay at his post and face the enemy."[81] Socrates, however, notes that ἀνδρεία can be expressed outside the battlefield as well. For Socrates, ἀνδρεία means steadfastness in enduring the pain of disease, poverty, or dishonor. It was also possible to show ἀνδρεία by not fearing death.[82] For Plato, ἀνδρεία entailed self-controlled (σώφρων) and moderate (μέτριος) endurance.[83] Thus, ἀνδρεία appears close to another important virtue, self-control (σωφροσύνη), in Plato's texts.[84]

Plato was not the only one to see σωφροσύνη as a masculine virtue. His innovation lay in connecting the traditionally martial idea of ἀνδρεία with the more moral quality of σωφροσύνη. Originally σωφροσύνη meant prudence, but later the word gained moral connotations of self-control, controlling emotions and passions.[85] The manly nature of σωφροσύνη is revealed in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, when the choir says to Clytemnestra: "you speak as wisely as a prudent man (κατ' ἄνδρα σώφρονα)."[86] Self-control was a masculine virtue. Women could be self-controlled, but for them it was also masculine.[87]

---

80 For *virtus* as a military value, see, e.g., Livy 23.15.12; Horace, *Carm.* 3.2; Plutarch, *Marcius Coriolanus* 1.4: "in those days Rome held in highest honour that phase of virtue which concerns itself with warlike and military achievements, and evidence of this may be found in the only Latin word for virtue (ἀρετή), which signifies really *manly valour* (ἀνδρεία); they made valour, a specific form of virtue, stand for virtue in general." Transl. Bernadotte Perrin. See also Sarsila 1982, esp. p. 90.

81 Plato, *Lach.* 190e. Transl. W. R. M. Lamb. For Aristotle, ἀνδρεία was a mean between cowardice and rashness; *Eth. nic.* 1104a25: "The man who runs away from everything in fear and never endures anything becomes a coward (δειλός); the man who fears nothing whatsoever but encounters everything becomes rash (θρασύς)." Transl. H. Rackham. See also *Eth. nic.* 1107b.

82 Plato, *Lach.* 191d–e; *Resp.* 386a; *Leg.* 633c–d. See also Hobbs 2000; Schmid 1992.

83 Plato, *Resp.* 399a–d.

84 Plato, *Phaed.* 68c–d. See also Hobbs 2000, 231.

85 Another important term for self-control was ἐγκράτεια.

86 Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 351.

87 Foucault 1990, 63–77, 83. This was especially the case in Stoic philosophy, where the virtues of men and women were the same. If the virtues of men and women were considered to be different, σωφροσύνη meant different things for men and women. For men, it was a civic virtue, whereas for women it specifically meant the feminine virtues of chastity, modesty, and obedience. See North 1966; 1977.

Effeminacy and Lack of Self-Control

The importance of self-control as a masculine virtue can also be seen in how all vices were considered examples of a lack of self-control (*incontinentia*, ἀκολασία).[88] Placing excessive attention on appearance, seeking to be dominated and to pleasure others, and yielding to passions were examples of lack of control, which emasculated a man.[89] Lack of control epitomized the subordinated masculinities of the ancient Greco-Roman world.

Above I suggested that there were two different ideals concerning retaliation for wrongs: control over others and self-control. These two ideals can be found in texts concerning sexual behavior as well. Some writers emphasized the importance of control over others. Williams suggests that the dominant paradigm of masculinity in the ancient Rome was what he calls "priapic masculinity." In this paradigm, the man asserted his masculinity by dominating others.[90] Other writers emphasized the importance of self-control.[91] Self-control meant being restrained and moderate. Sex was only for procreation. Common to both of these ideals was the idea that the man had an active role in sex. Passivity was a sign of lack of control, which made a man effeminate.

Connell mentions that in the modern Western world, homosexuality is the most important subordinated masculinity. In the ancient Greco-Roman world, on the contrary, effeminacy was not necessarily connected with same-sex sexual behavior.[92] Instead of exclusive sexual orientation, the ancient Greeks and Romans made a distinction between the active, penetrative role and the passive, receptive role.[93] The hegemonically masculine "real" man was to have

---

88 Edwards 1993, 5; Foucault 1990, 63–77.

89 Williams 1999, 141; also Glancy 2003, 242; Gleason 1995, 65; Roisman 2005, 89.

90 Williams 1999, 18, 51, 153.

91 In medical texts, moderation was the ideal. Celsus (*De Medicina* 1.1.4) argued that sexual intercourse should be neither feared nor desired too much. Soranus (*Gynecology* 1.7.30–32) considered permanent virginity to be healthful. Philosophers like Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius maintained that men should strive not to desire sex. Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.18.15; 4.9.3; Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 2.10; 9.40. Epictetus admits that not everyone shared his ideal; on the contrary, there were some men who admired those who "can cajole and corrupt most women"; *Diatr.* 4.9. Transl. Whitney J. Oates. Epicurus thought that sexual intercourse was never beneficial; see Diogenes Laertius 10.118.

92 Williams 1999, 7. Whether the word 'homosexual' can be used in the context of antiquity has raised a heated debate. See, e.g., Richlin 1993; Williams 1999; Halperin 1990; 2002a; 2002b; Parker 2001.

93 Williams (1999, 16–17) maintains that the Romans did not condemn homosexual behavior *per se*. He argues that it was specifically the Greek practice of pederasty, engaging

an active role regardless of the gender of the person he had sex with. It was the free adult man who wanted to be penetrated who was labeled as effeminate—that is, as an example of subordinated masculinity. The most common word used for a man who sought to be penetrated was κίναιδος or *cinaedus*.[94] This word is not found in the Synoptic Gospels. However, eunuchs were another group that was considered effeminate, and they are mentioned in Matthew 19:12.[95]

Playing the passive role in sex was not the only way to acquire the label of a "sexual deviant." According to Craig Williams, a man who played the active role could still be accused of effeminacy.[96] For example, Catullus accuses Julius Caesar and Mamurra both of being *cinaedi* and of seducing women and girls.[97] Even though an adulterer played an active role, his passivity in regard to pleasures made him effeminate.[98] Effeminate men were excessively active with both sexes. Even being too fond of one's wife could result in a man being accused of effeminacy, as happened to Pompey the Great.[99] Effeminacy was the result of not just passivity, but insatiability and lack of control. This was also the case in other matters than sex.[100]

Thus, seeking to be penetrated was only one symptom of effeminacy. Other symptoms were softness and moral decadence.[101] Excess in any area of life (such as food and drink, physical appearance, and clothing) might lead to a man being labeled as effeminate. Sex and eating were often connected in the

---

in sexual relationships with freeborn adolescent males, that was disgraceful and illicit behavior (*stuprum*). Williams 1999, 62–63.

94 Williams 1999, 7. The *cinaedus* was a common scare-figure in the Greco-Roman texts. E.g., Plato, *Phaedr.* 239c–d; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 3.1. Long (1996, 71–74) offers examples of sexual accusations and effeminacy.

95 See more in Chapter 4.

96 Williams 1999, 125.

97 Catullus 57.

98 Davidson 1997, 176–177.

99 Plutarch, *Pompey* 48.5–7. See also Chariton, *Chaereas and Callirhoe* 5.2: "Barbarians are naturally passionately fond of women." Transl. Bryan P. Reardon.

100 See also Davidson, who notes that the connection between effeminacy and sex did not lie in passivity but in insatiability. Davidson argues that Foucault's power-penetration theory focuses too much on penetration. The passive partner was not inactive: he or she was not the object of someone else's enjoyment, but a too-willing participant, "opening up too readily to pleasure." Davidson 1997, 177–178.

101 Williams 1999, 175. The word *mollis* (soft) and its synonyms were common pejoratives for an effeminate man. E.g., Catullus 25.1; Horace, *Epod.* 1.9–10; Martial, *Epigr.* 5.37.2; Juvenal, *Sat.* 8.15; Cicero, *Cat.* 2.22–23. Plato also associates softness with the unmanly mode of life; *Phaedr.* 239c. Edwards (1993, 68) notes that *mollitia* was used as an accusation in a whole range of discourses that had nothing to do with sexual behavior.

ancient literature.[102] Sex, food, and drink were necessities, but they needed to be enjoyed in moderation. As mentioned above, women were stereotypically depicted as gluttonous and inebriate. A man who could not control his appetites was effeminate.[103] Excessive concern for one's appearance—such as soft and depilated skin, using perfume, and feminine dress—betrayed a man's effeminacy. Effeminacy was also evident in feminine gestures and the way of walking.[104] Moreover, behavior that was considered luxurious, hedonistic, self-indulgent, or avaricious was labeled as effeminate.[105] This behavior indicated lack of control over one's desires. Gluttony and luxury reflected the Eastern way of life, and this association with the barbarians made the man effeminate.[106]

Another example of effeminacy was the abuse of power evident in tyranny. Ambition and lust for power were seen as feminine vices. Tyranny did not imply hypermasculinity or the dominance of others, but the inability to control oneself.[107] The ideal leader in the ancient Greco-Roman world, as mentioned above, was self-controlled in his use of power. Tyrants were accused of several vices connected with a lack of self-control: *vis* (violence), *superbia*

---

102 Aeschines, *Against Timarchus* 1; Suetonius, *Claud.* 33; *Galb.* 22; Valerius Maximus 2.5.6; Plato, *Leg.* 781d; Sallustius, *Bell. Cat.* 13; Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.1.1–4; Plutarch, *The Eating of Flesh* 997 2B–C. Eating in moderation is recommended in Musonius Rufus, *On Food*; Pseudo-Phocylides 69. See also Henry 1992, 251–255; Swancutt 2003, 211–212; Glancy 2003, 245; Bailey 2007.

103 Seneca the Elder, *Contr.* 1.pr.8.9; Horace, *Sat.* 2.2. Edwards 1993, 81–82. Jones (2012, 209) argues: "Food, drink, and sex were all thought to require moderation; consequently, over-indulgence in any or all of these areas had the power to label the agent an effeminate, and if a man is gluttonous towards food and drink, it is safe to assume that he may also be sexually voracious, and indiscriminately so."

104 Depilation: Martial, *Epigr.* 2.36.6, 2.62, 9.27.5, 9.57; Juvenal, *Sat.* 2.12, 8.13–18, 9.95. Use of makeup: Juvenal, *Sat.* 2.93–95, 6.O.21–O.22. Clothing: Martial, *Epigr.* 1.96.9, 3.82.5; Juvenal, *Sat.* 2.97; Cicero, *Verr.* 2.5.31; *Cat.* 2.22–23; *Phil.* 2.76. Gestures: Juvenal, *Sat.* 6.O.24, 9.133; Plutarch, *Pompey* 48.7. Walk: Seneca, *Ep.* 52.12, 114.4–6; Phaedrus, *App.* 8; Macrobius, *Sat.* 2.3.16. For effeminate gestures and ways of walking, see also Pseudo-Aristotle, *Physiogn.* 807a–808a quoted above. See also Edwards 1993, 68–69; Herter 1959, 629–636; Richlin 1992, 221 n. 3; Swancutt 2007, 30; Williams 1999, 130, 226–227. Herter (1959, 642–650) notes that the early Christian writers also considered these features as signs of effeminacy.

105 Cicero, *Verr.* 2.1.62; Sallust, *Bell. Cat.* 11; Aulus Gellius, *Noct. att.* 3.1. Plutarch argues that gluttony leads to cruelty and lawlessness. Plutarch, *The Eating of Flesh* 997B.

106 Polybius 31.25.2–5; Sallust, *Bell. Cat.* 11–12. Julius Caesar suggests that the Belgae are the bravest (*fortissimi*) of the Gauls because they did not have imported luxury products that effeminate the mind; *Bell. gall.* 1.1. See also Corbeill 1997, 99–103; Edwards 1993, 80; Richlin 2003, 218.

107 Langlands 2006, 292.

(arrogance, pride), *libido* (lust), and *crudelitas* (cruelty).[108] For example, Cicero accused C. Verres, L. Calpurnius Piso, and Mark Antony of lust, arrogance, and cruelty.[109] He also accused P. Clodius of unbridled lust, cruelty, and impiety. These qualities not only made Clodius tyrannical, but also effeminate (*homo effeminatus*).[110] Even though tyrants were high in the power hierarchy, according to ancient writers they were not masculine. Tyrants were more likely to act like women and barbarians.[111] One reason for this depiction of tyrants as effeminate is that the Roman sources were republican. One way of disputing the legitimacy of the rule of the tyrants was to label them as effeminate.

Marginalized Masculinities in the Ancient Greco-Roman World

Next we will look at some marginalized masculinities in the ancient Greco-Roman world. What strategies did they employ in relation to the hegemonic masculinities? As the examples of marginalized masculinities in the ancient Greco-Roman world, I have chosen the masculinity of gladiators and the masculinities in early Judaism.[112] I consider early Jewish masculinities as marginal for the same reasons as the early Christian masculinities. Both groups were minor religious groups that did not occupy the hegemonic position in the ancient Greco-Roman world. The difference between early Judaism and early Christianity is that early Judaism was tolerated for its long history and thus more likely to be somewhat authorized by the hegemonic groups.[113]

The masculinity of the gladiators was marginalized, since the majority of the gladiators were slaves or condemned prisoners. The general attitude toward gladiators was ambivalent. On one hand, they were despised as providers

108 Dunkle 1967, 151; Starr 1949.

109 Cicero, *Verr*. 2.1.82; 2.5.81; *Prov. cons*. 6, 8; *Pis.* 66; *Phil.* 3.28–29: "What is there in Antonius save lust, cruelty, insolence, audacity? He is wholly compacted of these vices. No trace in him of gentlemanly feeling, none of moderation, none of self-respect, none of modesty." Transl. D. R. Shackleton Bailey. See also Dunkle 1967, 164.

110 Cicero, *Mil*. 89; *Dom*. 109–110. See also Dunkle 1967, 163.

111 Bassi 1998, 145–146.

112 Early Judaism is usually dated to the periods of Persian and Roman rule from the 6th century BCE to the 3rd century CE. However, in this study I concentrate on sources that are roughly contemporary with the New Testament.

113 On the other hand, one has to note that the "parting of the ways" between early Judaism and early Christianity had not yet happened in the first century CE, so the ancient Greco-Roman people did not necessarily differentiate between Jews and Christians.

of public entertainment.[114] On the other hand, they were admired in the philosophical writings, since the gladiator's oath transformed involuntary death into a voluntary one. Philosophers lauded gladiators as examples of endurance and the acceptance of death.[115] They were the ultimate models of self-control. While this did not make them fully masculine, they could be used as examples for those who subscribed to the self-controlled, philosophic ideal of masculinity. Gladiators can thus be seen as an ancient example of marginalized masculinity that was nonetheless relatively authorized by the hegemonic masculinities.

Ideal masculinities found in early Jewish texts form closer examples to the early Christian masculinities. Early Judaism was a similarly marginalized religious group as early Christianity. Although the Hebrew Bible is an important background for the entire New Testament, I concentrate on the Jewish writers that were approximately contemporary with the New Testament writers.[116] How did they relate to the hegemonic masculinities of the ancient Greco-Roman world? As suggested in Chapter 1, there were several possible strategies (for example, acceptance or resistance). On closer investigation, a more complex picture emerges. The attitude of Judaism to the surrounding culture was not necessarily either acceptance or resistance, but can be characterized as a mixture of both acceptance and resistance.

A certain acceptance of Greco-Roman ideals can be seen in the knowledge and use of philosophical concepts. Philo, for example, shows knowledge of and uses the concepts of Hellenistic philosophy. Several early Jewish writings present similar ideals of masculinity as the Greco-Roman masculinities.

---

114 Juvenal, *Sat*. 2.142–145; Seneca, *Nat.* 7.31.3. Edwards 1993; Williams 1999, 141–142.

115 See, e.g., Seneca, *Ep*. 30.8; Cicero, *Phil.* 3.35; *Tusc*. 2.17.40–41. Barton 1993, 15–16; Cobb 2008, 48–49; Kyle 1998, 80.

116 The Hebrew Bible is closer to the ancient Near Eastern cultures than the Greco-Roman world. The Hebrew Bible should be compared to the masculinities of the ancient Near East. It is possible that the Hebrew Bible had different ideas of masculinity than those in the Greco-Roman world. Moreover, it is possible that the masculinities in the Hebrew Bible differed from both Greco-Roman and Near Eastern ideals. Susan Haddox (2010), for example, maintains that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob all occasionally appear feminine. Haddox argues that this critique of hegemonic masculinity is intended to show a proper relationship with God: "While the biblical text in many ways reflects and supports the categories of hegemonic masculinity, in the realm of the relation with God, these norms are frequently subverted because no human can assume the position of ultimate power. That position is left to God." Haddox 2010, 15. On Hebrew Bible masculinities, see Creangă (ed.) 2010; Creangă & Smit (ed.) 2014; Zsolnay (ed.) 2017.

Self-control, for example, was the masculine ideal in several early Jewish texts.[117] As we will see, Josephus has an apologetic aim of showing to the opponents of Judaism that the biblical characters were ideal men. In *Joseph and Aseneth*, Joseph is called "a man powerful (δυνατός) in wisdom and experience." He is also described as self-controlled, meek, and merciful; in other words, he is an ideal man.[118] Ben Sira argues that the man should exercise control over his speech, associates, sexual behavior, and household.[119]

Some early Jewish texts reflect a negative attitude toward Rome. For example, in *Sibylline Oracles* 5.162–173, Rome is called an "effeminate (θηλυγενὴς) and unjust, evil city." The rabbis also had a more ambivalent attitude toward Rome.[120] I suggest that the writers who had a negative attitude toward Rome were more likely to be voluntarily marginalized, and thus their masculinity would be less complicit with the hegemonic ideals. I expect Philo and Josephus, who were members of the Jewish elite, although not the Roman elite, to be more complicit with the hegemonic ideals of masculinity. In the following, the aim is not to offer a comprehensive account of early Jewish masculinities, but to present some examples of how masculinity can be seen in some early Jewish writers and texts, namely Philo, Josephus, 4 Maccabees, and the rabbinical writings. These texts show a variety of strategies that the early Jews adopted vis-à-vis Greco-Roman culture.

Philo

Philo belonged to the Jewish elite. He was also probably a Roman citizen. Philo wrote predominantly for an elite Jewish audience, but some texts also explicitly take into account the Roman audience. Nevertheless, his texts are not apologetics to Greeks or Romans. Rather, the texts which are occasionally interpreted as having an apologetic aim, such as *On the Embassy to Gaius* and *Against Flaccus*, were in fact intended for fellow Jews as a way of defending

117 Philo (e.g., in *Alleg. Interp.* 3.156); *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*; Sir *passim*. Smith 1999, 100.

118 *Joseph and Aseneth* 4.7; 8.8. Transl. C. Burchard.

119 Ben Sira mentions controlling one's wife and children, esp. daughters (e.g., Sir 25:25–26; 26:1–27; 30:1–13; 42:9–11) and self-control (e.g., Sir 18:30–31). See also Camp 1991, 19.

120 Leander (2011, 170–171) notes the ambivalent attitude of the rabbis toward Rome (*b. Šabbat* 33b): "R. Judah, R. Jose, and R. Simeon were sitting … R. Judah commenced [the discussion] by observing, 'How fine are the works of this people! They have made streets, they have built bridges, they have erected baths.' R. Jose was silent. R. Simeon b. Yohai answered and said: 'All what they made they made for themselves; they built market-places, to set harlots in them; baths, to rejuvenate themselves; bridges, to levy tolls for them.'"

Philo's pro-Roman policy.[121] In any case, even if Philo was a member of the Jewish elite, this does not mean that he was in the hegemonic position. His marginal position in relation to the Roman elite can be seen from his deferent posture in *On the Embassy to Gaius*.

Sharon Lea Mattila argues that Philo's thought is influenced by a gender gradient, with positive (male) and negative (female) poles.[122] This gradient also has cosmic dimensions: beyond the peak of the positive "male" pole lies God, while below the negative "female" pole lies unformed matter.[123] The soul of a human being has a higher part and a lower part. The higher, rational part of the soul is masculine and likened to God. The irrational part is feminine and identified with the senses and passions.[124]

Philo shares several ideas with the Greco-Roman world. He regards activity, strength, and rationality as masculine, whereas passivity, weakness, and irrationality are feminine.[125] Furthermore, the male is more complete and superior to the female; a female is nothing but an imperfect male.[126] The masculine mind must control the feminine senses.[127] As in the Greco-Roman writings, these are stereotypes, not depictions of real men and women. Women can acquire rational, manly virtues, but this is exceptional.[128] Philo also notes the possibility for a man to become effeminate if the "male" mind descends to the "female" pole of the gradient, being under the influence of passions and the sense perception.[129]

Philo also shares the ideals of masculinity with the ancient Greco-Roman writers. For example, ἀνδρεία is an important virtue for Philo. Philo defines

---

121 Niehoff 2001, 8–9, 39–40; see, e.g., *Moses* 1.1–3.

122 Mattila 1996, 106, 119.

123 Mattila 1996, 125–126.

124 See, e.g., Philo, *Spec. Laws* 3.178–180; *Alleg. Interp.* 2.6, 50; 3.161; *Creation* 146, 165–166; *Names* 223; *Worse* 28, 89–90; *Heir* 232–233; *QG* 1.46; *Sacrifices* 103. Baer 1970, 14–17; Mattila 1996, 105; Sly 1990, 47.

125 Philo, *Spec. Laws* 1.200–201; *Alleg. Interp.* 2.97. Philo also argues that the Essenes do not marry because a woman is a selfish, jealous, deceitful, proud, and shameless creature. Philo, *Hypothetica* 11.14–16.

126 Philo, *QE* 1.7–8.

127 Philo, *Worse* 28: "the passions are by nature feminine, and we must practice the quitting of these for the masculine traits that mark the noble affections."

128 Philo mentions Sarah (*Worse* 28) when commenting on Gen 18:11, as well as Julia Augusta (*Embassy* 319–320): "training and practice gave virility (ἀρρενωθεῖσα) to her reasoning power." Transl. F. H. Colson.

129 Mattila 1996, 107, 127. Philo mentions Laban (*QG* 4.117–118, *Dreams* 1.45), Lot (*Migration* 13), and Joseph (*Migration* 203–204) as examples of effeminate men who are identified with the sense perception. Mattila 1996, 112.

ἀνδρεία as "not the warlike fury that the multitudes take it for, which uses anger as its guide, but courage as knowledge (ἐπιστήμην)."[130] Philo is thus closer to the philosophical ideal of courage as an intellectual rather than a military virtue. He presents the biblical characters as exemplifying the ideals of the Greco-Roman world. Moses combines the qualities of the king, philosopher, law-giver, priest, and prophet, and thus he exemplifies the virtuous life.[131] Philo's Moses is self-controlled, avoids luxury, and is persuasive in speech.[132] Joseph is an example of how a man needs first to become a good manager of the household before becoming a statesman.[133] In the incident with Potiphar's wife, Joseph epitomizes masculine self-control while Potiphar's wife exemplifies unrestrained femininity.[134] In Pentateuchal legislation, self-control (ἐγκράτεια) is presented as the Jewish ideal.[135]

So far, Philo's ideal masculinity seems similar to the philosophical ideal of self-controlled masculinity competing for the hegemonic position. He shares the same stereotypes and the same ideals for men. Philo can thus be seen as complicit with the philosophical ideal of masculinity. At the same time, he aims to present Judaism as meeting and even exceeding the Greco-Roman ideals.[136] Philo argues that the Jewish religion offers superior methods for achieving the same virtues.[137] While being complicit with the philosophical ideals of masculinity, he also shows resistance to the attempts to marginalize Judaism, arguing that the Jews are actually better able to achieve the masculine virtues. This makes Philo's relationship to the hegemonic masculinities more complex and shows a strategy of mixed acceptance and resistance that a marginal group can adopt in relation to the hegemonic groups.

---

130 Philo, *On Courage* 1. Transl. Walter T. Wilson.

131 Philo, *Moses* 2.3–7; *Joseph* 54: "Moses has now set before us three characteristics of the statesman, his shepherd-craft, his household-management, his self-control." Transl. F. H. Colson.

132 Philo, *Moses* 2.3–7, 2.8.

133 Philo, *Joseph* 38–39. On Joseph in Jewish texts, see Tinklenberg deVega 2006. Philo argues also that men and women have different roles: "that the physical forms of a man and a woman are dissimilar, and that the life assigned to each of these forms is not the same (for one a domestic, to the other a civic life has been allotted)." *On Courage* 19. Transl. Walter T. Wilson.

134 Philo, *Alleg. Interp.* 3.237.

135 Philo, *Spec. Laws* 2.195. See also *On the Contemplative Life*, where the Therapeutai are portrayed as examples of self-control.

136 See also Niehoff 2001, 75–110.

137 E.g., Philo, *Spec. Laws* 4.179.

Josephus

Josephus' primary audience was non-Jews.[138] As a result, Josephus' works have an apologetic bent. He strove to answer the accusations of the opponents of Judaism and show that the biblical characters were virtuous. In ancient Greco-Roman literature, the Jews were labeled as lazy, superstitious, credulous, and zealous for missionary activity. They were accused of cowardice, misanthropy (hating non-Jews), and impiety.[139] Apion also claims that there were no wise men among the Jews.[140] Some of these qualities, such as superstition, credulity, and cowardice, were considered stereotypically feminine. Even though the Jews are not explicitly called effeminate in the Greco-Roman literature, they were accused of a lack of the qualities considered to be masculine. Josephus' aim is to counter these claims and show that the biblical characters possessed all of the masculine virtues.

Louis Feldman has studied the characterization of several biblical characters in Josephus' writings. His studies do not have a gender perspective, but the ideal qualities that Feldman mentions are the same as the ideals of the hegemonic Greco-Roman masculinities, especially the philosophical ideals. For example, Josephus argues that the biblical characters epitomized the masculine virtues of wisdom, courage, temperance, justice, and piety. Josephus also changes the biblical narrative by adding details or omitting embarrassing events.[141] This suggests that the non-Jewish audience would potentially have found the characters unmasculine and that Josephus is trying to counter this interpretation.

In contrast to the claims that there were no wise men among the Jews, Josephus emphasizes the wisdom of biblical characters. He portrays Abraham as the ideal statesman and compares Moses with other legislators.[142] Abraham, Moses, and Joshua also showcase the important masculine quality of being able to persuade people.[143] Against the accusation that the Jews were cowards, Josephus highlights the courage and military achievements of biblical figures.

---

138 See, e.g., Josephus, *Ant.* 1.5; 20.262. Feldman 1998, 543.

139 Laziness (Seneca, according to Augustine, *Civ.* 6.11); superstition (Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1.205–211; Plutarch, *On Superstition* 8.169C); credulity (Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2.112–114; Horace, *Sat.* 1.5.97–103); zealous missionary activity (Horace, *Sat.* 1.4.142–143); misanthropy (*Ag. Ap.* 2.121, 2.148); impiety (*Ag. Ap.* 2.148, 2.291); lack of courage (*Ag. Ap.* 2.148). See also Feldman 1997.

140 Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2.135.

141 Feldman 1968; 1983; 1990; 1995; 1998.

142 Abraham (*Ant.* 1.154), Moses (*Ant.* 4.328). See also Jacob (*Ant.* 2.15), Saul (*Ant.* 6.45), and Solomon (*Ant.* 8.34).

143 Abraham (*Ant.* 1.154–155; 1.167), Moses (*Ant.* 3.13; 4.328), Joshua (*Ant.* 3.49; 5.118).

Joshua, Saul, and David are presented as courageous (ἀνδρεῖος).[144] Moses, Gideon, Saul, David, and Solomon are praised for their modesty and self-control (ἐγκράτεια, σωφροσύνη).[145] Josephus also notes the justice (δικαιοσύνη) of Moses, Samuel, David, Solomon, and Josiah.[146] Josephus answers the accusations that Jews were impious by highlighting the piety of Jacob, Joshua, and Solomon.[147] Against the accusation that Jews hate people, Josephus emphasizes the humanity (φιλανθρωπία) of Joseph and David.[148]

In Josephus' texts, the marginality of Judaism in relation to the dominant Greco-Roman world can be seen in his apologetic interest. Sharing the same virtues as the ideal makes Josephus complicit with the philosophical ideal of self-controlled masculinity. John Barclay, however, maintains that there are "hints of cultural defiance" when Josephus insists on the antiquity of Judaism and the originality of Moses' commandments.[149] Thus, Josephus' relationship to the hegemonic masculinities—like Philo's relationship—is more complex than straightforward complicity. Josephus also wants to argue that Judaism is superior to Greco-Roman culture.

4 Maccabees

4 Maccabees was written between the 1st century BCE and the 1st century CE. It is thus roughly contemporary with the Synoptic Gospels. According to Stephen D. Moore and Janice C. Anderson, masculinity is shown in 4 Maccabees as self-control and the endurance of suffering.[150] Eleazar, an aged man, endures suffering and says: "I am not so old and cowardly (ἄνανδρος) as

144 Joshua (*Ant.* 3.49: "man of extreme courage"; 5.118: "daring in action"); Saul (*Ant.* 6.54); David's courage is emphasized more than in the biblical narrative (*Ant.* 7.74; cf. 2 Sam 5:20): "Let no one, however, suppose that it was a small army of Philistines that came against the Hebrews, or infer from the swiftness of their defeat or from their failure to perform any courageous or noteworthy act that there was any reluctance or cowardice on their part." Transl. Ralph Marcus.

145 Moses (*Ant.* 4.328–329: "thorough command of his passions"), Gideon (*Ant.* 5.230: "man of moderation and a model of every virtue"), Saul (*Ant.* 6.63), David (*Ant.* 7.391), and Solomon (*Ant.* 7.362).

146 Moses (*Ant.* 3.66–67), Samuel (*Ant.* 6.294), David (*Ant.* 7.110), Solomon (*Ant.* 8.21), and Josiah (*Ant.* 10.50).

147 Jacob (*Ant.* 2.196), Joshua (*Ant.* 3.49), Solomon (*Ant.* 8.22), and Josiah (*Ant.* 10.50). Josephus also omits or changes events that call David's piety into question (1 Sam 20:6; 21:4–7; 26:19).

148 Joseph (*Ant.* 2.101, 136), David (*Ant.* 6.304; 7.391).

149 Barclay 2005, 321.

150 Moore & Anderson 1998.

not to be young in reason on behalf of piety."[151] The seven brothers also show endurance (4 Macc 8–12). As mentioned above, men in their prime were seen as the most likely candidates for masculinity, whereas young boys and old men were not considered sufficiently masculine. By not submitting to King Antiochus, Eleazar and the seven brothers make a fool out of him. Antiochus is exposed as an impious and cruel tyrant, not an exemplary masculine figure.[152] Eleazar and the seven brothers appear more masculine than the king. The most masculine character in the book, however, is the mother of the boys. Her sufferings are said to be greater than even those of Daniel in the cave of lions. Still, she remains steadfast in her commitment to God. For the author, this ability represents her ἀνδρεία.[153] The ideal woman is masculine in her self-control and endurance.

The martyrs show their ἀνδρεία in their ability to endure torture. This idea of ἀνδρεία is closer to the philosophical ideal than the military ideal. Piety (εὐσέβεια) is another masculine virtue that plays an important role in the depiction of the martyrs as exemplary.[154] 4 Maccabees is close to Stoicism in its view of the passions and their control. In his speech to Antiochus, Eleazar argues that the Law "teaches us self-control (σωφροσύνη), so that we master all pleasures and desires, and it also trains us in courage (ἀνδρεία), so that we endure any suffering willingly." The Law also teaches justice (δικαιοσύνη) and piety (εὐσέβεια).[155] 4 Maccabees shares the same virtues with the wider Greco-Roman world.[156] While this makes the text complicit with the hegemonic philosophical ideals, at the same time the text attempts to argue that the Jewish community excels in moral and religious matters.[157] 4 Maccabees maintains that the Jewish religion offers a superior method for self-control: even though the virtues are the same as in the wider Greco-Roman culture, the Jews have a better method of achieving them. Even unexpected groups, like boys and women, can become virtuous by observing the Law. 4 Maccabees, like Philo and Josephus, thus shows a mixture of acceptance and resistance. These texts exemplify the idea that resistance and complicity can be mixed. Ostensible

151 4 Macc 5:31. Cf. 2 Macc 6:27: "by manfully (ἀνδρείως) giving up my life now, I will show myself worthy of my old age."

152 Cf. 4 Macc 10:11–16.

153 4 Macc 15:30: "O more noble than males in steadfastness, and more courageous (ἀνδρειοτέρα) than men in endurance!".

154 See also D'Angelo 2003b.

155 4 Macc 5:23–24.

156 See also 4 Macc 7:23: "For only the wise and courageous (σώφρων ἀνδρεῖος) are masters of their emotions."

157 See also D'Angelo 2003b, 141.

acceptance of the ideals of the dominant culture can still mean subversion of those ideals in some way.[158] This subversion is evident when these texts argue that the early Jews have a better means of achieving the ideals than the members of the dominant culture.

Rabbinic Judaism

The rabbis were active later than the Gospel writers, from the second to the sixth centuries CE in Palestine and Babylonia. During this time, Jewish culture in Roman Palestine was colonized and marginalized.[159] Although the rabbis were not contemporary with the Synoptic Gospels, they form an analogy to the Synoptic Gospel writers, since they can be seen as an example of a marginalized group in the ancient Greco-Roman world.

In comparison to the Jewish texts studied above, a very different picture emerges from the rabbinic writings. The rabbinic texts can be seen as less complicit with hegemonic masculinities and as voluntarily marginalized. This is not the whole picture, however, since rabbinic Judaism was not unified. The rabbis argued with each other and shared different interpretations and attitudes. For example, the attitude of the rabbis toward Rome was ambivalent. On one hand, the rabbis noted the military strength and power of Rome. On the other hand, they called Rome wicked and morally decadent.[160] In the following, I present one of the attitudes that the rabbinic writings showed toward Roman masculinity.

Daniel Boyarin argues that in the Babylonian Talmud the rabbis produced a stereotype of Roman masculinity as a violent and cruel hypermasculinity, thus presenting a countertype against which Jewish society could define itself.[161] The rabbis opposed this representation of masculinity as activity and dominance. The ideal man of the Babylonian Talmud was nonaggressive and not physically active.[162] The Talmud introduces the study of the Torah as

158 See Chapter 1.

159 Boyarin 1993, 16. One has to note that although the rabbis were in a marginal position in the overall culture, their cultural hegemony within Judaism grew during this period with the production of Midrashim and Talmuds. Boyarin 1993, xi.

160 Feldman 2000, 281–283 refers to *'Abodah Zarah* 2b; *Midrash Leviticus Rabbah* 13.5; *Megillah* 6a–b; *Midrash Genesis Rabbah* 65.21, 76.6; *Midrash Song of Songs Rabbah* 3.4.2. See also Leander 2011, 170.

161 Boyarin 1997, 4–6; 1995, 44. Boyarin (1995, 53) notes that whether or not this presentation is true, it tells us something about how the Romans were seen by outsiders.

162 See Boyarin 1997, 81–126, esp. 99–107, where Boyarin talks about *Baba Meṣi'a* 88a. Rabbis also expressed ambivalence about Jewish military figures like the Maccabees and Bar

the alternative to the aggressive ideal of masculinity.[163] Boyarin argues that "the Rabbis, who exclusively devoted themselves to study, were feminized vis-à-vis the larger cultural world."[164] Another feature of the Jewish culture that feminized men was circumcision. This was also interpreted positively by the rabbis. Since Israel is female in relation to God, circumcision—although effeminizing—made it possible for the male Israelite to enter into communion with a male deity.[165] The rabbis thus accepted the stereotype of themselves as feminized, but understood this feminization as a positive aspect of their identity.[166] This feminization was in contrast with the ideals of the hegemonic masculinities of the Greco-Roman world. Boyarin underlines that this was not the only representation of an ideal masculinity in the rabbinic writings. There was contestation and conflict over different models for ideal masculine behavior.[167] Nevertheless, it can be said that at least some of the rabbinic writings seem to have advocated masculinity that was voluntarily marginalized. This shows that at least some marginalized groups did not showcase complicit and accommodating attitudes toward the dominant group.

Conclusions

In this chapter, I have argued that there were two ideals of masculinity in the Greco-Roman world competing for the hegemonic position. The first of these

---

Kochba; see Boyarin 1997, 273–274. Instead, the rabbis valorized deception in opposition to the "manly" acts of violent resistance; see Boyarin 1999, 48–49.

163 Boyarin 1997, 143.

164 Boyarin 1995, 64. Boyarin refers to *Baba Meṣi'a* 84a, where Rabbi Yohanan invites Resh Lakish to join the fellowship of "real men" who study the Torah. Boyarin 1995; 1997, 127–150. Boyarin (1997, 2) argues that the gentle and studious man was presented also as the paramount "object of female desire." Moore (2001, 32) maintains that the message of the Targum and Midrashim is: "*Scholarship is sexy*" (emphasis original). See also Eilberg-Schwartz 1994, 219–220.

165 Boyarin 1992, 495–496; 1995, 51–52.

166 Boyarin 1993, 217; 1995, 44; 1997, 12.

167 Boyarin 1997, 81. Boyarin also notes the difference between later Ashkenazic Jews in Christian cultures and Sefaradic Jews in Muslim cultures. Boyarin sees the sociopolitical conditions of power and powerlessness as contributing factors to the different masculinity ideologies of these two groups of Jews. The Sefaradic Jews, who were socially dominant and close to the ruling class, identified with the local culture, including its masculinism, while the marginalized Ashkenazic Jews identified themselves as the "opposite" of the surrounding culture. Boyarin 1997, 164–165.

emphasized control over others. This masculinity advocated self-assertive behavior, such as retaliating against wrongs and the "priapic masculinity" of having an active role in sexual behavior. The other emphasized the importance of self-control. This was more of a philosophical ideal, advocated especially by Plato and the Stoics. One has to note that not all ancient Greco-Roman writers necessarily agreed with all facets of the ideal. They could advocate self-control in some issues and assertiveness in others, or they could pick and choose from the ideals the ones that suited their purposes at the moment.

In Jewish texts, we have seen complex relations of acceptance and resistance toward the hegemonic ideals. Writings by members of the Jewish elite such as Philo and Josephus seem to have had the aim of showing that the Jews could not only achieve the philosophical ideal of self-controlled masculinity competing for the hegemonic position, but also exceed the virtues of the Greeks and Romans. This same idea can be found in 4 Maccabees. At least some of the rabbinic writings, on the other hand, seem to accept feminization as a positive part of their identity. This alternative ideal of masculinity made the rabbinic masculinity voluntarily marginalized. Can these different strategies of complicity, mixed acceptance and resistance, and voluntary marginality be found in the Synoptic Gospels?

In the following chapters, I move on to study the ideal masculinities in the Synoptic Gospels. In the Synoptic Gospels, the word ἀνήρ is most commonly found in Luke, whereas Mark and Matthew do not seem to share the same interest in masculinity.[168] It is interesting that the word ἀνδρεία is not used in the New Testament at all.[169] The term σωφροσύνη or σώφρων is not used to describe Jesus either. Jesus is never explicitly said to be manly or self-controlled, or to have any other masculine attributes or virtues. The lack of explicit use of these terms does not mean that Jesus cannot be portrayed as behaving in ways that present these masculine ideals. What are the ideals of masculinity in the Synoptic Gospels and how do they relate to the ideals mentioned in this chapter? Do the Synoptic Gospels evince complicity or resistance or a mixture of both vis-à-vis the hegemonic ideals of either self-assertive or self-controlled masculinity?

168 See also Oepke 1964a, 362–363; D'Angelo 1990, 453; 1999, 187; 2002. Interestingly, the New Testament uses the gender specific Greek term for a man, ἀνήρ, for Jesus only three times, twice in Acts (2:22; 17:31) and once in the Gospel of John (1:30).

169 Paul uses the derivative ἀνδρίζομαι ("to be manly") in 1 Cor 16:13: "Γρηγορεῖτε, στήκετε ἐν τῇ πίστει, ἀνδρίζεσθε, κραταιοῦσθε." NRSV translates the verse as: "Keep alert, stand firm in your faith, be courageous, be strong."

CHAPTER 3

Jesus and His Opponents

Introduction

In this chapter, I study portrayals of Jesus' opponents in the Synoptic Gospels. How do the Synoptic Gospels portray the opponents of Jesus? How does this portrayal affect their masculinity? What does the way in which the opponents are depicted tell about the ideal masculinities of the Synoptic Gospels? As we will see, the opponents are presented as examples of unideal behavior and consequently as unmasculine.

In the Synoptic Gospels, all of the Jewish groups are united in their opposition to Jesus: scribes, Pharisees, Herodians, chief priests, elders, and Sadducees. For the Gospel writers, the opponents are almost a homogenous group, even though theological differences between the groups are occasionally mentioned. What matters for the Gospel writers is that all of these groups are against Jesus.[1] What is less often noted is that the opponents of Jesus are men. Therefore, studying them from the point of view of masculinity could lead to

1 See Driggers 2007, 233; Overman 1990, 142. This does not mean that the portrayal of the opponents is completely negative. Mark has a positive remark about a good scribe (Mark 12:28–34), and Matthew mentions a "scribe who has been trained for the kingdom of heaven" (Matt 13:51–52). Luke's portrayal of the Pharisees is occasionally positive. The Pharisees warn Jesus against Herod (Luke 13:31–33). Whereas Mark notes that "the Pharisees" question Jesus (Mark 2:24), Luke changes the reference into "some of the Pharisees" (Luke 6:2). Jesus dines with the Pharisees three times (Luke 7:36–50; 11:37–54; 14:1–24). Nevertheless, on each of these occasions, his behavior or speech scandalizes the host. See also Hakola 2013, 53–55. Green (1997, 307) argues that Luke portrays the Pharisees negatively only when in company with scribes, the off-duty priests, on whom Luke places the blame of Jesus' death (cf. Luke 11:53).

Matthew, on the other hand, expands the tradition of Pharisees being Jesus' opponents. Matthew mentions the Pharisees 30 times, compared to 12 times in Mark. The reason for the differences in Matthew's and Luke's portrayal of the opponents may lie in their different writing contexts. Matthew was hostile to the Jewish leaders because of the closeness of his group to Judaism; he sought both to remain within the boundaries of the Jewish community and to argue that the Christian teaching superseded the Jewish tradition. Saldarini 1995, 247, 250–251; Freyne 1985, 119, 122. The relative lack of polemics in Luke may be due to Luke's intended audience. If Luke was addressing Gentile readers, there may have been less of a need for polemics against the Jewish groups. However, because Luke needed to appease the Roman authorities, the Jewish leaders are attacked even in the Gospel of Luke. Luke sought to show that the Jewish elite, not the Roman judicial system, was to blame for Jesus' death.

important insights. Aside from the Jewish groups, Pilate and Herod can also be seen as opponents of Jesus and other messengers of God. One would expect Pilate and Herod as members of the elite to be presented as exemplars of hegemonic masculinity. As we will see, however, this is not the case in the Synoptic Gospels. Historically, Sadducees were part of the Jewish elite, and thus close to the hegemonic position. Pharisees and scribes, on the other hand, were not part of the elite, but they have often been called a "retainer class." They were the local leaders who benefited from co-operating with Rome.[2] Even though Pharisees and scribes were not in a hegemonic position, they served the interests of the Romans, which likely meant that they were complicit with the Roman ideals. In any case, all of Jesus' opponents were closer to the hegemony than Jesus' followers, who were members of the lower classes.[3] However, in order to demonstrate the superiority of Christianity, the Synoptic Gospels hoped to show how the opponents failed to achieve the ideals of hegemonic masculinities. It has to be noted, of course, that the Synoptic Gospel portrayals of the Jewish leaders do not necessarily reflect the reality. Rather, the opponents are used as negative examples to depict what is not the ideal masculinity. As we shall see, the non-ideal behavior of the opponents is rarely presented in explicitly gendered terms. Nevertheless, knowledge of the ancient ideals of masculinity may shed light on the interpretation of Synoptic Gospel portrayals of the opponents of Jesus.

The Authority of Jesus

I will first examine the question of the authority of Jesus and its relation to masculinity in the Synoptic Gospels. Jesus' conflict with his opponents is closely connected with the question of authority or power (ἐξουσία). In Chapter 2, we saw that control over others was an important facet of masculinity. Authority over others is one form of control. The central issue in the conflict with the opponents is the question of who has the authority to interpret Scripture. The opponents question where Jesus' authority comes from (Matt 21:23–27; Mark 11:27–33; Luke 20:1–8). The crowds marvel at Jesus' authority in all of the Synoptic Gospels. Mark and Matthew explicitly contrast Jesus' authority with the lack of authority of his opponents: "They were astounded at his teaching,

2 Overman 1990, 13.

3 According to the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus' followers were fishermen and tax collectors. Although the tax collectors benefited from the Roman power, they were in the Gospels associated with sinners.

for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes" (Mark 1:22; Matt 7:28–29; cf. Luke 4:32). In Matthew, Jesus' authority is connected with his teaching in the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus' role as authoritative teacher holds an important place for Matthew, as we will also see in the next chapter. Mark and Luke connect Jesus' authority first with his teaching, then with his exorcisms (Mark 1:22, 27; Luke 4:32, 36). Mark does not describe the content of Jesus' teaching. More important for Mark is that Jesus has the authority to speak freely in the synagogue.[4] The opponents, on the other hand, lack power and control over the crowds.[5] It is only in Mark's and Matthew's passion narratives that the opponents do in the end succeed in controlling the crowds.[6] It seems that authority as such is not something right or wrong for Mark and Matthew. In the case of Jesus' opponents, the problem is that they use their power over the crowds to satisfy a desire that, from the point of view of Mark and Matthew, is wrong. This makes the opponents' use of authority unmasculine. The Synoptic Gospels present Jesus as more masculine than his opponents, who lack the authority that Jesus has.

That authority as such is not negative or positive can be seen in Jesus' encounter with the centurion who asks Jesus to heal his servant (Matt 8:5–13; Luke 7:1–10). The centurion opposes the idea that Jesus would come to his house by saying that he has the authority to command people and they obey. Therefore Jesus has the authority to just command the healing and it will happen. Jesus sees this as a positive example of the centurion's faith. Authority as such is not criticized in this pericope.

Jesus' authority is also evident in his dealings with the demonic forces in exorcisms. Jesus shows his authority and control when he commands unclean spirits and they obey. One poignant example is the healing of the Gerasene demoniac (Mark 5:1–20; par. Matt 8:28–34; Luke 8:26–39). That Mark's pericope is full of military imagery has been widely established.[7] Jesus is thus presented as a military leader, which is a specifically masculine role. Leander suggests that in the pericope, Jesus' authority and the power of God manifested in Jesus

4 Stewart 2005, 280.

5 E.g., Matt 21:46; 26:5; Mark 12:12; 14:2; Luke 19:47–48; 22:2.

6 Mark 15:11; Matt 27:20; cf. Luke 23:14–25.

7 The first indication of the pericope's connections to the Roman army is the name of the demon, Legion. Horsley (2001, 141) lists other examples of military imagery: "the term behind 'herd,' while inappropriate for a bunch of pigs in Greek, was often used for a troop of military recruits. 'Dismissed' is a military command given to the troop by the officer in command. And 'charging' suggests troops rushing headlong into battle." The destruction of the pigs in the sea is also reminiscent of the destruction of Pharaoh's army in Exodus 14:21–31. See also Leander 2011, 223–228; Myers 2008, 190–194.

are satirically contrasted with the inefficiency of the hypermasculine Roman power.[8] Jesus is portrayed as more masculine than the demonic forces. As we can see, Jesus' opponents are not only people, but also include demonic forces. In this chapter, however, I concentrate on the human opponents of Jesus.

The Opponents as Negative Examples of Unmasculine Behavior

The Synoptic Gospels present the opponents of Jesus as examples of unmasculine behavior. The opponents are especially denounced in Mark 12:38–40, Luke 20:45–47, and in the woe sections in Matthew 23:13–36 and Luke 11:37–52, although the opponents are portrayed negatively throughout the Synoptic Gospels. There are differences in emphasis between the Synoptic Gospels. Matthew, for example, calls for righteousness that exceeds the righteousness of the scribes and the Pharisees (Matt 5:20). He especially underlines the need for mercy (Matt 9:13; 12:7), appealing to the Hebrew Bible tradition by quoting Hosea 6:6: "I desire mercy and not sacrifice." Luke, on the other hand, addresses behavior at meals and the concern for public recognition (Luke 11:39–52; 14:7–14). What does portraying the opponents as negative examples tell us about the ideal masculinities of the Synoptic Gospels? As seen in Chapter 2, ideal behavior was closely connected with masculinity. Vices, on the other hand, were stereotypically feminine. Masculinity was the ideal, and ideally men should not act like stereotypical women.

As mentioned in previous chapters, masculinity is an achieved state. In order for a man to be considered masculine, his masculinity must be approved of by other men. Accordingly, evaluating the masculinity of other men was common in the ancient Greco-Roman world. A common method of questioning the masculinity of other men was attacking them, especially their sexual behavior.[9] As seen in Chapter 2, sexual slander was connected to the ideal of masculinity. According to "priapic" masculinity, the man should play the active role, whereas the philosophical ideal emphasized the importance of moderation and self-control. The man who did not succeed in displaying these qualities was slandered. In Chapter 2, it was also noted that besides reprehensible sexual acts, the ancient Greco-Roman writers accused their opponents of other things that showed lack of self-control, such as excess in food, drink, or concern for one's appearance. Studying ancient speeches of blame, Jennifer

8 Leander 2011, 228.

9 See, e.g., Aristophanes, *Nub.* 1089–1094; *Eq.* 1281–1299; Lucian, *Jupp. trag.* 52; Cicero, *Cat.* 2.17–25; 2.22–23; *Phil.* 2.44. Knust 2006, 6; Long 1996, 71–74.

Knust notes that the ancient Greco-Roman writers also accused each other of having to work for a living, hating one's family and friends, and having improper appearance or dress.[10] Charges of cruelty and corruption were common in political invective.[11] Accusations of non-ideal behavior were widespread in the polemics between different philosophical schools as well. For instance, Epictetus writes against the Epicureans: "your doctrines are bad, subversive of the state, destructive of the family, not even fit for women."[12] Epictetus thus implies that the Epicureans are even worse than stereotypically behaving women. This calls their masculinity into question, since men ideally should not act like stereotypical women.

The polemics against the opponents in the Synoptic Gospels need to be read in light of this ancient Greco-Roman tradition of vilifying opponents.[13] The polemics in the Synoptic Gospels use the same stereotyped slander as various Greco-Roman and Jewish texts, where opponents are portrayed, for example, as hypocrites, lovers of money, and lovers of glory.[14] There is very little explicitly gendered slander in the Synoptic Gospels. Nevertheless, even though the vices are not explicitly called effeminate in the Synoptic Gospels, ancient Greco-Roman ideas of masculinity and femininity can shed additional light on the texts. The two most important things that opponents are accused of are a desire for public prestige and a lack of piety. These two are connected. Desire for public recognition leads to lack of piety, since for the Synoptic Gospels piety means valuing the honor that comes from God over the opinions of others. The fundamental schism between Jesus and his opponents is thus based on the issue of following God's will or seeking public recognition from others. Both desire for public prestige and lack of piety are called hypocrisy in the

10 Knust 2006, 21–22, 28. See also Johnson 1989, 430–434.

11 For examples, see Long 1996, 68–70.

12 Epictetus, *Diatr*. 3.7.21.

13 On the vilification of the opponents in the New Testament, see Johnson 1989; Du Toit 1994.

14 Because the slander in the Synoptic Gospels uses ancient Greco-Roman stereotypes, it is difficult to know what in the depiction of the opponents is historical and what is not. Hakola, Nikki & Tervahauta (2013, 16) note that "what the text *does* is more interesting than what it *says*. While polemical texts may offer only little by way of historical accuracy, they provide a good window into the mechanisms of identity construction: they show how boundaries are drawn and reinforced, and how a group goes about clarifying its identity and heightening its status at the expense of others." Emphasis original. Heightened status includes also heightened masculinity. By slandering the masculinity of opponents, the masculinity of the early Christian groups is heightened at their expense. The opponents are labeled as unmasculine.

Synoptic Gospels. The opponents also lack self-control, which, as we have seen in Chapter 2, was an important masculine quality.

The only clearly gendered label given to the opponents is "adulterous generation" (Matt 12:39; 16:4).[15] This label is used for opponents only in Matthew. In the ancient Greco-Roman world, there were different opinions concerning men's infidelity in marriage. Generally, extramarital affairs were acceptable for a man. "Priapic" masculinity did not demand faithfulness in marriage from the husband.[16] He could use the services of prostitutes and slaves.[17] The man committed adultery only when he had sex with another man's wife. Nevertheless, there were also other ideals inspired by the philosophical tradition. Already Aristotle maintained that the husband's relations with another woman were, without exception, shameful.[18] Later the double standard was opposed more frequently. For example, Musonius Rufus and Plutarch argued for mutual fidelity in marriage.[19] However, Williams notes that this was only an ideal, not a widespread practice. The overwhelming majority of sources supported a man's right to extramarital affairs. Still, if a man's behavior was seen as excessive or if he was pursuing sexual relations with other men's wives, he could be labeled as effeminate.[20] The definitions of what counted as adultery thus differed, but from the point of view of both "priapic" masculinity and the self-controlled ideal of masculinity, a man who had extramarital affairs could potentially be called effeminate. As an adulterous generation, therefore, the opponents were seen as unmasculine.

When the Synoptic Gospels use the label "adulterous generation," adultery is employed in a metaphorical sense, referring not to marital unfaithfulness but unfaithfulness to God. This metaphorical usage was common in the Hebrew Bible.[21] Matthew thus argues that the opponents do not act according to the will of God. The scribes are accused of a lack of piety. Piety was a masculine virtue, whereas women were often susceptible to superstition.[22] The lack of piety showcases the lack of masculinity of the opponents.

---

15 See also the list of vices in Matthew 15:19, which mentions adultery along with evil intentions, murder, fornication, theft, false witness, and slander.

16 Williams 1999, 51.

17 See, e.g., Demosthenes, *Against Neaera* 59.122; Xenophon, *Oec.* 10.12.

18 Aristotle, *Pol.* 1335b40–1336a1.

19 Musonius Rufus, *On Sexual Indulgence*; Plutarch, *Advice to the Bride and Groom* 16, 44. See also Foucault 1990, 17–18; Treggiari 1991, 312.

20 Williams 1999, 43, 47–48, 51–55, 143, 148.

21 Cf. Jer 3:1–10; Ezek 23; Hos 1–3; 5:3–4. See also Knust 2006, 7; Davies & Allison 1991, 355; Filson 1971, 152.

22 Plutarch, *Advice to the Bride and Groom* 19; Juvenal, *Sat*. 6.511–591.

Other labels that Matthew uses for the opponents are "brood of vipers" (Matt 3:7–9; 12:34)[23] and "blind guides" (Matt 23:16). These labels are not explicitly about gender. Nevertheless, the label "brood of vipers" would have been very insulting in a culture where a man's status was connected with his family and kin.[24] The practice of attacking the family of an adversary was common in antiquity, as can be seen when Demosthenes strives to defame the parents of his opponent Aeschines, thereby calling into question his credibility and masculinity.[25] The expression "brood of vipers" can thus be seen as a threat to the opponents' masculinity. As "blind guides," the opponents are not good leaders or teachers. They are accused of being interested in controlling other people rather than helping people to follow the commandments of God.[26] The opponents thus fail in being good leaders. Unlike Jesus, they do not succeed in roles that require authority. Therefore, the opponents also lack masculinity.

In addition, the opponents are called hypocrites. This is a term that all of the Synoptic Gospels use for the opponents, but it is most common in Matthew's Gospel.[27] Jesus criticizes the hypocrisy of the opponents, since they do not practice what they teach (Matt 23:3). The Pharisees and scribes are accused of breaking the commandments of God for the sake of the tradition of the elders. They are hypocrites because they honor God only with their lips while "teaching human precepts as doctrines" (Matt 15:3–9; par. Mark 7:6–13). The opponents thus lack proper piety. In Matthew, the Pharisees are depicted as hypocrites not merely because they lack piety, but because they have also failed to fulfill the most important commandments of the Torah: justice and mercy.[28] These, according to Matthew, represent the true righteousness that exceeds the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees (Matt 5:20). Therefore, exhibiting the virtues of justice and mercy seems to be an essential part of Matthew's ideal masculinity. The importance of mercy for Matthew will be studied in detail in Chapter 4. Justice, as mentioned in Chapter 2, was an important masculine virtue in the ancient Greco-Roman world. Failure in regards

23 In Luke, the expression is not directed at the Jewish leaders (Luke 3:7).

24 Malina & Rohrbaugh 1992, 38; Malina 2001, 154.

25 Demosthenes, *On the Crown* 18.10, 128–131. Cf. Lucian, *Jupp. trag.* 52. As we will see, the accusation of illegitimate origin is potentially used against Jesus in Mark's Gospel.

26 Cf. Matt 23:4; Luke 11:46.

27 The term is used of the opponents, most often the Pharisees, in Matt 15:7; 22:18; 23:13, 15, 23, 25, 27, 29; Mark 7:6; Luke 12:1; 13:15. Matthew uses the term also in 6:2, 5, 16; 7:5; 24:51; Luke in 6:42; 12:56.

28 Matt 9:13; 12:7; 23:23.

to justice also makes the opponents fall short of the ideals of a good leader. The opponents again lack masculine authority.

Hypocrisy is connected not only with a lack of piety, but also with concern for public prestige. In the Sermon on the Mount, Matthew claims that the hypocrites practice piety in order to be honored by other people (Matt 6:1–18). These verses are not explicitly about the opponents, but later in the Gospel it becomes evident that this is how they behave as well. The Pharisees and scribes "do all their deeds to be seen by others" (Matt 23:5). Mark and Luke also blame the scribes for saying long prayers for the sake of appearance (Mark 12:40; Luke 20:47). Additionally, the scribes' desire for public prestige can be seen in their love for the best seats in synagogues, places of honor at banquets, and greetings in market-places.[29] Another example of their valuing public recognition by other people is the fact that the scribes wear long robes (Mark 12:38; Luke 20:46) or make their phylacteries broad and their fringes long (Matt 23:5). As mentioned above, improper appearance or dress was often denounced in the speeches of blame. Placing too much attention on one's dress and appearance could make a man effeminate. This is not likely the case here. The scribes are not labeled as effeminate because of their attire, as was common in ancient Greco-Roman polemics. The impropriety of their dress has more to do with their desire for public prestige. Even though there is nothing inherently negative about the dress of the scribes, it becomes a negative feature in Jesus' argumentation against them.

Since the opponents value public recognition over following God's will, they also lack piety. Their desire for public recognition and prestige shows that the leaders are not interested in divine issues, but are instead motivated by their own reputation. They prefer public honor over honor in the eyes of God. The accusation that the opponents loved glory and honor was a widespread phenomenon in ancient Greco-Roman polemics.[30] The Synoptic Gospels once more employ traditional methods of defaming the opponents and their masculinity.

The concern for public prestige is also evident in the opponents' desire to arrest Jesus. The opponents look for a cause to arrest Jesus throughout

29 Matt 23:6–7; Mark 12:38–40; Luke 20:45–47. Luke also mentions the Pharisees' interest in the first places in meals when Jesus shares a meal with a Pharisee (Luke 14:7–14). For the importance of the first places at the table, see, e.g., Theophrastus, *Char.* 21.2; Plutarch, *Table-Talk* 615C–619A.

30 For the love of glory, see Lucian, *Pisc.* 31, 34, 46; *Par.* 52; *Men.* 5; *Fug.* 12, 19; *Dial. mort.* 369, 417; Dio 32.10–11; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.26.9.

the Synoptic Gospels.[31] But despite their desire to arrest Jesus, the leaders do not do so because they are afraid of the people (Matt 21:46; Mark 12:12; Luke 20:19). The Jewish authorities fear losing their position and power. They are again more concerned with public opinion. Their fear is also contrary to the quintessential masculine virtue of ἀνδρεία, manliness or courage. Xenophon, for example, depicts fear as a typically feminine quality.[32] The depiction of the opponents as fearful calls their masculinity into question.

Some pericopes refer to the lack of self-control exhibited by the opponents of Jesus. The clearest example can be found in Matthew 23:25, where Jesus claims that the scribes and Pharisees are full of incontinence (ἀκρασία), the opposite of the masculine ideal of self-control (ἐγκράτεια).[33] Another sign of the opponents' lack of self-control is found in Luke, who describes the Pharisees as "lovers of money" (φιλάργυροι; Luke 16:14). Avarice was something that made a man effeminate in the ancient Greco-Roman world.[34] In the ancient Greco-Roman and Jewish texts, the criticism of wealth was connected with self-control: one should not be a slave of money.[35] Jesus also speaks against the pursuit of wealth on several occasions, especially in the Gospel of Luke.[36] Being lovers of money, the Pharisees lack self-control and are potentially effeminate. In addition, the scribes are potentially avaricious when Mark and Luke accuse them of devouring the houses of widows (Mark 12:40; Luke 20:47). In the next verses after this accusation, Jesus presents as a contrast a poor widow, who gives her whole life to the temple (Mark 12:41–44; Luke 21:1–4). The widow's action parallels Jesus' act of self-sacrifice (cf. Mark 10:45). The juxtaposition also underlines that the scribes are not good men. Good men should take care of women, especially destitute women like widows. Here Mark and Luke join the Jewish tradition. Taking care of widows and orphans was an important virtue in the Hebrew Bible.[37] When the opponents neglect to help those in need, they also demonstrate their lack of piety and inability to follow the Scriptures.

---

31 Matt 12:9; 22:18; Mark 3:2, 6; 12:12–13; Luke 6:7; 11:54–55; 20:19.

32 Xenophon, *Oec*. 7.25. See also Sophocles, *Trach*. 898–899; Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.33.

33 For more on self-control as a masculine virtue, see Chapter 2. See also Foucault 1990, 63–77.

34 According to Sallust, avarice makes the male body and mind effeminate (*Bell. Cat.* 11). Livy sees women as stereotypically avaricious (Livy 34.4.15–16). See also Smethurst 1950, 82–83. For the love of money, see Lucian, *Fug.* 14; *Vit. auct.* 24; *Tim.* 56; *Hermot.* 9–10; Dio 32.11; Epictetus, *Diatr*. 2.17.3; 4.1.139.

35 Plutarch, *On the Love of Wealth*; Seneca, *Vit. beat.* 22.1–5; Cicero, *Tusc*. 5.91–92; Sir 13:19–24; 31:4–7; Pseudo-Phocylides 42–47.

36 E.g., Matt 6:19–24; 19:21–26; Mark 10:21–27; Luke 6:24; 12:13–21; 16:10–15; 18:22–26.

37 E.g., Exod 22:21–24; Deut 14:29; 24:17–22; 26:12–13; Isa 1:17; Ezek 22:6–7.

The lack of self-control of the opponents can also be seen in their inability to control their emotions. In Luke, the opponents are filled with fury (Luke 6:11) and indignation at Jesus healing the bent woman (Luke 13:14). In Matthew, the chief priests become angry at Jesus after the children call him the son of David (Matt 21:15). In Mark, the Pharisees' lack of self-control can be seen when they conspire about how to destroy Jesus (Mark 3:6). This type of emotional behavior makes the masculinity of the opponents questionable, as will be seen in Chapter 6.

In sum, the pejorative portrayal of the opponents not only presented them as negative examples for the early Christians, but also called their masculinity into question. Their lack of masculinity can be seen especially in their lack of piety. The opponents' lack of piety is connected with their valuation of public prestige over recognition from God. They prefer public honor to honor in the eyes of God. Thus, they live in human terms, not on God's terms.[38] The opponents are also accused of a lack of self-control, which was an important masculine virtue, and failing to be good leaders and teachers, which meant a lack of masculine authority. Their failure as leaders can be seen in their lack of justice. Justice and piety were also part of the hegemonic ideals of masculinity, as seen in Chapter 2. The Synoptic Gospels suggest that the early Christians could fulfill these ideals better than their Jewish opponents. Like Philo and Josephus, the Synoptic Gospels thus suggest that their group is better equipped to fulfill the ideals of masculinity than the members of the other groups. The difference is that the Synoptic Gospels do not compare their group so much with the Romans, but with Jewish opponents, a group that is closer to them. It is often noted that polemics are the most intense where there is a need for building identity and making boundaries between an in-group and an out-group.[39]

Jesus' Disputes with His Opponents

In this section, I study Jesus' disputes with his opponents from the point of view of masculinity. Speaking publicly was one of the prerogatives of elite men. The ancient Greco-Roman world can be seen as divided into public and private spheres. The public world belonged to men and the private world to women. Spending too much time indoors or with women was potentially threatening

38 Lawrence 2003, 143, 166; Rhoads, Dewey & Michie 1999, 120.

39 See, e.g., Hakola, Nikki & Tervahauta 2013; Horrell 2000, 97; Smith 1985, 47.

to a man's masculinity.[40] It is important to note that this reflected more the ideal than the reality. Women did move outside the private sphere of home, but they had fewer opportunities to achieve official public roles. Thus, competence in public speaking and defending oneself in trials was one of the primary markers of masculinity, according to the hegemonic masculinities.[41] Jesus was not a member of the elite, but he spoke publicly. The Synoptic Gospels present Jesus besting his opponents in verbal exchanges.[42] Liew notes that "Jesus consistently shows himself to be more of a man than the Jerusalem authorities by dominating them in every debate and each controversy." The people also acknowledged Jesus' masculinity by recognizing his domination over the Jewish leaders.[43] Gleason argues that since lower-class men who spoke in public were regarded with suspicion, the public speaking of Jesus would not have been considered masculine by elite readers.[44] However, this is not because public speaking was considered unmasculine but because it was masculine: lower-class men who spoke in public were trying to claim the same authority, which was threatening to the elite. By showing Jesus besting his opponents in debates, the Synoptic Gospels both accept the idea that public speaking is masculine and subvert it by depicting a lower-class man speaking in public. Although Jesus was not a member of the elite, from the point of view of the Synoptic Gospels he was authorized by God to speak publicly. The disputes thus highlight Jesus' masculine status at the expense of his opponents.

The majority of Jesus' interactions with his opponents are centered on some kind of disagreement or conflict. The function of the Jewish leaders is to oppose or question Jesus' behavior and teaching. The controversies with the opponents arise when the behavior of Jesus (eating with sinners, healing on the Sabbath, forgiving sins) or the disciples (plucking corn on the Sabbath, eating with unwashed hands) raises an objection or when some question is asked of Jesus by the opponents.[45] It is important to note that not all disputes involve conflict. For example, when questioning Jesus about fasting, the opponents

40 See, e.g., Cicero, *Verr.* 2.5.81: "this Roman governor […] spent the days of summer giving daily dinner parties to women, with no men at table except himself and his young son—and as they were the men, I might as well have said that no men at all were present." Transl. L. H. G. Greenwood. See also Xenophon, *Oec.* 7.19–25; Philo, *Spec. Laws* 3.169–171.

41 See also D'Angelo 2003a, 294.

42 The disputes have often been studied from the perspective of honor and shame as challenge-riposte exchanges. See, e.g., Malina 2001, 33–35; Neyrey 1998, 20, 44–45. For the criticism of this approach see, e.g., Crook 2009; Lawrence 2002; 2003.

43 Liew 2003, 114.

44 Gleason 2003, 325–326.

45 Dewey 1980, 28–29.

are merely asking Jesus to validate his practice.[46] Nevertheless, even when no conflict is present, the disputes offer the writers of the Synoptic Gospels an opportunity to present the practice of the opponents as unideal, which makes their masculinity questionable as well. At the same time, the disputes provide Jesus with a chance to elaborate on his teaching.

In Mark, there are two larger collections of disputes, at the beginning and at the end of the Gospel. All of these controversies can also be found in Matthew and Luke.[47] Of the five controversies in Mark 2:1–3:6, the first and the last are healing narratives.[48] The three controversies in the middle are related to practices of Jesus or his followers.[49] The healing controversies are more serious than the ones related to Jesus' practices. In the first controversy, Jesus is accused of blasphemy, the offense for which in the end he is sentenced to death.[50] This accusation calls Jesus' masculinity into question, since the opponents argue that Jesus lacks masculine piety. They do not realize that Jesus is in fact following God's will. From the point of view of the Synoptic Gospels, the opponents are the ones who lack piety. The last dispute ends with the plot to kill Jesus, when the Pharisees conspire with the Herodians about how to destroy him (Mark 3:6; cf. Matt 12:14). The relentless hostility of the Pharisees evinces their lack of self-control and, consequently, their lack of masculinity. In Luke, unlike in Mark, the Pharisees do not seek to destroy Jesus. Luke replaces this with a more vague threat: the scribes and Pharisees discuss "what they might do to Jesus" (Luke 6:11). This change is probably intended to save Jesus by omitting the threat of violence, not to make the Pharisees more ideal. On the same occasion, Luke produces a very negative portrayal of the Pharisees as filled with fury. The Pharisees do not exhibit masculine self-control in Luke either. Furthermore, Luke's presentation of Jesus is closer to the self-controlled ideal of masculinity than the emotional portrayal in Mark since Luke omits the mention of Jesus' emotions.[51] This increases the difference between Jesus and his opponents.

---

46 See also Lawrence 2003, 157–159, 165.

47 Mark 2:1–3:6; 11:27–12:37; Matt 9:2–7; 12:1–14; Luke 5:17–6:11; 20:1–44. Matthew breaks up the first collection by including material from Q and reorganizing the material from Mark. Luke moves the question of the first commandment of the Law (Mark 12:28–34) earlier, so that it becomes a preface to his parable on the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25–37).

48 Healing the paralyzed (Mark 2:1–12) and healing on Sabbath (Mark 3:1–6).

49 Eating with sinners (Mark 2:15–17), the question about fasting (Mark 2:18–22), and plucking corn on the Sabbath (Mark 2:23–28).

50 Dewey 1980, 86; Kingsbury 1988, 5.

51 For more on emotions, see Chapter 6.

In the same collection of disputes, the three controversies related to Jesus' practice are less hostile, since the Pharisees do not condemn Jesus' practices straight away but rather ask Jesus to validate them.[52] Jesus is not breaking the Torah, only the Pharisaic tradition.[53] The central tension in these conflict stories stems from the contrast between Jesus' and the Pharisees' interpretation of the Law. The question is who has the authority and the right to interpret the Scriptures. From the point of view of the Synoptic Gospels, the Pharisees fail to interpret the Scriptures correctly. This is can be seen, for example, in Matthew, where Jesus twice tells the Pharisees to study the Scriptures and learn mercy. This is more important than their tradition (Matt 9:13; 12:7). Another example of the Pharisees failing to interpret the Scriptures correctly can be found in Mark 7:1–13.[54] The Pharisees ask why the disciples break the traditions of the elders by eating with unwashed hands. Possibly the Pharisees expect Jesus to denounce the behavior of his disciples. Jesus, on the contrary, claims that it is the opponents who break the commandments of God (Mark 7:6–13). Jesus differentiates between human precepts and the commandments of God. From the point of view of the Synoptic Gospels, the conflict with the opponents has to do with the choice between living on God's terms or human terms.[55] Jesus accuses the opponents of choosing to live in human terms. They also fail to interpret Scripture and, accordingly, God's will. This suggests that the Synoptic Gospels see piety and following God's will as the most important facets of ideal masculinity. The notion that piety was part of the ideal masculinity was widespread in the ancient Greco-Roman world. The Synoptic Gospels adhere to this ideal, although in Chapter 4 we will see that Matthew's idea of private piety was very different from the public piety of the Greco-Roman world. Jesus' opponents are depicted as impious in order to show the superiority of early Christian piety and masculinity.

52 This is one of the reasons why Lawrence (2003, 142–180) maintains that the challenge-riposte exchange model with its emphasis of conflict and confrontation is not suitable for the interpretation of the disputes.

53 Dewey 1980, 86; Overman 1990, 80–81; Segal 1991, 7.

54 Cf. Matt 15:1–9. Luke omits this discussion. Possibly the issues of purity were not pertinent to Luke's community.

55 Rhoads, Dewey & Michie 1999, 90.

Challenges to the Masculinity of Jesus

So far we have studied the portrayal of the opponents. Are there polemics against Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels? Understandably, the Gospel writers do not want to record opponents defaming Jesus. Still, on a couple of occasions, they report polemics against Jesus. How do the opponents of Jesus characterize him? Do the accusations against Jesus make his masculinity questionable? How do the Gospel writers meet the challenges to his masculinity? The challenges to Jesus' masculinity are related to piety, lack of self-control with regard to food and drink, keeping the wrong company, working for a living, and illegitimate origin. As mentioned earlier, these were all themes used in ancient Greco-Roman polemics.

The most serious attack is the accusation that Jesus is in league with the devil (Matt 9:34; 12:24; Mark 3:20–30; Luke 11:14–23).[56] The opponents question Jesus' authority by suggesting that his authority comes from the wrong source. They also accuse Jesus of impiety. The scribes attempt to marginalize Jesus as an agent of the devil.[57] This marginalization affects Jesus' masculinity. The opponents are saying that he is not legitimately masculine because of his impiety and lack of correct authority. From the point of view of the Synoptic Gospels, this accusation is wrong since Jesus' exorcisms are brought about not by the devil, but by the Holy Spirit. This makes the accusation of the scribes even more reprehensible, since Jesus argues that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is the greatest sin (Mark 3:29).

Another challenge against Jesus' masculinity is the claim that he lacks self-control and keeps wrong company. In Matthew and Luke, Jesus notes that his opponents call him "a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners" (Matt 11:19; Luke 7:33).[58] The description "a glutton and a drunkard" alludes to Deut 21:20, where it refers to a stubborn and rebellious son.[59] The parents are supposed to take their son to the elders of the city and say: "This son of ours is stubborn and rebellious. He will not obey us. He is a glutton and a drunkard." The son is then condemned to death by stoning. Thus, what the

56 In the Gospel of Mark, Jesus' family implicitly seems to agree with this accusation, because they think that Jesus has gone out of his mind (Mark 3:21). This pericope is studied in Chapter 4.

57 Carter 2000, 272.

58 In Mark and Matthew, the opponents ask why Jesus eats with tax collectors and sinners (Mark 2:16; Matt 9:11). In Luke, the opponents ask the same question of the disciples, but Jesus answers for them (Luke 5:30).

59 See also Prov 23:20: "Do not be among winebibbers, or among gluttonous eaters of meat."

opponents call Jesus is not a petty insult. They imply that Jesus deserves the death penalty. The epithet "friend of tax collectors and sinners" may have been a similar label,[60] which connected him with people with questionable morals. By associating with sinners, Jesus became one of them. Halvor Moxnes notes that "Jesus is accused of lack of control of his own body, and of not keeping proper control of the boundaries of the social body concerning meals."[61] As seen in Chapter 2 above, in addition to being the ability to control sexual passions, self-control was connected with eating and drinking. Inability to control one's appetite and drinking was considered stereotypically feminine. When the opponents label Jesus a glutton and a drunkard, they mean that Jesus is not moderate or self-controlled. From the point of view of the opponents, Jesus is not ideally masculine.

The Gospels answer the accusation that Jesus lacks self-control in two ways. First, both Matthew and Luke emphasize that Jesus began his public career as an ascetic in the desert (Matt 4:2; Luke 4:2). In this way, they show that Jesus was not gluttonous. On the other hand, Jesus also refuses to fast with the disciples of John the Baptist and the Pharisees (Matt 9:14–17; Mark 2:18–22; Luke 5:33–39). Jesus offers an explanation for his behavior: "The wedding guests cannot fast while the bridegroom is with them" (Mark 2:19). The Gospels thus validate Jesus' practice and explain why his behavior does not exemplify a lack of self-control.

In Luke, the portrayal of Jesus as the friend of sinners is tempered by showing Jesus repeatedly eating with the Pharisees. In fact, the pericope following this accusation, featuring the sinful woman anointing Jesus (Luke 7:36–50), clarifies what Jesus being the friend of sinners and tax collectors means for Luke. The focus of the pericope is repentance and forgiveness. Furthermore, in the pericope where Jesus goes to eat with the tax collector Zacchaeus, it is underlined that this leads to repentance on Zacchaeus' part. He promises to give half of his possessions to the poor (Luke 19:1–10). In Luke, Jesus specifies that "I have come to call not the righteous but sinners *to repentance*," a qualification that is missing from Mark and Matthew (Luke 5:32; cf. Matt 9:13; Mark 2:17). Thus, Jesus does not simply associate with sinners, he requires repentance from them. In Mark and Matthew, this requirement of repentance is not evident. Whitney Taylor Shiner notes that in light of the tradition of philosophical conversion, which stressed the change of character of the convert, it is striking that Mark does not demand a change of character.[62] Luke's changes thus move

60 Duling 1999, 18.

61 Moxnes 2003, 102.

62 Shiner 1995, 196.

the text closer to the prevalent sentiments. Potentially, the Markan portrayal of Jesus can be seen as scandalous and unmasculine, and Luke revises the portrayal to ensure Jesus' masculinity.

Another place where potential polemics against Jesus are found is in Mark, where the people of Nazareth call Jesus a τέκτων (Mark 6:3). The word τέκτων means someone who works with his hands building things. In the ancient Greco-Roman world, the ideal for the free man was owning land, as having to work was scorned on. For example, Cicero argues that working for a living was unsuitable for a free man.[63] Based on Mark's account, Celsus ridiculed the Christians for worshiping an ordinary laborer.[64] This shows that Jesus' status as a τέκτων could be used against the early Christians. Matthew and Luke evidently found the depiction of Jesus having a profession problematic. Luke leaves out any mention of Jesus' profession (Luke 4:22), whereas Matthew changes the account so that instead of Jesus being a τέκτων, it is Joseph who is so designated (Matt 13:55).

The people of Nazareth were peasants and not members of the elite. Thus, it is possible that they did not agree with the ideals of the elite. They might not have seen working for a living as reprehensible. Ancient Greco-Roman tomb stones of ordinary workers show that they were proud of their professions. Nevertheless, the people of Nazareth did question Jesus' authority as a teacher on account of his background as an ordinary worker. In this regard, Jesus was trying to usurp a higher status than what was suitable for a man with his background. Jesus notes in Mark 6:4: "Prophets are not without honour, except in their home town, and among their own kin, and in their own house." Moxnes argues that the reason a prophet is not honored is because he pretends to be something more than he is; a prophet does not "know one's place." The Nazarenes' response to Jesus is "an attempt to shame him back into his proper place."[65] From their point of view, Jesus lacks masculinity because he has left his proper place. The same reaction can be found in the other Synoptic Gospels. In Luke, for instance, the reaction is very hostile: the Nazarenes attempt to stone Jesus (Luke 4:28–29). On the other hand, both Matthew and Luke tone down other aspects of Jesus' visit to Nazareth. According to Mark, Jesus could not do any deed of power (Mark 6:5). Luke leaves out the mention of miracles, while Matthew changes the wording to Jesus not being able to

63 Cicero, *Off.* 1.150–151; Aristotle, *Pol.* 1277b–1278b; *Rhet.* 1367a; Xenophon, *Oec.* 4.3. See also Knust (2006, 21–22, 28), who notes that having to work for a living was a common feature in the speeches of blame.

64 Origen, *Cels.* 6.34, 36.

65 Moxnes 2003, 51–52.

do *many* deeds of power (Matt 13:58). Mark does not hesitate to show potentially negative aspects of Jesus' background. According to Mark, even people from low origins can be instruments in bringing about God's new world order. Matthew and Luke, on their part, elevate Jesus' status. In this way, they also make Jesus appear more masculine from the point of view of the hegemonic masculinities.

In the same pericope, the people of Nazareth refer to Jesus as "the son of Mary" (Mark 6:3). Some interpreters have seen this expression as a sign of Jesus' illegitimate origin.[66] However, having studied comparative material from the early Jewish writings, Tal Ilan maintains that the use of metronyme to designate a man did not indicate an illegitimate or questionable birth, but rather that it appears in cases where the mother possessed a superior lineage.[67] Susan Miller argues that Ilan's analysis does not apply to Mark, since there is no indication that Mary came from a prominent family.[68] Nevertheless, it is possible that Mary was more important or known better to the early Christians. This is especially the case if Jesus' father had died before Jesus' public career or if Mary became part of the early Christian community, as Luke claims (Acts 1:14). In any case, it is interesting that both Matthew and Luke change the account and refer to Jesus' father (Matt 13:55; Luke 4:22).[69] It is possible that "the son of Mary" could be interpreted as an insult, even if the metronyme bears no connection to illegitimate birth.

In sum, Mark mentions features of Jesus' background that are potentially negative from the point of view of hegemonic masculinities. It seems that Mark is voluntarily accepting the marginal position of early Christianity. Matthew and Luke, on the other hand, attempt to redeem the portrayal of Jesus and move it closer to hegemonic ideals by omitting or changing Mark's details. Luke does this even more than Matthew, since he emphasizes that Jesus being a friend of sinners does not mean that he accepted their behavior.

66 E.g., Smith 1978, 26–28.

67 Ilan 1992, 24, 42–45.

68 Miller 2004, 33.

69 Celsus' claim that Jesus' father was a Roman soldier named Panthera shows also that it was possible to interpret Mark's account as suggesting a questionable birth. Origen, *Cels.* 1.32.

Herod

Next I study two examples of elite men, Herod and Pilate, found in the Synoptic Gospels. One would expect them as members of the elite to be exemplars of hegemonic masculinity. Herod and Jesus meet only once, in the Gospel of Luke (Luke 23:8–12). Herod is not Jesus' opponent in the same way as the other characters studied in this chapter. However, in the narrative he is an opponent of God's prophet, John the Baptist. Therefore, his portrayal merits treatment in this chapter. Herod foreshadows Pilate in the same way as the fate of John the Baptist foreshadows the passion of Jesus. Both Herod and Pilate are depicted as weak rulers.[70] Both pass a death sentence on an innocent man in order to preserve their own status. Both Pilate and Herod are motivated by concern for public prestige. As a result, despite their socially hegemonic position, they do not manage to be exemplars of hegemonic masculinities—or at least the self-controlled masculinity. In this section, I first study Herod's role in the death of John the Baptist and then the other mentions of Herod in the Synoptic Gospels.

The Death of John the Baptist

The death of John the Baptist and Herod's role in it are mentioned in all of the Synoptic Gospels. I first concentrate on Mark's account. After that, I study briefly how Matthew and Luke differ from Mark's account. Mark's account of the death of John the Baptist is the longest of the Synoptic Gospels (Mark 6:14–29). Some commentators see Mark's portrayal of Herod as positive.[71] One of the reasons for this is Mark's portrayal of Herodias as a woman with a grudge and the one who wants to kill John (Mark 6:19). Therefore, some scholars maintain that Mark portrays Herodias negatively as a scheming woman.[72] In contrast to this, several feminist interpreters have pointed out that the women in the story do not have power.[73] Jennifer Glancy, for example, argues that the scholars have ignored Herod's responsibility and have exaggerated the role of the women in John's death.[74] Miller, however, notes that Glancy ignores the cruelty of the women.[75] Herodias wants to kill John and the girl makes a macabre addition

70 See also Marcus 2009, 1027; Miller 2004, 83; Placher 2010, 93–94; Shiner 1995, 19.

71 Anderson 1992, 120; Janes 2006, 449; Marcus 2000, 399.

72 Anderson 1992, 120; Marcus 2000, 400.

73 Glancy 1994, 41. Janice Anderson notes that as a king and husband, Herod has control over Herodias' actions, but women without direct power can achieve their goals indirectly. Anderson 1992, 120–121. See also Dewey 1995, 483.

74 Glancy 1994, 41–43.

75 Miller 2004, 78–79.

to her mother's wish by asking for John's head on a platter (Mark 6:24–25). In Mark's account, Herodias embodies stereotypically feminine vices, such as vindictiveness, arrogance, and lust for power. She is an example of a woman who opposes God's messengers.[76] Nevertheless, it is still important to note that in the story, Herod himself claims responsibility for John's death (Mark 6:16). Although the women are cruel, they are not the only characters responsible for John's death.

An opportunity for Herodias arises at Herod's birthday party. A girl (κοράσιον) comes out to dance (Mark 6:22). According to some manuscripts, the girl is the daughter of Herod himself, called Herodias, whereas other manuscripts call the girl Herodias' daughter, making her Herod's step-daughter.[77] As Herodias was Herod's niece, in any case the girl and Herod were close relatives. The dance pleases (ἀρέσκω) Herod so much that he makes an extravagant offer: "Ask me for whatever you wish, and I will give it." The offer is repeated in the next verse: "Whatever you ask me, I will give you, even half of my kingdom" (Mark 6:22–23). The offer has given rise to the question of whether the dance was the innocent dance of a little girl or the sexually lascivious dance of a marriageable young woman.[78] According to Joel Marcus, in the Septuagint the verb ἀρέσκω has a connotation of arousing sexual interest.[79] Because of this, several commentators see the dance as sexual.[80] Janice Capel Anderson, on the contrary, argues that in the New Testament the word does not refer to sexual pleasure. Thus, she interprets the dance as innocent.[81] The dance itself is not described

76 Liew (2003, 122–123) argues that Mark's intention was to show that "a woman becomes most destructive if she is allowed to become masculine." Herodias is masculine in the wrong way, since she attempts to control a man, like Clytemnestra in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*.

77 The girl is usually identified as Salome, even though Mark does not mention her name. This name comes from Josephus, *Ant.* 18.136.

78 The word κοράσιον is also used in Mark 5:42–43 of Jairus' 12-year-old daughter. For the age of marriage in ancient Judaism, see Satlow 2001, 104–111.

79 Marcus 2000, 396; see Gen 19:8; Esth 2:4; and esp. Esth 2:9.

80 Marcus 2000, 396; Placher 2010, 94; Anderson 1976, 169; Guelich 1989, 332. Lane (1975, 221) maintains that the dance is "unquestionably lascivious."

81 Anderson (1992, 122) argues that in the New Testament, the verb refers to "making someone happy, accommodating someone, or doing something that someone will approve, or find pleasant"; see Acts 6:5; Rom 8:8; 15:1–3; Gal 1:10; 1 Cor 7:33, 34; 10:33; 1 Thess 2:4, 15; 4:1; 2 Tim 2:4. See also Bach 1996, 109.

Hoehner notes that in Jewish literature there are mentions of dance as a respectable exercise. Hoehner (1972, 157) refers to *m. Sukkah* 5.4, where it is mentioned that pious men dance in the temple during a festival. However, the context of the dance in Herod's banquet is very different from a pious dance in a temple.

in Mark. What the text concentrates on is Herod's reaction. Whatever the nature of the dance, Herod's offer to grant anything the girl wants, even half of his kingdom, is extravagant and immoderate. Herod does not exemplify the ideal of masculine self-control.

The girl consults her mother and returns to ask for the head of John the Baptist. Despite being deeply grieved (περίλυπος) over the request, Herod's desire to maintain his status and save face is greater than his desire to save John (Mark 6:26). He "chooses earthly power and status in preference to the will of God."[82] Like all of the other opponents in Mark's Gospel, Herod does not seek the will of God and thus does not fulfill the ideal masculinity of the Gospel. Moreover, Herod's emotions make him lack self-control, at least from the point of view of Stoic philosophy.[83]

In Mark's account, Herod is called a king (Mark 6:14). Historically, this was not the case and in fact Herod could not have given his territory away.[84] Calling Herod "king" emphasizes the contrast between a supposedly powerful man and an apparently weak "girl."[85] According to Abraham Smith, Mark uses features from ancient Greco-Roman culture to paint Herod as a tyrant type. Smith argues that all of the stock features of a stereotypical tyrant appear in the pericope of the death of John the Baptist.[86] Herod has an encounter with John the Baptist, a type of wise man or philosopher that tyrants often have encounters with in ancient Greco-Roman texts. Stereotypical tyrants display excess, make rash requests, and are manipulated by women. The stereotypical tyrant is also portrayed as paranoid. Herod is afraid of John and, after his execution, he expresses a paranoid fear that he has been resurrected (Mark 6:16). Herod's superstitious response to rumors about Jesus can also be considered emasculating, since superstition was commonly seen as a stereotypical quality of women.[87] According to Stoics, superstition was an irrational emotion and, as such, unmasculine.[88] As seen in Chapter 2, tyrants were regularly considered to be unmasculine, especially because they lacked self-control. Herod's lack of self-control is evident when he becomes pleased, possibly sexually aroused,

82 Miller 2004, 82–83.

83 For more on emotions and Stoicism, see Chapter 6.

84 Gundry 1993, 321; Schweizer 1985, 134.

85 Heil 1992, 139.

86 Smith 2006, 262, 271–276. For a tyrant type in the ancient Greco-Roman world, see also Dunkle 1967; Starr 1949.

87 For example, Plutarch sees superstition (δεισιδαιμονία) as a typically feminine vice; Plutarch, *Advice to the Bride and Groom* 19.

88 See more on the Stoic concepts of emotions and masculinity in Chapter 6.

by the girl's dance. His immoderate offer also shows his lack of self-control. Moreover, the women of the Herodian family lack self-control as well, as is shown by their desire to kill John.[89] Men were supposed to control women who were stereotypically thought to lack self-control. Therefore, it is Herod's fault that the women of his family lack self-control. Instead of controlling the women of his family, Herod is manipulated by them. Herod does not have power and authority either, because he is dependent on the opinions of his guests. Thus, Herod comes off as a corrupt and weak ruler.

In sum, Herod does not fare as well in Mark's Gospel as some interpreters propose. If Mark's objective was to present Herod as a sympathetic figure, he does not succeed, because Herod comes off as emasculated. One possible reason for the emasculation of Herod is Mark's desire to compensate for John's shameful and emasculating death by feminizing Herod. Herod's weakness is used to bolster John's masculinity.[90]

Matthew's account of the death of John the Baptist differs in details from Mark's account (Matt 14:1–12). In Matthew's account, it is Herod himself who wants to kill John (Matt 14:5). Herod is not afraid of John, nor does he listen to him with pleasure, as he does in Mark. Instead, the only thing stopping Herod from killing John is his fear of the masses. These changes increase the parallelism between the opposition that John the Baptist and Jesus face.[91] Herod is not upset by the girl's request because he does not want to kill John. Rather, he is upset because he is afraid of the ramifications of his action (Matt 14:9). He is afraid of the people, as are the Jewish leaders when they want to arrest Jesus (Matt 21:46). These changes make Herod less ambiguous and more malevolent, and at the same time also less ideally masculine.[92]

Ross Kraemer argues that Matthew's account "remasculinizes Herod a little" by making both Herod and Herodias more evenly culpable.[93] While it is true

89 Smith 2006, 277–279.

90 See also Kraemer 2006, 345; Myles 2008. For the shamefulness of John's death, see Anderson 1992, 126.

91 Davies & Allison 1997, 471; see also Meier 1980, 399.

92 This does not stop some commentators from putting the blame on women, even though Herodias' grudge against John is only implicit in Matthew 14:8. According to Filson, Herodias' "merciless scheming and hatred are apparent" and she prompts and bolsters Herod's hatred of John. The dance is "no doubt immodest and provocative," and "with no trace of feminine gentleness" Salome demands John to be beheaded. Filson 1971, 169. According to Jones (1966, 173), the dance, again, was "doubtless instigated by the far-sighted Herodias" and Herod "was being rushed into an act which did not suit his policy," even though in verse 14:5, to which Jones refers here, Herod specifically wants to kill John!

93 Kraemer 2006, 346–347.

that Herod may not lack self-control and he is not susceptible to the manipulation of women as in Mark, his desire to kill John can hardly be seen as ideally masculine from Matthew's point of view. Moreover, Herod's regard for public opinion and his fear of the masses make him a weak ruler. Thus, Herod does not fare any better in Matthew than in Mark.

In the Gospel of Luke, Herod is mentioned twice before the pericope of the death of John the Baptist. He is mentioned in Luke 3:1, when the stage of Jesus' public ministry is being set, and in Luke 3:19–20, when John is imprisoned. In Luke, John rebukes Herod not only because of Herodias, but also "because of all the evil things that Herod had done." Luke thus portrays Herod as having a "history of evil deeds."[94] Already at the beginning of the Gospel, the reader is presented with a portrayal of Herod that is not positive. The pericope of the death of John the Baptist (Luke 9:7–9) is drastically shortened. There is no mention of such details as Herod's banquet or John's death. Herod merely finds out about the different opinions concerning Jesus. Luke is not interested in the death of John the Baptist, and the pericope functions more as an anticipation of the meeting of Herod and Jesus at the end of the Gospel. On first glance, Herod seems to fare better in Luke's account. The manipulation by women and Herod's weakness are not mentioned. Herod regards with skepticism the superstition that Mark ascribes to him: "John I beheaded; but who is this about whom I hear such things?" (Luke 9:9). However, later in the Gospel the Herod who scoffs at superstitious interpretations seeks miracles himself (Luke 23:8). Herod takes responsibility for John's death, but this can hardly be seen as a positive portrayal. In the end, the fact that Herod has opposed and killed one of God's prophets makes Herod's portrayal negative. It is hardly likely that the reader will expect anything good to come out of Herod's desire to see Jesus.

Other Mentions of Herod

There are also other mentions of Herod in the Synoptic Gospels. What do these tell about how Herod's masculinity is portrayed in the Synoptic Gospels? Most of the other mentions of Herod can be found in the Gospel of Luke, but one possible allusion to Herod appears in Matthew and Luke. Even though Herod is not explicitly mentioned, it is possible that the intention of the passage is to contrast John the Baptist to Herod (Matt 11:7–9; Luke 7:24–26). When Jesus talks about John the Baptist, he asks the crowd: "What did you go out into the wilderness to look at? A reed shaken by the wind? What then did you go out to see? Someone dressed in soft robes? Look, those who wear soft robes are

94 Green 1997, 183.

in royal palaces."[95] The reed was a symbol of Herod used in coins.[96] It is thus possible that this is meant to evoke Herod as a counterpole to John. The reed shaken in the wind was a proverbial expression for a wavering person.[97] The easily bending reed can be read as a contrast to John, who stood firm. John was clearly not weak or vacillating, since his uncompromising message led him to prison.[98] John's steadfastness highlights his masculinity, whereas the weak and wavering person is unmasculine. As a result, John the Baptist is portrayed as more masculine than Herod.

The mention of someone dressed in soft clothes (ἐν μαλακοῖς ἠμφιεσμένον; Matt 11:8) contrasts with John's dress (Matt 3:4–6).[99] Luke includes a mention of people who live in luxury (τρυφή; Luke 7:25). Remarks about clothes and living in a royal palace also may be a reference to Herod. As seen in Chapter 2, placing too much attention on one's appearance and clothes made a man effeminate. The word μαλακός was used not only for soft clothes made of fine material, but also for effeminate persons.[100] The word was used to imply enjoyment of sexual penetration, but it also had broader implications of effeminacy. Moreover, men who lived in decadence and luxury were considered effeminate.[101]

Both the reed as Herod's symbol and the mention of a palace support the interpretation that Herod acts as a counterpole to John. John as a strong prophet is contrasted with the weak ruler Herod. If this reading is correct, it serves to strengthen the negative portrayal of Herod. As a weak and wavering person, he is unmasculine. In addition, his soft clothes and life in a luxurious royal palace make him effeminate, because they reveal his lack of self-control.

The other mentions of Herod are unique to Luke. The first of these is found in Luke 13:31–33. The Pharisees come to warn Jesus: "Get away from here, for Herod wants to kill you." Some scholars see here an underlying hostility or deceit. However, it is more likely that Luke wants to present the Pharisees' motive

---

95 This translation follows Matthew's text; Luke's text differs slightly in the end: "Look, those who put on fine clothing and live in luxury are in royal palaces."

96 Hagner 1993, 305; Evans 2012, 237.

97 Cf. 1 Kgs 14:15. Morgan (2007, 65) refers to an ancient fable where a reed survives in the wind by bending while an oak is uprooted. See, e.g., Aesop, *Fab*. 71. France 2007, 426; Marshall 1978, 294.

98 France 2007, 426; Hagner 1993, 304.

99 This is less evident in Luke, which does not mention John's dress.

100 See Chapter 2 above. This idea of softness as effeminacy can also be found in the New Testament; cf. 1 Cor 6:9.

101 Desire for luxury items was seen as a stereotypically feminine concern. E.g., Plutarch, *Advice to the Bride and Groom* 26, 30, 48.

for warning Jesus as sincere.[102] After all, in his answer Jesus criticizes Herod, not the Pharisees (Luke 13:32–33). Elsewhere in the Gospel, the Pharisees are depicted as well disposed toward Jesus, so it is likely that this is the case here also. Jesus calls Herod a "fox," which in classical Greek was an epithet for craftiness and deception.[103] Deception, as mentioned in Chapter 2, was a stereotypically feminine vice. The image of Herod as a fox fits the following word of Jesus (Luke 13:34), where Jesus uses a feminine image and compares himself with a mother hen protecting her chicks.[104] Possibly the idea is that Jesus is protecting the chicks from foxes like Herod. In these verses, Herod is once again portrayed as evil and thus not ideally masculine. The ideal ruler should be the one to protect his subjects. Herod does not succeed in fulfilling the demands for the ideal masculine ruler.

The mention of Herod in the passion narrative is also unique to Luke (Luke 23:6–12). During the Roman trial, Pilate finds out that Jesus is Galilean, and therefore he sends Jesus to Herod. Herod is very glad to see Jesus and he questions him. When Jesus does not answer, Herod mocks him and sends him back to Pilate. Pilate interprets this to mean that Herod has not found Jesus to be guilty (Luke 23:14–15). The commentators usually see the scene's importance in terms of Herod's testimony of the innocence of Jesus, a theme that continues throughout Luke's passion narrative.[105] The fact that Herod is portrayed negatively throughout the Gospel makes it even more remarkable that Herod does not find Jesus guilty. Still, Luke's Herod remains ambiguous. On one hand, he is glad to see Jesus; on the other hand, he wants to kill him. He mocks Jesus, but according to Pilate he announces that Jesus is innocent. The mockery of Jesus assigned to the Roman soldiers in the other Synoptic Gospels is taken over by Herod: in Luke, he is the one to dress Jesus in an elegant robe (Luke 23:11). Luke's intent seems to be to protect the Roman authorities by shifting blame from the Romans to Herod.

Despite the ambiguity of Herod's portrayal, he remains an evil, weak ruler who opposes God's prophets. This is true for all of the Synoptic Gospel portrayals of Herod. Therefore, Herod cannot be seen as an example of the ideal masculinity in any of the Synoptic Gospels. Although Herod is a member of the elite, he does not succeed in fulfilling the ideals of hegemonic masculinities. He is depicted as deceitful and lacking self-control. Why do the Synoptic

---

102 Fitzmyer 1985, 1030; Sanders 1985, 144–145; Stein 1992, 382.

103 See, e.g., Pindar, *Pyth.* 2.77–78; Plato, *Resp.* 365c; Plutarch, *Solon* 30.2; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.3.7–8. Fitzmyer 1985, 1031; Plummer 1981, 349.

104 This feminine image of Jesus is studied in Chapter 5.

105 Conway 2008, 131; Fitzmyer 1985, 1480; Stein 1992, 578.

Gospels wish to portray Herod as unmasculine? First, portraying Herod as unmasculine forms a negative contrast to the depiction of Jesus, and thus it highlights the masculinity of Jesus. In addition, the unmasculine portrayal of Herod is part of the marginal strategy of the Synoptic Gospels. Like Philo and Josephus, the Synoptic Gospels resist the marginality of their group by suggesting that they are better at fulfilling the ideals of masculinity, especially the ideals of self-controlled masculinity, than the members of the elite.

Pilate

In this section, I focus on the portrayal of Pilate in the Synoptic passion narratives. Jesus' behavior in the Roman trial is studied in Chapter 7. As we will see, Pilate lacks courage and resolution, and he is thus depicted as a weak ruler. Some scholars argue that it was the intention of the Synoptic Gospels to exculpate Pilate.[106] However, the Synoptic Gospel portrayals of Pilate can never be completely positive since in the end he condemns Jesus to death. From the point of view of the Synoptic Gospels, this is an unjust verdict, and as an unjust judge, Pilate is also unmasculine.

Pilate in Mark (*15:1–15*)

On first glance, Pilate's portrayal in Mark's account may seem positive. Pilate does not instigate Jesus' arrest and he does not seem anxious to condemn Jesus. He perceives that the leaders have handed Jesus over because of envy (Mark 15:10). However, this does not mean that Mark attempts to exonerate Pilate. On the contrary, Mark is less emphatic about Pilate's reluctance than the writers of the other Synoptic Gospels.[107] Pilate does suggest that he would release Jesus, but he does not insist upon it. He does not pronounce Jesus innocent, but simply asks the crowd why he should be crucified (Mark 15:14). In the end, the outcome of the trial seems to be a matter of indifference to Pilate.

106 E.g., Marcus 2009, 1026: "Mark describes Pilate as disinclined to exercise this power on Jesus, and the later evangelists paint him as even more reluctant to do so." According to Brown (1970, 794), the apologetic tendencies of the Gospels are clear in the portrayal of Pilate. In Mark, "Pilate attempts to have Jesus released but makes no great issue of his reluctance to sentence Jesus." In Matthew, "Pilate's reluctance is much more noticeable." In Luke, "Pilate solemnly states three times that he finds Jesus not guilty."

107 Senior 1987, 16.

Several scholars claim that Pilate lacked control over the situation and the strength to do what he knew to be right.[108] This would make Pilate a weak ruler and thus not ideally masculine. However, there is nothing here to show that Pilate is not in control of the crowds, since there is no threat of riot, as in Matthew. In the end, Pilate is not explicitly reluctant to condemn Jesus, but he condemns Jesus because he wishes to "satisfy the crowd" (Mark 15:15). In and of itself, this does not necessarily make Pilate less masculine.[109] Nevertheless, from Mark's point of view Pilate satisfies a wrong desire, which makes him not ideal. Pilate is an unjust judge, who is not bothered to hold a fair trial. As mentioned in Chapter 2, justice (δικαιοσύνη) was one of the cardinal virtues, and thus an important masculine quality. Pilate's behavior in the trial means that he lacks the ideal masculine qualities. Pilate is not exonerated since he hands Jesus over to be scourged and crucified. Mark does not try to save Pilate, which becomes even more evident when we compare Mark's account with the other Synoptic Gospels, especially Luke's depiction of Pilate.

Pilate in Matthew (*27:11–26*)

How is Pilate portrayed in the Gospel of Matthew? The commentators often suggest that Matthew was trying to exculpate Pilate. For example, David Hill argues that Matthew's addition of Pilate washing his hands (Matt 27:24) exculpates Pilate "as far as possible."[110] However, as we will see, it is doubtful that the hand washing would exonerate Pilate. Moreover, Matthew reproduces all of the Markan material. Like in Mark, Pilate sees that the chief priests handed Jesus over because of envy (Matt 27:18), but he does not pronounce Jesus innocent. In addition to the hand washing scene, Matthew also adds other details of his own. For example, Pilate's wife warns her husband not to do anything with Jesus (Matt 27:19). Pilate's wife is commended because of her divinely inspired belief of Jesus as righteous or innocent (δίκαιος) and for the action

108 E.g., Liew 1999, 82; Marcus 2009, 1035. Bond, on the contrary, argues that Pilate is not a weak and impotent character, but rather "an astute governor." He "handles a potentially difficult case with […] a great deal of political shrewdness." Pilate plays an important role in Jesus' execution. Bond 1998, 103–104. If Mark intends to portray Pilate as a strong leader, this makes Pilate evil for condemning an innocent man, and thus he is not masculine. Regardless of whether Mark intends to portray Pilate as a strong or a weak leader, in either case Pilate comes off as unmasculine.

109 In gladiator games, the patron of the event could satisfy the crowd's desire. Wishing to satisfy a crowd's desire did not mean that a patron was a weak leader, since the patron was still in control. Cobb (2008, 40) notes that in the martyrdom accounts, the editor of the games often granted the requests of the crowd.

110 Hill 1972, 351, 348.

she takes in response to her dream.[111] Pilate ignores this advice. He does not follow his wife's recommendation, with the implication that he does not follow God's instructions.[112] This lack of piety makes Pilate unable to fulfill the ideals of masculinity. In Matthew, Pilate also co-operates with the Jewish authorities in appointing the guard to the tomb (Matt 27:62–66). All of these changes increase Pilate's culpability and emphasize his injustice.

In contrast to Mark, where Pilate merely wishes to satisfy the desire of the crowd, Matthew emphasizes the weakness of the governor. The Jewish leaders are capable of manipulating the crowds to the extent that a riot threatens to break out (Matt 27:24).[113] Pilate is incapable of controlling the mob and acknowledges his powerlessness when he washes his hands. Helen Bond notes that a question of guilt runs throughout Matthew's passion narrative: with the exception of Judas, every character seeks to shift responsibility away from himself. Pilate washes his hands and pronounces himself innocent (Matt 27:24). He does not accept any responsibility for what he has done. In the end, the responsibility is accepted by the people.[114] For Matthew, more important than Pilate's portrayal is the portrayal of the Jewish opponents of Jesus. Matthew's aim is not to exculpate Pilate but to inculpate the Jewish opponents. In any case, Pilate's powerlessness does not make him innocent.[115] As a weak and unjust judge who does not follow the prophetic instruction of his wife, Pilate is not depicted as masculine by Matthew.

Pilate in Luke (*23:1–25*)

Luke's portrayal of Pilate seems to be the most positive of the Synoptic Gospels. Throughout the passion narrative, Luke presents Jesus as a rejected prophet and an innocent martyr. The theme of innocence has special prominence in Luke's narrative. Pilate declares Jesus innocent three times (Luke 23:4, 14, 22). Herod and the centurion at the cross also pronounce Jesus innocent (Luke 23:15, 47). Bond notes that Luke's major apologetic purpose is to "use Pilate as the official witness to Jesus' innocence."[116] Moreover, Pilate does not have Jesus scourged. This makes Pilate a less negative character.

Still, Luke's main purpose is to save Jesus' dignity rather than portray Pilate positively. Despite the pronouncements of innocence, Pilate hands Jesus over

111 Weaver 2005, 120–121.

112 Callon 2006, 68.

113 See also Weaver 2005, 117.

114 Bond 1998, 124–125.

115 Weaver 2005, 119.

116 Bond 1998, 159.

to be crucified. As a result, Luke depicts Pilate as too weak to release a prisoner he has announced innocent. First, Pilate tries passing the case to Herod (Luke 23:6–12). After that, he twice suggests a milder form of punishment, a disciplinary beating (Luke 23:16, 22). However, the fact that Pilate is willing to give a person he has pronounced innocent even a mild punishment suggests that Luke is not portraying Pilate completely positively. In the end, Pilate acquiesces to the demands of the people (Luke 23:23–24). As Bond notes, this is "hardly a favourable picture of the Roman judge."[117] Ultimately, Luke's portrayal of Pilate is not positive.[118] Pilate is an incompetent and weak ruler who is not in control of the crowds. He is also an unjust judge. On both of these accounts, he does not fulfill the masculine ideal. In any case, Luke's portrayal of Rome is more positive than that of Mark and Matthew. This same theme continues in Acts, where Luke distinguishes between the corrupt and incompetent governors and the Roman law, which sees Christianity as harmless.[119]

Conclusions

On first glance, the Synoptic Gospels seem to share with the Greco-Roman hegemonic masculinities the idea that authority and public speaking were masculine features. However, accepting these ideals can be seen as subversive as well, since the Synoptic Gospels argue that Jesus, although a member of the lower classes, bests his opponents in disputes and has authority over the crowds which the opponents for the most part do not have. The Synoptic Gospels do not consider authority as unmasculine or masculine *per se*. Whether authority is masculine or not depends on what ends it is used to reach. In the Synoptic Gospels, two ways of living—living on God's terms and living in human terms—are contrasted. The opponents prefer living in human terms, which means that they prefer public recognition, over the recognition that comes from God. Jesus, on the contrary, argues that the recognition that comes from God should be more important. This also affects the ideal masculinity of the Synoptic Gospels. Public recognition is not what makes a man masculine;

117 Bond 1998, 154.

118 Luke has mentioned Pilate already in Luke 13:1, where Jesus is told how Pilate has mingled the blood of the Galileans with their sacrifices. This affects the portrayal of Pilate. When Pilate is mentioned again in the passion narrative, the reader already has a negative image of Pilate.

119 See also Bond 1998, 160; Luz 2005, 464.

instead, masculinity means following God's will. This ideal is studied more in detail in Chapter 4, where ideal discipleship is examined.

The opponents' desire for public recognition is thus connected with their lack of piety. This means that they do not succeed in fulfilling the masculine virtue of piety. In addition, the opponents are accused of a lack of self-control, which was another important masculine virtue. Moreover, the opponents fail at being good leaders and teachers. Matthew, for example, argues that the scribes fail to interpret Scripture correctly. They do not see the importance of mercy, which again makes them impious. Their failure to interpret Scripture means that they are not good teachers. The role of the teacher was a masculine role, and the opponents of Jesus fail in this regard. Jesus, on the contrary, has authority as a teacher. Jesus is thus portrayed as more masculine than his opponents.

Occasionally in the Synoptic Gospels, the masculinity of Jesus is challenged. The Jewish opponents and the people of Nazareth cite Jesus' piety, lack of self-control with regard to food and drink, keeping the wrong company, working for a living, and illegitimate origin. The Synoptic Gospels answer these accusations in different ways and seek to validate Jesus' practices. Mark seems to be the least concerned with potentially portraying Jesus in a negative manner. In this way, the Gospel of Mark is closest to voluntarily accepting the marginal position of early Christianity. Matthew and Luke, on the other hand, enhance the portrayal of Jesus and thus make him appear more masculine.

The two elite characters, Herod and Pilate, lack control over others. Herod cannot control his family, and in Matthew Pilate is unable to control the crowds. Herod also seems to lack self-control, especially in Mark's portrayal of the death of John the Baptist. Both Herod and Pilate are portrayed as unjust judges, which makes them unmasculine. Although they are members of the elite, Herod and Pilate fail to fulfill the ideals of the hegemonic masculinities. The Synoptic Gospels aim to show that members of the elite are not ideally masculine, whereas Jesus fulfills the ideals of masculinity.

The most important masculine quality for the Synoptic Gospels was piety, fulfilling the will of God. Piety was part of the ideal of the hegemonic masculinities as well, but the Synoptic Gospels claimed that they offered a better means of achieving piety. The Synoptic Gospels employ the same strategy as Philo and Josephus when they argue that their group offers a better method of fulfilling the ideals of masculinity. Up to this point, it seems that the Synoptic Gospels share similar ideals with the hegemonic masculinities, or at least the self-controlled ideal of masculinity. As we will see in the next chapter on ideal discipleship, however, the Synoptic Gospels—especially Mark and Matthew—also present a very different strategy of voluntary marginality.

CHAPTER 4

Jesus and His Male Followers

Introduction

In the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus' disciples are constructed as men.[1] Only men are explicitly called disciples, the disciples are addressed by means of male terminology as brothers, and Jesus' teaching assumes a male audience. In this chapter, I concentrate on the masculinity of Jesus and his (male) disciples. The Synoptic Gospels are not concerned with the disciples themselves, but rather in relation to Jesus. Do the disciples succeed in fulfilling the ideals of masculinity of the Synoptic Gospels? I also study Jesus' teaching on ideal discipleship and some unexpected exemplary characters: children, slaves, and eunuchs. What are the qualities of the ideal disciple and how do those qualities relate to the hegemonic masculinities of the ancient Greco-Roman world? In other words, what is the ideal masculinity of the Synoptic Gospels?

The Portrayal of the Disciples in the Synoptic Gospels

I begin by examining the portrayal of the disciples in the Synoptic Gospels. In the ancient Greco-Roman hierarchy, students were always below the teacher and, accordingly, comparatively less masculine. This is also true of Jesus and his disciples.[2] The disciples' decision to follow Jesus immediately after he calls them highlights Jesus' authority and his success in persuading others (Matt 4:18–22; Mark 1:16–20; Luke 5:1–11).[3] This emphasizes Jesus' higher position in the gender hierarchy in relation to his disciples. Since authority and persuasion were important parts of hegemonic masculinities, in their portrayal

1 Bauckham (2002, 112) maintains that Luke is a possible exception, since women may be included in the seventy-two disciples (Luke 10:1, 17). Nevertheless, this is not explicit. De Boer (2006, 140) also notes that it does not seem very likely that women are included in the group of the seventy-two disciples. Only at the end of the Synoptic Gospels is it said that women followed Jesus. This is also the case with Luke. Although Luke 8:1–3 mentions women who provided for Jesus and his disciples, they are not described as following Jesus. For more on the female followers of Jesus, see Chapter 5.

2 Cf. Matt 10:24; Luke 6:40.

3 See also Shiner 1995, 185–188.

of Jesus the Synoptic Gospels are in line with the hegemonic ideals. A radically different ideal of masculinity arises when the disciples' failures offer Jesus an opportunity to teach them the importance of service. As we will later see, service becomes the ideal for the masculinity in the Synoptic Gospels.

As discussed in the previous chapter, two ways of living—living on God's terms and living in human terms—are contrasted in the Synoptic Gospels. The disciples vacillate between these. On one hand, they want to follow Jesus. On the other hand, they do not want to give up their pursuit of status and public recognition.[4] In this regard, they are similar to the opponents. They expect Jesus to be a powerful Messiah, and they want to be first and great. The negative portrayal of the disciples intensifies in the latter half of the Synoptic Gospels, when the disciples first fail to accept Jesus' interpretation of what being a Messiah means and finally they forsake and deny Jesus. Eric Thurman notes that the disciples' desire to be great betrays "their investment in hegemonic masculinity."[5] This is true for the self-assertive ideal of masculinity, which emphasized power and control over others. As will be seen, Jesus' ideal masculinity is different and closer to the self-controlled ideal of masculinity.

Studies on the depictions of the disciples in the Synoptic Gospels have usually centered on whether the portrayal of the disciples is positive or negative. Mark's portrayal of the disciples initially seems negative. The disciples are presented as lacking in understanding (e.g., Mark 4:13; 8:17). Jesus calls them "a faithless generation" (Mark 9:19), and Mark comments that "their hearts were hardened" (Mark 6:52). Hard-heartedness is elsewhere in Mark ascribed to the Pharisees (Mark 3:5). The disciples are also preoccupied with their own status. The disciples thus resemble the opponents. In addition, Mark describes the disciples as having an aversion to suffering. Their lack of ideal characteristics means that they lack masculinity as well. This can be seen, for example, in Mark's depiction of the disciples as fearful (Mark 4:40–41; 9:32). As mentioned in Chapter 2, courage was the quintessential masculine virtue in the ancient Greco-Roman world. The disciples' fear entails a loss of masculinity.[6] Nevertheless, merely focusing on negative portrayals of the disciples ignores the positive. Despite their misunderstandings, they have left everything and they continue to follow Jesus (Mark 10:28–31). They are his new family (Mark 3:31–35). They preach and exorcise successfully (Mark 3:14–15; 6:12–13,

4 E.g., Matt 18:1–20; 20:20–28; Mark 9:33–37; 10:35–45; Luke 9:46–48; 22:24–27. Rhoads 1994, 366; Rhoads, Dewey & Michie 1999, 90.

5 Thurman 2003, 153–154.

6 Fear was stereotypically feminine; see, e.g., Xenophon, *Oec.* 7.25. See also Liew 2003, 115; Malina & Rohrbaugh 1992, 206.

30). And at the end of the Gospel, even after they have abandoned Jesus, Jesus wants to be reunited with them (Mark 16:7). Thus, Mark's portrayal of the disciples can be seen as both positive and negative.[7] Elizabeth Struhers Malbon, for instance, calls the disciples "fallible followers."[8] The disciples are not shown as lacking masculinity to the extent that the opponents of Jesus are. Still, the disciples are clearly on a lower level in the gender hierarchy than Jesus.

Although Mark's portrayal of the disciples is not completely negative, Matthew and Luke apparently saw it to be at least somewhat problematic. The specifically Markan elements that speak adversely of the disciples—as fearful, failing to understand, and objects of rebuke—are toned down by Matthew and Luke. Matthew, for example, removes the motif of the disciples' failure. They never fail to believe or understand.[9] Matthew also erases the negative commentary of the disciples' hard-heartedness and lack of understanding.[10] Instead, the disciples recognize Jesus as the son of God and worship him (Matt 14:33). Matthew gives the disciples more authority than the authors of the other Synoptic Gospels: for instance, they can forgive sins (Matt 16:19; 18:18). This authority makes them more masculine. In the gender hierarchy, the disciples are still below Jesus, but relatively more masculine than in Mark.

Matthew's more favorable portrayal of the disciples can be seen in how he changes the request of the sons of Zebedee (Matt 20:20–28). In Mark, John and James come to Jesus and ask for the seats of honor (Mark 10:35–45). In contrast to Mark, in Matthew it is the mother of the sons, not the sons themselves, who asks for the places of honor for James and John. It is possible that Matthew intends to depict the sons as less self-interested.[11] Nevertheless, the sons are present with the mother. Jesus' words are directed at them in the second-person plural and the sons answer. The mother's request is presented in more modest terms. She does not ask for Jesus to give them whatever they want, but rather that Jesus grant them "something." In this way, her behavior contrasts with the behavior of the sons in Mark's Gospel, where the sons simply presume that Jesus must grant their wish.[12] Although her request is

7 Rhoads, Dewey & Michie 1999, 101.

8 Malbon 1983.

9 Nevertheless, although the disciples have faith, their faith is weak. Matthew often calls them "those of little faith" (ὀλιγόπιστοι). Cf. Matt 6:30; 8:26; 14:31; 16:8. Luke uses this expression only once, in Luke 12:28.

10 Matt 13:16–17; cf. Mark 4:13. At the end of the parable discourse, the disciples have understood everything (πάντα) Jesus has said (Matt 13:51). See also Fowler 1991, 238; Luz 1983, 101.

11 Mattila 2002, 118.

12 Luz 2001, 543.

more modest, Matthew still portrays the woman as having the stereotypically feminine vice of ambition.[13] Matthew transfers the ambition from the sons to the mother. The portrayal of the mother is not completely negative, however, since she goes on to follow Jesus (Matt 27:56). The request of the sons of Zebedee also shows that while Matthew's portrayal of the disciples is less negative than Mark's, it is still not completely positive.[14] Like in Mark, the disciples have an aversion to suffering and are preoccupied with their status.

In Luke as well, the disciples do not understand Jesus' message of suffering, and they are preoccupied with status. Nevertheless, Luke provides an even more positive portrayal of the disciples. He omits their wonder and fear (Luke 18:31; cf. Mark 10:32b), as well as their embarrassed silence (Luke 9:47; cf. Mark 9:34). When the disciples fail, Luke offers an explanation. Their sleep in Gethsemane is due to grief (Luke 22:45); their post-resurrection disbelief is a result of joy (Luke 24:41). Most importantly, the disciples do not abandon Jesus in the end. Instead, all of Jesus' acquaintances observe the crucifixion (Luke 23:49). Especially in the second volume of Luke's work, the apostles approach Jesus in masculinity.[15] Luke makes the disciples more ideal characters than Mark or Matthew, which also makes them more masculine. Apparently, Luke wants to present the disciples as examples of masculinity. Nevertheless, Luke also retains the hierarchy between the disciples and Jesus. Jesus remains higher in the gender hierarchy and is thus more masculine than his disciples.

Peter in the Synoptic Gospels

Of all the disciples, Peter has the most developed character in the Synoptic narratives. Peter exemplifies the disciples in both good and bad. Mark portrays Peter, like all disciples, both positively and negatively as a "fallible follower." He wants to follow Jesus, and he confesses him to be the Messiah. At the same time, he also exemplifies the failures of the disciples when he misunderstands Jesus. Matthew and Luke emphasize Peter's role as the spokesperson of the disciples by adding him to some pericopes. In Matthew, Peter is the "first" of the disciples (Matt 10:2).[16] In Luke, Jesus appears first to Peter (Luke 24:34). Peter

13 The mother resembles Tacitus' portrayals of Livia and Agrippina, who both plotted for their sons to become emperors. Rutland 1978; Smethurst 1950, 81–83.

14 Brown 2002, 36, 55–58; Edwards 1997, 31; Luz 1983, 101; 2005, 337; Wire 1991, 102.

15 This is also noted by Conway 2008, 132–133, 142.

16 Peter also plays a larger role in some pericopes; e.g., Matt 14:22–33 (walking on the water); 16:13–23 (the Messiah confession).

also has a major role in the Acts of the Apostles. Both Matthew and Luke thus enhance Peter's position and make him more masculine. This is in accordance with their general tendency to change Mark's portrayal of the disciples, making them more ideal characters. In this section, I concentrate on three episodes where Peter has an important role: the Messiah confession, the Gethsemane account, and the denials of Peter.

The Messiah Confession

In all of the Synoptic Gospels, Peter confesses Jesus to be the Messiah (Mark 8:27–30; Matt 16:13–20; Luke 9:18–22). I suggest that in his confession and Jesus' subsequent reaction, two different ideals of masculinity are contrasted. This is especially the case in Mark (Mark 8:27–30). Some scholars interpret Peter's Messiah confession in Mark in a negative light. Theodore Weeden, for example, argues that Mark wrote his Gospel against opponents who advocated an erroneous Christology. Mark presents Peter as a spokesman of this erroneous θεῖος ἀνήρ Christology, which is contrasted against the suffering Christology that Mark advocates.[17] Weeden's negative evaluation of Peter's confession is probably not correct. Jesus does not rebuke the confession, but rather offers a reinterpretation of what being a Messiah means (Mark 8:31).[18]

Although Peter's confession is essentially correct, his concept of messiahship appears to be flawed. Peter's reaction to Jesus' prediction of his suffering (Mark 8:31) shows that he expected messiahship to mean something different. Even if the Gospel of Mark was not written against the proponents of a wrong Christology, there seems to be two competing ideas of what the Messiah should be like. These competing ideals also translate into two competing ideals of masculinity. The disciples expect a powerful and victorious military Messiah figure. They seem to share the messianic aspirations of intertestamental Judaism and the wish for an anointed king who would defeat Rome and restore Israel.[19] Their idea of masculinity is connected with power and status. As can be seen from the passion prediction in Mark 8:31, Jesus' ideal is different and includes the acceptance of suffering. Jesus does not reject Peter's confession, but corrects it by adding the notion of suffering. Peter's confession is flawed since he does not see suffering as an inevitable part of messiahship and as part of Jesus' masculinity.

---

17 Weeden 1985, 64–67.

18 The passion prediction of this verse will be studied in more detail in Chapter 7.

19 See, e.g., *Sib. Or.* 3.652–656; *1 En.* 45:3–6. Brown, Donfried & Reumann 1973, 65; Collins 2007, 407.

Peter responds to Jesus' prediction of his suffering by rebuking him (Mark 8:32). He holds onto his idea that the Messiah should not be defeated. Peter is attached to ideas of power and prestige. Therefore, he censures his teacher for the understanding that Jesus has of messiahship. Nevertheless, Peter's response does not reflect negatively on him. Indeed, Jesus' prediction should elicit some sign of concern from the disciples, lest they otherwise appear uncaring.[20] Jesus rebukes his disciples sharply.[21] Peter's failure to understand the importance of suffering and the strong language used in Jesus' rebuke serve to underscore the importance of properly understanding the teaching.[22] Peter's objection provides a negative contrast to Jesus' masculine steadfastness and courage. Although the term ἀνδρεία is not used, Jesus' predicted endurance of suffering is close to the idea of ἀνδρεία as endurance and self-control. Peter's insistence that the Messiah should be a victorious military figure is closer to the self-assertive ideal of masculinity. Jesus' teaching on the suffering he will face and what kind of masculinity it implies will be studied in more detail in Chapter 7.

Matthew's account follows the same basic structure as Mark's, but Matthew changes some of the details. First, Jesus praises Peter's confession: it is the result of a divine revelation (Matt 16:16–19). The disciples have already confessed Jesus to be the Son of God (Matt 14:33), and Peter's confession repeats this confession. According to Jesus, Peter is the rock that the church is built on and he is given the authority to bind and loose (Matt 16:18–19). All of this makes the portrayal of Peter and other disciples more positive. On the other hand, in Matthew as well, Peter rebukes Jesus' prediction that he must suffer and die: "This must never happen to you" (οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο; Matt 16:22). Peter's rebuke expresses the common Jewish idea of the Messiah, with which the idea of a suffering Messiah was incompatible.[23] The double negative (οὐ μὴ) of Peter's rebuke shows that the suffering is not just undesirable, but unthinkable.[24] Matthew also strengthens Jesus' rebuke of Peter. Jesus calls Peter σκάνδαλον, a stumbling block. Acting as a stumbling block to others was a serious issue that

20 As Shiner notes, it is difficult to find alternatives to Peter's reaction: "'And Peter said, "Good, it's about time that you died,"' is grotesque. 'And Peter said, "That's right, Teacher; it is only by losing your life that you can gain it,"' reverses the roles of teacher and disciple." Shiner 1995, 261–262.

21 The word for rebuke, ἐπιτιμάω, is used elsewhere in the Gospel in exorcism stories in the struggle to gain control over the demons. Cf. Mark 1:25; 3:12; 9:25.

22 Shiner 1995, 262–264.

23 Filson 1971, 188; Hill 1972, 264.

24 France 2007, 634.

would lead to punishment in the afterlife (Matt 13:41; 18:6–9). By suggesting that Peter's misunderstanding is a serious sin, Matthew highlights the importance of the teaching even more than Mark. The failure to understand Jesus' teaching calls Peter's chances of fulfilling the ideals of masculinity even more into question.

In Luke, Peter's failure to understand Jesus' prediction is omitted and Jesus moves straight from his confession to the teaching on suffering (Luke 9:18–22). There is no misunderstanding of the nature of messiahship. Luke's portrayal of Peter is the most positive of the Synoptic Gospels in this sense. Peter and the disciples seem to more easily accept the necessity of suffering, and they form no negative contrast to Jesus. Luke has changed the Messiah confession so that the portrayal of Peter falls more in line with Luke's general portrayal of the disciples. Peter, like the disciples in general, is portrayed as a more ideal—and therefore also more masculine—character.

Peter in the Passion Narratives

In the passion narratives, the issue is less about competition between the self-assertive and self-controlled ideals of masculinity than remaining steadfast. As mentioned in Chapter 2, steadfastness could be seen as a sign of ἀνδρεία, the quintessential masculine ideal. The disciples demonstrate self-assertive masculinity when they try to prevent Jesus' arrest from taking place. The fact that in the end they flee shows that they are unable to fulfill the masculine ideal of steadfastness. A lack of steadfastness can also be seen in Peter's depiction in the passion narratives. Peter boasts of his courage and claims that he will remain steadfast and not deny or forsake Jesus (Mark 14:29–31; Matt 26:33–35; Luke 22:33). Peter's behavior in Gethsemane and his denial of Jesus demonstrate his failure to keep these promises.

In Mark's and Matthew's accounts of the Gethsemane pericope, Jesus asks Peter, John, and James to stay awake and pray while he prays (Mark 14:34; Matt 26:38). The disciples fall asleep, however. This is especially ironic, since Peter and all of the disciples had just been boasting of their courage and steadfastness.[25] They fail to manifest these masculine characteristics. On the other hand, one can ask whether Jesus' emotional behavior is ideally masculine either. This is a question I will return to in Chapter 7. In any case, the sleeping Peter forms a contrast to the piously praying Jesus.

Luke's tendency to soften the portrayal of the disciples is evident in the Gethsemane pericope as well (Luke 22:39–46). Luke does not mention Peter by name in the Gethsemane scene and thus he does not receive any special

25 Myers 2008, 367.

blame for sleeping. Luke also gives a reason for the somnolence of the disciples: they have fallen asleep because of grief (Luke 22:45). Moreover, Jesus has predicted the ultimate faithfulness of the disciples and has prayed for Peter that he will not fail (Luke 22:31–32). Although Luke excuses the disciples and in this way redeems their masculinity, the disciples remain at the lower level in the gender hierarchy, especially since Luke does not portray Jesus as emotional in Gethsemane.

Another point in the passion narratives where Peter has an important role is the scene with his denials. While Jesus is questioned by the Jewish leaders, Peter faces his own trial and denies Jesus three times (Mark 14:66–72; Matt 26:69–75; Luke 22:54–62). The low status of the first interrogator is emphasized in all of the Synoptic Gospels: the accuser is a servant girl (παιδίσκη). As a doubly marginal figure, the servant girl poses minimal danger to Peter. This increases Peter's responsibility and further underlines his weakness, since he cannot keep his promise to Jesus even in front of servants.[26] Matthew makes Peter's failure even more severe than Mark. Peter denies Jesus publicly "before them all" (Matt 26:70). Peter also swears an oath on two occasions (Matt 26:72, 74). This is even more condemnable, since Jesus had prohibited swearing (Matt 5:33–37). It is only after the cock crows that Peter finally becomes aware that he has acted with self-confidence and pride throughout the passion narrative.[27] Peter again fails to show the masculine courage and steadfastness he earlier boasted of having.

In Luke, Peter does not swear or curse. Since Jesus has predicted Peter's ultimate faithfulness (Luke 22:31), the portrayal is not as negative as in Mark and Matthew. In addition, the prominent role that Peter plays in the resurrection narrative and in the Acts serves to soften the negative impact of the denials. In Luke, Peter's failures are clearly temporary. This again preserves Peter's masculinity. Nevertheless, Peter comes off as less masculine than Jesus since he does not manage to demonstrate courage and steadfastness. As we will see in Chapter 7, Luke changes Jesus' portrayal in the passion narratives so that Jesus becomes more self-controlled—and thus more masculine—than in Mark and Matthew.

In sum, Peter's portrayal in the Synoptic Gospels follows the overall characterization of the disciples in each Gospel. In Mark and Matthew, Peter manifests negative features when he misunderstands the nature of messiahship and fails to exemplify the masculine virtues of courage and steadfastness in the passion narratives. Luke gives a more positive portrayal of Peter and at the

26 Borrell 1998, 116.

27 Borrell 1998, 112–113.

same time makes him more masculine. Nevertheless, even in Luke, Peter is on a lower level of the gender hierarchy in comparison to Jesus.

Jesus' Teaching on Ideal Behavior in the Sermon on the Mount

The disciples are thus sometimes depicted as fallible followers, and they are on a lower level in the masculinity hierarchy than Jesus. What, then, would the ideal follower be like? What does Jesus teach about ideal masculine behavior? In this section, I concentrate on the teaching on ideal behavior in the Sermon on the Mount, which is Jesus' longest speech concerning ethics and the ideal behavior of the disciples.

Matthew presents Jesus as an authoritative teacher, which is a masculine role. The language used in the Sermon on the Mount shows that the teaching is addressed to men. Teachings concerning adultery, divorce, and enemies are given to men.[28] Addressees refer to each other as brothers, using masculine terminology.[29] Matthew also uses masculine pronouns and articles. This does not mean that Matthew is not envisioning women as part of Jesus' audience or that there were no women in Matthew's audience. It means that even though women may have been present, the audience is constructed as male and the potential female audience is invisible. Thus, the Sermon on the Mount seems to be about the ideal behavior of men in particular. The explicit topic of the Sermon on the Mount is righteousness (δικαιοσύνη), which means "proper interpersonal relationships and behavior."[30] For example, in Matthew 5:20 Jesus says: "unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven." The goal of ideal behavior is salvation. Righteousness is the most important characteristic of ideal behavior: the

28 On the Sermon on the Mount as a male text, see Weidemann 2014, 107–108.

29 Matt 5:22–24; 7:3–5.

30 Malina & Rohrbaugh 1992, 51. Neyrey has interpreted the Sermon on the Mount from the point of view of honor and shame. He argues that the Sermon prohibits the disciples from seeking and maintaining honor in traditional ways defined by the Mediterranean culture. The disciples are forbidden to make honor claims (Matt 5:34–37), challenges (Matt 5:21, 27–32, 33), and ripostes (Matt 5:22, 39–42, 43–45). Neyrey 1998, 210–211. Neyrey also argues that by discrediting conventional methods of gaining honor, Jesus challenges the prevailing masculinity ideology. Neyrey 2003, 63. Neyrey's interpretation has received criticism. A concern for honor is not explicit in the Sermon on the Mount. In addition, Lawrence (2003, 147–155) criticizes the use of the challenge-riposte model for study of the Sermon on the Mount.

ideal man is righteous. The Sermon on the Mount sets guidelines for exemplary behavior.

Beatitudes (*Matthew 5:3–12*)

In the Beatitudes, certain behaviors are recommended. For example, the followers of Jesus should be meek, merciful, and peacemakers.[31] These behaviors are part of the ideal of masculine deportment in Matthew's Gospel.

One of the ideal qualities mentioned in the Beatitudes is being πραΰς, meek or gentle (Matt 5:5). Jerome Neyrey interprets meekness to connote weakness or loss of power, such as being a victim of another's violence. By honoring meekness, Jesus raises the strategy of non-retaliation as the ideal. Nevertheless, Neyrey goes too far when he claims that this strategy is "totally at odds with his [Jesus'] cultural world."[32] For instance, Aristotle considered meekness to be the mean between too much anger and lack of (proper) anger, ἀοργησία. Aristotle uses πραότης to refer to "a calm temper, not led by emotion but only becoming angry in such a manner, for such causes and for such a length of time as principle may ordain."[33] This to Aristotle was the ideal. Epictetus also considered being meek (πρᾶος) as ideal behavior.[34] The definitions of what constitutes meekness differed, however. The Stoics did not agree with Aristotle's idea of proper anger, and thus for the Stoics, becoming angry was not part of meek behavior.[35] Still, these examples show that at least some ancient Greco-Roman philosophers saw meekness as the ideal. Matthew's teaching may have been at odds with some ideals present in the ancient Greco-Roman world, mainly the self-assertive ideal of masculinity, but it was not at odds with the entire cultural world. There were two competing ideals, and Matthew agreed with the self-controlled ideal of masculinity. Even if the self-assertive ideal was more popular than the self-controlled ideal of the philosophers, this does not make Matthew countercultural. Jesus' teaching is in keeping with the philosophical ideals, and since Matthew elsewhere forbids anger (Matt 5:22), his definition of meekness seems to be closer to the Stoic ideal that Epictetus presents.

Matthew is the only Synoptic Gospel to use the term πραΰς. Jesus exemplifies his teaching of meekness as the ideal characteristic twice elsewhere in the

---

31 Matthew has clearly spiritualized some of the Beatitudes. Whereas Luke 6:20–23 speaks of people who are literally hungry and poor, Matthew talks about those that "hunger for righteousness" and are "poor in spirit." Luke's wording is probably closer to the text of Q.

32 Neyrey 1998, 182.

33 Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 1125b–1126b. Transl. H. Rackham.

34 E.g., Epictetus, *Diatr.* 3.20.9–10. This is also noted by Neyrey 1998, 182.

35 See more on emotions in Chapter 6.

Gospel. In Matthew 11:29, Jesus tells that he is "gentle and humble in heart" (πραΰς εἰμι καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ). In Matthew 21:4–5, Jesus is also depicted as πραΰς. The passage is a quotation from Zechariah 9:9 LXX, where the ideal king is called meek (πραΰς) and righteous (δίκαιος). Jesus is masculine according to his own teaching and according to the philosophical, self-controlled ideal of masculinity.

A potentially counterhegemonic ideal arises when Matthew holds pity (ἐλεημοσύνη) to be an important virtue (Matt 5:7). ἔλεος is an important part of virtuous behavior elsewhere in the Gospel as well (Matt 9:13; 12:7). Aristotle considered ἔλεος to be a good thing: "we sympathize with and pity (συνάχθεσθαι καὶ ἐλεεῖν) those who suffer undeservedly."[36] Thus, following Aristotle, ἔλεος could also be seen as ideally masculine from the point of view of the hegemonic masculinities. The Stoic philosophers, however, maintained that ἔλεος was an irrational emotion, because it was unnecessary and might include the possibility of injustice.[37] Seneca, for example, considered pity (*misericordia*) to be effeminate.[38] From the Stoic point of view, Matthew is presenting unmasculine behavior as the ideal.

Peacemakers (εἰρηνοποιοί) are another group of people that Matthew mentions in the Beatitudes (Matt 5:9). Neyrey claims that peacemaking was shameful behavior, since it meant forswearing riposte. By declaring peacemakers to be honorable, Jesus honors people who have "suffered dishonor for behavior at variance with cultural expectations."[39] This might have been the case from the perspective of the self-assertive ideal of masculinity. However, peacemaking was part of the Roman rhetoric of a good emperor, and εἰρηνοποιός was used as a royal epithet.[40] Augustus mentioned as one of his achievements that he had closed the doors of the temple of Janus (which were kept open during war) three times during his principate.[41] Vespasian built a temple of Peace in 75 CE, celebrating Rome's victory over the Jews. These examples show that the *Pax Romana* was considered the ideal state. The importance of the

36 Aristotle, *Rhet*. 1386b. Transl. John Henry Freese.

37 E.g., Epictetus, *Diatr*. 2.17.26; 3.22.13; 3.24.43; 4.1.4.

38 Seneca, *Clem.* 2.5.1. On *misericordia* and ἔλεος, see also Cicero, *Tusc*. 4.16–21; Diogenes Laertius 7.111. On clemency, see also Matthews 2009; 2010.

39 Neyrey 1998, 181–182, 184.

40 Dio 44.49.2; Xenophon, *Hell*. 6.3.4. Philo presents God as a peacemaker. See, e.g., Philo, *Spec. Laws* 2.192. On peacemaking, see Betz 1995, 137–139; Swartley 1996, esp. 2309–2314; Windisch 1925, 240–260.

41 Augustus, *Res gest. divi Aug.* 13.

Pax Romana and the use of εἰρηνοποιός as a royal title show that peacemaking was an important part of the hegemonic masculine ideals.

Jesus' teaching in the Beatitudes seems opposed to the self-assertive ideal of masculinity. The teaching concerning meekness and peacemaking is close to the self-controlled ideal of masculinity. Therefore, the Beatitudes may be called complicit with the self-controlled ideal of masculinity that was competing for the hegemonic position. Nevertheless, self-control for a marginalized group is not the same thing as for the hegemonic group. All of the ideals studied in this section recommend that the early Christians accept their marginality. They should not try to change their marginal position as the self-assertive ideal of masculinity would suggest. Matthew thus seems to advocate a voluntarily marginalized masculinity.

Antitheses (*Matthew 5:21–48*)

In the antitheses, the main theme of the Sermon—righteousness—is "developed in relation to specific commandments of the Law."[42] The themes that the antitheses address are anger and murder, adultery and divorce, and retaliation and hating enemies. The antitheses follow the same pattern. First Jesus quotes a saying that the audience has heard. Then Jesus interprets this saying in a new way. The wording of the reinterpretation, "but I say to you," emphasizes Jesus' authority. Jesus' teaching is the revelation of the divine will in contrast to the misunderstandings of others.[43] Jesus' authoritative teaching instructs the disciples about ideal behavior. How does this teaching affect the ideal masculinity of the Gospel of Matthew?

Interpreting the antitheses from the point of view of honor and shame, Neyrey argues that in the antitheses Jesus prohibits challenge-riposte exchanges.[44] The disciples are not to challenge others by physical affronts, verbal abuse, or the sexual seduction of another's wife (Matt 5:23–30). The disciples are also forbidden to offer a riposte when challenged. Instead, they should turn the other cheek and love their enemies (Matt 5:39–45). Culturally speaking, the result from this kind of behavior would be a loss of honor.[45] If Neyrey is correct, the disciples would also lose their masculinity, at least from the point of view of self-assertive masculinity. However, the behavior that Jesus criticizes was already forbidden in the Torah. Jesus does not oppose the original commandments of the Torah, but actually intensifies them. Louise Lawrence

42 Beare 1981, 164.

43 Carter 1994, 64.

44 On challenge-riposte exchanges, see Malina 2001, 33–35; Neyrey 1998, 20, 44–45.

45 Neyrey 1998, 190–211.

notes that the antitheses are rooted in Jewish ethical norms.[46] As we shall see, criticism of this type of behavior can be found in Greco-Roman literature as well, especially philosophical literature. Matthew thus agrees with the self-controlled ideal of masculinity.

Jesus teaches that one should not be angry at one's brother (Matt 5:21–24). Anger and other emotions will be studied more in detail in Chapter 6. Here it is sufficient to note that although some ancient Greco-Roman writers saw anger as masculine, the Stoic philosophers frowned on it. Seneca, for instance, argued that anger should be challenged with kindness.[47] Jesus' teaching on adultery (Matt 5:27–30) also has parallels in the ancient Greco-Roman writings. As mentioned in Chapter 3, "priapic" masculinity did not expect fidelity from a husband, but several philosophers argued for it. Adultery with another man's wife made a man effeminate.

In a similar way, the instruction not to resist an evildoer and to love one's enemies (Matt 5:38–47) can be understood in light of the ancient Greco-Roman discussion on self-restraint and moderation.[48] In Chapter 2, the two ideals of defending oneself or seeking redress from the law were mentioned. According to the self-assertive ideal, a man should be able to defend himself. The self-controlled ideal, on the other hand, favored self-restraint and moderation. In the ancient Greco-Roman world, the idea that a man should help his friends and harm his enemies was widespread.[49] However, some philosophers criticized this idea. Seneca, for instance, argued that even enemies should be helped.[50] Matthew's verse is part of the tradition that rejects retribution.[51] Jesus' ideal of restraint is thus not countercultural. Nevertheless, from the point of view of the self-assertive ideal, the non-defensive behavior of the disciples could make them effeminate. The command not to hit back but to turn the other cheek would entail the disciples losing masculinity (at least according to some) rather than breaking God's will, as presented in Jesus' teaching.

In all of the antitheses, Matthew is in line with the philosophical ideals of self-controlled masculinity. Conway notes that even though Matthew does not

46 Lawrence 2002, 696–699; 2003, 147–152. Cf. Exod 23:5; Deut 15:7–8; Prov 24:29; 25:8.

47 Seneca, *Ira* 2.34: "Someone gets angry with you? Challenge him with kindness in return." Transl. John W. Basore.

48 Conway 2008, 119.

49 See, e.g., Xenophon, *Cyr*. 1.4.25; 8.7.28; Pindar, *Pyth.* 2.84–85. The same idea is expressed by Meno in Plato's *Meno* 71e. Socrates nevertheless disagrees with this type of thinking.

50 Seneca, *Otio* 1.4: "We shall never cease working for the common good, helping everyone and even our enemies, until our helping hand is feeble with age." Transl. John W. Basore. Cf. Plutarch, *Sayings of Spartans* 218A. See also Theissen 2002, 239.

51 See, e.g., Seneca, *Const.* 12.3; Lev 19:18; Prov 24:29.

use the term for self-control, he seems to encourage the practice when forbidding anger and adultery (Matt 5:21–22, 27).[52] Therefore, following these ideals does not make disciples less masculine. Matthew is not defining the masculine ideal in a countercultural way, but rather in accordance with the philosophical ideals of masculinity. Following these commands makes one perfect, like God (Matt 5:48). The disciples would thus be moving up in the gender hierarchy to a more masculine level. Nevertheless, from the point of view of the self-assertive ideal of masculinity, the ideal behavior according to the antitheses would be unmasculine.

Piety (*Matthew 6:1–18*)

So far, Matthew's ideals seem similar to the philosophical ideal of masculinity competing for the hegemonic position. However, Matthew's teaching on piety adds a more marginal element to his ideal masculinity. In the ancient Greco-Roman world, *pietas* or εὐσέβεια was an important masculine virtue. It included both piety toward the gods and obedience toward parents. Here piety refers specifically to duties toward God. Jesus' teaching on duty toward one's parents is studied in the next section. The verses Matthew 6:1–18 give instructions on giving alms, praying, and fasting. In all three cases, there is a juxtaposition between piety displayed in public and piety done in private, "in secret" (ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ). Jesus speaks against the desire for public recognition: those who seek public recognition in matters of piety are hypocrites. The practices of almsgiving, prayer, and fasting are not criticized. It is only their misuse that is condemned.

Matthew argues that piety should be practiced away from public places where men were expected to be. Acts of piety are to be performed "in secret," that is, in the private world of the household, which is female space.[53] As mentioned in Chapter 3, the public world was the space for men. This does not mean that men did not spend time in the private world of the household. Nevertheless, in the ancient Greco-Roman world, piety was a public virtue. Conway notes that Matthew's teaching on piety is in contrast to the Greco-Roman idea of piety as "a virtue to be put on display."[54] The public cult was an important part of the Roman hegemonic masculinities. Private or secret cults, especially those of Eastern origin, were suspicious. Such cults were associated with women.[55] Teachings on withdrawing to a private space to practice piety

52 Conway 2008, 119.

53 Neyrey 1998, 214, 220.

54 Conway 2008, 122.

55 See, e.g., Plutarch, *Advice to the Bride and Groom* 19; Juvenal, *Sat*. 6.511–591.

made Matthew's teaching more voluntarily marginal. According to the Gospel, piety should be practiced in secret but in front of God. The disciples should practice piety, but not for public recognition from other people. Regarding this criticism of public piety, there seem to be no parallels in the ancient Jewish or Greco-Roman writings.[56] Nevertheless, Epictetus argues that a true philosopher should not trumpet his behavior to other people but practice his philosophy inconspicuously.[57] In this sense, Matthew's teaching contains the same ideal as Epictetus' instruction. Nonetheless, withdrawal from the public world to engage in private piety made Matthew's teaching problematic from the point of view of hegemonic masculinities.

Jesus and Family in the Synoptic Gospels

Doing one's duty regarding one's parents was an important ideal in the ancient Greco-Roman world. It was part of the concept of *pietas* or εὐσέβεια. The ideal son was supposed to be obedient and respectful toward his parents.[58] In the Synoptic Gospels, on the contrary, the disciples are expected to leave their families like Jesus. This would make them non-ideal sons. However, the reason why they should leave their families is to follow God. Doing God's will becomes a more important virtue than taking care of one's parents.

In all of the Synoptic Gospels, there is an account of Jesus' mother and brothers coming to see him (Mark 3:19–21, 31–35; Matt 12:46–50; Luke 8:19–21). Mark's account begins with a mention of Jesus' family thinking that he has gone mad. They go out to restrain him (Mark 3:21) in order to stop his mission. This shows that they are aligned with the forces that are against God's work. This becomes evident when Mark continues with the Beelzebul account (Mark 3:22–30). The scribes accuse Jesus of casting out demons with the help of the ruler of the demons. Jesus responds by saying that "whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit can never have forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin" (Mark 3:29). When his family thinks that Jesus is mad, they also blaspheme against the Holy Spirit. Jesus' new family, on the contrary, is made

56 This is noted also by Betz 1995, 344–345.

57 E.g., Epictetus, *Diatr*. 3.12.16–17, where he quotes Apollonius: "When you wish to train for your own sake, then when you are thirsty some hot day take a mouthful of cold water, and spit it out—and don't tell anybody about it!" Transl. W. A. Oldfather. See also Epictetus, *Ench*. 23, 24, 46, 47, 48; *Diatr*. 3.14.4–6.

58 Eyben 1993, 206. This ideal can be found in the Jewish writings as well; e.g., Exod 20:1–17; Deut 5:6–21; *Syr. Men*. 359–367.

up of people who do the will of God (Mark 3:35). On one hand, this kind of devaluing of family makes Jesus a non-ideal son. The ideal son took care of his parents and was obedient to them. Jesus does not act this way, and hence his masculinity is called into question from the point of view of hegemonic masculinities. On the other hand, Jesus shows his masculine piety by emphasizing the importance of following God's will. Following God's will again takes the most important place in Mark's ideal masculinity. In the ancient Greco-Roman world, the duties to family and duties to God were part of the same ideal of *pietas* or εὐσέβεια. Jesus' juxtaposition of these breaks with the ideals of hegemonic masculinities.

Matthew and Luke omit any mention of Jesus' family thinking that he had gone mad. Luke also moves the Beelzebul account to a different context. Matthew and Luke thus remove the element of conflict from Jesus' relations with his family. At the same time, however, Matthew increases the distance between Jesus and his family by having Jesus gesture toward his disciples and say explicitly that they are his new family (Matt 12:49). In Mark and Matthew, Jesus' refusal to speak to his family means that he is not behaving like an ideal son and honoring his parent.[59] He is not fulfilling the ideals of hegemonic masculinities. By leaving out the idea that Jesus was mad, Matthew enhances the portrayal of Jesus' masculinity. Nevertheless, he does not change Jesus' teaching but makes it even more radical. Voluntary marginalization is still expected of the disciples and Jesus exemplifies this idea. Matthew and Mark both advocate a masculinity that is voluntarily marginalized.

Luke, on the other hand, leaves out the question "who is my mother, and who are my brothers." In this way, Luke leaves open the possibility that Jesus' mother and brothers are still his family. At the beginning of the Gospel, Mary hears the word of God and follows it (Luke 1:38), so she at least seems to be part of Jesus' family.[60] Moreover, Jesus has already been presented as an ideal son and obedient to his parents earlier in the Gospel (Luke 2:51–52). Therefore, Luke is closer to the traditional Greco-Roman ideal of a good son who is

59 May (1987, 86) argues that "The only way in which Jesus could refuse to acknowledge his family and not have dishonor on it is by a higher level, legitimating norm. Therefore, the resolution of this narrative tension is found in the legitimating norm of 'doing God's will.' When he places the honor of God above his family, Jesus does not dishonor his family and is shown at the same time to be even more honorable." Moxnes, however, notes that the ancient Greco-Roman people would not have understood Jesus as someone "consumed by a passion which relativizes all other obligations." Rather, they would have considered him a reprobate. Moxnes 2003, 65–66.

60 Mary also continues to be part of the early Christian movement, according to Acts 1:14.

obedient to his parents. Luke's Jesus is not in opposition to the traditional ideals of masculinity. These changes are most likely due to Luke's apologetic interests of showing that early Christianity was not subversive or a threat to the prevalent values of the Greco-Roman society. As a result, Luke's account is complicit with the hegemonic ideals of masculinity, whereas Matthew and Mark appear more voluntarily marginalized.

Jesus' looking at those around him (in Mark) and even more clearly his hand movement to his disciples (in Matthew) emphasize the fact that Jesus' true family are his disciples, those who follow him. Jesus establishes new kin and a new household by replacing literal kinship with a fictive kin.[61] This same devaluing of family does not happen in Luke to the same extent. Nevertheless, in Luke as well, Jesus' teaching relativizes the importance of family. Leaving family is presented as the ideal for the disciples in all of the Synoptic Gospels (Matt 10:37; 19:29; Mark 10:29–30; Luke 14:26; 18:29–30). Obedience to God is more important than the commitment to family. However, Jesus does not outright reject the concept of family. The Synoptic Gospels are not anti-family. Family merely gives way to the more important task, doing the will of God. This interpretation is supported by passages where Jesus prohibits divorce and condemns those who want to avoid caring for their families (Mark 7:9–13; 10:1–12; Matt 15:3–9; 19:1–9).

Jesus moves in public spaces, which were occupied by men. As mentioned in Chapter 3, this would make him masculine. However, Jesus also speaks of himself as not having a home (Matt 8:20; Luke 9:58). Not having a home makes him outcast and, accordingly, not masculine. Instead of leaving a female private space and moving to public male space, Jesus moves outside of (male) space. Using Moxnes' term, Jesus becomes "a displaced person."[62] Moxnes notes that the social role of being a husband was important for masculinity in the ancient Greco-Roman world. When Jesus leaves his home, it puts his masculinity in question because he did not act as was expected of men.[63] This makes Jesus' masculinity marginal.[64] Jesus invites his followers to join him in the marginal

61 Anderson & Moore 2003, 75; Neyrey 2003, 55.

62 Moxnes 2003, 67.

63 Moxnes 2003, 95–96.

64 Conway argues that ascetic detachment from household and family structures was a means toward an alternative ideal masculinity. As examples of this alternative ideology, Conway mentions Cynics and Therapeutae. Conway 2008, 123, 179. However, one has to note that this alternative ideal was a marginal one. Would the proponents of hegemonic masculinities have considered the alternative ideal of these marginal groups as masculine? It is possible that this masculinity could have been somewhat authorized by hegemonic masculinities, but it was not expected that everyone would follow their ideals.

area. The disciples are exemplary when they leave everything (Mark 10:28–31; Matt 19:27–30; Luke 18:28–30). Being without a family is not the ideal; rather it is a fact that the Christians have to bear. Nevertheless, the ideal is to put God first, which the disciples do when they choose to follow Jesus. Abandoning family or being abandoned by family is a consequence of this choice. The old family is replaced with a new family and eschatological rewards that compensate for what was left behind.

Matthew uses male language of brotherhood to describe the new eschatological family. The followers are called brothers.[65] Matthew seems to criticize structures of authority in the Christian community. The disciples should not call anyone a rabbi or a teacher (Matt 23:8–10), nor should they call anyone father. This does not mean that Jesus' new family is egalitarian or without hierarchy.[66] First, Jesus plays a central role in the coming kingdom of God. Moreover, Matthew reintroduces the idea of father in the figure of God (Matt 23:9).[67] Thus, Jesus does not change the structure of hierarchy so much as change who is at the top of the hierarchy.[68] God is the patriarch of the household of the disciples. Like children, the disciples are to have a subordinate role in the household and obey their father, God. Just as God is the parent that Jesus obeys, Jesus also instructs his disciples to be obedient to God. Obedience to God makes Jesus and the disciples ideal children in relation to God.

Service and Slavery as the Ideal Masculinity

In all of the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus presents some marginal groups as examples for the disciples to imitate. One of these groups is slaves and servants. Jesus' instruction inverts the traditional hierarchy of the ancient Greco-Roman

---

Therefore, it is unclear whether the proponents of hegemonic masculinities would find Jesus' alternative marginal ideal masculine or not.

65 The term "brothers" is especially important to Matthew, where it appears 39 times (compared to 29 times in Mark and 24 times in Luke).

66 Seim (1995, 734) notes that brothers and sisters are not equal, as "brothers had greater worth than sisters."

67 In Matthew, 44 of the 63 occurrences of the word "father" refer to God. Anderson & Moore 2003, 76. Luke also uses father terminology more often than Mark; Luke 2:49; 6:36; 9:26; 10:21–22; 11:2, 13; 12:30; 22:29, 42; 23:34, 46; 24:49. Still, the terminology can be found in Mark as well; see Mark 8:38; 11:25–26; 13:32; 14:36.

68 Trible notes that Jesus reinforces patriarchy by absolutizing God's rule. She argues that "[t]o transfer male dominance from earth to heaven is not to eliminate but to exacerbate it." Trible 1980, 118. See also D'Angelo 1992, 629.

world. I begin by examining Mark's teaching on discipleship, since it includes the ideal of disciples as servants.

In Mark's Gospel, the teaching on discipleship is connected with the disciples' misunderstanding of Jesus' teaching on suffering. The three passion predictions (Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:32–34) are followed by the disciples' misunderstanding of what being the Messiah means. The disciples value status and public recognition. As mentioned above, the disciples' concern for status and public recognition and their wish to dominate others shows their investment in the self-assertive ideal of hegemonic masculinity. Peter rebukes Jesus' passion prediction (Mark 8:32–33), the disciples argue who among them is the greatest (Mark 9:34), and finally the sons of Zebedee request a prominent place for themselves (Mark 10:35–40). These three misunderstandings give Jesus an opportunity to offer a teaching on discipleship. The teaching is addressed to those who are complicit with the self-assertive masculinity that emphasizes dominance over others. The first teaching concerns suffering and is studied in detail later.[69] The next two teachings address those who wish to be first and great. Jesus redefines what being first and great means. Jesus' teaching inverts the traditional values: the first become last, and the way to become the greatest is to be the least. This idea is repeated several times in the latter half of the Gospel. The marginal figures of slaves and children are set forth as examples to be imitated. Jesus himself exemplifies the teaching he gives to his disciples when the Synoptic Gospels present Jesus as a model servant (Matt 20:28; Mark 10:45; Luke 22:27). When the disciples are like slaves or servants, they become like Jesus: obedient servants who do the will of God.

After James and John have asked for the seats of honor, Jesus speaks to the disciples and negatively characterizes the Roman leadership as strong, violent, and oppressive (Mark 10:42–45; Matt 20:25–28). The Gentile rulers "lord over" (κατακυριεύουσιν) others and the great ones "exercise authority over" (κατεξουσιάζουσιν) them. Both verbs have connotations of oppressive rule.[70] The disciples are not to exercise the type of rule that is supposedly exercised by the Gentiles. Instead, they are to be like servants and slaves.

Although Luke omits the request of James and John, he has a similar discussion on greatness. When Jesus predicts his betrayal at the last supper, the disciples begin to argue about which of them is the greatest (Luke 22:25–27). Jesus opposes this preoccupation with status and presents worldly rulers as a negative example. Unlike these rulers, a leader has an obligation to serve. The difference between Luke, on one hand, and Mark and Matthew, on the

69 See Chapter 7.

70 Senior 1987, 16.

other, is that in Luke Jesus does not tell the disciples to adopt the position of slaves (δοῦλος). He merely tells the disciples to be like servants (διάκονος), an expression which is found also in Mark and Matthew. Jennifer Glancy notes that Luke's modification suggests that Mark's text was "potentially offensive to hearers."[71] Luke softens this potentially offensive instruction. It is possible that once again Luke's desire is to present early Christianity not as threatening the prevalent values of the Greco-Roman world. This would again make Luke's masculinity ideal more complicit with hegemonic ideals of masculinity.

In the ancient Greco-Roman world, a slave was neither fully a thing nor fully a human. Slaves were a marginalized group.[72] Adopting the position of a slave meant that the disciples should marginalize themselves voluntarily, according to Mark and Matthew. For free men, this meant allying with a marginal group, which made their masculinity marginal as well. True men were not servile.[73] The language of submission and servility used in the Synoptic Gospels would have commonly been associated with being effeminate.[74] The values of the world and the rule of God are once more contrasted. Mark and Matthew advocate accepting the marginal position voluntarily. This is not as evident in Luke, who does not talk about slavery.

One has to note that the rhetoric of service was also used in Greco-Roman philosophical writings when discussing the ideal qualities of the leader.[75] However, this ideal was not the only ideal of leadership, as can be seen from the fact that the disciples misunderstand Jesus. This shows that they expect

71 Glancy 2002, 106.

72 Patterson 1982, 38–51. One has to note that there were status differences between slaves. The slave working in the house of a member of the elite had very different opportunities than slaves engaged in prostitution or working in mines. Nevertheless, all slaves were marginalized in comparison to the free people. On slavery in the ancient Greco-Roman world, see also Glancy 2002.

73 E.g., Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 6.35.2.

74 Conway 2008, 99.

75 See, e.g., Plato, *Leg.* 762e: "Now it is needful that every man should hold the view, regarding men in general, that the man who has not been a servant will never become a praiseworthy master, and that the right way to gain honor is by serving honourably rather than by ruling honourably." Transl. R. G. Bury. Cf. Plato, *Leg*. 715c–d; Seneca, *Ep*. 90.5; *Clem.* 1.8.1; Aelian, *Var. hist.* 2.20. See also Conway 2008, 99–100; Carter 2000, 403–404; Theissen 2002, 240–241. Seeley (1993) presents examples of the ideal of service for rulers in ancient Greco-Roman texts. However, some of the examples that Seeley mentions are about euergetism, which is connected with the patronage system of the ancient Greco-Roman world. The good deeds a patron does are voluntary, unlike the service of a slave or a servant. On patronage, see Saller 1989; Wallace-Hadrill (ed.) 1989.

being great and first to mean something else. They are still preoccupied with their idea of masculinity, which emphasizes control over others. This may have been the more popular idea of leadership that philosophers tried to counter. Competition between the self-assertive and self-controlled ideals of masculinity is thus evident in the ideals of leadership as well. The notion of ideal leadership as service is not marginal, but part of the self-controlled ideal of masculinity. Nevertheless, Matthew and Mark go further than the Greco-Roman philosophical teaching on leadership by suggesting that the disciples should adopt the role of slaves. The connotations of service are different for a Hellenistic king or a Roman emperor than for a member of a marginal group like the early Christians. For a ruler, service takes the form of patronage. Acceptance of the position of slaves makes the masculinity of Mark and Matthew voluntarily marginal. When Luke softens Jesus' words by omitting any mention of slaves, he brings the discussion closer to the Greco-Roman ideals.

Still, the inversion of traditional values does not completely dismantle the hierarchy. The hierarchy is reinscribed when the disciples become first and great by adopting the status of slaves.[76] Moreover, the disciples can expect eschatological rewards. In Mark 10:28–31, Jesus mentions the rewards that followers will get. In Matthew and Luke, Jesus adds a promise that the twelve disciples shall sit on twelve thrones and judge the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt 19:27–30; Luke 22:25–27). Even though the voluntarily marginal masculinity found in Mark does offer some rewards to the disciples in the future, they will not get places of authority. Since in Matthew and Luke the disciples are rewarded with these places, Matthew and Luke are closer to the ideal of masculinity that privileged authority. According to this ideal, the disciples' masculinity will be restored when they receive their eschatological rewards.

Children as Examples for the Disciples

Children are another marginal and not fully masculine group used in the Synoptic Gospels as an example for the disciples. What does presenting children as positive examples tell about the ideal masculinities of the Synoptic Gospels? I suggest that accepting the socially marginal position of children would mean that the disciples are voluntarily marginalizing themselves.

The social status of children in the first-century CE world needs to be taken into account when interpreting the verses that describe Jesus and children. In the ancient Greco-Roman world, children were not considered ideal figures.

76 Thurman 2003, 154.

On the contrary, negative stereotypes predominate the list of characteristics that were seen as typical of children. Children were considered to be physically weak, morally incompetent, ignorant, and irrational.[77] They were associated with other marginal groups, such as women and slaves.[78] Children, women, and slaves symbolized behavior that was in opposition to the ideal behavior of the free adult man.[79] In other words, children were everything the ideal man was not. Masculinity was considered something that belonged to adult men. Accordingly, it was something that children did not have. It is thus interesting that in the Synoptic Gospels, children are presented as examples to imitate.

Despite the negative stereotypes, the prevailing attitude toward actual children was not hostile. Parents loved and valued their children.[80] In Jewish writings also, having children was considered a blessing and a gift from God.[81] There was a difference in the stereotypical portrayal of children and the treatment of actual children. A man should not behave like children, but ideally children did not behave in the way that was stereotypically expected of them either. Children were esteemed if they did *not* behave as they were stereotypically expected to act. The ideal children had adult qualities: they were self-controlled and mature.[82] Recounting the great deeds that famous men had precociously performed as children was a common trope in ancient Greco-Roman biographies. For example, Philo presents Moses as behaving in an adult-like manner even as a child.[83] Despite these positive views of children in both Greco-Roman and Jewish texts, the general attitude toward children

77 Golden 1990, 4–5; Nortwick 2008, 25; Aasgaard 2009b, 90; Carter 1994, 105; 2000, 384. In Judaism as well, children were considered foolish. For example, according to Wis 12:24, those who did not live righteously "were deceived like foolish infants." See also Wis 15:14: "But most foolish, and more miserable than an infant, are all the enemies who oppressed your people." Prov 22:15: "Folly is bound up in the heart of a boy, but the rod of discipline drives it far away." Children were not worth adults' time and could be a distraction from the study of the Torah: "Morning sleep and midday wine and children's talk and sitting in the meeting houses of the ignorant people put a man out of the world" (*m. 'Abot* 3:11). See also Clark 2002, 240; Marcus 2009, 718.

78 E.g., Plato, *Ep*. 355c; *Resp*. 431c; *Theaet*. 171e; *Leg*. 808d–e. See also Marcus Aurelius, *Med*. 4.28, 5.11.

79 Wiedemann 1989, 8.

80 E.g., Pliny the Younger, *Ep*. 9.12.

81 E.g., Ps 127:3–5; Ps 128:3–6; Sir 25:7; Josephus, *Ant*. 4.8.261; Pseudo-Phocylides 175; *Ps. Sol*. 1:3.

82 Aasgaard 2009b, 89–90; Chartrand-Burke 2001, 378; Eyben 1993, 10; Roisman 2005, 12–13.

83 Philo, *Moses* 1.18–24: "Yet he did not bear himself like a mere infant that he was, nor delight in fun and laughter and sport [...] but with modest and serious bearing he applied himself to hearing and seeing what was sure to profit the soul." Transl. F. H. Colson. See also Plutarch, *Cicero* 2.2; Pliny the Younger, *Ep*. 5.16.

was indifference. Children were unimportant to the public world of men and to their fathers' pursuits of state.[84] This negative stereotype can be found in the Synoptic Gospels as well. For example, the children in the marketplace are used as a negative parallel of how "this generation" behaves (Matt 11:16–17; Luke 7:31–32).[85] Nevertheless, there are also pericopes in the Synoptic Gospels where children are presented as exemplary.

The first pericope where children have an important positive role is when Jesus uses a child to exemplify his teaching on greatness. Mark's pericope follows Jesus' second passion prediction (Mark 9:33–37). Following Mark's pattern, the passion prediction is once again followed by the disciples misunderstanding Jesus. They argue amongst each other about who is the greatest. The disciples' question about greatness continues to position Jesus and the disciples in an ideological conflict. The disciples are still preoccupied with power and status. This reflects the disciples' understanding of masculinity, which is closer to the self-assertive ideal of masculinity.

Jesus presents an alternative ideal of masculinity where greatness is not connected with power and status. Jesus exemplifies his teaching by taking a child and embracing him or her (the Greek is in the neuter, so the child can be either a boy or a girl). The disciples are to receive a marginal figure, such as a child. Luke, like Mark, talks of welcoming the children (Luke 9:46–48). In both Mark and Luke, children are recipients of hospitality. Joel B. Green notes that in the ancient Greco-Roman world, children may have been called upon to perform acts of hospitality, but that normally they were not recipients of honorable behavior.[86] As marginal figures, children were the exact opposite of those who were great. Jesus again criticizes the disciples' preoccupation with status, teaching that discipleship means putting the service of others first and giving up one's pursuit of status. Welcoming a marginal person—such as a child, who was the least in the social hierarchy—exemplifies the type of service which is the mark of greatness in the kingdom of God. Receiving a child means receiving Jesus himself. Later in the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus exemplifies his teaching by welcoming children.

In Matthew, the disciples talk about greatness in the kingdom in general, and not only among the twelve disciples, as in Mark (Matt 18:1–6). Moreover, they do not argue among each other but simply ask a question of Jesus. In this way, Matthew has improved on Mark's portrayal of the disciples. They no longer exemplify a wrong type of masculinity. Matthew has also changed

84 Clark 2002, 243–244.

85 For Paul as well, being childlike was something negative; cf. 1 Cor 3:1–3; 14:20.

86 Green 1997, 391.

Jesus' teaching. In addition to the disciples "receiving" children (Matt 18:5), Matthew speaks of them "becoming like" children (Matt 18:3). Matthew clarifies that becoming like a child means becoming humble (ταπεινός) like a child (Matt 18:4). As in Mark and Luke, the disciples are to share children's lack of status. Such social insignificance is a complete antithesis to the disciples' interest in power and prestige. Unlike in Mark, however, in Matthew the disciples are not only supposed to receive people of such status but accept for themselves the social status of children. Matthew thus makes the teaching even more radical. The disciples should voluntarily accept the marginal position of children. This means voluntarily marginalizing their masculinity as well.

Later in the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus exemplifies his teaching by receiving and blessing children (Mark 10:13–16; Matt 19:13–15; Luke 18:15–17). The disciples express strong disapproval of the people who bring children to Jesus. They have not learned the lesson that discipleship involves receiving the least ones, and they still seem to share the common ancient Greco-Roman attitude of children as insignificant and not worth adults' time. Presenting children as models, Jesus once again attacks the disciples' concern for power. Children are an example of God's reversal of status. The kingdom of God belongs to those who are like children. In the Gospel of Mark, the importance of the teaching is highlighted when Jesus responds with a strong emotional reaction: he becomes indignant (ἀγανακτέω) and, in contrast to the disciples, embraces the children. Matthew and Luke omit this indignation and embracing of the children. The teaching on the need to receive marginal groups does not seem to be as important to them as it is to Mark. By omitting the emotional aspects of Mark's portrayal, Matthew and Luke move Jesus closer to the traditional ideals. Matthew does not systematically radicalize Jesus' teaching like he did with the question on greatness. Nevertheless, since Matthew had made the previous teaching more radical, the difference between Matthew and Mark is not as great as between Mark and Luke. Luke makes the receiving of children clearly less radical.

Both pericopes concerning children are preoccupied with salvation. This is exemplified by the use of a double negative: the disciples "will never (οὐ μή) enter" the kingdom unless they do what Jesus instructs them to do (Mark 10:15; Matt 18:3; Luke 18:17). The salvation depends on receiving children or becoming like them. The Synoptic Gospels are not interested in children as such, but in children as examples for adults.[87] The kingdom not only belongs to children, but to "such ones" (τοιούτων). Children thus become a metaphor for all who

87 Marshall 1978, 682.

are marginal or unimportant.[88] Matthew and Luke also compare the disciples with small children (νήπιος) in contrast to the wise and intelligent (Matt 11:25; Luke 10:21), and Jesus calls the disciples his children in Mark 10:24.[89] Jesus also talks about the "little ones" (μικρός), which most likely refers not to actual children but to the followers of Jesus.[90] The designation "little ones" is intended to make the reader think of people with low social status, who are similar to children. The Synoptic Gospels do not change the characterization of children as weak, marginal, or unimportant, but instruct the followers to adopt these traits.

In sum, in some verses a child is the example of who will receive the kingdom (Mark 10:15; Luke 18:17), while in other verses it is the disciple who is exemplary when receiving the child (Mark 9:37; Matt 18:5; Luke 9:48). What does receiving children or becoming like children mean to the ideal masculinity of the Synoptic Gospels? The marginality of children was involuntary. The (male) disciples, on the other hand, are called to choose the marginal position of children voluntarily. The disciples, like children, are to be marginal and without status. All of the Synoptic Gospels present a marginal and unimportant group as the ideal to imitate. This makes their ideal masculinity more marginalized. This is most apparent in Matthew, who talks not only about receiving children, but becoming like children. Matthew recommends that the disciples voluntarily marginalize themselves in this way. At the same time, by making Jesus' reception of the children less emotionally charged, Matthew changes Mark's portrayal of Jesus so that it is closer to hegemonic ideals.

Matthew, Eunuchs, and Subordinated Masculinities

Eunuchs are another marginal group used as an example for the disciples (Matt 19:12).[91] Eunuchs are also an example of an ancient Greco-Roman subordinated masculinity—or, in other words, masculinity that was associated with femininity or effeminacy. The masculinity of the eunuch was a subordinated masculinity that functioned as the "other" against which the "real men" of the ancient Greco-Roman hegemonic masculinities were compared and contrasted. From the point of view of the hegemonic masculinities, eunuchs were

88 Carter 2000, 386; Luz 2001, 506.

89 Matthew and Luke leave out the reference of disciples as children in their parallel versions; cf. Matt 19:23–26; Luke 18:24–27.

90 Mark 9:42; Matt 18:6–10; Luke 17:1–4. See Anderson 1976, 237; Hill 1972, 274; Luz 2001, 434.

91 For a more in-depth analysis of the eunuch passage, see Asikainen 2014.

detestable because they confused the categories of male and female.[92] For the ancient Greco-Roman writers, eunuchs epitomized a lack of self-control, which made them effeminate. Eunuchs were also accused of sexual misconduct. They were accused of playing both a passive role with men and an active role with women.[93] Invectives against eunuchs as sexually insatiable can be found in numerous writings from the first and second centuries CE.[94] Thus, eunuchs were not considered celibate in the ancient Greco-Roman world. Besides sexual insatiability, eunuchs were accused of the same things as other effeminate men, such as being soft, weak, deceitful, cowardly, and incapable of virtue.[95] This negative evaluation of eunuchs can be attested also in Judaism.[96] However, a positive evaluation of eunuchs is found in Isaiah 56:3–5 and Wisdom 3:14. Both texts encourage the eunuch not to lament his childlessness, because keeping the Torah is ultimately better than having children.

I first examine some previous studies on the eunuch passage before moving on to my own interpretation. Previous interpretations can be roughly categorized in terms of four types. The first interpretation sees the eunuch passage as being about celibacy as an alternative to marriage.[97] According to

92 Lucian writes that "a eunuch was neither man nor woman (οὔτε ἄνδρα οὔτε γυναῖκα) but something composite, hybrid, and monstrous, alien to human nature." Lucian, *Eunuch.* Transl. A. M. Harmon. Eunuchs were called half-men (*semiviri* or *semimares*). See, e.g., Ovid, *Fast.* 4.183; Juvenal, *Sat*. 6.513. See also Catullus 63.27, where Attis is described as a "fake woman" (*notha mulier*). Guyot 1980, 38–39; Roller 1997, 550; 1999, 323 n. 57.

93 After certain kinds of post-pubescent castration, the possibility of penetration remains, and so eunuchs were thought to be able to have penetrative sex with women. For example, Lucian, *Syr. d.* 22; Terence, *Eun.* 665–668; Martial, *Epigr.* 3.81; Juvenal, *Sat*. 6.366–378 show that eunuchs were considered able to have sexual relations with women. See also Guyot 1980, 59–66, esp. 63–66; Hester 2005, 22–23; Rousselle 1988, 123; Stevenson 1995, 499. For the effect of castration on the ability to gain erection, see Greenstein, Plymate & Katz 1995.

94 See, e.g., Martial, *Epigr.* 6.2, 6.67; Juvenal, *Sat*. 1.22, 30; Epictetus, *Diatr*. 2.20.19; Lucian, *Eunuch.*; Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 1.34–37.

95 Herter 1959, 641; Hester 2005, 21–22; Kuefler 2001, 35. The eunuchs were also ridiculed for having a feminine voice. See, e.g., Lucian, *Eunuch.*; Valerius Maximus 7.7.6. On voice and masculinity, see Gleason 1995, 83.

96 The Torah prohibits castration in Deut 23:1. See also Lev 21:20–21; Philo, *Spec. Laws* 1.325; Josephus, *Ant.* 4.292. The early Christian writers also used familiar rhetoric against the blurring of gender boundaries when denouncing the *galli*, the castrated priests of Cybele or Magna Mater. E.g., Firmicus Maternus, *Err. prof. rel.* 4.2; Augustine, *Civ.* 7.26; 7.24. See Kuefler 2001, 249.

97 Albright & Mann 1984, 227; Filson 1971, 207; France 2007, 724; Evans 2012, 342; Hill 1972, 281; Keener 1999, 470; Kodell 1978, 21; Nolland 2005, 781.

this interpretation, Jesus agrees with his disciples that it is better not to marry, but only in part: celibacy is not for everyone.[98] However, would Jesus accept the disciples' criticism? According to Quentin Quesnell, the whole passage (Matt 19:1–12) has been stressing the importance and sanctity of monogamous marriage, so it would be odd if Jesus suddenly agreed with the disciples' objection.[99] Moreover, the narrative function of the disciples' speech in the Gospels is to ask questions, misunderstand, and object. Their statements are not accepted by Jesus, but corrected or rebuked.[100] Here the disciples' comment offers Jesus an opportunity to develop his teaching and underscore the permanence of marriage.[101]

According to the first interpretation, Jesus does not forbid remarriage, even after adultery. However, if the exception clause allowed remarriage for those who had divorced because of adultery, Jesus would be contradicting his earlier teaching on the permanence of marriage (Matt 19:4–8).[102] Furthermore, if Jesus approved of remarriage, why would the disciples be so shocked?[103] It is thus more likely that Jesus is reaffirming his own teaching, prohibiting remarriage even after divorce on account of adultery. According to the second interpretation, the eunuch passage thus refers to celibacy after divorce.[104]

The proponents of these two interpretations do not explain why the passage would refer specifically to celibacy.[105] However, can celibacy really be spoken of in terms of castration?[106] As mentioned above, eunuchs were hardly considered celibate in the ancient Greco-Roman literature. The third interpretation still sees the eunuchs as celibate, but takes into account their marginal social position. Janice Anderson and Stephen Moore point out that Jesus' reference to the eunuch as a positive example of discipleship is striking, especially given

98 Davies & Allison 1997, 21; France 2007, 723; Hill 1972, 281; Manson 1949, 215; Nolland 2005, 775.

99 Quesnell 1966, 341–342.

100 E.g., Matt 8:19, 21, 25; 14:26, 30; 15:12; 16:7, 21–23; 18:1; 19:23–26. Gundry 1994, 382; Luz 2001, 500; Quesnell 1966, 343; Wenham 1984, 99.

101 Carter 1994, 69; Luz 2001, 499.

102 See also Carter 1994, 69; Wenham 1984, 97–99.

103 Carter 1994, 69 n. 6; 2000, 381; Luz 2001, 493; Wenham 1984, 99; 1986, 18.

104 Wenham 1984, 105; 1986, 18. See also Barton 1994, 194–195; Carter 1994, 66–71; 2000, 381; Luz 2001, 493; Quesnell 1966, 336.

105 The word "eunuch" was never used for unmarried or celibate people in classical literature. This happens only in Christian literature. E.g., Clement of Alexandria, *Paed*. 3.4; Tertullian, *Mon.* 3; Athenagoras, *Suppl.* 33; Cyprian, *Test.* 3.32. On the interpretation of the passage by the early Christians, see Bauer 1967.

106 See Bernabé 2003, 134.

the negative perception of eunuchs in antiquity.[107] Christians are urged to embrace the roles of typically subordinated groups: eunuchs, slaves, and children.[108] Colleen Conway also notes that the eunuch figure represents a challenge to the hegemonic masculinity, but argues that Matthew seeks to "neutralize" the passage. Matthew places it in a context that discusses marriage, thereby associating the passage with less radical ascetic practices.[109] David Hester also notes that in Greco-Roman antiquity, eunuchs were considered highly sexual beings.[110] When turning to Matthew 19:12, he nevertheless comes to the conclusion that "[h]ere the eunuch is a figure of sexual renunciation" and that Matthew tries to "domesticate" the saying by placing it in a context discussing marriage and divorce.[111] Conway and Hester thus argue that Matthew seeks to neutralize or domesticate the saying. However, considering the entire Gospel of Matthew, it is more plausible that the eunuch passage is not neutralized. As we have seen, in the immediate context of the eunuch passage (Matt 18–20), the disciples are exhorted to become like children (Matt 18:3–5) and servants (Matt 20:26–27).

The fourth interpretation suggests that Matthew did not try to neutralize the saying; instead, Matthew retained its radical quality. This interpretation maintains that the eunuch passage is not about celibacy in general or celibacy after divorce, but about an alternative ideal of marriage and a new, equal relationship between the spouses.[112] The divorce passage does put the wife and husband in somewhat equal positions, since each must be faithful to the other. However, even though the ideal of mutual faithfulness can be found in the Greco-Roman literature as well, the ideal of equality in marriage is anachronistic.[113] In addition, Matthew 19:3–9 is not about the marriage relationship, but about divorce. The eunuch passage needs to be read in light of the larger context of the divorce and adultery teaching in Matthew 5 and 19.

The divorce teaching in Matthew 5:31–32 is set in a larger context, where Jesus expands the meaning of adultery and forbids even looking with lust

107 Anderson & Moore 2003, 90. See also Moxnes 2005, 21.

108 Anderson & Moore 2003, 90–91; see also Moxnes 2005, 32: "The eunuch represents a male person in a non-hegemonic position, that is, in a position similar to that of most women."

109 Conway 2008, 122–124.

110 Hester 2005, 14, 24.

111 Hester 2005, 25–30.

112 Bernabé 2003; Dewey 1992; Talbott 2006.

113 For example, even though Plutarch argues for mutual faithfulness in marriage, this does not make the marriage egalitarian. Plutarch still thinks that the husband should rule his wife; see Plutarch, *Advice to the Bride and Groom* 33. See also Asikainen forthcoming.

(Matt 5:27–30).[114] Jesus maintains that self-mutilation is better than committing adultery (Matt 5:29–30). Self-mutilation to avoid sinning is also favored in Matthew 18:8–9. Both self-mutilation and self-castration are done in order to avoid hell and to enter life or the kingdom of God.[115] The point of the passages concerning self-mutilation is that any sacrifice is worth making to avoid sinning. In sum, the eunuch passage in Matthew 19:12 is about avoiding adultery at all costs, even if it requires self-castration. This does not make Matthew's ideal marriage egalitarian. Rather than arguing that men should stay faithful in marriage for their wives' sake, Matthew's standpoint is soteriological. Self-castration is a sacrifice intended to ensure salvation and thus strengthen the vertical ties with divinity.[116]

As seen in Chapter 3, there were different ideals concerning men's fidelity in marriage. Matthew opposes "priapic" masculinity, which allowed men relations with other women as long as they were not other men's wives, and requires mutual fidelity from spouses. This means that Matthew agrees with the self-controlled ideal of masculinity. However, Matthew goes further than the self-controlled ideal by demanding that men should even be ready to castrate themselves.[117] While from the point of view of the ancient Greco-Roman hegemonic masculinities adultery could make a man effeminate, self-castration definitely did. Voluntary castration would bring shame, mockery,

---

114 A similar idea of looking and lust can be found in Philo, *Spec. Laws* 3.177: "are not the hands much more to be blamed for the touch? For the eyes, being wholly at freedom, are nevertheless often constrained so as to see things which they do not wish to see; but the hands are ranked among those parts which are completely under subjection, and obey our commands, and are subservient to us." Transl. F. H. Colson. See also Sir 9:5, 7–9; *T. Iss.* 7.2; Job 31:9–10; Sir 23:5; 41:21.

115 See also Nolland 2005, 777.

116 See Launderville 2010, xxi, 486. As we have seen in Isa 56:3–5 and Wis 3:14, being a eunuch is better than transgressing the Law. In a similar way in Matthew, castrating oneself is better than going to hell. Why does Matthew find it important to stress self-mutilation throughout his work? I would argue that willingness to mutilate or castrate oneself served as a sign of commitment in the Matthean community. According to the costly signaling theory, both secular and religious communities are confronted with the problem of commitment. The community may attract free riders who do not invest as much as others do. Therefore, the community needs commitment signals that are costly to fake. Self-mutilation and making oneself a eunuch can be seen as examples of these costly-to-fake signals of commitment to the Matthew's community. On costly signaling theory, see, e.g., Sosis & Bressler 2003.

117 For example, although Plutarch argues for mutual faithfulness in marriage, in the end a man's infidelity is a minor transgression that his wife should forgive; Plutarch, *Advice to the Bride and Groom* 16. See also Asikainen 2012; Foucault 1988, 174–175.

and accusations of effeminacy. Therefore, Matthew is suggesting that the men of his community voluntarily accept subordination as part of their already marginal masculinity. Matthew urges the Christian men to embrace a form of masculinity that Matthew considers more perfect than the type of hegemonic masculinity that advocates self-control. Embracing of marginality and claiming that this masculinity is more perfect than the hegemonic ideals shows that Matthew's ideal masculinity is not complicit with these ideals competing for the hegemonic position. For hegemonic masculinities, the figure of eunuch served as the necessary "other," which showed what real men must not be. For Matthew, however, the eunuch figure shows what "real men" must be willing to do. Matthew demands that men need to be willing to follow Jesus' commands for the kingdom of heaven, even if it means giving up their masculinity.

Conclusions

In all of the Synoptic Gospels, the disciples form a contrast to Jesus' perfect example. Jesus is the one with the authority. This authority makes Jesus more masculine than his disciples. Discipleship means following Jesus' lead at any cost, even if it means abandoning one's family and losing one's life. The desire to follow Jesus makes the disciples ideal, even if they are portrayed as fallible in other regards. The portrayal of the disciples as fallible followers is most evident in the Gospel of Mark. They lack the masculine qualities of courage and steadfastness. This is especially seen in the portrayal of Peter in the passion narratives. Peter also exemplifies the contest between two competing ideals of masculinity. In the Messiah confession, Peter's idea of Messiah is closer to the self-assertive ideal of masculinity, whereas Jesus' teaching of the Messiah is closer to the self-controlled ideal of masculinity. Luke changes Mark's portrayal of the disciples, thus making the disciples more ideally masculine. Matthew, on the other hand, improves the portrayal of the disciples somewhat, but not to the same extent as Luke. In all of the Synoptic Gospels, the disciples are on the lower level of gender hierarchy and thus relationally less masculine in comparison to Jesus. In comparison to the opponents, however, the disciples are not unmasculine *per se*, but only less masculine in relation to Jesus.

Jesus' teaching in the Sermon on the Mount is against the self-assertive ideal of masculinity that emphasized control over others. However, similar ideas advocating self-controlled masculinity can be found in ancient Greco-Roman writings, so this teaching does not advocate countercultural or even counterhegemonic masculinity. The ideal masculinity advocated in the Sermon on the Mount is quite complicit with the self-controlled ideal of masculinity.

Nevertheless, Matthew's teaching also goes further than the philosophical ideal of self-control. When instructing the disciples to show pity (ἔλεος), Matthew is advocating potentially unmasculine behavior. That he goes further than the self-controlled ideal is evident in the teaching on forgoing retaliation (Matt 5:39) and the eunuch passage (Matt 19:12). In both cases, the outcome is the same: the disciples should lose masculinity (at least in the eyes of some) rather than go against God's will. This makes Matthew's ideal masculinity voluntarily marginalized.

The masculinity of the early Christians is not only marginalized, but the early Christians should also voluntarily accept the marginal position and ally themselves with involuntarily marginal groups: slaves, children, and eunuchs. Even though slaves, children, and eunuchs are utilized as positive examples in the Synoptic Gospels, the subordinate position of these groups in society is hardly abandoned. The purpose of the Synoptic Gospels is not to improve the social position of these groups, but rather to argue that the Christian men should adopt the subordinate position of these groups. When the Synoptic Gospels present "feminine" service as a value, they formulate an alternative, voluntarily marginal ideal of masculinity. The instruction that the disciples should be ready to leave their families is another marginalizing aspect of Jesus' teaching. This idea of voluntary marginalization is advocated especially in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. As mentioned in earlier chapters, in the ancient Greco-Roman world masculinity was evaluated by other men. Mark and Matthew argue that this public recognition from other people is less important than following God's will. This may mean that the disciples lose their masculinity in the eyes of some people. Luke, on the other hand, seems to be closer to the hegemonic ideals.

Overall, out of the Synoptic Gospels Luke is clearly most complicit with the hegemonic ideals. He softens both the portrayal of Jesus and the disciples, thus preserving their masculinity. Matthew and Mark are more voluntarily marginalized. This is seen in Mark's portrayal of both Jesus and the disciples. Matthew, on the other hand, occasionally advocates even more marginal deportment than Mark. For instance, he argues that the disciples should become like children, not just welcome them. This radicalization of Jesus' teaching can be seen in the eunuch passage as well. However, Matthew also enhances the portrayal of Jesus, for example, by leaving out the mention that Jesus' relatives thought him to be mad. As we will later see, this tendency to enhance the portrayal of Jesus is evident in other aspects of Jesus' depiction (for example, his emotions). Matthew thus moves the portrayal of Jesus closer to the traditional hegemonic ideals of masculinity, whereas his demands for discipleship are occasionally even more radical than Mark's.

CHAPTER 5

Jesus and Women

Introduction

Masculinities are contrasted with and defined not only in relation to other masculinities, but also femininities. Kate Cooper has noted that in ancient Greco-Roman texts, "wherever a woman is mentioned a man's character is being judged—and along with it what he stands for."[1] What is written about women—whether it includes negative stereotypes they allegedly represent or the ideal qualities and behavior they should exhibit—tells about the ideals of masculinity. Jesus' encounters with women allow his character to be judged. What do Jesus' encounters with women tell us about the ideal femininities in the Synoptic Gospels? How do the ideal femininities relate to the ideal masculinities of the Synoptic Gospels?

Raewyn Connell notes that there is no hegemonic femininity that holds a position in relation to other femininities in the same way as hegemonic masculinity in relation to other masculinities and femininities. Connell suggests, however, that there is "emphasized femininity," which can be characterized as compliance with the subordination of women. It is also "oriented to accommodating the interests and desires of men."[2] Theoretically, there could be several emphasized femininities like there are several hegemonic masculinities. This means that each masculinity competing for the hegemonic position could have its own ideal femininity. However, this does not seem to have been the case in the ancient Greco-Roman world, where emphasized femininity appears relatively unified. The emphasized femininity in the ancient Greco-Roman world can be found in a wide variety of writings by men, from philosophical writings of the elite to tomb inscriptions of the lower classes. This shows how widespread these ideals were.

From the point of view of hegemonic masculinities, emphasized femininity is the ideal femininity. The behavior of the women that the Synoptic Gospels present can be seen as ideal, since, with the exception of Herodias, there are no

1 Cooper 1996, 19.

2 Connell 1987, 183–187. There are probably also marginalized and subordinated femininities, but Connell does not theorize about femininities further.

evil women in the Synoptic Gospels.[3] Moreover, Jesus approves of and praises these women. Still, the ideal femininity in the Synoptic Gospels is not necessarily compliant with the dominance of men. Is the ideal femininity of the Synoptic Gospels similar to the emphasized femininity of the wider ancient Greco-Roman world?

Ideal Women in the Ancient Greco-Roman World

Let us begin with what the ideal femininity was like in the ancient Greco-Roman world. Since the focus of this study is on masculinity, this examination is inevitably much more simplistic than the analysis of masculinities. In Chapter 2, we saw some negative stereotypical feminine aspects that were contrary to the ideal masculine qualities. This does not reflect the full picture of the portrayal of women in ancient Greco-Roman texts. Ancient Greco-Roman writers also praised individual women for having ideal qualities. The ideal woman, the paragon of emphasized femininity, was most often defined in relation to men as a good wife and mother. While women, like children, were in general portrayed as stereotypically negative, some women were used as examples of ideal qualities. Nevertheless, these women were used as examples for other women, not men. Some of the Synoptic Gospel stories of women, on the other hand, are not about specifically feminine virtues. The women are presented as examples for everyone, including men.[4]

Women were praised especially for domestic virtues, chastity, modesty, and marital fidelity. For example, Musonius Rufus maintained that a woman should be a good housekeeper, but the most important qualities for a woman were chastity and self-control.[5] Plutarch teaches in his *Advice to the Bride and Groom* that the ideal wife was self-controlled, modest, silent, and submissive.[6]

3 As seen in Chapter 4, the mother of John and James in Matthew is portrayed as having a stereotypical feminine vice of ambition, but she is not evil, since she continues to follow Jesus (Matt 20:20–28; 27:56).

4 Beavis 1988, 8.

5 Musonius Rufus, *That Women Too Should Study Philosophy; Should Daughters Receive the Same Education as Sons?* One has to note that the woman's role as the mistress of the house, δέσποινα or *domina*, included authority over the servants. As the mistress of the house, the woman was higher in the hierarchy than the slaves and servants, regardless of their gender. It is important to keep this perspective of intersectionality in mind.

6 For more on the ideal wife in Plutarch, see Asikainen forthcoming.

The same ideals for the good wife can be found in Jewish writings.[7] In rabbinic writings, the ideal wife is known for her domestic duties and taking care of her husband's welfare. The specifically Jewish emphasis is that the good wife also enables her husband to study the Torah.[8] Although the ideal femininity is mostly discussed in philosophical treatises, similar ideals can be found in other literary sources and funerary inscriptions as well. This means that the ideals were widespread and not only held by the elite. Treggiari, for instance, notes that Latin epitaphs mention such virtues as chastity, being married only once (*univira*), faith, respect and co-operation, and kindness.[9]

In Chapter 2, I mentioned that there existed two opinions on the virtues of women and men. One maintained that the virtues of men and women were different, the other that men and women shared the same virtues. In any case, the ideal behavior of women expected by the proponents of both of these opinions was similar. When Musonius Rufus argued that a woman should exhibit masculine virtues such as self-control and ἀνδρεία, he maintained that these qualities were necessary so that the woman's chastity and other feminine qualities were not compromised. Since self-control and ἀνδρεία were masculine qualities, a woman who displayed these qualities was praised for being manly.[10] In his work *Bravery of Women*, Plutarch mentions women who display these virtues. These women do not conform to the norm of silence and submission. Still, the brave deeds of women opposing tyranny or shaming men into action are mentioned precisely because they are exceptional. The actual resolution of the conflict is achieved by men. Moreover, after the status quo has been regained, the women withdraw from the public world.[11] Another example of

---

7 The good wife in the Proverbs is prudent (Prov 19:14) and gracious (Prov 11:16). For Philo's ideal wife, see *Spec. Laws* 3.171–174. See also *Joseph and Aseneth*, where Aseneth is transformed from a boastful and arrogant woman into an ideal wife who worships the right God, eats the proper food, and displays proper humility to her parents and affection for Joseph. Kraemer 1995, 129–132; Sly 1990, 160, 196.

8 See Hauptman (1974, 187–198), who refers to *Yebamot* 63a, *Šabbat* 118b; *Soṭah* 21a.

9 Treggiari 1991; esp. 229–261; Cobb 2008, 30–31; Hemelrijk 2004, 188. Treggiari (1991, 230) points out that "[o]f all Latin writers, apart from the scribbler of graffiti, the supplier or purchaser of a modest tomb inscription will be least suspected of being a deep student of Greek philosophy." These ideals were thus not only held by the elite.

10 Aspegren 1990, 11.

11 For example, after Aretaphila had helped to free the city of tyrants, the people suggested that she should join the government. Aretaphila, however, "withdrew at once to her own quarters among the women, and, rejecting any sort of meddling in affairs, spent the rest of her life quietly at the loom" (Plutarch, *Bravery of women* 255E–257E). The reaction of the people suggests that it would have been acceptable for her to receive a public position,

a woman showing masculine virtues is "Turia" from the inscription known as *Laudatio Turiae*. She is praised for her *virtus* because she had pleaded for her husband during his exile. Emily Hemelrijk notes that the masculine qualities of "Turia" did not "de-feminize" her, because she still adhered to the traditional feminine virtues and did not threaten the masculinity of her husband—he remained the superior partner.[12] In neither Plutarch nor *Laudatio Turiae* does the masculine virtue of the women threaten the masculinity of men or challenge them.[13] It was acceptable for a woman to be masculine as long as she was not *too* masculine. Women who were too masculine or masculine in the wrong way were labeled as transgressive.[14] Since the ideal femininity was formulated by men, the women who fulfilled the ideals of emphasized femininity were women who were beneficial to men.

The Women Followers of Jesus

Women are not explicitly called disciples in the Synoptic Gospels.[15] The women followers are mentioned only when no male disciples are present.[16] In Mark, they appear for the first time in the passion narrative. They are present at the cross and the tomb. Mark mentions that they have followed and served Jesus already in Galilee (Mark 15:40–41). Following was an important aspect of discipleship,[17] so even though Mark does not explicitly call the women disciples, they can be said to exemplify discipleship. The service performed by the women, although a traditional feminine role, also exemplifies Markan discipleship. The women act as foils to the male disciples, who, as seen in Chapter 4, have been occupied with a struggle for status and power. The women, like slaves and children, are models for all followers. On the other hand, the women followers in Mark are also fallible.[18] They flee from the tomb and remain silent

---

so the fact that Plutarch emphasizes her retiring to the private women's sphere tells more about Plutarch's ideals regarding feminine behavior. See also Jones 2012, 109–110.

12 Hemelrijk 2004, 196.

13 See also Chapman (2011, 32), who notes that "from a male point of view their virtue offers no challenge to the patriarchal system; in other words, they know their place."

14 For example, Aeschylus' Clytemnestra is transgressive since she acts like a man; *Agamemnon* 10–11, 351. See also Goldhill 1995, 137.

15 The only occurrence of the term 'female disciple' (μαθήτρια) is in Acts 9:36.

16 The only exception is in Luke, where women are mentioned along with Jesus' acquaintances at the cross. See Luke 23:49; cf. also Luke 8:1–3.

17 See, e.g., Mark 1:18; 2:14–15; 3:7; 5:24; 6:1; 8:34; 9:38; 10:21, 28.

18 Malbon 1983, 32–33, 44–46.

because they are afraid (Mark 16:8). Their fear is a stereotypically feminine aspect. For Mark, the women are not important witnesses in their own right. Their role is limited to the restoration of the bond between Jesus and his male disciples.[19] The ideal women followers fulfill the traditional feminine ideal of service.

Matthew's changes to Mark's narrative enhance the portrayal of the women. When the women leave the tomb after the resurrection, they are still afraid, but also joyful and no longer silent (Matt 28:8). In Matthew, Jesus himself appears to the women. Nevertheless, the women's role is still to inform the disciples. The important teaching at the end of the Gospel is given to the eleven male disciples (Matt 28:16–20). Nevertheless, in Matthew—as well as in Mark—the women are presented as the ideal and the disciples should learn from them. Even though the disciples are given authority, they are also challenged to learn the traditional feminine ideal of service that the women already demonstrate.

In Luke, the women who are with Jesus are first mentioned already in Luke 8:2–3. In both the Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles, the women have more restricted roles. Instead of serving Jesus, as in Mark and Matthew, they provide for Jesus and his male disciples out of their own resources. They are benefactors and suppliants who have stayed out of gratitude.[20] Leadership roles are reserved for men in both the Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles. Moreover, in Luke the women are not the only witnesses of the crucifixion. Jesus' disciples have not fled, so the women are part of a larger group with men present as well (Luke 23:49). Nor are the women the only witnesses of the empty tomb, since Peter goes to the tomb as well (Luke 24:12). When Mary Magdalene and the other women come back from the tomb, their story is dismissed as merely an idle tale (Luke 24:11). When the disciples do not believe the women, it is not a negative portrayal of their lack of faith, but rather an indication that their faith is not based on flimsy evidence. Luke's motivation is apologetic: outsiders would regard early Christianity with suspicion if the disciples had been portrayed as believing the women's testimony. In ancient Greco-Roman writings, women were stereotypically characterized as being superstitious and credulous.[21]

In sum, in the passion narratives all of the Synoptic Gospels employ traditional stereotypical qualities in their depiction of women as fearful. The

19 See also Liew 1999, 146.

20 D'Angelo 2002, 50–51; 2003a, 288; Schüssler Fiorenza 1992, 64.

21 See Chapter 2. In Matthew, the disciples apparently believe the testimony of the women, since they come to the mountain. On the other hand, it is possible that they simply remember Jesus' earlier teaching on the matter (Matt 26:32).

women play a limited role in bringing the message of Jesus' resurrection to the male disciples and restoring their relationship with Jesus. On the other hand, elsewhere in the Synoptic Gospels the ideal of service is presented as the ideal for the male disciples to follow. It was exceptional that the role of service was given as the ideal for men, but for women service was part of the traditional feminine virtues. Since the women already exemplify the ideal of service, the roles of the women followers are closer to the traditional ideals of emphasized femininity. Luke, who ascribes more restricted roles to women followers, seems closest to the traditional ideas of emphasized femininity. As we will see, this is also the case with the other women characters in the Gospel of Luke.

The Syrophoenician or Canaanite Woman

In the Gospels of Mark and Matthew, a Syrophoenician or Canaanite woman challenges Jesus and persuades him into giving her what she wants, thereby securing healing for her daughter (Mark 7:24–30; Matt 15:21–28). Being a persuasive speaker was an important characteristic of masculinity in the ancient Greco-Roman world and women did not generally persuade men. Still, in the studies of masculinity in the Gospels, this pericope has not garnered much interest. The Gentile woman is seen only as an "exception that proves the rule" that women did not usually persuade men.[22] However, Jesus' meeting with the Syrophoenician woman is one of the central episodes in the Gospel of Mark. It could be called the turning point in Mark's Gospel where the breakthrough to a mission among Gentiles occurs.[23] In addition, since there are very few women in the Synoptic Gospels, this event is noteworthy. What is also important in this pericope is that it is the only time Jesus loses a dispute, and to a Gentile woman no less. My aim is to study what the ideal masculinity and femininity are like in this story. Does the challenge of the Syrophoenician woman affect the portrayal of Jesus' masculinity? What do the differences between Mark and Matthew tell about their ideals of masculinity and femininity?

The context of the story is the same in Mark and Matthew. Jesus has gone to the Gentile region of Tyre (or, in Matthew, Tyre and Sidon). A woman comes to Jesus, bows down in front of him, and asks for help for her daughter. Before this, the reader has witnessed Jesus healing several supplicants. The readers' expectations are challenged when Jesus now refuses to help the woman. The reason why Jesus does not help her immediately is her ethnic identity as

22 Clines 1998.

23 Rhoads 1994, 348.

Syrophoenician or Canaanite. In both Gospel accounts, therefore, the woman is clearly a Gentile.[24] The dialogue between Jesus and the Gentile woman differs in Mark and Matthew, and I look at these two accounts separately before comparing Mark's and Matthew's portrayal of femininity and masculinity in this pericope.

Mark's Account of the Story (Mark 7:24–30)

In Mark, Jesus responds with a parable to the woman's petition to heal her daughter (Mark 7:27): "Let the children be fed first, for it is not fair to take the children's bread and throw it to the dogs." Calling someone a dog was a common insult both in Greco-Roman literature and in the Jewish writings.[25] In ancient Israel, dogs were not household pets but street animals that scavenged for food.[26] It is clear that Jesus' saying is meant as an insult.

Some commentators seek to soften Jesus' harsh words. Based on the use of κυνάριον, the diminutive form of κύων ("dog"), they claim that the word should be translated as "puppies" or "pet dogs."[27] They argue that Jesus' words only appear to be an insult, since the dogs he mentions are not street scavengers. Therefore, Jesus' words should not be taken at face value. These commentators suggest either that Jesus was talking to himself,[28] that his expressions or tone

---

24 Even though the ethnicity of the woman seems to be more important in the pericope than her gender, it does not mean that the gender aspect does not matter. The fact that Jesus is a man and the Syrophoenician is a woman makes it possible to study the text also from the point of view of gender. One can compare Mari Matsuda's method of "asking the other question"; see Matsuda 1990–1991, 1188.

25 The word "dog" was used as an insult already by Homer; see, e.g., *Il.* 8.527; 9.373; 11.362; 20.449; *Od.* 17.248; 18.338; 19.91; 22.35. For "dog" as an insult in the Old Testament, see, e.g., 1 Sam 17:43; 2 Sam 16:9; Isa 56:10–11; Ps 22:16, 20. The dog was also a despised animal in the New Testament; see, e.g., Phil 3:2; Rev 22:15. Sacred things should not be given to dogs; Exod 22:31; Matt 7:6; *Did.* 9:5. There are texts that mention domestic dogs. *Joseph and Aseneth* 10.14 differentiates between "strange dogs" and "my dogs." *b. Ketub.* 61b talks of a woman's little dogs. Dogs worked as hunting dogs (e.g., Homer, *Od.* 2.11; 17.290–304) or guard dogs (e.g., Homer, *Od.* 14.29–36; Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe* 1.21; Phaedrus 3.7, 4.19). Nevertheless, these dogs with owners were not pets in the modern sense. Even if Jesus was talking about a dog with an owner, the reference to throwing the bread implies that the dogs were outside and thus did not have the same status as pet dogs living indoors.

26 1 Kgs 14:11; 21:23; Luke 16:21. Mentions of scavenger dogs can be found in classical Greek writings as well; see, e.g., Homer, *Il.* 17.127; 22.42–43, 66–70, 335–36, 339; 23.21; 24.211; *Od.* 3.258–260; 21.363–364; 22.476. See also Lips 1988, 176.

27 E.g., Filson 1971, 178; Lane 1975, 262; Taylor 1952, 350.

28 Taylor 1952, 350.

of voice hinted to the woman that his refusal was not final,[29] or that he was testing the woman's faith.[30] Therefore, some scholars claim that the woman's answer shows that she "felt no insult" in the comparison.[31] I argue instead that she was insulted, but she did not let that stop her.

Mark softens the saying slightly by adding that the children are to be fed "first" (πρῶτον; Mark 7:27). Some scholars maintain that Jesus gives only temporal precedence to the children, and the dogs will get something later.[32] However, the phrasing "it is not fair to take the children's food and throw it to the dogs" delays the healing so indefinitely that Jesus in effect refuses the request.[33]

I argue that the offensive nature of Jesus' words should not be overlooked.[34] As T. A. Burkill notes, "to call a woman 'a little bitch' is no less abusive than to call her 'a bitch' without qualification."[35] The diminutive is used to convey not only smallness but it is also used pejoratively as an insult. For example, *muliebris* (the diminutive of *mulier*) indicates physical and emotional weakness or a disreputable character.[36] On the other hand, in Koine Greek the diminutive is often indistinguishable from the regular form.[37] Mark uses diminutives freely, so it is possible that the word does not carry any diminutive force at all.[38] In both cases, however, the expression would be insulting.

Several commentators maintain that Jesus' words refer to a domestic setting: the dogs are under the table.[39] Lilly Nortjé-Meyer, for example, argues that the

---

29 Filson 1971, 180. Although noting that this is "inevitably speculation," France (2007, 591) suggests: "Cold print does not allow us to detect a quizzical eyebrow or a tongue in the cheek, and it may be that Jesus' demeanor already hinted that his discouraging reply was not to be his last word on the subject."

30 Keener 1999, 417; Lane 1975, 262.

31 Lane 1975, 263.

32 Keener 1999, 416; Luz 2001, 340; Nolland 2005, 634.

33 Gundry 1993, 373.

34 See also Alonso 2011, 176; Beare 1981, 342; Rhoads 1994, 345.

35 Burkill 1967, 173.

36 Santoro L'Hoir 1992, 40, 81. See, e.g., Livy 2.33.8; 2.40.4; 3.48.8; 6.34.7; 8.18.6; 10.23.4.

37 For example, Plutarch uses κυνάριον and κύων interchangeably; Plutarch, *Arat.* 7.3. BDAG *s.v.*; Collins 2007, 367; Marcus 2000, 463.

38 In the cases of the daughters of Jairus and the Syrophoenician woman, both the regular and the diminutive forms are used to describe the girls: θυγάτριον (Mark 5:23; 7:25) and θυγάτηρ (Mark 5:34–35; 7:26, 29). Rhoads (1994, 357) and Miller (2004, 97) suggest that Jesus may be using the diminutive κυνάριον to strengthen the parallel with the little daughter of the woman. Mark also uses πλοιάριον (Mark 3:9) and πλοῖον (Mark 4:1, 36–37) interchangeably.

39 Gundry 1994, 315; Keener 1999, 416; Luz 2001, 340; Nolland 2005, 634.

dogs cannot be street scavengers since the woman interprets the reference to be about household dogs.[40] However, does the woman interpret the words in the same way that Jesus meant them? I argue that Jesus and the woman are speaking with different meanings.[41] It is important to note that Jesus does not talk about the table or the household, but taking bread away from children and throwing it to the dogs. Therefore, I argue that Jesus is talking about street scavengers, dogs that are outside the house. It is the woman who introduces the notion of the table, thereby transforming the context.

Earlier in the Gospel, Jesus says that parables are used for those on the outside (Mark 4:11). The woman understands Jesus' metaphorical teaching better than the disciples and answers with a parable of her own. The woman seems to employ a common ancient proverbial saying.[42] It is important to note that the woman does not say "yes" to Jesus.[43] Instead, she says, "Sir, even the dogs under the table eat the children's crumbs" (Mark 7:28). In Mark, the woman does not accept Jesus' saying. On the contrary, her statement is a disagreement with Jesus. Thus in Mark, the woman's answer challenges Jesus' authority and therefore also his masculinity.

Although the woman talks about household dogs, they are still not truly members of the household like children are. The difference of status between children and dogs remains, and the woman does not challenge the privileged position of children.[44] Dogs remain under the table. Mark is ambiguous about how the dogs obtain crumbs. It may be only incidentally or as an intentional gift from the children.[45] The woman is willing to become the last if it secures healing for her daughter. Her response thus anticipates Jesus' teaching on the greatness of being the last of all and a servant for others (Mark 9:35–37; 10:42–44). The woman also treats Jesus as a superior by calling him κύριος. In this

40 Nortjé-Meyer 2000, 70.

41 The same is noted by Dufton 1988–1989, 417; Collins 2007, 367; Marcus 2000, 470; Miller 2004, 98.

42 For example, in Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius* a character is described as "acting like a dog that feeds on the scraps fallen from a dinner." *Vit. Apoll.* 1.19; see also Homer, *Il.* 23.173; 10.216.

43 Some manuscripts make the woman's response markedly affirmative by adding "yes" at the beginning of verse 28. However, this is probably influenced by the Matthean parallel. Alonso 2011, 65; Metzger 1994, 82. Schüssler Fiorenza (1992, 12) notes: "a substantial part of the manuscript tradition seeks to portray the woman as an example of humble submissiveness by inserting 'yes' into the text, and thereby downplaying the 'but' of the woman." This is what happens in Matthew, as we will see.

44 See also Alonso 2011, 176, 208; Burkill 1967, 173.

45 Alonso 2011, 204; Gundry 1993, 381; Marcus 2000, 465.

way, on one hand the woman preserves Jesus' honor. Nevertheless, since the woman disagrees with Jesus, I agree with Jim Perkinson's assertion that "she *does* (covertly) shame him—into honoring her appeal."[46] On the other hand, then, the woman shames Jesus, even if covertly.

As a result of the woman's retort, Jesus changes his mind and heals the daughter. The Syrophoenician woman is an exceptional figure because she is the only person in the Synoptic Gospels to best Jesus in a dispute. Jesus acknowledges this: "Because of this word (Διὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον), you may go" (Mark 7:29). It is because of her "word" (λόγος), not because of her faith, that Jesus cures her daughter.[47]

It is important to note that Jesus' change of heart was not a mere exception for this woman. What is even more remarkable is that in Mark's Gospel, after the meeting with the Syrophoenician woman, Jesus changes his strategy. The woman leads Jesus to expand his mission. In the following episodes, Jesus travels through Gentile lands where he heals and feeds four thousand people (Mark 7:31–8:9).[48] Jesus' mission is now also directed toward the Gentiles. This is the only instance where Jesus is taught by someone—and moreover, that someone is a woman. It seems that the Syrophoenician woman is not a traditional silent and submissive woman. As such, she comprises a threat to Jesus' masculinity, at least from the point of view of hegemonic masculinities. Before examining the ideals of masculinity and femininity in Mark's story, let us study Matthew's version of the account.

Matthew's Account of the Story (*Matthew 15:21–28*)

Matthew changes several details of Mark's story and even makes the story longer.[49] He retains and intensifies the opposition against the woman, although in general Matthew had no hesitations about toning down Mark's potentially negative portrayal of Jesus. It is likely, therefore, that the changes were not incidental but had an important function for Matthew.

---

46 Perkinson 1996, 76. Emphasis original.

47 Rhoads argues that the woman's faith is shown in her actions and speech. Rhoads 1994, 346, 359–360. However, faith is not mentioned in the text. Therefore, Alonso notes, "one must resist the depiction of the woman as having faith when Mark has explicitly avoided it." Alonso 2011, 215, 342.

48 The portrayal of Jesus' route is geographically odd and seems designed to show that Jesus deliberately avoided Jewish areas: "Then he returned from the region of Tyre, and went by way of Sidon towards the Sea of Galilee, in the region of the Decapolis" (Mark 7:31). Jesus thus goes south-east via the north. See also Malbon 1992, 44.

49 The story of the Canaanite woman is an exception, since Matthew usually shortens the healing narratives. See also Dewey 1997, 55.

In Matthew, the story is structured with four verbal exchanges. As a result, Matthew has made the pericope an extended dialogue. The first three of these exchanges end with a negative response (οὐκ), building opposition to the woman. This means that on one hand, the persistence of the woman is highlighted in the story.[50] On the other hand, the woman is presented less favorably in Matthew as a stereotypically nagging woman.[51]

Matthew begins with the woman's request in direct speech, in contrast to Mark, where the narrator sets the stage. Jesus does not respond at all to the first request, making his first reaction even ruder than in Mark (Matt 15:23). Perkinson notes that Jesus' silence "can be read as an attempt at silenc*ing*."[52] Jesus does not readily enter into discussion, but resists the woman's attempts to engage him. This silent treatment fails when the woman persists and keeps shouting.

Next the disciples intervene by asking Jesus to do something (Matt 15:23). The disciples' request is ambiguous, since they may be asking Jesus to send the woman away or to grant her petition. The meaning "send her away" is more consistent with Matthew's portrayal of the disciples.[53] Nevertheless, Jesus' answer to their request implies that the disciples actually wanted him to "give her what she wants."[54] This time Jesus answers with a saying found only in Matthew: "I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt 15:24). It is not clear whether the answer is directed at the disciples or the woman.[55] Nevertheless, the woman seizes the opportunity and approaches Jesus. She kneels in front of him and asks again for his help (Matt 15:25).

Jesus' answer to the woman here is harsher than in Mark. Matthew retains the comparison with dogs, but leaves out the reference to children being fed

---

50 Gench 2004, 4.

51 See also Dewey 1994, 128.

52 Perkinson 1996, 64. Emphasis original.

53 Therefore some scholars argue that the disciples ask Jesus to send the woman away. Alonso 2011, 254; Anderson 1983, 16; 1994, 184; Davies & Allison 1991, 549; Gundry 1994, 312; Luz 2001, 339; Schüssler Fiorenza 1992, 160; Scott 1997, 37; Wainwright 1991, 108; 1995, 653; Wire 1991, 104.

54 France 2007, 593; Gench 2004, 7; Patte 1987, 221; Perkinson 1996, 64. Wainwright argues that the disciples' use of the verb κράζω suggests their disapproval of the woman's action. Wainwright 1991, 108. Nevertheless, even if the disciples disapproved of the woman, it is still possible that they asked Jesus to heal the woman's daughter. In this case, their request could be paraphrased as "do something, anything!"

55 On the reply being to the woman, see Wainwright 1991, 109. On the reply being to the disciples, see Corley 1993, 167; Gundry 1994, 314; France 2007, 593; Love 2010, 148. Davies & Allison (1991, 550) and Mattila (2002, 109) leave the issue undecided.

"first" (Matt 15:26). This omission fits in with the larger Matthean paradigm of Jesus' exclusive mission to the Jews.[56] Again, Matthew's Jesus is even ruder than Mark's.[57]

The woman persists. Like in Mark, she answers with a parable of her own. Some scholars argue that the woman's response is not an agreement but a refusal.[58] As we have seen, this is true of Mark's version. This is not the case here, however, as can be seen in the different ways that Matthew changes the woman's reply. First, he adds "yes" to the beginning of her answer, turning it into an agreement.[59] Secondly, the woman addresses Jesus three times as Lord (κύριος)[60] and once as the son of David, thus acknowledging Jesus' authority (Matt 15:23, 25, 27). In Matthew, the woman is not insolent in any way.

Moreover, unlike Mark, who does not specify how the dogs get the crumbs, according to Matthew the crumbs fall from the table (Matt 15:27). The dogs only obtain the crumbs by chance.[61] The woman avoids saying that the dogs were the intended recipients, which would have disagreed with Jesus. In addition, instead of children's crumbs, the woman talks about the master's table. This increases the distance between the dogs and the giver of the bread. In Matthew, not only is Jesus' statement harsher than in Mark, but the woman's reply also creates more distance between the Gentiles and the Jews, as well as between herself and Jesus. The woman does not disagree with Jesus in any way. Her answer is not subversive and thus not a threat to Jesus' masculinity.

Nevertheless, it is possible to see a challenge when the woman cries to Jesus, "Have mercy on me (Ἐλέησόν με)." Mercy was an important theme for

56 Cf. Matt 10:5–6.

57 Keener (1999, 416) notes that omitting "first" makes the saying harsher, even if Matthew's reason is to abbreviate the narrative. Leaving one word out does not really shorten the narrative, however, especially since Matthew adds material elsewhere. Therefore, it is not likely that Matthew is here guided by a desire to shorten the account.

58 France 2007, 595; Luz 2001, 341.

59 Corley 1993, 168; Gundry 1994, 315; Nolland 2005, 635. *Contra* France (2007, 589 n. 6), who argues that the use of ναί after a negative statement indicates disagreement with Jesus' statement. France (2007, 589) translates: "'It is not right to take the children's bread and throw it to the dogs.' 'Yes it is, Lord,' she replied, 'for even the dogs eat the crumbs that fall from their masters' table.'"

60 Gundry (1994, 315) maintains that Matthew "regards the woman's use of κύριε as an address in the full sense 'Lord' [...] rather than in the weak sense 'Sir.'" See also Alonso 2011, 278. Cf. Mark, where the woman's use of κύριος is unclear. It is not necessarily a messianic title, as it clearly is in Matthew, but may be translated as "sir," which is how the NRSV translates it.

61 Alonso 2011, 272–273; Marcus 2000, 465.

Matthew. Before this, Matthew's Jesus has twice quoted Hosea 6:6: "I desire mercy (ἔλεος), not sacrifice."[62] The woman challenges Jesus to practice what he preaches, but the challenge is more covert than in Mark.

Finally, Jesus answers the woman. Unlike in Mark, Jesus does not applaud her witty response. Instead, he commends her faith.[63] Praising the woman's faith also gives Matthew's version a more Christological focus. The main point of the passage becomes what Jesus says, not the woman's λόγος. Some scholars argue that in Matthew as well, Jesus is transformed by the encounter with the woman.[64] However, in Matthew's context it seems more likely that the healing is merely an exception for this particular woman. The following healings and feeding happen in Jewish territory (Matt 15:29–39). In this way, Matthew has reduced the narrative importance of the woman.[65] It appears that Matthew seeks to alleviate the tension that Mark's version creates for Jesus' masculinity.

The Syrophoenician Woman's Challenge to Jesus' Masculinity

Since masculinity and femininity are constructed in relation to each other, I examine both the woman's femininity and Jesus' masculinity. First, what does this story tell about the Gentile woman's femininity? Unlike what has been claimed by some scholars, there is no indication that the woman's request of healing for her daughter was subversive. Neither Mark nor Matthew considers the woman's request to be unusual.[66] Nevertheless, how the woman reacts after her request is turned down can be seen as a challenge to Jesus and his masculinity. In both Mark and Matthew, the Gentile woman argues with Jesus, even though in Matthew the woman does not confront Jesus to the same extent as in Mark. Gerald Downing notes that in the ancient texts, with the exception of the Cynic Hipparchia, there are no analogies of a woman talking back to a

62 Matt 9:13; 12:7.

63 Matt 15:28. The only other person whose faith is portrayed favorably in Matthew is the centurion (Matt 8:5–13). Jesus' answer to the centurion is usually understood as a statement: "I will come and heal him." However, Jesus' answer can also be translated as a question: "You want me to come and heal him?" Considering the centurion's answer, this translation is more likely. Davies & Allison 1991, 22; Evans 2012, 187; France 2007, 310; Keener 1999, 266; Nolland 2005, 354–355. Thus, in both pericopes Jesus makes an exception for the centurion and the Canaanite woman because of their faith, although both characters are Gentiles.

64 Anderson 1983, 14; Scott 1997, 41, 43.

65 D'Angelo 1999, 175–176.

66 Levine 2001b, 26–31.

man and winning the argument.[67] In the Old Testament and the rabbinic writings, however, women sometimes speak to men and even occasionally prevail in arguments.[68] Moreover, Plutarch has several anecdotes of women who give witty replies to men, make them change their minds, and shame them into action. For example, Plutarch tells in *Sayings of Kings and Commanders* of a poor woman who changed the mind of King Philip:

> When a poor old woman insisted that her case should be heard before him, and often caused him annoyance, he said he had no time to spare, whereupon she burst out, "Then give up being king." Philip, amazed at her words, proceeded to hear not only her case but those of the others.[69]

In *Advice to the Bride and Groom*, Plutarch recounts an anecdote of Theano:

> Theano once exposed her hand as she was arranging her cloak. "What a beautiful arm," said someone. "But not public property," she replied.[70]

In *Bravery of Women*, Plutarch tells a story of Timocleia, who kills a Macedonian soldier trying to rob her house. When brought to Alexander the Great, she answers him in such a way that he "marveled at her bravery and her words (τὸν λόγον)." Her answer also leads Alexander to change his policy and order that the houses of prominent people should be left alone. Plutarch also recounts several stories where women shame men into action, usually in connection with warfare.[71] Compared with these parallels, the story of the Gentile woman is striking since it does not provide a model for a specifically female virtue.[72] The Gentile woman's story is meant to be an example to the Christians in general. Plutarch, on the contrary, uses his anecdotes as examples for proper female virtue. Theano's witty answer to a rude remark, for example, emphasizes

---

67 Diogenes Laertius 6.97–98. Downing (1992, 134) therefore argues that the Gentile woman is a Cynic. Scott (1997, 24), however, notes that this interpretation "demands at least a degree of imagination in the reader."

68 2 Sam 14; 2 Kgs 4:1, 6:26; *b. 'Erubin* 53b; *b. Berakot* 10a; *b. Sanhedrin* 39a. See also Hauptman 1974, 202–203.

69 Plutarch, *Sayings of Kings and Commanders* 179C–D. Cf. also Dio 69.6.3.

70 Plutarch, *Advice to the Bride and Groom* 31. See also *Advice to the Bride and Groom* 46: "A woman said to Philip, when he tried to lay hands on her against her will, 'Let go; every woman is the same when the lamp is taken away'".

71 Plutarch, *Bravery of Women* 244E–245C; 246A–B; see also 261E–262D, where the word (ῥῆμα) of an unnamed woman causes men to take action against tyranny.

72 A similar argument is made also by Beavis 1988, 8.

her chastity, a traditional feminine virtue. Thus, the ideal femininity advocated by Plutarch could be called emphasized femininity.

The Gentile woman either intrudes on the privacy of Jesus (in Mark) or enters the public domain of men and disturbs them by shouting loudly (in Matthew). The fact that the woman dares to challenge Jesus publicly is an even bigger threat to Jesus' masculinity. Her willingness to transgress social boundaries means that her behavior is not in accordance with the ancient Greco-Roman ideal of emphasized femininity.

On the other hand, both Mark and Matthew portray the woman as accepting the status of a subordinate. Her posture is submissive in both Mark and Matthew. She talks about the dogs that are under the table, where they present no threat to the children's higher status. The woman accepts the traditional subordinate status of women. In Mark, however, the woman is "anything but humble and submissive,"[73] since she disagrees with Jesus. Thus, by challenging Jesus and not behaving in a submissive manner, the woman does not exemplify the ideal emphasized femininity. The same is not true for Matthew, where the woman explicitly agrees with Jesus. Instead, her humility and acceptance of the subordinate position are highlighted. Although she begins with publicly breaching the social boundaries, in the end the Gentile woman is put in her proper place.[74]

How does this all affect Jesus' masculinity? Joanna Dewey maintains that not only the woman ignores the social rules, but Jesus does also by readily entering into a debate with her.[75] This is true of Mark's Gospel, but in Matthew Jesus resists several times the woman's attempts to engage him in conversation. In Mark, the woman disagrees with Jesus, threatening his authority and thus his masculinity. Her response to Jesus is at least a covert challenge. Moreover, Jesus acknowledges that the woman's words persuaded him to change his mind, which led to a changed strategy on Jesus' part. In Mark, Jesus is willing to change his mind and be influenced by other people, even by a Gentile woman. Jesus does not seem to interpret the woman's response as a threat to his masculinity. Mark's ideal masculinity does not require having power over others.

---

73 Gench 2004, 18.

74 Wainwright (1995, 653) argues that her feminist rereading of the passage reveals that in Matthew "female power has once again endured against all the barriers the patriarchal culture had erected against it, and the words of Jesus recognize and celebrate this." However, it should be noted that Jesus is the one that erects and tries to hold on to the barriers!

75 Dewey 1994, 127.

As a result, Mark's ideas of masculinity and femininity appear less traditional than Matthew's.

The fact that Matthew has worked to alleviate the tension attests to his finding the story problematic.[76] In Matthew, the woman agrees with Jesus, and thus her response is not an overt threat to Jesus' masculinity. Her portrayal as a stereotypically nagging woman also makes her less of a threat. If her response is still a challenge, it is more covert than in Mark. Moreover, in Matthew, there is no major change in Jesus' strategy. Matthew preserves Jesus' masculinity, because the woman does not challenge Jesus' masculinity to the same extent as in Mark. Matthew is closer to the traditional ideals. The woman's challenge is a threat to male power and she needs to be put back in her place.

It is interesting to note that Luke does not have this pericope. Stuart Love suggests that Luke might have omitted the story because of its ethnocentric perspective, which is incompatible with his universal vision.[77] However, could another reason for the story being left out be because in Mark the woman wins the dispute and thus challenges Jesus' masculine authority?[78] As we will see, Luke's ideal femininity is close to the ideal emphasized femininity of the ancient Greco-Roman world, and it is possible that this is one of the reasons why Luke left out the pericope of a woman who does not fulfill the traditional ideals and gets away with it.

The Women Jesus Heals: The Hemorrhaging Woman

What other encounters do the Synoptic Gospels depict between Jesus and women in need of help? Two of the stories of Jesus healing women are common to the Synoptic Gospels: the healing of Peter's mother-in-law and the hemorrhaging woman. Peter's mother-in-law is passive in all Gospel accounts (Mark 1:29–31; Matt 8:14–15; Luke 4:38–39). She does not ask for healing. Others request it for her. After she has been healed, she serves Jesus (and, in Mark and Luke, his disciples). Thus, she is depicted as behaving like an ideal woman. Luke includes a story of healing of a bent woman (Luke 13:10–17). In the story of the bent woman, the healing of the woman is not as important as the dispute with the leader of the synagogue, a male figure. The issue is not that Jesus

76 See Merenlahti (1999, 69), who notes: "the later the version, the smaller the scandal."

77 Love 2010, 148.

78 See also Gench (2004, 69): "Is it any wonder, then, that an uppity woman such as Mark's Syrophoenician [...], who dares to approach Jesus and argue with him in public, is discreetly omitted from the Lukan narrative?"

heals a woman, but that he heals on the Sabbath. The woman does not ask for healing, and she acts more as a prop for Jesus' teaching. In both of these accounts, the women play a traditional, silent role and others act on their behalf. These women do not challenge the ideal of emphasized femininity. In Chapter 3, it was mentioned that helping destitute widows is part of the ideal of the Synoptic Gospels. Here the Synoptic Gospels present helping women in need and healing them as part of Jesus' ideal masculinity.

In this section, I focus on the story of the hemorrhaging woman (Mark 5:24–34; Matt 9:20–22; Luke 8:42–48). What does this pericope tell about the woman's femininity and Jesus' masculinity? This story has usually been studied from the point of view of ritual impurity.[79] Does the bleeding mean that she is ritually impure? Does the woman's touch make Jesus impure, thereby making the woman less ideally feminine? Does Jesus disregard purity rules, which would make his masculine piety questionable? These questions have been debated extensively in previous studies, and therefore it is pertinent to start the discussion by addressing these issues.

In Mark and Luke, the woman is described as having a flow of blood (ῥύσις αἵματος; Mark 5:25; Luke 8:43). The expression ῥύσις αἵματος is used in the Septuagint (Lev 15:19, 25; 20:18) when talking about a menstruating woman. According to Leviticus, a menstruating woman is impure for seven days, and whoever touches her shall be unclean until the evening. In addition, Mark uses the expression "fountain of her blood" (ἡ πηγὴ τοῦ αἵματος; Mark 5:29), which is used in Leviticus 12:7 LXX when talking about purification after childbirth.[80] The expressions that Mark uses thus most likely mean that the woman's bleeding was vaginal.[81] This is also the case with Luke. The question of whether the woman was ritually impure is more complex in Matthew, since he uses a different expression. He does not talk about "a flow of blood," but simply "hemorrhaging" (αἱμορροοῦσα; 9:20). It is not clear whether the bleeding is uterine.[82] Nevertheless, since that verb occurs in Leviticus 15:33 LXX with reference to

79 Purity is not explicitly mentioned in this pericope. Still, it is reasonable to suppose that this pericope concerns purity, at least in Mark, since issues dealing with purity are mentioned several times in his Gospel. Nevertheless, in Mark's Gospel the concern for purity is raised only to be dismissed. Previously, Jesus has touched a leper (Mark 1:41) and visited a graveyard (Mark 5:1–20), and after the encounter with the hemorrhaging woman Jesus will touch the dead girl (Mark 5:41) and declare all foods clean (Mark 7:14–23). Matthew and Luke do not bring up the topic of impurity to the same extent as Mark.

80 Cf. Lev 20:18.

81 Marcus 2000, 357.

82 D'Angelo 1999, 175; Mattila 2002, 100.

menstruation, uterine bleeding is probably meant in Matthew as well. Thus, in all of the Synoptic Gospels, the woman is depicted as ritually impure.

What would this ritual impurity mean for the woman? First of all, it does not mean that she was isolated or that she could not participate in the social life of a rural community. Leviticus does mention that the impurity of a menstruating woman is contagious, but this impurity lasts only until the evening. Moreover, these laws were not necessarily followed as strictly in rural communities. The laws had more to do with the holiness of the temple.[83] The fact that she is moving out in the open does not mean that her behavior is transgressive.

It has usually been argued that the woman's touch would make Jesus impure as well. Being impure would not have affected Jesus' masculinity, however, since impurity did not imply moral censure.[84] The question here is more about the woman's femininity. If she touches Jesus knowing that it would make him impure, she could be considered as behaving in a transgressive manner. She would not be exemplifying emphasized femininity. This assumes that traditional feminine behavior included women ensuring that they did not impart their impurity to men.

In recent studies, however, it has been questioned whether the woman's touch really did make Jesus impure. As mentioned above, in Leviticus it is said that whoever touches a woman with a flow of blood shall be unclean until the evening. Thus, Charlotte Fonrobert argues that a woman with the flow of blood "communicates impurity by *being touched*," not by *touching*. In Leviticus, there is no prohibition of her touching anyone.[85] In the case of the hemorrhaging woman, it is she who touches Jesus, not the other way around. Accordingly, the touch of the hemorrhaging woman would not have made Jesus impure, and the woman was not behaving in a transgressive manner. While Fonrobert notes also that Mishnaic tradition held that the touch of a woman with blood flow imparts impurity,[86] this was a later development that did not necessarily reflect the practice at the time of the writing of the Gospels. It is nevertheless a logical extension of Leviticus. If impurity is contagious, does it matter who does the touching?

---

83 In earlier studies, it was commonly argued that the woman was probably quarantined. See Marcus 2000, 357. However, in more recent studies this has been questioned, meaning that the woman would not have been banished or isolated. See Collins 2007, 284; Gench 2004, 42; Fredriksen 1995; Lawrence 2003, 270; Levine 2001a, 76–78; Nolland 2005, 395–396.

84 Fredriksen 1995.

85 Fonrobert 1997, 130–133; emphasis original. See also Gench 2004, 42.

86 *m. Zab*. 5:1. Fonrobert 1997, 131.

It is possible that Matthew and Luke considered that the woman's touch could make Jesus impure, which thus led them to attempt to tone down this risk. Both Matthew and Luke stress the minimal nature of the woman's contact with Jesus. She touches only the hem or the tassel (κράσπεδον) of his clothes.[87] Moreover, in Matthew it is unclear if the woman actually touches Jesus or merely attempts to do so. In all three Gospels, the woman also approaches Jesus from behind and tries to hide who she is. All these factors indicate that her behavior could be considered inappropriate. Yet, Jesus accepts the woman's behavior. This would mean that even if the woman's touch may make Jesus impure, he is willing to approve transgressive behavior from a woman. This conclusion is not certain, however, since in the end it is difficult to say whether the woman's behavior is transgressive or not. If her touch did not carry a risk of making Jesus impure, she would not be acting in a transgressive manner.

Joanna Dewey argues that Jesus challenges cultural norms when he does not rebuke the woman and instead disregards purity rules.[88] Disregarding purity laws would make Jesus' piety questionable. This would jeopardize his masculinity. However, there is no indication that Jesus was aware of the woman's presence, in which case Jesus could not have made a conscious choice to disregard purity rules. Thus, the story of the hemorrhaging woman is not a critique or abrogation of the purity laws.[89] Focusing on the aspect of purity does not give us enough information to ascertain what this story tells about the ideals of femininity and masculinity.

For the study of masculinity and femininity, more important than the question of impurity is the depiction of the woman as active and Jesus as passive. In Mark and Luke, the woman does not request healing but claims it for herself. The healing occurs without any conscious intent when power goes out from Jesus (Mark 5:30; Luke 8:46). Jesus seems unable to control his power. In general, the miracle stories highlight Jesus' power and authority. In the story of the hemorrhaging woman, however, Jesus has a passive role. In a way, the woman steals Jesus' power. Jesus is not only passive in this pericope, he also loses his power to a woman who is active and takes the initiative. Jesus' passivity and the lack of control of his own power make his masculinity questionable. The woman takes the initiative and seeks healing for herself. This would make her behavior less in accordance with the emphasized femininity. Although the

87 Nolland (1989, 419; see also 2005, 396) argues that unlike in Matthew, who means a tassel, in Luke a more general "edge" or "hem" is meant.

88 Dewey 1994, 127.

89 Haber 2003.

woman's behavior is not necessarily transgressive, she does not behave in a way that is traditionally expected of women.

In Mark and Luke, the woman is instantly healed (Mark 5:28; Luke 8:44). Jesus notices what has happened and looks for who touched him. In Mark, the woman approaches Jesus with fear and trembling because she knows "what had happened to her" (Mark 5:33). The woman's fear can be interpreted either as her being afraid of Jesus' reaction upon finding out who had touched him or as an appropriate expression after an encounter with the supernatural. Luke increases the woman's fear: "When the woman saw that she could not remain hidden, she came trembling; and falling down before him, she declared in the presence of all the people why she had touched him, and how she had been immediately healed" (Luke 8:47). By having her share embarrassing details of her personal life, Jesus humiliates the woman. This is even more evident in Luke, where the confession takes place before all the people.[90] Luke's addition of the woman having to publicly confess her act can be seen as a move to censure her behavior. This is a plausible interpretation when taking into account the changes that Luke makes to Mark's other accounts of women.

Matthew further amends Mark's account. In Matthew, the woman does not cure herself. Jesus' statement is not an acknowledgement of what had already happened, but words that effect the healing (Matt 9:22). There is no crowd present, which makes the woman's approach more obvious. Jesus does not need to find out who touched him. Instead, the woman seems to have been caught in the act. Martin Scott argues that "the element of humiliation" is removed from the story, and thus Matthew "spares the woman the intense shame of having to reveal her most intimate problems to the surrounding crowd."[91] However, Matthew's intention may have been less to save the woman from embarrassment than to put the focus on Jesus. Matthew also deletes the thoughts of the woman and omits the crowds and the messengers, keeping Jesus on center stage.[92] As in the story of the Syrophoenician woman, Jesus does not lose control.[93] Matthew thus preserves Jesus' masculinity by changing the narrative.

Dewey maintains that the woman lacks proper female shame, since she not only seeks out and touches Jesus but also shamelessly tells in public what she

90 Some commentators excuse Jesus' action as necessary. They argue that the woman's problem was a public one, so people needed to know that she was healed. Geldenhuys 1993, 261; Green 1997, 349.

91 Scott 1997, 28.

92 Davies & Allison 1991, 124.

93 See also Merenlahti 1999, 68–69.

has done.[94] However, as mentioned earlier with regard to the Syrophoenician woman, asking for healing was not subversive behavior. One should note that the hemorrhaging woman approaches Jesus from behind and does not want to tell about what happened until Jesus insists. The woman's behavior is not shameless. Nevertheless, the initiative the woman takes can in any case be seen as evidence of a different ideal than emphasized femininity. Faith required action from women as well. The ideal behavior required of men and women was the same. In Mark, the woman even becomes an example for Jairus to imitate.

In all three accounts, the story of the hemorrhaging woman is embedded in the story of a prominent male leader whose daughter is either dying (in Mark and Luke) or already dead (in Matthew). The hemorrhaging woman and the male leader, who in Mark and Luke is named Jairus, are opposites: Jairus is a religious leader with a family, and he seems to have been wealthy (his house has a separate bedroom), while the woman is impoverished by her long illness and probably unable to have children. Jairus seeks help publicly, the woman in secret. Mark and Luke put equal emphasis on the hemorrhaging woman and Jairus. Matthew, on the other hand, abbreviates Mark's account so that the healing of the woman is merely a minor tangent. In Mark and Luke, Jesus delays an urgent mission when he pauses to find out who touched him. This causes him to be too late to save Jairus' daughter before her death. Matthew changes the narrative so that the girl is already dead and the delay is shortened. Jesus is not hindered in his mission to help a prominent man. Mark's version highlights the faith of the woman. In Mark, the woman is a model of faith for Jairus and for the Markan audience. The woman's faith is commended, "your faith has made you well" (ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε), whereas Jairus is exhorted: "Do not fear, only believe" (μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστευε).[95] In Matthew, the ruler also becomes an example of faith. The little girl is dead, so the ruler's faith is greater. Consequently, he does not need to be told to believe. In Mark and Luke, the woman is the exemplary character, whereas in Matthew the male leader becomes the ideal that the early Christians are to imitate.

The woman starts off as determined and independent, but in the end she approaches, trembling, and kneels in front of Jesus to give him an account of her healing. In Mark, and even more in Luke, the woman has to face public embarrassment when Jesus insists that she tell what happened. This does not happen in Matthew, although his intent was probably not to save the woman from embarrassment. Even though the woman's behavior may have been less indicative of traditional feminine behavior, Jesus accepts the woman's initiative

94 Dewey 1994, 127.

95 Mark 5:34–36.

and sees it as an example of faith. The woman's behavior makes her an ideal character for both men and women. Jesus also incorporates her into his family by calling her "daughter" (Mark 5:34; Matt 9:22; Luke 8:48). Jesus' initial passivity may call his masculinity into question, but by the end he establishes himself as her protector and benefactor, which is a traditionally masculine role. At the end of the pericope, the woman is under the control of a man, which was part of the emphasized femininity.[96] Nevertheless, one should not overlook the features of her behavior which make her femininity less emphasized. This is most clearly the case in Mark's account of the narrative.

The Anointing Woman

All of the Synoptic Gospels include a story of an unnamed woman anointing Jesus. Mark's and Matthew's anointing pericope begins the passion narrative (Matt 26:6–13; Mark 14:3–9), whereas Luke's anointing happens earlier in Jesus' ministry (Luke 7:36–50). Luke's narrative also has other differences from the anointing in Mark and Matthew. What do the anointing narratives tell about the ideal femininity and masculinity of the Synoptic Gospels?

In Mark and Matthew, a woman anoints Jesus in Bethany before his last days. This is not a regular anointing, which was part of normal hospitality, since the anointing does not happen with oil but with perfume.[97] The narrative instead evokes royal anointing, where perfumed oil was poured over the head of the future king.[98] Priests and prophets were also anointed.[99] However, the anointing in Mark and Matthew differs from the type of anointing found in the Hebrew Bible. Instead of being anointed by a high priest or prophet, Jesus is anointed by an unknown woman. The anointers in the Hebrew Bible were men, and thus Susan Miller notes that "the woman is taking on a role usually associated with men."[100] In addition, expectations are overturned when the anointing does not happen in the temple but in a leper's house.

---

96 A similar idea is presented by Liew, who notes that Jesus' new family is still associated with "compulsory femininity," which means "dependence on, and submission to, male figures." Liew 1999, 139; 2003, 120–121.

97 Guijarro & Rodríguez 2011, 137.

98 1 Sam 9:16; 10:1; 1 Kgs 1:32–48; 2 Kgs 9:3–6; 11:12.

99 Exod 28:41; 1 Kgs 19:16.

100 Miller 2004, 133. The fact that the anointer is unnamed is not unprecedented: an unnamed man anointed Jehu (2 Kgs 9:3–6).

The onlookers reprimand the woman for wasting money on precious ointment. Jesus defends the woman and interprets her action as prophetic: she has anointed him for burial. Jesus thus interprets the anointing as a burial anointing. This can be seen as downplaying the woman's importance. Anointing was a typical task for women when preparing a body for burial. Nevertheless, in both cases Jesus assigns a prophetic role to the woman.

In Mark and Matthew, the anointing woman is a model for all of Jesus' followers. She gives a valuable gift, for 300 denarii equaled a year's worth of wages for an ordinary laborer. In this way, she exemplifies self-giving service. The woman acts like an ideal disciple. The woman's self-denial is linked with Jesus' self-denial. It is also juxtaposed with Judas and the priests, who seek to betray and kill Jesus.[101]

Like the Syrophoenician woman and the hemorrhaging woman, the anointing woman herself takes the initiative. She shows up unexpectedly to a meal. Some have argued that her behavior is anomalous, but Miller notes that the woman showing up at a meal might not have been unorthodox, since meal practices were not as rigid among the non-elite.[102] Her presence at a meal does not mean that she is breaking with the ideals of emphasized femininity. However, her act and the prophetic role that Jesus assigns to her can be seen as a break with the ideals of traditional femininity. Nevertheless, as we will see, she does not completely subvert the traditional feminine virtues. In any case, Jesus again accepts a woman with a less traditional role and presents her as an example to the male disciples.

Luke changes the story to suit his interests better.[103] The anointing woman becomes an example of hospitable behavior, which the Pharisee acting as the host of the dinner has failed to show (Luke 7:44–46). In Luke, the woman is not a prophet. She is described as "a woman in the city, who was a sinner" (Luke 7:37). This description has usually been interpreted as a euphemism for a prostitute. The symposium setting, the woman loosening her hair, and her caressing Jesus publicly, as well as the Pharisee's thoughts, all point in this

101 Malbon 1983, 40; Miller 2004, 129–130. This juxtaposition is strengthened in the later Gospels. In Matthew, the disciples are the ones that condemn the woman's act; then Judas, "one of the twelve," betrays Jesus (Matt 26:8, 14). In John, it is Judas who criticizes the woman, even though he is about to betray Jesus (John 12:4–6).

102 Miller 2004, 131.

103 One possible reason for the change is that Luke's Gentile readers would not have understood messianic anointing.

direction (Luke 7:38–39).[104] Her act of anointing Jesus' feet is not a deed of prophecy, but arises out of repentance, gratitude, and love. It is Jesus who is the prophet in Luke's story, as can be seen when he is able to read the Pharisee's thoughts. This heightens Jesus' status at the woman's expense. Luke's purpose for these changes was probably apologetic. He wanted to illustrate what Jesus being the "friend of the tax collectors and sinners" (Luke 7:34) entailed. It did not mean that Jesus encouraged sin, especially the sexual immorality of women. On the contrary, Jesus' friendship with sinners meant support for repenting sinners.[105] The story also gives Jesus the chance to proclaim his message on forgiveness (Luke 7:47–48). The theme of repentance and forgiveness is important elsewhere in Luke as well.[106]

In all of the Synoptic Gospels, the woman herself remains silent. Jesus is the one who interprets her actions. Jesus and the other men talk about the woman's actions, and Jesus defends her. In Mark and Matthew as well, the woman exemplifies traditional feminine virtues by being silent and serving Jesus. Nevertheless, while her prophetic role gives her a higher status, Luke downplays her importance. Instead of defending a prophetic action, Luke's Jesus defends a repentant woman. The anointing woman exemplifies traditional feminine virtues: she is silent, submissive, and serves a man. As such, she poses no threat to men. Still, as the Pharisee's thoughts show, as a sinner she is a potential threat to Jesus' status as a prophet and thus Jesus' masculinity, if he is seen associating with such people. Luke's explanation that Jesus requires repentance from the sinners safeguards Jesus' status. What does this mean for the masculinity of Jesus? It seems that Mark's and Matthew's Jesus is again more accepting of a woman who takes the initiative and plays an important role in the narrative. Jesus gives a prophetic role to and receives royal, messianic anointing from a woman. By downplaying the woman's status and emphasizing Jesus' status, Luke also highlights Jesus' masculinity.

104 See also Nolland 1989, 353; Pesonen 2009, 122–123. Cosgrove (2005) criticizes interpreting unbound hair as a sign of the woman's status as a prostitute and argues that unbound hair rather depicts the woman's repentance.

105 Pesonen 2009, 129.

106 Cf. Luke 4:18–19; 23:34, 39–43.

The Ideal Woman in Luke

Out of the Synoptic Gospels, the Gospel of Luke has the most references to women.[107] However, Luke only has four occasions where a woman speaks in the stories of Jesus' adulthood.[108] Moreover, outside of the infancy narratives, the women who speak in Luke are either corrected by Jesus or disbelieved.[109] What is important in studying the Gospel accounts of women is not the number of women, but what they do and what is said about them. Luke's pericopes that include women present a clearly different ideal from Mark and Matthew's. In Mark and Matthew, the women have both subversive and traditional roles. As we have seen, Luke leaves out the story of the Syrophoenician woman and publicly shames the hemorrhaging woman. Both of these women are independent women who take the initiative. In contrast to these two women, Luke presents ideal women who remain silent.[110] As we have already seen, Luke changes the narrative of the anointing woman to downplay her prophetic role and portray her as a repentant sinner. Luke also has a story of the healing of the bent woman (Luke 13:10–17). In this pericope, the woman does not play an important role, but rather works as a prop in the dispute between Jesus and the leader of the synagogue. The anointing woman and the bent woman have traditional, silent roles and men talk about them. They do not challenge the ideal of emphasized femininity.

Luke's ideal femininity can be seen also in his portrayal of Mary and Martha. Luke presents Mary sitting at Jesus' feet, listening to his teaching (Luke 10:38–42). In this way, on one hand Mary occupies the traditional place of a student.[111] On the other hand, Mary is not "eschewing her traditional woman's role."[112] She remains silent and does not become the teacher. Moreover, Jesus does not tell

---

107 Luke has 22 narratives that include women, compared with Mark's 16 and Matthew's 17.

108 Luke has eleven occurrences in total of women speaking, whereas Mark has five and Matthew nine. See also De Boer 2006, 166; Ricci 1994, 63.

109 D'Angelo 1990, 452; Gench 2004, 69; Reid 1996, 52.

110 This ideal can be seen throughout the Gospel and also in the Acts of the Apostles. The women following Jesus and the women in the early Christian communities are silent benefactors of the Christian community. See Haynes (2003, 37), who notes that "the women who meet with Jesus' total approval are silent."

111 *Contra* Corley 1993, 135–137, who argues that Mary's position at Jesus' feet means that Mary occupies the traditional position of a silent wife, "sitting at the feet of her husband at the table." For Luke, however, "sitting at the feet" is a technical term for discipleship; cf. Paul at the feet of Gamaliel in Acts 22:3. Moreover, Martha is still preparing the meal. It is better to see Mary as Jesus' student.

112 *Contra* González 2010, 141.

Martha to stop doing household tasks; she is simply told that it is not the best thing to do. Listening to Jesus' teaching should trump all other concerns. Even though Luke approves the women's role as members of the Christian community, he seeks to encourage the traditional Greco-Roman role for women. The silent Mary receives approval while Martha is silenced.[113] The role of the teacher was a masculine role.[114] Luke does not invert this traditional structure when he portrays Jesus as the teacher and Mary as the student.

In sum, the women in Luke's Gospel mostly remain silent and serve the men. The appropriate behavior for women included remaining silent in public.[115] What is the relationship between Luke's ideal masculinity and the ideal of emphasized femininity that Luke seems to advocate? Luke comes closest of the Synoptic Gospels to the emphasized femininity of the ancient Greco-Roman world. Luke's changes and additions to Mark's text probably reflect anxiety that early Christianity would be accused of un-Roman activities. Luke seeks to demonstrate that Christianity is not a threat to the Roman order and that the followers of Jesus do not disturb the stability of the empire. Luke aims to present both women and men in the Christian movement as respectable.[116] Thus, of the writers of the Synoptic Gospels Luke is the most concerned with maintaining the traditional role for women. As seen in the previous chapter, Luke is also closest to the hegemonic ideals of masculinity in his depictions of Jesus and the disciples. The traditional roles for men and women go hand in hand in Luke's Gospel.

Feminine Jesus

Although the main focus of this chapter has been Jesus' encounters with women and how the ideal masculinities of the Synoptic Gospels relate to femininities in the Gospels, I conclude with a few words on the feminine imagery used to portray Jesus.

The majority of titles used of Jesus, such as the son of David or the son of man, employ masculine terminology. However, the characterization of Jesus is also influenced by the biblical wisdom tradition (Matt 11:19, 25–30; 23:34–36;

113 Gench 2004, 69; Schüssler Fiorenza 1992, 62; Spencer 1999, 135.

114 On the husband's role as a teacher of his wife, see Asikainen forthcoming.

115 De Boer 2006, 149.

116 See also D'Angelo 1990.

Luke 7:35; 10:21; 11:49–51).[117] In the Hebrew Bible, wisdom is seen as female.[118] Colleen Conway notes that although virtues were hypostasized as female in the ancient Greco-Roman world, they were also considered masculine qualities. Thus, the identification of Jesus with Wisdom "does not negate his masculine status, but rather reinforces his virtuous character."[119] Sharon Lea Mattila notes that according to Philo, Wisdom is feminine in relation to God and masculine in relation to humanity. At the same time, Wisdom continues to play a "female" role as "the mother of all things."[120] Although Wisdom is a feminine aspect, Jesus' identification with it does not make him less masculine. Rather, it shows that Jesus is on a lower level of the gender hierarchy compared to God, but as Wisdom he is above the disciples and more masculine than they are.

The clearest use of feminine imagery to characterize Jesus can be found in Matthew 23:37 and Luke 13:34–35, where Jesus compares himself with the feminine figure of the mother hen:

> Jerusalem, Jerusalem, the city that kills the prophets and stones those who are sent to it! How often have I desired to gather your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, and you were not willing!

A mother bird was a common biblical image used of God in the Hebrew Bible.[121] The Hebrew Bible also has other feminine images of God, such as God as mother or midwife.[122] Matthew and Luke join the Jewish tradition here. They did not hesitate to use feminine images of Jesus. Since both Matthew and Luke otherwise enhance the portrayal of Jesus' masculinity, they apparently did not think that these feminine images would make Jesus appear less masculine.

---

117 See also Robinson 2007, 81.

118 E.g., Prov 1–9; Sir 15:2–3; Wis 8:2, 9.

119 Conway 2008, 117, 152–156.

120 Mattila 1996, 108–109. See Philo, *Flight* 51–52: "How, pray, can Wisdom, the daughter of God, be rightly spoken of as a father? Is it because, while Wisdom's name is feminine, her nature is manly? As indeed all the virtues have women's titles, but powers and activities of consummate men." Transl. F. H. Colson.

121 E.g., Deut 32:11; Ruth 2:12; Ps 17:8; 36:8; 57:2; 61:5; 63:8; 91:4. Plutarch also uses the image of a mother hen as a sign of how even animals protect and love their offspring; Plutarch, *On Affection for Offspring* 494E–F.

122 E.g., Ps 22:9–10; 71:6; Isa 42:14; 49:15.

Conclusions

What is the ideal femininity of the Synoptic Gospels like? In Mark, women followers are examples of service for the disciples. Although the women have traditional roles of service, this is what is expected of the male disciples as well. The women that Jesus encounters use tactics that are less traditional. The women take the initiative and are praised for their actions: the Syrophoenician woman for her speech, the hemorrhaging woman for her faith, and the anointing woman for her prophetic action and service. Matthew, on the other hand, puts focus more on Jesus and enhances the portrayal of Jesus. The Canaanite woman and the hemorrhaging woman do not challenge or threaten Jesus' masculinity. Matthew's ideal femininity thus moves closer to the emphasized femininity of the ancient Greco-Roman world. This move toward emphasized femininity is even more evident with Luke, who clearly supports the emphasized femininity of the ancient Greco-Roman world. Luke leaves out the story of the Syrophoenician woman and changes the story of the anointing woman. Moreover, the women both in the Gospel and in the Acts have more restricted roles and exhibit the traditional feminine virtues of silence and submissiveness.

What is the relationship between how women and femininities are portrayed in the Synoptic Gospels and the ideal masculinity of the Synoptic Gospels? Luke's traditional female roles seem to go hand in hand with traditional male roles. As seen in the previous chapter, Luke portrays the disciples as ideal characters. Both Jesus and the disciples are close to the hegemonic ideals of masculinity. In Mark, on the other hand, nontraditional female roles are connected with nontraditional male roles. The disciples are supposed to be servants to each other, a role which the women exemplify. Jesus adopts this role of service for others as well. Still, Jesus also embodies the masculine role of benefactor in the cases of the Syrophoenician and the hemorrhaging woman. Nevertheless, the nontraditional roles that the women characters have in Mark's Gospel affect Mark's ideal masculinity by making the masculinity of Jesus and the masculinity expected of the disciples more marginal than Luke's ideal masculinity. Matthew moves the portrayal of Jesus closer to the hegemonic ideals, which also leads his ideal femininity to being closer to the ideals of ancient Greco-Roman emphasized femininity. On the other hand, Matthew recommends marginalized roles for the disciples. Women, like children and eunuchs, become examples for the disciples to imitate. Thus, although Matthew enhances the masculinity of Jesus, he also advocates a more voluntarily marginalized ideal for the disciples.

CHAPTER 6

Jesus and Emotions

Introduction

Self-control, including control over emotions, was an important facet of the ideal masculinity of the ancient Greco-Roman world. In this chapter, I study how the Synoptic Gospels portray emotions. I concentrate especially on Jesus' emotions, but I also briefly examine how the other characters are portrayed as emotional. Before that, let us begin with a short introduction on emotions in ancient Greco-Roman writings.

Emotions in Greco-Roman Antiquity

As we have seen in Chapter 2, self-control was generally thought to be a masculine characteristic in Greco-Roman antiquity. Self-control was also valued with regard to emotions. Women, believed to be unable to control themselves, were also considered to be more emotional than men. Thus, an inability to control one's emotions was effeminate for men. For example, crying and anger were considered as typically feminine.[1] In this section, I first present general theories on emotions that can be found in ancient Greco-Roman writings, especially philosophical texts. After that, I concentrate on what the ancient Greco-Roman philosophers wrote concerning grief and anger.

At the time of the writing of the Synoptic Gospels, Stoicism was the dominant philosophical movement. Therefore, I begin with the Stoic theory on emotions. The Stoics found emotions problematic because an emotional person was devoid of rationality and self-control.[2] According to the Stoic theory of emotions, there were pre-emotions (προπάθειαι), such as unbidden tears, which could happen involuntarily. Emotions, on the other hand, were intentional and under the control of the person experiencing the pre-emotion.[3] The Stoics categorized emotions into four groups depending on whether the

1 Cobb 2008, 62–64; Dover 1974, 101; Harris 2001, 264–265; 2003, 130; Wees 1998, 14–19; Williams 1999, 138.

2 E.g., *Stob*. 2.88.8–90.6; Seneca, *Ep.* 85.8. Brennan 1998, 37. On the Stoic theory of emotions, see Long & Sedley 1987, 410–419.

3 Seneca, *Ira* 1.16.7. On pre-emotions, see Knuuttila 2004; Graver 2007, 78, 89–91.

emotion was good or evil, present or expected: pleasure (ἡδονή; present good), desire (ἐπιθυμία; expected good), distress (λύπη; present evil), and fear (φόβος; expected evil).[4] These categories were then divided into subcategories. For example, anger (ὀργή) was a subcategory of desire, since anger was defined as a desire for vengeance. Envy (φθόνος), rivalry (ζῆλος), and pity (ἔλεος) were subcategories of distress. Pity, for example, was irrational since it included a possibility of injustice. Superstition (δεισιδαιμονία) was literally "the fear of divine things," so it was a subcategory of fear.[5] The Stoics argued that since the emotions could not be moderated, they had to be extirpated.[6] The wise man was without passion (ἀπαθής),[7] but this did not mean that the Stoic was completely devoid of emotions. On the contrary, the wise man would have good emotions (εὐπαθεῖαι): wish (βούλησις; expected good), joy (χαρά; present good), and caution (εὐλάβεια; expected evil).[8]

It is important to note that the Stoic theory of emotions was not the only theory in the ancient Greco-Roman world. Plutarch, for instance, criticized the Stoics and argued that the Stoic eradication of passions was neither possible nor desirable. The emotions should instead be domesticated.[9] The Peripatetics also maintained that passions should be moderated, not abolished. Aristotle argued that there were two opposing emotions, excess and deficiency of emotion, both of which were wrong. The ideal was the mean between these two emotions. When discussing anger, for example, Aristotle defined the opposing emotions as too much anger and a lack of proper anger, whereas the mean was called "gentleness" (πραότης).[10] Unlike the Stoics, Aristotle also considered some emotions, such as pity (ἔλεος) and rivalry (ζῆλος), to be good emotions.[11] The Stoics, for their part, criticized the Peripatetic ideas about the possibility of controlling and moderating passions. According to Seneca, it is "easier to exclude the harmful passions than to rule them."[12] Seneca claims that "moderate passion is nothing else than a moderate evil."[13] Cicero also argues: "the views

4 Cicero, *Tusc*. 4.11–21; Diogenes Laertius 7.111–115. For a table on Stoic emotions; see Graver 2007, 54–56.

5 E.g., *Stob*. 2.90.19–91.9.

6 Irwin 1998, 223; Nussbaum 1994, 78.

7 E.g., Diogenes Laertius 7.117.

8 Diogenes Laertius 7.116; Cicero, *Tusc.* 4.12–13. See Graver 2007, 54–56; Oksenberg Rorty 1998, 243–244; Sorabji 2000, 48.

9 George 2009, 47.

10 Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 1125b–1126b. See more on Aristotle's views on anger below.

11 Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1386b–1388b.

12 Seneca, *Ira* 1.7.1–2. Transl. John W. Basore.

13 Seneca, *Ira* 1.10.4. Transl. John W. Basore.

and utterances of the Peripatetics must be regarded as weak and effeminate (*mollis et enervata*), when they say that souls are necessarily subject to disorders, but fix a certain limit beyond which disorders should not pass. Do you I ask prescribe a limit for vice?"[14] As we can see, there were several competing views concerning emotions. The competition between these ideals could become heated. Cicero, for example, uses explicitly gendered language when he calls the Peripatetic view of emotions effeminate.

In early Jewish writings, emotions were treated in a similar manner as in the Greco-Roman texts. For instance, Philo's treatment of emotions was close to the Stoic ideas.[15] Philo argues that the passions are feminine, whereas good emotions (εὐπαθείαι) are masculine.[16] While ἀπάθεια was the ideal for Philo, he accepted that the majority of people could not achieve complete mastery of the passions. Still, Philo argued that moderation of passions (μετριοπάθεια) was possible for most.[17] For example, Moses achieved the state of ἀπάθεια, whereas Abraham conquered some emotions and moderated others.[18] Josephus also argues that Moses was in full command of his passions.[19] Another Jewish text that discusses the emotions is 4 Maccabees. In 4 Maccabees 1:3–4, the author argues that reason rules the emotions. Nevertheless, 4 Maccabees 3:2–5 maintains that the passions cannot be completely extirpated, but only mastered.

In sum, there were at least two ancient ideals about whether a man was allowed to be emotional. The Stoic philosophers maintained that all emotions (except εὐπαθείαι) should be extirpated. Cicero labeled as effeminate those who held a differing opinion. The Peripatetic school and Plutarch maintained that emotions should be moderated, but that they could not be completely eradicated. Thus, for a man it was acceptable to show emotions as long as he moderated them. One has to note also that these ideals were presented in the philosophical writings by the elite. These ideals were not necessarily universal. For example, both in ancient Greco-Roman mythology and in the Hebrew Bible, divine beings and heroes were portrayed as emotional. Nevertheless, in this chapter my intention is to see how the ideals presented in the Synoptic

14 Cicero, *Tusc*. 4.38. Transl. J. E. King. Cicero calls emotions vices in *Tusc*. 4.34.

15 On Philo and emotions, see Aune 1994, 126; George 2009, 108–109.

16 Philo, *Worse* 28: "the passions (τὰ πάθη) are by nature feminine (θήλεα), and we must practice the quitting of these for the masculine traits (τοὺς ἄρρενας) that mark the noble affections (τῶν εὐπαθειῶν)." Transl. F. H. Colson.

17 George 2009, 109–112, 125–126.

18 Moses: Philo, *Sacrifices* 9. Abraham: Philo, *Abraham* 244, 256–257. See also Aune 1994, 128–130; George 2009, 114–117.

19 Josephus, *Ant*. 4.328.

Gospels relate to the elite philosophical ideals that were competing for the hegemonic position.[20]

Grief and Tears in Greco-Roman Antiquity

In Greco-Roman antiquity, crying and lamenting were considered feminine.[21] This was already the case in the Homeric epics.[22] Nevertheless, there is also evidence for competing views. Several attitudes toward tears seem to have existed.[23] For example, in Euripides' *Helen*, Menelaus argues that tears would feminize him: "If I incline to the womanish side with my tears, I will be pitiful rather than a man of action."[24] In *Iphigenia in Aulis*, on the other hand, Agamemnon maintains that tears are shameful not because they are womanish, but because they are inappropriate for his social position.[25] The inappropriateness of tears is still connected with masculinity, even though Agamemnon does not use gendered language. Agamemnon argues that crying is acceptable for men of lower classes, whose masculinity is marginalized, but not for hegemonically masculine, elite men.

The philosophical texts present a stricter ideal for masculinity and crying. In Plato's *Phaedo*, for example, there is a strict distinction between the sexes. When Socrates is about to die, his friends cannot control their tears and start crying. Socrates chides them: "What conduct is this, you strange men! I sent the women away chiefly for this very reason that they might not behave in this absurd way; for I have heard that it is best to die in silence. Keep quiet and

20 It is also less easy to determine whether the descriptions of the characters in myths and stories are supposed to be taken as ideal. For example, the wrath of the Greek hero Achilles led to the events described in Iliad. It seems unlikely that we should consider his behavior as ideal.

21 Seneca, *Ep*. 99.17 argues that displays of pain or grief are womanish. Cf. Cicero, *Tusc*. 2.58: "What is more disgraceful for a man than womanish weeping?" (*Quid est enim fletu muliebri viro turpius?*) Cicero, *Fin*. 2.94 talks about "womanish weakness in pain"; see also Cicero, *Off*. 1.71 (*in dolore sint molliores*); Livy 25.37.10; Horace, *Epod.* 1.9–10; 10.17; 16.39; Euripides, *Andr*. 93–95; *Hel.* 991–992; *Med*. 928; *Orest*. 1022.

22 See, e.g., Homer, *Il*. 2.289–290; 16.7–11; *Od*. 8.523–530. See also Cairns 2009, 45.

23 Suter argues that ancient Greek tragedy reflects several attitudes toward tears that existed in ancient Greece. Suter 2009, 80.

24 Euripides, *Hel*. 991–992. Transl. David Kovacs.

25 Euripides, *Iph. Aul.* 446–449: "Low birth—what a good thing that is! Such people may weep without hesitation and say anything they like! But to a man of high birth all is misery. The prestige of our position controls our lives." Transl. David Kovacs. See also Suter 2009, 68.

be brave."[26] Plato thus considers crying to be incompatible with masculinity. The Roman philosophers Seneca and Cicero also ascribe mourning to women, and moderation and self-control to men. It was believed that grief and weeping make a man effeminate. Cicero maintains that "it is unmanly (*non viri esse*) to be weakened by grief, to be broken by it, or to succumb to it."[27] Seneca argues that being consumed by sorrow is womanish (*muliebre*).[28] On one hand, Plutarch agrees: "mourning is verily feminine, and weak, and ignoble, since women are more given to it than men, and barbarians more than Greeks, and inferior men more than better men."[29] On the other hand, Plutarch does not condemn moderate grief. It is extravagant grief that makes a man effeminate.[30] Nevertheless, Plutarch also notes that a man who bears misfortunes moderately should not be condemned. He criticizes Aeschines for considering lamentation to be the sign of an affectionate spirit, and he calls him "soft" (μαλακός), a word that has connotations of effeminacy.[31] Lamentation thus made a man potentially effeminate.

One has to note that women's displays of grief were also expected and accepted as ritual mourning of the dead.[32] Still, philosophers argued that women should exhibit self-control and moderation in lamenting. Seneca notes that although grief is typical of women, it should not be used as an excuse for excessive mourning.[33] Plutarch also recommended self-control and moderation in mourning in *A Consolation to his Wife*, a treatise he wrote after the death of their daughter.

The ideals expressed by some of the philosophers in their writings were not necessarily widespread or commonly accepted. Wees, for example, notes that "Plato sets higher standards of self-control than most of his

---

26 Plato, *Phaed*. 117c–d; transl. Harold North Fowler. See also *Resp*. 605d–e.

27 Cicero, *Fin*. 2.95. Transl. H. Rackham. See also *Fin*. 2.94, where Cicero notes that courage forbids "a man to show womanish weakness in pain" (*effeminari virum vetant in dolore*), and *Tusc*. 3.71, where Cicero argues that sorrow and mourning are unbefitting in a man.

28 Seneca, *Cons. ad Pol*. 6.2: "Yet what is so base and so womanish (*muliebre*) as to give oneself to be utterly consumed by sorrow?" Transl. John W. Basore. See also Seneca, *Ep*. 99.17.

29 Plutarch, *A Letter of Condolence to Apollonius* 112F–113A. Transl. Frank Cole Babbitt.

30 Plutarch, *A Letter of Condolence to Apollonius* 102C–E.

31 Plutarch, *Demosthenes* 22.1–4. Plutarch is referring to Aeschines, *Against Ctesiphon* 3.77–78, where Aeschines attacks Demosthenes after he did not mourn his daughter, saying that "the man who hates his child and is a bad father could never become a safe guide to the people." Transl. Charles Darwin Adams.

32 Just 1989, 156.

33 Seneca, *Helv*. 16.1–2.

contemporaries."[34] Even though several philosophers maintained that displays of emotions were womanish, MacMullen suggests that "most upper-class people of the empire encouraged and respected" public displays of emotion.[35] For example, *Historia Augusta* tells how Caracalla wept publicly when he saw condemned criminals pitted against wild beasts. The people were pleased by this emotional reaction.[36] However, can we be sure that these people were members of the upper class and not of the lower classes? Possibly the ideal of the common people was different and more open to emotional displays, as Agamemnon claims in *Iphigenia in Aulis*: emotional responses were acceptable for the lower classes. With crying, as well as emotions in general, there seems to have existed at least two ideals. The philosophical writings favored self-control, while there were also people who accepted public displays of emotion.

Anger in Greco-Roman Antiquity

Aristotle defined anger as the desire for revenge provoked by undeserved harm.[37] This definition was accepted by other philosophical schools as well.[38] Harris notes that the Greek words for anger always meant "intense and openly expressed" emotions.[39] Emotions were not merely inner feelings, but were manifested through behavior.[40] The lack of self-control involved with anger made it not masculine.[41] Women were considered stereotypically more irascible than men.[42]

Aristotle argued that when it comes to emotions, the ideal is the mean between two opposite vices, excess and deficiency of emotion. In respect to

34 Wees 1998, 16.

35 MacMullen 1980, 254–255.

36 Historia Augusta, *Caracalla* 1.5. Augustus and Titus wept publicly as well; see Suetonius, *Aug.* 58.2, *Tit.* 10.1. See also Barton 2001, 231.

37 Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1378a–b: "Let us then define anger as a longing, accompanied by pain, for a real or apparent revenge for a real or apparent slight, affecting a man himself or one of his friends, when such a slight is undeserved." Transl. John Henry Freese.

38 See, e.g., Seneca, *Ira* 1.3.3; Plutarch, *On the Control of Anger* 454B–C.

39 Harris 2001, 70.

40 See, e.g., Seneca, *Ira* 2.3–4.

41 Cicero, *Tusc.* 3.19: "the wise man is never angry" (*numquam igitur sapiens irascitur*). Transl. J. E. King. Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 11.18, argues that being angry "is not manly (ἀνδρικόν), but a mild (πρᾷον) and gentle (ἥμερον) disposition, as it is more human, so it is more masculine." Transl. C. R. Haines. Harris 2001, 264.

42 Seneca, *Clem.* 1.5.5: "It is womanish to rage in anger" (*muliebre est furere in ira*). Transl. John W. Basore. See also Plutarch, *On the Control of Anger* 457A–B, who claims that women are more prone to anger than men.

anger (ὀργή), the mean is called gentleness (πραότης). Excessive anger would be irascibility (ὀργιλότης) while a lack of anger would be not defending oneself (ἀοργησία).[43] Thus, it is wrong to get angry too violently, but also not violently enough.[44] Aristotle did not maintain that one should avoid anger or that one's temperament should be between irascibility and an absence of anger, but that one should be angry at the right people for the right reasons, in the right manner, at the right moment, and for the right length of time. This does not mean moderate anger, since in some cases strong anger and in other cases mild irritation are appropriate while moderate anger is inappropriate.[45] In other words, Aristotle maintains that anger is sometimes the right reaction.[46] In some cases, not responding to a slight would seem to show a lack of perception and make a person seem stupid and servile.[47] Aristotle admits that sometimes it is difficult to judge on what grounds and how long one should be angry. Occasionally people err and call excessive anger masculine and a qualification for ruling others.[48] Aristotle argues, however, that irascibility is in fact a sign of inability to control one's passions. Irascibility was seen as a sign of softness and lack of self-control, which were characteristically feminine.[49]

Aristotle and the Peripatetic tradition thus maintained that not feeling fear or anger at certain times was a vice.[50] This was in stark contrast to the Stoic tradition, which advocated an absolute prohibition of anger. The absolutist stance on anger can be found in the writings of Roman imperial writers, such as Seneca, Musonius Rufus, Marcus Aurelius, and on occasion also Plutarch.[51]

---

43 Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 1108a5–10: "In respect of anger (ὀργὴν) also we have excess, deficiency, and the observance of the mean. These states are virtually without names, but as we call a person of the middle character gentle (πρᾶον), let us name the observance of the mean Gentleness (πραότητα), while of the extremes, he that exceeds may be styled irascible (ὀργίλος) and his vice Irascibility (ὀργιλότης), and he that is deficient, spiritless (ἀόργητός), and the deficiency Spiritlessness (ἀοργησία)." Transl. H. Rackham.

44 Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 1105b25–30: "we have a bad disposition in regard to anger (τὸ ὀργισθῆναι) if we are disposed to get angry too violently or not violently enough, a good disposition if we habitually feel a moderate amount of anger; and similarly in respect of the other emotions." Transl. H. Rackham.

45 Harris 2001, 94–95.

46 Procopé 1998, 172.

47 Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 1126a. Konstan 2006, 58; Nussbaum 1994, 95–96.

48 Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 1126a–b. See also *Eth. nic.* 1109b15–20.

49 Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 1145b, 1150b.

50 Seneca refers to Theophrastus, who argued that a good man would by necessity be angered by evil. Seneca, *Ira* 1.12.3, 14.1.

51 Harris 2001, 112.

According to Seneca, for example, anger is a temporary madness, devoid of self-control.[52] Therefore, anger cannot be moderated.[53] Seneca argues that it is best to "reject at once the first incitement to anger, to resist even its small beginnings."[54] Seneca also maintains that anger is unmasculine:

> Thus anger is a most womanish and childish weakness (*Ita ira muliebre maxime ac puerile vitium est*). "But," you will say, "it is found in men also." True, for even men may have childish and womanish natures (*Nam viris quoque puerile ac muliebria ingenia sunt*).[55]

Plutarch also argues that anger is not masculine: ill temper "is not well-bred, nor manly (οὐδ᾽ ἀνδρώδης), nor possessing any quality of pride or greatness."[56] Elsewhere, however, Plutarch also notes that everyone did not share his point of view:

> For although no one has ever called a fever "health," nor consumption "excellent condition," nor gout "swiftness of foot," nor sallowness a "fresh complexion," yet many call hot temper "manliness" (θυμὸν δὲ πολλοὶ καλοῦσιν ἀνδρείαν).[57]

Nevertheless, sometimes Plutarch suggests that moderate anger is acceptable, since it can assist in courage.[58] In some texts, Plutarch joins the Stoics in ar-

---

52 Seneca, *Ira* 1.1.2.

53 For Stoic criticism of the Peripatetics, see Seneca, *Ira* 1.7.1–2; Cicero, *Tusc.* 4.43. See also Procopé 1998, 171; Nussbaum 1994, 410.

54 Seneca, *Ira* 1.8.1. Transl. John W. Basore.

55 Seneca, *Ira* 1.20.3–4.

56 Plutarch, *On the Control of Anger* 456F. See also *On the Control of Anger* 457C: "Some err in transferring anger from the women's quarters to the men's." Transl. W. C. Helmbold.

57 Plutarch, *Whether the Affections of the Soul Are Worse than Those of the Body* 501A–B. Transl. W. C. Helmbold. See also Plutarch, *On the Control of Anger* 456F: "Yet most people think its [anger's] turbulence to be activity, its blustering to be confident boldness, its obstinacy force of character; and some claim that even its cruelty is magnificence in action and its implacability firmness in resolution and its moroseness hatred of evil, but they are wrong in this." Transl. W. C. Helmbold.

58 Plutarch, *On the Control of Anger* 463B. See also Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 451D–E: "anger, if it be moderate, will assist courage (ὁ θυμὸς τῇ ἀνδρείᾳ μέτριος ὢν), and hatred of evil will aid justice, and righteous indignation will oppose those who are prosperous beyond their deserts when their souls are inflamed with folly and insolence and they need to be checked." Transl. W. C. Helmbold.

guing that anger is not masculine, but in other texts Plutarch joins Aristotle in accepting moderate anger. The different ideals concerning emotions in the ancient Greco-Roman world can also be seen in relation to how anger was viewed. Aristotle maintained that in some cases, anger was a necessary reaction, whereas the Stoics advocated its complete eradication. Aristotle and Plutarch both mention the existence of people who saw anger as a sign of masculinity. There seems to have been several different ideals competing for the hegemonic position.

The Emotions of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels

Now it is time to move on to the depiction of the emotions of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels. How do the Synoptic Gospels relate to the different views on emotions outlined above? Do they portray Jesus as emotional or self-restrained?

Mark mentions several times that Jesus was angry or indignant. Jesus is explicitly called angry in Mark 1:41 and in Mark 3:5. Matthew and Luke omit anger in both cases. Luke omits most of the mentions of Jesus' emotions, whereas Matthew forms a middle ground: he changes several references to Jesus' emotions, but does not systematically omit all of them. In this section, I mostly concentrate on the Synoptic Gospel depictions of Jesus as angry. Mark and Matthew also depict Jesus as sad in Gethsemane (Mark 14:33; Matt 26:37). Luke transfers the emotions from Jesus to the disciples (Luke 22:45). This pericope is studied in detail in Chapter 7.

In Mark 1:40–45, a leper comes to ask Jesus for healing. Jesus is said to either pity (σπλαγχνισθείς) or become angry at (ὀργισθείς) the leper (Mark 1:41).[59] The former is a more widely attested reading, but it is probably a scribal amelioration. It is more likely that the wording was changed from anger to pity than vice versa.[60] In addition, Matthew and Luke omit any mention of Jesus' emotion (cf. Matt 8:1–4; Luke 5:12–16), which is easier to explain if ὀργισθείς is the original. Matthew and Luke would probably have included σπλαγχνισθείς in their text if it was the original reading. Since anger is the more difficult reading, it is more likely to be the original.[61] The anger of Jesus also corresponds with Jesus' reaction in Mark 1:43, which NRSV translates as "sternly warning." The verb ἐμβριμάομαι means "to express indignation by an explosive expulsion of

59 ὀργισθείς can be found from the MSS D a ff^2 r^1.

60 Placher 2010, 42.

61 See also Anderson 1976, 96; Guelich 1989, 72; Marcus 2000, 206.

breath."[62] The verb refers to an outward expression of anger or aggressive style of behavior.[63] Scholars have variously suggested that Jesus' anger is directed at demonic forces,[64] at religious leaders who refused to help lepers,[65] or at "the ravages of sin, disease and death."[66] Whatever the reason for Jesus' anger, from the point of view of Mark's Gospel it is justified because Jesus is the ideal character. This does not mean, however, that Jesus' reaction would have been approved of by everyone. A Peripatetic philosopher might have accepted Mark's portrayal of Jesus' emotion as proper anger, which was appropriate for the occasion. The Stoics, on the other hand, would have found Jesus' behavior in this instance questionable. Jesus does not eradicate his emotion, which from the Stoic point of view might even make him effeminate.

Matthew omits the anger and stern warning from the story of the healing of the leper (Matt 8:3–4). Nevertheless, Matthew uses the verb ἐμβριμάομαι in a different context. After Jesus heals two blind men, Jesus warns them sternly (Matt 9:30). Jesus' emotion is not explicitly called anger, but the verb ἐμβριμάομαι suggests anger or irritation. Matthew is not against portraying Jesus as stern, or potentially even angry. Matthew nevertheless leaves out the actual word for anger, thus downplaying Mark's portrayal of Jesus. Luke, on the other hand, eliminates all mentions of Jesus' anger. In the pericope of the healing of the leper, Luke omits both any reference to Jesus' anger and the stern warning (Luke 5:13–14). Luke softens Jesus' tone of speech, since Jesus merely exhorts (παραγγέλλω) the leper. David George notes that Mark's ἐμβριμάομαι has a "much stronger emotional connotation."[67] Luke also omits Jesus' anger in Luke 6:10 and Luke 18:16.[68] When he refrains from mentioning anger, Luke thus seems to be closest to the Stoic ideal of restraining emotions.

In Mark 3:1–6, Jesus heals a man with a withered hand in the synagogue. The opponents watch Jesus to see if he will cure the man, in order to accuse Jesus. He reacts with anger and grief at his opponents' hard-heartedness (Mark 3:5): "He looked around at them with anger (μετ' ὀργῆς); he was grieved (συλλυπούμενος) at their hardness of heart." The description intensifies the conflict with the opponents. The opponents seek to destroy Jesus (Mark 3:6).

62 Marcus 2000, 206. Hugh Anderson (1976, 97) maintains that the verb means "'roaring at' or 'snorting' (like a horse)."

63 Cf. Mark 14:5; Lam 2:6; Dan 11:30. See also Lindars 1992, 542.

64 Marcus 2000, 209.

65 Anderson 1976, 97; Placher 2010, 42.

66 Lane 1975, 86.

67 George 2009, 188–189.

68 Cf. Mark 3:5; 10:14.

Matthew and Luke omit Jesus' emotions in this pericope as well (Matt 12:13; Luke 6:10). What is interesting is that Luke transfers the anger to the scribes and Pharisees: they feel a maddening rage (ἄνοια; Luke 6:11).[69] Luke nevertheless lessens the threat of violence to Jesus, and the scribes and Pharisees only discuss what they might do to Jesus.[70] The depiction of the opponents as emotional is part of Luke's portrayal of the opponents as unideal. At the same time, Luke wants to downplay the opposition that Jesus faces. Jesus' portrayal is again closer to the Stoic ideals.

In Mark 10:14, Jesus is said to be indignant (ἀγανακτέω) at his disciples when they try to prevent people from bringing children to Jesus.[71] Matthew and Luke omit both the notion of indignation at the disciples and the positive emotional gesture of affection toward the children (Matt 19:13–15; Luke 18:15–17). Even though welcoming children is important for all of the Synoptic Gospels, Matthew and Luke do not see it as worth getting angry over. Mark emphasizes the importance of the teaching by portraying Jesus as emotional. Matthew and Luke enhance the portrayal of Jesus, at least from the Stoic point of view, by presenting him as unemotional.

This move closer to the Stoic ideals is evident also in the Sermon on the Mount, where Jesus teaches that one should not be angry: "But I say to you that if you are angry[72] with a brother or sister, you will be liable to judgement; and if you insult a brother or sister, you will be liable to the council; and if you say, 'You fool', you will be liable to the hell of fire" (Matt 5:22). Jesus' followers are not to insult each other. Anger includes relatively harmless abusive language.[73] Jesus' prohibition of anger and insults shows that they provoke God's judgment as much as murder. The point of the prohibition is that anger can work on several levels of intensity, and Jesus' instruction covers them all.[74] Although

69 Fitzmyer (1981, 611) notes that "[t]he Greek noun *a-noia* actually describes a state of unthinking or thoughtlessness and often means no more than 'folly.' But Plato (*Timaeus* 86b) distinguishes two kinds of it: *mania* ('madness, fury') and *amathia* ('ignorance'). The former meaning suits the Lucan context better; it expresses the hardness of the hearts of Jesus' critics." See also George 2009, 177.

70 George 2009, 177.

71 This pericope was studied above in Chapter 4.

72 Some manuscripts add here the word εἰκῇ, "without a cause." This reading is found in manuscripts ℵ^{2} D K L W Θ 0233 f^{1} f^{13} 33 it sy co. The word is not included in manuscripts p^{64}, ℵ* B vg. Metzger has argued that it was more likely to have been added as softening the precept than omitted as unnecessary. Metzger 1994, 11. See also Betz 1995, 219; Guelich 1983, 185; Nolland 2005, 226.

73 Luz 2007, 235–236.

74 Nolland 2005, 230.

Matthew does not change Mark's narrative of Jesus' emotions as much as Luke, at least for the disciples Matthew recommends a stricter ideal of refraining from anger. The prohibition of anger in the Sermon on the Mount is compatible with the Stoic teaching.[75]

As mentioned above, Luke omits all of the Markan mentions of Jesus' emotions.[76] Luke's portrayal of Jesus is thus in line with Stoic philosophy.[77] David George argues that the removal of emotion from Jesus' characterization is related to Luke's desire to emphasize Jesus' power and authority. Jesus' lack of emotion makes him authoritative, because he is rational and self-controlled.[78] Luke's portrayal is close to the Stoic ideal and in this way complicit with one of the ideals competing for the hegemonic position. Jesus' lack of strong emotions is also a part of Luke's larger agenda of presenting Christianity as compatible with Greco-Roman values.[79]

Comparison between the Synoptic Gospels shows that Mark does not shy away from presenting Jesus as emotional. Matthew and Luke seem to have considered this portrayal problematic, and therefore they changed or omitted Jesus' emotions. Luke especially omits all mentions of Jesus' anger and other emotions, thus moving the portrayal of Jesus closer to the Stoic ideals. Mark's portrayal of Jesus as emotional differs clearly from the Stoic ideals. For Mark, strong emotions are part of the portrayal of Jesus. If Jesus' emotions are seen as examples of proper anger, this would have made Mark's Gospel potentially acceptable to Peripatetic readers. As mentioned earlier, it is possible that some people approved of the display of emotions. Thus, Mark's Gospel could have been closer to the sentiments of the these people.

The Tears of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke

Considering Luke's reticence in depicting Jesus as emotional, it is interesting that Luke is the only Synoptic Gospel to portray Jesus crying. In Luke, when Jesus approaches Jerusalem, he weeps over Jerusalem, prophesying its

75 See also Roberts 2010, 3.

76 Aside from Jesus' anger and stern rebukes mentioned above, Luke also omits Jesus' pity (Luke 9:11; cf. Mark 6:34), love (Luke 18:22; cf. Mark 10:21), embracing children (Luke 9:48; 18:17; cf. Mark 9:36; 10:16), and distress and anguish (Luke 22:40; cf. Mark 14:33–34). See also George 2009, 1–2, 168–169; Fitzmyer 1981, 95; Stein 1992, 172.

77 See also George 2009, 3, 243.

78 George 2009, 211–218, 250.

79 George 2009, 5.

destruction (Luke 19:41–44). Jesus' tears form a stark contrast to the rejoicing of the disciples, who "praise God joyfully with a loud voice for all the deeds of power that they had seen" (Luke 19:37).

> As he came near and saw the city, he wept (ἔκλαυσεν) over it, saying, "If you, even you, had only recognized on this day the things that make for peace! But now they are hidden from your eyes. Indeed, the days will come upon you, when your enemies will set up ramparts around you and surround you, and hem you in on every side. They will crush you to the ground, you and your children within you, and they will not leave within you one stone upon another; because you did not recognize the time of your visitation from God."
>
> LUKE 19:41–44

The word that Luke uses for crying is κλαίω, which refers to lamenting, crying aloud, or "any loud expression of pain or sorrow."[80] It is interesting to compare Luke's portrayal with Jesus' crying in the Gospel of John, where Jesus cries at the grave of Lazarus (John 11:35). John uses the aorist of the verb δακρύω ('to weep, to shed tears'), which can be translated as "Jesus burst into tears." The weeping of Mary and the Jews in verses John 11:31 and 11:33 is depicted by the verb κλαίω. It is possible that this distinction is intended to contrast Jesus' quiet shedding of tears with the loud grief of Mary and the Jews.[81] The verb that Luke uses for crying is stronger than John's, as it includes screaming and moaning.[82] Jesus is not concerned about himself, that is, his upcoming suffering and death, but instead laments the fate of the city.[83] Joseph Fitzmyer argues that the point of the pericope lies in Jesus' pronouncement, not in his weeping.[84] Nevertheless, it is interesting that Luke, who otherwise is so quiet about the emotions of Jesus, suddenly portrays him as emotional. George suggests that Luke shows Jesus' emotion in order to emphasize the importance of the teaching on the coming destruction of Jerusalem.[85]

As mentioned above, lamenting was a feminine activity and to some extent approved for women, although several philosophers argued for moderation in lamenting for women as well. Weeping and lamenting women can be found in

80 Liddell & Scott *s.v.*

81 Voorwinde 2011, 180.

82 For the differences between δακρύω and κλαίω, see also Schmidt 1967, 471–476.

83 Fitzmyer 1985, 1256.

84 Fitzmyer 1985, 1254.

85 George 2009, 239–240.

Luke's passion narrative. When Jesus is taken to be crucified, the women cry (κλαίω) for him (Luke 23:27–31). The women thus form a parallel to Jesus' crying. Jesus suggests that they should not lament his ruin, but their own. Again the lamentation is connected with the future destruction of Jerusalem.

Jesus' lamentation suggests that he is adopting a feminine role. Jesus' crying would not be seen as masculine from the point of view of the hegemonic masculinities. Nevertheless, from the point of view of early Christian marginal masculinity, lamenting can be seen as part of Jesus' prophetic role. It is possible to interpret the crying as a prophetic, symbolic action.[86] Jesus' crying would thus resemble the crying of Jeremiah in Jeremiah 9:1 and Jeremiah 14:17.[87] Like Jeremiah, Jesus weeps in lamentation for Jerusalem's doom. For prophets, breaking with the expected norms may have been more acceptable than for other people. Thus, in this instance Jesus' lamenting may not make him less masculine, even though it remains problematic from the point of view of the Stoic ideal of self-control.

The Incident at the Temple

Next I study the incident at the temple where Jesus drives the sellers of the sacrificial animals out of the temple (Mark 11:15–18; Matt 21:12–16; Luke 19:45–46). There is no explicit mention of emotions in the Synoptic accounts of the incident, but Jesus' behavior can still be seen as emotional. The incident at the temple is found in all four of the canonical Gospels. In the Synoptic Gospels, the incident is situated at the end of Jesus' ministry. Mark's account is the longest and most detailed, whereas Matthew and Luke shorten the pericope; Luke's account is the shortest.[88] In Matthew and Luke, the emphasis falls more on the quotations from the Hebrew Bible than on Jesus' behavior.[89] Jesus quotes Isaiah 56:7, "my house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples," and he lifts the expression "den of robbers" from Jeremiah 7:11. Jesus' rationale

86 Fitzmyer 1985, 1256; Green 1997, 689.

87 Jer 9:1: "O that my head were a spring of water, and my eyes a fountain of tears, so that I might weep day and night for the slain of my poor people!" Jer 14:17: "You shall say to them this word: Let my eyes run down with tears night and day, and let them not cease, for the virgin daughter—my people—is struck down with a crushing blow, with a very grievous wound."

88 In John, the incident at the temple is situated at the beginning of Jesus' public ministry (John 2:13–22). John's account is longer than those in the Synoptic Gospels. In addition, John includes the detail of the whip of cords, which is not found in the Synoptic Gospels.

89 Gundry 1994, 412; Voorwinde 2011, 141.

for his action also gets more attention in Matthew and Luke, with the quotations functioning as an explanation of why Jesus had to act this way. Jesus' action is justified since it shows his loyalty to God.

None of the Synoptic Gospel accounts explicitly mention Jesus being angry or having any emotion, unlike John, where the disciples note Jesus' zeal, ζῆλος (John 2:17). The only explicit mention of emotions in the Synoptic Gospels is in the Gospel of Matthew, where the chief priests are angry at the noisy children and blame Jesus for not silencing them (Matt 21:15). Their anger, unlike Jesus' possible emotion, is clearly wrong. This means that for Matthew, being emotional is not necessarily wrong, as long as the object of or the reason for the emotion is acceptable. Even though no specific emotion is mentioned, several commentators nevertheless see Jesus' behavior as angry or violent. The incident has been dubbed Jesus' "temple tantrum."[90] Erin Roberts, on the contrary, argues that since Jesus is not explicitly called emotional, the episode should not be seen as an expression of anger.[91]

However, several aspects in the Markan and Matthean narratives can be interpreted as expressions of violence. Since the ancient Greco-Roman writers saw anger as manifested through action, the actions of Jesus would probably have been interpreted by readers as a sign of emotion. Jesus' emotions are shown through his actions. In Mark and Matthew, Jesus drives out sellers and buyers, and he overturns the money-changers' tables and the seats of the dove-sellers. In Mark, Jesus also prohibits carrying vessels through the temple area. Luke leaves out most of these details and mentions only the driving out of the sellers. Thus, Luke's Gospel again shows Jesus as less emotional. The following table shows the differences and similarities in the details of the incident:[92]

	Mark	**Matthew**	**Luke**
Sellers driven out	+	+	+
Buyers driven out	+	+	–
Money-changers' tables overturned	+	+	–
Seats of dove-sellers overturned	+	+	–
Prohibition on carrying vessels	+	–	–

90 Stowers 2010, 70.

91 Roberts 2010, 20–23.

92 For a similar table, see Wahlen 2007, 249.

In Mark, Jesus had visited the temple already the previous day: "Then he entered Jerusalem and went into the temple; and when he had looked around at everything, as it was already late, he went out to Bethany with the twelve" (Mark 11:11). Jesus' act is not spontaneous, but premeditated.[93] Matthew and Luke change this detail by placing the act on the day that Jesus enters Jerusalem, but their reason for the change is most likely just to shorten the account, not because they want to portray Jesus as more unrestrained than how he is in Mark.

Richard Horsley notes that in Mark, Jesus' action is a "forcible prophetic demonstration of God's condemnation."[94] All of the Synoptic Gospel narratives frame Jesus' action as an exorcism: Jesus "drives out" (ἐκβάλλω) the sellers and buyers. The use of this expression highlights Jesus' authority and power. Jesus exercises his control over others. This might make Jesus masculine from the point of view of the self-assertive ideal of masculinity, but it is unlikely that this act would make Jesus appear self-controlled. In Mark, Jesus "began to drive out" (ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν) the sellers and buyers. Possibly this means that Jesus just began and did not finish the act. However, Mark often uses the verb "begin" in an auxiliary sense.[95] Matthew further eliminates the possibility of this interpretation by removing the verb "began" and adding "all" before the sellers and buyers. In this way, Matthew has sharpened Jesus' action. Matthew's intention is not necessarily to make Jesus more violent, but rather to emphasize how Jesus' act is successful, eliminating the possibility that Jesus failed. Matthew also follows the incident with Jesus healing people, again highlighting that Jesus is successful in his mission (Matt 21:14). The aftermath of the incident, the healing of the blind and the lame, the celebrating children, and the opposition of the chief priests and scribes seem more important for Matthew than Jesus' act itself (Matt 21:14–16). In Mark, Jesus leaves the temple immediately after the incident (Mark 11:19). However, it is noteworthy that Matthew does not play down Jesus' actions. The only detail that he omits from Mark is the prohibition of carrying vessels. Matthew also sharpens Jesus' speech. Matthew turns Mark's question (Mark 11:17) into an accusatory declaration (Matt 21:13). Whereas in Mark, Jesus asks "Is it not written, 'My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations'? But you have made it a den of robbers," in Matthew Jesus says "It is written, 'My house shall be called a house of prayer'; but you are making it a den of robbers." This accusatory tone makes the conflict in the scene more pronounced.

93 See also Merenlahti 2002, 74.

94 Horsley 2005, 73. See also Carter 2006, 69.

95 Cf. Mark 6:7; 10:28.

Jesus overturns the tables of the money-changers in Mark and Matthew. Marc Huys explains this seemingly superfluous gesture by noting the symbolic and ritual dimensions of overturning a table in ancient Greco-Roman texts.[96] In several texts, the social and rational world of men is overturned by an irrational creature, whether it is an animal, irrational woman, or a fool.[97] Overturning a table symbolizes the contrast between "the irrational world of passions" and "the world of rational control and established order."[98] In mythological stories, the act is a demonstration of "indignation or cosmic fury" in order to reject or condemn perverted practices.[99] Huys argues that Jesus' violent action "can only be explained as a manifestation of an anger or indignation of divine origin."[100]

In sum, in the ancient Greco-Roman writings turning over a table is an irrational act or an expression of indignation or fury. Based on these examples, ancient readers would probably have interpreted Jesus' action as a sign of some emotion, or at least they would have perceived Jesus as not exhibiting self-control. Turning over a table is a forcible action. The other actions in Mark and Matthew are similarly forcible, and they could potentially be interpreted as displays of emotion or a lack of self-control. There is no need to explicate the emotion that Jesus is showing. The point is that ancient readers would have understood Jesus to be emotional, based on his behavior. Seneca, for example, provides an interesting parallel for Jesus overturning the tables in his description of angry behavior: "What is to be gained by overturning the table, by hurling cups upon the floor, by dashing oneself against pillars, tearing the hair, and smiting the thigh and the breast?"[101] Seneca thus sees turning over tables as a sign of anger. Anger was not merely a feeling but manifested through behavior. Violence did not necessarily equal anger, but forceful or violent acts could be interpreted as a sign of anger. It is clear that Seneca would not consider Jesus' behavior to be masculine. Nevertheless, as we have seen, there were different ideals for masculine behavior. Plutarch mentions people who maintained that angry behavior was masculine. They might have considered Jesus' behavior to be masculine. In any case, Mark's and Matthew's accounts of the temple incident are not in accordance with the Stoic ideal behavior for men.

---

96 Huys 2010, 139.

97 Huys (2010, 146–147) refers to Lucian, *Gall.* 12; Pseudo-Lucian, *Lucius or The Ass* 40.6; Demosthenes, *On the Embassy* 19.198; Lucian, *Dial. meretr.* 15.1.

98 Huys 2010, 147.

99 Huys 2010, 151–152. E.g., Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 1601; Pausanias, *Descr*. 8.2.4–6.

100 Huys 2010, 151–154, quotation from p. 153.

101 Seneca, *Ira* 1.19.4. Transl. John W. Basore.

Luke's account of the temple episode is much more abbreviated. Luke omits details of violence. These changes indicate that Luke at least seems to have seen Jesus' behavior as problematic. Howard Marshall suspects that Luke may have "played down the details of the action in order to avoid any suspicion that Jesus was a man of violence."[102] Driving out the sellers is the only detail that Luke keeps from Mark's depiction of the incident at the temple. Luke softens the portrayal of Jesus, but the act is still a sign of Jesus' authority. The main focus of the incident becomes Jesus' subsequent teaching in the temple. Luke also uses a participial construction when telling that Jesus "began to drive out those who were selling things there *by saying* (λέγων) to them" (Luke 19:45–46). James Dawsey notes that "[i]n Luke, Jesus drives out the sellers by proclaiming."[103] This change also plays down the violent elements of Mark's narrative. Luke thus moves the Markan narrative closer to the Stoic ideals of self-control and unemotional behavior.

In sum, Mark provides the longest account with several details that can be interpreted as emotional or lacking in self-control. As seen above, Jesus is portrayed as emotional and even angry earlier in Mark's Gospel, which makes it more plausible that Jesus is portrayed as emotional in this pericope as well. Matthew shortens the account slightly and moves the emphasis to Jesus' teaching after the incident, but he does not play down the violent elements of the act. Matthew omits emotions elsewhere in the Gospel, so Jesus' behavior may be interpreted here as a forcible action but not necessarily emotional. Nevertheless, the contrast between Jesus' earlier behavior and the incident at the temple is greater in Matthew's Gospel, which highlights the importance of the episode. Luke, on the other hand, clearly plays down the violent elements of Mark's account of the act. Luke omits mentions of Jesus' emotions elsewhere in the Gospel as well. Here again Luke moves Jesus closer to the Stoic ideal.

As we have seen, several ancient writers, including Plutarch and Seneca, voiced their opinion that anger was not masculine.[104] Nevertheless, Plutarch does acknowledge that there were "some" who supported the idea that anger is masculine. Conway maintains that these different ideals show that the ancient ideal of hegemonic masculinity was internally contradictory. She then uses this conclusion to explain that Jesus' anger could have been seen as masculine from the point of view of the hegemonic masculinity.[105] For Conway, the

102 Marshall 1978, 721.

103 Dawsey 1984, 155.

104 Seneca, *Ira* 1.20.3.

105 Conway 2008, 147.

different attitudes to aggression, which were in tension with each other, were all part of the hegemonic masculinity. One can ask, however, if the hegemonic masculinity was so variegated and contradictory, can it really be called one ideal? It would seem more likely that the contradictions were different ideals of masculinity competing for the hegemonic position, as I argued in Chapter 1. Moreover, neither Plutarch nor any other writer seems to agree that these men were masculine. If the opinion that anger was masculine was held by non-elite people, their ideal would not have been considered part of the hegemonic masculinities. In other words, I do not find Conway's argument persuasive. At least from the point of view of the Stoic philosophical ideal that was competing for the hegemonic position, Jesus' actions were not masculine.

Since control over emotions was an important ideal for masculinity, the philosophers argued that gods did not get angry. Cicero, for example, claims that "God is never angry."[106] This lack of emotions was one sign of the gods' highest position in the gender hierarchy. Against this background, the biblical portrait of God as angry and jealous was problematic for ancient Jewish writers. For example, Josephus omits the Golden Calf incident in his retelling of the Bible, probably because the anger and violence of God would have been embarrassing.[107] Philo argues that God did not have passions. He explains that God is portrayed as angry in the Torah because that is "the only way in which the fool can be admonished."[108] The texts were interpreted as expressing God's just indignation.

The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides, on the other hand, suggests that anger should not be eradicated but tempered, since even God has justifiable anger.[109] Early Christian theologians like Basil and Lactantius also defended the anger of God as justified, since it was directed against evil and sin.[110] Conway argues that Jesus' demonstration of anger in the temple would likely have been viewed in a similar way. Jesus manifests "the appropriately righteous anger of a virtuous man."[111] However, the early Christian theologians who defended God's anger were apologists. The reason why they defended God's anger was because they needed to reconcile the biblical portrait of God with the ideals of the

106 Cicero, *Off.* 3.102. Transl. Walter Miller.

107 George 2009, 155.

108 Philo, *Unchangeable* 60–68. Transl. F. H. Colson. See also Philo, *Cherubim* 86.

109 Pseudo-Phocylides 100–101.

110 Basil, *Against Those Prone to Anger*; Lactantius, *The Wrath of God*. Origen also argues that the wrath of God is not passion but discipline by stern means; *Cels.* 4.72. See also Conway 2008, 147.

111 Conway 2008, 147. Stowers also argues that Jesus' act could be seen as an example of just indignation. Stowers 2010, 72.

ancient Greco-Roman world. It is not certain that their arguments would have been widely accepted by non-Christians.

It is evident that the Synoptic Gospels sought to portray Jesus' behavior as righteous and ideal. If Jesus was emotional, his emotion must have been justified. Jesus' emotional behavior in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew can thus be seen as part of his prophetic mission, as a symbolic act of God's righteous anger.[112] In the Hebrew Bible and in Greco-Roman myths, gods were portrayed as emotional and angry. It is possible that anger was only considered unsuitable for gods in the elite philosophical writings. In any case, the Stoic philosophers would not have accepted the interpretation that Jesus' emotional behavior in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew was justified. Thus, Jesus' behavior would not have been considered masculine from the point of view of the self-controlled ideal of masculinity. Luke tones down the emotional elements of Mark's narrative. His changes bring it more in line with the Stoic ideals, thereby making it easier for Stoic readers to accept his portrayal of Jesus. Again Luke seems to be the closest to the hegemonic ideal of self-control and the Stoic theory of emotions.

The Emotions of the Other Characters

I end this chapter by briefly studying the emotions of the other characters in the Synoptic Gospels. Is the depiction of the emotions of the other characters different from the portrayal of Jesus' emotions? In all of the Synoptic Gospels, the other characters, both the disciples and the opponents, are occasionally depicted as emotional. This is true for Luke's Gospel as well. George notes that Luke does not eliminate every mention of emotion from the Gospel, only the emotions exhibited by Jesus.[113] In several cases, Luke merely retains Mark's depiction of the emotions that the other characters exhibit.[114] There are also cases where Luke transfers the emotion from Jesus to other people.[115] The fact that Luke mentions emotions in connection with the other characters makes

112 Theissen (2002, 235) notes that "[i]n carrying out their symbolic actions, Israel's prophets likewise behaved in ways that would otherwise be judged reprehensible." Theissen mentions Hosea, who married an adulteress.

113 George 2009, 171–173, 252.

114 George 2009, 257. For example, Luke retains the emotions in the Jairus account, transfiguration, passion prediction, and the story of the rich man. See George 2009, 268–279.

115 George 2009, 256. For example, in Gethsemane Luke transfers Jesus' grief to the disciples and in the story of the healing of the man with a withered hand, he transfers the emotion to the scribes and the Pharisees. See George 2009, 266–267.

it even more remarkable that he removes all mentions of Jesus' emotions. The depiction of the other characters as emotional highlights the Stoic impassivity of Jesus.

As mentioned in Chapter 4, the disciples often manifest negative characteristics in the Synoptic Gospels. This is especially the case with Mark, and to some extent with Matthew as well. The disciples' emotional reactions form a contrast to Jesus' decisive attitude to his death (Mark 14:19; Matt 17:23). Jesus' miracles cause fear in the disciples (Mark 4:41; Matt 14:26). In both Mark and Matthew, the other disciples react with anger, when they hear that John and James have requested seats of honor from Jesus (Mark 10:41; Matt 20:24). They are not angry because they reject ambition. Rather, they are angry because they share the same concern for status as John and James. The disciples are angry at John and James for trying to steal the honorable places for themselves.[116] Since Jesus condemns it, the anger of the disciples is clearly not justified anger. The emotions of the disciples show that they are on a lower level of the gender hierarchy than Jesus. Luke's depiction of the disciples is more positive in this regard as well, as is his portrayal of the disciples in general.

The opponents of Jesus are portrayed as angry on several occasions. In Luke, the opponents are filled with fury (Luke 6:11) and indignant at Jesus for healing the bent woman (Luke 13:14). The chief priests become angry at the children in the temple (Matt 21:15). King Herod is excessively angry when he finds out that he was tricked by the magi (Matt 2:16). The people of Nazareth become furious at Jesus' teaching (Luke 4:28). The Jewish leaders are envious (φθόνος) of Jesus (Mark 15:10; Matt 27:18), another negative emotion mentioned by the Stoics. The negative emotions that the opponents have toward Jesus are a sign of their lack of self-control. George notes that Jesus is the true authority figure, while Jesus' opponents do not have the "emotional disposition necessary for true leadership," as is evident in their emotional reactions.[117] Their lack of authority and self-control also translates into a lack of masculinity.

The anger and other negative emotions of the opponents and the disciples are clearly not righteous or justified. This means that in Mark and Matthew, anger is not a negative emotion as such. What is important is the object of the anger. The opponents are angry at the wrong target, Jesus. This is why their anger is inappropriate. Jesus' anger, on the other hand, is directed at the right target from the point of view of Mark and Matthew. Their ideal thus seems closer to Aristotle's idea of proper anger than the Stoic idea of restraining emotions. For Luke, on the other hand, since he does not depict Jesus as angry or

116 France 2007, 759.

117 George 2009, 285.

emotional, the fact that the opponents are angry also highlights their lack of masculine self-restraint.

Conclusions

In sum, Mark is the Synoptic Gospel that portrays Jesus as emotional the most often. Luke, on the other hand, is clearly closest to the Stoic ideal of self-control and control over emotions. He omits all of Mark's mentions of Jesus' emotions. Matthew also tones down Mark's portrayal of Jesus' emotions, but does not systematically omit every reference. In Mark, and to a certain extent in Matthew, the ideal masculinity includes righteous anger. Their idea comes closer to Aristotle's view of proper anger. Luke's portrayal of self-controlled Jesus is closer to Stoic standards, which might make the description more attractive to elite readers. This is in accordance with the apologetic intent of Luke's Gospel perceived elsewhere in Luke's narrative. Luke is again complicit with the self-controlled ideal of masculinity that was competing for the hegemonic position in the ancient Greco-Roman world.

From the point of view of the Synoptic Gospels, whatever emotions Jesus has, they are justified. Jesus' tears in Luke and his emotional behavior in the temple can be seen in light of his prophetic mission. Exceptional behavior might be more acceptable to a prophet than to other people. Jesus' emotions would have caught the attention of the readers and emphasized the importance of the events he was predicting. The intended audience was supposed to regard Jesus' emotions, such as those shown in the incident at the temple, as examples of righteous anger. Whether the real audience agreed depends on which of the competing ideals existing in the ancient Greco-Roman world they held. Mark's and Matthew's accounts could have been approved by Peripatetics, since Aristotle argued that a good man is angry at the right time for the right object. Stoics, however, would likely have not approved of Jesus' emotions. From the point of view of the Stoic ideal masculinity, Jesus' inability to control his emotions would not have been seen as masculine.

CHAPTER 7

Jesus and Suffering

Introduction

> What death is more shameful than to be crucified? What death worse than this condemnation is conceivable? Even now he remains a reproach among all who have not yet received faith in him.[1]
>
> But if he was really so great he ought, in order to display his divinity, to have disappeared suddenly from the cross.[2]

As can be seen from the first quotation above, Jesus' crucifixion and death posed a problem for the early Christian writers. For Celsus, on the other hand, it was a reason to have contempt for Christians. Jesus' death was also problematic for his masculinity, since the crucifixion and his manner of dying were potentially shameful. In all three of the Synoptic Gospels, the trial and crucifixion are "the ultimate public settings for the shaming of Jesus."[3] Throughout the passion narratives, Jesus is the object of humiliating practices. Jesus is arrested, bound, scourged, and crucified. As Celsus' example shows, for outsiders presenting a crucified man as the ideal was nonsense or crazy.[4] In this chapter, I study Jesus' passion predictions and the passion narratives, from the Gethsemane account to the crucifixion and the death of Jesus. The Gospels of Mark and Matthew present Jesus as abandoned by his followers and dying alone, whereas Luke's passion narrative is less negative in its presentation of Jesus. In Mark and Matthew, mocking and failure dominate the passion narrative, while forgiveness and clemency are central in Luke's account.[5] I begin by briefly studying what the ancient Greco-Roman philosophers wrote about death and suffering. This discussion was closely connected with the ideals of masculinity.

1 Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 10.8, in Oden & Hall (ed.) 1998, 218.

2 Origen, *Cels.* 2.68. Transl. Henry Chadwick.

3 Rhoads, Dewey & Michie 1999, 71.

4 Cf. 1 Cor 1:23.

5 See also Brown 1994a, 26–30.

Death and Suffering in the Ancient Greco-Roman World

Especially for the Stoic philosophers, enduring pain and death were important signs of masculinity. Cicero argues: "man's peculiar virtue is fortitude, of which there are two main functions, namely scorn of death and scorn of pain. These then we must exercise if we wish to prove possessors of virtue, or rather, since the word for 'virtue' (*virtus*) is borrowed from the word for 'man' (*vir*), if we wish to be men."[6]

The proper attitude to death and the right way of dying were commonly discussed in ancient Greco-Roman philosophical treatises.[7] Philosophers maintained that wise men were not afraid of death.[8] A noble, fearless death was a way of showing masculinity. Its most important characteristic was manliness (ἀνδρεία), but a noble death was not limited to men. As mentioned in Chapter 2, women could also display ἀνδρεία and become masculine. For women, however, a noble death was a sign of their exceptional character.[9] The deaths of Socrates and Seneca were commonly invoked as examples of the noble death.[10] Other examples included Zeno and Anaxarchus, who died while resisting tyrants.[11] The tradition of the noble death can also be found in the Jewish martyrdom stories, especially in 2 and 4 Maccabees.[12]

The ideal of a noble death was related to the idea of how a man was supposed to behave when in pain or being tortured. Complaining about pain was considered feminine. Cicero argues that courage (*fortitudo*) forbids "a man to show womanish weakness in pain."[13] The ideal was to endure hardships

---

6 Cicero, *Tusc*. 2.43: "*viri autem propria maxime est fortitudo, cuius munera duo sunt maxima mortis dolorisque contemptio. Utendum est igitur his, si virtutis compotes vel potius si viri volumus esse, quoniam a viris virtus nomen est mutuata*." Transl. J. E. King. See also Cicero, *Tusc*. 2.50–51; Seneca, *Ep*. 24.14.

7 On the tradition of the noble death in the ancient Greco-Roman world, see Droge & Tabor 1992; Seeley 1990; Henten & Avemarie 2002.

8 See, e.g., Plato, *Phaed.* 67e; Cicero, *Tusc*. 2.2; Epicurus to Menoeceus; Epictetus, *Diatr*. 1.1.23–25; Ammianus Marcellinus 14.9.6.

9 See, e.g., Josephus, *Ant*. 15.235–236, where Mariamme's noble lineage can be seen in her calm death. See also Conway 2008, 71–72.

10 Plato, *Phaed.* 117d–e; Cicero, *Tusc*. 1.102; Seneca, *Ep*. 24.4–8; Plutarch, *On Tranquility of Mind* 475E; Epictetus, *Diatr*. 1.29.18; 2.2.15; 3.23.21; *Ench*. 53.4; Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.53; 15.60–64.

11 See, e.g., Diogenes Laertius 9.27; 9.59; Plutarch, *Reply to Colotes* 1126D; Philo, *Worse* 176; *Good Person* 106–109. See also Sterling 2001, 385–389.

12 E.g., 2 Macc 6–7; 4 Macc 5–7. See also Sterling 2001, 391–392.

13 Cicero, *Fin*. 2.94: "*effeminari virum vetant in dolore*." Transl. H. Rackham.

without complaining or giving in.[14] This showed masculine steadfastness and the self-control of a man. Torture is a common part of the accounts of philosophers and martyrs dying at the hands of tyrants. Tortured heroes do not cry out in pain. This can be seen, for instance, in 4 Maccabees, where Eleazar and the seven boys condemn the tyrant Antiochus and pray to God while they are being tortured.[15] However, as was noted already in Chapter 2, there also existed a competing, self-assertive ideal that a man should revenge wrongs that happen to him. For example, in Plato's *Gorgias* Callicles argues that "endurance of wrong done is not a man's part at all, but a poor slave's."[16] Brent Shaw notes that the equation of nobility and passive endurance was seen as womanish by the dominant culture.[17] In ancient Greco-Roman writings, evidence can be found for both self-controlled and self-assertive ideals of masculinity concerning how a man was to behave regarding suffering and death. Compared with these ancient Greco-Roman ideals, how do the Synoptic Gospels present Jesus' suffering and death?

Jesus' Teaching on Suffering

In the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus predicts his suffering and death on three occasions.[18] The contents of the predictions are similar. Jesus will suffer and die, but also be resurrected on the third day. None of the passion predictions tell how Jesus is going to behave in the course of his abuse and death. The predictions list what is going to happen to him: physical and verbal abuse and death. It is thus difficult to ascertain whether Jesus' behavior is going to be masculine or not, but it seems that Jesus will endure abuse and death, not fight

14 See, e.g., Seneca, *Ep.* 78.15–19. This ideal can be found in the Jewish writings as well. In *Mart. Isa.* 5.14 it is said: "while Isaiah was being sawed in half, he did not cry out, or weep, but his mouth spoke with the Holy Spirit until he was sawed in two." Transl. M. A. Knibb.

15 4 Macc 5:16–38; 6:17–29; 9:15–12:19. For the manner in which martyrs were supposed to face death, see also 2 Macc 6–7; Acts 6:8–7:60; *Mart. Pol.* 5.

16 Plato, *Gorg.* 483a–b. Transl. W. R. M. Lamb. Hobbs 2000, 138–140. The philosophical tradition of endurance and noble death is made fun of in the ancient novels. In Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* 4.3, self-control is out of place when an innocent man remains silent during crucifixion. In Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* 5.23, the main character Clitophon gets tired of "philosophizing" (suffering in silence) when being beaten. This is a satirical presentation of the philosophical ideal of stoically bearing a beating.

17 Shaw 1996, 279.

18 Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:33–34; Matt 16:21; 17:22–23; 20:18–19; Luke 9:22, 44; 18:31–33. Matthew adds another short passion prediction in Matthew 26:1–2.

against it. In Mark, the teaching is always followed by the disciples not understanding Jesus, which gives Jesus the occasion to offer further teaching on the nature of discipleship. This structure is less evident in Matthew and Luke. Only the first passion prediction is followed by Jesus teaching on how the disciples should view suffering.[19] This is why I focus here on the first passion prediction and the subsequent teaching on suffering. The disciples are called to endure suffering as an inevitable part of discipleship.

In all three Synoptic Gospels, the first passion prediction follows Peter's confession of Jesus as the Messiah. As mentioned in Chapter 4, Peter's conception of messiahship seems to be flawed. The Messiah confession is followed by a teaching that is a redefinition of messiahship: Jesus is the Messiah, but not the kind of Messiah the disciples expect. The three passion predictions aim to counter the disciples' view of the Messiah as a strong and powerful military leader, that is, their self-assertive ideal of masculinity. Instead, Jesus presents the figure of the suffering Messiah. In all of the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus' death is a divinely decreed necessity. He must (δεῖ) die (Mark 8:31; Matt 16:21; Luke 9:22). Later, the Gospel accounts show Jesus following his own teaching when he does not try to escape from death. Jesus' acceptance of his suffering and death makes him an exemplary figure. The disciples' behavior after the passion predictions contrasts them with Jesus' decisive attitude regarding his death. For example, after the first passion prediction, Peter rebukes Jesus in Mark and Matthew. Matthew adds that the disciples were sad after the second prediction (Matt 17:23). Although Jesus' assertion of his suffering is incompatible with the self-assertive ideal of masculinity, his teaching is in line with the self-controlled ideal of the noble, masculine death.

This redefinition of messiahship is followed by a redefinition of discipleship. Jesus' followers should accept the necessity of suffering: "If any want to become my followers, let them deny themselves and take up their cross and follow me" (Mark 8:34; Matt 16:24; Luke 9:23). The followers of Jesus should deny their own interests and concern for their well-being. Remaining loyal to Jesus should surpass all other concerns. The outcome of taking up their cross may mean the loss of their lives.[20]

Jesus teaches the acceptance and endurance of suffering. Jesus' passion predictions are thus compatible with the rhetoric of the noble death tradition.

---

19 The misunderstandings after the second and third predictions (that is, the question of who is the greatest and the request of John and James) were studied earlier in Chapter 4.

20 It is possible that Mark and Matthew literally mean cross-bearing and martyrdom. Luke, on the other hand, softens the expression. In Luke, "taking up the cross" is transformed from literal martyrdom into a metaphor by the addition of the word "daily" (καθ' ἡμέραν).

This would make his death masculine from the point of view of the self-controlled ideal of masculinity. However, in Mark, Jesus notes another possibility: someone might consider his death shameful (Mark 8:38): "Those who are ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of them the son of man will also be ashamed when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." Accordingly, it is not self-evident that Jesus' death would be regarded as a noble, masculine death. Death by crucifixion was normally considered shameful. Jesus combats this view by maintaining that it is in fact those who are ashamed of his death that will later be shamed themselves. They are also part of the adulterous and sinful generation. As seen earlier, adultery was regarded as effeminate in the ancient Greco-Roman world.[21] Thus, whoever is ashamed of Jesus is not masculine in the right way. Those who are masculine in the right way should expect a negative judgment from the surrounding culture. Mark thus offers a redefinition of what is masculine and recommends a voluntarily marginal position for the disciples. Matthew and Luke tone down the teaching, but this has less to do with their depiction of the disciples' masculinity than a wish to enhance the portrayal of Jesus and preserve his masculinity. This is especially the case with Matthew, who omits any mention of the shamefulness of Jesus' death.

Jesus also instructs his disciples on how the disciples should behave when they face persecution and potential martyrdom (Matt 5:11–12; 10:16–42; 24:9; Mark 13:9–13; Luke 21:12–19). The disciples are going to be handed over to councils, flogged in synagogues, and dragged before governors and kings. All three Synoptic Gospels mention that those who endure (ὑπομένω) this will be saved (Matt 10:22; 24:13; Mark 13:13; Luke 21:19). The disciples should not resist suffering, but endure it with patience. The Synoptic Gospels are thus closer to the Stoic philosophical ideal of endurance than the self-assertive ideal that a man should revenge the wrongs he suffers.

Jesus in Gethsemane

Let us examine next the passion narratives, starting with the Gethsemane accounts. How does Jesus' behavior in the passion narratives relate to the competing hegemonic ideals of masculine behavior? I study the Gethsemane accounts of each Synoptic Gospel separately.

21 See above Chapter 3. See also Conway 2008, 97.

Mark 14:32–42

Jesus has prophesied his death previously in Mark's Gospel, but in Gethsemane Jesus' resolve seems to crumble.[22] The emotions that Jesus expresses in Gethsemane are not in accordance with either the self-assertive or the self-controlled ideals of masculine behavior. Mark uses strong and emotional language to describe Jesus (Mark 14:33). The narrator portrays Jesus as "being distressed and agitated" (ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν) and Jesus himself tells his disciples he is "deeply grieved" (περίλυπος). Ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, "to be overwhelmed," describes great emotional turmoil. This is the only time in the Gospel that this verb is used to describe Jesus. It is used elsewhere to portray the amazement of the crowds and the disciples when they witness Jesus' miracles or teaching (Mark 1:27; 9:15; 10:24). Here the meaning of the verb is closer to distress or anguish.[23] Ἀδημονεῖν, "be in anxiety, be distressed, troubled," also refers to great anguish.[24] The two verbs express very strong emotions.

Jesus' posture also highlights his emotional state. He falls on the ground (Mark 14:35). The past tenses of falling (ἔπιπτεν), saying (ἔλεγεν), and praying (προσηύχετο) can mean either repeated action or duration.[25] In either case, the verbs highlight the magnitude of Jesus' distress. These excessive emotions also feminize Jesus.[26] Jesus' emotion and his behavior are in contrast with his previous demeanor in the passion predictions. As we have seen, Jesus' emotional behavior is also in contrast with the calm manner in which martyrs were expected to face death.

Mark notes that Jesus "began to" be distressed (Mark 14:33). From the Stoic perspective, it is possible that Jesus only began to feel pre-emotion, the initial involuntary reaction, but did not allow it to develop into full emotion.[27] However, Mark often uses the construction "began to" in an auxiliary sense.[28] Moreover, Jesus' own words make clear that he actually feels deeply grieved (Mark 14:34). Therefore, one can conclude that Mark portrays Jesus as emotional, not just experiencing a pre-emotion. The presentation of Jesus as emotional

22 Marcus 2009, 982; Placher 2010, 206; Thurman 2003, 150.

23 Blaising 1979, 335; Evans 2001, 409; Holleran 1973, 12; Marcus 2009, 983; Myers 2008, 366.

24 Blaising 1979, 336; Myers 2008, 366; Voorwinde 2011, 48.

25 Holleran argues that the expression should be taken as meaning repeated action and not duration. Holleran 1973, 19, 22.

26 See also Thurman 2007, 200.

27 This is how the early Christian theologians Origen and Jerome understood Matthew's text. They argue that Jesus only began to be overwhelmed, but did not arrive at that state. Origen, *Comm. Matt.* 90; Jerome, *Comm. Matt.* 4.26.37. See also Layton 2000, 268–269; Stowers 2010, 72–73.

28 Mark 6:7; 10:28; 11:15.

elsewhere in the Gospel supports this interpretation as well.[29] Mark's Jesus does not demonstrate the Stoic ideal of ἀπάθεια or self-control of emotions.

Jesus' prayer is described first in indirect, then in direct discourse (Mark 14:35–36). In indirect discourse, Mark tells that Jesus prayed for the hour to pass "if it were possible" (εἰ δυνατόν ἐστιν). In direct discourse, however, the condition is changed into a statement: "Abba, Father, for you all things are possible; remove this cup from me" (πάντα δυνατά σοι: παρένεγκε τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ). Mark comments that the next time Jesus prays "saying the same words" (τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπών; Mark 14:39). Jesus seems to have a great difficulty in accepting his fate. In the end, however, Jesus resigns to God's will.

Robert Gundry argues that Mark's intention is to "counter the scandal of the Cross" by presenting Jesus as strong.[30] In contrast to the disciples, who keep falling asleep and do not stay awake to pray, Jesus does appear strong. His prayer exhibits his piety. However, Mark could have emphasized the strength of Jesus in some other way than portraying Jesus praying in agony for the cup to pass. For example, he could have employed the noble death tradition, which would have portrayed Jesus as more obviously strong and masculine. Mark could have portrayed Jesus as readily accepting suffering. Although suffering may be a divine necessity and endurance may be the ideal, Mark also highlights that endurance and the acceptance of suffering are not easy.

Jesus does not embrace his death calmly like Socrates or the Maccabean martyrs. For example, the Maccabean martyrs ask their torturers "Why do you delay?" in response to the suggestion that the torture would stop if the martyrs ate defiling foods (4 Macc 9:1). Jesus does not deliver a noble martyr's speech; instead, he decidedly does not want to die. Accordingly, Mark's presentation was seen as problematic by non-Christians as well as later Gospel writers and early Christian theologians. For Celsus, the mourning and lamentation of Jesus were proof that he was not divine.[31] The early Christian writers tried to salvage the Gospel accounts by claiming that Jesus was in fact in control of his emotions. Jerome and Hilary of Poitiers argue that Jesus did not feel sorrow for himself, but for his disciples or because of the rejection of the Jewish people.[32] As we will see, the scene was also problematic for Mark's first known readers, Matthew and Luke. Luke omits the Markan references to Jesus' emotions and

29 Cf. Chapter 6.

30 Gundry 1993, 856.

31 Origen, *Cels*. 2.24. See also Theodore of Mopsuestia, in *Ev. Lucae comm. Fragmenta*, PG 66.724; quoted in Luz 2005, 394.

32 See Jerome, *Comm. Matt.* 4.26.37 and Hilary of Poitiers, *on Matthew* 31.4, in Simonetti (ed.) 2002, 254–255.

depicts him as pious and in control of events. Matthew also alters the account, but his changes are more subtle.

Matthew 26:36–46

Compared with Mark's Gospel, Matthew has very few references to Jesus' emotions before the Gethsemane scene. The fact that few emotions are mentioned before this pericope makes the emotions in this pericope stand out in sharp relief. In comparison to Mark, Matthew still tones down the portrayal of Jesus' agony. According to Matthew, Jesus "began to be grieved and agitated" (ἤρξατο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν). He changes Mark's ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, "to be overwhelmed," to λυπεῖσθαι, "to grieve." This makes the Markan phrase slightly milder.[33] Matthew's Jesus is grieved in comparison to Mark's anguish and terror. While λυπεῖσθαι is commonly used to express sorrow, this is the first occasion in Matthew where it is used to describe Jesus.[34] In Matthew 26:39, Jesus falls "on his face" (ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ), while in Mark Jesus falls "on the ground" (ἔπιπτεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς). Both expressions paint a picture of desperation and anguish. Matthew partly tones down Mark's description of Jesus emotions, but he does not do this systematically. In the end, Matthew does not seem to see Mark's account as very problematic.

A more substantial alteration is found in Matthew's depiction of the prayers of Jesus. Matthew changes Mark's prayer from a statement into a condition: "if it is possible, let this cup pass from me" (Matt 26:39). In this way, Matthew combines Mark's indirect and direct discourses, thus making the account shorter. At the same time, he also tones down Jesus' prayer. By leaving out "everything is possible to you," Matthew changes the prayer into one of submission.[35] Craig Blaising claims that the first-class condition used in the prayer (εἰ δυνατόν ἐστιν, παρελθάτω ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο) assumes that the condition is a real possibility. Therefore, Blaising argues that the cup passing from Jesus would actually be God's will.[36] However, a first-class condition does not imply whether the condition is real or not. The conditional sentence of the first type sets forth "the conclusion as real, if the condition be real—but implies nothing as to the latter."[37] Accordingly, it is more likely that the cup passing from Jesus

33 Beare 1981, 514; Blaising 1979, 335; Holleran 1973, 71; Voorwinde 2011, 112.

34 Cf. Matt 14:9; 17:23; 18:31; 19:22; 26:22.

35 Gould 1948, 271; Nolland 2005, 1099.

36 Blaising 1979, 337, quoting A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*: "This class of condition assumes the condition to be a reality and the conclusion follows logically and naturally from that assumption."

37 Kaegi 2007, 144. See also Hagner 1995, 783.

would not be God's will, but Jesus' desire. In the end, Jesus submits to God's will. Richard Sorabji notes that the Stoic philosophers maintained that the wise person should qualify their desires and expectations with reservation (for example "if God wills," or "if nothing prevents").[38] In this way, the wise person avoids disappointment if things happen differently. Matthew's change moves the request closer to the Stoic ideals.

In Mark, Jesus prays the second and third times using the same words as in the first prayer; that is, he is praying for the cup to pass. In Matthew, the second prayer is different from the first. Jesus quotes the prayer he has taught his disciples: "My Father, if this cannot pass unless I drink it, your will be done" (Matt 26:42; cf. Matt 6:10). Jesus' obedience is emphasized. He prays like he has taught his disciples.[39] It is only when describing the third prayer that Matthew tells that Jesus prays by "saying the same words" (τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπών; Matt 26:44). Thus, the prayer that Jesus repeats is not the plea for deliverance, but rather the second prayer that God's will be done. As a result, there is less struggle in Matthew than in Mark. Jesus submits to the divine will already in the second prayer. Matthew is closer to the noble death tradition than Mark and, accordingly, he also makes Jesus more masculine, at least from the point of view of the self-controlled ideal of masculinity. From the point of view of the self-assertive ideal, Jesus would not be masculine in Matthew's Gospel, since in the end he does not attempt to fight back.

Luke 22:39–46

Luke changes Mark's version even more than Matthew by emphasizing the calmness of Jesus. No mention of Jesus' emotions is made. The emotions are transferred to the disciples (Luke 22:45). Their emotion is understandable, but it is still a sign that they are lower in the masculinity hierarchy than Jesus. Luke also emphasizes Jesus' piety. Jesus goes away to pray only once and he kneels reverently instead of throwing himself to the ground. Luke also changes the content of the prayer, stressing God's will: "if you are willing, remove this cup

38 Sorabji 2000, 53–54. See, e.g., Seneca, *Tranq*. 13.2–3: "I will set sail unless anything happens to prevent me, I shall be praetor, if nothing hinders me, my financial operations will succeed, unless anything goes wrong with them. This is why we say that nothing befalls the wise man which he did not expect." Transl. John W. Basore. See also Epictetus, *Diatr*. 2.6.9–10; 4.1.89–90; *Ench.* 4; cf. Jas 4:13–17.

39 Barbour 1969/1970, 238; Beare 1981, 515; Luz 2005, 397.

from me" (εἰ βούλει παρένεγκε τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ). These changes move the account close to the ideal of the noble, masculine death.[40]

Although the account is generally stripped of emotions, in some manuscripts Jesus receives heavenly reassurance in the form of an angel (Luke 22:43–44): "Then an angel from heaven appeared to him and gave him strength. In his anguish (ἀγωνία) he prayed more earnestly, and his sweat became like great drops of blood falling down on the ground."[41] The word ἀγωνία refers to fear and anguish (Luke 22:44).[42] This adds an emotional element to the portrayal of Jesus. These verses bring the depiction of Jesus more in line with the other Synoptic Gospel presentations.

Nevertheless, verses 43–44 are most likely a later interpolation. The verses are absent from the oldest manuscripts of Luke. The length of the passage makes an accidental omission unlikely.[43] Moreover, the verses add an emotional tone to an otherwise restrained account of Jesus' behavior in Gethsemane.[44] Luke does not reference Jesus' distress or include the prayer for the hour to pass. In the previous chapter, we saw that Luke omits the mentions of Jesus' emotions elsewhere in the Gospel as well. In addition, as we shall see, during the rest of the passion narrative Luke presents Jesus in control of events and his emotions.[45] Given the calmness of Jesus in the face of death, verses 43–44 appear intrusive. Since the absence of these verses fits better with the overall narrative of Luke's Gospel, it is more likely that they did not originally belong to it. The tradition behind these verses itself must be early, however, since Justin Martyr already shows knowledge of it.[46] Bart Ehrman and Mark Plunkett suggest that the verses were added to Luke as an anti-Docetic polemic emphasizing the humanity of Jesus.[47] There is thus no struggle in Luke, and Jesus accepts the necessity of his suffering faster than in Mark or Matthew. Luke is closer to the noble death tradition than either Mark or Matthew. This

40 Wilson (2015, 214) argues that since Luke retains Jesus' plea for the removal of the cup, Luke's portrayal of Jesus is also unmasculine and in opposition to the ideal of the noble death. However, Wilson does not pay attention to Luke's change of wording. Luke adds an important condition: if God is willing. These two words (εἰ βούλει) change the meaning of the sentence. Jesus' prayer emphasizes his masculine piety.

41 The verses are omitted, for example, in p^{75} $\aleph^{1}$ A B N T W 579 1071 844 and included in $\aleph^{*,2}$ D L Θ Ψ 0171. See Ehrman & Plunkett 1983, 402–403.

42 Stauffer 1964, 140.

43 Ehrman & Plunkett 1983, 403–404; Marshall 1978, 831–832.

44 See also Nolland 1993, 1080; Sterling 2001, 396.

45 See also Ehrman & Plunkett 1983, 411.

46 Justin, *Dial.* 103.8.

47 Ehrman & Plunkett 1983, 407–408. See also Metzger 1994, 151.

makes Luke complicit with the philosophical ideal masculinity of self-control and endurance.

The Masculinity of Jesus in Gethsemane

In sum, Luke's account is closest to the ideal of the noble, masculine death, whereas Mark's account is furthest away from that ideal. In Mark, Jesus prays to God to "remove the cup." Jesus does not act like the philosophers or the Maccabean martyrs approaching their death calmly. Conway notes that if there were a masculine aspect in Mark's account, it would be in the "heroic overcoming of the passions" that Jesus manifests.[48] However, the account would have an even more masculine aspect if there was no struggle and overcoming of passions at all. It is unlikely that Mark's portrayal of Jesus would have been seen as masculine by either those who maintained that a man should be in control or those who maintained that a man should endure suffering with patience.

Matthew and especially Luke emend Mark's account by bringing it closer to the ideal of noble death. Nevertheless, they do not go so far as John, who echoes the Synoptic accounts of Gethsemane while at the same time disagreeing with them. In John 12:27, Jesus says: "Now my soul is troubled. And what should I say—'Father, save me from this hour'? No, it is for this reason that I have come to this hour." The anguished prayer in Mark and Matthew is transformed into a rhetorical question.[49] In John, Jesus does not face a struggle of trying to accept his fate.

Conway argues that the Gethsemane account shows the relativity of the gender gradient in the ancient world. In relation to God as the "ultimate masculine figure," Jesus cannot be the stronger one. Jesus maintains a submissive posture throughout the arrest and trial, not only vis-à-vis God but other people as well.[50] As we have seen in earlier chapters, obeying God's will was part of the ideal masculinity of the Synoptic Gospels. Nevertheless, would it not have been enough for Jesus to be submissive to God but not to other people? The relativity of the gender gradient does not explain why Jesus is submissive to other people. Luke shows that Jesus can remain in control of events even while submitting to God's will. Luke is again closest to the hegemonic ideals, whereas Mark and Matthew seem to advocate a more marginal ideal of masculinity.

---

48 Conway 2008, 101.

49 See also Schnackenburg 1980, 387; Sanders & Mastin 1968, 294; Morris 1995, 528–529. Cf. also John 18:11, where Jesus asks Peter "Am I not to drink the cup that the Father has given me?".

50 Conway 2008, 101.

The Arrest of Jesus

After the prayer in Gethsemane, a group of armed men led by Judas Iscariot comes to arrest Jesus (Mark 14:43–52; Matt 26:47–56; Luke 22:47–53). In Mark, Jesus henceforth begins to play a more passive role in the narrative. Starting with the arrest, Jesus is continually "handed over" (παραδίδωμι) and thus increasingly passive and feminized.[51] Before Mark 14:43, Jesus has been the subject of most of the action, but after the arrest he becomes the object of most of the verbs. This also makes his few following speeches more striking.[52] Passivity would make Jesus seem unmasculine, at least from the point of view of the self-assertive ideal of masculinity. Still, the silence and passivity of Jesus are not surprising, since at the end of his prayer struggle in Gethsemane, Jesus had resigned himself to God's will. However, Mark does not present Jesus as completely passive in the arrest scene. Jesus protests against being taken, and he holds the authorities responsible when a bystander violently resists arrest (Mark 14:48–49).[53] This to some extent makes Jesus follow the self-assertive ideal of masculinity. On the whole, nevertheless, Jesus does not manage to come off as masculine from the point of view of self-assertive masculinity. In the end, Jesus is arrested without resistance.

The behavior of the disciples forms a contrast to Jesus. They first attempt to resist the arrest, which means that they again endorse the self-assertive ideal and have yet to understand Jesus' teaching of the inevitability of his suffering. When they fail to protect Jesus, they flee the scene. Trying to protect Jesus does not make the disciples negative examples, although it makes them proponents of the wrong type of masculinity. Fleeing the scene does make the disciples unmasculine from the point of view of the ancient Greco-Roman ideals, where the military virtue of ἀνδρεία was defined as standing one's ground and not fleeing from the battle scene. Desertion was one of the most shameful acts a man could commit in the ancient Greco-Roman world.[54] Unlike his disciples, Jesus does not try to escape or violently oppose the arrest. Earlier in the Gospel, Jesus has said that his arrest and death are a divine necessity, and now Jesus obeys God's will. In the arrest scene, Mark's ideal is closer to the Stoic ideal of endurance than the Aristotelian ideal of revenging wrongs.

---

51 Thurman 2003, 151.

52 Marcus 2009, 995–996.

53 Myers 2008, 367–368.

54 Miller 2000, 97–98. E.g., Plutarch, *Sayings of Spartan Women* 241B–C, 241F, 242A. See, however, Archilochus, *fr.* 6.5; Horace, *Carm.* 2.7.9–12, who both mention throwing away their shield and running away from battle.

Matthew makes Jesus more in control of the arrest scene than Mark, and as a result he also makes Jesus appear more masculine. Jesus reacts to both Judas' kiss and the violent action of a disciple (Matt 26:50, 52–54). Jesus' speeches are also longer, which underlines the control that he has over the scene. He makes no attempt to resist arrest, but rather reprimands the disciples and those who have come to arrest him. In Matthew, Jesus' rebuke stresses that the disciples should not be violent. This is in accordance with Jesus' earlier teaching of not resisting an evildoer (Matt 5:39). Matthew thus presents Jesus as an example of his own teaching. Unlike Mark, who leaves Jesus' inaction unexplained, Matthew clarifies that the inaction is the result of Jesus' voluntary acceptance of his suffering. In Matthew, Jesus tells his disciples: "Do you think that I cannot appeal to my Father, and he will at once send me more than twelve legions of angels?" (Matt 26:53). Jesus' speech emphasizes the voluntary nature of his death. Accordingly, Mark's portrayal of Jesus is mitigated to some degree in Matthew and again moved closer to the ideal of the noble, masculine death. Jesus behavior is once more in contrast to that of the disciples, who desert Jesus. In Mark and Matthew, Jesus now has to face his death alone.

In Luke, Jesus is in control and dominates the scene. He stops Judas short before he has the chance to kiss him, rebukes the disciples, and heals the ear of the victim of violence (Luke 22:48, 51). Stopping to heal the victim not only allows Luke to show Jesus demonstrating his control, but also has him exhibiting clemency. As we will see, the theme of clemency continues throughout the passion narrative. Luke's portrayal of the disciples is also more favorable. The disciples do not flee. Accordingly, later the acquaintances of Jesus will witness the crucifixion (Luke 23:49). This not only improves the portrayal of the disciples, but the portrayal of Jesus. Jesus is not deserted, as in Mark and Matthew. Emphasizing Jesus' control and clemency enhances the depiction of Jesus displaying masculine features. Luke's account is even closer to the noble death tradition and makes Jesus more of an agent, instead of a passive victim.

In none of the Synoptic Gospels does Jesus try to escape the arrest. This is in accordance with the philosophical ideal of self-control and endurance. The philosophical writings often suggest that the ideal was to accept the necessity of death and not try to escape God's will. For instance, Socrates rejects Crito's offer of assistance to escape the death penalty.[55] From the point of view of this tradition, Jesus appears masculine. Nevertheless, from the point of view of the self-assertive ideal of masculinity, Jesus' passive acceptance of the arrest makes Jesus unmasculine.

55 Plato, *Crito* 44b–46c. See also Droge & Tabor 1992, 117.

The Jewish and the Roman Trials: The Silence of Jesus

After the arrest, Jesus faces two trials: the Jewish trial and the Roman trial. During both of these, Jesus is verbally and physically abused. I study the trials together because they have significant similarities. During both trials, Jesus remains silent and does not respond to the charges. Could this silence be interpreted as virtuous, masculine behavior? Public speaking and the ability to defend oneself in a trial were important facets of the ancient Greco-Roman masculinity, so Jesus' silence was problematic in this regard. Socrates, the Maccabean martyrs, and early Christian martyrs gave long speeches during their trials and executions.

In Mark, Jesus remains silent for the first part of the Jewish trial, while the chief priests and the whole council search for testimony against Jesus and find none (Mark 14:55–56). Mark uses a double negative to highlight Jesus' silence.[56] Jesus responds only to the direct question from the high priest (Mark 14:62), giving an unequivocally affirmative answer that condemns him. During the Roman trial, Jesus gives a short, evasive answer to Pilate's question and then again remains silent when the high priests accuse him (Mark 15:2–5). In the Gospel of Matthew as well, Jesus initially remains silent in the Jewish trial and only briefly answers Pilate during the Roman trial (Matt 26:63; 27:11–14). The short answer that Jesus gives Pilate is the last time that Jesus speaks in Mark and Matthew before his last words on the cross.

Jesus' silence is again a sign that after Gethsemane, he has accepted his fate and does not wish to fight for his life. What does this silence mean for Jesus' masculinity? Not defending oneself could be seen as unmasculine. This is possibly the case in Mark and Matthew, when Pilate is amazed that Jesus does not answer the accusations (Mark 15:5; Matt 27:14). The most plausible interpretation is that Pilate is surprised that Jesus is not defending himself.[57] Jesus thus acts in an unexpected way. Although there existed a wider precedence of victims suffering in silence, none of these themes are explicitly developed in the Synoptic Gospels. Moreover, as Eric Thurman notes, "more assertive, and hence more overtly 'masculine,' rhetorical tactics might be expected." Jesus' silence, as well as his lack of action, "opens him to charges of cowardice for failing to defend himself."[58] This is true at least for the self-assertive ideal of masculinity. Jesus' silence would have made him seem unmasculine from the point

56 Mark 14:61: "But he was silent and did not answer anything" (ὁ δὲ ἐσιώπα καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδέν).

57 See also Thurman 2003, 151; 2007, 212.

58 Thurman 2007, 211–213; see also Thurman 2003, 151.

of view of this ideal. Mark and Matthew thus advocate an ideal of masculinity where following God's will is more important than following the prevalent ideals of masculinity.

On the other hand, Stephen Moore maintains that Jesus' silence could have been interpreted "as a bravura exercise of self-mastery" in a culture where self-control was "the supreme index of masculinity."[59] Nevertheless, Luke's changes to Mark's text show that Jesus' silence was potentially problematic. Luke does not depict Jesus as silent. Instead, Jesus readily replies to the questions in both the Jewish and the Roman trials (Luke 22:66–23:5). Jesus is only silent before Herod (Luke 23:9), who nevertheless seems to have considered Jesus to be innocent (Luke 23:15). Luke's pro-Roman and apologetic tendencies are evident in the way he softens the Roman responsibility in the depiction of the trial.[60] Jesus is declared innocent several times. The verdict against Jesus (Mark 14:64; Matt 26:66) is replaced by a threefold declaration of innocence (Luke 23:4, 14–15, 22).[61] Luke intends to show that Jesus and early Christianity were not a threat to Rome. In addition to this apologetic motif, Luke also seeks to depict Jesus as more masculine. A. R. C. Leaney points out that had Jesus been silent in Luke's Gospel, it would have suggested to his readers that Jesus lacked an effective defense.[62] Because Jesus is not silent, however, Luke differs from the more negative portrayal by Mark. Jesus can clearly defend himself, which is closer to hegemonic ideals of masculine portrayal.

The Mocking and Scourging of Jesus

During both trials, Jesus is physically and verbally abused. During the Jewish trial, Jesus is struck, spat on, and commanded to prophesy who hit him (Mark 14:65; Matt 26:67–68; Luke 22:63–65). In none of the Synoptic Gospels does Jesus answer anything to his abusers. He seems to be passively enduring the violence and mockery without uttering a word. In Matthew, this makes Jesus the exemplar of his teaching not to resist an evildoer (Matt 5:39). It is possible that Jesus' behavior would make him exemplarily self-controlled and thus masculine, but this theme is not explicitly developed in the Synoptic Gospels.

The scourging or disciplining of Jesus is mentioned in all of the Synoptic Gospels as part of the Roman trial. In the Roman judicial system, this

59 Moore 2003, 11. See also Malina & Rohrbaugh 1998, 264; Neyrey 1996, 114; Pilch 1995, 68.

60 Matthews 2005, 132.

61 At the cross, the centurion also declares Jesus to be innocent (δίκαιος); cf. Luke 23:47.

62 Leaney 1971, 275.

punishment was meted out either as a warning not to continue causing trouble, as part of inquisitional torture to obtain a confession, or as part of the capital sentence. The Romans used three words to describe the punishment: *fustigatio* (beating), *flagellatio* (flogging), and *verberatio* (scourging). The first of these was a punishment in itself, whereas the last two were used as part of the capital sentence.[63]

In Mark and Matthew, Jesus is flogged before the crucifixion (Mark 15:15; Matt 27:26). Both Gospels use the Latinism φραγελλόω to describe the flogging. The verb refers to flogging as part of the capital sentence. Crucifixion was usually preceded by flogging or scourging.[64] However, the narratives do not dwell on this flogging; it is mentioned in a subordinate clause. The accounts concentrate instead on the mocking of Jesus by the soldiers. The soldiers clothe Jesus in the typical insignias of a king, a purple cloak and a crown, and salute him as the "King of the Jews." They also strike his head with a reed, spit on him, and kneel down in mock homage to him (Mark 15:17–19; Matt 27:27–31). The accounts focus more on dishonor than physical pain. Jesus' reaction to this abuse is not depicted this time either. Again Jesus may be understood as exhibiting self-control, but this theme is not the explicit concern of Mark and Matthew.

In Luke, verses 23:16 and 22 are the only references to the beating of Jesus. Luke does not use the same word as Mark and Matthew; instead he uses παιδεύω, which means "to discipline, punish."[65] Luke thus suggests the lightest form of the beating (*fustigatio*), the one given as a warning.[66] Whether this disciplining actually happened is not clear. Nor is Jesus mocked by the Romans here. Instead, Luke transfers the mocking to Herod and his soldiers (Luke 23:11). This is clearly part of Luke's attempt to tone down the punishment. He may have also wished to exonerate the Romans.

In sum, in Mark and Matthew Jesus' scourging is part of the crucifixion. In Luke, it is disciplining, a form of lesser punishment, and it is not even clear if it ever happens.[67] How would this treatment affect Jesus' masculinity and can Jesus' behavior during the mocking and physical abuse be seen as masculine?

---

63 For ancient sources, see, e.g., Acts 16:22; 22:24–25; Josephus, *J. W.* 2.306–308; 5.449; 7.200–203; Livy 1.26.6; 28.37.3; 33.36.3; Philo, *Flaccus* 9.72; 10.75; 10.84; Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 4.67; Apuleius, *Metam.* 3.9.1; Horace, *Sat.* 1.3.119. See also Brown 1970, 876; 1994a, 851–852; Keener 1999, 672; Lane 1975, 557; Walaskay 1975, 91.

64 See, e.g., Plato, *Gorg.* 473b–c; *Resp.* 361e–362a; Livy 28.37.3; 33.36.2; Josephus, *J. W.* 2.306–308; 5.449; 7.200–203; Philo, *Flaccus* 9.72.

65 Cf. Hos 7:12 LXX.

66 Walaskay 1975, 90–91.

67 See also Glancy 2005, 121–122.

Protecting bodily boundaries and the inviolability of the body were important aspects of the ideal masculinity in the ancient Greco-Roman world. Slaves, noncitizens, prisoners of war, convicted criminals, and conquered foreigners—in other words, groups that were not fully men—could legitimately be beaten.[68] Richard Saller notes that more was at stake with corporal punishment than mere physical pain. More important was the deep humiliation that the act caused.[69] It was an outrage if a free citizen man was hit, since it associated him with the treatment of slaves.[70] Aristotle, for example, argued that an inability to defend oneself was disgraceful. Meek endurance and the absence of resistance were signs of unmanliness.[71] Aristotle also argued that one is not "courageous if he shows a bold face when about to undergo a flogging."[72] However, some philosophers, especially in the Stoic tradition, saw the endurance of suffering as the ideal masculine deportment. Seneca, for example, maintained that abuse is not shameful.[73] According to this self-controlled ideal, the endurance of physical abuse would make a man more masculine than retribution of wrongs.

Some scholars argue that Jesus stoically endures physical abuse. Silence may imply endurance and Stoic perseverance.[74] Jesus' behavior would thus be in accordance with the self-controlled ideal and close to the ideal of the noble, masculine death.[75] However, Celsus did not interpret Jesus' silence during torture in this way. Instead he presents the examples of Anaxarchus and Epictetus, who spoke calmly under torture, and asks: "What saying equal to

68 Glancy 2002, 25; 2004, 108–111; Grig 2002, 325; Richlin 1999, 196; Saller 1991, 153; Walters 1997, 30.

69 Saller 1991, 151–153.

70 See, e.g., Demosthenes, *Against Meidias* 21.178, 180; *Against Androtion* 22.53–55.

71 Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1355a–b: "it would be absurd if it were considered disgraceful not to be able to defend oneself with the help of the body, but not disgraceful as far as speech is concerned, whose use is more characteristic of man than that of the body." Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1384a20: "meek endurance and the absence of resistance are the result of unmanliness or cowardice." Transl. John Henry Freese.

72 Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 1115a20–25. Transl. H. Rackham.

73 E.g., Seneca, *Ep.* 67; 85.27; Seneca, *Const.* 16.1–2. See also Epictetus, *Diatr.* 3.22.54: if flogged, a Cynic "must love the men who flog him." Transl. W. A. Oldfather. Cf. Epictetus *Diatr.* 2.2.13.

74 Neyrey 1998, 150.

75 Glancy (2004) notes that there are other New Testament texts, such as in 2 Cor 11:23–25 and Acts 5:40–41, where corporal punishment is mentioned in a positive light.

these did your god utter under suffering?"[76] Jesus' silence could thus be interpreted as passivity. Origen, nevertheless, read it as a sign of courage. For Origen, Jesus "manifested a courage and patience (καρτερίαν καὶ ὑπομονήν) superior to that of any of the Greeks who spoke while enduring torture."[77] From the point of view of the self-assertive ideal of masculinity, in any case, Jesus' behavior is not masculine. During the scourging, Jesus is not in control of his bodily boundaries and he does nothing to prevent the punishment from taking place. The proponents of the self-assertive ideal of masculinity would not have seen Jesus as masculine. From the point of view of the self-controlled ideal, Jesus could be considered masculine, but Celsus' example shows that this is not self-evident either.

The Crucifixion and Death of Jesus

The Synoptic Gospel accounts of the crucifixion are reticent to go into detail. Mark and Luke mention it in passing (Mark 15:24; Luke 23:33), and Matthew brushes over the event in a subordinate clause (Matt 27:35). This is in contrast with 4 Maccabees, for instance, where the torture of the seven brothers is recorded in merciless detail.[78] One reason for this reticence could be the humiliating nature of crucifixion. For the ancient Greco-Roman people, crucifixion was utterly offensive and shameful.[79] It was the typical punishment for slaves

76 Origen, *Cels.* 7.53: "At any rate you had Anaxarchus who, when cast into a mortar and while he was being beaten with great violence, nobly showed contempt for the punishment, saying 'Beat on, beat the pouch of Anaxarchus, for you are not beating him.' The utterance is surely one of some divine spirit. But some natural philosophers have preceded you in taking him for their master. What about Epictetus then? When his master was twisting his leg he smiled gently and calmly said 'You are breaking it.' And when he had broken it he said 'Did I not tell you that you were breaking it?' What comparable saying did your God utter while he was being punished?" Transl. Henry Chadwick. See also Collins 1994, 482.

77 Origen, *Cels.* 7.55. Transl. Henry Chadwick.

78 E.g., 4 Macc 5:16–38; 6:17–29; 9:15–12:19.

79 For ancient attitudes toward crucifixion, see, e.g., Plato, *Gorg.* 473b–c; *Resp.* 361e–362a; Cicero, *Verr.* 2.5.162–169; Pliny the Elder, *Nat.* 28.11.46; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.2.20; Diodorus Siculus 14.53.4; Curtius Rufus, *History of Alexander* 4.4.17; Livy 28.37.3; 33.36.2; Apuleius, *Metam.* 1.14.2; Plautus, *Capt.* 469; *Cas.* 611; *Men.* 66, 849; *Poen.* 347; *Pers.* 352; *Rud.* 518; *Trin.* 598; Josephus, *J. W.* 7.200–203; Philo, *Flaccus* 9.72; *Posterity* 61; *Dreams* 2.213; Origen, *Cels.* 6.10; Justin, *1 Apol.* 13.4. In the New Testament as well, it was admitted that crucifixion was a shameful way of dying, cf. Heb 12:2; 1 Cor 1:23. See also Cook 2014; Green 1997, 810; Hengel 1977, 22, 64–68; Pilch 1995, 65.

and criminals.[80] Physical torture was not the only reason why this death was so despicable. The public humiliation made it even more so.[81] The condemned was crucified while naked, which further added to the shame.[82] The inability to control one's bodily boundaries, as well as the loss of power, made the condemned unmasculine. Mark's and Matthew's accounts of the crucifixion and the death of Jesus are relatively similar to each other. Therefore, in the following I study the accounts of Mark and Matthew together and examine Luke's account separately after that.

The Death of Jesus in Mark and Matthew

After the trials and the scourging, the soldiers take Jesus to the place of crucifixion (Mark 15:20–22; Matt 27:31–33). They have to enlist Simon to carry the cross. William Campbell claims that in the Gospel of Mark, Jesus actively tries to obstruct the sentence from taking place by refusing to bear the cross. The soldiers are forced to carry Jesus to the place of execution. Campbell bases his interpretation on Mark's use of the verb φέρω. He argues that in its previous occurrences in Mark, the term means literal or figurative "carrying," when the person could not or would not move independently.[83] If Jesus was actively resisting the crucifixion, it would make the portrayal more in line with the self-assertive ideal of masculinity. However, if Jesus refused to carry the cross, he would be doing this against the will of God. Active resistance of the sentence may be more masculine according to the self-assertive ideal of masculinity, but not according to the ideal masculinity of Mark's Gospel. In addition, as Adela Yarbro Collins notes, φέρω does not necessarily mean literal carrying; it can also mean that other people took the initiative. Collins concludes that Jesus was thus subordinated to the soldiers, and it was their initiative to move to Golgotha.[84] Therefore, it is more likely that Jesus did not obstruct the sentence but possibly was too weak to carry the cross. This would call his masculinity into question.

---

80 See, e.g., Plautus, *Mil. glor.* 372–373; *Bacch.* 362; Juvenal, *Sat*. 6.219. See also Hengel 1977, 51–57; Neyrey 1998, 139.

81 Watson 2010, 69.

82 Cf. Plutarch, *The Roman Questions* 274A. Especially for Jews, naked execution was shameful; Gen 3:7, 10–11; *Jubilees* 3:21–22, 30–31; 7:8–10, 20.

83 Campbell 2004, 294–295.

84 Collins 2007, 737–738. Collins points out that the deaf man in Mark 7:32 and the blind man in Mark 8:22 needed assistance, not carrying. In both of these cases, the implication is that "other people took the initiative and the man in need of healing was subordinated to them." Moreover, in Mark 2:3 another verb, αἴρω, is needed to describe the actual carrying of the paralytic: καὶ ἔρχονται φέροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικὸν αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων.

In Mark, Jesus is offered wine with myrrh (Mark 15:23), which was probably intended to dull the pain of crucifixion.[85] Jesus refuses, possibly because he is determined to go to his death with full consciousness. The rejection of the drink stresses the voluntary nature of Jesus' death. Here Mark is close to the Stoic ideal of despising pain. Jesus' voluntary death would make him seem masculine from the perspective of the Stoics and the noble death tradition. In Matthew, the wine is spiked with gall (χολή), which probably made the wine undrinkable (Matt 27:34). The drink thus becomes one more example of abuse by Jesus' opponents.[86] It emphasizes Jesus' passivity and suffering and does nothing to make Jesus appear more masculine.

The accounts of the crucifixion itself are restrained. Like in the flogging scene, Mark and Matthew instead concentrate on the humiliation of Jesus. The soldiers strip Jesus of his clothes and divide them (Mark 15:24; Matt 27:35). The passersby, high priests, and scribes, as well as the criminals who were crucified with Jesus, deride Jesus with humiliating gestures and words (Mark 15:29–32; Matt 27:39–44). For the outsiders, Jesus' death is shameful and shows that his claims to status are wrong. They suggest that Jesus should show his claims to be correct by coming down from the cross. The outsiders see Jesus' death as a sign that he has been a failure as God's representative. For Mark and Matthew, on the contrary, Jesus' refusal to "save himself" demonstrates Jesus' royal status, since it benefits people and saves them.[87] If Jesus does not descend from the cross, he passes the test of his own teaching.[88] The outsiders represent the self-assertive ideal that considers a man who is unable to defend himself to be unmasculine. Mark and Matthew, on the contrary, are closer to the ideal of the noble death, which considers voluntary death and enduring suffering as masculine ideals.

After several hours of silence, Jesus speaks by quoting Psalm 22:2: "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" In Matthew, the last words of Jesus are almost the same as in Mark. Jesus has not spoken since his brief answer to Pilate. Nothing in the narrative has prepared for this cry of abandonment. Accordingly, some scholars have suggested that Jesus has all of Psalm 22 in mind and that the quotation should be understood as a confident prayer.[89] However, Brown notes that although it can be supposed that Hebrew Bible citations were

85 In Dioscorides Pedanius' pharmaceutical, *De materia medica* 1.77, wine mixed with myrrh is referred to as an anesthetic or narcotic.

86 Cf. Ps 68:22 LXX. See also Brown 1994b, 943; France 2007, 1067; Nolland 2005, 1191.

87 Cf. Mark 8:35; 10:45; Matt 16:25; 20:28.

88 Marcus 2009, 1052; Luz 2005, 537–538.

89 E.g., Donahue & Harrington 2002, 451.

familiar to readers, in this case "it would mean that Mark expected his readers to recognize that a psalm was being cited, to know the whole psalm, and to detect from a reference to the agonized opening verse the triumphant fate of the one who prays." In other words, Mark and Matthew would have expected the readers to come to exactly the opposite meaning than what they wrote.[90] Moreover, there is nothing in the narrative that shows God as being on Jesus' side: Jesus has been abandoned by his disciples and is mocked by passersby.[91] It is better to take the quotation literally as a cry of abandonment.

Jesus lets forth a loud cry (ἀφεὶς φωνὴν μεγάλην) right before he dies (Mark 15:37; cf. Matt 27:50). Robert Gundry argues that the loudness emphasizes Jesus' superhuman strength.[92] However, Mark could have emphasized Jesus' strength in some other, more masculine, way. As Colleen Conway notes, "surely there are more straightforward ways to display manliness, strength, and courage in a death scene."[93] The expression refers to a tortured rather than a voluntary action.[94] G. W. Bowersock maintains that the cry is "utterly at variance with the standards of the Graeco-Roman society."[95] Although Cicero remarks that "sometimes, though seldom, it is allowable for a man to groan aloud," the brave and wise man (*vir fortis ac sapiens*) does not do even that. Only in exceptional cases should a man indulge in a groan, but Cicero still doubts whether it is useful. Cicero questions why one would disgrace oneself when it does nothing to abate the pain.[96] In the end, therefore, Cicero finds groaning in pain to be questionable behavior for a man: "if the groan is melancholy, weak, despondent, piteous I can scarcely give the name of man to him who has succumbed." Jesus' cry makes his masculinity questionable.[97]

Jesus' last words are not a trusting and confident prayer to God, like the prayers of the Maccabean martyrs, or, as we shall see, like Jesus' last words in the Gospel of Luke. His last words are also in contrast to the peaceful death of Socrates and the philosopher's ironic last words. Moreover, Mark's and Matthew's accounts differ from the later accounts of the deaths of early Christian martyrs. Mark and Matthew do not model Jesus' manner of dying

90 Brown 1994b, 1050. Filson (1971, 297) and France (2007, 1076) maintain that there is no reason to interpret Matthew's psalm quotation differently from Mark.

91 Brown 1994b, 1045–1046.

92 Gundry 1993, 947, 970.

93 Conway 2008, 102.

94 Brown 1994b, 1081.

95 Bowersock 1994, 74.

96 Cicero, *Tusc*. 2.55–57. Transl. J. E. King.

97 This is also noted by Conway 2008, 102.

after the noble death tradition.[98] The way in which Jesus dies would have been considered unmasculine by both the self-assertive and self-controlled ideals of masculinity. What does this mean for the masculinity presented in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew? They do not present Jesus' death in accordance with the noble death tradition, which would be complicit with the self-controlled ideal. As we will see, this is what Luke does. Mark and Matthew, on the contrary, seem to advocate a voluntarily marginal ideal of masculinity.

The Death of Jesus in Luke

Luke's account of Jesus' crucifixion and death is notably different from Mark's and Matthew's accounts. Luke portrays Jesus as calm before death, facing death with confidence and courage. David Liberto maintains that Luke's intention was to present his readers with the proper attitude to death.[99] As we will see, Luke's account is close to the philosophical ideal of a noble death. Having a proper attitude to death also meant dying like a man. Luke changes several details of Mark's text to accomplish this goal. The themes of forgiveness and clemency are also important for Luke's narrative of Jesus' crucifixion and death.

Unlike in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew, where Jesus does not speak after his brief answer to Pilate until his last words on the cross, in the Gospel of Luke Jesus speaks several times on his way to Golgotha and while on the cross. The scourging of Jesus is not mentioned, but Simon is still enlisted to carry the cross (Luke 23:26). On the way, Jesus addresses women, who are lamenting for him (Luke 23:27–31). Thus, in Luke's narrative Jesus is not as passive as in Mark and Matthew, but more in control of events. The depiction of the journey to the place of crucifixion seems more like a dignified procession.[100] Luke also adds dialogue between the criminals and Jesus on the cross (Luke 23:39–43). All of these changes make Jesus' death more voluntary and closer to the ideal of the noble, masculine death.

Luke mentions that a large crowd was following Jesus (Luke 23:27). The crowds are not depicted as mocking Jesus. Instead they beat their breasts when returning home after Jesus' death (Luke 23:48). Jesus' acquaintances, not just

98 Collins 2007, 754.

99 Liberto 2003, 219–220.

100 Wilson (2015, 230) argues that since Simon carries Jesus' cross, Luke is probably suggesting that Jesus was scourged and is too weak to carry the cross. However, since Jesus is able to hold a conversation with the women on the way, the scene seems to instead highlight Jesus' dignity. Moreover, Simon carries the cross "behind Jesus," which makes him an example of discipleship; cf. Luke 14:27.

women, are also watching the crucifixion (Luke 23:49).[101] As a result, there are more sympathetic figures at the crucifixion, and Jesus does not die alone and abandoned like in Mark and Matthew. The high priests and soldiers mock Jesus, but this does not receive as much emphasis as in Mark and Matthew. Luke instead emphasizes Jesus' control over events. Jesus is forgiving and speaks on the cross several times. Besides forgiving the criminal that is crucified next to him, Jesus also forgives the crucifiers. When he is crucified, Jesus prays: "Father, forgive them; for they do not know what they are doing" (Luke 23:34). While this verse is absent from some manuscripts,[102] it is easier to presume that Luke wrote the prayer than to presume that a later scribe added the prayer in Luke's style.[103] The similarities with Stephen's prayer at his death (Acts 7:60) also point to the originality of the verse.[104] The verse is thus probably original.

Jesus' prayer is connected to the virtue of clemency (*clementia*), which was a peculiarly Roman virtue.[105] The word *clementia*, used in the contexts of war and law courts, meant sparing a conquered enemy or mitigating the sentence of a convict.[106] Thus, it was connected with self-control,[107] which also made it a masculine virtue. Seneca argues that whereas *misericordia* was a womanish emotion of pity for the unfortunate, *clementia* was combined with rationality.

> [...] good men (*boni viri*) will all display mercy and gentleness (*clementiam mansuetudinemque*), but pity (*misericordiam*) they will avoid; for it is the failing of a weak nature that succumbs to the sight of others' ills. And so it is most often seen in the poorest types of persons; there are old

101 Wilson (2015, 232–233) argues that since the disciples are watching the crucifixion from a distance, this represents a negative portrayal of the disciples. However, Luke's tendency to enhance the portrayal of the disciples makes it more likely that here as well he is trying to make their portrayal more positive in comparison to Mark.

102 The prayer is absent from, e.g., p^{75} $\aleph^{1}$ B D W, but it is found in, e.g., $\aleph^{*}$, ^{2} A C D L. Matthews (2009, 122–123) notes that the patristic evidence for the verse is also substantial.

103 Brown 1994b, 980.

104 See Matthews 2010, 101. Matthews suggests that an increase in anti-Jewish sentiment was the motive for the scribes to leave this verse out. The problem of the verse for the scribes was that Jesus not only prayed for forgiveness for Jews, but for undeserving and unrepentant Jews. Matthews 2009, 124; 2010, 102. A similar argument is also made by Brown 1994b, 979.

105 In Greek, φιλανθρωπία and πραΰτης imply forgiveness, which is close to the meaning of *clementia*, but their primary usage denotes benevolence or gentleness respectively. Dowling 2006, 4.

106 Dowling 2006, 5–6.

107 Matthews 2009, 142–144; 2010, 118–119.

> women and wretched females (*anus et mulierculae*) who are moved by the tears of the worst criminals, who, if they could, would break open their prison. Pity regards the plight, not the cause of it; mercy is combined with reason.[108]

Clemency was an act of power. Only those in a position of exacting revenge could choose to exercise clemency.[109] This made *clementia* the virtue of elite men, since women, slaves, and foreigners did not have the power or right to dispense clemency.[110] Seneca, for example, notes that *clementia* separates the elite self-controlled ruler from women and wild beasts.[111] Since clemency was connected to vertical power, it was the ideal virtue of the emperor. This is most evident in Seneca's *De Clementia*, where Seneca urges Nero to act with clemency.[112]

Shelly Matthews notes that Jesus acts like an emperor throughout Luke's passion narrative. He is in complete control of his emotions in Gethsemane and he remains in control over events. His prayer of forgiveness for the crucifiers and his granting of forgiveness to a criminal distinguish him as a true emperor, who has the right and power to display clemency. It is important to note that in Roman discourse, the clemency shown in Jesus' prayer for mercy was not a sign of passivity, submission, or humility. Rather, the prayer should be understood as an act of power.[113] Jesus is not passive, but exercises power over his executors. What makes the narrative unusual is that the one exhibiting clemency is a convicted criminal. However, Matthews also notes that Jesus appeals to God to grant forgiveness, which an emperor does not have to do since he himself authorizes the pardon.[114] In Luke, God takes the place of the emperor. This emphasizes the masculine piety of Jesus.

Although Seneca considered *clementia* to be masculine, this was not the only interpretation of mercy. Matthews notes that in the Greco-Roman culture, *clementia*—or refraining from administering punishment—could be interpreted as a violation of justice and thus as an example of the womanish vice

---

108 Seneca, *Clem.* 2.5.1. Transl. John W. Basore. See also Seneca, *Clem.* 2.4.4.

109 See, e.g., Seneca, *Clem.* 1.21.1; 2.3.1. Dowling 2006, 17–18; Matthews 2009, 142, 144; 2010, 118–119.

110 Dowling 2006, 17–18, 27.

111 Seneca, *Clem.* 1.5.5.

112 See, e.g., Seneca, *Clem.* 1.3.2: "for all men none is better graced by mercy than a king or a prince. For great power confers grace and glory only when it is potent for benefit." Transl. John W. Basore. Cf. Cicero, *Off.* 2.22–24; Seneca, *Clem.* 1.5.6.

113 Matthews 2009, 144–145; 2010, 120–121.

114 Matthews 2010, 120.

of pity, *misericordia*.[115] Therefore, not even all of the Stoic philosophers accepted clemency. Traditionally, the Stoics opposed clemency because it withholds the penalty that the guilty deserves to suffer. Thus, clemency is not just, but an emotional impulse not guided by reason.[116] As a result, it is possible that some ancient Greco-Roman readers interpreted Luke's depiction of Jesus' clemency as showing that Jesus is behaving in an unmasculine way. Nevertheless, since Luke's depiction of Jesus' behavior is close to the ideal masculinity presented by Seneca, it is also possible that from the point of view of the self-controlled ideal of masculinity, Luke's portrayal of Jesus would have been understood as masculine.

As mentioned above, Luke wants to present what it means to have a proper attitude to death. In order to do this, Luke reshapes the tradition by emphasizing the calmness of Jesus. The calmness of Jesus in his death can be seen, for example, in how Luke softens Jesus' last words. Luke omits the cry of abandonment, replacing it with an "affirmation of dedication."[117] Instead of "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me," Jesus quotes Psalm 31:6 and prays "Father, into your hands I commend my spirit." The last words of Jesus emphasize the voluntary nature of his death.[118] Not only are the words that Jesus utters important, but also the manner in which he speaks them. In Mark and Matthew, the scene is full of anguish and desolation. The verb that Luke uses to describe Jesus' speech is different. In Mark, Jesus "cries out" (βοάω), a verb Mark also uses for the evil spirits when Jesus exorcizes them. Mark's verb describes a violent action. Luke's use of φωνέω ("speak loudly") avoids the sense of despair and anguish.[119] Unlike in Mark and Matthew, in Luke Jesus' death is peaceful. His trust in God never wavers.[120] Emphasizing the calmness and peacefulness of Jesus makes him like Socrates and other philosophers, who died a noble death. This depiction also removes emotional elements from Jesus' death, which, as we have seen, is part of a larger pattern in Luke. Both emphasizing calmness and removing the emotional elements move Luke's narrative in the direction of Stoic philosophical accounts of a good death.[121] Luke transforms

115 Matthews 2010, 25–26, 100, 122.

116 Dowling 2006, 202. Cf. Seneca, *Clem.* 1.2.1.

117 Sterling 2001, 395–396.

118 Plummer 1981, 538.

119 Brown 1994b, 1067; Liberto 2003, 220–221.

120 Green 1997, 812.

121 See also Sterling 2001, 397–398.

Jesus' embarrassing crucifixion into an exemplary noble death.[122] Once more, Luke's account of Jesus' death is closer to the ideal of the noble death than Mark's and Matthew's passion narratives.

Conclusions

Out of the Synoptic Gospels, Mark emphasizes the humiliating elements of Jesus' death the most. Mark depicts Jesus as not defending himself in the trials and silently suffering abuse and the crucifixion. In these instances, Mark may be employing the tradition of the noble, masculine death. However, Jesus' emotional behavior in Gethsemane and his loud cry from the cross make this interpretation questionable. Matthew occasionally emends Mark's account. For example, he changes Jesus' prayer in Gethsemane. As a result, Matthew's depiction of Jesus is closer to the ideals of the noble, masculine death. Nevertheless, Matthew does not change the narrative of Jesus' trials and death. Jesus' death is still not in accordance with the ideals of the noble death. Luke, on the other hand, changes Mark's narrative considerably and thus moves it clearly in the direction of the ideal of the noble, masculine death. Jesus is not emotional in Gethsemane, defends himself in the trials, and remains confident and calm on the cross.

Protecting one's bodily boundaries and not allowing humiliation by others were key features of the ancient Greco-Roman self-assertive ideal of masculinity. Mocking, abuse, flogging, and crucifixion were all shameful. In the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus' body is violated and he is humiliated, yet he does nothing to stop the violence and abuse from happening. Jesus is a passive victim. At least from the point of view of the self-assertive ideal of masculinity, this can be seen as a sign of effeminacy. Jesus comes off as passive, especially in the accounts of Mark and Matthew. Luke, on the other hand, depicts Jesus more in control over events. In this way, Luke preserves Jesus' masculinity. Nevertheless, in none of

122 See also D'Angelo 1990, 453; 1999, 187; Sterling 2001, 384; Syreeni 1991, 36–57. Unlike most scholars, Wilson (2015, 190–191) comes to the conclusion that Luke does not portray Jesus' death as a noble death. Wilson argues that "[a]s someone who dies the death of convicted criminal, Jesus has lost his claims to manhood as well." Wilson 2015, 231–232. Wilson thus emphasizes the importance of the manner of execution over the way in which Jesus faces death in Luke's Gospel. However, a shameful mode of execution does not necessarily result in a loss of masculinity if one dies in the right way. Comparison with the other Synoptic Gospels shows that Luke has changed Mark's narrative in ways that make Jesus' death seem more like a noble death.

the Synoptic Gospels does Jesus succeed in protecting his masculinity in the way in which self-assertive masculinity maintained to be the ideal.

The noble death tradition, on the other hand, emphasized the importance of self-control as a masculine ideal. Jesus' silent endurance could have been a sign of masculinity to the proponents of the self-controlled ideal of masculinity. As we have seen, however, Celsus used the standard of the noble death to judge the passion narratives and he found Jesus wanting. In addition, Jesus' manner of dying and especially his loud cry before death appear to be less self-controlled and thus less masculine. At least in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew, Jesus appears unmasculine from the point of view of both the self-assertive and self-controlled ideals of masculinity. He does not protect his bodily boundaries or avenge his injuries, and he does not show signs of self-control in his emotional behavior in Gethsemane or his loud cry on the cross. Luke, on the other hand, again preserves Jesus' masculinity by presenting him as more calm and self-controlled in his death. Luke's ideal masculinity is thus closer to the ideal of the noble, masculine death in the ancient Greco-Roman world.

Although Luke tries to preserve Jesus' masculinity by moving it closer to the self-controlled ideal, crucifixion as the method of Jesus' death meant that the death itself remained shameful.[123] When Jesus dies willingly, the Synoptic Gospels reframe Jesus' shameful death on the cross as a victory over death. This is especially evident in Luke's depiction of Jesus' behavior in Gethsemane and his last, confident words on the cross. Nevertheless, Mark and Matthew also maintain that Jesus cannot save himself, since the one who attempts to save his life will lose it (Mark 10:35; Matt 16:25; Luke 9:24). The voluntary nature of death makes Jesus' death masculine. That Jesus' death was not shameful is proved when God resurrects him. The resurrection and the miraculous events that accompany Jesus' death are signs of God's vindication of Jesus. For the writers of the Synoptic Gospels, this vindication also confirms Jesus' masculinity. The resurrection moves Jesus closer to the more masculine divine realm. It is notable that Mark's original narrative does not include "masculinizing" appearances of the resurrected Jesus. In Mark, Jesus' masculinity remains questionable.[124] Other differences can be seen in the ways in which the Synoptic Gospels depict Jesus' death. Mark's and Matthew's accounts of the passion narrative present a more voluntarily marginalized masculinity, whereas Luke is more complicit with the ideal of self-controlled masculinity.

123 Cf. 1 Cor 1:23. This is noted also by Klinken & Smit 2013, 11–12.

124 See also Merenlahti 2015, 152.

It is difficult to say whether ancient Greco-Roman readers would have considered Jesus to be masculine. The answer probably depends on their social position and what ideal of masculinity they advocated. It is unlikely that those who favored self-assertive masculinity would have considered Jesus to be masculine. Those who favored the self-controlled ideal of masculinity might have seen Jesus' way of dying as masculine in Luke's Gospel, but not in Mark or Matthew. However, a male slave may have found attractive the idea that corporal vulnerability did not compromise masculinity. Thus, the Synoptic Gospels' way of portraying Jesus' death may have led readers to rethink what masculinity entailed.

CHAPTER 8

Conclusions

Now it is time to offer some concluding remarks on the ideal masculinities in the Synoptic Gospels. In this study, I have used a revised version of Raewyn Connell's concepts of hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinities. Unlike Connell, however, I suggest that in every culture there may have been not only one hegemonic masculinity, but several masculinities competing for the hegemonic position. In Chapter 2, I delineated two ideals of masculinity that were competing for the hegemonic position in the ancient Greco-Roman world. One advocated self-assertive behavior, whereas the other emphasized the importance of self-control. Both of these ideals are found in a wide variety of sources, although the self-controlled ideal is more widespread in philosophical writings, especially Stoic texts. The advantage of highlighting the variety and the competition between hegemonic masculinities is that the diversity of the ideal masculinities in the ancient Greco-Roman world becomes more evident. The ancient Greco-Roman texts do not put forward only one hegemonic ideal of masculinity.

At the beginning of this study, I suggested that the most fruitful approach would be to see early Christianity as a marginal religious movement. Thus, the masculinity of early Christianity was also marginalized. Marginalized masculinities have several strategies in relation to hegemonic masculinities, ranging from acceptance or complicity to resistance and voluntary marginality. These different strategies are evident in the early Jewish texts of Philo, Josephus, 4 Maccabees, and the rabbinic writings. In this study, my intention was to see whether these different strategies could be found in the Synoptic Gospels as well. The benefit of seeing the early Christian masculinities as marginalized is that this approach clarifies that the Synoptic Gospels have several potential strategies vis-à-vis hegemonic masculinities. In addition, although the Synoptic Gospels may be partially complicit with the hegemonic ideal, this does not mean that the Synoptic Gospels were part of the hegemonic masculinity or that the members of the elite would have accepted the ideal masculinity presented in the Synoptic Gospels. Moreover, the Synoptic Gospels may also employ a strategy of mixed acceptance and resistance.

We must keep in mind that we are not talking simply about multiple masculinities. There also exist power structures between these masculinities. Hegemonic masculinities decide which marginalized masculinities are ignored, which authorized, and which subordinated. Would the proponents of

ancient Greco-Roman hegemonic masculinities authorize masculinities presented in the Synoptic Gospels? The fact that a couple of centuries after the writing of the Synoptic Gospels early Christianity gained the hegemonic position might suggest so. However, this development cannot be taken as inevitable, as Celsus' example shows: he did not think early Christian Gospels showed masculinity ideals worth following.

I began the study of the ideal masculinities in the Synoptic Gospels by examining the portrayal of the opponents of Jesus. The opponents are presented as negative, unmasculine counterparts to Jesus. They prefer public recognition over following the will of God, they are impious, and they lack self-control. Jesus, on the contrary, is depicted as more masculine, since he is pious and has more authority than the opponents. The Synoptic Gospels aim in their depiction of the opponents to show that the opponents are not ideally masculine. Emphasis on the importance of piety and self-control makes the ideal masculinities of the Synoptic Gospels similar to the hegemonic ideals. Still, the Synoptic Gospels argue that their group offers superior methods for fulfilling the ideals of masculinity. The same strategy is employed, for example, by Philo and Josephus.

In their depiction of the opponents of Jesus, the Synoptic Gospels are relatively unified. It is in the depiction of the disciples and ideal discipleship where differences between the ideal masculinities of the Synoptic Gospels begin to appear. In Mark's Gospel, the disciples are occasionally depicted negatively as fallible followers. For example, Mark uses Peter to exemplify two competing ideals of masculinity. Peter's ideal of the Messiah is closer to the self-assertive ideal of masculinity, whereas Jesus' teaching of his death and suffering are closer to the self-controlled ideal of masculinity. Matthew and especially Luke amend Mark's portrayal of the disciples. Still, in none of the Synoptic Gospels are the disciples depicted as unmasculine *per se* like the opponents of Jesus are. The disciples are only on a lower level of gender hierarchy and relationally less masculine than Jesus. Jesus not only has authority in relation to his opponents, but also his disciples. When depicting Jesus in relation to his opponents and disciples, the Synoptic Gospels are in line with the hegemonic ideals that saw authority as masculine.

The ideal masculinity of the Synoptic Gospels presented in Jesus' teaching is closer to the self-controlled ideal of masculinity. This can be seen, for example, in the Sermon on the Mount, where Jesus teaches the importance of meekness and peacemaking. Nevertheless, there are also occasions where Jesus' teaching goes beyond the self-controlled ideal of masculinity into what seems like voluntary acceptance of the marginal position of the early Christians. The disciples are instructed to adopt the social position of marginal groups such as

children, slaves, and eunuchs. The women followers of Jesus are also offered as examples to the disciples. The disciples are instructed to adopt the feminine role of service. In addition, the disciples should be ready to leave their families, which would marginalize their masculinity further. This idea of voluntary marginalization is advocated especially in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. Occasionally, Matthew advocates an even more voluntarily marginal ideal than Mark (for instance, when he suggests that the disciples should become like children and eunuchs). Luke, on the other hand, seems to be closer to the hegemonic ideals.

The difference between Luke's recommendation of a masculinity that is more complicit with the hegemonic ideals and Mark's more voluntary marginality is seen also in their depictions of the ideal femininity. Luke's ideal femininity is close to the ancient Greco-Roman ideal of emphasized femininity when he portrays the ideal women as silent and submissive. In Mark, the women have less traditional roles: they take the initiative and are praised for their actions.

When comparing the Synoptic Gospel portrayals of the disciples and Jesus, it becomes evident that in Mark both Jesus and the disciples are depicted as marginal figures, whereas Luke changes Mark's portrayal of both Jesus and the disciples to be closer to the ideals of the Greco-Roman world and thus closer to the hegemonic ideals of masculinity. Matthew, on the other hand, follows Mark in depicting the disciples as marginal, but changes Mark's portrayal of Jesus to be closer to the ideals of hegemonic masculinities. Matthew thus maintains that Mark's portrayal of Jesus is problematic for masculinity, but he does not change the depiction of the disciples as much as Luke does.

This tendency of Luke and Matthew to enhance the portrayal of Jesus and make him appear more masculine is evident throughout the Gospels. Already in Chapter 3, I noted that Mark is not concerned about portraying Jesus in a potentially negative light. Matthew and Luke enhance the portrayal of Jesus by omitting or changing some of Mark's details and thus they make Jesus seem more masculine. Moreover, in Mark the nontraditional roles for women seem to go hand in hand with voluntarily marginalized masculinity. Luke's emphasized femininity and Matthew's changes to Mark's narratives of Jesus meeting women enhance the masculinity of Jesus. In Matthew, the women do not challenge Jesus' masculinity as potentially happens in Mark's Gospel. Matthew is thus closer to the ideal of emphasized femininity than Mark, although not as close as Luke. Mark seems closest to a voluntary acceptance of marginality, whereas Matthew and Luke move the portrayal of Jesus closer to hegemonic ideals.

In addition, when it comes to Jesus' emotions and death, Luke is closest to the self-controlled ideal of masculinity which was advocated especially by the Stoic philosophers. Luke does not portray Jesus as emotional and instead presents his death as an example of a calm, noble, masculine death. Mark, on the contrary, depicts Jesus as emotional throughout his Gospel and does not downplay the humiliating features of his death. Mark's depiction of Jesus as an emotional and suffering figure is not in accordance with the ideals of Stoic philosophy or the noble death tradition. Matthew's depiction of Jesus is situated between Luke's and Mark's portrayals of Jesus. He occasionally enhances the portrayal of Jesus, but not as systematically as Luke. In the end, Mark and Matthew do not present Jesus' death as a noble, masculine death. This makes their masculinity more voluntarily marginalized.

In conclusion, in this study I have shown that out of the Synoptic Gospels, the Gospel of Luke is most complicit with the self-controlled ideal of masculinity competing for the hegemonic position in the ancient Greco-Roman world. Matthew and Mark, on the other hand, present a more voluntarily marginalized masculinity as the ideal for the disciples. Thus, the Synoptic Gospels do not present only one ideal of masculinity. Each Gospels presents its own, slightly different version of what a "real man" should be like. Nevertheless, the Synoptic Gospels all reject the aggressive masculinity that strives to control and subordinate others. Those who are rulers may lord over the Gentiles and great ones be tyrants over them, but the disciples should serve each other.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Achilles Tatius. *Leucippe and Clitophon*. Transl. John J. Winkler, in *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Ed. B. P. Reardon. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Adamantius. *Physiognomonica*. Ed. R. Foerster, *Scriptores physiognomonici Graeci et Latini* vol. 1. Leipzig: Teubner, 1893.

Aelian. *Historical miscellany*. Ed. and transl. N. G. Wilson. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Aeschines. *The Speeches of Aeschines: Against Timarchus; On the Embassy; Against Ctesiphon*. Transl. Charles Darwin Adams. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1968.

Aeschylus. *Aeschylus in Two Volumes*. Vol. 1–2. Transl. Herbert Weir Smyth. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956–1957.

Aesop. *Corpus fabularum Aesopicarum*. Vols. 1.1–2. Ed. A. Hausrath & H. Hunger. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Teubner, 1959–1970.

Ammianus Marcellinus. *Ammianus Marcellinus in Three Volumes*. Vol. 1–3. Transl. John C. Rolfe. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1964–1972.

Apostolic Fathers. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Ed. and transl. Michael W. Holmes. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.

Apuleius. *The Golden Ass: Being the Metamorphoses of Lucius Apuleius*. Transl. W. Adlington; rev. S. Gaselee. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1958.

Archilochus. *Fragmenta*. Ed. M. L. West, *Iambi et elegi Graeci* vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Aristophanes. *Aristophanes*. Vol. 1–3. Ed. and transl. Jeffrey Henderson. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998–2002.

Aristotle. *Aristotle in Twenty-Three Volumes*. Vol. 1–23. Transl. A. L. Peck et al. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1947–2011.

Athenagoras. *Legatio sive Supplicatio pro Christianis*. Ed. W. R. Schoedel, *Athenagoras: Legatio and De resurrectione*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Augustine. *The City of God against the Pagans in Seven Volumes*. Vol. 1–7. Transl. George E. McCracken et al. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957–1972.

Augustus. *Compendium of Roman History: Res gestae divi Augusti*. Transl. Frederick W. Shipley. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1961.

Aulus Gellius. *The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius in Three Volumes*. Vol. 1–3. Transl. John C. Rolfe. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1946–1961.

Basil. *Homilia adversus eos qui irascuntur*. Ed. J.-P. Migne. Patrologiae cursus completus series Graeca (MPG) 31. Paris: Migne, 1857–1866.

Catullus. *Catullus*. Transl. Francis Warre Cornish. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1988.

Celsus. *De medicina*. Transl. W. G. Spencer. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953.

Chariton. *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. Transl. Bryan P. Reardon, in *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Ed. B. P. Reardon. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Cicero. *Cicero in Twenty Eight Volumes*. Vol. 1–28. Transl. H. Rackham et al. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1942–2005.

Clement of Alexandria. *Paedagogus*. Ed. M. Harl, H.-I. Marrou, C. Matray & C. Mondésert, *Clément d'Alexandrie: Le pédagogue*, 3 vols. Sources chrétiennes 70, 108, 158. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1960–1970.

Curtius Rufus. *Quintus Curtius in Two Volumes*. Vol. 1–2. Transl. John C. Rolfe. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1962.

Cyprian. *Three Books of Testimonies against the Jews*. Transl. Robert Ernest Wallis, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers* vol. 5. Ed. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson & A. Cleveland Coxe. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1886.

Demosthenes. *Orations*. Transl. J. H. Vince et al. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1958–1964.

Dio Chrysostom. *Dio Chrysostom in Five Volumes*. Vol. 1–5. Transl. J. W. Cohoon & H. Lamar Crosby. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1946–1964.

Diodorus of Sicily. *Diodorus of Sicily in Ten* [*i.e. Twelve*] *Volumes*. Vol. 1–12. Transl. C. H. Oldfather. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1946–1954.

Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Vol. 1–2. Transl. R. D. Hicks. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995–2000.

Dio Cassius. *Dio's Roman History in Nine Volumes*. Transl. Earnest Cary. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1914–1927.

Dioscorides Pedanius. *De materia medica*. Ed. M. Wellmann, *Pedanii Dioscuridis Anazarbei de materia medica libri quinque*. 3 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1906–1914.

Epictetus. *The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, the Manual, and Fragments*. Vol. 1–2. Transl. W. A. Oldfather. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959–1961.

Epicurus. *Epicurus to Menoeceus*. Transl. Whitney J. Oates, *The Stoic and Epicurean Philosophers: The Complete Extant Writings of Epicurus, Epictetus, Lucretius, Marcus Aurelius*. New York: Random House, 1940.

Euripides. *Euripides*. Ed. and transl. David Kovacs. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994–2002.

Firmicus Maternus. *De errore profanarum religionum*. Ed. Konrat Ziegler, *Iuli Firmici Materni De errore profanarum religionum: mit Einleitung und kritischen Apparat*. Das Wort der Antike 3. München: Max Hueber, 1953.

Herodotus. *Herodotus in Four Volumes*. Vol. 1–4. Transl. A. D. Godley. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1960–1963.

Hesiod. *Theogony; Works and Days; Testimonia*. Ed. and transl. Glenn W. Most. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Hippocrates. *Hippocrates*. Vol. 1–7. Transl. W. H. S. Jones et al. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1967–1994.

Historia Augusta. *Historia Augusta*. Vol. 2. Transl. David Magie. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1924.

Homer. *The Iliad*. Vol. 1–2. Transl. A. T. Murray. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957–1971.

Homer. *The Odyssey*. Vol. 1–2. Transl. A. T. Murray. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Horace. *Odes and Epodes*. Ed. and transl. Niall Rudd. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Horace. *Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica*. Transl. H. Rushton Fairclough. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1961.

Iamblichus. *De vita Pythagorica*. Ed. U. Klein post L. Deubner, *Iamblichi de vita Pythagorica liber*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1937.

Jerome. *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri opera: Commentariorum in Matheum libri IV*. Ed. D. Hurst & M. Adriaen. Corpus christianorum 77. Turnholti: Brepols, 1969.

Josephus. *Josephus in Nine* [*i.e. Ten*] *Volumes*. Vol. 1–10. Transl. H. St. J. Thackeray et al. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1926–1981.

Julius Caesar. *The Gallic War*. Transl. H. J. Edwards. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Justin Martyr. *Justin Martyr*. Transl. Alexander Roberts & James Donaldson, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers* vol. 1. Ed. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson & A. Cleveland Coxe. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885.

Juvenal. *Juvenal and Persius*. Ed. and transl. Susanna Morton Braund. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Lactantius. *The Wrath of God*. Transl. William Fletcher, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers* vol. 7. Ed. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson & A. Cleveland Coxe. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1886.

Livy. *Livy in Fourteen Volumes*. Vol. 1–14. Transl. B. O. Foster et al. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958–1967.

Longus. *Daphnis and Chloe*. Transl. Christopher Gill, in *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Ed. B. P. Reardon. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Lucian. *Lucian in Eight Volumes*. Vol. 1–8. Transl. A. M. Harmon, K. Kilburn & M. D. Macleod. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959–1972.

Macrobius. *Saturnalia*. Ed. and transl. Robert A. Kaster. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011.

Marcus Aurelius. *The Communings with Himself of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, Emperor of Rome Together with His Speeches and Sayings*. Transl. C. R. Haines. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1970.

Martial. *Epigrams*. Vol. 1–3. Transl. Walter C. A. Ker & D. R. Shackleton Bailey. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961–1993.

The Mishnah. *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. Transl. Jacob Neusner. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.

Musonius Rufus. "Musonius Rufus 'The Roman Socrates.'" Ed. Cora E. Lutz. *Yale Classical Studies* 10 (1947), 32–145.

Novum testamentum. *Novum testamentum Graece post Eberthart et Erwin Nestle*. Ed. Kurt Aland et al. 27. rev. Aufl. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.

Origen. *Contra Celsum*. Transl. Henry Chadwick. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.

Origen. *Origenes Werke XI: Commentarius in Matthaeum II*. Ed. Erich Klostermann & Ernst Benz, *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Erster Drei Jahrhunderte* vol. 38. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1933.

Ovid. *Fasti*. Transl. James George Frazer. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1989.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses in Two Volumes*. Vol. 1–2. Transl. Frank Justus Miller. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1956–1958.

Pausanias. *Description of Greece*. Vol. 3. Transl. W. H. S. Jones. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1960.

Phaedrus. *Babrius and Phaedrus*. Ed. and transl. Ben Edwin Perry. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1965.

Philo. *Philo in Ten Volumes* (*and Two Supplementary Volumes*). Vol. 1–10. Transl. F. H. Colson et al. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958–1962.

Philo. *On Virtues*. Introduction, translation and commentary by Walter T. Wilson. Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series 3. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Philostratus. *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. Vol. 1–2. Ed. and transl. Christopher P. Jones. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Pindar. *Olympian Odes; Pythian Odes*. Ed. and transl. William H. Race. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Plato. *Plato*. Transl. Harold North Fowler et al. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1952–1999.

Plautus. *Plautus in Five Volumes*. Vol. 1–5. Transl. Paul Nixon. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1959–1965.

Pliny the Elder. *The Elder Pliny on the Human Animal: Natural History Book 7*. Transl. with introduction and commentary by Mary Beagon. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005.

Pliny the Younger. *Letters in Two Volumes*. Vol. 1–2. Transl. William Melmoth; rev. W. M. L. Hutchinson. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1961–1963.

Plutarch. *Plutarch's Lives in Eleven Volumes*. Vol. 1–11. Transl. Bernadotte Perrin et al. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1948–1959.

Plutarch. *Plutarch's Moralia in Fifteen* [*i.e. Sixteen*] *Volumes*. Vol. 1–16. Transl. Frank Cole Babbitt et al. The Loeb Classical Library 305. London: Heinemann, 1927–1994.

Polemo. *Physiognomonica*. Ed. R. Foerster, *Scriptores physiognomonici Graeci et Latini* vol. 1. Leipzig: Teubner, 1893.

Polybius. *The Histories in Six Volumes*. Vol. 1–6. Transl. W. R. Paton. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Sallust. *Sallust*. Transl. J. C. Rolfe. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1955.

Seneca. *Ad Lucilium epistulae morales in Three Volumes*. Vol. 1–3. Transl. Richard M. Gummere. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1961–1962.

Seneca. *Moral Essays in Three Volumes*. Vol. 1–3. Transl. John W. Basore. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1963–1965.

Seneca. *Naturales quaestiones*. Transl. Thomas H. Corcoran. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1971.

Seneca the Elder. *Declamations in Two Volumes*. Vol. 1, *Controversiae* Books 1–6. Transl. M. Winterbottom. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Sophocles. *Sophocles*. Vol. 1–2. Transl. Hugh Lloyd-Jones. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1994–1998.

Soranus. *Soranus' Gynecology*. Transl. with an introduction Owsei Temkin with the assistance of Nicholson J. Eastman, Ludwig Edelstein & Alan F. Guttmacher. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.

Stobaeus. *Ioannis Stobaei anthologium*. 5 vols. Ed. O. Hense & C. Wachsmuth. Berlin: Weidmann, 1884–1912.

Strabo. *The Geography of Strabo in Eight Volumes*. Vol. 1–8. Transl. Horace Leonard Jones. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1944–1961.

Suetonius. *Suetonius*. Vol. 1–2. Transl. J. C. Rolfe. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1997–1998.

Tacitus. *Tacitus in Five Volumes*. Vol. 1–5. Transl. M. Hutton et al. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1968–1970.

Terence. *Terence in Two Volumes*. Vol. 1–2. Transl. John Sargeaunt & John Batsby. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Tertullian. *On Monogamy*. Transl. S. Thelwall, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers* vol. 4. Ed. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson & A. Cleveland Coxe. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885.

The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. 1–2. Ed. James H. Charlesworth. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983–1985.

Theodore of Mopsuestia. *Synesiou Episkopou Kyrēnēs ta heuriskomena panta: Synesii Episcopi Cyrenes opera quae extant omnia editore et interprete Dionysio Petauio. Accedunt Theodori Mopsuesteni Episcopi, S. Arsenii Eremitae scripta vel scriptorum fragmenta quae supersunt*. J.-P. Migne. Patrologiae cursus completus Patrologiae Graecae 66. Turnhout: Brepols, 1980.

Theophrastus. *The Characters of Theophrastus*. Ed. and transl. J. M. Edmonds. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1961.

Valerius Maximus. *Memorable Doings and Sayings*. Vol. 1–2. Ed. and transl. D. R. Shackleton Bailey. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Xenophon. *Xenophon in Seven Volumes*. Vol. 1–7. Transl. Carleton L. Brownson et al. The Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1960–1998.

Secondary Literature

Aasgaard, Reidar. 2009a. "From Boy to Man in Antiquity: Jesus in the Apocryphal Infancy Gospel of Thomas." *Thymos: Journal of Boyhood Studies* 1/3, 3–20.

Aasgaard, Reidar. 2009b. *The Childhood of Jesus: Decoding the Apocryphal Infancy Gospel of Thomas*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.

Abercrombie, Nicholas & Bryan S. Turner. 1978. "The Dominant Ideology Thesis." *The British Journal of Sociology* 29, 149–170.

Abreu, José M., Rodney K. Goodyear, Alvaro Campos & Michael D. Newcomb. 2000. "Ethnic Belonging and Traditional Masculinity Ideology among African Americans, European Americans, and Latinos." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 1, 75–86.

Albright, William Foxwell & C. S. Mann. 1984. *Matthew: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. The Anchor Bible Commentary 26. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Allen, Prudence, R. S. M. 1985. *The Concept of Woman: The Aristotelian Revolution 750 BC–AD 1250*. Montreal: Eden Press.

Alonso, Pablo. 2011. *The Woman Who Changed Jesus: Crossing Boundaries in Mk 7,24–30*. Biblical Tools and Studies 11. Leuven: Peeters.

Alston, Richard. 1998. "Arms and the Man: Soldiers, Masculinity and Power in Republican and Imperial Rome." *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power and Identity in Classical Antiquity*. Ed. Lin Foxhall & John Salmon. London: Routledge, 205–223.

Anderson, Hugh. 1976. *The Gospel of Mark*. New Century Bible. Greenwood: Attic Press.

Anderson, Janice Capel. 1983. "Matthew: Gender and Reading." *Semeia* 28, 3–27.

Anderson, Janice Capel. 1992. "Feminist Criticism: The Dancing Daughter." *Mark & Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*. Ed. Janice Capel Anderson & Stephen D. Moore. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 103–134.

Anderson, Janice Capel. 1994. *Matthew's Narrative Web: Over, and Over, and Over Again*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 91. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Anderson, Janice C. & Stephen D. Moore. 2003. "Matthew and Masculinity." *New Testament Masculinities*. Ed. Stephen D. Moore & Janice Capel Anderson. Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies 45. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 67–91.

Antonovsky, Aaron. 1956. "Toward a Refinement of the 'Marginal Man' Concept." *Social Forces* 35, 57–62.

Asikainen, Susanna. 2012. "Avioliitto Plutarkhoksella ja Uudessa testamentissa." *Teologinen aikakauskirja* 117, 120–131.

Asikainen, Susanna. 2014. "'Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven': Matthew and Subordinated Masculinities." *Biblical Masculinities Foregrounded*. Ed. Ovidiu Creangă & Peter-Ben Smit. Hebrew Bible Monographs 62. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 156–188.

Asikainen, Susanna. Forthcoming. "The Ideal Husband and Wife in Plutarch and the New Testament." *Social Roles and Occupations in Early Christianity*. Ed. Antti Marjanen.

Aspegren, Kerstin. 1990. *The Male Woman: A Feminine Ideal in the Early Church*. Ed. René Kieffer. Uppsala Women's Studies A, Women in Religion 4. Uppsala: Uppsala University.

Aune, David C. 1994. "Of the Passions: Philo, 4 Maccabees and Earliest Christianity." *Hellenization Revisited: Shaping a Christian Response within the Greco-Roman World*. Ed. Wendy E. Helleman. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 125–158.

Baca Zinn, Maxine. 1989. "Chicano Men and Masculinity." *Men's Lives*. Ed. Michael S. Kimmel & Michael A. Messner. New York: Macmillan, 87–97.

Bach, Alice. 1996. "Calling the Shots: Directing Salome's Dance of Death." *Semeia* 74, 103–126.

Baer, Richard A., Jr. 1970. *Philo's Use of the Categories Male and Female*. Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums 3. Leiden: Brill.

Bailey, Lisa. 2007. "'These Are Not Men': Sex and Drink in the Sermons of Caesarius of Arles." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 15, 23–43.

Barbour, R. S. 1969/1970. "Gethsemane in the Tradition of the Passion." *New Testament Studies* 16, 231–251.

Barclay, John M. G. 2005. "The Empire Writes Back: Josephan Rhetoric in Flavian Rome." *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Ed. Jonathan Edmondson, Steve Mason & James Rives. Corby: Oxford University Press, 315–332.

Barton, Carlin A. 1993. *The Sorrows of the Ancient Romans: The Gladiator and the Monster*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Barton, Carlin A. 2001. *Roman Honor: The Fire in the Bones*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Barton, Stephen C. 1994. *Discipleship and Family Ties in Mark and Matthew*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bassi, Karen. 1998. *Acting like Men: Gender, Drama, and Nostalgia in Ancient Greece*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Bauckham, Richard. 2002. *Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Bauer, Walter. 1967. "Matth. 19,12 und die alten Christen." Walter Bauer, *Aufsätze und kleine Schriften*. Hrsg. Georg Strecker. Tübingen: Mohr, 253–262.

BDAG. 1979. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature: A Translation and Adaptation of the Fourth Revised and Augmented Edition of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*. Ed. William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Beagon, Mary. 2005. *The Elder Pliny on the Human Animal: Natural History Book 7*. Transl. with introduction and commentary by Mary Beagon. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Beare, Francis Wright. 1981. *The Gospel According to Matthew: A Commentary*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Beasley, Chris. 2005. *Gender & Sexuality: Critical Theories, Critical Thinkers*. London: SAGE.

Beavis, Mary Ann. 1988. "Women as Models of Faith in Mark." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 18, 3–9.

Bell, Derrick. 1995. "The Race-Charged Relationship of Black Men and Black Women." *Constructing Masculinity*. Ed. Maurice Berger, Brian Wallis & Simon Watson. New York: Routledge, 193–210.

Bernabé, Carmen. 2003. "Of Eunuchs and Predators: Matthew 19:1–12 in a Cultural Context." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 33, 128–134.

Berry, John W. 1990. "Psychology of Acculturation." *Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. Ed. John J. Berman. Current Theory and Research in Motivation 37; Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 201–234.

Berry, John W. 1997. "Immigration, Acculturation, and Adaptation." *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 46, 5–34.

Betz, Hans-Dieter. 1995. *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain* (*Matthew 5:3–7:27 and Luke 6:20–49*). Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Bjelland Kartzow, Marianne. 2010. "'Asking the Other Question': An Intersectional Approach to Galatians 3:28 and the Colossian Household Codes." *Biblical Interpretation* 18, 364–389.

Blaising, Craig A. 1979. "Gethsemane: A Prayer of Faith." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 22, 333–343.

Bond, Helen K. 1998. *Pontius Pilate in History and Interpretation*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Borrell, Augusti. 1998. *The Good News of Peter's Denial: A Narrative and Rhetorical Reading of Mark 14:54.66–72*. University of South Florida International Studies in Formative Christianity and Judaism 7. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Bowersock, G. W. 1994. *Fiction as History: Nero to Julian*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Boyarin, Daniel. 1992. "'This We Know to Be the Carnal Israel': Circumcision and the Erotic Life of God and Israel." *Critical Inquiry* 18, 474–505.

Boyarin, Daniel. 1993. *Carnal Israel: Reading Sex in Talmudic Culture*. The New Historicism 25. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Boyarin, Daniel. 1995. "Homotopia: The Feminized Jewish Man and the Lives of Women in Late Antiquity." *Differences* 7.2, 41–81.

Boyarin, Daniel. 1997. *Unheroic Conduct: The Rise of Heterosexuality and the Invention of the Jewish Man*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Boyarin, Daniel. 1999. *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Breitman, Barbara. 1988. "Lifting up the Shadow of Anti-Semitism: Jewish Masculinity in a New Light." *A Mensch among Men: Explorations in Jewish Masculinity*. Ed. Harry Brod. Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press, 101–117.

Brennan, Tad. 1998. "The Old Stoic Theory of Emotions." *The Emotions in Hellenistic Philosophy*. Ed. Juha Sihvola & Troels Engberg-Pedersen. The New Synthese Historical Library 46. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 21–70.

Brisson, Luc. 2002. *Sexual Ambivalence: Androgyny and Hermaphrodism in Graeco-Roman Antiquity*. Transl. Janet Lloyd. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Brod, Harry. 1994. "Some Thoughts on Some Histories of Some Masculinities: Jews and Other Others." *Theorizing Masculinities*. Ed. Harry Brod & Michael Kaufman. Research on Men and Masculinities 5. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 82–96.

Brown, Jeannine K. 2002. *The Disciples in Narrative Perspective: The Portrayal and Function of the Matthean Disciples*. Society of Biblical Literature Academia Biblica 9. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.

Brown, Peter. 1988. *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Brown, Raymond E. 1970. *The Gospel According to John (XIII–XXI): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. The Anchor Bible 29A. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Brown, Raymond E. 1994a. *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*. Volume 1. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Brown, Raymond E. 1994b. *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*. Volume 2. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Brown, Raymond E., Karl P. Donfried & John Reumann, eds. 1973. *Peter in the New Testament*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House.

Bucholtz, Mary. 1999. "You da Man: Narrating the Racial Other in the Production of White Masculinity." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3, 443–460.

Burkill, T. A. 1967. "The Historical Development of the Story of the Syrophoenician Woman (Mark VII:24–31)." *Novum Testamentum* 9, 161–177.

Burrus, Virginia. 2000. *Begotten, Not Made: Conceiving Manhood in Late Antiquity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, Judith. 1993. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*. New York: Routledge.

Cairns, Douglas L. 2009. "Weeping and Veiling: Grief, Display, and Concealment in Ancient Greek Culture." *Tears in the Graeco-Roman World*. Ed. Thorsten Fögen. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 37–57.

Callon, Callie. 2006. "Pilate the Villain: An Alternative Reading of Matthew's Portrayal of Pilate." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 36, 62–71.

Camp, Claudia V. 1991. "Understanding Patriarchy: Women in Second Century Jerusalem through the Eyes of Ben Sira." *"Women like This": New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World*. Ed. Amy-Jill Levine. Early Judaism and Its Literature 01. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1–39.

Campbell, William Sanger. 2004. "Engagement, Disengagement and Obstruction: Jesus' Defense Strategies in Mark's Trial and Execution Scenes (14.53–64; 15.1–39)." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 26, 283–300.

Carrigan, Tim, Bob (R. W.) Connell & John Lee. 1985. "Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity." *Theory and Society* 5/14, 551–604.

Carson, Anne. 1999. "Dirt and Desire: The Phenomenology of Female Pollution in Antiquity." *Constructions of the Classical Body*. Ed. James I. Porter. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 77–100.

Carter, Warren. 1994. *Households and Discipleship: A Study of Matthew 19–20*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 103. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Carter, Warren. 2000. *Matthew and the Margins: A Sociopolitical and Religious Reading*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Carter, Warren. 2006. *The Roman Empire and the New Testament: An Essential Guide*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.

Chaney, Cassande. 2009. "Boys to Men: How Perceptions of Manhood Influence the Romantic Partnership of Black Men." *Western Journal of Black Studies* 33, 110–122.

Chapman, Ann. 2011. *The Female Principle in Plutarch's Moralia*. Dublin: University College Dublin Press.

Chartrand-Burke, Tony. 2001. *The Infancy Gospel of Thomas: The Text, Its Origins, and Its Transmission*. Diss. University of Toronto.

Clark, Ronald R., Jr. 2002. "Kingdoms, Kids, and Kindness: A New Context for Luke 18:15–17." *Stone-Campbell Journal* 5, 235–248.

Clines, David. 1995. "David the Man." *Interested Parties: The Ideology of Writers and Readers of the Hebrew Bible*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 205; Gender, Culture, Theory 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 212–241.

Clines, David. 1998. "Ecce Vir, or: Gendering the Son of Man." *Biblical Studies/Cultural Studies: The Third Sheffield Colloquium*. Ed. J. Cheryl Exum & Stephen D. Moore. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 266; Gender, Culture, Theory 7. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 352–375.

Clines, David. 2002. "He-Prophets: Masculinity as a Problem for the Hebrew Prophets and Their Interpreters." *Sense and Sensitivity: Essays on Reading the Bible in Memory of Robert Carroll*. Ed. Alastair G. Hunter and Philip R. Davies. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 348. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 311–328.

Clines, David. 2003. "Paul, the Invisible Man." *New Testament Masculinities*. Ed. Stephen D. Moore & Janice Capel Anderson. Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies 45. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 181–192.

Clines, David. 2007. "Being a Man in the Book of Covenant." *Reading the Law: Studies in Honour of Gordon J. Wenham*. Ed. J. G. McConville & Karl Möller. New York: T & T Clark, 3–9.

Clines, David. 2010. "Dancing and Shining at Sinai: Playing the Man in Exodus 32–34." *Men and Masculinity in the Hebrew Bible and Beyond*. Ed. Ovidiu Creangă. The Bible in the Modern World 33. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 54–63.

Cobb, L. Stephanie. 2008. *Dying to Be Men: Gender and Language in Early Christian Martyr Texts*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Cohen, David. 1995. *Law, Violence, and Community in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Collins, Adela Yarbro. 1994. "From Noble Death to Crucified Messiah." *New Testament Studies* 40, 481–503.

Collins, Adela Yarbro. 2007. *Mark: A Commentary*. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Coltrane, Scott. 1992. "The Micropolitics of Gender in Nonindustrial Societies." *Gender and Society* 6, 86–107.

Connell, Raewyn (R. W.). 1987. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Connell, Raewyn (R. W.). 1991. "Live Fast and Die Young: The Construction of Masculinity among Young Working-Class Men on the Margin of the Labour Market." *Journal of Sociology* 27, 141–171.

Connell, Raewyn (R. W.). 1993. "The Big Picture: Masculinities in Recent World History." *Theory and Society* 22, 597–623.

Connell, Raewyn (R. W.). 1995. "Politics of Changing Men." *Socialist Review* 25, 135–159.

Connell, Raewyn (R. W.). 1997. "Men, Masculinities and Feminism." *Social Alternatives* 16, 7–10.

Connell, Raewyn (R. W.). 1998. "Masculinities and Globalization." *Men and Masculinities* 1, 3–23.

Connell, Raewyn (R. W.). 2000. "Understanding Men: Gender Sociology and the New International Research on Masculinities." Clark Lecture, Department of Sociology, University of Kansas, September 19, 2000. Cited February 13, 2015. Online: http://www.europrofem.org/contri/2_04_en/research-on-masculinities.pdf.

Connell, Raewyn (R. W.). 2002. "On Hegemonic Masculinity and Violence: Response to Jefferson and Hall." *Theoretical Criminology* 6, 89–99.

Connell, Raewyn (R. W.). 2005. *Masculinities*. 2nd ed. 1st ed. 1995. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Connell, R. W. & James W. Messerschmidt. 2005. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender and Society* 19, 829–859.

Conway, Colleen M. 2008. *Behold the Man: Jesus and Greco-Roman Masculinity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cook, John Granger. 2014. *Crucifixion in the Mediterranean World*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 327. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Cooper, Kate. 1996. *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Corbeill, Anthony. 1997. "Dining Deviants in Roman Political Invective." *Roman Sexualities*. Ed. Judith P. Hallett & Marilyn B. Skinner. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 99–128.

Corley, Kathleen E. 1993. *Private Women, Public Meals: Social Conflict in the Synoptic Tradition*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Cosgrove, Charles H. 2005. "A Woman's Unbound Hair in the Greco-Roman World, with Special Reference to the Story of the 'Sinful Woman' in Luke 7:36–50." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124, 675–692.

Creangă, Ovidiu, ed. 2010. *Men and Masculinity in the Hebrew Bible and Beyond*. The Bible in the Modern World 33. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press.

Creangă, Ovidiu & Peter-Ben Smit, ed. 2014. *Biblical Masculinities Foregrounded*. Hebrew Bible Monographs 62. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press.

Crook, Zeba. 2009. "Honor, Shame, and Social Status Revisited." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128, 591–611.

D'Angelo, Mary Rose. 1990. "Women in Luke-Acts: A Redactional View." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109, 441–461.

D'Angelo, Mary Rose. 1992. "Abba and 'Father': Imperial Theology and the Jesus Traditions." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111, 611–630.

D'Angelo, Mary Rose. 1999. "(Re)Presentations of Women in the Gospel of Matthew and Luke-Acts." *Women & Christian Origins*. Ed. Ross Shepard Kraemer & Mary Rose D'Angelo. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 171–195.

D'Angelo, Mary Rose. 2002. "The ἀνήρ Question in Luke-Acts: Imperial Masculinity and the Deployment of Women in the Early Second Century." *A Feminist Companion to Luke*. Ed. Amy-Jill Levine with Marianne Blickenstaff. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 44–69.

D'Angelo, Mary Rose. 2003a. "'Knowing How to Preside over His Own Household': Imperial Masculinity and Christian Asceticism in the Pastorals, *Hermas*, and Luke-Acts." *New Testament Masculinities*. Ed. Stephen D. Moore & Janice Capel Anderson. Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies 45. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 265–296.

D'Angelo, Mary Rose. 2003b. "Ευσεβεια: Roman Imperial Family Values and the Sexual Politics of 4 Maccabees and the Pastorals." *Biblical Interpretation* 11, 139–165.

D'Angelo, Mary Rose. 2007. "Gender and Geopolitics in the Work of Philo of Alexandria: Jewish Piety and Imperial Family Values." *Mapping Gender in Ancient Religious Discourses*. Ed. Todd Penner & Caroline Vander Stichele. Biblical Interpretation 84. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 63–88.

Davidson, James N. 1997. *Courtesans and Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Davies, W. D. & Dale C. Allison. 1991. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew. Volume 2, Commentary on Matthew 8–18*. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Davies, W. D. & Dale C. Allison. 1997. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew. Volume 3, Commentary on Matthew 19–28*. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Davis, Kathy. 2008. "Intersectionality as Buzzword: A Sociology of Science Perspective on what Makes a Feminist Theory Successful." *Feminist Theory* 9, 67–85.

Dawsey, James M. 1984. "Confrontation in the Temple: Luke 19:45–20:47." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 11, 153–165.

Dean-Jones, Lesley. 2003. "The Cultural Construct of the Female Body in Classical Greek Science." *Sex and Difference in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Ed. Mark Golden & Peter Toohey. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 183–201.

De Boer, Esther A. 2006. *The Gospel of Mary: Listening to the Beloved Disciple*. London: T & T Clark International.

Demetriou, Demetrakis Z. 2001. "Connell's Concept of Hegemonic Masculinity: A Critique." *Theory and Society* 30, 337–361.

Dewey, Arthur J. 1992. "The Unkindest Cut of All? Matt 19:11–12." *Foundations and Facets Forum* 8, 113–122.

Dewey, Joanna. 1980. *Markan Public Debate: Literary Technique, Concentric Structure, and Theology in Mark 2:1–3:6*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 48. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.

Dewey, Joanna. 1994. "Jesus' Healings of Women: Conformity and Non-Conformity to Dominant Cultural Values as Clues for Historical Reconstruction." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 24, 122–131.

Dewey, Joanna. 1995. "Gospel of Mark." *Searching the Scriptures Vol. 2: A Feminist Commentary* Ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Ann Brock & Shelly Matthews. London: SCM Press, 470–509.

Dewey, Joanna. 1997. "Women in the Synoptic Gospels: Seen but Not Heard?" *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 27, 53–60.

Donahue, John R. & Daniel J. Harrington. 2002. *The Gospel of Mark*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press.

Dover, K. J. 1974. *Greek Popular Morality: In the Time of Plato and Aristotle*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dowling, Melissa Barden. 2006. *Clemency and Cruelty in the Roman World*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Downing, F. Gerald. 1992. "The Woman from Syrophoenicia, and Her Doggedness: Mark 7:24–31 (Matthew 15:21–28)." *Women in the Biblical Tradition*. Ed. George J. Brooke. Studies in Women and Religion 31. Lewiston, NY: E. Mellen Press, 129–149.

Driggers, Ira Brent. 2007. "The Politics of Divine Presence: Temple as Locus of Conflict in the Gospel of Mark." *Biblical Interpretation* 15, 227–247.

Droge, Arthur J. & James D. Tabor. 1992. *A Noble Death: Suicide and Martyrdom among Christians and Jews in Antiquity*. New York: Harper Collins.

Dufton, Francis. 1988–1989. "The Syrophoenician Woman and Her Dogs." *The Expository Times* 100, 417.

Duling, Dennis C. 1993. "Matthew and Marginality." *Society of Biblical Literature 1993 Seminar Papers*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 32. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 642–671.

Duling, Dennis C. 1999. "Matthew 18:15–17: Conflict, Confrontation, and Conflict Resolution in a 'Fictive Kin' Association." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 29, 4–22.

Duling, Dennis C. 2002. "Matthew as Marginal Scribe in an Advanced Agrarian Society." *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 58, 520–575.

Dunkle, J. Roger. 1967. "The Greek Tyrant and Roman Political Invective of the Late Republic." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 98, 151–171.

du Toit, Andreas B. 1994. "Vilification as a Pragmatic Device in Early Christian Epistolography." *Biblica* 75, 403–412.

Eagleton, Terry. 1991. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso.

Edwards, Catharine. 1993. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, Richard A. 1997. *Matthew's Narrative Portrait of Disciples: How the Text-Connoted Reader is Informed*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press.

Edwards, Tim. 2006. *Cultures of Masculinity*. London: Routledge.

Ehrman, Bart D. & Mark A. Plunkett. 1983. "The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43–44." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45, 401–444.

Eilberg-Schwartz, Howard. 1994. *God's Phallus: And Other Problems for Men and Monotheism*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Espiritu, Yen Le. 2007. "All Men Are Not Created Equal: Asian Men in U.S. History." *Men's Lives*. Ed. Michael S. Kimmel & Michael A. Messner. 7th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 21–29.

Evans, Craig A. 2001. *Mark 8:27–16:20*. Word Biblical Commentary 34B. Dallas, TX: Word Books.

Evans, Craig A. 2012. *Matthew*. New Cambridge Bible Commentary. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Eyben, Emiel. 1993. *Restless Youth in Ancient Rome*. Transl. Patrick Daly. London: Routledge.

Fausto-Sterling, Anne. 1993. "The Five Sexes: Why Male and Female Are Not Enough." *The Sciences* 33, 20–25.

Fausto-Sterling, Anne. 2000. *Sexing the Body: Gender Politics and the Construction of Sexuality*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Feldman, Louis H. 1968. "Abraham the Greek Philosopher in Josephus." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 99, 143–156.

Feldman, Louis H. 1983. "Josephus' Portrait of Saul." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 53, 45–99.

Feldman, Louis H. 1990. "Josephus' Portrait of David." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 60, 129–174.

Feldman, Louis H. 1995. "Josephus' Portrait of Solomon." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 66, 103–167.

Feldman, Louis H. 1997. "Reflections on Jews in Graeco-Roman Literature." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 8, 39–52.

Feldman, Louis H. 1998. *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 58. Leiden: Brill.

Feldman, Louis H. 2000. "Rabbinic Insights on the Decline and Forthcoming Fall of the Roman Empire." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 31, 275–297.

Filson, Floyd Vivian. 1971. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Adam & Charles Black.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1981. *The Gospel According to Luke (I–IX): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. The Anchor Bible 28. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1985. *The Gospel According to Luke (X–XXIV): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. The Anchor Bible 28A. New York: Doubleday.

Flanigan-Saint-Aubin, Arthur. 1994. "The Male Body and Literary Metaphors for Masculinity." *Theorizing Masculinities*. Ed. Harry Brod & Michael Kaufman. Research on Men and Masculinities 5. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 239–258.

Fonrobert, Charlotte. 1997. "The Woman with a Blood-Flow (Mark 5.24–34) Revisited: Menstrual Laws and Jewish Culture in Christian Feminist Hermeneutics." *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Ed. Craig A. Evans & James A. Sanders. Journal for the Study of the New Testament 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 121–140.

Foucault, Michel. 1988. *The History of Sexuality. Volume 3: The Care of the Self*. Transl. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage.

Foucault, Michel. 1990. *The History of Sexuality. Volume 2: The Use of Pleasure*. Transl. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage.

Fowler, Robert M. 1991. *Let the Reader Understand: Reader-Response Criticism & the Gospel of Mark*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

France, R. T. 2007. *The Gospel of Matthew*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Franklin II, Clyde W. 1987. "Surviving the Institutional Decimation of Black Males: Causes, Consequences, and Intervention." *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies*. Ed. Harry Brod. Boston: Allen & Unwin, 155–169.

Fredriksen, Paula. 1995. "Did Jesus Oppose the Purity Laws?" *Bible Review* 11, 18–25, 42–47.

Freyne, Sean. 1985. "Vilifying the Other and Defining the Self: Matthew's and John's Anti-Jewish Polemic in Focus." *"To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*. Ed. Jacob Neusner & Ernest S. Frerichs. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 117–143.

Frilingos, Chris. 2003. "Sexing the Lamb." *New Testament Masculinities*. Ed. Stephen D. Moore & Janice Capel Anderson. Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies 45. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 297–317.

Geldenhuys, Norval. 1993. *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdman.

Gench, Frances Taylor. 2004. *Back to the Well: Women's Encounters with Jesus in the Gospels*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.

George, David G. 2009. *Jesus' Lack of Emotion in Luke: The Lukan Redactions in Light of the Hellenistic Philosophers*. Diss. University of Notre Dame.

Gilmore, David D. 1990. *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Glancy, Jennifer. 1994. "Unveiling Masculinity: The Construction of Gender in Mark 6:17–29." *Biblical Interpretation* 2, 34–50.

Glancy, Jennifer. 2002. *Slavery in Early Christianity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Glancy, Jennifer. 2003. "Protocols of Masculinity." *New Testament Masculinities*. Ed. Stephen D. Moore & Janice Capel Anderson. Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies 45. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 235–264.

Glancy, Jennifer. 2004. "Boasting of Beatings (2 Corinthians 11:23–25)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 123, 99–135.

Glancy, Jennifer. 2005. "Torture: Flesh, Truth, and the Fourth Gospel." *Biblical Interpretation* 13, 107–136.

Gleason, Maud W. 1990. "The Semiotics of Gender: Physiognomy and Self-Fashioning in the Second Century CE." *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient World*. Ed. David M. Halperin, John J. Winkler & Froma I. Zeitlin. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 389–415.

Gleason, Maud W. 1995. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gleason, Maud W. 2003. "By Whose Gender Standards (If Anybody's) Was Jesus a Real Man?" *New Testament Masculinities*. Ed. Stephen D. Moore & Janice Capel Anderson. Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies 45. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 325–327.

Golden, Mark. 1990. *Children and Childhood in Classical Athens*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Goldhill, Simon. 1995. *Foucault's Virginity: Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

González, Justo L. 2010. *Luke*. Belief: A Theological Commentary on the Bible. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.

Gould, Ezra. 1948. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark*. The International Critical Commentary 27. Edinburgh: Clark.

Graver, Margaret R. 2007. *Stoicism and Emotion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Green, Joel B. 1997. *The Gospel of Luke*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdman.

Greenstein, Alexander, Stephen R. Plymate & P. Gary Katz. 1995. "Visually Stimulated Erection in Castrated Men." *The Journal of Urology* 153, 650–652.

Grig, Lucy. 2002. "Torture and Truth in Late Antique Martyrology." *Early Medieval Europe* 11, 321–336.

Guelich, Robert A. 1983. *The Sermon on the Mount: A Foundation for Understanding*. Waco, TX: Word Books.

Guelich, Robert A. 1989. *Mark 1–8:26*. Word Biblical Commentary 34A. Dallas, TX: Word Books.

Guijarro, Santiago & Ana Rodríguez. 2011. "The 'Messianic' Anointing of Jesus (Mark 14:3–9)." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 41, 132–143.

Gunderson, Erik. 2000. *Staging Masculinity: The Rhetoric of Performance in the Roman World*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Gundry, Robert Horton. 1993. *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdman.

Gundry, Robert Horton. 1994. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Guyot, Peter. 1980. *Eunuchen als Sklaven und Freigelassene in der griechisch-römischen Antike*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.

Haber, Susan. 2003. "A Woman's Touch: Feminist Encounters with the Hemorrhaging Woman in Mark 5.24–34." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 26, 171–192.

Haddox, Susan E. 2010. "Favoured Sons and Subordinate Masculinities." *Men and Masculinity in the Hebrew Bible and Beyond*. Ed. Ovidiu Creangă. The Bible in the Modern World 33. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2–19.

Hagner, Donald A. 1993. *Matthew 1–13*. Word Biblical Commentary 33A. Dallas, TX: Word Books.

Hagner, Donald A. 1995. *Matthew 14–28*. Word Biblical Commentary 33B. Dallas, TX: Word Books.

Hakola, Raimo. 2013. "Pharisees as Others in the New Testament." *Others and the Construction of Early Christian Identities*. Ed. Raimo Hakola, Nina Nikki & Ulla Tervahauta. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 106. Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, 33–73.

Hakola, Raimo, Nina Nikki & Ulla Tervahauta. 2013. "Introduction." *Others and the Construction of Early Christian Identities*. Ed. Raimo Hakola, Nina Nikki & Ulla Tervahauta. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 106. Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, 9–30.

Halberstam, Judith. 1998. *Female Masculinity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Halperin, David M. 1990. *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality: And Other Essays on Greek Love*. New York: Routledge.

Halperin, David M. 2002a. "Forgetting Foucalt: Acts, Identities, and the History of Sexuality." *The Sleep of Reason: Erotic Experience and Sexual Ethics in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Ed. Martha C. Nussbaum & Juha Sihvola. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 21–54.

Halperin, David M. 2002b. "The First Homosexuality?" *The Sleep of Reason: Erotic Experience and Sexual Ethics in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Ed. Martha C. Nussbaum & Juha Sihvola. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 229–268.

Harper, Shaun R. 2007. "The Measure of a Man: Conceptualizations of Masculinity among High-Achieving African American Male College Students." *Men's Lives*. Ed. Michael S. Kimmel & Michael A. Messner. 7th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 41–53.

Harrell, Sarah E. 2002. "Marvelous *Andreia*: Politics, Geography, and Ethnicity in Herodotus' *Histories*." *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*. Ed. Ralph M. Rosen & Ineke Sluiter. Leiden: Brill, 77–94.

Harris, William V. 2001. *Restraining Rage: The Ideology of Anger Control in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Harris, William V. 2003. "The Rage of Women." *Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen*. Ed. Susanna Braund & Glenn W. Most. Yale Classical Studies 32. New York: Cambridge University Press, 121–143.

Hauptman, Judith. 1974. "Images of Women in the Talmud." *Religion and Sexism: Images of Women in the Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Ed. Rosemary Radford Ruether. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 184–212.

Haynes, Katherine. 2003. *Fashioning the Feminine in the Greek Novel*. London: Routledge.

Hearn, Jeff. 2004. "From Hegemonic Masculinity to the Hegemony of Men." *Feminist Theory* 5, 49–72.

Hearn, Jeff & David L. Collinson. 1994. "Theorizing Unities and Differences between Men and between Masculinities." *Theorizing Masculinities*. Ed. Harry Brod & Michael Kaufman. Research on Men and Masculinities 5. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 97–118.

Heil, John Paul. 1992. *The Gospel of Mark as a Model for Action: A Reader-Response Commentary*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Hemelrijk, Emily A. 2004. "Masculinity and Femininity in the Laudatio Turiae." *Classical Quarterly* 54, 185–197.

Hengel, Martin. 1977. *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*. London: SCM Press.

Henry, Madeleine M. 1992. "The Edible Woman: Athenaeus's Concept of the Pornographic." *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*. Ed. Amy Richlin. New York: Oxford University Press, 250–268.

Henten, Jan Willem van & Friedrich Avemarie. 2002. *Martyrdom and Noble Death: Selected Texts from Graeco-Roman, Jewish, and Christian Antiquity*. The Context of Early Christianity. London: Routledge.

Herdt, Gilbert. 1994. "Introduction: Third Sexes and Third Genders." *Third Sex, Third Gender: Beyond Sexual Dimorphism in Culture and History*. Ed. Gilbert Herdt. New York: Zone Books, 21–81.

Herman, Gabriel. 1993. "Tribal and Civic Codes of Behaviour in Lysias I." *The Classical Quarterly New Series* 43, 406–419.

Herman, Gabriel. 1994. "How Violent Was Athenian Society?" *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*. Ed. Robin Osborne & Simon Hornblower. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 99–117.

Herman, Gabriel. 1996. "Ancient Athens and the Values of the Mediterranean Society." *Mediterranean Historical Review* 11, 5–36.

Herter, H. 1959. "Effeminatus." *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum: Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt. Band 4: Dogma II-Empore*. Begründet von Franz Joseph Dölger et al. Hrsg. Theodor Klauser. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, cols. 620–650.

Hester, J. David. 2005. "Eunuchs and the Postgender Jesus: Matthew 19.12 and Transgressive Sexualities." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28, 13–40.

Hill, David. 1972. *The Gospel of Matthew*. New Century Bible. London: Oliphants.

Hobbs, Angela. 2000. *Plato and the Hero: Courage, Manliness and the Impersonal Good*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hoehner, Harold W. 1972. *Herod Antipas*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 17. Cambridge: University Press.

Holleran, J. Warren. 1973. *The Synoptic Gethsemane: A Critical Study*. Roma: Università Gregoriana.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. 1992. "Overcoming Patriarchal Constraints: The Reconstruction of Gender Relations among Mexican Immigrant Women and Men." *Gender & Society* 6, 393–415.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette & Michael A. Messner. 1994. "Gender Displays and Men's Power: The 'New Man' and the Mexican Immigrant Man." *Theorizing Masculinities*. Ed. Harry Brod & Michael Kaufman. Research on Men and Masculinities 5. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 200–218.

hooks, bell. 1995. "Doing it for Daddy." *Constructing Masculinity*. Ed. Maurice Berger, Brian Wallis & Simon Watson. New York: Routledge, 98–106.

hooks, bell. 2004. *We Real Cool: Black Men and Masculinity*. New York: Routledge.

Horrell, David G. 2000. "Models and Methods in Social-Scientific Interpretation: A Response to Philip Esler." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 78, 83–105.

Horsley, Richard A. 2001. *Hearing the Whole Story: The Politics of Plot in Mark's Gospel*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.

Horsley, Richard A. 2005. "'By the Finger of God': Jesus and Imperial Violence." *Violence in the New Testament*. Ed. Shelly Matthews & E. Leigh Gibson. New York: T & T Clark, 51–80.

Hunter, Andrea G. & James Earl Davis. 1992. "Constructing Gender: An Exploration of Afro-American Men's Conceptualization of Manhood." *Gender & Society* 6, 464–479.

Huttunen, Niko. 2013. "In the Category of Philosophy? Christians in Early Pagan Accounts." *Others and the Construction of Early Christian Identities*. Ed. Raimo

Hakola, Nina Nikki & Ulla Tervahauta. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 106. Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, 239–281.

Huys, Marc. 2010. "Turning the Tables: Jesus' Temple Cleansing and the Story of Lycaon." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 86, 137–161.

Ilan, Tal. 1992. "'Man Born of Woman …' (Job 14:1): The Phenomenon of Men Bearing Metronymes at the Time of Jesus." *Novum Testamentum* 34, 23–45.

Irwin, T. H. 1998. "Stoic Inhumanity." *The Emotions in Hellenistic Philosophy*. Ed. Juha Sihvola & Troels Engberg-Pedersen. The New Synthese Historical Library 46. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 219–241.

Janes, Regina. 2006. "Why the Daughter of Herodias Must Dance (Mark 6.14–29)." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 2, 443–467.

Jefferson, Tony. 2002. "Subordinating Hegemonic Masculinity." *Theoretical Criminology* 6, 63–88.

Johnson, Luke T. 1989. "The New Testament's Anti-Jewish Slander and the Conventions of Ancient Polemic." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108, 419–441.

Jones, Alexander. 1966. *The Gospel According to St. Matthew: A Text and Commentary for Students*. London: Geoffrey Chapman.

Jones, Meriel. 2012. *Playing the Man: Performing Masculinities in the Ancient Greek Novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Just, Roger. 1989. *Women in Athenian Law and Life*. London: Routledge.

Kaegi, Adolf. 2007. *Kaegi's Greek grammar*. Transl. and ed. James A. Kleist. Mineola, NY: Dover.

Kahl, Brigitte. 2000. "No Longer Male: Masculinity Struggles behind Galatians 3.28?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 19, 37–49.

Keener, Craig S. 1999. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Kessler, Suzanne J. & Wendy McKenna. 1978. *Gender: An Ethnomethodological Approach*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kimmel, Michael S. 1988. "Judaism, Masculinity and Feminism." *A Mensch among Men: Explorations in Jewish Masculinity*. Ed. Harry Brod. The Crossing Press: Freedom, CA, 153–156.

Kingsbury, Jack Dean. 1988. *Matthew as Story*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press.

Klinken, Adriaan S. van & Peter-Ben Smit. 2013. "Introduction: Jesus Traditions and Masculinities in World Christianity." *Exchange* 42, 1–15.

Knust, Jennifer Wright. 2006. *Abandoned to Lust: Sexual Slander and Ancient Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Knuuttila, Simo. 2004. "Ensimmäinen liike." *Stoalaisuus: Tiedon, tunteiden ja hyvän elämän filosofia*. Toim. Teija Kaarakainen & Jari Kaukua. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 57–67.

Kodell, Jerome. 1978. "The Celibacy Logion in Matthew 19:12." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 8, 19–23.

Konstan, David. 2006. *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Kraemer, Ross S. 1995. "The Other as Woman: An Aspect of Polemic among Pagans, Jews, and Christians in the Greco-Roman World." *The Other in Jewish Thought and History: Constructions of Jewish Culture and Identity*. Ed. Laurence L. Silberstein & Robert L. Cohn. New York: New York University Press, 121–144.

Kraemer, Ross S. 2006. "Implicating Herodias and Her Daughter in the Death of John the Baptizer: A (Christian) Theological Strategy?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 125, 321–349.

Kuefler, Mathew. 2001. *The Manly Eunuch: Masculinity, Gender Ambiguity, and Christian Ideology in Late Antiquity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kyle, Donald G. 1998. *Spectacles of Death in Ancient Rome*. London: Routledge.

Lane, William L. 1975. *The Gospel According to Mark: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Langlands, Rebecca. 2006. *Sexual Morality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Laqueur, Thomas Walter. 1990. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Larson, Jennifer. 2004. "Paul's Masculinity." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 123, 85–97.

Launderville, Dale. 2010. *Celibacy in the Ancient World: Its Ideal and Practice in Pre-Hellenistic Israel, Mesopotamia, and Greece*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.

Lawrence, Louise Joy. 2002. "'For Truly, I Tell You, They Have Received Their Reward' (Matt 6:2): Investigating Honor Precedence and Honor Virtue." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 64, 687–702.

Lawrence, Louise Joy. 2003. *An Ethnography of the Gospel of Matthew*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 165. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Layton, Richard A. 2000. "Propatheia: Origen and Didymus on the Origin of the Passions." *Vigiliae Christianae* 54, 262–282.

Lazur, Richard F. & Richard Majors. 1995. "Men of Color: Ethnocultural Variations of Male Gender Role Strain." *A New Psychology of Men*. Ed. Ronald F. Levant & William S. Pollack. New York: BasicBooks, 337–358.

Leander, Hans. 2011. *Discourses of Empire: The Gospel of Mark from a Postcolonial Perspective*. Avhandlingar utgivna av institutionen för litteratur, idéhistoria och religion, Göteborgs universitet 23. Göteborg: Department of Literature, History of Ideas, and Religion, University of Gothenburg.

Leaney, A. R. C. 1971. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Adam & Charles Black.

Lefkowitz, Mary R. & Maureen B. Fant, ed. 2005. *Women's Life in Greece and Rome: A Source Book in Translation*. 3rd ed. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Leifkovitz, Lori. 1988. "Coats and Tales: Joseph Stories and Myths of Jewish Masculinity." *A Mensch among Men: Explorations in Jewish Masculinity*. Ed. Harry Brod. Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press, 19–29.

Levine, Amy-Jill. 2001a. "Discharging Responsibility: Matthean Jesus, Biblical Law, and Hemorrhaging Woman." *A Feminist Companion to Matthew*. Ed. Amy-Jill Levine with Marianne Blickenstaff. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 70–87.

Levine, Amy-Jill. 2001b. "Matthew's Advice to a Divided Readership." *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study: Studies in Memory of William G. Thompson, S. J*. Ed. David E. Aune. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 22–41.

Liddell, Henry George & Robert Scott. 1953. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Lieu, Judith M. 2004. *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Liew, Tat-siong Benny. 1999. *Politics of Parousia: Reading Mark Inter*(*con*)*textually*. Biblical Interpretation Series 42. Leiden: Brill.

Liew, Tat-siong Benny. 2003. "Re-Mark-able Masculinities: Jesus, the Son of Man, and the (Sad) Sum of Manhood?" *New Testament Masculinities*. Ed. Stephen D. Moore & Janice Capel Anderson. Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies 45. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 93–135.

Liberto, David. 2003. "To Fear or Not to Fear? Christ as *Sophos* in Luke's Passion Narrative." *The Expository Times* 114, 219–223.

Lindars, Barnabas. 1992. "Rebuking the Spirit: A New Analysis of the Lazarus Story in John 11." *John and the Synoptics*. Ed. Adelbert Denaux. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 101. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 542–547.

Lips, Hermann von. 1988. "Schweine füttert man, Hunde nicht: Ein Versuch, das Rätsel von Matthäus 7:6 zu lösen." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 79, 165–186.

Long, A. A. & D. N. Sedley. 1987. *The Hellenistic Philosophers. Volume 1: Translations of the Principal Sources, with Philosophical Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Long, Jacqueline. 1996. *Claudian's In Eutropium, or, How, When, and Why to Slander a Eunuch*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Love, Stuart L. 2010. *Jesus and Marginal Women: The Gospel of Matthew in Social-Scientific Perspective*. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co Ltd.

Lusher, Dean. 2008. *Masculinities in Local Contexts: Structural, Individual, and Cultural Interdependencies*. Saarbrück: VDM Verlag Dr.Muller.

Luz, Ulrich. 1983. "The Disciples in the Gospel According to Matthew." *The Interpretation of Matthew*. Ed. Graham Stanton. Issues in Religion and Theology 3. London: SPCK, 98–128.

Luz, Ulrich. 2001. *Matthew 8–20: A Commentary*. Transl. James E. Crouch. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Luz, Ulrich. 2005. *Matthew 21–28: A Commentary*. Transl. James E. Crouch. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Luz, Ulrich. 2007. *Matthew 1–7: A Commentary*. Transl. James E. Crouch. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

MacMullen, Ramsay. 1980. "Romans in Tears." *Classical Philology* 75, 254–255.

Majors, Richard. 1989. "Cool Pose: The Proud Signature of Black Survival." *Men's Lives*. Ed. Michael S. Kimmel & Michael A. Messner. New York, NY: Macmillan, 83–87.

Majors, Richard. 2001. "Cool Pose: Black Masculinity and Sports." *The Masculinities Reader*. Ed. Stephen M. Whitehead & Frank J. Barrett. Malden, MA: Polity Press, 209–217.

Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers. 1983. "Fallible Followers: Women and Men in the Gospel of Mark." *Semeia* 28, 29–48.

Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers. 1992. "Narrative Criticism: How Does the Story Mean." *Mark & Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*. Ed. Janice Capel Anderson & Stephen D. Moore. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 23–49.

Malina, Bruce J. 2001. *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. Louisville, KY: Westminster.

Malina, Bruce J. & Richard L. Rohrbaugh. 1992. *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Malina, Bruce J. & Richard L. Rohrbaugh. 1998. *Social-Science Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Manson, T. W. 1949. *The Sayings of Jesus as Recorded in the Gospels According to St. Matthew and St. Luke*. London.

Marcus, Joel. 2000. *Mark 1–8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible 27. New York: Doubleday.

Marcus, Joel. 2009. *Mark 8–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible 27A. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Marshall, I. Howard. 1978. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary 3. Exeter: Paternoster Press.

Martin, Patricia Yancey. 1998. "Why Can't a Man Be more like a Woman? Reflections on Connell's Masculinities." *Gender & Society* 12, 472–477.

Matsuda, Mari J. 1990–1991. "Beside My Sister, Facing the Enemy: Legal Theory Out of Coalition." *Stanford Law Review* 43, 1183–1192.

Matthews, Shelly. 2005. "The Need for the Stoning of Stephen." *Violence in the New Testament*. Ed. Shelly Matthews & E. Leigh Gibson. New York: T & T Clark, 124–139.

Matthews, Shelly. 2009. "Clemency as Cruelty: Forgiveness and Force in the Dying Prayers of Jesus and Stephen." *Biblical Interpretation* 17, 118–146.

Matthews, Shelly. 2010. *Perfect Martyr: The Stoning of Stephen and the Construction of Christian Identity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mattila, Sharon Lea. 1996. "Wisdom, Sense Perception, Nature, and Philo's Gender Gradient." *Harvard Theological Review* 89, 103–129.

Mattila, Talvikki. 2002. *Citizens of the Kingdom: Followers in Matthew from a Feminist Perspective*. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 83. Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society.

May, David M. 1987. "Mark 3:20–35 from the Perspective of Shame/Honor." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 17, 83–87.

Mayordomo Marín, Moisés. 2006. "Construction of Masculinity in Antiquity and Early Christianity." *Lectio Difficilior* 2/2006. Cited February 13, 2015. Online: http://www.lectio.unibe.ch/06_2/marin_construction.htm.

McDonnell, Myles. 2006. *Roman Manliness: Virtus and the Roman Republic*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Meier, John P. 1980. "John the Baptist in Matthew's Gospel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99, 383–405.

Merenlahti, Petri. 1999. "Characters in the Making: Individuality and Ideology in the Gospels." *Characterization in the Gospel: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*. Ed. David Rhoads & Kari Syreeni. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 49–72.

Merenlahti, Petri. 2002. "Evankeliumi (nyky)kirjallisuutena." *Jeesus ja temppeli: Viisi näkökulmaa Raamatun tekstiin*. Ed. Tom Holmén & Petri Merenlahti. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino, 65–78.

Merenlahti, Petri. 2015. "Jeesus, maskuliinisuus ja queer: Miestutkimuksen näkökulmia Raamattuun." *Uskonnon ja sukupuolen risteyksiä*. Ed. Johanna Ahonen & Elina Vuola. Tietolipas 247. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura, 140–160.

Metzger, Bruce M. 1994. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies.

Miller, Susan. 2004. *Women in Mark's Gospel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 259. London: T & T Clark.

Miller, William Ian. 2000. *The Mystery of Courage*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Moore, Stephen D. 1996. *God's Gym*. New York: Routledge.

Moore, Stephen D. 2001. *God's Beauty Parlor and Other Queer Spaces in and around the Bible*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Moore, Stephen D. 2003. "'O Man, Who Art Thou …?': Masculinity Studies and New Testament Studies." *New Testament Masculinities*. Ed. Stephen D. Moore & Janice Capel Anderson. Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies 45. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1–22.

Moore, Stephen D. & Janice Capel Anderson. 1998. "Taking It like a Man: Masculinity in 4 Maccabees." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 117, 249–273.

Morgan, Teresa. 2007. *Popular Morality in the Early Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morris, Leon. 1995. *The Gospel According to John*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdman.

Moxnes, Halvor. 2003. *Putting Jesus in His Place: A Radical Vision of Household and Kingdom*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Moxnes, Halvor. 2005. "Jesus in Gender Trouble." *Tidsskrift for kjønnsforskning* 3, 20–34.

Myers, Ched. 2008. *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus*. Twentieth anniversary ed. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Myles, Robert. 2008. "Challenging John the Baptist's Masculinity." Paper presented at the SBL International Meeting Auckland, New Zealand, July 11, 2008.

Nash, Jennifer C. 2008. "Re-Thinking Intersectionality." *Feminist Review* 89, 1–15.

Neyrey, Jerome H. 1996. "Despising the Shame of the Cross: Honor and Shame in the Johannine Passion Narrative." *Semeia* 69, 113–37.

Neyrey, Jerome H. 1998. *Honor and Shame in the Gospel of Matthew*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox.

Neyrey, Jerome H. 2003. "Jesus, Gender, and the Gospel of Matthew." *New Testament Masculinities*. Ed. Stephen D. Moore & Janice Capel Anderson. Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies 45. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 44–66.

Niehoff, Maren. 2001. *Philo on Jewish Identity and Culture*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 86. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Nolland, John. 1989. *Luke 1–9:20*. Word Biblical Commentary 35A. Dallas, TX: Word Books.

Nolland, John. 1993. *Luke 18:35–24:53*. Word Biblical Commentary 35C. Dallas, TX: Word Books.

Nolland, John. 2005. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

North, Helen. 1966. *Sophrosyne: Self-Knowledge and Self-Restraint in Greek Literature*. Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 35. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

North, Helen. 1977. "The Mare, the Vixen, and the Bee: *Sophrosyne* as the Virtue of Women in Antiquity." *Illinois Classical Studies* 2, 35–48.

Nortjé-Meyer, Lilly. 2000. "Gentile Female Characters in Matthew's Story: An Illustration of Righteousness." *Transformative Encounters: Jesus and Women Re-Viewed*. Ed. Ingrid Rosa Kitzberger. Biblical Interpretation Series 43. Leiden: Brill, 54–76.

Nortwick, Thomas van. 2008. *Imagining Men: Ideals of Masculinity in Ancient Greek Culture*. Praeger Series on the Ancient World. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Nussbaum, Martha C. 1994. *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Nussbaum, Martha C. 2002. "The Incomplete Feminism of Musonius Rufus, Platonist, Stoic, and Roman." *The Sleep of Reason: Erotic Experience and Sexual Ethics in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Ed. Martha C. Nussbaum & Juha Sihvola. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 283–326.

Oden, Thomas C. & Christopher A. Hall, ed. 1998. *Mark*. Vol 2. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture. London: Fitzroy.

Oepke, Albrecht. 1964a. "ἀνήρ." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol 1. Ed. Gerhard Kittel & Gerhard Friedrich. Transl. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdman, 360–363.

Oepke, Albrecht. 1964b. "γυνή." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. 1. Ed. Gerhard Kittel & Gerhard Friedrich. Transl. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdman, 776–789.

Oksenberg Rorty, Amélie. 1998. "The Two Faces of Stoicism: Rousseau and Freud." *The Emotions in Hellenistic Philosophy*. Ed. Juha Sihvola & Troels Engberg-Pedersen. The New Synthese Historical Library 46. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 243–270.

Ouzgane, Lahoucine & Daniel Coleman. 1998. "Cashing out the Patriarchal Dividends: An Interview with R. W. Connell." *Jouvert: A Journal of Postcolonial Studies* 2. Cited February 13, 2015. Online: http://english.chass.ncsu.edu/jouvert/v2i1/CONNELL.HTM.

Overman, J. Andrew. 1990. *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Parker, Holt N. 2001. "The Myth of the Heterosexual: Anthropology and Sexuality for Classicists." *Arethusa* 34, 313–362.

Parsons, Mikeal Carl. 2006. *Body and Character in Luke and Acts: The Subversion of Physiognomy in Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Patte, Daniel. 1987. *The Gospel According to Matthew: A Structural Commentary on Matthew's Faith*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Patterson, Orlando. 1982. *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Perkinson, Jim. 1996. "A Canaanitic Word in the Logos of Christ; or the Difference the Syro-Phoenician Woman Makes to Jesus." *Semeia* 75, 61–85.

Pesonen, Anni. 2009. *Luke, the Friend of Sinners*. Diss. University of Helsinki.

Petersen, Alan. 2003. "Research on Men and Masculinities: Some Implications of Recent Theory for Future Work." *Men and Masculinities* 6, 54–69.

Pierce, Karen F. 1998. "Ideals of Masculinity in New Comedy." *Thinking Men: Masculinity and Its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition*. Ed. Lin Foxhall & John Salmon. London: Routledge, 130–147.

Pilch, John J. 1995. "Death with Honor: The Mediterranean Style Death of Jesus in Mark." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 25, 65–70.

Placher, William C. 2010. *Mark*. Belief: A Theological Commentary on the Bible. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.

Pleck, Joseph H. 1995. "The Gender Role Strain Paradigm: An Update." *A New Psychology of Men*. Ed. Ronald F. Levant & William S. Pollack. New York: BasicBooks, 11–32.

Plummer, Alfred. 1981. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: Clark.

Procopé, John. 1998. "Epicureans on Anger." *The Emotions in Hellenistic Philosophy*. Ed. Juha Sihvola & Troels Engberg-Pedersen. The New Synthese Historical Library 46. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 171–196.

Quesnell, Quentin, S. J. 1966. "'Made Themselves Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven' (Mt 19,12)." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 30, 335–358.

Reid, Barbara. 1996. *Choosing the Better Part? Women in the Gospel of Luke*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press.

Rhoads, David. 1994. "Jesus and the Syrophoenician Woman in Mark: A Narrative-Critical Study." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 62, 343–375.

Rhoads, David, Joanna Dewey & Donald Michie. 1999. *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Ricci, Carla. 1994. *Mary Magdalene and Many Others: Women Who Followed Jesus*. Transl. Paul Burns. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Richlin, Amy. 1992. *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Richlin, Amy. 1993. "Not Before Homosexuality: The Materiality of the *Cinaedus* and the Roman Law against Love between Men." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 3, 523–573.

Richlin, Amy. 1999. "Cicero's Head." *Constructions of the Classical Body*. Ed. James I. Porter. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 190–211.

Richlin, Amy. 2003. "Gender and Rhetoric: Producing Manhood in the Schools." *Sex and Difference in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Ed. Mark Golden & Peter Toohey. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 202–220.

Roberts, Erin. 2010. *Anger, Emotion, and Desire in the Gospel of Matthew*. Diss. Brown University Providence, Rhode Island.

Robinson, James M. 2007. *Jesus: According to the Earliest Witness*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Rogers, Martyn. 2008. "Modernity, 'Authenticity', and Ambivalence: Subaltern Masculinities on a South Indian College Campus." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 14, 79–95.

Roisman, Joseph. 2002. "The Rhetoric of Courage in the Athenian Orators." *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*. Ed. Ralph M. Rosen & Ineke Sluiter. Leiden: Brill, 127–143.

Roisman, Joseph. 2005. *The Rhetoric of Manhood: Masculinity in the Attic Orators*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Roller, Lynn E. 1997. "The Ideology of the Eunuch Priest." *Gender & History* 9, 542–559.

Roller, Lynn E. 1999. *In Search of God the Mother: The Cult of Anatolian Cybele*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rousselle, Aline. 1988. *Porneia: On Desire and the Body in Antiquity*. Transl. Felicia Pheasant. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Rubin, Gayle. 1975. "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex." *Toward an Anthropology of Women*. Ed. Rayna R. Reiter. New York: Monthly Review Press, 157–210.

Russell, D. A. 2001. *Plutarch*. London: Bristol Classical Press.

Rutland, Linda W. 1978. "Women as Makers of Kings in Tacitus' *Annals*." *The Classical World* 72, 15–29.

Saldarini, Anthony J. 1995. "Boundaries and Polemics in the Gospel of Matthew." *Biblical Interpretation* 3, 239–265.

Saller, Richard. 1989. "Patronage and Friendship in Early Imperial Rome: Drawing the Distinction." *Patronage in Ancient Society*. Ed. Andrew Wallace-Hadrill. Leicester-Nottingham Studies in Ancient Society 1. London: Routledge, 49–62.

Saller, Richard. 1991. "Corporal Punishment, Authority, and Obedience in the Roman Household." *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome*. Ed. Beryl Rawson. Canberra: Humanities Research Centre, 144–165.

Sanders, Jack T. 1985. "The Pharisees in Luke-Acts." *The Living Text: Essays in Honor of Ernest W. Saunders*. Ed. Dennis E. Groh & Robert Jewett. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 141–188.

Sanders, J. N. & B. A. Mastin. 1968. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St John*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Black.

Santoro L'Hoir, Francesca. 1992. *The Rhetoric of Gender Terms: 'Man,' 'Woman,' and the Portrayal of Character in Latin Prose*. Mnemosyne Supplementum 120. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Sarsila, Juhani. 1982. *Some Aspects of the Concept of Virtus in Roman Literature until Livy*. Studia Philologica Jyväskyläensia 16. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Satlow, Michael L. 2001. *Jewish Marriage in Antiquity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Schmid, Walter T. 1992. *On Manly Courage: A Study of Plato's Laches*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Schmidt, J. H. H. 1967. *Synonymik der griechischen Sprache*. Erster Band. A. M. Hakkert: Amsterdam.

Schmidt, J. H. H. 1967–1969. *Synonymik der griechischen Sprache*. Zweiter Band. A. M. Hakkert: Amsterdam.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. 1980. *The Gospel According to St. John. Vol. 2, Commentary on Chapters 5–12*. Herder's Theological Commentary on the New Testament. London: Burns & Oates.

Schüssler Fiorenza, Elizabeth. 1992. *But She Said: Feminist Practices of Biblical Interpretation*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Schweizer, Eduard. 1985. *The Good News According to Mark: A Commentary on the Gospel*. London: SPCK.

Scott, James C. 1990. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Scott, J. Martin C. 1997. "Matthew 15.21–28: A Test-Case for Jesus' Manners." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 19, 21–44.

Seeley, David. 1990. *The Noble Death: Graeco-Roman Martyrology and Paul's Concept of Salvation*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 28. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press.

Seeley, David. 1993. "Rulership and Service in Mark 10:41–45." *Novum Testamentum* 35, 234–250.

Segal, Alan F. 1991. "Matthew's Jewish Voice." *Social History of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches*. Ed. David L. Balch. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 3–37.

Seim, Turid Karlsen. 1995. "The Gospel of Luke." *Searching the Scriptures Vol. 2: A Feminist Commentary*. Ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Ann Brock & Shelly Matthews. London: SCM Press, 728–762.

Senior, Donald. 1987. "'With Swords and Clubs …': The Setting of Mark's Community and His Critique of Abusive Power." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 17, 10–20.

Shaw, Brent D. 1996. "Body/Power/Identity: Passions of the Martyrs." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4, 269–312.

Shiner, Whitney Taylor. 1995. *Follow Me! Disciples on Markan Rhetoric*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 145. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Simonetti, Manlio, ed. 2002. *Matthew 14–28*. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Sipilä, Jorma. 1994. "Miestutkimus: Säröjä hegemonisessa maskuliinisuudessa." *Miestä rakennetaan, maskuliinisuuksia puretaan*. Toim. Jorma Sipilä & Arto Tiihonen. Tampere: Vastapaino, 17–33.

Sly, Dorothy. 1990. *Philo's Perception of Women*. Brown Judaic Studies 209. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Smethurst, S. E. 1950. "Women in Livy's History." *Greece and Rome* 19, 80–87.

Smit, Peter-Ben. 2006. "Jesus and the Ladies: Constructing and Deconstructing Johannine Macho-Christology." *The Bible and Critical Theory* 3/2, 31.1–31.15.

Smith, Abraham. 1999. "'Full of Spirit and Wisdom': Luke's Portrait of Stephen (Acts 6:1–8:1a) as a Man of Self-Mastery." *Asceticism and the New Testament*. Ed. Leif E. Vaage & Vincent L. Wimbush. New York: Routledge, 97–114.

Smith, Abraham. 2006. "Tyranny Exposed: Mark's Typological Characterization of Herod Antipas (Mark 6:14–29)." *Biblical Interpretation* 14, 59–293.

Smith, Jonathan Z. 1985. "What a Difference a Difference Makes." *"To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*. Ed. Jacob Neusner & Ernest S. Frerichs. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 3–48.

Smith, Morton. 1978. *Jesus the Magician*. New York: Harper & Row.

Sorabji, Richard. 2000. *Emotion and Peace of Mind: From Stoic Agitation to Christian Temptation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sosis, Richard & Eric R. Bressler. 2003. "Cooperation and Commune Longevity: A Test of the Costly Signaling Theory of Religion." *Cross-Cultural Research* 37, 211–239.

Spencer, F. Scott. 1999. "Out of Mind, Out of Voice: Slave-Girls and Prophetic Daughters in Luke-Acts." *Biblical Interpretation* 7, 133–155.

Staples, Robert. 1989. "Masculinity and Race: The Dual Dilemma of Black Men." *Men's Lives*. Ed. Michael S. Kimmel & Michael A. Messner. New York, NY: Macmillan, 73–83.

Stark, Rodney. 1997. *The Rise of Christianity: How the Obscure, Marginal Jesus Movement Became the Dominant Religious Force in the Western World in a Few Centuries*. San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco.

Starr, Chester G., Jr. 1949. "Epictetus and the Tyrant." *Classical Philology* 44, 20–29.

Stauffer, Ethelbert. 1964. "ἀγών." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. 1. Ed. Gerhard Kittel & Gerhard Friedrich. Transl. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdman, 134–140.

Stegemann, Ekkehard W. & Wolfgang Stegemann. 1999. *The Jesus Movement: A Social History of Its First Century*. Transl. O. C. Dean, Jr. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Stein, Robert H. 1992. *Luke*. The New American Commentary 24. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press.

Sterling, Greg. 2001. "*Mors Philosophi*: The Death of Jesus in Luke." *Harvard Theological Review* 94, 383–402.

Stewart, Eric C. 2005. *Gathered around Jesus: An Alternative Spatial Practice in the Gospel of Mark*. Diss. University of Notre Dame.

Stevenson, Walter. 1995. "The Rise of Eunuchs in Greco-Roman Antiquity." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 5, 495–511.

Stowers, Stanley K. 2010. "Jesus the Teacher and Stoic Ethics in the Gospel of Matthew." *Stoicism in Early Christianity*. Ed. Tuomas Rasimus, Troels Engberg-Pedersen & Ismo Dunderberg. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 59–76.

Suter, Ann. 2009. "Tragic Tears and Gender." *Tears in the Graeco-Roman World*. Ed. Thorsten Fögen. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 59–83.

Swancutt, Diana M. 2003. "'The Disease of Effemination": The Charge of Effeminacy and the Verdict of God (Romans 1:18–2:16)." *New Testament Masculinities*. Ed. Stephen D. Moore & Janice Capel Anderson. Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies 45. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 193–233.

Swancutt, Diana M. 2007. "Still before Sexuality: 'Greek' Androgyny, the Roman Imperial Politics of Masculinity and the Roman Invention of the *Tribas*." *Mapping Gender in Ancient Religious Discourses*. Ed. Todd Penner & Caroline Vander Stichele. Biblical Interpretation 84. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 11–61.

Swartley, Williard M. 1996. "War and Peace in the New Testament." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung. Tl. 2, Principat, Bd. 26: Religion, 3. Teilbd.: Vorkonstantinisches Christentum: Neues Testament*. Hrsg. Wolfgang Haase & Hildegard Temporini. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2298–2408.

Syreeni, Kari. 1991. "The Gospel in Paradigms: A Study in the Hermeneutical Space of Luke-Acts." *Luke-Acts: Scandinavian Perspectives*. Ed. Petri Luomanen. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 54. Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, 36–57.

Talbott, Rick Franklin. 2006. "Imagining the Matthean Eunuch Community: Kyriarchy on the Chopping Block." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 22, 21–43.

Taylor, Vincent. 1952. *Gospel According to St. Mark: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indexes*. London: Macmillan.

Thatcher, Tom. 2009. *Greater than Caesar: Christology and Empire in the Fourth Gospel*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Theissen, Gerd. 2002. "The Political Dimension of Jesus' Activities." *The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels*. Ed. Wolfgang Stegemann, Bruce J. Malina & Gerd Theissen. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 225–250.

Thurman, Eric. 2003. "Looking for a Few Good Men: Mark and Masculinity." *New Testament Masculinities*. Ed. Stephen D. Moore & Janice Capel Anderson. Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies 45. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 137–161.

Thurman, Eric. 2007. "Novel Men: Masculinity and Empire in Mark's Gospel and Xenophon's *An Ephesian Tale*." *Mapping Gender in Ancient Religious Discourses*. Ed. Todd Penner & Caroline Vander Stichele. Biblical Interpretation 84. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 185–229.

Tinklenberg deVega, Jessica Lyn. 2006. *"A Man Who Fears God": Constructions of Masculinity in Hellenistic Jewish Interpretations of the Story of Joseph*. Diss. The Florida State University.

Torres, José B. 2007. "Masculinity and Gender Roles among Puerto Rican Men: Machismo on the U.S. Mainland." *Men's Lives*. Ed. Michael S. Kimmel & Michael A. Messner. 7th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 30–40.

Treggiari, Susan. 1991. *Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Trible, Phyllis. 1980. "Book Review of God the Father: Theology and Patriarchy in the Teaching of Jesus by Robert Hamerton Kelly." *Theology Today* 37, 116–119.

Voorwinde, Stephen. 2011. *Jesus' Emotions in the Gospels*. London: T & T Clark.

Wahlen, Clinton. 2007. "The Temple in Mark and Contested Authority." *Biblical Interpretation* 15, 248–267.

Wainwright, Elaine. 1991. *Towards a Feminist Critical Reading of the Gospel According to Matthew*. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 60. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Wainwright, Elaine. 1995. "The Gospel of Matthew." *Searching the Scriptures Vol. 2: A Feminist Commentary*. Ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Ann Brock & Shelly Matthews. London: SCM Press, 635–677.

Walaskay, Paul W. 1975. "The Trial and Death of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94, 81–93.

Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew, ed. 1989. *Patronage in Ancient Society*. Leicester-Nottingham Studies in Ancient Society 1. London: Routledge.

Walters, Jonathan. 1997. "Invading the Roman Body: Manliness and Impenetrability in Roman Thought." *Roman Sexualities*. Ed. Judith P. Hallett & Marilyn B. Skinner. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 29–43.

Watson, David F. 2010. *Honor among Christians: The Cultural Key to the Messianic Secret*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Weaver, Dorothy Jean. 2005. "'Thus You Will Know Them by Their Fruits': The Roman Characters of the Gospel of Matthew." *The Gospel of Matthew in Its Roman Imperial Context*. Ed. John Riches & David C. Sim. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 276. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 107–127.

Weeden, Theodore J. 1985. "The Heresy that Necessitated Mark's Gospel." *The Interpretation of Mark*. Ed. William Telford. Issues in Religion and Theology 7. London: SPCK, 64–77.

Wees, Hans van. 1998. "A Brief History of Tears: Gender Differentiation in Archaic Greece." *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power and Identity in Classical Antiquity*. Ed. Lin Foxhall & John Salmon. London: Routledge, 10–53.

Weidemann, Hans-Ulrich. 2014. "Being a Male Disciple of Jesus According to Matthew's Antitheses." *Biblical Masculinities Foregrounded*. Ed. Ovidiu Creangă & Peter-Ben Smit. Hebrew Bible Monographs 62. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 107–155.

Wenham, G. J. 1984. "Matthew and Divorce: An Old Crux Revisited." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 22, 95–107.

Wenham, G. J. 1986. "The Syntax of Matthew 19:9." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28, 17–23.

West, Candace & Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender and Society* 1, 125–151.

Wetherell, Margaret & Nigel Edley. 1999. "Negotiating Hegemonic Masculinity: Imaginary Positions and Psycho-Discursive Practices." *Feminism & Psychology* 9, 335–356.

Whitehead, Stephen M. 2002. *Men and Masculinities: Key Themes and New Directions*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Whitehead, Stephen M. & Frank J. Barrett. 2001. "The Sociology of Masculinity." *The Masculinities Reader*. Ed. Stephen M. Whitehead & Frank J. Barrett. Malden, MA: Polity Press, 1–26.

Wiedemann, Thomas. 1989. *Adults and Children in the Roman Empire*. London: Routledge.

Williams, Craig A. 1999. *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, Brittany E. 2015. *Unmanly Men: Refigurations of Masculinity in Luke-Acts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Windisch, Hans. 1925. "Friedensbringer—Göttessöhne: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Interpretation der 7. Seligpreisung." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 24, 240–260.

Winkler, John J. 1990. "Laying down the Law: The Oversight of Men's Sexual Behavior in Classical Athens." *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient World*. Ed. David M. Halperin, John J. Winkler & Froma I. Zeitlin. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 171–209.

Wire, Antoinette Clark. 1991. "Gender Roles in a Scribal Community." *Social History of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches*. Ed. David L. Balch. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 87–121.

Young, Steve. 1994. "Being a Man: The Pursuit of Manliness in *the Shepherd of Hermas*." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 2, 237–255.

Zsolnay, Ilona, ed. 2017. *Being a Man: Negotiating Ancient Constructs of Masculinity*. Studies in the History of the Ancient Near East. London: Routledge.

Index of Modern Authors

Index of Ancient Sources

Other Ancient Literature