

Sex and Gender as Anthropological Categories in the New Testament

William Loader

This paper addresses the broad topic of marriage and related issues under two main perspectives: sexuality and gender, two overlapping but not identical categories. Gender is wider than sexuality. For some gender roles have nothing to do with sexuality, such as in leadership or household management. Similarly, sexuality is wider than gender, at least in the sense that some aspects of sexuality bear no relation to gender roles. At the same time the discourse on sex and gender generally is much wider than what we find in the pages of the New Testament in the first century. For that discourse is at least 2000 years old and includes the wisdom of the fathers and mothers of the church in east and west. But even in the first century the discourse is wider than what is found in the New Testament. Indeed, to understand statements made in the New Testament about sex and gender, one needs to read them in the light of their contemporary social context and the traditions which lie behind them, including especially the traditions of Israel.¹

Gender

Let me begin with what is a common pattern in both Greco-Roman and Jewish society, namely marriage.² Most people were married. Marriages were arranged by fathers between families. They were not private decisions between two individuals, but the establishment of partnerships which affected the welfare of the whole extended family. Normally a man around 30 would marry a woman little more than half his age,³ as soon after a girl began having menstrual periods as possible to avoid unwanted pregnancies. This common pattern underlay some basic assumptions about men and women. Since they were significantly younger than their male spouses, women at marriage were normally less experienced and less mature.⁴

¹ For detailed discussion of issues of gender and sexuality in early Jewish and New Testament writings see the extensive treatments in the following volumes by William Loader: *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees on Sexuality: Attitudes Towards Sexuality in the Early Enoch Literature, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Book of Jubilees* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007); *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Sectarian and Related Literature at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009); *The Pseudepigrapha on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Apocalypses, Testaments, Legends, Wisdom, and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011); *Philo, Josephus, and the Testaments on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in the Writings of Philo, Josephus, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011); *The New Testament on Sexuality* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012); and the summary volume with indices to all of the above: *Making Sense of Sex: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Early Jewish and Christian Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013).

² On the commonality of attitudes towards marriage between Jewish and Greek and Roman societies see the discussion in Susan Treggiari, "Marriage and Family in Roman Society," in *Marriage and Family in the Biblical World* (ed. Ken M. Campbell; Downers Grove: IVP, 2003) 132-82; S. M. Baugh, "Marriage and Family in Ancient Greek Society," in Campbell, *Marriage and Family*, 103-31; Werner Krenkel, *Naturalia non turpia: Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece and Rome: Schriften zur antiken Kultur und Sexualwissenschaft* (ed. Wolfgang Bernard and Christiane Reitz; Spudasmata 113; Hildesheim: Olms, 2006) and Michael L. Satlow, *Jewish Marriage in Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), who writes: "Jewish writers during the Second Temple period had entirely conventional assumptions about the purpose of marriage, assumptions that they shared with much of the Greek and later Roman intelligentsia. The purpose of marriage was to create an *oikos*, through which (1) its members gained identity; (2) a man achieved respectability and 'manhood'; and (3) new members of the state and household were reproduced and raised. Marriage was by no means an end in itself, but carried social expectations, obligations, and privileges" (20).

³ Philo, for instance, approves the recommendation attributed to Solon that men should enter marriage when they in the range of 29-35 years of age (Opif. 103, 104).

⁴ Plutarch's advice on marriage suggests that husbands should treat their wives as both lovers and as daughters to be educated (Conj. Praec. 48).

This inequality at marriage need not have led to the conclusion that men and women are unequal by nature, but it frequently did, a fateful fallacy of male logic. Accordingly, the inferior status of women also received ideological underpinning. In his *Timaeus*, Plato, for instance, depicts the female as a lower form of life, brought about as a result of failed males (90E-91A). Indeed, he develops a theory of devolution which links moral failure to the generation of every lower forms of life, down to the worms which hug the ground (91E-92).⁵

Notions of women's inferiority need not, therefore, have arisen because of misogyny. It was simply assumed as a fact that women were a secondary creation in sequence and status. Jews, including those who emerged from the Jesus movement, could find warrant for this in their reading of the creation stories, especially in the LXX. For unlike the Hebrew, the LXX makes a closer connection between the creation of woman in 2:18 and the creation of man in 1:26 by using "Let us make" (ἑτοιμήσωμεν) in both, instead of "Let us make" (ἑποίησα) in 1:26 and "I shall make" (ἐποίησα) in 2:18. The LXX of 2:20 also refers to the woman being made in the likeness of the man (ἰσμοίος αὐτῷ), unlike the Hebrew creating an echo of his being made in the likeness of God (καθ' ὁμοίωσιν, 1:26). In addition, the LXX translators had to cope with the problem of translating the Hebrew word pun *adam* (אָדָם), which they began by translating with ἄνθρωπον, but then moved to treat it as a male name, Adam. This all produced the possibility of reading a hierarchy of being especially into the LXX version of the story. Philo reads it in this way,⁶ as does Paul, when he depicts men as made in the image of God and women in the image of men (ἡ ἀνὴρ μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ὀφείλει κατακαλύπτεσθαι τὴν κεφαλὴν εἰκῶν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ ὑπάρχων ἡ γυνὴ δὲ δόξα ἀνδρός ἐστίν. 1 Cor 11:7; similarly, 11:3).

The predominance of masculine language in referring to God is no surprise in the light of the world of the time, with only the occasional female images being applied as similes. At the same time Jewish tradition did come to embrace the feminine as part of God by personifying God's wisdom to a degree that Sophia/Wisdom and its descent (Prov 8:22; Sirach 24; Wisd 7; 1 Enoch 42) became a favoured source for christological reflection (e.g. Col 1:15-18). Authors such as the fourth evangelist and his tradition adopted the male Logos adaptation of the speculation (as present in Philo) to depict the incarnation (John 1:1-18) in the person of the male Jesus, who is now depicted as offering what previously were the gifts of Wisdom/Torah: water and bread, light and life.

Woman in Jewish tradition is not as in Plato the product of failure, but the product of God's care and concern, who secondarily creates woman to be a companion for the man (Gen 2:18-22). Despite the underlying assumptions of women being secondary in sequence and status, the biblical tradition rooted in Genesis sees both men and women as God's creation and as good. The extraction of woman from the man reflects not failure, but love and so provides an aetiology of sexual desire, to be re-joined to become one flesh (Gen 2:24), as something overall positive.⁷ This is in contrast to the theory expounded by Aristophanes in Plato's *Symposium* according to which originally male, female and bisexual human beings were cut in half by Zeus as punishment for their insolence, resulting in the two halves ever since seeking to re-join: males with females; males with males and females with

⁵ On the potential influence of the *Timaeus* on the LXX translators of Genesis see Martin Rösel, *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung* (BZAW 223; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), 72–87, and the discussion in William Loader, "Sexuality and Ptolemy's Greek Bible: Genesis 1-3 In Translation: '... Things Which They Altered For King Ptolemy' (Genesis Rabbah 8.11)" in *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World* (ed. Paul McKechnie and Philippe Guillaume; Mnemosyne, Supplements; History and Archaeology of Classical Antiquity, 300; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 207-32.

⁶ See the discussion in William Loader, *The Septuagint, Sexuality and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 59-69.

⁷ On the impact of the Edenic model of marriage see René Gehring, *The Biblical "One Flesh" Theology of Marriage as Constituted in Genesis 2:24* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2013).

females, a very different aetiology of heterosexuality and homosexuality and not even affirmed by Plato (*Symposium* 189–193, cited also with strong disapproval by Philo *VitCont* 50-63).

The underlying assumptions about gender, reflecting the common pattern of inequality in marriage and reinforced by ideology, played themselves out in the ways in which women's and men's roles were understood in society and the household. To begin with the obvious, only women give birth to children. Without adequate means of contraception young married women were frequently pregnant and a number would not have survived difficult childbirth, estimated to be half of them before the age of forty,⁸ and those, for instance, who had two children would on average have given birth five times.⁹ Their roles included managing the household, which, if financially possible, would include management of slaves and involvement in craft and agriculture. In that sense women worked in the household, somewhat in contrast to what evolved as a result of the industrial revolution in the modern west, where men often became the sole bread winners and women were meant to stay home, have babies, cook, wash the clothes, and keep the house clean and tidy.

In the ancient world women managed the work within the household while men managed relations beyond the household, such as relating to other families to arrange suitable marriages, handling relations with landlords and patrons, and engaging with the wider community and its issues. The man assumes leadership and responsibility for the household and its survival. Frequently survival meant ensuring lands held by the extended family remained in their possession. This accounts for some of the focus on endogamous marriage, marriage within the extended family, even when some of the extended family may live elsewhere. We see this norm reflected in the patriarchal marriages but also in the tale of Tobias and Sarah in the Book of Tobit.

Survival depended not only on effective partnership in marriage for managing the household, but also progeny, especially male progeny for the household's future leadership but also generally to ensure those who grow old would have a younger generation to support them. The household was the source not only of food but also of health and welfare support.

Early Christian insistence on not intermarrying with unbelievers might also be seen as an expansion of household concerns to the fictive household of the family of believers, but this concern also reflects a frequently expressed broader Jewish concern with the holiness of the holy people and the dangers which mixed marriage might bring, especially of idolatry and sexual wrongdoing.¹⁰ Compared with Jewish sources, we find only a few expressions of this concern, primarily in Paul (*1 Cor* 7:39; *2 Cor* 6:14 – 7:1), who understands the household of the faithful as a holy temple (*1 Cor* 6:19-20; *2 Cor* 6:16-18), and its holiness as able even to sanctify the offspring of believers (*1 Cor* 7:14).¹¹

⁸ M. I. Finley, "The Silent Women of Rome," in *Sexuality and Gender in the Classical World* (ed. Laura K. McClure; Oxford: Blackwell, 2002) 146-60, 153.

⁹ Ross S. Kraemer, "Typical and Atypical Family Dynamics: the Cases of Babatha and Berenice," in *Early Christian Families in Context: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue* (ed. David L. Balch and Carolyn Osiek; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003) 130-56, 141; Carolyn Osiek and David L. Balch, *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 67.

¹⁰ On the difference in emphasis between concerns about intermarriage in Judaism and those within the emerging Jesus movement see the discussion in William Loader, "The Intermarriage Issue in Early Jewish Theologies and the New Testament" (forthcoming).

¹¹ On this see the discussion in Loader, *New Testament on Sexuality*, 200-204.

The common pattern of house churches in the emerging Christian movement would have intersected with the common household patterns. The woman would have managed at least the infrastructure for the gatherings, a not insignificant role, perhaps explaining why in some instances the local congregation is named as hers as in 2 John. The norms of discourse in meetings also reflect the common assumptions about men and women. Men speak in public discourse. Women remain silent. Paul's advice accordingly in 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 should not surprise us. It is what one would expect.¹² Martha whose manner of exercise of her gendered role as hostess was deemed distracting (Luke 10:38-42) would like her sister Mary have been welcome to sit and listen to Jesus with the disciples, but, one may assume, with her and other women to remain a passive listener.

We see this later spelled out with ideological underpinning in 1 Timothy where in Paul's name the author not only enjoins that women dress modestly as women (as in 1 Pet 3:3-4), do good works (a common ideal present also in Luke-Acts),¹³ "learn in silence with full submission", but also that they not be permitted "to teach or to have authority over a man", but to "keep silent". He also cites the story of creation and the fall in Genesis in support: "For Adam was formed first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor" (1 Tim 2:8-15).¹⁴ When the author then cites Gen 3:16 about childbearing (2:15), the implication is that this is what justifies her existence and keeps her secure, saves her.¹⁵ In the Pastoral epistles as in Luke-Acts we see the traditional understanding of women's roles in society reflected, largely as domestic, though allowed to sit and listen and not just serve, and sometimes to function publicly as the voice of the soul, such as in Luke's image of women wailing like a Greek chorus as Jesus journeys to his fate (23:27).

Paul, however, also provides evidence of exceptions, when he speaks of some women who were inspired to speak as prophets (1 Cor 11:2-16).¹⁶ The exceptions prove the rule. As in Jewish society and tradition generally, there were exceptional circumstances where women might assume leadership. The legend of Judith illustrates this, although she afterwards returns to her estate, but she was managing it all as a widow. Queen Salome Alexandra, whom the tale may well have been used to support,¹⁷ is another example. Women could also be prophets, attested in the Testament of Job 46 – 51 and in Luke 2:36 (Anna) and Acts 21:9 (cf. also the alleged Sibyl as author). It should not surprise us then that some women assumed leadership roles in the early Christian movement, as reflected, for instance, in Romans 16, where we read of Prisca, Mary, Junia ("prominent among the apostles" 16:7), and Tryphaena and Tryphosa (16:3-12), as Paul's fellow workers in mission.

When Paul affirmed that in Christ "there is no longer Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free, there is no longer male and female; for all of you are one in Christ Jesus" (Gal 3:28; cf. Col 3:9-11), he

¹² See Loader, *New Testament on Sexuality*, 383-89.

¹³ On this see Turid Karlsen Seim, *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke-Acts* (London: T&T Clark, 2004).

¹⁴ Loader, *New Testament on Sexuality*, 417-22.

¹⁵ Loader, *New Testament on Sexuality*, 422-24.

¹⁶ Loader, *New Testament on Sexuality*, 368-83.

¹⁷ Tal Ilan, "'And Who Knows Whether You have not Come for a Time Like this?' (Esther 4:14): Esther, Judith and Susanna as Propaganda for Shulamzion's Queenship" in Tal Ilan, *Integrating Women into Second Temple History* (TSAJ 76; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 127-53; Philip Francis Esler, "Ludic History in the Book of Judith: The Reinvention of Israelite Identity?" *BibInt* 10 (2002) 107-43, 121; Clanton, Jr., Dan W. "(Re)Dating the Story of Susanna: A Proposal," *JSJ* 34 (2003) 121-40, 135-40. While Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, *Einführung zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit: Historische und legendarische Erzählungen* (SHRZ 6.1.1; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2000), notes that 2:28 must reflect a time before the annexation of the coastlands during the time of Alexander Jannaeus (103 – 76 B.C.E) and that 4:6-8 appears to reflect the political structures of the later Hasmoneans, thus suggesting composition of Judith during the time of John Hyrcanus (142-104 B.C.E.) (85), the work may have later been used to support and celebrate Salome's elevation, though not itself composed with that in mind.

was affirming the value of each, not denying the distinctions nor the nature of each. Jews remain Jews and Greeks, Greeks, and, indeed, slaves remain slaves, and free, free.¹⁸ Males certainly remain males and females, females. Paul's elaboration on slaves in 1 Corinthians 7:17-24 certainly shows that he is not advocating denial and in 1 Corinthians 11 he makes it very clear that the customary difference relating to hair and headware between men and women is to be upheld, while at the same time affirming the value of both, to the extent of his slight humour in telling men that while woman came from man all of them as men came from women (17:12). He does not advocate an eschatology, let alone, a realised eschatology that would see women made into men, such as we find in the last saying in the Gospel of Thomas, promising that Mary will be made male (14).

If women were to be with men, there needed to be control. Sometimes this was done by separating them, as is well reflected in the tale of Antipas' birthday party where the women are clearly located in a room apart from the men (Mark 6:24). The disciples' worry that Jesus was sitting by a well talking with a woman (John 4:27) would not have been heard as in any way abnormal. Similarly, their discomfit at a woman coming to anoint him (Mark 14:3-9; Matt 26:6-13; John 12:1-8; Luke 7:36-50), however they explained it, reflects the same.

Arguably Jesus' insistence on men taking responsibility for their sexual responses in the Sermon on the Mount (5:27-30), if derived from Jesus, himself, reflects a stance which would have challenged notions that women were dangerous or to be avoided, thus making it easier for them to be disciples alongside male disciples and even be part of the itinerant group. There would have been issues of purity as women had their monthly menstrual cycle or irregular flows of blood, such as with the woman who touched Jesus (Mark 5:25-34), but nothing indicates that this overrode the possibility of women being part of the discipleship group.

The common social pattern of gender roles is also reflected in Jesus' symbolic choice of 12 males to be heads of the 12 tribes of Israel (Mark 3:14-19; Matt 19:28; Luke 22:28-30). But Jesus also made heroes of the marginalised, from the Samaritan in the parable (Luke 10:30-36), to the poor widow and her generosity (Mark 12:41-44). This perspective of elevating the marginal is also evident in the inclusion of certain women in Matthew's genealogy,¹⁹ and the role of women in the resurrection stories. The men run away. The women remain.

Jesus' advocated greatness in terms of lowly service (Mark 8:27-37; 9:30-37; 10:41-45), modelled most dramatically in his own life, and recognised in the accounts of the passion which depict him as truly a different kind of king, one crowned with thorns and enthroned on a cross. This confronted the male hearers of this predominantly male discourse, represented by the male disciples depicted as persistently slow learners, because it subverted traditionally male values, which were even more to the forefront in Rome's ideology of masculinity. Jesus' call of some to itinerancy also symbolised a rejection of what was a male system of patronage and control. Paul, in part out of his own weakness, perpetuates this subversion, defiantly asserting the wisdom of the cross's foolishness and boasting of it (1 Cor 1:18-25; 2 Cor 12:6-10).

¹⁸ Loader, *New Testament on Sexuality*, 389-96. See also the recent discussion in Adela Yarbro Collins, "No Longer 'Male and Female' (Gal 3:28). Ethics and an early Christian baptismal Formula," *Journal of Ethics in Antiquity and Christianity* 1 (2019) DOI: 10.25784/jeac.v1i0.98, who discusses both the text and its interpretation in subsequent literature.

¹⁹ See the discussion of options in William Loader, "What light does Matthew's use of Mark in Matthew 1-4 throw on Matthew's theological location?" *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 72(4), a3284. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v72i4.3284>.

Movements of resistance against the socially powerful often galvanise the disadvantaged into a solidarity where hierarchies have little place. That dynamic push towards valuing all reached at least as far as asserting the value of all, including foreigners, women, children, and slaves, even though later the desire to project respectability with wider society led to adaptation of household codes which kept the structures of authority in place: the man, the head of the household, the wife as submissive, the children and slaves as obedient (Col 3:18 – 4:1; Eph 5:21 – 6:9; cf. also Tit 2:2-5; 1 Pet 3:1-7).²⁰

That valuing remained alive and would have the potential one day to overturn the ancient structures of household and leadership when the underlying assumptions about the nature of man and woman were exposed as a male fallacy. But that underlying male fallacy seems so often intransigent and theologies which deem Easter a reversal rather than an affirmation of divine lowliness and as rehabilitation of male might and power as the key attribute of greatness in God, in Jesus, and among men, keep winning the day.

Sexuality

Sexuality takes us in many respects beyond gender roles though at many points they intersect. Most Jewish writings which imagine the eschaton see it as a time of abundance and fertility, including abundance of progeny and absence of miscarriages among humans and animals.²¹ There are some exceptions and these appear to be where the age to come is understood as holy time and space, so that rules for the sanctity of the temple apply. That means no sexual relations. This appears sometimes to be combined with an understanding of a transformed embodiment where such desires no longer play a role. Jubilees, which depicts the garden of Eden as a sanctuary and so has Adam and Eve refrain from intercourse during their time there till after their expulsion (Jub 2:6; 8:19),²² appears to assume a celibate future.

The Jesus movement appears also to have embraced notions of the age to come as entry into holy space. Hence the words attributed to Jesus in Mark 12:25, “When they rise from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like the angels in heaven”. This does not envisage free sexual relations without marriage. It envisages resurrection life as asexual. This probably accounts for the image in Revelation of the 144,000 who were already celibate in this age, who had “not defiled themselves with women” (Rev 14:4), an allusion not to moral but ritual impurity. They enter that holy space first followed by the rest of us (Rev 7:4-10), who from then on would also be celibate. Paul appears to assume the same.²³

It is important to see here that celibacy in these terms is a matter of time and space. Sexual intercourse, indeed any emission of seminal fluid or menstrual flow, brings ritual impurity and has no place in the sanctuary. Some, like the author of the Temple Scroll, extended this further to apply

²⁰ Loader, *New Testament on Sexuality*, 403-17. See also Jayachitra Lalitha, *Re-Reading Household relationships Christologically: Ephesians, Empire and Egalitarianism* (New Delhi: Christian World Imprints, 2017), who notes that “both concepts of mutuality and subordination exist in Eph. 5:21-23 side by side in constant tension” with the “one-flesh” notion playing a subversive role in favour of the former (169).

²¹ On what follows see William Loader, “Sexuality and Eschatology: In Search of a Celibate Utopia in Pseudepigraphic Literature” *JSP* 20 (2014), 43-67.

²² See Loader, *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees on Sexuality*, 275-85.

²³ Loader, *New Testament on Sexuality*, 459-67.

the concept of holy space to the whole of Jerusalem (11Q13/11Q19 45.11-12; CD 12.1b-2a).²⁴ Others imposed it on sacred time, so that Jubilees forbids sexual intercourse on the sabbath (Jub 5:8; and probably also the Damascus Document: 4QD^e/4Q270 2 i.18-19; 4QD^f/4Q271 5 i.1-2). In none of these instances is human sexuality seen as sinful, any more than giving birth would be sinful.

Some also deemed it appropriate to approach God in prayer in a ritually pure state and so, as Paul puts it, for the sake of prayer to agree to abstain from sexual intercourse (1 Cor 7:5). Some felt called to celibacy either for a time or permanently in relation to their special ministry. John the Baptist, Jesus, and Paul saw that as their calling, but the latter two made it very clear that this was a calling for some and not for all (Matt 19:12; 1 Cor 7:7) and made no distinction in terms of value between celibates and non-celibates.

In Matthew, Jesus' response employs the somewhat controversial image of eunuchs (Matt 19:12), often looked upon with disdain, because, while impotent and perhaps because they were so, they were frequently sexually profligate. It was typical of Jesus to identify with the marginalised. Jesus first lists eunuchs who have been so since birth (perhaps born intersex),²⁵ then others made so by castration, and finally, by implication, himself and others who have chosen not to marry for the sake of the kingdom of God. There were, however, some who insisted on celibacy for all, following what seemed to them a reasonable conclusion that they should seek to live now as they would be living in the age to come.

Again, we are in the realm of potentially fallacious reasoning. Paul has, therefore, to counter this when he insists that, while remaining celibate is his preferred option, this was not for everyone and it should not be considered sinful if one chooses to marry (1 Cor 7:1, 8-9, 28, 36). After all, our bodies are God's creation. For all the dangers which strong passions may present, passions in themselves are not evil. They are God's creation. Misdirected and out of control they are a disaster, but not if exercised as God directed.

The notion that sexual desire itself is sinful, let alone its enactment, or must only be for procreation, had its roots among philosophers of the Greco-Roman world, Stoics, and especially Neopythagoreans, not in Jewish tradition.²⁶ Such views would have been known to Paul and were certainly known to Philo, but neither rejects passion altogether,²⁷ as would later occur, where some saw giving way to sexual and other desires as sinful, rendering one sinful or at least as a second rate Christian compared with the only holy way, that of celibacy.

One of the key texts with an influential legacy is Jesus' comment about adultery in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 23:27-30).²⁸ In effect he applies what is traditionally seen as the tenth commandment, against covetous desire, to the adultery commandment, shifting the focus from adulterous act to adulterous intent. πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτήν ἐν τῇ

²⁴ Loader, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 15-17, 166-67.

²⁵ J. David Hester, "Eunuchs and the Postgender Jesus: Matthew 19.12 and Transgressive Sexualities," *JSNT* 28 (2005) 13-40, draws attention to the awareness of the irregularity. To be a eunuch did not imply being homosexual. Eunuchs were seen as impotent males, some of whom were notoriously sexually active and profligate in relation to both females and males.

²⁶ Loader, *New Testament on Sexuality*, 91-97.

²⁷ On Philo, see Loader, *Philo, Josephus and the Testaments*, 84-99. On Paul, Loader, *New Testament on Sexuality*, 220-22.; cf. Dale B. Martin, "Paul Without Passion: on Paul's Rejection of Desire in Sex and Marriage," in Dale B. Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior: Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006) 65-76.

²⁸ See the discussion in Loader, *New Testament on Sexuality*, 109-19.

καρδία αὐτοῦ ἡ:28). Looking at a woman, has to mean looking at another's wife and the preposition πρὸς has to mean purpose, "with a view to", as in 6:1; 23:5, not result, "with the result that". The translation which accuses a man of adultery who looks at any woman with the result that he has a sexual response had two disastrous consequences: it demonised sexual desire and it demonised women, who were seen as endangering men and therefore needing to be controlled and covered up. The shifting of focus from act to attitude is typical of Jesus' teaching elsewhere, such as in his statement that what defiles is what comes out of the mind in Mark 7:22-23.

Jesus' warnings against adultery and sexual abuse are stark: cutting off hands or feet, plucking out eyes ἡ:29-30). Matthew repeats the imagery in his warnings against causing little ones to stumble in Matthew 18:8-9. While now probably envisaging the little ones as believers as, the warning may well originally target paedophilia.²⁹ To stumble occurs often in sexual contexts ἡPs Sol 16:7; Sir 9:5).

Adultery was widely recognised as a threat not only to the marriage but also to the wider household and so widely condemned. Augustus in his *Lex Julia* 18 BCE seeks to reinforce its prohibition by requiring men to divorce adulterous wives and prosecute them or be themselves prosecuted when they did not do so.³⁰ Mandating divorce is also indirectly implied in Deuteronomy 24:1-4 and in stories of extramarital intercourse which rendered a woman unclean and so forbidden to return to sexual relations with her husband. Biblical law made adultery a capital offence ἡLev 20:10; Deut 22:22; Prov 2:16-19; 7:25-27).³¹ When Rome removed that right, what originally in Deuteronomy 24 did not apply to adultery, namely "something objectionable" *'erwath dabar*, עֲוֹנוֹת דָּבָר, came to be expanded to include it.

The understanding of divorce underwent change also because of the gradual rejection of traditional polygyny. The alternative of adding another wife to the one who offended disappeared, leaving divorce as the only option and raising the issue of what were valid grounds for divorce,³² reflected in rabbinic tradition about disputes between the houses of Shammai and Hillel ἡm. *Git.* 9:10), brought as an issue before Jesus ἡMark 10:2-9). In the anecdote his response is clear. He appeals, as did others of the period,³³ to the Genesis texts, in order to argue that divorce was never meant to be. Yoking was never meant to be undone. Only Matthew brings the formulation of Jesus' prohibiting divorce into line with the requirement that adultery mandated divorce ἡMatt 5:32; 19:9), but it is likely to have been assumed already in the sayings which state the prohibition in absolute terms ἡMark 10:10-12; 1 Cor 7: 10-11; Luke 16:18).³⁴

The logic of the mandate of requiring divorce where adultery had taken place rested in part on the assumption that sexual union created a one flesh entity and by implication severs any previous union, as reflected also in the prohibition of women ever coming back to their husbands once they have slept with someone else. This is most dramatically illustrated by Absalom depriving his father of his concubines by sleeping with them ἡ2 Sam 20:3) and Herod's son, Alexander, doing the same with his eunuchs ἡJosephus *A.J.* 16.229-231; *B.J.* 1.488-492).³⁵ Similarly, according to *Jubilees* Jacob never

²⁹ Loader, *New Testament on Sexuality*, 119-27.

³⁰ Treggiari, "Marriage and Family," 167-68; Loader, *New Testament on Sexuality*, 103-104.

³¹ Assumed also in Sir 9:9; Sus 22; Philo *Spec.* 3.11; *Hypoth.* 7:1; Josephus *A.J.* 3.274-275; 7.130-131; *Ap.* 2.215.

³² On this see Loader, *New Testament on Sexuality*, 58-62.

³³ Jub 3:1-7; *A.J.* 1.27-51; 4QInstr^b/4Q416 2 iii.15b-iv.13; Tobit 6:18; 1 Esd 4:20-21, 25; CD 4.20-21; and possibly Mal 2:14-16. See Loader, *New Testament on Sexuality*, 38, 61.

³⁴ William Loader, "Did Adultery Mandate Divorce? A Reassessment of Jesus' Divorce Logia," *NTS* 61 (2015) 67-78.

³⁵ Two early second century marriage contracts ἡ *Mur.* 20 and *P. Yadin* 10 = 5/6Hev 10) actually specify that the husband is to redeem his wife if taken captive. Ze'ev Safrai, "Halakhic Observance in the Judaean Desert Documents," in

touched Bilhah after Reuben forced intercourse on her (Gen 34:20; similarly *T. Reub.* 3:15). Paul uses this imagery to argue that when a believer sleeps with a prostitute he becomes one flesh with her (1 Cor 6:16-17) and so severs his relationship with Christ (1 Cor 6:16-17). That divorce was understood as mandated after adultery also underlies Joseph's initial response to Mary's pregnancy (Matt 1:18-19), who knows he has no choice but to divorce. He showed himself as good by choosing the less painful option of divorcing her privately.

Warnings against prostitutes and "strange women", whether foreigners or not, meet us already in Proverbs³⁶ and are assumed among New Testament writers, putting them somewhat at odds with earlier tradition and with practices in the Greco-Roman world, where, at least for Romans, while sexual relations are forbidden with fellow citizens, they were permitted with lesser mortals like foreigners or slaves or prostitutes. The notion that the male head of the household may sleep not only with his wife but also with its female and male slaves was widely accepted in the Greco-Roman world, as it was at least in relation to female slaves in the world of the patriarchal narratives and beyond. How far this notion persisted in the first century and within the early Christian movement is a matter of debate, not least because it is never addressed.³⁷ Sex with slaves of another man's household, like adultery, was seen as theft.³⁸ Men were not to covet their "neighbour's wife", nor their "house, or field, or male or female slave, or ox, or donkey, or anything that belongs to" their neighbour (Deut 5:21).

The concern with adultery also helps explain the concern that fathers ensure that their daughters are virgins before marriage, since if a daughter had been promiscuous when unmarried there was a chance that she might be so in marriage. Thus, virginity was highly valued and came to symbolise the pure, most notably in celebration of the virginity of Mary at the conception of Jesus. This mystery of faith which celebrates Jesus' unique identity would have been understood then within the framework of ancient understandings of human reproduction. The most common understanding was that the man placed the seed in the woman, as in a field, and that therefore the seed or egg was nurtured and brought to birth by the mother. Another theory was that whether a child was male or female depended on whether the father or the mother produced the greater amount of fluid at intercourse; if the woman the child would be a girl; if the man, a boy. While the former explanation will have informed the early understanding of Jesus' conception, its mystery as miracle is nowadays affirmed independent of such explanations.

There is no indication that Matthew or Luke in affirming Jesus' virginal conception imply that being a virgin gives one superior status to being married, let alone that being married and engaging in sexual intercourse renders one less pure in a moral sense, although Luke appears to reflect a common Roman ideal of the *univira*, that is of a woman having had only one husband and thereafter choosing

Law in the Documents of the Judaean Desert (ed. Ranon Katzoff and David Schaps; JSJSup 96; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 205-36, 217.

³⁶ On this see William Loader, "Proverbs' 'Strange Woman': Image and Reality in LXX Proverbs and Ben Sira, Hebrew and Greek" in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse. 2. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.-27. Juli 2008* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer; WUNT 1.252; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 562-75; and William Loader, "The Strange Woman in Proverbs, LXX Proverbs and *Aseneth*" in *Septuagint and Reception: Essays Prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa* (ed. Johann Cook; SVT 127; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 209-27.

³⁷ On this see Carolyn Osiek, and Margaret Y. MacDonald, *A Woman's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 113; Jennifer A. Glancy, *Slavery in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 59-63.

³⁸ Ben Sira (Hebrew) is exceptional in forbidding also sleeping with one's own slaves (1:22ab ms B), which the Greek corrects to disapproval of sleeping with others' slaves (1:24ab). On this see Ibolya Balla, *Ben Sira on Family, Gender, and Sexuality* (Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 8; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 154-55.

to remain unmarried as a widow, when he depicts Anna the prophetess as a *univira* (2:36-37). Luke may also reflect the view that the sole purpose of sexual intercourse was for having children when he re-edits Jesus' saying in Mark 12:25 about there being no marrying in the age to come by adding the reason that they will be like angels living forever and not need to reproduce (20:34-36; similarly the grounds for condemning the watchers in 1 Enoch 15:5-6, who had no need to procreate). The gospels refer to brothers and sisters of Jesus (Mark 4:31-35; 6:3), suggesting that Mary gave birth to them, at least as the texts would normally have been understood, but later interpreters have also argued that the words might simply mean that they were his cousins, not his siblings.

There were strict laws regarding incest, which sometimes went beyond concern with shared DNA, to include prohibiting marriage, as in the case of Antipas' marriage, to the divorced wife of his stepbrother (Mark 6:17-18). Incest laws were sometimes a matter of debate, especially about whether prohibiting marriage to nephews (Lev 18:14; 20:19) implied also prohibiting marriage to nieces, as Essenes argued,³⁹ an implication rejected by Pharisees who affirmed it as a common and favoured solution within extended families.

Sexual wrongdoing was an important aspect in the way Jews differentiated themselves from their pagan world. Beside opposition to abortion and exposure of infants, one of the common targets was the practice of sexual relations between people of the same sex.⁴⁰ Usually this was depicted as pederasty, often with the young being slaves, forced into service in brothels. Drunken parties were also a common occasion for sexual profligacy which might include both heterosexual and homosexual promiscuity and involve not only minors but also adult males. In Romans 1:24-28 Paul makes such condemnation part of his pitch to win the favour of the Romans churches whom he planned to visit, because he knew that it would win their approval, generally, and possibly also because of the allegations and evidence of sexual depravity in the imperial households of Caligula⁴¹ and Nero.⁴²

Like Philo, Paul sees such behaviour as not only contrary to the prohibitions in Leviticus, which condemn a man's lying with another where his wife would normally lie,⁴³ but also as contrary to nature, which for him as for Philo is defined by the Genesis creation stories, according to which God made human beings male and female (1:27) and not anything else. Philo cites and rejects Aristophanes' aetiology of a natural homosexual desire and we may assume Paul would have done the same (Symp 189-193; Philo *VitCont* 50-63). There are only heterosexual people in their view.⁴⁴

³⁹ 11QT^a/11Q19 66.15-16 (cf. also 66.8b-11); CD 5.7b-11a (similarly 4QD^e/4Q270 2 ii.16; 4QHalakha A/4Q251 17 2, 4-5); see also Jubilees, which prefers to make Sarah Abraham's sister than his niece (Jub. 12:9; cf. Gen 11:29; Josephus *A.J.* 1.151).

⁴⁰ On this see the discussion in Loader, *New Testament on Sexuality*, 22-33, 293-338.

⁴¹ Neil Elliott, *The Arrogance of Nations: Reading Romans in the Shadow of Empire*, Minneapolis 2008, 79-82; see also James V. Brownson, *Bible, Gender, Sexuality: Reframing the Church's Debate on Same-Sex Relationships* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 157.

⁴² Robert Jewett, *Romans* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 171. Swancutt suggests wayward Stoic teachers in Diana M. Swancutt, "'The Disease of Effemination': The Charge of Effeminacy and the Verdict of God (Romans 1:18-2:16)," in *New Testament Masculinities* (ed. Stephen D. Moore and Janice Capel Anderson; SemeiaSt 45; Atlanta: SBL, 2003) 193-234, 205-206; and Diana M. Swancutt, "Sexy Stoics and the Rereading of Romans 1.18-2.16," in *A Feminist Companion to Paul* (ed. Amy-Jill Levine with Marianne Bickerstaff; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 42-73, 43, 70-72.

⁴³ Jan Joosten, "A New Interpretation of Leviticus 18:22 (par. 20:13) and its Ethical Implications," *Journal of Theological Studies*, forthcoming and accessible at <https://oxford.academia.edu/JanJoosten>, proposes a translation: "You shall not lie with a male on the bed of a woman", implying "prohibition of male-male intercourse with a married man".

⁴⁴ Cf. John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1980) 111-14; Walter Wink, "Homosexuality and the Bible," in *Homosexuality and Christian Faith: Questions of Conscience for the Churches* (ed. Walter

In typical fashion Paul goes beyond being concerned with the acts to focus on the attitudes and desires, which he depicts as the result of what we would call psychological damage produced when people have a perverted understanding of God.⁴⁵ So Paul in a few verses speaks of darkened and unfit minds (1:21, 22, 28) producing unfit dishonourable passions, leading to shameful acts, including where they occur between mutual consenting adults (1:27). This cause and effect, root and fruit analysis, makes sense on the basis that Paul assumes that all people are heterosexual and so any orientation otherwise must be a perversion from how God created them. In his argumentation Paul probably also shares the view that not only were such acts dishonourable because they were contrary to how God made people as male and female, but also because they entailed one male partner taking the role of a female, a matter of shame,⁴⁶ as also was a women's taking a male role in a lesbian relationship. Philo makes much of what he sees as the feminisation of men,⁴⁷ but other common arguments he cites do not appear to be reflected in Paul's comments, such as that it would lead to depopulation, that men might run out of semen and that sex must be for procreation.⁴⁸

Not all view Paul's statement in Romans 1:26 about women exchanging natural for unnatural intercourse (ἡ δὲ φύσις ἀλλάξασα τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν εἰς τὴν παρὰ φύσιν) as referring to lesbian relations.⁴⁹ Some suggest it might refer to sex with animals or oral or anal sex, or sex during menstruation (cf. Lev 18:19), or with angels. The fact, however, that Jewish writers came to include lesbianism in the purview of what Leviticus forbade (Philo 190-192; QuGen II 49; Virt 20-21; Her 274) and the way Paul uses "likewise" (ὁμοίως) to go on to write about male same-sex relations in similar terms (ὁμοίως τε καὶ οἱ ἄρσενες ἀφέντες τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν τῆς θηλείας ἐξεκαύθησαν ἐν τῇ ὀρέξει αὐτῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἄρσενες ἐν ἄρσεσιν τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην κατεργαζόμενοι) tips the probability in favour of seeing 1:26 as also addressing same sex relations.⁵⁰

In the interest of seeking to legitimize their affirmation of gay people some in modern times have sought to identify positive references to homosexual people in passages such as those celebrating David's love for Jonathan⁵¹ or depicting Jesus having a beloved disciple or reporting that Jesus healed a centurion's slave who might have been his pederastic pet.⁵² These approaches read more into the text than is evident and are just as much to be challenged as those readings which, by

Wink; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999) 33-49, 34-37, who argue that Paul attacks only heterosexual men, but accepts homosexual men without judgement.

⁴⁵ Paul relates the perversion to people's perverted understanding of God not to the fall of Adam and Eve. Cf. Cf. Richard B. Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics* (San Francisco: HarperOne, 1996), 384, 385, 388; James D. G. Dunn, *Romans* (WBC 38AB; Nashville: Nelson, 1988) 62. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993), writes: "The alleged echoes of the Adam stories in Genesis are simply nonexistent," unlike those to Genesis 1 (274).

⁴⁶ Marilyn B. Skinner, *Sexuality in Greek and Roman Culture* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 212, 249-51; Johannes N. Vorster, "The Making of Male Same-Sex in the Graeco-Roman World and its Implications for the Interpretation of Biblical Discourses," *Scriptura* 93 (2006), 432-54, 449.

⁴⁷ Philo *Abr.* 135; see also *Spec.* 3.37; *Abr.* 136; *Contempl.* 60; *Spec.* 1.325; *Spec.* 2.50. He also condemns those active males who put others in a passive role (*Spec.* 3.37, 39).

⁴⁸ *Spec.* 3.32-33, 39; *Abr.* 135-36; *Contempl.* 62.

⁴⁹ For a detailed discussion of alternative views see William Loader, "Reading Romans 1 on Homosexuality in the Light of Biblical/Jewish and Greco-Roman Perspectives of its Time," *ZNW* 108 (2017) 119-49, 142.

⁵⁰ Bernadette J. Broonen, *Love Between Women: Early Christian Responses to Female Homoeroticism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 299; cf. Roy Bowen Ward, "Why Unnatural? The Tradition behind Romans 1:26-27," *HTR* 90 (1997) 263-84, 277-278.

⁵¹ Loader, *New Testament on Sexuality*, 27-31.

⁵² Loader, *New Testament on Sexuality*, 337-38. See the claims argued in Theodore W. Jennings and Tat-Siong Benny Liew, "Mistaken Identities but Model Faith: rereading the Centurion, the Chap, and the Christ in Matthew 8:5-13," *JBL* 123 (2004) 467-94.

contrast, argue that Paul was attacking only pederasty⁵³ or only such relations in pagan cultic context,⁵⁴ or only where passion is excessive⁵⁵ or only the act and embracing the desire to act, not the orientation.⁵⁶ Reading with respect means hearing the other in their context and not selectively in order to suit our preferences.

Of course, where people conclude that, as in the mammal kingdom, some people are naturally homosexual,⁵⁷ they need to recognise that what Paul writes cannot apply. That is a realisation which has caused necessary debate and discussion about the hermeneutics of engaging tradition where some of its underlying assumptions have come to be questioned, such as we have also needed to do in relation to what we say about women and their leadership and about divorce, to name just two instances.

Indeed, our engagement with these ancient texts on both gender and sexuality calls for integrity in not explaining away what they say and courage to take responsibility for discernment of what abides and what must not.

Words: 5647

Highlighted/omitted: 650+193 = 843

Trimmed length: 4804

⁵³ Cf. Robin Scroggs, *The New Testament and Homosexuality: Contextual Background for Contemporary Debate* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 99-139.

⁵⁴ Cf. Boswell, *Homosexuality* 1980: 108, M. Kuefler, *The Manly Eunuch: Masculinity, Gender Ambiguity, and Christian Ideology in Late Antiquity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001) 255-60; Thomas Hanks, "Romans," in *The Queer Bible Commentary* ed. Deryn Guest, Robert E. Goss, Mona West, and Thomas Bohache; London: SCM, 2006) 582-605, 594. As Jewett, *Romans*, Paul would have certainly been aware of sexual exploitation of slaves (1:81), but this is just part of what Paul is condemning which includes mutual consenting passion and its fulfilment (1:27).

⁵⁵ Cf. Dale B. Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior: Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 51-64, 54, 56; Boswell, *Homosexuality*, 111-12; Brownson, *Sexuality*, 149-78.

⁵⁶ Cf. Robert A. J. Gagnon, "The Bible and Homosexual Practice: Key Issues," and "Response to Dan O. Via," in Dan O. Via, and Robert A. J. Gagnon, *Homosexuality and the Bible: Two Views* (Minneapolis: Fortress) 40-92, 99-105, 81, 92; and Robert A. J. Gagnon, "Notes to Gagnon's Essay in the Gagnon-Via *Two Views* Book," <http://www.robagnon.net/2VOnlineNotes.htm> (accessed Feb 2009) 82, 136.

⁵⁷ In contrast to Plato's claim that there is no such thing among animals (Plato, Leg 836C; cf. also Ps Phoc 191).

Bibliography

- Balla, Ibolya. *Ben Sira on Family, Gender, and Sexuality* (Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 8; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011).
- Baugh, S. M. "Marriage and Family in Ancient Greek Society," in *Marriage and Family in the Biblical World* (ed. Ken M. Campbell; Downers Grove: IVP, 2003), 103-31.
- Boswell, John. *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1980).
- Brooten, Bernadette J. *Love Between Women: Early Christian Responses to Female Homoeroticism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).
- Brownson, James V. *Bible, Gender, Sexuality: Reframing the Church's Debate on Same-Sex Relationships* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013).
- Clanton, Jr., Dan W. "(Re)Dating the Story of Susanna: A Proposal," *JSJ* 34 (2003) 121-40.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. "No Longer 'Male and Female' (Gal 3:28). Ethics and an early Christian baptismal Formula," *Journal of Ethics in Antiquity and Christianity* 1 (2019) DOI: 10.25784/jeac.v1i0.98.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Romans* (WBC 38AB; Nashville: Nelson, 1988).
- Elliott, Neil. *The Arrogance of Nations: Reading Romans in the Shadow of Empire* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008).
- Esler, Philip Francis. "Ludic History in the Book of Judith: The Reinvention of Israelite Identity?" *BibInt* 10 (2002) 107-43.
- Finley, M. I. "The Silent Women of Rome," in *Sexuality and Gender in the Classical World* (ed. Laura K. McClure; Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 146-60.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *Romans* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993).
- Gagnon, Robert A. J. "The Bible and Homosexual Practice: Key Issues," and "Response to Dan O. Via," in Dan O. Via, and Robert A. J. Gagnon, *Homosexuality and the Bible: Two Views* (Minneapolis: Fortress) 40-92, 99-105, and "Notes to Gagnon's Essay in the Gagnon-Via *Two Views* Book," <http://www.robgagnon.net/2VOnlineNotes.htm> (accessed Feb 2009).
- Gehring, René. *The Biblical "One Flesh" Theology of Marriage as Constituted in Genesis 2:24* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2013).
- Glancy, Jennifer A. *Slavery in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006).
- Hanks, Thomas. "Romans," in *The Queer Bible Commentary* (ed. Deryn Guest, Robert E. Goss, Mona West, and Thomas Bohache; London: SCM, 2006), 582-605.
- Hays, Richard B. *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics* (San Francisco: HarperOne, 1996).
- Hester, J. David. "Eunuchs and the Postgender Jesus: Matthew 19.12 and Transgressive Sexualities," *JSNT* 28 (2005) 13-40.
- Ilan, Tal. "'And Who Knows Whether You have not Come for a Time Like this?' (Esther 4:14): Esther, Judith and Susanna as Propaganda for Shelamzion's Queenship" in Tal Ilan, *Integrating Women into Second Temple History* (TSAJ 76; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 127-53.
- Jennings Theodore W. and Tat-Siong Benny Liew, "Mistaken Identities but Model Faith: rereading the Centurion, the Chap, and the Christ in Matthew 8:5-13," *JBL* 123 (2004) 467-94.
- Jewett, Robert. *Romans* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress. 2007), 171.
- Joosten, Jan. "A New Interpretation of Leviticus 18:22 (par. 20:13) and its Ethical Implications," *Journal of Theological Studies*, forthcoming, accessible in pre-published form at <https://oxford.academia.edu/JanJoosten>.

- Kraemer, Ross S. "Typical and Atypical Family Dynamics: the Cases of Babatha and Berenice," in *Early Christian Families in Context: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue* (ed. David L. Balch and Carolyn Osiek; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 130-56.
- Krenkel, Werner. *Naturalia non turpia: Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece and Rome: Schriften zur antiken Kultur und Sexualwissenschaft* (ed. Wolfgang Bernard and Christiane Reitz; Spudasmata 113; Hildesheim: Olms, 2006).
- Kuefler, M. *The Manly Eunuch: Masculinity, Gender Ambiguity, and Christian Ideology in Late Antiquity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001).
- Lalitha, Jayachitra *Re-Reading Household relationships Christologically: Ephesians, Empire and Egalitarianism* (New Delhi: Christian World Imprints, 2017)
- Loader, William. "Did Adultery Mandate Divorce? A Reassessment of Jesus' Divorce Logia," *NTS* 61 (2015) 67-78.
- Loader, William. "Proverbs' 'Strange Woman': Image and Reality in LXX Proverbs and Ben Sira, Hebrew and Greek" in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse. 2. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.-27. Juli 2008* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer; WUNT 1.252; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 562-75.
- Loader, William. "Reading Romans 1 on Homosexuality in the Light of Biblical/Jewish and Greco-Roman Perspectives of its Time," *ZNW* 108 (2017) 119-49.
- Loader, William. "Sexuality and Eschatology: In Search of a Celibate Utopia in Pseudepigraphic Literature," *JSP* 20 (2014) 43-67.
- Loader, William. "Sexuality and Ptolemy's Greek Bible: Genesis 1-3 In Translation: '... Things Which They Altered For King Ptolemy' (Genesis Rabbah 8.11)" in *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World* (ed. Paul McKechnie and Philippe Guillaume; Mnemosyne, Supplements; History and Archaeology of Classical Antiquity, 300; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 207-32.
- Loader, William. "The Intermarriage Issue in Early Jewish Theologies and the New Testament" (forthcoming).
- Loader, William. "The Strange Woman in Proverbs, LXX Proverbs and *Aseneth*" in *Septuagint and Reception: Essays Prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa* (ed. Johann Cook; SVT 127; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 209-27.
- Loader, William. "What light does Matthew's use of Mark in Matthew 1-4 throw on Matthew's theological location?" *HTS Theologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 72(4), a3284. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v72i4.3284>.
- Loader, William. *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees on Sexuality: Attitudes Towards Sexuality in the Early Enoch Literature, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Book of Jubilees* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007).
- Loader, William. *Making Sense of Sex: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Early Jewish and Christian Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013).
- Loader, William. *Philo, Josephus, and the Testaments on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in the Writings of Philo, Josephus, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011).
- Loader, William. *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Sectarian and Related Literature at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009).
- Loader, William. *The New Testament on Sexuality* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012).
- Loader, William. *The Pseudepigrapha on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Apocalypses, Testaments, Legends, Wisdom, and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011).
- Loader, William. *The Septuagint, Sexuality and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004).
- Martin, Dale B. *Sex and the Single Savior: Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006).

- Mittmann-Richert, Ulrike. *Einführung zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit: Historische und legendarische Erzählungen* (SHRZ 6.1.1; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2000).
- Osiek, Carolyn and David L. Balch, *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997).
- Osiek, Carolyn and Margaret Y. MacDonald, *A Woman's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 113.
- Rösel, Martin. *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung* (BZAW 223; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994).
- Safrai, Ze'ev. "Halakhic Observance in the Judaean Desert Documents," in *Law in the Documents of the Judaean Desert* (ed. Ranon Katzoff and David Schaps; JSJSup 96; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 205-36.
- Satlow, Michael L. *Jewish Marriage in Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).
- Scroggs, Robin. *The New Testament and Homosexuality: Contextual Background for Contemporary Debate* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).
- Seim, Turid Karlsen. *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke-Acts* (London: T&T Clark, 2004).
- Skinner, Marilyn B. *Sexuality in Greek and Roman Culture* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005).
- Swancutt, Diana M. "'The Disease of Effemination': The Charge of Effeminacy and the Verdict of God (Romans 1:18-2:16)," in *New Testament Masculinities* (ed. Stephen D. Moore and Janice Capel Anderson; SemeiaSt 45; Atlanta: SBL, 2003) 193-234.
- Swancutt, Diana M. "Sexy Stoics and the Rereading of Romans 1.18–2.16," in *A Feminist Companion to Paul* (ed. Amy-Jill Levine with Marianne Bickerstaff; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 42-73.
- Treggiari, Susan. "Marriage and Family in Roman Society," in *Marriage and Family in the Biblical World* (ed. Ken M. Campbell; Downers Grove: IVP, 2003) 132-82.
- Vorster, Johannes N. "The Making of Male Same-Sex in the Graeco-Roman World and its Implications for the Interpretation of Biblical Discourses," *Scriptura* 93 (2006), 432-54.
- Ward, Roy Bowen, "Why Unnatural? The Tradition behind Romans 1:26-27," *HTR* 90 (1997) 263-84.
- Wink, Walter. "Homosexuality and the Bible," in *Homosexuality and Christian Faith: Questions of Conscience for the Churches* (ed. Walter Wink; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 33-49.